# 2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

# lowa





#### Acknowledgments

#### **STATES**

State education agencies remain our most important partners in this effort, and their gracious cooperation has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Every state formally received a draft of the *Yearbook* in July 2013 for comment and correction; states also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but two states responded to our inquiries. While states do not always agree with our recommendations, their willingness to engage in dialogue and often acknowledge the imperfections of their teacher policies is an important step forward.

#### **FUNDERS**

The primary funders for the 2013 Yearbook were:

Bill and Melinda Gates FoundationCarnegie Corporation of New York

- The Joyce Foundation
- The Walton Family Foundation
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The National Council on Teacher Quality does not accept any direct funding from the federal government.

#### **STAFF**

Sandi Jacobs, *Project Director* Adrienne S. Davis, *Project Assistant* Kathryn M. Doherty, *Special Contributor* Kelli Lakis, *Lead Researcher* Stephanie T. Maltz and Lisa N. Staresina, *Researchers* Phil Lasser, *Research Assistant* 

Special thanks to Leigh Zimnisky, Brittany Atkinson and Justin Rakowski at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2013 *Yearbook*. Thanks also to Colleen Hale and Jeff Hale at EFA Solutions for the original *Yearbook* design and ongoing technical support.

National Council on Teacher Quality

## **Executive Summary**

The 2013 *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* includes the National Council on Teacher Quality's (NCTQ) full review of the state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession. This year's report measures state progress against a set of 31 policy goals focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers.

## Iowa at a Glance



## Overall 2013 Yearbook Grade

Overall 2011 Yearbook Grade: D


| Area Grades                              | 2013 | 2011           |
|--|------|----------------|
| Area 1 Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers | D+   | D              |
| Area 2 Expanding the Teaching Pool       | D+   | D              |
| Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers    | D-   | D-             |
| Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers      | D    | D <sup>1</sup> |
| Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers      | D    | D              |

| 2013 | Progress on Goals                                  |
|------|--|
| 0    | Since 2011   |
| 2    | Progress has increased 7                           |
| 2    | <ul><li>No change in progress</li><li>23</li></ul> |
| 7    |  |
| 6    | Progress has decreased1                            |
| 14   |  |
|      | 0<br>2<br>2<br>7<br>6                              |

<sup>1</sup> State teacher pension policy is no longer included in the State Teacher Policy Yearbook. So that Area 4 grades can be compared, 2011 grades have been recalculated to exclude the pension goals. Overall 2011 grades were not recalculated, as the impact was negligible.

## How is **lowa** Faring?

| Adm                                 | nission into Teacher Preparation   |   | Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science   | $\bigcirc$   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                                     | nentary Teacher Preparation  | $\bigcirc$  | Special Education Teacher Preparation  |  |
|                                     | cher Preparation in Reading Instruction  | $\bigcirc$  | Assessing Professional Knowledge   |  |
|                                     | cher Preparation in Mathematics  |   | Student Teaching   |  |
|                                     | dle School Teacher Preparation   |   | Teacher Preparation Program Accountability   | , <u> </u>   |
| Seco                                | ondary Teacher Preparation   |   |  | $\bigcirc$   |
| Poli                                | cy Strengths   |   |  |  |
| 1                                   | Middle school teachers may not teach on generalist license, and they must appropria single-subject content test.   |   | <ul> <li>The state does not offer a K-12 speci certification.</li> <li>All new teachers are required to pass</li> </ul>  |  |
| Poli                                | icy Weaknesses   |   |  |  |
|                                     | Although teacher candidates are required<br>a test of academic proficiency as a criteric<br>admission to teacher preparation program<br>not normed to the general college-going p  | on for<br>is, the test is   | Although most secondary teachers m<br>content test to teach a core subject a<br>secondary science and social studies<br>required to pass content tests for eac<br>are licensed to teach.   | area, some<br>teachers are no  |
|                                     | Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a content test with individually score   |   | There are no requirements to ensure teachers are placed with cooperating   |  |
|                                     | each of the core content areas, including r  |   | were selected based on evidence of e   |  |
| •                                   |  | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>nowledge of<br>ion programs  |  | ffectiveness.<br>Proval process  |
| Are                                 | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kr<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat   | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>lowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.  | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app<br/>does not hold programs accountable<br/>the teachers they produce.</li> </ul>  | ffectiveness.<br>Proval process  |
|                                     | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kr<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat<br>are not required to address this critical top<br>ea 2: Expanding the Pool of   | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>lowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.  | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app does not hold programs accountable the teachers they produce.</li> </ul>  | ffectiveness.<br>proval process<br>for the quality   |
| Alte                                | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kr<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat<br>are not required to address this critical top<br>ea 2: Expanding the Pool c  | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>lowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.  | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app does not hold programs accountable the teachers they produce.</li> </ul> ers Part-Time Teaching Licenses  | ffectiveness.<br>proval process<br>for the quality   |
| Alte<br>Alte                        | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kr<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat<br>are not required to address this critical top<br>ea 2: Expanding the Pool of   | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>lowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.  | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app does not hold programs accountable the teachers they produce.</li> </ul>  | ffectiveness.<br>proval process<br>for the quality   |
| Alte<br>Alte<br>Alte                | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kn<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat<br>are not required to address this critical top<br>ea 2: Expanding the Pool c<br>ernate Route Eligibility<br>ernate Route Preparation  | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>lowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.  | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app does not hold programs accountable the teachers they produce.</li> <li>ers</li> <li>Part-Time Teaching Licenses</li> <li>Licensure Reciprocity</li> </ul>   | ffectiveness.<br>proval process<br>for the quality<br>Page 51  |
| Alte<br>Alte<br>Alte<br><b>Poli</b> | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kn<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat<br>are not required to address this critical top<br>ea 2: Expanding the Pool c<br>ernate Route Eligibility<br>ernate Route Preparation<br>ernate Route Usage and Providers  | mathematics.<br>quired to<br>nowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.  | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app does not hold programs accountable the teachers they produce.</li> <li>ers</li> <li>Part-Time Teaching Licenses</li> <li>Licensure Reciprocity</li> <li>The state does not offer a license with requirements that would allow conter</li> </ul> | Affectiveness.<br>proval process<br>for the quality<br>Page 51<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()<br>()   |
| Alte<br>Alte<br>Alte<br><b>Poli</b> | each of the core content areas, including r<br>Elementary teacher candidates are not rec<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure kr<br>effective reading instruction, and preparat<br>are not required to address this critical top<br>ea 2: Expanding the Pool of<br>ernate Route Eligibility<br>ernate Route Preparation<br>ernate Route Usage and Providers<br>icy Weaknesses<br>Admission requirements for the alternate | nathematics.<br>quired to<br>nowledge of<br>ion programs<br>bic.<br><b>Of Teach</b><br><b>Of Teach</b><br>route are | <ul> <li>were selected based on evidence of e</li> <li>The teacher preparation program app does not hold programs accountable the teachers they produce.</li> <li>ers</li> <li>Part-Time Teaching Licenses</li> <li>Licensure Reciprocity</li> <li>The state does not offer a license with</li> </ul>                                      | Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness.<br>Affectiveness. |



| Figure A                      | Overall <sub>State</sub><br>Grade 2013 | Overall <sub>State</sub><br>Grade 2017 | Overall State<br>Grade 2009 |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Florida                       | B+                                     | В                                      | С                           |
| Louisiana                     | в                                      | C-                                     | C-                          |
| Rhode Island                  | В                                      | B-                                     | D                           |
| Tennessee                     | В                                      | B-                                     | C-                          |
| Arkansas                      | B-                                     | C                                      | C-                          |
| Connecticut                   | B-                                     | C-                                     | D+                          |
| Georgia                       | B-                                     | C                                      | C-                          |
| Indiana                       | B-                                     | C+                                     | D                           |
| Massachusetts                 | B-                                     | C                                      | D+                          |
| Michigan                      | B-                                     | C+                                     | D-                          |
| New Jersey                    | B-                                     | D+                                     | D+                          |
| New York                      | B-                                     | C                                      | D+                          |
| Ohio                          | B-                                     | C+                                     | D+                          |
| Oklahoma                      | B-                                     | B-                                     | D+                          |
| Colorado                      | C+                                     | C                                      | D+                          |
| Delaware                      | C+                                     | C                                      | D                           |
| Illinois                      | C+                                     | C                                      | D+                          |
|                               | C+<br>C+                               | D+                                     | D+                          |
| Virginia                      | C+                                     |  |                             |
| Kentucky                      | c                                      | D+<br>D+                               | D+<br>D+                    |
| Mississippi<br>North Carolina | c                                      | D+                                     |                             |
|                               |  |  | D+                          |
| Utah                          | C                                      | C-                                     | D                           |
| Alabama                       | C-                                     | C-                                     | C-                          |
| Arizona                       | C-                                     | D+                                     | D+                          |
| Maine                         | C-                                     | D-                                     | F                           |
| Minnesota                     | C-                                     | C-                                     | D-                          |
| Missouri                      | C-                                     | D                                      | D                           |
| Nevada                        | C-                                     | C-                                     | D-                          |
| Pennsylvania                  | C-                                     | D+                                     | D                           |
| South Carolina                | C-                                     | C-                                     | C-                          |
| Texas                         | C-                                     | C-                                     | C-                          |
| Washington                    | C-                                     | C-                                     | D+                          |
| West Virginia                 | C-                                     | D+                                     | D+                          |
| California                    | D+                                     | D+                                     | D+                          |
| District of Columbia          | D+                                     | D                                      | D-                          |
| Hawaii                        | D+                                     | D-                                     | D-                          |
| Idaho                         | D+                                     | D+                                     | D-                          |
| Maryland                      | D+                                     | D+                                     | D                           |
| New Mexico                    | D+                                     | D+                                     | D+                          |
| Wisconsin                     | D+                                     | D                                      | D                           |
| Alaska                        | D                                      | D                                      | D                           |
| IOWA                          | D                                      | D                                      | D                           |
| Kansas                        | D                                      | D                                      | D-                          |
| New Hampshire                 | D                                      | D-                                     | D-                          |
| North Dakota                  | D                                      | D                                      | D-                          |
| Oregon                        | D                                      | D-                                     | D-                          |
| Wyoming                       | D                                      | D                                      | D-                          |
| Nebraska                      | D-                                     | D-                                     | D-                          |
| South Dakota                  | D-                                     | D                                      | D                           |
| Vermont                       | D-                                     | D-                                     | F                           |
| Montana                       | F                                      | F                                      | F                           |

## How to Read the Yearbook

#### **GOAL SCORE**

The extent to which each goal has been met:

| *          | Best Practice           |
|------------|-------------------------|
|            | Fully Meets             |
|            | Nearly Meets            |
|            | Partially Meets         |
|            | Meets Only a Small Part |
| $\bigcirc$ | Does Not Meet           |

#### **PROGRESS INDICATOR**


Whether the state has advanced on the goal, policy has remained unchanged or the state has lost ground on that topic:

| $\mathbf{O}$ | Goal progress has increased since 2011         |
|--------------|--|
| $\bigcirc$   | Goal progress has decreased since 2011         |
| Ð            | Goal progress has remained the same since 2011 |

BAR RAISED FOR THIS GOAL Indicates the criteria to meet the goal have been raised since the 2011 Yearbook.

#### **READING CHARTS AND TABLES:**

Strong practices or the ideal policy positions for the states are capitalized:






## Area 1 Summary

## How States are Faring on Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

State Area Grades



### **Topics Included In This Area**

- 1-A: Admission into Teacher Preparation
- **1-B:** Elementary Teacher Preparation
- 1-C: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction
- 1-D: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics
- 1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation

- 1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation
- 1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science
- 1-H: Special Education Teacher Preparation
- 1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge
- 1-J: Student Teaching
- 1-K: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

## Goal A – Admission into Teacher Preparation

The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong academic records.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. All preparation programs in a state should use a common admissions test to facilitate program comparison, and the test should allow comparison of applicants to the general college-going population. The selection of applicants should be limited to the top half of that population.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 1 How States are Faring in Admission Requirements Best Practice States 2 Delaware<sup>1</sup>, Rhode Island<sup>1</sup> State Meets Goal Texas States Nearly Meet Goal Mississippi<sup>1</sup>, New Jersey<sup>1</sup>, Utah<sup>1</sup> 11 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky 1, North Carolina, South Carolina 1, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin 13 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama<sup>1</sup>, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois<sup>1</sup>, IOWA, Louisiana, Michigan<sup>1</sup>, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire 1, Oklahoma 1, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania 21 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 12:12 ⇔:38 1:1

## 1-A Analysis: **lowa**

State Meets Small Part of Goal 🛛 🔿 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 ۻ Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

lowa requires that approved undergraduate teacher preparation programs only accept teacher candidates who have passed a basic skills test. The test is normed just to the prospective teacher population. lowa does not allow teacher preparation programs to exempt candidates who demonstrate equivalent performance on a college entrance exam.

Supporting Research Iowa Code Title VII Chapter 256.16

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Require preparation programs to use a common test normed to the general college-bound population.

Iowa should require an assessment that demonstrates that candidates are academically competitive with all peers, regardless of their intended profession. Requiring a common test normed to the general college population would allow for the selection of applicants in the top half of their class, as well as facilitate program comparison. Iowa's policy is especially weak because the state allows individual teacher preparation programs to set their own passing scores.

#### Exempt candidates with comparable SAT or ACT scores.

Iowa should waive its current basic skills test requirement for candidates whose SAT or ACT scores demonstrate that they are in the top half of their class.

#### Consider requiring candidates to pass subject-matter tests as a condition of admission into teacher programs.

In addition to ensuring that programs require a measure of academic performance for admission, lowa might also want to consider requiring content testing prior to program admission as opposed to at the point of program completion. Program candidates are likely to have completed coursework that covers related test content in the prerequisite classes required for program admission. Thus, it would be sensible to have candidates take content tests while this knowledge is fresh rather than wait two years to fulfill the requirement, and candidates lacking sufficient expertise would be able to remedy deficits prior to entering formal preparation.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**


Iowa was helpful in providing facts that enhanced this analysis.

#### **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**

For admission to teacher preparation programs, **Rhode Island** and **Delaware** require a test of academic proficiency normed to the general collegebound population rather than a test that is normed just to prospective teachers. Delaware also requires teacher candidates to have a 3.0 GPA or be in the top 50th percentile for general education coursework completed. Rhode Island also requires an average cohort GPA of 3.0, and beginning in 2016, the cohort mean score on nationally-normed tests such as the ACT, SAT or GRE must be in the top 50th percentile. In 2020, the requirement for the mean test score will increase from the top half to the top third.

#### Figure 2

Do states require an assessment of academic proficiency that is normed to the general college-going population?




1. Strong Practice: Delaware, Rhode Island, Texas

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Wyoming

#### Figure 3

When do states test teacher candidates' academic proficiency?




- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- Alaska, California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Vermont

3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Wyoming

| Figure 4                |            | Test normed to teacher<br>and the processing of the |               | No test required |
|-------------------------|------------|---|---------------|------------------|
| Do states measure the   | č          |   |               | or afte          |
| Do states measure the   | C<br>Q     | teact   | efore<br>Drog | program in the   |
| academic proficiency of | MED .      |   | Drep 1        | Prep<br>Prep     |
| teacher candidates?     | 10 A A     | ON jorm   | orme<br>brime | ion of           |
| ,                       | LEST<br>MC | Test ,<br>Test ,<br>Tissi   | Test r        | No test required |
|                         | , a Q      | 10 m  | 8 8           | / ~              |
| Alabama                 |            |   |               |                  |
| Alaska                  |            |   |               |                  |
| Arizona                 |            |   |               |                  |
| Arkansas                |            |   |               |                  |
| California              |            |   |               |                  |
| Colorado                |            |   |               |                  |
| Connecticut<br>Delaware |            |   |               |                  |
| District of Columbia    |            |   |               |                  |
| Florida                 |            |   |               |                  |
| Georgia                 |            |   |               |                  |
| Hawaii                  |            |   |               |                  |
| Idaho                   |            |   |               |                  |
| Illinois                |            |   |               |                  |
| Indiana                 |            |   |               |                  |
| IOWA                    |            |   |               |                  |
| Kansas                  |            |   |               |                  |
| Kentucky                |            |   |               |                  |
| Louisiana               |            |   |               |                  |
| Maine                   |            |   |               |                  |
| Maryland                |            |   |               |                  |
| Massachusetts           |            |   |               |                  |
| Michigan                |            |   |               |                  |
| Minnesota               |            |   |               |                  |
| Mississippi<br>Missouri |            |   |               |                  |
| Montana                 |            |   |               |                  |
| Nebraska                |            |   |               |                  |
| Nevada                  |            |   |               |                  |
| New Hampshire           |            |   |               |                  |
| New Jersey              |            |   |               |                  |
| New Mexico              |            |   |               |                  |
| New York                |            |   |               |                  |
| North Carolina          |            |   |               |                  |
| North Dakota            |            |   |               |                  |
| Ohio                    |            |   |               |                  |
| Oklahoma                |            | 1   |               |                  |
| Oregon                  |            |   |               |                  |
| Pennsylvania            |            |   |               |                  |
| Rhode Island            |            |   |               |                  |
| South Carolina          |            |   |               |                  |
| South Dakota            |            |   |               |                  |
| Tennessee               |            |   |               |                  |
| Texas<br>Utah           |            |   |               |                  |
| Vermont                 |            |   |               |                  |
| Virginia                |            |   |               |                  |
| Washington              |            |   |               |                  |
| West Virginia           |            |   |               |                  |
| Wisconsin               |            |   |               |                  |
| Wyoming                 |            |   |               |                  |
|                         | 3          | 26  | 14            | 8                |
|                         | 5          | 20  | 14            | 0                |

1. Candidates in Oklahoma also have the option of gaining admission with a 3.0 GPA.

Do states require a minimum GPA for admission to teacher prep?



1. Strong Practice: Delaware, Mississippi<sup>6</sup>, New Jersey<sup>6</sup>, Oklahoma<sup>7</sup>, Pennsylvania<sup>8</sup>, Rhode Island<sup>6</sup>, Utah

3. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut<sup>9</sup>, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin<sup>10</sup>

4. Louisiana

- 5. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 6. The 3.0 GPA requirement is a cohort average; individual candidates must have a 2.75 GPA.
- 7. Candidates in Oklahoma also have the option of gaining admission by passing a basic skills test.
- 8. Students can also be admitted with a combination of a 2.8 GPA and qualifying scores on the basic skills test or SAT/ACT.

9. Connecticut requires a B- grade point average for all undergraduate courses.

10. The GPA admission requirement is 2.5 for undergraduate and 2.75 for graduate programs.

<sup>2.</sup> Kentucky, Texas

## Goal B – Elementary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, providing the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core or similar state standards.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require all elementary teacher candidates, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all core subjects.
- 2. The state should require that its approved teacher preparation programs deliver a comprehensive program of study in broad liberal arts coursework. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours to ensure appropriate depth in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts. (*Mathematics preparation for elementary teachers is discussed in Goal 1-D.*)
- 3. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to complete a content specialization in an academic subject area. In addition to enhancing content knowledge, this requirement ensures that prospective teachers have taken higher level academic coursework.



The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 6

*How States are Faring in Elementary Teacher Preparation* 



 Best Practice State Indiana
 States Meet Goal

- States Meet Goal Connecticut<sup>1</sup>, New Hampshire<sup>1</sup>
- 11 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama 1, Arkansas 1, District of Columbia 1, Florida 1, Idaho 1, Kentucky 1, New Jersey 1, Rhode Island 1, Texas 1, Utah 1, Virginia 1
- 14 States Partly Meet Goal California, Delaware 1, Georgia, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York 1, North Carolina 1, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania 1, South Carolina 1, Vermont 1, West Virginia 1

5

- States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona ↑, Colorado, Mississippi, New Mexico, Washington
- 18 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Illinois, IOWA, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio<sup>1</sup>, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:24 ↔:27 ↓:0

## 1-B Analysis: Iowa

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 🔿 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛞 Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

lowa has adopted the Common Core State Standards, which represent an effort to significantly raise the standards for the knowledge and skills American students will need for college readiness and global competitiveness. However, the state does not ensure that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach the rigorous content associated with these standards.

lowa requires candidates to pass the Praxis II general elementary content test, which does not report teacher performance in each subject area, meaning that it is possible to pass the test and still fail some subject areas, especially given the state's low passing score for the test. Further, based on available information on the Praxis II, there is no reason to expect that the current version required by lowa would be well aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

In addition, Iowa only requires its early childhood education teacher candidates with the combined special education endorsement, who are allowed to teach general or special education up through grade 3, to pass the Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education test, which is not a content test.

Candidates must also complete a "field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal interdisciplinary program" consisting of at least 12 semester hours.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirement www.ets.org Iowa Administrative Code 282-13.26(5) and 281-79.15(7)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Require all elementary teacher candidates—including candidates for an early childhood license—to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all subjects.

Iowa should require both a rigorous content test as a condition of certification and separate, meaningful passing scores for each area on the test. Use of a composite passing score offers no assurance of adequate knowledge in each subject area. A candidate may achieve a passing score and still be seriously deficient in a particular subject area.

Iowa is urged to require all early childhood education teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass an appropriate test, either the same test as other elementary teachers or a comparably rigorous one geared to early childhood content. It is especially worrisome that the state allows teachers up through grade 3 to teach without ever having passed a content test.

#### Ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver a comprehensive program of study in broad liberal arts coursework.

Iowa should establish more comprehensive coursework requirements for elementary teacher candidates that align with the Common Core State Standards to ensure that candidates will complete coursework relevant to the common topics in elementary grades. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts.

As of September 1, 2015, elementary teacher candidates will have to complete the following content coursework:

- 9 semester hours in literacy, including content in children's literacy, and oral and written skills for the 21st century;
- 9 semester hours in social sciences, including content in history, geography, political science/ civic literacy, economics and behavioral sciences; and
- 9 semester hours in science, including content in physical science, earth/space science and life science.

Although these new coursework requirements address some important subject areas, they should be more specific to guarantee that the courses used to meet them will be relevant to the topics taught in the elementary classroom.

#### Require at least an academic concentration.

Iowa's policy requiring elementary candidates to earn a "field of specialization" is undermined because it may be met with an interdisciplinary program. Unlike an academic concentration, an interdisciplinary concentration will not necessarily enhance teachers' content knowledge or ensure that prospective teachers have taken higher-level academic coursework. Further, the policy does not provide an option for teacher candidates unable to fulfill student teaching or other professional requirements to still earn a degree, as an academic major does.

## Close the loophole that allows teachers to add elementary grade levels to an existing license without demonstrating content knowledge.

Iowa allows teachers to add new grade levels to certificates without having to pass an additional content test. The state is urged to require that all teachers who add the elementary grade levels to their certificates pass a rigorous subject-matter test to ensure content knowledge of all subject areas before they are allowed in the elementary classroom. Of particular concern is the fact that teachers already teaching at other grade levels may only be prepared to teach a single subject and not the multiple subjects required at the elementary level.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 7       Do states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?         Alabama       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?         Alabama       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?         Alabama       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?       Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core ensure that elementary teachers know teachers kn  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| Arizona  | Figure 7              |              | DNIC /               | with           | with   |  |
| Arizona  | Do states ensure that | ENT.         | PASS<br>IECT<br>test | Te fo          | 100    |  |
| Arizona  | elementary teachers   | No.          | sugar sugar          | o aco          | P      |  |
| Arizona  | know core content?    | SEPA         |                      | Cor.           | quire  |  |
| Arizona  |                       | MITH<br>WITH | Thent's              | entar<br>Site  | est re |  |
| Arizona  |                       | ORE TEL      | Eler,<br>Separ       | Elem,<br>ompo  | Not    |  |
| Arizona  | Alabama               | چ<br>ا       | / s/                 |                |        |  |
| Arkansas       Image: California       Image: California         California       Image: California       Image: California         Connecticut       Image: California       Image: California         Delaware       Image: California       Image: California         District of Columbia       Image: California       Image: California         Florida       Image: California       Image: California         Georgia       Image: California       Image: California         Hawaii       Image: California       Image: California         Idaho       Image: California       Image: California         Illinois       Image: California       Image: California         Illinois       Image: California       Image: California         Illinois       Image: California       Image: California         Image: California       Image: California       Image: California         Indiana       Image: California       Image: California         Image: California       Image: California       Image: California <td< td=""><td>Alaska</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></td<>   | Alaska                |              |                      |                | 1      |  |
| California   | Arizona               |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Colorado   | Arkansas              |              |                      |                |        |  |
| ConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIldinoisIndianaIOWAKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JarseyNew JarseyNew YorkNew YorkNew YorkNew YorkNew YorkNew YorkNew TalandaOhioOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth Carolina<  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Delaware       Image: Control in the second se                     |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| District of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIdahoIllinoisIndianaIOWAIOWAIOWAIowaIowaKansasKansasIndianaIowa </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Florida       Image: State of the state of                      |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Georgia       Image: Construct of the second s                     |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Havaii       Image: Second secon                     |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Illinois       Indiana         Indiana       Indiana         IOWA       Indiana         Iowisiana       Indiana         Maine       Indiana         Maryland       Indiana         Maryland       Indiana         Maryland       Indiana         Maryland       Indiana         Maryland       Indiana         Maryland       Indiana         Minesota       Indiana         Minesota       Indiana         Minesota       Indiana         Minesota       Indiana         Missouri       Indiana         Missouri       Indiana         Montana       Indiana         Nevada       Indiana         New Jersey       Indiana         New Mexico       Indiana         North Carolina       Indiana         North Dakota       Indiana         <   | Ū                     |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Indiana       Image: Second seco                     | Idaho                 |              |                      |                |        |  |
| IOWA       Image: Constraint of the second sec                     |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Kansas   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Kentucky Image: Second s |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Louisiana       Imaine       Imaine         Maine       Imaine       Imaine         Maryland       Imaine       Imaine         Massachusetts       Imaine       Imaine         Minnesota       Imaine       Imaine         Minnesota       Imaine       Imaine         Minnesota       Imaine       Imaine         Mississippi       Imaine       Imaine         Missouri       Imaine       Imaine         Montana       Imaine       Imaine         Nebraska       Imaine       Imaine         New Jarsey       Imaine       Imaine         New Jersey       Imaine       Imaine         New York       Imaine       Imaine         New York       Imaine       Imaine         New York       Imaine       Imaine         North Dakota       Imaine       Imaine         Ohio       Imaine       Imaine         Ohio       Imaine       Imaine         Oregon       Imaine       Imaine         Pennsylvania       Imaine       Imaine         South Carolina       Imaine       Imaine         South Dakota       Imaine       Imaine   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Maine       Image: Constraint of the second of                     | -                     |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Maryland2Massachusetts3Michigan1Minnesota1Mississippi1Missouri1Montana1Nebraska1Nevada2New Hampshire1New Jersey1New York1North Carolina3North Dakota1Ohio1Oregon1Pennsylvania1South Carolina1South Carolina1Virginia1Virginia1Vermont1Vermont1Virginia1West Virginia1Wisconsin1Wyoming1Wyoming1  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Massachusetts       3         Michigan       1         Minnesota       1         Mississippi       1         Missouri       1         Montana       1         Nebraska       1         Nebraska       1         New Hampshire       1         New Jersey       1         New York       1         New York       1         North Carolina       3         North Dakota       1         Ohio       1       4         Oklahoma       1       1         Oregon       1       4         Oklahoma       1       1         Oregon       1       4         Oklahoma       1       1         Oregon       1       1         Pennsylvania       1       1         South Carolina       1       1         South Dakota       1       1         Tennessee       1       1         Texas       1       1         Washington       1       1         West Virginia       1       1         Wisconsin       1       1 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2<sup>2</sup></td> <td></td> <td></td>  |                       |              |                      | 2 <sup>2</sup> |        |  |
| Minnesota       Image: Sissippi definition of the second                     | -                     |              |                      | 3              |        |  |
| Mississippi       Image: Constraint of the second of the sec                     | Michigan              |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Missouri       Image: Constraint of the second                     |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Montana   Nebraska   Nevada   Nevada   New Hampshire   New Hampshire   New Jersey   New Mexico   New Mexico   New York   North Carolina   North Dakota   Ohio   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Carolina   South Carolina   Iteration   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   Wisconsin   Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Nebraska   Nevada   New Hampshire   New Hampshire   New Jersey   New Mexico   New Mexico   New York   North Carolina   North Dakota   Ohio   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Carolina   Itennessee   Texas   Utah   Virginia   Washington   Wisconsin   Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Nevada 2   New Hampshire 3   New Jersey 1   New Mexico 1   New York 1   New York 1   North Carolina 3   North Dakota 1   Ohio 1   Ohio 1   Oregon 1   Pennsylvania 1   Rhode Island 1   South Carolina 1   South Carolina 1   South Carolina 1   Vermont 1   Vermont 1   Virginia 1   Washington 1   Wisconsin 1   Wyoming 1   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| New Hampshire   New Jersey   New Mexico   New York   North Carolina   North Dakota   Ohio   New Hampshire   North   Ohio   Ohio   Ohio   North   Ohio   Ohio </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td></td>  |                       |              |                      | 2              |        |  |
| New Jersey   New Mexico   New York   North Carolina   North Dakota   Ohio   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| New York   North Carolina   North Dakota   Ohio   Ohio   Ohio   Ohio   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| North Carolina   North Dakota   Ohio   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming   | New Mexico            |              |                      |                |        |  |
| North Dakota   Ohio   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Ohio Image: Constraint of the second s |                       |              |                      | 3              |        |  |
| Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Oregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Dakota   Image: South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                | 4      |  |
| Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Tennessee    Texas    Utah    Vermont    Virginia    Washington    West Virginia    West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming  | South Carolina        |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Texas    Utah    Vermont    Virginia    Washington    West Virginia    West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming   | South Dakota          |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Utah    Vermont    Virginia    Washington    West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Vermont    Virginia    Washington    West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Virginia    Washington    West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Washington  Image: Constraint of the second   |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming  |                       |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Wisconsin    Wyoming   | -                     |              |                      |                |        |  |
| Wyoming  | -                     |              |                      |                |        |  |
| 19 9 19 4  | Wyoming               |              |                      |                |        |  |
|  |                       | 19           | 9                    | 19             | 4      |  |

#### **EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE**

Indiana ensures that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades possess the requisite subjectmatter knowledge before entering the classroom. Not only are elementary teacher candidates required to pass a content test comprised of independently scored subtests, but the state also requires its early childhood education teachers-who are licensed to teach up through grade 3-to pass a content test comprised of four subtests. Elementary teacher candidates in Indiana must also earn either a major or minor in an academic content area.

1. Alaska does not require testing for initial licensure.

- 2. The required test is a questionable assessment of content knowledge, instead emphasizing methods and instructional strategies.
- 3. Massachusetts and North Carolina require a general curriculum test that does not report scores for each elementary subject. A separate score is reported for math.

4. Only teachers of grades 4 and 5 are required to pass content test.

Do states require early teach elementary grades to pass a content knowledge test?


| Do states require early | E   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| childhood teachers who  |   | ţ;                                   |                                   |                  |                  |
| teach elementary grade  | es జ్రార్ల్   | core                                 | ittle<br>"t                       | lifed            | 'bleı            |
| to pass a content       | UBJE VI   | int t <sub>e</sub> sites             | vith,<br>onte                     | nb <sub>a,</sub> | oplica           |
| knowledge test?         | CONTENT FEST WITH<br>SUBSCORES FOR WITH<br>EACH SUBJECT | Content test with<br>composite score | Test with little<br>to no content | No test required | Not applicable i |
| 5                       | 0 3 X /   |                                      | ~ Q /                             | ~ /              | ~                |
| Alabama                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Alaska                  |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Arizona                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Arkansas                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| California              |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Colorado                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Connecticut             |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Delaware                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| District of Columbia    |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Florida                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Georgia                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Hawaii                  |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Idaho                   |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Illinois                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Indiana                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| IOWA                    |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Kansas                  |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Kentucky                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Louisiana               |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Maine                   |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Maryland                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Massachusetts           |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Michigan                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Minnesota               |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Mississippi             |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Missouri                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Montana                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Nebraska                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Nevada                  |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
|                         |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| New Hampshire           |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| New Jersey              | _   |                                      | _                                 |                  |                  |
| New Mexico              |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| New York                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| North Carolina          |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| North Dakota            |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Ohio                    |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Oklahoma                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Oregon                  |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Pennsylvania            | 2   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Rhode Island            | -   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| South Carolina          |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| South Dakota            |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Tennessee               |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Texas                   |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Utah                    | 2   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Vermont                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Virginia                |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Washington              |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| West Virginia           |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Wisconsin               |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
| Wyoming                 |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |
|                         | 6   | 12                                   | 16                                | 4                | 13               |
|                         |   |                                      |                                   |                  |                  |

1. These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.

2. May pass either multiple subjects (subscores) or content knowledge (no subscores) test.


| Figure 9             |         |                    |                            | GLISH            |         | /                |                   | SCIE   |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             | FINE<br>ARTS   |
|----------------------|---------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Do states expect     |         |                    | Writing/Can                | 1 1              | ' /     | /                | /                 | Earth Sci  | ·/ /               | /             |                    | /                    | World His       | World History (Ancient) |              | -                |             |                |
| elementary teachers  |         | Worlding           | erat                       | Children's Lites | ture    | /                |                   | / <sub>Scie</sub>                                    | Biology/Life Scie  | e<br>"        | American History / | American Junitory II | <sup>Time</sup> | Anci                    | Mod          |                  |             |                |
| to have in-depth     |         | liter <sub>a</sub> | sh Lii                     | innu<br>Dhan     | \$//    |                  | /                 | )sica  | دن.<br>وی          | · / .         | list <sub>o</sub>  | list <sup>o</sup>    | ð               | Eq.                     | 5.           | tern)            |             |                |
| knowledge of         |         |                    | Pariti                     | Ssiti<br>Philos  |         | \$ 2             | , / ;             | μ <sup>'</sup> , '', '', '', '', '', '', '', '', '', | Mii                |               |                    |                      |                 |                         | ISI P        | Wesi<br>aphy     | et of       | डे / /         |
| core content?        | mer     | orld               | Writi<br>Writi             | hildr            | Chemic. | Physics          | ener              | Earth Sci  | 1000               | meri          | meri               | meri                 | Vorlo           | Vorla                   | Worl         | Geography        | Art Histon  | Music          |
|                      | र,<br>_ |                    | / -0                       |                  |         | / ٩              |                   | / <i>\u</i>  | / 8° /             | र             | / रू<br>           | / マ ,<br>            | / <u>~</u> .    |                         |              | 2/0/             | \ <b>\ </b> |                |
| Alabama<br>Alaska    |         |                    | <b>*</b>                   |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Arizona              |         |                    | -                          |                  |         |                  | -                 | -  | +                  |               | <br>- ★            | -                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             | *              |
| Arkansas             |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  | $\overline{\Box}$ |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             | Î              |
| California           |         |                    | -                          |                  |         |                  | -                 | -  | *                  | -             | -                  | -                    | -               |                         |              | *                |             | *              |
| Colorado             |         |                    | Ê                          |                  |         |                  |                   | $\overline{\Box}$                                    | $\hat{\Box}$       | Ô             | $\widehat{\Box}$   | Ê                    | $\hat{\Box}$    | $\widehat{\Box}$        |              | Î                |             |                |
| Connecticut          |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    | *             | *                  |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Delaware             |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                |                   | *  | *                  | *             | *                  | *                    | *               |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| District of Columbia |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                |                   | *  | *                  | *             | *                  | *                    | *               |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Florida              |         |                    | *                          |                  | *       |                  | *                 | *  | *                  |               |                    | *                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             |                |
| Georgia              |         |                    | *                          |                  |         |                  | *                 | *  | *                  | *             | *                  | *                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             |                |
| Hawaii               |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Idaho                |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                |                   | *  | *                  | *             | *                  | *                    | *               |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Illinois             |         |                    | *                          |                  |         |                  | *                 | *  | *                  |               |                    | *                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             |                |
| Indiana              |         |                    | *                          |                  |         |                  | *                 | *  | *                  |               |                    | *                    | *               | *                       |              | *                |             | *              |
| IOWA                 |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Kansas               |         |                    | *                          | *                |         |                  | *                 | *  | *                  |               |                    | *                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             |                |
| Kentucky             |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Louisiana<br>Maine   |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Maryland             |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Massachusetts        |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Michigan             |         |                    | -                          | *                |         |                  | -                 | -  | *                  |               |                    | -                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             |                |
| Minnesota            |         |                    | -                          | ÷                |         | *                |                   | -  | ÷                  |               |                    | ÷                    |                 |                         |              | $\widehat{\Box}$ |             |                |
| Mississippi          |         |                    | $\hat{\Box}$               | Ô                |         |                  | Ê                 | Ê  | Î                  |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Missouri             |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | $\star$          | $\star$           | *  | *                  | *             |                    | $\star$              |                 | $\star$                 |              | *                | *           |                |
| Montana              |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Nebraska             |         |                    | $\rightarrow$              |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Nevada               |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| New Hampshire        |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| New Jersey           |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| New Mexico           |         |                    | *                          |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             | *              |
| New York             |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| North Carolina       |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| North Dakota<br>Ohio |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Oklahoma             |         |                    | *                          |                  |         |                  | <br>★             | *  | *                  |               |                    | -                    |                 |                         |              | <br>★            |             |                |
| Oregon               |         |                    | $\frac{1}{2}$              |                  |         |                  | $\frac{1}{2}$     | -  | ÷.                 | *             | -                  |                      | -               | *                       | *            | *                |             | *              |
| Pennsylvania         |         |                    | -                          |                  |         | *                | $\frac{1}{2}$     |  | ÷                  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |                    |                      | $\widehat{}$    | Ê                       | $\hat{\Box}$ | *                |             |                |
| Rhode Island         |         |                    | $\widehat{\mathbf{\star}}$ |                  |         | $\mathbf{\star}$ |                   | ÷  | $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ | <b>*</b>      | +                  |                      | *               |                         |              | Ê                |             |                |
| South Carolina       |         |                    |                            |                  |         | ñ                |                   | Ê  | Ê                  | Ô             | ñ                  | <b>n</b>             | Â               |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| South Dakota         |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Tennessee            |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                | *                 | *  | *                  |               |                    | *                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             |                |
| Texas                |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                | $\mathbf{\star}$  | *  | *                  | *             | $\mathbf{\pi}$     | $\mathbf{\star}$     |                 |                         |              | *                | *           | *              |
| Utah                 |         |                    | - ★                        |                  |         | *                |                   | *  | *                  | *             | $\mathbf{\pi}$     | *                    | *               |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Vermont              |         |                    | *                          |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Virginia             |         |                    | *                          |                  | *       |                  | *                 | *  | *                  | *             | *                  | *                    | *               | *                       | *            | *                |             |                |
| Washington           |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                | *                 | *  | *                  |               |                    | *                    |                 |                         |              | *                |             | *              |
| West Virginia        |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Wisconsin            |         |                    | *                          |                  |         | *                |                   |  | *                  | *             | X                  |                      | X               |                         |              |                  |             |                |
| Wyoming              |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    |                      |                 |                         |              |                  |             |                |
|                      |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    | Subia                | ect me          | ntia                    | nod          | 📥 c.             | bioct c     | overed in dept |
|                      |         |                    |                            |                  |         |                  |                   |  |                    |               |                    | Subje                | cu me           | entio                   | neu          | <b>X</b> 21      | bject C     | overed in dept |

What subjects does lowa expect elementary teachers to know?



#### Figure 11

Do states expect elementary teachers to complete an academic concentration?



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico

2. Strong Practice: Indiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma

3. California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia

These states require a major, minor or concentration but there is no assurance it will be in an academic subject area.

4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

## Goal C – Elementary Teacher Preparation in **Reading Instruction**

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that new elementary teachers, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, pass a rigorous test of reading instruction in order to attain licensure. The design of the test should ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without knowing the five instructional components shown by scientifically based reading research to be essential to teaching children to read.
- 2. The state should require that teacher preparation programs prepare candidates in the science of reading instruction.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy



# 1-C Analysis: Image: Comparison of the second state of the s

#### ANALYSIS

lowa does not require teacher candidates to pass an assessment that measures knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction prior to certification or at any point thereafter.

Iowa also does not require that teacher preparation programs for elementary teacher candidates address the science of reading. The state has neither coursework requirements nor standards related to this critical area.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Require all teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous assessment in the science of reading instruction.

Iowa should require a rigorous reading assessment tool to ensure that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction before entering the classroom. The assessment should clearly test knowledge and skills related to the science of reading, and address all five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. If the test is combined with an assessment that also tests general pedagogy or elementary content, it should report a subscore for the science of reading specifically. Elementary teachers who do not possess the minimum knowledge in this area should not be eligible for licensure.

Iowa should also require all early childhood education teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous assessment to ensure that they are adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction before entering the classroom.

Ensure that teacher preparation programs prepare elementary teaching candidates in the science of reading instruction.

lowa should require teacher preparation programs in the state to train candidates in scientifically based reading instruction.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| Figure 13   |   | EPARATIO                          | TS /       | TEST<br>REQUIRI |                 |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Do states ensure that<br>elementary teachers<br>know the science<br>of reading? | EEQ<br>FULLY ADDRESS<br>READINC SCIENCE | Do not address<br>reading science | APPROPRIAT | Inadequate to   | No reading test |
| Alabama   |   |                                   | 1          |                 |                 |
| Alaska  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Arizona   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Arkansas  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| California  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Colorado  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Connecticut   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Delaware  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| District of Columbia  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Florida   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Georgia   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Hawaii  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Idaho   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Illinois  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Indiana   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| IOWA  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Kansas  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Kentucky  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Louisiana   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Maine   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Maryland  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Massachusetts   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Michigan  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Minnesota   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Mississippi   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Missouri  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Montana   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Nebraska  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Nevada  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| New Hampshire   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| New Jersey  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| New Mexico  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| New York  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| North Carolina  |   |                                   | 2          |                 |                 |
| North Dakota  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Ohio  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Oklahoma  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Oregon  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Pennsylvania  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Rhode Island  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| South Carolina<br>South Dakota  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
|   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Tennessee<br>Texas  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Utah  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Vermont   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Virginia  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
|   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
|   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Washington  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Washington<br>West Virginia   |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |
| Washington  |   |                                   |            |                 |                 |

#### **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Fifteen states meet this goal by requiring that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades pass comprehensive assessments that specifically test the five elements of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Independent reviews of the assessments used by **Connecticut** and **Massachusetts**, confirm that these tests are rigorous measures of teacher candidates' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction.

Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
 Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.


Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of the science of reading?



- Strong Practice: Alabama<sup>4</sup>, California, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina<sup>5</sup>, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont
- Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming
- 4. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
- 5. Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.

#### Figure 15

Do states measure knowledge of the science of reading for early childhood teachers who can teach elementary grades?



- Strong Practice: Alabama<sup>5</sup>, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Idaho
- Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, lowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming
- 4. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.
- 5. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum

## Goal D – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require teacher preparation programs to deliver mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates. This content should be specific to the needs of the elementary teacher (i.e., foundations, algebra and geometry with some statistics).
- 2. The state should require elementary teacher candidates, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, to pass a rigorous test of mathematics content in order to attain licensure.
- Such test can also be used to test out of course requirements and should be designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of mathematics.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 16 How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation in Mathematics **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal Arkansas 1, Florida 1, Indiana, Kentucky 1, New York 1, North Carolina 1, Texas 1, Virginia 1 15 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama<sup>1</sup>, Connecticut<sup>1</sup>, Delaware<sup>1</sup>, District of Columbia 1, Idaho 1, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire 1, New Jersey 1, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina 1, Utah, Vermont 1, West Virginia 1 State Partly Meets Goal California 21 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, IOWA, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wyoming 6 States Do Not Meet Goal Colorado, Hawaii I, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Wisconsin **Progress on this Goal Since 2011:** ★:20 ↔:30 4:1

### 1-D Analysis: Iowa

🚽 State Meets a Small Part Goal 🕋 Bar Raised for this Goal 💮 Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Iowa requires that all new elementary teachers pass a general elementary subject-matter test, the Praxis II. This commercial test lacks a specific mathematics subscore, so one can fail the mathematics portion and still pass the test. Further, while this test does cover important elementary school-level content, it barely evaluates candidates' knowledge beyond an elementary school level, does not challenge their understanding of underlying concepts and does not require candidates to apply knowledge in nonroutine, multistep procedures.

Early childhood education candidates in Iowa, who are allowed to teach through grade 3, are required to pass the early childhood general content test, which also does not report an individual math subscore.

As of September 1, 2015, elementary education candidates will be required to earn at least nine semester hours in mathematics, which must include content in the following areas: numbers and operations, algebra/number patterns, geometry, measurement, and data analysis/probability. However, it does not appear that these requirements are specifically geared to meet the needs of the elementary teacher.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirements www.ets.org Iowa Administrative Code 282-13.26(5)

#### RECOMMENDATION

## Require all teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous mathematics assessment.

Iowa should assess mathematics content with a rigorous assessment tool, such as the test required in Massachusetts that evaluates mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenges candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts. Such a test could also be used to allow candidates to test out of coursework requirements. Teacher candidates who lack minimum mathematics knowledge should not be eligible for licensure.

#### Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.

Iowa must ensure that new teachers are prepared to teach the mathematics content required by the Common Core State Standards. Although Iowa now requires some knowledge in key areas of mathematics, the state should require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers. This includes specific coursework in foundations, algebra and geometry, with some statistics coursework.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

#### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Eight states meet this goal by requiring that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades earn a passing score on an independently scored mathematics subtest. **Massachusetts's** MTEL mathematics subtest continues to set the standard in this area by evaluating mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenging candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts.

#### Figure 17

*Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?* 




 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas<sup>4</sup>, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia

 Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- 3. Alaska<sup>5</sup>, Hawaii, Montana, Ohio<sup>6</sup>
- 4. Test is not yet available for review.
- 5. Testing is not required for initial licensure.
- 6. Only teachers of grades 4 and 5 are required to pass an adequate content test.

#### Figure 18

Do states measure knowledge of math of early childhood teachers who can teach elementary grades?



#### 1. Strong Practice: Florida, Indiana, New York, Virginia

- 2. Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.

## Goal E – Middle School Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)


- 1. The state should require that new middle school teachers pass a licensing test in every core academic area that they are licensed to teach.
- 2. The state should not permit middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers.
- 3. The state should encourage middle school candidates who are licensed to teach multiple subjects to earn minors in two core academic areas rather than earn a single major. Middle school candidates licensed to teach a single subject area should earn a major in that area.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 19

How States are Faring in Middle School Teacher Preparation



19 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, IOWA<sup>1</sup>, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Ohio<sup>1</sup>, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island<sup>1</sup>, Texas<sup>1</sup>, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia



States Nearly Meet Goal Maryland, New York, North Carolina 1, Tennessee

States Partly Meet Goal Massachusetts, Minnesota, Wisconsin

7 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Michigan, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming

14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii I, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:5 ↔:45 ↓:1



#### ANALYSIS

Iowa requires middle school teachers to earn a K-8 endorsement (math, English language arts, social studies or science) or a 5-12 endorsement in a subject area. Candidates must complete at least 24 semester hours in applicable coursework.

All new middle school teachers in Iowa are also required to pass a single-subject Praxis II content test to attain licensure; a general content knowledge test is not an option.

Commendably, Iowa does not offer a K-8 generalist license.

Supporting Research Test Requirements http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=477&Itemid=535#praxisii

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Ensure meaningful content tests.**

To ensure meaningful middle school content tests, Iowa should make certain that its passing scores reflect high levels of performance.

#### **Strengthen middle school teachers' subject-matter preparation.**

Iowa should encourage middle school teachers who plan to teach multiple subjects to earn two minors in two core academic areas. Middle school candidates who intend to teach a single subject should earn a major in that area.

## Close the loophole that allows teachers to add middle grade levels to an existing license without demonstrating content knowledge.

Iowa allows teachers to add middle-level endorsements with just coursework; additional content tests are not required. The state is urged to require that all teachers who add the middle grade levels to their certificates pass a rigorous subject-matter test to ensure content knowledge of all subject areas before they are allowed in the classroom.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis.

| Figure 20   | IFERED                  | tor<br>Doms  | /                   |
|---|-------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Do states distinguish<br>middle grade preparation from<br>elementary preparation? | K-8 LICENSE NOT OFFERED | As license offered for<br>self.contained dassrooms | K-8 license offered |
| Alabama   |                         |  |                     |
| Alaska  |                         |  |                     |
| Arizona   |                         |  | 1                   |
| Arkansas  |                         |  |                     |
| California  |                         | 2  |                     |
| Colorado  |                         |  |                     |
| Connecticut   |                         |  |                     |
| Delaware  |                         |  |                     |
| District of Columbia  |                         |  |                     |
| Florida   |                         |  |                     |
| Georgia   |                         |  |                     |
| Hawaii  |                         |  |                     |
| Idaho   |                         |  |                     |
| Illinois  |                         |  |                     |
| Indiana   |                         |  |                     |
| IOWA  |                         |  |                     |
| Kansas  |                         |  |                     |
| Kentucky  |                         |  |                     |
| Louisiana   |                         |  |                     |
| Maine   |                         |  |                     |
| Maryland  |                         |  |                     |
| Massachusetts   |                         |  |                     |
| Michigan  |                         |  |                     |
| Minnesota   |                         |  |                     |
| Mississippi<br>Missouri   |                         |  |                     |
| Montana   |                         |  |                     |
| Nebraska  |                         |  |                     |
| Nevada  |                         |  |                     |
| New Hampshire   |                         |  |                     |
| New Jersey  |                         |  |                     |
| New Mexico  |                         |  |                     |
| New York  |                         |  |                     |
| North Carolina  |                         |  |                     |
| North Dakota  |                         |  | 1                   |
| Ohio  |                         |  |                     |
| Oklahoma  |                         |  | 3                   |
| Oregon  |                         |  | 4                   |
| Pennsylvania  |                         |  |                     |
| Rhode Island  |                         |  |                     |
| South Carolina  |                         |  |                     |
| South Dakota  |                         |  |                     |
| Tennessee   |                         |  |                     |
| Texas   |                         |  |                     |
| Utah  |                         |  |                     |
| Vermont   |                         |  |                     |
| Virginia  |                         |  |                     |
| Washington  |                         |  |                     |
| West Virginia   |                         |  | 1                   |
| Wisconsin<br>Wyoming  |                         |  |                     |
| wyoning   |                         |  |                     |
|   | 31                      | 5  | 15                  |

### **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey and South Carolina ensure that all middle school teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach middle school-level content. None of these states offers a K-8 generalist license and all require passing scores on subject-specific content tests. Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina explicitly require at least two content-area minors, and New Jersey requires a content major along with a minor for each additional area of certification.

1. Offers 1-8 license.

2. California offers a K-12 generalist license for all self-contained classrooms.

3. With the exception of mathematics.

4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.

|                             |     | ,                        | ,                        | ,                          |
|-----------------------------|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Figure 21                   |     | No. test does not report | 5                        |                            |
| Do middle school teachers   |     | t t                      | No, K-8 license equipeds | No testing of all subjects |
| have to pass an appropriate |     | t rep.                   | ure s <sub>t</sub>       | est subje                  |
| content test in every core  |     | sno,                     | "Ser                     | of all                     |
| subject they are licensed   |     | es fo                    | 8 lice                   | sting<br>uired             |
| to teach?                   | YES | b, te<br>bscor           | 5.5<br>5.6<br>6          | lo, te<br>t'req            |
| to teach:                   | ¥ / | < ru                     | < 6                      | < 0                        |
| Alabama                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Alaska                      |     |                          |                          | 1                          |
| Arizona                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Arkansas                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| California                  |     |                          |                          | 2                          |
| Colorado                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Connecticut                 |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Delaware                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| District of Columbia        |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Florida                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Georgia                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Hawaii                      |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Idaho                       |     |                          | 3                        |                            |
| Illinois                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Indiana                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| IOWA                        |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Kansas                      |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Kentucky                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Louisiana                   |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Maine                       |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Maryland                    | 4   |                          |                          |                            |
| Massachusetts               |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Michigan                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Minnesota                   |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Mississippi                 |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Missouri                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Montana                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Nebraska                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Nevada                      |     |                          |                          |                            |
| New Hampshire               |     |                          |                          |                            |
| New Jersey                  |     |                          |                          |                            |
| New Mexico                  |     |                          |                          |                            |
| New York                    | 5   |                          |                          |                            |
| North Carolina              | 6   |                          |                          |                            |
| North Dakota                |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Ohio                        |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Oklahoma                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Oregon                      |     |                          | 7                        |                            |
| Pennsylvania                |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Rhode Island                |     |                          |                          |                            |
| South Carolina              |     |                          |                          |                            |
| South Dakota                |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Tennessee                   |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Texas                       |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Utah                        |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Vermont                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Virginia                    |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Washington                  |     |                          |                          |                            |
| West Virginia               |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Wisconsin                   |     |                          |                          |                            |
| Wyoming                     |     |                          |                          |                            |
|                             | 26  | 3                        | 16                       | 6                          |
|                             |     |                          |                          |                            |

#### 1. Alaska does not require content tests for initial licensure.

- 2. Candidates teaching multiple subjects only have to pass the elementary test. Single-subject credential does not require test.
- 3. For K-8 license, Idaho also requires a single-subject test.
- 4. Maryland allows elementary teachers to teach in departmentalized middle schools if not less than 50 percent of the teaching assignment is within the elementary education grades.
- 5. For nondepartmentalized classrooms, generalist in middle childhood education candidates must pass new assessment with three subtests.
- 6. Teachers may have until second year to pass tests, if they attempt to pass them during their first year.
- 7. Candidates opting for middle-level endorsement may either complete a major or pass a content test.

## Goal F – Secondary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a licensing test in every subject they are licensed to teach.
- 2. The state should require secondary social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each social studies discipline they are licensed to teach.
- 3. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a content test when adding subject-area endorsements to an existing license.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 22

*How States are Faring in Secondary Teacher Preparation* 



3 Best Practice States Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee



States Meet Goal Minnesota, South Dakota

#### 28 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri 1, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina, Texas, Utah,

Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

8 States Partly Meet Goal District of Columbia, IOWA<sup>↑</sup>, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Nebraska<sup>↑</sup>, Nevada, New Mexico



State Meets a Small Part of Goal North Carolina

9 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii 1, Montana, New Hampshire, Washington, Wyoming

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:6 ↔:44 ↓:1



#### **ANALYSIS**

lowa requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a Praxis II content test to teach any core secondary subjects.

Unfortunately, Iowa permits a significant loophole to this important policy by allowing both general science and general social studies licenses, without requiring subject-matter testing for each subject area within these disciplines.

Secondary social studies teachers in Iowa have the option of a general social studies teaching field license. Candidates are required to pass the Praxis II Social Studies test. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the topical areas. (For the state's science loophole, see Goal 1-G.)

Regrettably, Iowa allows teachers to add secondary certification areas with coursework; additional content tests are not required.

#### Supporting Research

Praxis Test Requirement www.ets.org Iowa Administrative Code 282-13.28(18)

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Require subject-matter testing for all secondary teacher candidates.

Idaho wisely requires subject-matter tests for most secondary teachers but should address any loopholes that undermine this policy (see Goal 1-G). This applies to the addition of endorsements as well.

Require secondary social studies teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.

By allowing a general social studies certification—and only requiring a general knowledge social studies exam—lowa is not ensuring that its secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. The state's required assessment combines all subject areas (e.g., history, geography, economics) and does not report separate scores for each subject area.

#### Require subject-matter testing when adding subject-area endorsements.

Iowa should require passing scores on subject-specific content tests, regardless of other coursework or degree requirements, for teachers who are licensed in core secondary subjects and wish to add another subject area, or endorsement, to their licenses. While coursework may be generally indicative of background in a particular subject area, only a subject-matter test ensures that teachers know the specific content they will need to teach.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia, Indiana and Tennessee require that all secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subject—both as a condition of licensure and to add an additional field to a secondary license. Further, none of these states offers secondary certification in general social studies; all teachers must be certified in a specific discipline. Also worthy of mention is **Missouri**, which now requires its general social studies teachers to pass a multi-content test with six independently scored subtests.

#### Figure 23

Does a secondary teacher have to pass a content test in every subject area for licensure?




1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina<sup>4</sup>, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin [For more on loopholes, see Goal 1-G (science) and Figure 25 (social studies).]
- 3. Alaska, Arizona<sup>5</sup>, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Montana, New Hampshire<sup>5</sup>, Washington, Wyoming<sup>6</sup>
- 4. Teachers may also have until second year to pass tests, if they attempt to pass them during their first year.
- 5. Candidates with a master's degree in the subject area do not have to pass a content test.
- 6. Only secondary comprehensive social studies teachers must pass a content test.

#### Figure 24


Does a secondary teacher have to pass a content test in every subject area to add an endorsement?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Minnesota, Tennessee

- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin (Science is discussed in Goal 1-G.)
- Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Washington, Wyoming

#### Figure 25



1. Strong Practice: Georgia, Indiana, South Dakota, Tennessee

- 2. Strong Practice: Minnesota<sup>4</sup>, Missouri
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma<sup>5</sup>, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Minnesota's test for general social studies is divided into two individually scored subtests.
- 5. Oklahoma offers combination licenses.

## Goal G – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that secondary science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require secondary science teachers to pass a subject-matter test in each science discipline they are licensed to teach.
- 2. If a general science or combination science certification is offered, the state should require teachers to pass a subject-matter test in each science discipline they are licensed to teach under those certifications.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 26 How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Science **Best Practice State** 1 Missouri 1 13 States Meet Goal Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia 1 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona<sup>1</sup>, Arkansas States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah States Meet a Small Part of Goal 28 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, IOWA, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:4 ↔:47 4:0

# 1-G Analysis: Iowa State Does Not Meet Goal Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Iowa offers a broad-field science endorsement. Candidates must earn a passing score on the Praxis II General Science test. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general science but rather can teach any of the topical areas.

The state also offers a physical science endorsement. These candidates are required to pass the Praxis II Physical Science assessment.

Iowa has recently announced that it will merge the general science and physical science endorsements into one secondary basic science endorsement. It is unclear which content tests will be required, or whether the candidates will be allowed to teach all topical areas.

Supporting Research Praxis Testing Requirements www.ets.org

http://iowaboee.wordpress.com/

#### RECOMMENDATION

## Require secondary science teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.

States that allow general science certifications or combination licenses across multiple science disciplines—and only require a general knowledge science exam—are not ensuring that these secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. Iowa's required general assessments combine subject areas (e.g., biology, chemistry and physics) and do not report separate scores for each subject area. Therefore, candidates could answer many—perhaps all—chemistry questions, for example, incorrectly yet still be licensed to teach chemistry to high school students.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis. The state noted that it offers a 5-12 basic science endorsement. Candidates must pass the middle school science content test and are limited to teaching middle-level science courses. They cannot teach high school-level single-subject courses (biology, chemistry, physics) or related high school science courses.

| Figure 27                   | Ę                      | OFERS GENERAL SCIENCE OF<br>WITH ADE OLATION LICENCE OR | . /                       | Offers Beneral Science or<br>Without adeutor ficence or |              |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|--------------|
| Do states ensure that       | -SUBJ                  |   |                           | e or  | ക            |
| secondary general science   | S WIT                  | LE A SO   | te-sul                    | icienc<br>Ises  | testi        |
| teachers have adequate      | N V S<br>E STASE       |   | sing<br>Ses y             | Peral s<br>n lice                                       | פורה<br>שורה |
| subject-matter knowledge?   | PSCO<br>MELLO<br>MELLO | PDEQ  | rs on<br>rs on<br>the tes | rs ger<br>inatic<br>it ade                              |              |
| Subject matter knowledge.   | E S S                  | ĔŎĘ   | Science<br>Gequi          |   |              |
| Alabama                     | OFFRSONLYSNOLE-SUBJEC  |   | Offersonly single subject | 2   |              |
| Alaska                      |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Arizona                     |                        | <b>1</b>  |                           |   |              |
| Arkansas                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| California                  |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Colorado                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Connecticut                 |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Delaware                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| District of Columbia        |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Florida                     |                        |   |                           | 2   |              |
| Georgia                     |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Hawaii                      |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Idaho<br>Illinois           |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Indiana                     |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| IOWA                        |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Kansas                      |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Kentucky                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Louisiana                   |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Maine                       |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Maryland                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Massachusetts               |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Michigan                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Minnesota                   |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Mississippi                 |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Missouri                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Montana                     |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Nebraska                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Nevada<br>Neva Hamachira    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| New Hampshire<br>New Jersey |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| New Mexico                  |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| New York                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| North Carolina              |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| North Dakota                |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Ohio                        |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Oklahoma                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Oregon                      |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Pennsylvania                |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Rhode Island                |                        | 1   |                           |   |              |
| South Carolina              |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| South Dakota                |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Tennessee                   |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Texas                       |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Utah<br>Vermont             |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Virginia                    |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Washington                  |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| West Virginia               |                        | 1   |                           |   |              |
| Wisconsin                   |                        |   |                           |   |              |
| Wyoming                     |                        |   |                           |   |              |
|                             | 10                     | 5   | 1                         | 25  |              |
|                             | 10                     | 2   |                           | 35  |              |

#### **T** EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Missouri ensures that its secondary science teachers know the content they teach by taking a dual approach to general secondary science certification. The state offers general science certification but only allows these candidates to teach general science courses. Missouri also offers an umbrella certification-called unified sciencethat requires candidates to pass individual subtests in biology, chemistry, earth science and physics. These certifications are offered in addition to single-subject licenses.

1. Teachers with the general science license may only teach general science courses.

2. Georgia's science test consists of two subtests.

# Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

## Goal H – Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should not permit special education teachers to teach on a K-12 license that does not differentiate between the preparation of elementary teachers and that of secondary teachers.
- All elementary special education candidates should be required to pass a subjectmatter test for licensure that is no less rigorous than what is required of general education candidates.
- 3. The state should ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 28 How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Social Studies n **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama<sup>1</sup>, New York<sup>1</sup>, Rhode Island<sup>1</sup>, Texas 1 8 States Partly Meet Goal Idaho 1, IOWA , Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin 10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Connecticut 1, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, North Carolina<sup>1</sup>, Oregon, Tennessee 1, Vermont, Virginia 1 29 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas I, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas I, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:9 👄 : 39 4:3

## 1-H Analysis: **Iowa**

State Partly Meets Goal

Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

Iowa does not offer a K-12 special education certification.

However, teacher candidates applying for either the stand-alone K-8 or 5-12 certificate are only required to pass the Praxis II Fundamental Subjects: Content Knowledge test. It includes subtests in English language arts, math, citizenship and social science, and science, but does not report individual subscores. This test is also not the one required of Iowa's general education elementary teacher candidates—a requirement the state had implemented in the past.

#### **Supporting Research**

Iowa Administrative Code 282-14.1, -.2 and 13.28 Special Education Test Requirements http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=477&Itemid=535#praxisii

#### RECOMMENDATION

# Require that elementary special education candidates pass a rigorous content test as a condition of initial licensure.

To ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess sufficient knowledge of the subject matter at hand, Iowa should require a rigorous content test that reports separate passing scores for each content area. Iowa should also set these passing scores to reflect high levels of performance. Failure to ensure that teachers possess requisite content knowledge deprives special education students of the opportunity to reach their academic potential. Further, the state should ensure that content reflected in its test for special education teachers is no less rigorous than what is expected of general education teachers.

Ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

Secondary special education teachers are frequently generalists who teach many core subject areas. While it may be unreasonable to expect secondary special education teachers to meet the same requirements for each subject they teach as other teachers who teach only one subject, Iowa's current policy of only requiring a general content test, which is not even the one required of general education elementary teachers, is problematic and will not help special education students to meet rigorous learning standards. To provide a middle ground, Iowa should consider a customized HOUSSE route for new secondary special education teachers and look to the flexibility offered by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which allows for a combination of testing and coursework to demonstrate requisite content knowledge in the classroom.

IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

|                           |              | /  | /                  |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------|
| Figure 29                 |              | Offers K. 22 and<br>Back-specific cents. | tion(s)            |
| Do states distinguish     | DOESNOTOFERA | non<br>rd<br>ertis                       | Offers only a K-12 |
| between elementary        |              | cific of                                 | a k<br>a           |
| and secondary special     | PES N        | fers k<br>te-spe                         | fers o<br>lificati |
| education teachers?       |              | 0'er8                                    | Ю <sup>1</sup> аў  |
| Alabama                   |              |  |                    |
| Alaska                    |              |  |                    |
| Arizona                   |              |  |                    |
| Arkansas<br>California    |              |  |                    |
| Colorado                  |              |  |                    |
| Connecticut               |              |  |                    |
| Delaware                  |              |  |                    |
| District of Columbia      |              |  |                    |
| Florida                   |              |  |                    |
| Georgia                   |              |  |                    |
| Hawaii                    |              |  |                    |
| Idaho<br>Illinois         |              |  |                    |
| Indiana                   |              |  |                    |
| IOWA                      |              |  |                    |
| Kansas                    |              |  |                    |
| Kentucky                  |              |  |                    |
| Louisiana                 |              |  |                    |
| Maine                     |              |  |                    |
| Maryland                  |              |  |                    |
| Massachusetts             |              |  |                    |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota     |              |  |                    |
| Miniesota<br>Mississippi  |              |  |                    |
| Missouri                  |              |  |                    |
| Montana                   |              |  |                    |
| Nebraska                  |              |  |                    |
| Nevada                    |              |  |                    |
| New Hampshire             |              |  |                    |
| New Jersey                |              |  |                    |
| New Mexico<br>New York    |              |  |                    |
| North Carolina            |              |  |                    |
| North Dakota              |              |  |                    |
| Ohio                      |              |  |                    |
| Oklahoma                  |              |  |                    |
| Oregon                    |              |  |                    |
| Pennsylvania              |              |  |                    |
| Rhode Island              |              |  |                    |
| South Carolina            |              |  |                    |
| South Dakota<br>Tennessee |              |  |                    |
| Texas                     |              |  |                    |
| Utah                      |              |  |                    |
| Vermont                   |              |  |                    |
| Virginia                  |              |  |                    |
| Washington                |              |  |                    |
| West Virginia             |              |  |                    |
| Wisconsin                 |              |  |                    |
| Wyoming                   |              |  |                    |
|                           | 16           | 7  | 28                 |

### **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**

Unfortunately, NCTQ cannot award "best practice" honors to any state's policy in the area of special education. However, two states-New York and Rhode Island-are worthy of mention for taking steps in the right direction in ensuring that all special education teachers know the subject matter they are required to teach. Both states require that elementary special education candidates pass the same elementary content tests, which are comprised of individual subtests, as general education elementary teachers. Secondary special education teachers in New York must pass a newly developed multisubject content test for special education teachers comprised of three separately scored sections. Rhode Island requires its secondary special education teachers to hold certification in another secondary area.

#### Figure 30

Which states require subject-matter testing for special education teachers?

| Elementary Subject-Matter Test   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Required for an<br>elementary special<br>education license                             | Alabama, IOWA, Louisiana,<br>Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York,<br>Pennsylvania <sup>1</sup> , Rhode Island, Texas,<br>West Virginia <sup>2</sup> , Wisconsin |  |  |  |
| Required for a<br>K-12 special<br>education license                                    | Colorado, Idaho, North Carolina   |  |  |  |
| Secondary Subject-Matter Test(s)   |   |  |  |  |
| Tests in all core<br>subjects required for<br>secondary special<br>education license   | New York <sup>3</sup>   |  |  |  |
| Test in at least one<br>subject required for<br>secondary special<br>education license | Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania <sup>1</sup> ,<br>Rhode Island, West Virginia <sup>2</sup>  |  |  |  |
| Required for a<br>K-12 special<br>education license                                    | None  |  |  |  |

1. In Pennsylvania, a candidate who opts for dual certification in elementary or secondary special education and as a reading specialist does not have to take a content test.

2. West Virginia also allows elementary special education candidates to earn dual certification in early childhood, which would not require a content test. Secondary special education candidates earning a dual certification as a reading specialist are similarly exempted.

3. New York requires a multi-subject content test specifically geared to secondary special education candidates. It is divided into three subtests.

Figure 29:

1. Although New Jersey does issue a K-12 certificate, candidates must meet discrete elementary and/or secondary requirements.

# Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

# Goal I – Assessing Professional Knowledge

The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.

#### Goal Component

(The factor considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should assess new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning by means of a pedagogy test aligned to the state's professional standards.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 31

How States are Faring in Special Education **Teacher Preparation** Best Practice States 28 States Meet Goal Alabama<sup>1</sup>, Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana 1, IOWA1, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island<sup>1</sup>, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington 1, West Virginia States Nearly Meet Goal Maryland, North Carolina 1 3 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Pennsylvania<sup>1</sup>, Utah States Meet a Small Part of Goal 3 Massachusetts, Missouri, Wyoming 15 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:7 (↔):43 ↓:1



lowa requires all new teachers to pass a popular pedagogy test from the Praxis series in order to attain licensure.

lowa is part of the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) consortium and began a pilot program in Spring 2011.

Supporting Research http://www.ets.org/praxis/ia/requirements/

#### RECOMMENDATION

- Verify that commercially available tests of pedagogy actually align with state standards. Iowa should ensure that its selected test of professional knowledge measures the knowledge and skills the state expects new teachers to have.
- Ensure that performance assessments provide a meaningful measure of new teachers' knowledge and skills.

While Iowa is commended for considering the use of a performance-based assessment, the state should proceed with caution until additional data are available on the Teacher Performance Assessment. Additional research is needed to determine how the edTPA compares to other teacher tests as well as whether the test's scores are predictive of student achievement. The track record on similar assessments is mixed at best. The two states that currently require the Praxis III performance-based assessment report pass rates of about 99 percent. Given that it takes significant resources to administer a performance-based assessment, a test that nearly every teacher passes is of question-able value.


IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

## **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends the many states that require a pedagogy assessment to verify that all new teachers meet professional standards.

#### Figure 32

Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning?



1. Strong Practice: California, Illinois<sup>5</sup>, New York, Tennessee<sup>6</sup>, Washington

- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina<sup>7</sup>, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia
- 3. Connecticut, Maryland, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Utah<sup>8</sup>, Wyoming
- 4. Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin
- 5. Beginning in 2015.
- 6. Teachers may pass either the edTPA or a Praxis pedagogy test.
- 7. Teachers have until their second year to pass if they attempt to pass during their first year.
- 8. Not required until teacher advances from a Level One to a Level Two license.

# Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

# Goal J – Student Teaching

The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high quality clinical experience.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require that student teachers only be placed with cooperating teachers for whom there is evidence of their effectiveness as measured by consistent gains in student learning.
- 2. The state should require that teacher candidates spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 33 How States are Faring in Student Teaching 3 **Best Practice States** Florida, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee State Meets Goal Massachusetts 1 States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut<sup>1</sup>, Kentucky 24 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware 1, Georgia 1, Hawaii, Illinois 1, IOWA, Kansas, Maine 1, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri 1, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal Indiana, Michigan, Oregon, South Dakota 17 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: •:42 ↓:1 1:8

## 1-J Analysis: Iowa

State Partly Meets Goal

Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

lowa requires candidates to complete at least 14 weeks of student teaching in the final year of the practitioner preparation program. The state also requires that programs offer annual workshops of at least one day in duration for prospective cooperating teachers. "The workshop shall define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the institution deems necessary."

Supporting Research Iowa Code 272.25 SF 2284 (2012)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

In addition to the ability to mentor an adult, cooperating teachers in Iowa should also be carefully screened for their capacity to further student achievement. Research indicates that the only aspect of a student teaching arrangement that has been shown to have an impact on student achievement is the positive effect of selection of the cooperating teacher by the preparation program, rather than by the student teacher or school district staff.

Explicitly require that student teaching be completed locally, thus prohibiting candidates from completing this requirement abroad.

Unless preparation programs can establish true satellite campuses to closely supervise student teaching arrangements, placement in foreign or otherwise novel locales should be supplementary to a standard student teaching arrangement. Outsourcing the arrangements for student teaching makes it impossible to ensure the selection of the best cooperating teacher and adequate supervision of the student teacher and may prevent training of the teacher on relevant state instructional frameworks.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| Figure 34  | COPERATING TAGE             | STUDENT TEACHING<br>LASTS AT LEAST TO WEEKS |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Do states ensure a<br/>high-quality student</i> | ERATINC<br>D BASED<br>ENESS | NT TEAC                                     |
| teaching experience?                               | COOP<br>SELECTI             | STUD<br>STUD                                |
| Alabama  |                             |   |
| Alaska   |                             |   |
| Arizona  |                             |   |
| Arkansas   |                             |   |
| California   |                             |   |
| Colorado   |                             |   |
| Connecticut  |                             |   |
| Delaware   |                             |   |
| District of Columbia                               |                             |   |
| Florida  |                             |   |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii                                  |                             |   |
| Idaho  |                             |   |
| Illinois   |                             |   |
| Indiana  |                             |   |
| IOWA   |                             |   |
| Kansas   |                             |   |
| Kentucky   |                             |   |
| Louisiana  |                             |   |
| Maine  |                             |   |
| Maryland   |                             |   |
| Massachusetts                                      |                             |   |
| Michigan   |                             |   |
| Minnesota  |                             |   |
| Mississippi  |                             |   |
| Missouri   |                             |   |
| Montana  |                             |   |
| Nebraska   |                             |   |
| Nevada   |                             |   |
| New Hampshire                                      |                             |   |
| New Jersey   |                             |   |
| New Mexico   |                             |   |
| New York   |                             |   |
| North Carolina                                     |                             |   |
| North Dakota<br>Ohio                               |                             |   |
| Oklahoma   |                             |   |
| Oregon   |                             |   |
| Pennsylvania                                       |                             |   |
| Rhode Island                                       |                             |   |
| South Carolina                                     |                             |   |
| South Dakota                                       |                             |   |
| Tennessee  |                             |   |
| Texas  |                             |   |
| Utah   |                             |   |
| Vermont  |                             |   |
| Virginia   |                             |   |
| Washington   |                             |   |
| West Virginia                                      |                             | 1   |
| Wisconsin  |                             |   |
| Wyoming  |                             |   |
|  | 5                           | 32  |

## **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida, Rhode Island and Tennessee not only require teacher candidates to complete at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, but they also all require that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

1. West Virginia allows candidates to student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

*Is the selection of the cooperating teacher based on some measure of effectiveness?* 




1. Strong Practice: Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin
- Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

#### Figure 36

Is the student teaching experience of sufficient length?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia<sup>5</sup>, Wisconsin

- 2. Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Illinois, New Hampshire, Utah
- 4. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Maryland, Montana
- West Virginia allows candidates to student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

# Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

## Goal K – Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should collect data that connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs. Such data can include value added or growth analyses conducted specifically for this purpose or evaluation ratings that incorporate objective measures of student learning to a significant extent.
- 2. The state should collect other meaningful data that reflect program performance, including some or all of the following:

a. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including academic proficiency, subjectmatter and professional-knowledge tests;

b. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests;

c. Satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison and

d. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

- 3. The state should establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data. Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.
- 4. The state should produce and publish on its website an annual report card that shows all the data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs.
- 5. The state should retain full authority over its process for approving teacher preparation programs.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 37

How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation Program Accountability **Best Practice States** O State Meets Goal Louisiana 10 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Colorado, Delaware 1, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina<sup>1</sup>, Ohio<sup>1</sup>, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee, Texas States Partly Meet Goal 8 Indiana<sup>1</sup>, Kentucky, Massachusetts<sup>1</sup>, Michigan, Nevada, South Carolina, Washington 1, Wisconsin 1 18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, California<sup>1</sup>, Illinois, IOWA, Kansas<sup>1</sup>, Maine 1, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire 1, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia 14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 👄 : 38 13 : 13 J:0

## 1-K Analysis: **Iowa**

State Meets a Small Part of Goal (+) Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

lowa's approval process for traditional and alternate route teacher preparation programs does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Most importantly, Iowa does not collect or report data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

However, lowa does rely on some objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs. The state requires that its preparation programs document the quality of their programs by collecting evaluative data from practitioners who work with the teacher candidates as well as "evidence of evaluative data collected by the unit through follow-up studies of graduates and their employers." Regrettably, lowa does not appear to apply any transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval.

Further, there is no evidence that the state's standards for program approval are resulting in greater accountability. In the past three years, no programs in Iowa have been identified in required federal reporting as low performing.

The state's website does not include a report card that allows the public to review and compare program performance.

In Iowa, there is some overlap of accreditation and state approval. Although NCATE/CAEP and the state conduct concurrent on-site reviews, Iowa delegates its subject-matter program review process to NCATE/CAEP.

#### Supporting Research

Iowa Administrative Code 281-79.13, -.15(7) Title II State Reports https://title2.ed.gov www.ncate.org

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Collect data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.**

As one way to measure whether programs are producing effective classroom teachers, lowa should consider the academic achievement gains of students taught by programs' graduates, averaged over the first three years of teaching. Data that are aggregated to the institution (e.g., combining elementary and secondary programs) rather than disaggregated to the specific preparation program are not useful for accountability purposes. Such aggregation can mask significant differences in performance among programs.

#### Gather other meaningful data that reflect program performance.

Although measures of student growth are an important indicator of program effectiveness, they cannot be the sole measure of program quality for several reasons, including the fact that many programs may have graduates whose students do not take standardized tests. The accountability system must therefore include other objective measures that show how well programs are preparing teachers for the classroom. Iowa should expand its requirements to also include such measures as:

1. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including academic proficiency, subject matter and professional knowledge tests;

- 2. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests; and
- 3. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

#### Establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.

Merely collecting the types of data described above is insufficient for accountability purposes. The next and perhaps more critical step is for the state to establish precise minimum standards for teacher preparation program performance for each category of data. Programs should then be held accountable for meeting these standards, and there should be consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.

Publish an annual report card on the state's website.

Iowa should produce an annual report card that shows all the data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs, which should be published on the state's website at the program level for the sake of public transparency. Data should be presented in a manner that clearly conveys whether programs have met performance standards.

#### Maintain full authority over the process for approving teacher preparation programs.

Iowa should ensure that it is the state that considers the evidence of program performance and makes the decision about whether programs should continue to be authorized to prepare teachers.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa noted that NCATE/CAEP and the state conduct concurrent on-site reviews for institutions choosing national accreditation in addition to state accreditation. Iowa does not delegate its subject-matter program review process to NCATE/CAEP. This is completed by the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners. Subject-matter program review is performed by NCATE/CAEP only for those programs choosing national accreditation in addition to state accreditation.

#### LAST WORD

NCATE's website indicates that Iowa defers to NCATE's program review system. If this is not accurate, the state is urged to clarify its practice with NCATE/CAEP.


| Figure 38  | 414  | -CIED                                    | BSITE   |
|--|--|--|---|
| Do states hold teacher<br>preparation programs<br>accountable? | OBJECTURE PROCODAM.<br>SPECTRE DA COLORAM. | MINIMUM<br>STANDARDSFOR<br>PERFORMANCEOR | DATA PUBLICY<br>AVAILABLCLY<br>AVAILABLE ON WEBSITE |
|  | °, /                                       | - /                                      | × ·   |
| Alabama  |  |  |   |
| Alaska   |  |  |   |
| Arizona  |  |  |   |
| Arkansas<br>California   |  |  |   |
| Colorado   |  |  |   |
| Connecticut  |  |  |   |
| Delaware   |  |  |   |
| District of Columbia   |  |  |   |
| Florida  |  |  | 2   |
| Georgia  |  |  |   |
| Hawaii   |  |  |   |
| Idaho  |  |  |   |
| Illinois   |  |  |   |
| Indiana  |  |  |   |
| IOWA   |  |  |   |
| Kansas   |  |  |   |
| Kentucky   |  |  | 2   |
| Louisiana  |  |  | 2   |
| Maine  | 1  |  |   |
| Maryland   | 3  |  |   |
| Massachusetts  |  |  |   |
| Michigan   |  | 1  |   |
| Minnesota  |  |  |   |
| Mississippi  | 1  |  |   |
| Missouri   |  |  |   |
| Montana  | 1  |  |   |
| Nebraska   |  |  |   |
| Nevada <sup>1</sup>  |  |  |   |
| New Hampshire  |  |  |   |
| New Jersey   | 1  |  |   |
| New Mexico   |  |  |   |
| New York   |  |  |   |
| North Carolina   |  |  | 2   |
| North Dakota   |  |  |   |
| Ohio <sup>1</sup>  |  |  |   |
| Oklahoma   |  |  |   |
| Oregon   | 1  |  |   |
| Pennsylvania<br>Rhode Island                                   |  |  |   |
| South Carolina <sup>1</sup>                                    |  |  |   |
| South Dakota   |  |  |   |
| Tennessee  |  |  |   |
| Texas  |  |  |   |
| Utah   |  |  |   |
| Vermont  |  |  |   |
| Virginia   | 1  |  |   |
| Washington   |  |  |   |
| West Virginia  | 1  |  |   |
| Wisconsin  |  |  |   |
| Wyoming  |  |  |   |
|  | 36   | 4  | 19  |

## T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ is not awarding "best practice" honors to any state's policy in the area of teacher preparation program accountability. However, the following states should be commended for collecting data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs: Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee and Texas.

#### Figure 39

Do states connect student achievement data to teacher preparation programs?



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia<sup>3</sup>, Hawaii<sup>3</sup>, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland<sup>3</sup>, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York<sup>3</sup>, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Included in state's Race to the Top plan, but not in policy or yet implemented.

1. For traditional preparation programs only.

2. State does not distinguish between alternate route programs and traditional

preparation programs in public reporting.

3. For alternate routes only.

#### Which states collect meaningful data?

STUDENT LEARNING GAINS

Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

EVALUATION RESULTS FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas

#### AVERAGE RAW SCORES ON LICENSING TESTS

Alabama, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia

#### SATISFACTION RATINGS FROM SCHOOLS

Alabama, Arizona, Florida, IOWA, Kentucky, Maryland<sup>1</sup>, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

#### TEACHER RETENTION RATES

Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas

1. For alternate route only

1. National accreditation can be substituted for state approval. 2. For institutions with 2,000 or more full-time equivalent students

#### Figure 41


What is the relationship between state program approval and national accreditation?



# Area 2 Summary



State Area Grades



## **Topics Included In This Area**

- 2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility
- 2-B: Alternate Route Preparation
- 2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers
- 2-D: Part-Time Teaching Licenses
- 2-E: Licensure Reciprocity

REA 2 GRAD

/OW

# Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

# Goal A – Alternate Route Eligibility

The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- With some accommodation for work experience, alternate route programs should set a rigorous bar for program entry by requiring that candidates take a rigorous test to demonstrate academic ability, such as the GRE.
- 2. All alternate route candidates, including elementary candidates and those having a major in their intended subject area, should be required to pass the state's subject-matter licensing test.
- 3. Alternate route candidates lacking a major in the intended subject area should be able to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge by passing a test of sufficient rigor.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 42

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Eligibility

**Best Practice States** 2 District of Columbia, Michigan State Meets Goal Minnesota 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey 1, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington 11 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, IOWA, Kentucky, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas 1, Virginia 15 States Meet a Small Part of Goal California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia 9 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:2 •:49 📕 : 0



#### ANALYSIS

Iowa Teacher Intern License Pathway (ITILP) requires a minimum GPA of 2.5 for admission.

Candidates to ITILP are not required to pass a subject-matter test prior to admission to the program; however, candidates must pass a subject-matter test prior to licensure. ITILP candidates must pass a basic skills test and the "Star Teacher Pre-screener" assessment. The state will accept equivalent scores on the GRE in lieu of the basic skills requirement. Neither a major nor specific coursework is required; as a result there is no need for a test-out option.

Applicants must also possess a minimum of three years' successful work experience and participate in an interview process.

Supporting Research

Iowa Code 281-77.11(256) Iowa Teacher Intern License http://www.iowa.gov/boee/tilal.html

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Increase academic requirements for admission.

While a minimum GPA requirement is a first step toward ensuring that candidates are of good academic standing, the current standard of 2.5 does not serve as a sufficient indicator of past academic performance. Some accommodation in this standard may be appropriate for career changers. At a minimum, Iowa should set a standard for academic proficiency higher than for traditional candidates. A rigorous test appropriate for candidates who have already completed a bachelor's degree, such as the GRE, would be ideal.

#### Require applicants to pass a subject-matter test for admission.

The concept behind alternate routes is that the nontraditional candidate is able to concentrate on acquiring professional knowledge and skills because he or she has strong subject-area knowledge. Teachers without sufficient subject-matter knowledge place students at risk.

#### Eliminate basic skills test requirement.

Iowa's requirement that alternate route candidates pass a basic skills test is impractical and ineffectual, although Iowa is recognized for allowing candidates to use equivalent scores to fulfill this admission criterion. Basic skills tests measure minimum competency—essentially those skills that a person should have acquired in middle school—and are inappropriate for candidates who have already earned a bachelor's degree. A test designed for individuals who already have a bachelor's degree, such as the GRE, would be a much more appropriate measure of academic standing. At a minimum, the state should eliminate the basic skills test requirement or accept the equivalent in SAT or ACT scores.

#### **Consider flexibility in work-experience requirement.**

Iowa should consider using a candidate's years of experience as a factor in the admission process rather than as a requirement. Requiring a minimum number of years of work experience may disqualify potentially talented candidates unnecessarily. Recent graduates, who may demonstrate high academic ability and strong content knowledge but lack the minimum years of experience, would be needlessly excluded from the alternate route programs under this requirement.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.




### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

The **District of Columbia** and **Michigan** require candidates to demonstrate aboveaverage academic performance as a condition of admission to an alternate route program, with both requiring applicants to have a minimum 3.0 GPA. In addition, neither requires a content-specific major; subjectarea knowledge is demonstrated by passing a test, making their alternate routes flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.


#### Figure 44

Do states require alternate routes to be selective?



- 1. Strong Practice: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Rhode Island
- 2. Alabama, Illinois<sup>5</sup>, Indiana, Kentucky<sup>6</sup>, New York, Pennsylvania
- 3. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah
- 5. Illinois' routes are in the process of converting to a single new license.
- 6. Only one of Kentucky's eight alternate routes has a 3.0 GPA requirement.

*Do states accommodate the nontraditional background of alternate route candidates?* 



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maine, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

2. Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Washington

3. Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia

 Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

5. Hawaii, Idaho, New Mexico, North Dakota

# Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

# **Goal B** – Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide efficient preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as adequate mentoring and support.

#### Goal Components

# (The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that the amount of coursework it either requires or allows is manageable for a novice teacher. Anything exceeding 12 credit hours of coursework in the first year may be counterproductive, placing too great a burden on the teacher. This calculation is premised on no more than 6 credit hours in the summer, three in the fall and three in the spring.
- 2. The state should ensure that alternate route programs offer accelerated study not to exceed six (three credit) courses for secondary teachers and eight (three credit) courses for elementary teachers (exclusive of any credit for practice teaching or mentoring) over the duration of the program. Programs should be limited to two years, at which time the new teacher should be eligible for a standard certificate.
- 3. All coursework requirements should target the immediate needs of the new teacher (e.g., seminars with other grade-level teachers, training in a particular curriculum, reading instruction, classroom management techniques).
- 4. The state should require intensive induction support, beginning with a trained mentor assigned full time to the new teacher for the first critical weeks of school and then gradually reduced over the course of the entire first year. The state should support only induction strategies that can be effective even in a poorly managed school: intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers. Ideally, candidates would also have an opportunity to practice teach in a summer training program.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Figure 46

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Preparation 2 Best Practice States Delaware, New Jersey

- 2 States Meet Goal Arkansas, Georgia
- 4 States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina
- **15** States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, California, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 20 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, IOWA, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wyoming

#### 8 States Do Not Meet Goal Hawaii, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont, Wisconsin

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:0 ↔:51 ↓:0

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

## 2-B Analysis: Iowa

State Meets a Small Part of Goal

Raised for this Goal

#### Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Teachers participating in the Iowa Teacher Intern License Pathway (ITILP) must complete 24 credit hours of coursework. Eighteen credit hours must be completed prior to the first year of teaching, and six credits hours are taken during the internship year. Additional coursework to secure a content endorsement may also be required. The pre-internship coursework includes foundations of education, educational psychology, working with special-need children, curriculum and content methods, assessment, and classroom management and instruction.

ITILP candidates must complete at least 60 hours of field experience prior to their internship year. All of this classroom contact time occurs during the fall and spring when a candidate is most typically employed in a noneducation field. During the internship year the new teacher is assigned a mentor.

ITILP is a two-year program. Individuals may apply for a standard initial teaching license upon program completion..

#### **Supporting Research**

IAC 282 Chapter 13.9, Sec. 4 Iowa Teacher Intern License Pathway http://iowateacherintern.org/#internship\_experience

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Ensure that coursework meets the immediate needs of new teachers.**

While requiring some preparation prior to entering the classroom is important, lowa directs alternate route candidates to take a considerable amount of coursework before they begin teaching, much of which is more typically associated with a traditional preparation program. All coursework requirements should be manageable for career changers and other nontraditional candidates and contribute to the immediate needs of new teachers. Appropriate coursework should include grade-level or subject-level seminars, methodology in the content area, classroom management, assessment and scientifically based early reading instruction.

#### Strengthen the induction experience for new teachers.

Although Iowa is commended for requiring all new teachers to work with a mentor, there are insufficient guidelines indicating that the mentoring program is structured for new teacher success. Effective induction strategies include practice teaching prior to teaching in the classroom, intensive mentoring with full classroom support in the first few weeks or months of school, a reduced teaching load and release time to allow new teachers to observe experienced teachers during each school day.

### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 47  |                         | Day /               | . /                          | 1                 |                   |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Do states' alternate routes<br>provide efficient preparation<br>that meets the immediate<br>needs of new teachers? | EFFICIENT<br>COURSEWORK | RELEVANT COURSEMORK | REASONABLE<br>PROGRAM LENCTH | PRACTICE TEACHING | INTENSIVE SUPPORT |
| Alabama  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Alaska   |                         | *                   | *                            | *                 |                   |
| Arizona  |                         |                     | *                            | *                 |                   |
| Arkansas   | *                       | *                   | *                            |                   | *                 |
| California   |                         |                     | *                            |                   |                   |
| Colorado   | *                       |                     | *                            |                   |                   |
| Connecticut  | *                       | *                   | *                            | *                 |                   |
| Delaware   | *                       | *                   | *                            | *                 | *                 |
| District of Columbia   |                         |                     |                              | *                 |                   |
| Florida  |                         |                     | *                            |                   |                   |
| Georgia  | *                       | *                   | *                            |                   | *                 |
| Hawaii   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Idaho  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Illinois   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Indiana  |                         |                     |                              | *                 |                   |
| IOWA   |                         |                     |                              | *                 |                   |
| Kansas   |                         |                     |                              |                   | <b>_</b>          |
| Kentucky<br>Louisiana  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Maine  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Maryland   |                         | •                   | •                            |                   | •                 |
| Massachusetts  |                         | ÷                   |                              | ÷                 |                   |
| Michigan   |                         | $\widehat{\Box}$    |                              | ÷                 |                   |
| Minnesota  |                         |                     | +                            |                   |                   |
| Mississippi  | +                       | *                   | ÷                            |                   |                   |
| Missouri   | Ô                       |                     |                              |                   | *                 |
| Montana  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Nebraska   | *                       |                     |                              | *                 |                   |
| Nevada   |                         |                     | *                            |                   |                   |
| New Hampshire  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| New Jersey   | *                       | *                   | *                            | *                 | *                 |
| New Mexico   |                         |                     |                              | *                 |                   |
| New York   |                         |                     |                              |                   | *                 |
| North Carolina   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| North Dakota   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Ohio   |                         |                     |                              | <b>X</b>          |                   |
| Oklahoma   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Oregon   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Pennsylvania<br>Rhode Island   | <b>↓</b>                | *                   |                              | <b>4</b>          |                   |
| South Carolina   | ÷                       | ÷                   |                              | $\hat{\Box}$      | •                 |
| South Dakota   |                         |                     | <b>•</b>                     |                   |                   |
| Tennessee  |                         |                     | î î                          |                   |                   |
| Texas  |                         |                     | *                            |                   |                   |
| Utah   |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Vermont  |                         |                     |                              | *                 |                   |
| Virginia   | *                       |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Washington   |                         |                     | *                            |                   | *                 |
| West Virginia  |                         | *                   | *                            |                   | *                 |
| Wisconsin  |                         |                     |                              |                   |                   |
| Wyoming  |                         |                     | *                            |                   |                   |
| 🖉 For some alternate routes 🛛 🔲 For most or  | maatuidelu              | used alterna        |                              | Fam all alt       |                   |

## **T**EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Delaware and New Jersey ensure that alternate routes provide efficient preparation that meets the needs of new teachers. Both states require a manageable number of credit hours, relevant coursework, a field placement and intensive mentoring.

For some alternate routes
For most or most widely used alternate routes
For all alternate routes

# Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

# Goal C – Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from limitations on its usage and allows a diversity of providers.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should not treat the alternate route as a program of last resort or restrict the availability of alternate routes to certain subjects, grades or geographic areas.
- 2. The state should allow districts and nonprofit organizations other than institutions of higher education to operate alternate route programs.
- 3. The state should ensure that its alternate route has no requirements that would be difficult to meet for a provider that is not an institution of higher education (e.g., an approval process based on institutional accreditation).

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 48

*How States are Faring in Alternate Route Usage and Providers* 



## Best Practice States

23 States Meet Goal

Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington



States Nearly Meet Goal Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania↓, South Carolina↑, Utah

#### 12 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas↓, Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Hawaii, Idaho, Missouri, South Dakota

7 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, IOWA, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, Wyoming

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:1 ↔:47 ↓:3

## 2-C Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal ( Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

Iowa limits the usage and providers of its alternate route.

Iowa's alternate route can only be used for certification in secondary (7-12) teaching endorsement areas.

lowa currently only certifies colleges and universities to offer alternate route programs. Coursework requirements are set out only in credit hours, effectively precluding nonhigher education providers.

#### Supporting Research

Iowa Administrative Code 282-13.9(1) Iowa Teacher Intern License http://www.boee.iowa.gov/tilal.html

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Broaden alternate route usage.

Iowa should reconsider grade-level restrictions on its alternate route. Alternate routes should not be programs of last resort for hard-to-staff subjects, grade levels or geographic areas but rather a way to expand the teacher pipeline throughout the state. The state should allow the development of a route that provides a true alternative path to certification and eliminate requirements that alternate route teachers can only be hired if traditionally certified teachers cannot be found.

#### Encourage diversity of alternate route providers.

The state should specifically authorize alternate route programs run by local school districts and nonprofits, as well as institutions of higher education. A good diversity of providers helps all programs, both university- and nonuniversity-based, to improve.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| Figure 49                 |                         | SS QN                | ERS    |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------|
|                           | 4                       | PESA<br>PESA<br>PESA | ้อี่งก |
| Are states' alternate     |                         | OF PL                |        |
| routes free from          | P C P                   | SRAP.                |        |
| limitations?              | SCB                     | DIVERSITY OF PROV.   |        |
| Alabama                   |                         |                      |        |
| Alaska                    |                         |                      |        |
| Arizona                   |                         | *                    |        |
| Arkansas<br>California    |                         | *                    |        |
| Colorado                  | <b>T</b>                |                      |        |
| Connecticut               |                         |                      |        |
| Delaware                  |                         | *                    |        |
| District of Columbia      | <b>*</b>                | *                    |        |
| Florida                   | ÷ 🗎                     | ÷ 🗎                  |        |
| Georgia                   | *                       | *                    |        |
| Hawaii                    |                         |                      |        |
| Idaho                     |                         |                      |        |
| Illinois                  | *                       | *                    |        |
| Indiana                   | *                       | *                    |        |
| IOWA                      |                         |                      |        |
| Kansas                    |                         |                      |        |
| Kentucky                  |                         |                      |        |
| Louisiana<br>Maine        | <b>*</b>                | <b>*</b>             |        |
| Maryland                  |                         |                      |        |
| Massachusetts             | <b>T</b>                |                      |        |
| Michigan                  |                         |                      |        |
| Minnesota                 |                         |                      |        |
| Mississippi               | <u> </u>                |                      |        |
| Missouri                  |                         |                      |        |
| Montana                   | *                       |                      |        |
| Nebraska                  |                         |                      |        |
| Nevada                    |                         | *                    |        |
| New Hampshire             | *                       | *                    |        |
| New Jersey                | *                       |                      |        |
| New Mexico                | *                       |                      |        |
| New York                  | *                       | *                    |        |
| North Carolina            | *                       | *                    |        |
| North Dakota<br>Ohio      |                         |                      |        |
| Oklahoma                  | *                       | *                    |        |
| Oregon                    |                         |                      |        |
| Pennsylvania              |                         |                      |        |
| Rhode Island              | *                       |                      |        |
| South Carolina            |                         | - ÷                  |        |
| South Dakota              |                         | Â                    |        |
| Tennessee                 | □<br>★                  | *                    |        |
| Texas                     | *                       | *                    |        |
| Utah                      | *                       |                      |        |
| Vermont                   | *<br>*<br>*             |                      |        |
| Virginia                  | *                       | *                    |        |
| Washington                | *                       | *                    |        |
| West Virginia             |                         | *                    |        |
| Wisconsin                 |                         | *                    |        |
| Wyoming                   |                         |                      |        |
|                           | For most or most widely | + For all alternate  | route  |
| For some alternate routes | used alternate routes   |                      | outes  |
|                           |                         |                      |        |

### **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Twenty-three states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends all states that pemit both broad usage and a diversity of providers for their alternate routes.

#### Figure 50

Do states provide real alternative pathways to certification?



1. Strong Practice: Connecticut, Florida, New Jersey, Rhode Island

2. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

3. Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming

| Figure 51                 | PREREQUISITE OF STRONG | VERIFICATION OF SUBJECT |                   |                    | že /              | ORK                        | /               | INTENSIVE MENT | RING        | DERS                   |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|
| What are the              | ITE OF S               | ON OF S                 | AVAUABUTY OF TEST | EFFICIENT COURSENC | RELEVANT COURSELL | REASONABLE<br>PROCRAM LEAD | PRACTICE TEACUL | MENT           | Эн          | DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS |
| characteristics of states | ,<br>MIC F             | A K K                   |                   |                    | 4                 | 2N/48<br>417 L             |                 | SIVE           | 524         | °È                     |
| alternate routes?         | PRERE<br>4CADE         | VERIF<br>MATTE          | 4V41              | EFFICIE            | RELEVA            | REASC<br>PROCR             | PRACT           | INTEA          | BROAD USACE | DIVERS                 |
| Alabama                   |                        |                         | *                 |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             |                        |
| Alaska                    |                        |                         |                   |                    | *                 | *                          | *               |                |             |                        |
| Arizona                   |                        | *                       | *                 |                    |                   | *                          | *               |                | *           | *                      |
| Arkansas                  |                        | *                       | *                 | *                  | *                 | *                          |                 | *              |             | *                      |
| California                |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| Colorado                  |                        |                         | *                 | *                  |                   | *                          |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| Connecticut               | *                      |                         |                   | *                  | *                 | *                          | *               |                | *           | *                      |
| Delaware                  |                        |                         |                   | *                  | *                 | *                          | *               | *              |             | *                      |
| District of Columbia      | *                      | *                       | *                 |                    |                   |                            | *               |                | *           | *                      |
| Florida                   |                        | *                       | *                 |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii         |                        |                         | *                 | *                  | *                 | *                          |                 | *              | *           | *                      |
| Idaho                     |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             |                        |
| Illinois                  |                        |                         | *                 |                    |                   |                            |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| Indiana                   |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            | *               |                | *           | *                      |
| IOWA                      |                        |                         | *                 |                    |                   | *                          | *               |                |             |                        |
| Kansas                    |                        | *                       |                   |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                |             |                        |
| Kentucky                  |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 | *              | *           | *                      |
| Louisiana                 |                        | *                       | *                 |                    |                   |                            |                 | Ê              | -           | *                      |
| Maine                     |                        | *                       | ÷.                |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             |                        |
| Maryland                  |                        |                         | 2                 |                    | *                 | *                          | *               | *              | *           | *                      |
| Massachusetts             |                        | *                       | *                 |                    | *                 |                            | ÷               |                | ÷           | ÷                      |
| Michigan                  | *                      | <b>*</b>                | *                 |                    |                   |                            | *               |                | ÷.          | *                      |
| Minnesota                 |                        |                         | ÷.                |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                | ÷           |                        |
| Mississippi               |                        | *                       | *                 | *                  | *                 | *                          |                 |                |             |                        |
| Missouri                  |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 | *              |             |                        |
| Montana                   |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                | *           |                        |
| Nebraska                  |                        |                         |                   | *                  |                   |                            | *               |                |             |                        |
| Nevada                    |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                |             | *                      |
| New Hampshire             |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| New Jersey                | *                      | *                       |                   | *                  | *                 | *                          | *               | *              | *           |                        |
| New Mexico                |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            | *               |                | *           |                        |
| New York                  |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 | *              | *           | *                      |
| North Carolina            |                        |                         | *                 |                    |                   |                            |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| North Dakota              |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             |                        |
| Ohio                      |                        | *                       | *                 |                    |                   |                            | *               |                | *           | *                      |
| Oklahoma                  |                        | *                       | *                 |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             | *                      |
| Oregon<br>Pennsylvania    |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             |                        |
| Rhode Island              |                        | *                       |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             | *                      |
| South Carolina            | *                      |                         | *                 | *                  | *                 |                            | *               |                | *           | *                      |
| South Dakota              |                        | *                       |                   | *                  | *                 |                            |                 | *              |             | *                      |
| Tennessee                 |                        | *                       | *                 |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                | *           |                        |
| Texas                     |                        |                         | <br>★             |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                |             | ★<br>★                 |
| Utah                      |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                | ÷.          |                        |
| Vermont                   |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            | *               |                | *           |                        |
| Virginia                  |                        | *                       |                   | *                  |                   |                            |                 |                | *           | *                      |
| Washington                |                        | - <del>2</del> -        | *                 |                    |                   | *                          |                 | *              | ÷           | ÷                      |
| West Virginia             |                        | ÷                       | Ô                 |                    | *                 | ÷                          |                 | ÷.             |             | ÷.                     |
| Wisconsin                 |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             | ÷.                     |
| Wyoming                   |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   |                            |                 |                |             |                        |
|                           |                        |                         |                   |                    |                   | *                          |                 |                |             |                        |

🛛 For some alternate routes 📕 For most or most widely used alternate routes 🛛 📩 For all alternate routes

# Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

# Goal D – Part-Time Teaching Licenses

The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.

#### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Either through a discrete license or by waiving most licensure requirements, the state should license individuals with content expertise as part-time instructors.
- All candidates for a part-time teaching license should be required to pass a subjectmatter test.
- Other requirements for this license should be limited to those addressing public safety (e.g., background screening) and those of immediate use to the novice instructor (e.g., classroom management training).

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 52

How States are Faring in Part Time Teaching Licenses



Best Practice State Georgia

- 2 States Meet Goal Arkansas, Florida
  - States Nearly Meet Goal Kentucky, Michigan 1, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah



3 States Partly Meet Goal California, Louisiana, Oklahoma

10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania<sup>1</sup>, Washington, Wisconsin

28 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, IOWA, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:2 ↔:49 ↓:0

## 2-D Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal

\ominus Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

Iowa does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.

Supporting Research Iowa Requirements for Licenses http://www.iowa.gov/boee/require.html

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Offer a license that allows content experts to serve as part-time instructors.

Iowa should permit individuals with deep subject-area knowledge to teach a limited number of courses without fulfilling a complete set of certification requirements. The state should verify content knowledge through a rigorous test and conduct background checks as appropriate, while waiving all other licensure requirements. Such a license would increase districts' flexibility to staff certain subjects, including many STEM areas, that are frequently hard to staff or may not have high enough enrollment to necessitate a full-time position.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

lowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

|                             |     | /                    | 1   |
|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|
| Do states offer a license   |     | Irestricted or Vague |     |
| with minimal requirements   |     | Par Val              | . / |
| that allows content experts |     | ted c                | /   |
| to teach part-time?         | ŝ   | stric<br>nse         |     |
| to teach part-time:         | YES | li <sub>Ce</sub> Re  | °∧  |
| Alabama                     |     |                      |     |
| Alaska                      |     |                      |     |
| Arizona                     |     |                      |     |
| Arkansas                    |     |                      |     |
| California                  |     |                      |     |
| Colorado                    |     |                      |     |
| Connecticut                 |     |                      |     |
| Delaware                    |     |                      |     |
| District of Columbia        |     |                      |     |
| Florida                     |     |                      |     |
| Georgia                     |     |                      |     |
| Hawaii                      |     |                      |     |
| Idaho                       |     |                      |     |
| Illinois                    |     |                      |     |
| Indiana                     |     |                      |     |
| IOWA                        |     |                      |     |
| Kansas                      |     |                      |     |
| Kentucky                    |     |                      |     |
| Louisiana                   |     |                      |     |
| Maine                       |     |                      |     |
| Maryland                    |     |                      |     |
| Massachusetts               |     |                      |     |
| Michigan                    |     |                      |     |
| Minnesota                   |     |                      |     |
| Mississippi                 |     |                      |     |
| Missouri                    |     |                      |     |
| Montana                     |     |                      |     |
| Nebraska                    |     |                      |     |
| Nevada                      |     |                      |     |
| New Hampshire               |     |                      |     |
| New Jersey<br>New Mexico    |     |                      |     |
| New York                    |     |                      |     |
| North Carolina              |     |                      |     |
| North Dakota                |     |                      |     |
| Ohio                        |     |                      |     |
| Oklahoma                    |     |                      |     |
| Oregon                      |     |                      |     |
| Pennsylvania                |     |                      |     |
| Rhode Island                |     |                      |     |
| South Carolina              |     |                      |     |
| South Dakota                |     |                      |     |
| Tennessee                   |     |                      |     |
| Texas                       |     |                      |     |
| Utah                        |     |                      |     |
| Vermont                     |     |                      |     |
| Virginia                    |     |                      |     |
| Washington                  |     |                      |     |
| West Virginia               |     |                      |     |
| Wisconsin                   |     |                      |     |
| Wyoming                     |     |                      |     |
|                             |     |                      |     |
|                             | 10  | 12                   | 29  |

### **T** EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia offers a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time. Individuals seeking this license must pass a subject-matter test and will be assigned a mentor.

# Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

# Goal E – Licensure Reciprocity

The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.

#### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should offer a standard license to fully certified teachers moving from other states, without relying on transcript analysis or recency requirements as a means of judging eligibility. The state can and should require evidence of effective teaching in previous employment.
- The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet its own testing requirements.
- 3. The state should accord the same license to teachers from other states who completed an approved alternate route program as it accords teachers prepared in a traditional preparation program.
- 4. Consistent with these principles of portability, state requirements for online teachers based in other states should protect student interests without creating unnecessary obstacles for teachers.

#### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

#### Figure 54

How States are Faring in Licensure Reciprocity 2 **Best Practice States** Alabama, Texas States Meet Goal North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island States Nearly Meet Goal Delaware 1, Indiana 1, Oklahoma 1, Washington, Wisconsin 22 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho4, Illinois, IOWA<sup>1</sup>, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming 12 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Carolina States Do Not Meet Goal 7 California, District of Columbia, Kansas, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, Vermont Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:5 🛏 : 45 ↓:1

## 2-E Analysis: **lowa**

### State Partly Meets Goal

Progress Since 2011

#### ANALYSIS

Commendably, out-of-state teachers who graduate from a teacher preparation program after January 1, 2013, must submit passing scores for Iowa's required content tests.

An initial license does not require experience verification. A standard license requires at least three years of teaching experience.

All out-of-state teachers must submit transcripts for review. States that reach a determination about an applicant's licensure status on the basis of the course titles listed on the applicant's transcript may end up mistakenly equating the amount of required coursework with the teacher's qualifications. Alternate route teachers must also meet the recency requirement of 160 days of teaching experience within the last five years or six semester hours of credit within five years.

Iowa is also a participant in the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement, which outlines which other states' certificates will be accepted by the receiving state. This agreement is not a collection of two-way reciprocal acceptances, nor is it a guarantee that all certificates will be accepted by the receiving state, and is therefore not included in this analysis.

Although Iowa requires all online teachers to be licensed, it is not clear whether instructors located outside Iowa are required to meet the state's certification requirements.

Supporting Research Iowa Administrative Code 282-13.3 Out-of-State Application for Licensure Checklist http://www.iowa.gov/boee/forms/outstate.pdf SF 2284 (2012)

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

# Offer a standard license to certified out-of-state teachers, absent unnecessary requirements.

Transcript reviews are not a particularly meaningful or efficient exercise, and the state should consider discontinuing its requirement for the submission of transcripts for all teachers. Transcript analysis is likely to result in additional coursework requirements, even for traditionally prepared teachers; alternate route teachers, on the other hand, may have to virtually begin anew, repeating some, most or all of a teacher preparation program in Iowa.

lowa should also reconsider its recency requirement as a means to judge licensure eligibility. Recent coursework or experience is unlikely to positively affect a teacher's effectiveness, and such a requirement may deter effective teachers from applying for licensure in the state.

#### Require evidence of effective teaching when determining eligibility for full certification.

Rather than rely on transcripts to assess credentials, lowa should instead require that evidence of teacher effectiveness be considered for all out-of-state candidates. Such evidence is especially important for candidates who come from states that make student growth at least a significant factor of a teacher evaluation (see Goal 3-B).

#### Ensure that requirements for online teachers are as rigorous as those for in-state teachers.


Iowa should ensure that online teachers based in other states are at least equally as qualified as those who teach in the state. However, Iowa should balance the interests of its students in having qualified online instructors with making certain that these requirements do not create unnecessary obstacles for out-of-state teachers.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis.



Do states require all out-of-state teachers to pass their licensure tests?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska<sup>3</sup>, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine<sup>4</sup>, Massachusetts<sup>3</sup>, Minnesota, New York<sup>5</sup>, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas<sup>3</sup>, Utah, Washington<sup>6</sup>, Wisconsin
- 2. Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana<sup>7</sup>, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Allows one year to meet testing requirements.
- 4. Maine grants waiver for basic skills and pedagogy tests.
- 5. Waiver for teachers with National Board Certification; all others given two years to meet testing requirements.
- 6. Waiver for teachers with National Board Certification.
- 7. No subject-matter testing for any teacher certification.

- 1. State conducts transcript reviews.
- 2. Recency requirement is for alternate route.
- 3. For traditionally prepared teachers only.
- 4. Teachers with less than 3 years' experience are subject to transcript review.

| Figure 56                      | UCENSE RECIPROC. | Submission of trac. | Sts                 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                                | ć                | TACHE               | Recency requiements |
| What do states require of      | RECIPR           | <sup>30</sup> AT    | equire              |
| teachers transferring from     | NSE<br>TRIV      | nissi               | 164                 |
| other states?                  | LICE<br>NO S     | Subr                | Rece                |
| Alabama                        |                  |                     |                     |
| Alaska                         |                  |                     |                     |
| Arizona                        |                  |                     |                     |
| Arkansas                       |                  |                     |                     |
| California                     |                  |                     |                     |
| Colorado                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Connecticut                    |                  |                     |                     |
| Delaware                       |                  |                     |                     |
| District of Columbia           |                  | <b>1</b>            |                     |
| Florida                        |                  |                     |                     |
| Georgia                        |                  |                     |                     |
| Hawaii                         |                  |                     |                     |
| Idaho<br>Illinois              |                  |                     |                     |
| Illinois<br>Indiana            |                  |                     |                     |
| Indiana                        |                  | 1                   | 2                   |
| Kansas                         |                  | <b>1</b>            |                     |
| Kentucky                       |                  | 1                   |                     |
| Louisiana                      |                  |                     |                     |
| Maine                          |                  | 1                   |                     |
| Maryland                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Massachusetts                  |                  | 1                   |                     |
| Michigan                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Minnesota                      |                  | 1                   |                     |
| Mississippi                    |                  |                     |                     |
| Missouri                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Montana                        |                  |                     |                     |
| Nebraska                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Nevada                         |                  | <b>1</b>            |                     |
| New Hampshire                  |                  |                     |                     |
| New Jersey                     |                  |                     |                     |
| New Mexico                     |                  |                     |                     |
| New York                       | 3                |                     |                     |
| North Carolina                 |                  |                     |                     |
| North Dakota                   |                  |                     |                     |
| Ohio                           |                  |                     |                     |
| Oklahoma                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Oregon                         |                  |                     |                     |
| Pennsylvania<br>Phodo Island   |                  |                     |                     |
| Rhode Island<br>South Carolina |                  |                     |                     |
| South Carolina<br>South Dakota |                  |                     |                     |
| Tennessee                      |                  |                     |                     |
| Texas                          |                  |                     |                     |
| Utah                           |                  | <b>1</b>            |                     |
| Vermont                        |                  | 1                   |                     |
| Virginia                       |                  |                     |                     |
| Washington                     | 4                |                     |                     |
| West Virginia                  |                  |                     |                     |
| Wisconsin                      |                  |                     |                     |
| Wyoming                        | 3                |                     |                     |
|                                | 6                | 44                  | 11                  |
|                                | 6                | 44                  |                     |

| Figure 57                               |                   | State Specific different    | ate                                  |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Do states treat out-of-state            | EACL              | DLESS                       | alterr,<br>es wij<br>creat           |
| teachers the same whether               | STATE TREATS TEAC | V ARI<br>S for              | rs di<br>polici<br>ial to<br>rs alte |
| they were prepared in a                 | LYR               | Peci<br>Peci                | thes for the stand                   |
| traditional or an alternate             | TATE<br>PAR       | tate<br>quire<br>Ite te     | State<br>State<br>Stac<br>Stac       |
| route program?                          | PRE S             | <sup>o</sup> r <sup>s</sup> | 499                                  |
| Alabama                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| Alaska                                  |                   |                             |                                      |
| Arizona                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| Arkansas                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| California                              |                   |                             |                                      |
| Colorado                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Connecticut<br>Delaware                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| District of Columbia                    |                   |                             |                                      |
| Florida                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| Georgia                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| Hawaii                                  |                   |                             |                                      |
| Idaho                                   |                   |                             |                                      |
| Illinois                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Indiana                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| IOWA                                    |                   |                             |                                      |
| Kansas                                  |                   |                             |                                      |
| Kentucky                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Louisiana                               |                   |                             |                                      |
| Maine                                   |                   |                             |                                      |
| Maryland<br>Massachusetts               |                   |                             |                                      |
| Michigan                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Minnesota                               |                   |                             |                                      |
| Mississippi                             |                   |                             |                                      |
| Missouri                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Montana                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| Nebraska                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Nevada                                  |                   |                             |                                      |
| New Hampshire                           |                   |                             |                                      |
| New Jersey                              |                   |                             |                                      |
| New Mexico                              |                   |                             |                                      |
| New York                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| North Carolina<br>North Dakota          |                   |                             |                                      |
| Ohio                                    |                   |                             |                                      |
| Oklahoma                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Oregon                                  |                   |                             |                                      |
| Pennsylvania                            |                   |                             |                                      |
| Rhode Island                            |                   |                             |                                      |
| South Carolina                          |                   |                             |                                      |
| South Dakota                            |                   |                             |                                      |
| Tennessee                               |                   |                             |                                      |
| Texas                                   |                   |                             |                                      |
| Utah                                    |                   |                             |                                      |
| Vermont                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| Virginia                                |                   |                             |                                      |
| Washington<br>West Virginia             |                   |                             |                                      |
| Wisconsin                               |                   |                             |                                      |
| Wyoming                                 |                   |                             |                                      |
| , | 4                 | -                           | 41                                   |
|   | 4                 | 6                           | 41                                   |
|   |                   |                             |                                      |

### **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**


Alabama and Texas appropriately support licensure reciprocity by requiring that certified teachers from other states meet Alabama's and Texas's own testing requirements, and by not specifying any additional coursework or recency requirements to determine eligibility for either traditional or alternate route teachers. Also worthy of mention is Delaware for its reciprocity policy that limits the evidence of "successful" experience it will accept to evaluation results from states with rigorous requirements similar to its own.

# Area 3 Summary



## How States are Faring in Identifying Effective Teachers





### **Topics Included In This Area**

- 3-A: State Data Systems
- **3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness**
- **3-C: Frequency of Evaluations**

- 3-D: Tenure
- 3-E: Licensure Advancement
- 3-F: Equitable Distribution

# Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

## Goal A – State Data Systems

The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.

### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should establish a longitudinal data system with at least the following key components:

a. A unique statewide student identifier number that connects student data across key databases across years;

b. A unique teacher identifier system that can match individual teacher records with individual student records and

c. An assessment system that can match individual student test records from year to year in order to measure academic growth.

- Student growth or value-added data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be considered among the criteria used to determine teachers' effectiveness.
- 3. To ensure that data provided through the state data system is actionable and reliable, the state should have a clear definition of "teacher of record" and require its consistent use statewide.
- 4. Data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be used to publicly report information on teacher production.



The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 58

How States are Faring in State Data Systems



Best Practice States Hawaii, New York

States Meet Goal

- 0
  - **19** States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona<sup>↑</sup>, Arkansas, Connecticut<sup>↑</sup>, Delaware, District of Columbia<sup>↑</sup>, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan<sup>↑</sup>, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas<sup>↑</sup>, Washington, Wyoming



25 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska , California , Indiana, IOWA, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana , Nebraska, Nevada , New Hampshire, New Jersey , New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon , South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont , Virginia , West Virginia, Wisconsin

2

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Pennsylvania

3 States Do Not Meet Goal Maine, Oklahoma, South Dakota

### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**↑**:13 ↔:36 ↓:2



### **ANALYSIS**

lowa has a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Iowa has all three necessary elements of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. The state has assigned unique student identifiers that connect student data across key databases across years and has assigned unique teacher identifiers that enable it to match individual teacher records with individual student records. It also has the capacity to match student test records from year to year in order to measure student academic growth.

Iowa does not have a teacher of record definition. The state's teacher-student data link cannot connect more than one educator to a particular student in a given course, and it does not have in place a process for teacher roster verification.

Iowa does not publish data on teacher production that connects program completion, certification and hiring statistics. The state does publish "The Annual Condition of Education Report," but it only includes limited data regarding characteristics of beginning teachers.

Supporting Research Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org Report https://www.educateiowa.gov/annual-condition-education-report-pk-12

### RECOMMENDATION

# Develop a definition of "teacher of record" that can be used to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

To ensure that data provided through the state data system are actionable and reliable, Iowa should articulate a definition of teacher of record and require its consistent use throughout the state. The state's definition should reflect instruction rather than grading, and Iowa should develop a process for teacher roster verification as well as an ability to link more than one educator to a particular student.


### Publish data on teacher production.

From the number of teachers who graduate from preparation programs each year, only a subset are certified, and only some of those certified are actually hired in the state. While it is certainly desirable to produce a big enough pool to give districts a choice in hiring, the substantial oversupply in some teaching areas is not good for the profession. Iowa should look to Maryland's "Teacher Staffing Report" as a model whose primary purpose is to determine teacher shortage areas, while also identifying areas of surplus. By collecting similar hiring data from its districts, Iowa will form a rich set of data that can inform policy decisions.

### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states' data systems have the basic elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness: unique teacher and student identifiers that can be matched to test records over time?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

2. Colorado, Maine, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota

### Figure 60

Do states' data systems include more advanced elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness?



| Figure 61                           | Some Teacher and<br>Datta Pular Cher and | Some data published L   | 8                         |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| De states track                     |  | DUCT                    | No related data published |
| Do states track teacher production? | Ren                                      | blishe,                 | <sup>ogt</sup> rict       |
| leacher production?                 | ACH.                                     | uSHI<br>ta pu<br>d to o | 'data,                    |
|                                     | INE TE<br>TA PUL                         | ome d<br>nnecte         | relateo                   |
|                                     | 50 80                                    | <u>ه ج</u> ا            | 2°                        |
| Alabama                             |  |                         |                           |
| Alaska                              |  |                         |                           |
| Arizona<br>Arkansas                 |  |                         |                           |
| California                          |  |                         |                           |
| Colorado                            |  |                         |                           |
| Connecticut                         |  |                         |                           |
| Delaware                            |  |                         |                           |
| District of Columbia                |  |                         |                           |
| Florida                             |  |                         |                           |
| Georgia                             |  |                         |                           |
| Hawaii                              |  |                         |                           |
| Idaho<br>Illinois                   |  |                         |                           |
| Illinois<br>Indiana                 |  |                         |                           |
| IOWA                                |  |                         |                           |
| Kansas                              |  |                         |                           |
| Kentucky                            |  |                         |                           |
| Louisiana                           |  |                         |                           |
| Maine                               |  |                         |                           |
| Maryland                            |  |                         |                           |
| Massachusetts                       |  |                         |                           |
| Michigan                            |  |                         |                           |
| Minnesota                           |  |                         |                           |
| Mississippi                         |  |                         |                           |
| Missouri<br>Montana                 |  |                         |                           |
| Nebraska                            |  |                         |                           |
| Nevada                              |  |                         |                           |
| New Hampshire                       |  |                         |                           |
| New Jersey                          |  |                         |                           |
| New Mexico                          |  |                         |                           |
| New York                            |  |                         |                           |
| North Carolina                      |  |                         |                           |
| North Dakota                        |  |                         |                           |
| Ohio                                |  |                         |                           |
| Oklahoma<br>Oragon                  |  |                         |                           |
| Oregon<br>Pennsylvania              |  |                         |                           |
| Rhode Island                        |  |                         |                           |
| South Carolina                      |  |                         |                           |
| South Dakota                        |  |                         |                           |
| Tennessee                           |  |                         |                           |
| Texas                               |  |                         |                           |
| Utah                                |  |                         |                           |
| Vermont                             |  |                         |                           |
| Virginia                            |  |                         |                           |
| Washington                          |  |                         |                           |
| West Virginia<br>Wisconsin          |  |                         |                           |
| Wyoming                             |  |                         |                           |
|                                     |  |                         |                           |
|                                     | 6  | 8                       | 37                        |

### **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**

Hawaii and New York have all three necessary elements of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. Both states have developed definitions of "teacher of record" that reflect instruction. Their data links can connect multiple teachers to a particular student, and there is a process for teacher roster verification. In addition, Hawaii and New York publish teacher production data. Also worthy of mention is Maryland for its "Teacher Staffing Report," which serves as a model for other states. The report's primary purpose is to determine teacher shortage areas, while also identifying areas of surplus.

# Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

## Goal B – Evaluation of Effectiveness

The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion or should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Evaluation instruments, whether state or locally developed, should be structured so as to preclude a teacher from receiving a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.
- 2. Evaluation instruments should require classroom observations that focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.
- The state should encourage the use of student surveys, which have been shown to correlate strongly with teacher effectiveness.
- 4. The state should require that evaluation instruments differentiate among various levels of teacher performance. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 62

How States are Faring in Evaluation of Effectiveness

**Best Practice States** 



19 States Meet Goal Alaska<sup>↑</sup>, Colorado, Connecticut<sup>↑</sup>, Delaware, Florida, Georgia<sup>↑</sup>, Hawaii<sup>↑</sup>, Louisiana<sup>↑</sup>, Michigan, Mississippi<sup>↑</sup>, Nevada, New Mexico<sup>↑</sup>, North Carolina<sup>↑</sup>, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania<sup>↑</sup>, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Wisconsin<sup>↑</sup>

# 5 Stat

States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Virginia

16 States Partly Meet Goal Arkansas, District of Columbia 1, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas 1, Kentucky 1, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri 1, Oregon 1, South Carolina 1, South Dakota 1, Utah, West Virginia 1, Wyoming 1



States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, California, Idaho↓, IOWA↑, Nebraska, Texas, Washington↓

4 States Do Not Meet Goal Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

### Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:22 ↔:27 ↓:2

### 3-B Analysis: Iowa

🚽 State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🕋 Progress Since 2011

### **ANALYSIS**

lowa does not require that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.

According to state policy, local districts are responsible for the development of teacher evaluations, although the state provides some guidance. The state requires that district teacher evaluations take into consideration classroom observation as well as a review of teachers' individual career development plans to determine whether teachers are meeting the state's teaching standards. Student achievement goals are tracked on teacher evaluations, but there is no indication that these goals must be connected to objective measures of student achievement or the extent to which they will be counted.

Classroom observations are required. Supporting documentation from parents, students and other teachers is also required.

A task force has been convened to develop a statewide teacher evaluation system that includes "balanced consideration" of student growth measures, when available, for tested subjects and grades. The system must include a four-tiered rating system of highly effective, effective, minimally effective and ineffective.

Supporting Research Iowa Code 284.4; 284.6; 284.8 SF 2284 (2012) Teacher Evaluation Task Force Final Report http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=2659&Itemid=5164

#### RECOMMENDATION

# Require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

Although lowa requires some evidence of student achievement, it is not clear whether the state requires objective evidence of student achievement for all teacher evaluations. Iowa should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion, or it should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Whether state or locally developed, a teacher should not be able to receive a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.

# Ensure that classroom observations specifically focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.

Although Iowa requires classroom observations as part of teacher evaluations, the state should articulate guidelines that focus classroom observations on the quality of instruction, as measured by student time on task, student grasp or mastery of the lesson objective and efficient use of class time.

### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Do states consider      |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| classroom effectiveness |  |
| as part of teacher      |  |
| evaluations?            |  |
|                         |  |

| Figure 63               | REQURES THAT STUDENT<br>ACHEVENENT THAT STUDENT<br>PREDONDERANT CROUDENT | Requires the student<br>actives the student<br>criteron actives with a student<br>criterion (explicit) das is a spore. | Requires that student<br>achievenes that student<br>'Significant's student<br>without's ant's chowth is' | · explicit «mon – a<br>Requires some objens<br>of student (a.s. the objens | Student echievente evidence<br>Student echievennent data |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Do states consider      | anti anti  | TER I  | Requires that student<br>achievement, growth is<br>"significant" critics without is "                    | times  | "t dat   |
|                         | 141  | Stud<br>Town   | Boy H  | Buid   | ing the second   |
| classroom effectiveness | ES T<br>MEN<br>FRAN  | that<br>ent/e<br>vplici  | es the<br>Thent  | Plicit   | d lie  |
| as part of teacher      | OUND   | Pulite<br>even<br>ion (e   | equir<br>Vieve,<br>Vifica,   | uires.   | tent a   |
| evaluations?            | PREP RF  | Requires that Student<br>achievement growth<br>criterion (explicit/dent  | R<br><sup>sig</sup><br>With  | Requires some object.  | Student achie<br>Dot required                            |
| Alabama                 |  |  |  |  | 1  |
| Alaska                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arkansas                |  |  |  |  |  |
| California              |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut             |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware                |  |  |  |  |  |
| District of Columbia    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Georgia                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hawaii                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Idaho                   |  |  |  |  | 1  |
| Illinois                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indiana                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| IOWA                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kansas                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana               |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maine                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maryland                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Massachusetts           |  |  |  |  |  |
| Michigan                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota               |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mississippi             |  |  |  |  |  |
| Missouri                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Montana                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nebraska                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nevada                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Hampshire           |  |  |  |  | 1  |
| New Jersey              |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Mexico              |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York                |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Carolina          |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Dakota            |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oregon                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania            |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhode Island            |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina          |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Dakota            |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tennessee               |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas                   |  |  |  |  | 1  |
| Utah                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vermont                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Virginia                |  | 2  |  |  |  |
| Washington              |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Virginia           |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin               |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wyoming                 |  |  |  |  |  |
|                         | 19   | 7  | 9  | 6  | 10   |
|                         |  |  |  |  |  |


1. The state has an ESEA waiver requiring an evaluation system that includes student achievement as a significant factor. However, no specific guidelines or policies have been articulated.

2. Explicitly defined for the 2013-2014 school year.

| Figure 64                          |                 |                | · /          | <sup>1</sup> )pe of surps. | ed                        | /      |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|
| <i>Is survey data used as part</i> |                 |                |              |                            | Surveys not specification | Peq    |
| of teacher evaluations?            | Student surveys |                | . /          |                            | nots                      | יי חול |
| o) teacher crataations:            | Surve           | Parent surveys | Peer surveys | <i>tirva</i>               | not p                     |        |
|                                    | Ident           | tent s         | er sun       | le of s                    | Velys                     |        |
|                                    | 2 <sup>th</sup> | Pa             | Pe           | 2                          | 261                       |        |
| Alabama                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Alaska <sup>1</sup>                |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Arizona                            |                 |                |              | 2                          |                           |        |
| Arkansas                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| California                         |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Colorado                           | 2               | 2              | 2            |                            |                           |        |
| Connecticut <sup>3</sup>           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Delaware<br>District of Columbia   | <b>2</b>        | <b>2</b>       |              |                            |                           |        |
| Florida                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Georgia                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Hawaii                             |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Idaho                              |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Illinois                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Indiana                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| IOWA <sup>1</sup>                  |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Kansas                             |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Kentucky                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Louisiana                          |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Maine                              |                 |                | 2            |                            |                           |        |
| Maryland                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Massachusetts                      |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota              | 2               |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Mississippi                        | 2               |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Missouri                           | 2               | 2              | 2            |                            |                           |        |
| Montana                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Nebraska                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Nevada                             |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| New Hampshire                      |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| New Jersey                         |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| New Mexico                         | 2               | 2              |              |                            |                           |        |
| New York                           | 2               | 2              |              |                            |                           |        |
| North Carolina                     |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| North Dakota<br>Ohio               |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Oklahoma                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Oregon                             |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Pennsylvania                       |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Rhode Island                       |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| South Carolina                     |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| South Dakota                       |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Tennessee                          |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Texas                              |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Utah                               |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Vermont                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Virginia                           |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Washington                         |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| West Virginia<br>Wisconsin         |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| Wyoming                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
| wyoning                            |                 |                |              |                            |                           |        |
|                                    | 14              | 11             | 6            | 2                          | 33                        |        |

#### Figure 65

Do states require more than two categories for teacher evaluation ratings?



 Strong Practice: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Despectivenza, Bhade Island, Scuth Carolina, Chio, Scuth Torgescand Carolina, Chio, Scuth Carolina, Chio, Scuth Torgescand Despective Carolina, Control Carolina, Control Carolina, Chio, Chiana, Chiana Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

2. Alabama, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

1. Input from students, teachers and peers is required, but there is no explicit indication that this must come from surveys.

2. Explicitly allowed but not required.

3. Requires parent or peer surveys; whole-school student learning or student surveys.

### **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ has not singled out any one state for "best practice" honors. Many states continue to make significant strides in the area of teacher evaluation by requiring that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion. Because there are many different approaches that result in student learning being the preponderant criterion, all 19 states that meet this goal are commended for their efforts.

|                      |                                       | ~  |   |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Figure 66            |                                       | Contraction of the contraction o | District designed evaluation<br>9576m consistent with state<br>frame work criteria with state |
| Do states direct how |                                       | le op.   | th sta  |
| teachers should be   | ~ /                                   | e eva  | deva<br>n wii   |
| evaluated?           | 'wide<br>'sten                        | e stat<br>vith p   | signe<br>siste  |
| evaluated?           | state<br>ion g                        | icts y   |   |
|                      | ingle<br>alluat                       | distr  | Distr<br>Vister<br>Me u   |
|                      | Single statewide<br>evaluation system | a. 12  | S. Ip   |
|                      |                                       |  |   |
| Alaska               |                                       |  |   |
| Arizona              |                                       |  |   |
| Arkansas             |                                       |  |   |
| California           |                                       |  |   |
| Colorado             |                                       |  |   |
| Connecticut          |                                       |  |   |
| Delaware             |                                       |  |   |
| District of Columbia |                                       |  |   |
| Florida              |                                       |  |   |
| Georgia              |                                       |  |   |
| Hawaii<br>Idaho      |                                       |  |   |
| Idaho<br>Illinois    |                                       |  |   |
|                      |                                       |  |   |
| Indiana<br>IOWA      |                                       |  |   |
| Kansas               |                                       |  |   |
| Kentucky             |                                       |  |   |
| Louisiana            |                                       |  |   |
| Maine                |                                       |  |   |
| Maryland             |                                       |  |   |
| Massachusetts        |                                       |  |   |
| Michigan             |                                       |  |   |
| Minnesota            |                                       |  |   |
| Mississippi          |                                       |  |   |
| Missouri             |                                       |  |   |
| Montana              |                                       |  |   |
| Nebraska             |                                       |  |   |
| Nevada               |                                       |  |   |
| New Hampshire        |                                       |  | 1   |
| New Jersey           |                                       |  |   |
| New Mexico           |                                       |  |   |
| New York             |                                       |  |   |
| North Carolina       |                                       |  |   |
| North Dakota         |                                       |  |   |
| Ohio                 |                                       |  |   |
| Oklahoma             |                                       |  |   |
| Oregon               |                                       |  |   |
| Pennsylvania         |                                       |  |   |
| Rhode Island         |                                       |  |   |
| South Carolina       |                                       |  |   |
| South Dakota         |                                       |  |   |
| Tennessee            |                                       |  |   |
| Texas<br>Utah        |                                       |  |   |
| Vermont              |                                       |  |   |
| Virginia             |                                       |  |   |
| Washington           |                                       |  |   |
| West Virginia        |                                       |  |   |
| Wisconsin            |                                       |  |   |
| Wyoming              |                                       |  |   |
|                      |                                       | 12   | 20  |
|                      | 9                                     | 12   | 30  |
|                      |                                       |  |   |

1. New Hampshire is in the process of developing a state model/criteria for teacher evaluations.

| Figure 67              |                    | /               |                    | HERS              |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| What requirements have | MULTPLE EVALUATION | EVALUATOR TRAIL | EVALUATORS MUST RE | EVALUATOR CRITECO |
| states established for | 242                |                 | Nin Isa            | The state         |
| evaluators?            | 141                | Ter             | Rey A              | E B               |
|                        | PLE E<br>ERS       |                 | EVI<br>EVI         | ď ľ               |
|                        | SERV               | ALLY            | VALU.<br>VEBI      | 41 CVA            |
|                        | 2 8                |                 | 14                 |                   |
| Alabama                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Alaska                 |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Arizona                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Arkansas               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| California             |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Colorado               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Connecticut            |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Delaware               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| District of Columbia   |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Florida                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Georgia                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Hawaii                 |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Idaho                  |                    |                 |                    |                   |
|                        |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Illinois               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Indiana                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| IOWA                   |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Kansas                 |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Kentucky               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Louisiana              |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Maine                  |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Maryland               | <b>1</b>           |                 |                    |                   |
| Massachusetts          |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Michigan               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Minnesota              |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Mississippi            | <b>2</b>           |                 |                    |                   |
| Missouri               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Montana                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Nebraska               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Nevada                 |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| New Hampshire          |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| New Jersey             |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| New Mexico             | 2                  |                 |                    |                   |
| New York               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| North Carolina         |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| North Dakota           |                    |                 |                    |                   |
|                        |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Ohio                   |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Oklahoma               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Oregon                 |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Pennsylvania           |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Rhode Island           |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| South Carolina         |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| South Dakota           |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Tennessee              |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Texas                  |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Utah                   |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Vermont                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Virginia               |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Washington             |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| West Virginia          |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Wisconsin              |                    |                 |                    |                   |
| Wyoming                |                    |                 |                    |                   |
|                        |                    |                 |                    |                   |

Maryland requires multiple observers for ineffective teachers.
 Multiple evaluators are explicitly allowed but not required.

# Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

## Goal C – Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

### Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that all teachers receive a formal evaluation rating each year.
- 2. While all teachers should have multiple observations that contribute to their formal evaluation rating, the state should ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 68

How States are Faring in Frequency of Evaluations **Best Practice States** 0 12 States Meet Goal Alabama, Delaware 🕇 , Hawaii 🕇 , Idaho, Mississippi<sup>1</sup>, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington 15 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut 1, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana<sup>1</sup>, New Mexico<sup>1</sup>, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia<sup>1</sup>, Wisconsin<sup>1</sup>, Wyoming 8 States Partly Meet Goal Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, South Carolina States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Arkansas, IOWA<sup>1</sup>, Maine<sup>1</sup>, Virginia<sup>1</sup> 11 States Do Not Meet Goal California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:11 😝 : 38 J:2

### 3-C Analysis: **lowa**

🗩 State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🕐 Progress Since 2011

### ANALYSIS

Although all teachers are observed each year, they only receive a formal evaluation once every three years.

The first and second year of review must be conducted by a peer group of teachers. These reviews must be conducted on an "informal" basis and must be focused on assisting each peer member in achieving goals of the professional development plan. The reviews may not be used in any determination affecting a teacher's employment status. Every third year, teachers must be evaluated by a certified evaluator.

New teachers must have a comprehensive evaluation at the end of their second year to determine if they will be recommended for the standard license.

Supporting Research SF 2284 (2012), amending Iowa Code 284.8 IAC 282-13.7(272)

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Require annual formal evaluations for all teachers.

All teachers in Iowa should be evaluated annually by certified evaluators. Rather than treated as mere formalities, these teacher evaluations should serve as important tools for rewarding good teachers, helping average teachers improve and holding weak teachers accountable for poor performance.

#### Base evaluations on multiple observations.

To guarantee that annual evaluations are based on an adequate collection of information, Iowa should require multiple observations for all teachers, even those who have nonprobationary status.


### Ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

It is critical that schools and districts closely monitor the performance of new teachers. Iowa should ensure that its new teachers get the support they need, and that supervisors know early on which new teachers may be struggling or at risk for unacceptable levels of performance.

### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?




- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland<sup>3</sup>, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Alaska, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia
- 3. Regulations sunset on September 30, 2014.

### Figure 70

| Figure 70                   | AMVUALEIALUATON<br>OFALL VETERAUTTON | ANNUAL EVALUATION OF<br>ALL PROBATIONARY TEACHERS |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Do states require districts | NO.                                  |   |
| to evaluate all teachers    | V T                                  | NAR)  |
| each year?                  | ELA<br>STER                          | 4TIO  |
|                             | ANNUA<br>DE ALL VI                   | 4 MULAL   |
| Alabama                     |                                      |   |
| Alaska                      |                                      |   |
| Arizona                     |                                      |   |
| Arkansas                    |                                      |   |
| California                  |                                      |   |
| Colorado                    |                                      |   |
| Connecticut                 |                                      |   |
| Delaware                    |                                      |   |
| District of Columbia        |                                      |   |
| Florida                     |                                      |   |
| Georgia                     |                                      |   |
| Hawaii<br>Idaho             |                                      |   |
| Illinois                    |                                      |   |
| Indiana                     |                                      |   |
| IOWA                        |                                      |   |
| Kansas                      |                                      |   |
| Kentucky                    |                                      |   |
| Louisiana                   |                                      |   |
| Maine                       |                                      |   |
| Maryland                    |                                      |   |
| Massachusetts               |                                      |   |
| Michigan                    |                                      |   |
| Minnesota                   |                                      |   |
| Mississippi                 |                                      |   |
| Missouri                    |                                      |   |
| Montana                     |                                      |   |
| Nebraska                    |                                      |   |
| Nevada                      |                                      |   |
| New Hampshire               |                                      |   |
| New Jersey<br>New Mexico    |                                      |   |
| New York                    |                                      |   |
| North Carolina              |                                      |   |
| North Dakota                |                                      |   |
| Ohio                        |                                      |   |
| Oklahoma                    |                                      |   |
| Oregon                      |                                      |   |
| Pennsylvania                |                                      |   |
| Rhode Island                |                                      |   |
| South Carolina              |                                      |   |
| South Dakota                |                                      |   |
| Tennessee                   |                                      |   |
| Texas                       |                                      |   |
| Utah                        |                                      |   |
| Vermont                     |                                      |   |
| Virginia                    |                                      |   |
| Washington                  |                                      |   |
| West Virginia<br>Wisconsin  |                                      |   |
| Wyoming                     |                                      |   |
|                             |                                      |   |
|                             | 28                                   | 44  |
|                             |                                      |   |

Figure 71

Do states require multiple classroom observations?




1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington

 Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. California, District of Columbia, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming

#### Figure 72

What is the determining factor for frequency of observations?



1. Alabama, District of Columbia<sup>6</sup>, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island

2. Alaska, Arkansas<sup>7</sup>, California<sup>7</sup>, Colorado, Florida, Kansas<sup>7</sup>, Minnesota<sup>7</sup>, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma<sup>7</sup>, Oregon, Pennsylvania<sup>7</sup>, South Carolina, South Dakota<sup>7</sup>, Utah<sup>7</sup>, Washington, West Virginia<sup>8</sup>


- 3. Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio
- 4. Arizona<sup>9</sup>, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts<sup>7</sup>, Nevada, Tennessee, Texas<sup>7</sup>, Virginia<sup>7</sup>, Wisconsin<sup>7</sup>
- 5. Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming
- 6. Depends on LEA requirements.
- 7. Frequency is based on evaluation cycle, not year.
- 8. No observations required after year 5.
- 9. Second observation may be waived for tenured teachers with high performance on first observation.

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ is not awarding "best practice" honors for frequency of evaluations but commends **Alabama**, **Hawaii**, **Idaho**, **Mississippi**, **New Jersey**, **Tennessee** and **Washington**. These states not only require annual evaluations and multiple observations for all teachers, but they also ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback during the first half of the school year.

#### Figure 73

Do states require that new teachers are observed early in the year?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota<sup>3</sup>, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia
- Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia<sup>4</sup>, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. New teachers must be evaluated early in the year; observations not explicit.
- 4. Teachers in their first year are informally evaluated early in the year.

# Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

## Goal D – Tenure

The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- A teacher should be eligible for tenure after a certain number of years of service, but tenure should not be granted automatically at that juncture.
- 2. Evidence of effectiveness should be the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
- 3. The minimum years of service needed to achieve tenure should allow sufficient data to be accumulated on which to base tenure decisions; four to five years is the ideal minimum.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 74 How States are Faring in Tenure **Best Practice States** 2 Connecticut<sup>1</sup>, Michigan 3 States Meet Goal Colorado, Florida, Louisiana 1 States Nearly Meet Goal 7 Delaware, Hawaii 1, Nevada, New Jersey 1, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee States Partly Meet Goal 7 Arizona<sup>1</sup>, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina<sup>1</sup>, Virginia<sup>1</sup> States Meet a Small Part of Goal 7 Idaho, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, Washington 25 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Georgia, IOWA, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming **Progress on this Goal Since 2011:** 1:7 👄 : 44 🦊 : O

### 3-D Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

### ANALYSIS

lowa does not connect tenure decisions to evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Teachers in Iowa are awarded tenure automatically after a three-year probationary period, absent an additional process that evaluates cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Supporting Research Iowa Code 279.19

### RECOMMENDATION

### **End the automatic awarding of tenure.**

The decision to grant tenure should be a deliberate one, based on consideration of a teacher's commitment and actual evidence of classroom effectiveness.

**Ensure that evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.** 

lowa should make evidence of effectiveness, rather than the number of years in the classroom, the most significant factor when determining this leap in professional standing.

# Articulate a process that local districts must administer when deciding which teachers get tenure.

lowa should require a clear process, such as a hearing, to ensure that the local district reviews a teacher's performance before making a determination regarding tenure.

### Require a longer probationary period.

lowa should extend its probationary period, ideally to five years. This would allow sufficient time to collect data that adequately reflect teacher performance.

### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 75                                      |           | /                             | /       | /                  | /       | /       | /                |
|--|-----------|-------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------|------------------|
| <i>How long before a teacher earns tenure?</i> |           |                               |         |                    |         |         | STATE ON VANJARS |
|  | .J        |                               | /       |                    | 5       | 5       | AL CON Y         |
|  | No Policy | <sup>1</sup> Y <sub>ear</sub> | 2 Years | <sup>3</sup> Jears | 4 YEARS | 5 YEARS | STAT             |
| Alabama  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Alaska<br>Arizona                              |           |                               |         | -                  |         |         |                  |
| Arkansas                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| California                                     |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Colorado                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Connecticut                                    |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Delaware                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| District of Columbia                           |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Florida  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Georgia  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Hawaii   |           |                               |         | 1                  |         |         |                  |
| Idaho<br>Illinois                              |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Indiana  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| IOWA   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Kansas   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Kentucky                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Louisiana                                      |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Maine  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Maryland                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Massachusetts                                  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Michigan                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Minnesota<br>Missississi                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Mississippi<br>Missouri                        |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Montana  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Nebraska                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Nevada   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| New Hampshire                                  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| New Jersey                                     |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| New Mexico                                     |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| New York                                       |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| North Carolina                                 |           |                               |         |                    |         |         | 2                |
| North Dakota                                   |           |                               |         |                    |         | 3       |                  |
| Ohio<br>Oklahoma                               |           |                               |         | 4                  |         |         |                  |
| Oregon   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Pennsylvania                                   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Rhode Island                                   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         | 5                |
| South Carolina                                 |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| South Dakota                                   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Tennessee                                      |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Texas  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Utah   |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Vermont  |           |                               |         | 6                  |         |         |                  |
| Virginia<br>Washington                         |           |                               |         | 7                  |         |         |                  |
| West Virginia                                  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Wisconsin                                      |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
| Wyoming  |           |                               |         |                    |         |         |                  |
|  | 1         | 1                             | 4       | 32                 | 4       | 6       | 3                |

- 1. Idaho limits teacher contract terms to one year.
- 2. A teacher can receive up to a 4-year contract if deemed proficient on evaluation.
- 3. Teachers must hold an educator license for at least seven years and have taught in the district at least three of the last five years.
- 4. Teachers may also earn career status with an average rating of at least effective for a four-year period and a rating of at least effective for the last two years.
- 5. While technically not on annual contracts, Rhode Island teachers who receive two years of ineffective ratings are dismissed.
- 6. Local school board may extend up to five years.
- 7. At a district's discretion, a teacher may be granted tenure after the second year if he/she receives one of the top two evaluation ratings.

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Connecticut and Michigan appropriately base tenure decisions on evidence of teacher effectiveness. In Connecticut, tenure is awarded after four years and must be earned on the basis of effective practice as demonstrated in evaluation ratings. Michigan requires a probationary period of five years, with teachers having to earn a rating of effective or highly effective on their three most recent performance evaluations. Both states require that student growth be the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluations.

| Figure 76                | Impendence       Landence       Repondent       PREPONDENT | ~   | 1                       |
|--------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| How are tenure           | DENI   | TERIC   |                         |
| decisions made?          | STU  | CRI CRI   | lered<br>Micall         |
| decisions made:          | 15 T   | Phone | Itom <sub>e</sub>       |
|                          | EVIDEN<br>LEARNIN<br>PREPONDE                              | Some evidence of studence   | Virtually automatically |
| Alabama                  |  |   |                         |
| Alaska                   |  |   |                         |
| Arizona                  |  |   |                         |
| Arkansas                 |  |   |                         |
| California               |  |   |                         |
| Colorado                 |  |   |                         |
| Connecticut              |  |   |                         |
| Delaware                 |  |   |                         |
| District of Columbia     |  |   |                         |
| Florida                  | 1  |   |                         |
| Georgia                  |  |   |                         |
| Hawaii<br>Idaho          |  |   |                         |
| Idano                    |  |   |                         |
| Indiana                  |  |   |                         |
| IOWA                     |  |   |                         |
| Kansas                   |  |   |                         |
| Kentucky                 |  |   |                         |
| Louisiana                |  |   |                         |
| Maine                    |  |   |                         |
| Maryland                 |  |   |                         |
| Massachusetts            |  |   |                         |
| Michigan                 |  |   |                         |
| Minnesota                |  |   |                         |
| Mississippi              |  |   |                         |
| Missouri                 |  |   |                         |
| Montana                  |  |   |                         |
| Nebraska                 |  |   |                         |
| Nevada                   |  |   |                         |
| New Hampshire            |  |   |                         |
| New Jersey<br>New Mexico |  |   |                         |
| New York                 |  |   |                         |
| North Carolina           |  | 2   |                         |
| North Dakota             |  |   |                         |
| Ohio                     |  |   |                         |
| Oklahoma                 | 3  |   |                         |
| Oregon                   |  |   |                         |
| Pennsylvania             |  |   |                         |
| Rhode Island             |  |   |                         |
| South Carolina           |  |   |                         |
| South Dakota             |  |   |                         |
| Tennessee                |  |   |                         |
| Texas                    |  |   |                         |
| Utah                     |  |   |                         |
| Vermont                  |  |   |                         |
| Virginia                 |  |   |                         |
| Washington               |  |   |                         |
| West Virginia            |  |   |                         |
| Wisconsin<br>Wyoming     |  |   |                         |
| wyoning                  |  |   |                         |
|                          | 11   | 9   | 31                      |

1. Florida only awards annual contracts.

- 2. North Carolina has recently eliminated tenure. The state requires some evidence of effectiveness in awarding multipleyear contracts.
- 3. Oklahoma has created a loophole by essentially waiving student learning requirements and allowing the principal of a school to petition for career-teacher status.

# Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

## Goal E – Licensure Advancement

The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should base advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license on evidence of effectiveness.
- 2. The state should not require teachers to fulfill generic, unspecified coursework requirements to advance from a probationary to a nonprobationary license.
- 3. The state should not require teachers to have an advanced degree as a condition of professional licensure.
- 4. Evidence of effectiveness should be a factor in the renewal of a professional licenses.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy



### 3-E Analysis: **lowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

### ANALYSIS

In Iowa, to advance from an Initial license to a Standard license, teachers must complete a state-approved mentoring and induction program and meet state standards as determined by a comprehensive evaluation and two years' successful teaching experience. They must also meet a recency requirement, meaning that teachers who have fewer than 160 days of experience during the five-year period preceding the date of application must complete recent credit in professional education or endorsement areas.

The state also offers a Master Educator's license for teachers who meet a set of criteria, including five years of experience and a master's degree. Iowa does not include evidence of effectiveness as a factor in the renewal of a professional license. Teachers must renew their licenses every five years by completing six semester hours at an accredited institution of higher learning.

### **Supporting Research**

Iowa Administrative Code 282-13.7(272) http://www.iowa.gov/boee/renewal.html#a

### RECOMMENDATION

### Require evidence of effectiveness as a part of teacher licensing policy.

lowa should require evidence of teacher effectiveness to be a factor in determining whether teachers can renew their licenses or advance to a higher-level license.

### Discontinue licensure requirements with no direct connection to classroom effectiveness.

While targeted requirements may potentially expand teacher knowledge and improve teacher practice, Iowa's general, nonspecific coursework requirements for license renewal merely call for teachers to complete a certain amount of seat time. These requirements do not correlate with teacher effectiveness.

### **End requirement tying teacher advancement to master's degrees.**

Iowa should remove its mandate that teachers obtain a master's degree for license advancement. Research is conclusive and emphatic that master's degrees do not have any significant correlation to classroom performance. Rather, advancement should be based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis

|                            |                      | ,                               | ,   | ,                          |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Figure 78                  | OBJECTIVE ENDENCE OF |                                 |   |                            |
| Do states require teachers | ć                    | Some objective evidence         | Consideration Silven to<br>teacher Perform Silven to<br>Classification and a construction | Performance not considered |
| to show evidence of        | ENCE                 | , REQ<br>Viden                  | given<br>Panco  | or ties                    |
| effectiveness before       | EVID<br>550 II       | tive e                          | tion  | ective<br>Pot c            |
| conferring professional    | VEN                  | 2bjeg<br>tered                  | sidere<br>er pe   | m eff                      |
| licensure?                 | BECT                 | ome,<br>onsi                    | Efform freach Con   | 1000 mig                   |
|                            | 0 5                  | Some objective<br>is considered | - a - g   |                            |
| Alabama                    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Alaska                     |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Arizona                    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Arkansas                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| California                 |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Colorado<br>Connecticut    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Delaware                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| District of Columbia       |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Florida                    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Georgia                    | 1                    |                                 |   |                            |
| Hawaii                     |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Idaho                      |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Illinois                   |                      | 2                               |   |                            |
| Indiana                    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| IOWA                       |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Kansas                     |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Kentucky                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Louisiana                  |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Maine                      |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Maryland                   |                      | 3                               |   |                            |
| Massachusetts              |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Michigan                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Minnesota                  |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Mississippi                |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Missouri<br>Montana        |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Nebraska                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Nevada                     |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| New Hampshire              |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| New Jersey                 |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| New Mexico                 |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| New York                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| North Carolina             |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| North Dakota               |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Ohio                       |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Oklahoma                   |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Oregon                     |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Pennsylvania               |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Rhode Island               |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| South Carolina             |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| South Dakota               |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Tennessee                  |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Texas                      |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Utah                       |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Vermont                    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Virginia<br>Washington     |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| West Virginia              |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Wisconsin                  |                      |                                 |   |                            |
| Wyoming                    |                      |                                 |   |                            |
|                            | -                    |                                 |   |                            |
|                            | 6                    | 4                               | 9   | 32                         |

1. Evidence of effectiveness is required for license renewal but not for conferring of professional license.


2. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.

3. Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation systems for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.


Do states require teachers to earn advanced degrees before conferring professional licensure?

### Figure 80

Do states require teachers to take additional coursework before conferring or renewing professional licenses?




- Strong Practice: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, New York and Oregon all require a master's degree or coursework equivalent to a master's degree.
- 3. Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri
- 4. Alabama, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia



- 1. Strong Practice: Hawaii, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Tennessee
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Georgia, Minnesota
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina<sup>4</sup>, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyorning
- 4. Some required coursework is targeted.

Do states award lifetime licenses?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut<sup>3</sup>, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota,
- Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 2. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
- 3. Although teachers in Connecticut must renew their licenses every five years, there are no requirements for renewal.

### **T** EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

**Rhode Island** is integrating certification, certification renewal and educator evaluations. Teachers who receive poor evaluations for five consecutive years are not eligible to renew their licenses. In addition, teachers who consistently receive "highly effective" ratings will be eligible for a special license designation.

# Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

## Goal F – Equitable Distribution

The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.

### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance —from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness as described in Goal 3-B publicly available.
- 2. In the absence of such an evaluation system, the state should make the following data publicly available:

a. An "Academic Quality" index for each school that includes factors research has found to be associated with teacher effectiveness such as:

- percentage of new teachers;
- percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once;
- percentage of teachers on emergency credentials:
- average selectivity of teachers' undergraduate institutions and
- teachers' average ACT or SAT scores

b. The percentage of highly qualified teachers disaggregated by both individual school and by teaching area.

c. The annual teacher absenteeism rate reported for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school.

d. The average teacher turnover rate for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school, by district and by reasons that teachers leave.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 82



### 3-F Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

### ANALYSIS

Providing comprehensive reporting may be the state's most important role for ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers among schools. Iowa does not report school-level data that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

Iowa does not require districts to publicly report aggregate school-level data about teacher performance, nor does the state collect and publicly report most of the other data recommended by NCTQ. Iowa does not provide a school-level teacher-quality index that demonstrates the academic backgrounds of a school's teachers and the ratio of new to veteran teachers. The state also does not report on teacher absenteeism or turnover rates.

Iowa does report on the percentage of highly qualified teachers, but these data are reported only statewide, not at the district or school level. Iowa reports on the average years of teacher experience by district. The state also reports on aggregate disparities between percentage of highly qualified teachers by poverty level and minority population. Iowa's Equity Plan, published in December 2006, reported on teacher retention rate for the previous three years, but these data have not been updated.

#### Supporting Research

2010-2011 Iowa Annual Progress Reports by District https://www.edinfo.state.ia.us/web/apr\_summary\_staticweb\_float.asp?d=2673&s=0000&r=all&q=1 NCLB School Profiles Annual Condition of Education Report 2012 https://www.educateiowa.gov/annual-condition-education-report-pk-12

### RECOMMENDATION

### Report school-level teacher effectiveness data.

lowa should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance—from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness—publicly available. Data about the effectiveness of a school's teachers would shine a light on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts.

In the absence of data from such an evaluation system, the state should use a teacher-quality index to report publicly about each school. A teacher-quality index, such as the one developed by the Illinois Education Research Council with data including teachers' average SAT or ACT scores, the percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once, the selectivity of teachers' undergraduate colleges and the percentage of new teachers, can show how equitably teachers are distributed both across and within districts. Iowa should ensure that individual school report cards include such data in a manner that translates these factors into something easily understood by the public, such as a color-coded matrix indicating a school's high or low score.

### Publish other data that facilitate comparisons across schools.

lowa should collect and report school-level data that reflect the stability of a school's faculty, including the rates of teacher absenteeism and turnover.

### Provide comparative data based on school demographics.

Providing comparative data for schools with similar poverty and minority populations would yield an even more comprehensive picture of gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers.

### Ensure that data are current.

It is important to keep data updated and current in order to provide the public with an accurate picture of teacher distribution across schools in districts. Iowa should update the data it reports on highly qualified teachers.

### Report data at the school level.

lowa should ensure that it is reporting all currently collected data at the school level, rather than aggregated by district.

### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| Figure 83                 | PERFORMANCE DATA   | AV NDEX FOR ACH SCUATONS<br>THAT NDEX FOR EACH SCUC | PERCENTAGE OF                                  | ∑õ∕        | PERCENTAGE OF HICK |              | TEACHER ABEENTER | 4      |
|---------------------------|--------------------|---|--|------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|--------|
| Do states publicly report | PERFORMANCE DATA C | S S S   | Ê /  | PERCENTAGE | PERCENTAGE OF HIGH | ANNUAL TILD. | RATE             | MRA    |
| school-level data         | (PQ)               | E E E   |  |            | The second second  | E            | DVER<br>TEC:     | , EFIS |
| about teachers?           | 440<br>V2          |   | 1<br>2<br>2<br>3<br>3<br>4<br>4<br>8<br>4<br>8 |            |                    |              | BSEP N           |        |
|                           | ORN,<br>FER E      |   | EV14   |            | ENTA I             | אר א         | IFR A.           |        |
|                           | FER                | A E A E   | PERCENTAGE OLALITY                             | PERCE      | PERCENTAGE OF LICE | ANN          | IE4C             |        |
| Alabama                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Alaska                    |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Arizona                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Arkansas                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| California                |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Colorado                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Connecticut               |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Delaware                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| District of Columbia      |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Florida                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Georgia                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Hawaii                    |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Idaho                     |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Illinois                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Indiana                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| IOWA                      |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Kansas                    |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Kentucky                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Louisiana                 |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Maine                     |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Maryland                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Massachusetts             |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota     |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Minnesota                 |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Mississippi<br>Missouri   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Montana                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Nebraska                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Nevada                    |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| New Hampshire             |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| New Jersey                |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| New Mexico                |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| New York                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| North Carolina            |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| North Dakota              |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Ohio                      |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Oklahoma                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Oregon                    |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Pennsylvania              |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Rhode Island              |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| South Carolina            |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| South Dakota              |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Tennessee                 |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Texas                     |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Utah                      |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Vermont                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Virginia                  |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Washington                |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| West Virginia             |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
| Wisconsin                 |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |
|                           |                    |   |  |            |                    | _            |                  |        |
| Wyoming                   |                    |   |  |            |                    |              |                  |        |

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although not awarding "best practice" honors for this goal, NCTQ commends the nine states that meet the goal for giving the public access to teacher performance data aggregated to the school level. This transparency can help shine a light on on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts and help to ensure that all students have access to effective teachers.

### Figure 84

Do states publicly report school-level data about teacher effectiveness?




- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas<sup>3</sup>, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts<sup>4</sup>, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida<sup>5</sup>, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah<sup>5</sup>, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Reporting of teacher effectiveness data will begin in 2017.
- 4. Massachusetts' evaluation system is not based primarily on evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- 5. Reports data about teacher effectiveness at the district level.

# Area 4 Summary



## How States are Faring in Retaining Effective Teachers



### **Topics Included In This Area**

- 4-A: Induction
- 4-B: Professional Development
- 4-C: Pay Scales

- 4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience
- 4-E: Differential Pay
- 4-F: Performance Pay

# Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

## Goal A − Induction

The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.

### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that new teachers receive mentoring of sufficient frequency and duration, especially in the first critical weeks of school.
- 2. Mentors should be carefully selected based on evidence of their own classroom effectiveness and subject-matter expertise. Mentors should be trained, and their performance as mentors should be evaluated.
- 3. Induction programs should include only strategies that can be successfully implemented, even in a poorly managed school. Such strategies include intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers.


### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 85

How States are Faring in Induction Best Practice State 1 South Carolina 10 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Hawaii 1, Illinois 1, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia 1 15 States Nearly Meet Goal California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, IOWA, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota<sup>1</sup>, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah 11 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal Florida, Idaho, Montana 1, Texas 10 States Do Not Meet Goal District of Columbia, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: ↓:1 1:5 •:45

### 4-A Analysis: **Iowa**



Progress Since 2011

### **ANALYSIS**

Iowa requires that all new teachers receive mentoring through the Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program. The state mandates that every beginning teacher in the first or second year of the profession participate in a two-year induction program. Beginning teachers are assigned a mentor to "observe, critique, and provide support and advice on effective teaching practices." The state allocates \$1,300 for each beginning teacher; \$1,000 is paid to the mentor and the remainder pays for related program costs.

Mentors must have at least four years of teaching experience and "demonstrated skills in classroom training and coaching." Mentors receive at least 15-20 hours of training during the initial year, and this includes specialized training on district expectations. There should be a minimum of 15-20 interactions between mentors and new teachers.

#### **Supporting Research**

Iowa Technical Assistance for Mentoring and Induction Program http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\_docman&task=doc\_download&gid=6410 Mentoring and Induction for Beginning Educators http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=1674&Itemid=2479 Iowa Statute 284.5

Iowa Statute 284.5

### RECOMMENDATION

### Expand guidelines to include other key areas.

While still leaving district flexibility, Iowa should articulate minimum guidelines for a high-quality induction experience. The state should require that mentors be trained in a content area or grade level similar to that of the new teacher, and the state should mandate a method of performance evaluation. It should also offer specifics on release time or reducing teacher responsibilities.

### **Ensure that mentoring is of sufficient duration and frequency.**

lowa requires just 15-20 interactions between new teachers and their mentors over the course of the school year. The state should consider whether that time requirement ensures that new teachers receive adequate support, especially in the first critical weeks of school.

### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


|                              |                  |                     |                   |               | 6             |                   |       |                          |        |
|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------|
| Figure 86                    |                  | MENTORING OF SILE   | 1<br>12 0<br>12 0 | CAREFUL SELEC | MENTORS MILES | Į Į               | / /   | USE OF A MARETY OF EFECT | ELTIVE |
| Do states have policies that | MENTORING FOR AL |                     |                   |               | VOFA          | MENTORS / PROGRAM | Shing | PENS,<br>OF EF           | CIES   |
| articulate the elements of   | ĘŎ               | S OF S              | 00                |               |               |                   | 2 2   | Level Con                |        |
| effective induction?         |                  |                     |                   | SEL CO        | W 2           | EL.               | SSAP. | 2 Z S                    |        |
|                              | MENTORING FOR    | EVIC                |                   | REFU          | IN IN         | ENTC<br>157 BE    | NTO,  | 50<br>50<br>70<br>75     |        |
|                              | ~ ~ /            | ~ <u>~</u> <u>~</u> | A PE              | - ১           | / ¥ /         | ~~~/              | W.    | 25                       |        |
| Alabama<br>Alaska            |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Arizona                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Arkansas                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| California                   |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Colorado                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Connecticut                  |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Delaware                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| District of Columbia         |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Florida                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Georgia                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Hawaii<br>Idaho              |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Illinois                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Indiana                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| IOWA                         |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Kansas                       |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Kentucky                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Louisiana                    |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Maine                        |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Maryland                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Massachusetts                |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Michigan                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Minnesota                    |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Mississippi<br>Missouri      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Montana                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Nebraska                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Nevada                       |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| New Hampshire                |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| New Jersey                   |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| New Mexico                   |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| New York                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| North Carolina               |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| North Dakota<br>Ohio         |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Onio<br>Oklahoma             |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Oregon                       |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Pennsylvania                 |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Rhode Island                 |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| South Carolina               |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| South Dakota                 |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Tennessee                    |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Texas                        |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Utah                         |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Vermont                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Virginia                     |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Washington<br>West Virginia  |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Wisconsin                    |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| Wyoming                      |                  |                     |                   |               |               |                   |       |                          |        |
| , ,                          | 31               | 22                  | 9                 | 24            | 29            | 20                | 20    | 21                       |        |
|                              | 51               | 22                  | 9                 | 24            | 29            | 20                | 20    | 21                       |        |

### T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

**South Carolina** requires that all new teachers, prior to the start of the school year, be assigned mentors for at least one year. Districts carefully select mentors based on experience and similar certifications and grade levels, and mentors undergo additional training. Adequate release time is mandated by the state so that mentors and new teachers may observe each other in the classroom, collaborate on effective teaching techniques and develop professional growth plans. Mentor evaluations are mandatory and stipends are recommended.

#### Figure 87

Do states have policies that articulate the elements of effective induction?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia

2. Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming

# Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

## Goal B – Professional Development

The state should ensure that teachers receive feedback about their performance and require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

### **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.
- 2. The state should require that all teachers who receive a rating of ineffective/ unsatisfactory or needs improvement on their evaluations be placed on an improvement plan.
- 3. The state should direct districts to align professional development activities with findings from teachers' evaluations.

### Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

### Figure 88

How States are Faring in Professional Development



# 4-B Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal ( Progress Since 2011

### **ANALYSIS**

Iowa does not have state-level policy that requires that teachers receive feedback from their evaluations or that connects professional development to teachers' evaluations. The state requires intensive assistance plans for teachers "who [are] not consistently demonstrating one or more of the Iowa Teaching Standards." However, there is no state-level policy defining the criteria or rating that merits the creation of an intensive assistance plan.

#### **Supporting Research**

Model Framework for Designing a Local Teacher Evaluation http://educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=538&Itemid=3316 Iowa Administrative Code 284.6 and 284.8 SF 2284 (2012)

#### RECOMMENDATION

Require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.

In order to increase their effectiveness in the classroom, teachers need to receive feedback on strengths and areas that need improvement identified in their evaluations. As such, Iowa should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their classroom performance.

Ensure that professional development is aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations.

Professional development that is not informed by evaluation results may be of little value to teachers' professional growth and aim of increasing their effectiveness in the classroom. Iowa should ensure that districts utilize teacher evaluation results in determining professional development needs and activities.

Ensure that teachers receiving less than effective ratings are placed on a professional improvement plan.


Iowa should adopt a policy requiring that teachers who receive even one unsatisfactory evaluation be placed on structured improvement plans. These plans should focus on performance areas that directly connect to student learning and should identify noted deficiencies, define specific action steps necessary to address these deficiencies and describe how and when progress will be measured.

#### IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Alabama

Do states ensure that evaluations are used to help teachers improve?



# **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**


Louisiana and North Carolina require that teachers receive feedback about their performance from their evaluations and direct districts to connect professional development to teachers' identified needs. Both states also require that teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations are placed on structured improvement plans. These improvement plans include specific performance goals, a description of resources and assistance provided, as well as timelines for improvement.

| AldDaffid              |    |    |    |
|------------------------|----|----|----|
| Alaska                 |    |    |    |
| Arizona                |    |    |    |
| Arkansas               |    |    |    |
| California             |    |    |    |
| Colorado               |    |    |    |
| Connecticut            |    |    |    |
| Delaware               |    |    |    |
| District of Columbia   |    |    |    |
| Florida                |    |    |    |
| Georgia                |    |    |    |
| Hawaii                 |    |    |    |
| Idaho                  |    |    |    |
| Illinois               |    |    |    |
| Indiana                |    |    |    |
| IOWA                   |    |    |    |
| Kansas                 |    |    |    |
| Kentucky               |    |    |    |
| Louisiana              |    |    |    |
| Maine                  |    |    |    |
| Maryland               |    |    |    |
| Massachusetts          |    |    |    |
| Michigan               |    |    |    |
| Minnesota              |    |    |    |
| Mississippi            |    |    |    |
| Missouri               |    |    |    |
| Montana                |    |    |    |
| Nebraska               |    |    |    |
| Nevada                 |    |    |    |
| New Hampshire          |    |    |    |
| New Jersey             |    |    |    |
| New Mexico             |    |    |    |
| New York               |    |    |    |
| North Carolina         |    |    |    |
| North Dakota           |    |    |    |
| Ohio                   |    |    |    |
| Oklahoma               |    |    |    |
| Oregon                 |    |    |    |
| Pennsylvania           |    |    |    |
| Rhode Island           |    |    |    |
| South Carolina         |    |    |    |
| South Dakota           |    |    | 2  |
| Tennessee              |    |    |    |
| Texas                  |    |    |    |
| Utah                   |    |    |    |
| Vermont                |    |    |    |
| Virginia               |    |    |    |
| Washington             |    |    |    |
| West Virginia          |    |    |    |
| Wisconsin <sup>3</sup> |    |    |    |
|                        |    |    |    |
| Wyoming                |    |    |    |
|                        |    |    |    |
|                        | 31 | 21 | 29 |

1. Improvement plans are required for tenured teachers only.

- 2. Improvement plans are required only for teachers teaching for four years or more.
- 3. Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system includes many of these elements, but is still in the pilot stage. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-2015.


Do teachers receive feedback on their evaluations?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, California, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania
- Alabama, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin<sup>4</sup>
- 4. Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system requires that teachers receive feedback, but it is still in the pilot stages. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-15.

#### Figure 91

*Do states require that teacher evaluations inform professional development?* 



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas
- Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin<sup>4</sup>
- 4. Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system requires that evaluations inform professional development, but it is still in the pilot stages. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-15.

# Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

# Goal C – Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

# **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- While the state may find it appropriate to articulate teachers' starting salaries, it should not require districts to adhere to a statedictated salary schedule that defines steps and lanes and sets minimum pay at each level.
- The state should discourage districts from tying additional compensation to advanced degrees. The state should eliminate salary schedules that establish higher minimum salaries or other requirements to pay more to teachers with advanced degrees.
- 3. The state should discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective. The state should eliminate salary schedules that require that the highest steps on the pay scale be determined solely be seniority.

## Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

# Figure 92



# 4-C Analysis: **lowa**



### ANALYSIS

Iowa gives local districts the authority for pay scales, eliminating barriers such as state salary schedules and other regulations that control how districts pay teachers. The state mandates a minimum salary but allows districts to determine the remainder of the schedule.

Supporting Research lowa Code 294A.5

## RECOMMENDATION

#### Discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees.

While still leaving districts the flexibility to establish their own pay scale, lowa should articulate policies that definitively discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees, in light of the extensive research showing that such degrees do not have an impact on teacher effectiveness.

Discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective.

Similarly, Iowa should articulate policies that discourage districts from determining the highest steps on the pay scale solely by seniority.

## **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

lowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

# **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**

Florida and Indiana allow local districts to develop their own salary schedules while preventing districts from prioritizing elements not associated with teacher effectiveness. In Florida, local salary schedules must ensure that the most effective teachers receive salary increases greater than the highest salary adjustment available. Indiana requires local salary scales to be based on a combination of factors and limits the years of teacher experience and content-area degrees to account for no more than one-third of this calculation.

| What we la de se the state      | DISTRICTS SET SALAD | State sets minimum 5. | Statesets minimum salary sch  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| What role does the state        | ŝ                   |                       | alar<br>Salar                 |
| play in deciding teacher        | 541,                | imum,                 | ,unuu                         |
| pay rates?                      | SSET                | s min                 | <sup>s</sup> min <sub>i</sub> |
|                                 | TRICT               | te ser                | te set                        |
|                                 | Sia                 | Sta                   | Sta                           |
| Alabama                         |                     |                       |                               |
| Alaska                          |                     |                       |                               |
| Arizona                         |                     |                       |                               |
| Arkansas                        |                     |                       |                               |
| California                      |                     |                       |                               |
| Colorado                        | 1                   |                       |                               |
| Connecticut                     |                     |                       |                               |
| Delaware                        |                     |                       |                               |
| District of Columbia<br>Florida |                     |                       |                               |
|                                 |                     |                       |                               |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii               |                     |                       |                               |
| Idaho                           |                     |                       |                               |
| Illinois                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Indiana                         |                     |                       |                               |
| IOWA                            |                     |                       |                               |
| Kansas                          |                     |                       |                               |
| Kentucky                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Louisiana                       |                     |                       |                               |
| Maine                           |                     |                       |                               |
| Maryland                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Massachusetts                   |                     |                       |                               |
| Michigan                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Minnesota                       |                     |                       |                               |
| Mississippi                     |                     |                       |                               |
| Missouri                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Montana                         |                     |                       |                               |
| Nebraska                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Nevada                          |                     |                       |                               |
| New Hampshire                   |                     |                       |                               |
| New Jersey                      |                     |                       |                               |
| New Mexico                      |                     |                       |                               |
| New York                        |                     |                       |                               |
| North Carolina                  |                     |                       |                               |
| North Dakota                    |                     |                       |                               |
| Ohio                            |                     |                       |                               |
| Oklahoma                        |                     |                       |                               |
| Oregon                          |                     |                       |                               |
| Pennsylvania                    |                     |                       |                               |
| Rhode Island                    | <b>2</b>            |                       |                               |
| South Carolina                  |                     |                       |                               |
| South Dakota                    |                     |                       |                               |
| Tennessee                       |                     |                       |                               |
| Texas                           |                     |                       |                               |
| Utah                            |                     |                       |                               |
| Vermont                         |                     |                       |                               |
| Virginia<br>Washington          |                     |                       |                               |
| Washington                      |                     |                       |                               |
| West Virginia<br>Wisconsin      |                     |                       |                               |
| Wyoming                         |                     |                       |                               |
| wyoning                         |                     |                       |                               |
|                                 | 27                  | 9                     | 15                            |
|                                 |                     |                       |                               |

DUIE

1. Colorado gives districts the option of a salary schedule, a performance pay policy or a combination of both.

2. Rhode Island requires that local district salary schedules are based on years of service, experience and training.

| Figure 94                    |                    | 1                   | Leaves pay to dire. | - 1                                       |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| De states a revert districts | ACOURES PEROONNANC | PROHIBITS ADDITION. | L PAI               | Requires Compensation<br>advanced degrees |
| Do states prevent districts  | RMA                | ES ES               |                     | t disc                                    |
| from basing teacher pay on   | EREC               |                     | ED D                | Dense                                     |
| advanced degrees?            | NTA P              | 50 D                | 7 P                 | degra                                     |
|                              |                    |                     | es ba               | luires<br>nced                            |
|                              | 2 Q Q              | ¥ 0                 | lea1                | Rec                                       |
| Alabama                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Alaska                       |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Arizona                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Arkansas                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| California                   |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Colorado                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Connecticut                  |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Delaware                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| District of Columbia         |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Florida                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Georgia                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Hawaii                       |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Idaho                        |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Illinois                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Indiana                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
| IOWA                         |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Kansas                       |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Kentucky                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Louisiana                    |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Maine<br>Maryland            |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Massachusetts                |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Michigan                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Minnesota                    |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Mississippi                  |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Missouri                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Montana                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Nebraska                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Nevada                       |                    |                     |                     |   |
| New Hampshire                |                    |                     |                     |   |
| New Jersey                   |                    |                     |                     |   |
| New Mexico                   |                    |                     |                     |   |
| New York                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| North Carolina               |                    | <b>1</b>            |                     |   |
| North Dakota                 |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Ohio                         |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Oklahoma                     |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Oregon                       |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Pennsylvania                 |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Rhode Island                 |                    |                     | 2                   |   |
| South Carolina               |                    |                     |                     |   |
| South Dakota                 |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Tennessee                    |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Texas                        |                    |                     | 3                   |   |
| Utah<br>Vermont              | 4                  |                     |                     |   |
|                              |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Virginia<br>Washington       |                    |                     |                     |   |
| West Virginia                |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Wisconsin                    |                    |                     |                     |   |
| Wyoming                      |                    |                     |                     |   |
|                              |                    |                     |                     |   |
|                              | 3                  | 1                   | 32                  | 15  |

1. For advanced degrees earned after April 2014.

- 2. Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training".
- 3. Texas has a minimum salary schedule based on years of experience. Compensation for advanced degrees is left to district discretion.
- 4. Beginning in 2015-2016.

# Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

# > Goal D – Compensation for Prior Work Experience

The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.

# Goal Component

(The factor considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

 The state should encourage districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience through mechanisms such as starting these teachers at an advanced step on the pay scale. Further, the state should not have regulatory language that blocks such strategies.

# Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

# Figure 95 How States are Faring in Compensation for Prior Work Experience **Best Practice State** North Carolina State Meets Goal California State Nearly Meets Goal Louisiana States Partly Meet Goal Delaware, Georgia, Texas, Washington State Meets a Small Part of Goal 1 Hawaii **43** States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, IOWA, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: **!**:0 + : 50 1:1

# 4-D Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 (🚍) Progress Since 2011

## ANALYSIS

lowa does not encourage local districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience. However, the state does not seem to have regulatory language blocking such strategies.

### RECOMMENDATION

Encourage local districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience.

While still leaving districts with the flexibility to determine their own pay scales, Iowa should encourage districts to incorporate mechanisms such as starting these teachers at a higher salary than other new teachers. Such policies would be attractive to career changers with related work experience, such as in the STEM subjects.

# **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**


Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

# T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

North Carolina compensates new teachers with relevant prior-work experience by awarding them one year of experience credit for every year of full-time work after earning a bachelor's degree that is related to their area of licensure and work assignment. One year of credit is awarded for every two years of work experience completed prior to earning a bachelor's degree.

#### Figure 96

Do states direct districts to compensate teachers for related prior work experience?



1. Strong Practice: California, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, Washington

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii<sup>2</sup>, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

3. Hawaii's compensation is limited to prior military experience.

# Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

# Goal E – Differential Pay

The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.

# **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 2. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in high-need schools.
- 3. The state should not have regulatory language that would block differential pay.

# Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

# Figure 97

How States are Faring in Differential Pay



Best Practice State Georgia

11 States Meet Goal Arkansas, California, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia

- 2 States Nearly Meet Goal Maryland, Washington
- 10 States Partly Meet Goal Colorado, Delaware 1, Hawaii, New Mexico 1, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 8 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Illinois, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont
- **19** States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, IOWA, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia

# Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

**1**:3 ↔:46 ↓:2

# 4-E Analysis: **lowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 \ominus Progress Since 2011

## ANALYSIS

lowa neither supports differential pay by which a teacher can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects nor offers incentives to teach in high-need schools. However, the state has no regulatory language that would directly block districts from providing differential pay.

## RECOMMENDATION

Support differential pay initiatives for effective teachers in both subject-shortage areas and high-need schools.

lowa should encourage districts to link compensation to district needs. Such policies can help districts achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers.

# **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 98                             |              | HIGH NEED<br>SCHOOLS | /                   | SHORTAGE<br>SUBJECT | /                     |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Do states provide                     |              |                      |                     | AREAS               | /                     |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |              | Loan fogiveness      |                     | Loan folgiveness    |                       |
| high-need schools                     | UIFFERENTIAL | (ene,                | DIFFERENTIAL<br>PAY | (ene,               | *                     |
| or shortage subject                   | REV          | orgi                 | REV                 | orgi                | loda                  |
| or shortage subject                   | Ë,           | an f                 |                     | an f                | ns og n               |
|                                       | 2 2          | 707                  | 74                  | 707                 | No <sub>support</sub> |
| Alabama                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Alaska                                |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Arizona                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Arkansas                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| California                            |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Colorado                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Connecticut                           |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Delaware                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| District of Columbia                  |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Florida                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Georgia                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Hawaii                                |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Idaho                                 |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Kansas                                |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Kentucky                              | -            |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Louisiana                             |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Maine                                 |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Maryland                              | <u>'</u> '   |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Massachusetts                         |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Michigan                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| FT                                    |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Missouri                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Montana                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Nebraska                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Nevada                                |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| New Hampshire                         |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| New Jersey                            |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| New Mexico                            |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| New York                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| North Carolina                        |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| North Dakota                          |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Ohio                                  |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Oklahoma                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| 5                                     |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     | 2                     |
| Tennessee                             |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Texas                                 |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Vermont                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Virginia                              |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Washington                            |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| 0                                     |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Wisconsin                             |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
| Wyoming                               |              |                      |                     |                     |                       |
|                                       |              |                      | 15                  | 11                  | 20                    |

 Maryland offers tuition reimbursement for teacher retraining in specified shortage subject areas and offers a stipend for alternate route candidates teaching in subject shortage areas.


2. South Dakota offers scholarships to teachers in high-need schools.

# T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

**Georgia** supports differential pay by which teachers can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects. The state is especially commended for its compensation strategy for math and science teachers, which moves teachers along the salary schedule rather just providing a bonus or stipend. The state also supports differential pay initiatives to link compensation more closely with district needs and to achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers.

#### Figure 99

Do states support differential pay for teaching in high need schools and shortage subjects?



- Strong Practice: Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia
- 2. Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Pennsylvania, Utah
- 4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia

# Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

# **>** Goal F – Performance Pay

The state should support performance pay, but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.

# **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support performance pay efforts, rewarding teachers for their effectiveness in the classroom.
- 2. The state should allow districts flexibility to define the criteria for performance pay provided that such criteria connect to evidence of student achievement.
- 3. Any performance pay plan should allow for the participation of all teachers, not just those in tested subjects and grades.

# Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

# Figure 100

How States are Faring in Performance Pay **Best Practice States** 2 Florida. Indiana **16** States Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii1, Louisiana<sup>1</sup>, Maine<sup>1</sup>, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi<sup>1</sup>, New York<sup>1</sup>, Ohio<sup>1</sup>, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah State Nearly Meets Goal California 5 States Partly Meet Goal Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia State Meets a Small Part of Goal Nebraska 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, IOWA, Kansas, Maryland, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: **⇒**:42 4:3 1:6

# 4-F Analysis: **lowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 ( Progress Since 2011

## **ANALYSIS**

lowa does not support performance pay. The state does not have any policies in place that offer teachers additional compensation based on evidence of effectiveness.

## RECOMMENDATION

## Support a performance pay plan that recognizes teachers for their effectiveness.

Whether it implements the plan at the state or local level, lowa should ensure that performance pay structures thoughtfully measure classroom performance and connect student achievement to teacher effectiveness. The plan must be developed with careful consideration of available data and subsequent issues of fairness.

## Consider piloting performance pay in a select number of school districts.

This would provide an opportunity to discover and correct any limitations in available data or methodology before implementing the plan on a wider scale.

### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 101                       | RED   | S.                 | ters                       | , /                                      | nance  |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Do states support                | ACTC  |                    | emit                       | late<br>Perfor                           | ed in<br>lools   |
| performance pay?                 | L EQ  | CEB<br>ALL         | Pay p                      | Ited ,                                   | or set   |
| perjoinnance pay:                | PERFORMANCE FACTORED<br>INTO SALARY FOR ALL<br>TEACTERS | PERCONNANCE BONUES | Performance pay permitters | State-Supported perfo-<br>set intratives | autricis of the dimance<br>Dees not support<br>Performance Day |
| Alabama                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Alaska                           |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Arizona                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Arkansas                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| California                       |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Colorado                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Connecticut                      |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Delaware<br>District of Columbia |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Florida                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Georgia                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Hawaii                           |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Idaho                            |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Illinois                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Indiana                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| IOWA                             |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Kansas                           |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Kentucky                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Louisiana                        |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Maine                            |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Maryland                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Massachusetts                    |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota            |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Mississippi                      |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Missouri                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Montana                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Nebraska                         |   | 1                  |                            |  |  |
| Nevada                           |   |                    | 2                          |  |  |
| New Hampshire                    |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| New Jersey                       |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| New Mexico                       |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| New York                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| North Carolina                   |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| North Dakota                     |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Ohio<br>Oklahoma                 |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Oregon                           |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Pennsylvania                     |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Rhode Island                     |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| South Carolina                   |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| South Dakota                     |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Tennessee                        |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Texas                            |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Utah                             |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Vermont                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Virginia                         |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Washington                       |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| West Virginia                    |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Wisconsin                        |   |                    |                            |  |  |
| Wyoming                          |   |                    |                            |  |  |
|                                  | 6   | 2                  | 8                          | 9  | 26   |

# **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**

An increasing number of states are supporting performance pay initiatives. Florida and Indiana are particularly noteworthy for their efforts to build performance into the salary schedule. Rather than award bonuses, teachers' salaries will be based in part on their performance in the classroom.


1. Nebraska's initiative does not go into effect until 2016.

2. Nevada's initiative does not go into effect until 2015-2016.

# Area 5 Summary

# How States are Faring in Exiting Ineffective Teachers

State Area Grades



# **Topics Included In This Area**

- 5-A: Extended Emergency Licenses
- **5-B:** Dismissal for Poor Performance
- 5-C: Reductions in Force

# Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

# Goal A – Extended Emergency Licenses

The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.

# **Goal Components**

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Under no circumstances should a state award a standard license to a teacher who has not passed all required subject-matter licensing tests.
- 2. If a state finds it necessary to confer conditional or provisional licenses under limited and exceptional circumstances to teachers who have not passed the required tests, the state should ensure that requirements are met within one year.

# Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

# Figure 102

How States are Faring in Licensure Loopholes **Best Practice States** 4 Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, New Jersey 3 States Meet Goal Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina 14 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, IOWA1, Kentucky, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah, West Virginia 2 States Partly Meet Goal New York, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Michigan, Vermont 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:1 👄 : 50 4:0

# 5-A Analysis: **Iowa**



Progress Since 2011

# ANALYSIS

lowa grants a one-year, nonrenewable teaching license to new teachers who have not met state requirements if a school needs to fill positions under "unique needs circumstances."

Supporting Research IAC 282--14.115(272)

# RECOMMENDATION

# Ensure that all teachers pass required subject-matter licensing tests before they enter the classroom.

While Iowa's policy offering its provisional license for one year only minimizes the risks brought about by having teachers in classrooms who lack sufficient or appropriate subject-matter knowledge, the state could take its policy a step further and require all teachers to meet subject-matter licensure requirements prior to entering the classroom.


## **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa was helpful in providing NCTQ with the facts necessary for this analysis.

| Figure 103  |             | /                       | /             | 6   |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| How long can new teachers<br>practice without passing |             |                         |               | <sup>3/earc</sup> ormore (or unspecified) |
| licensing tests?                                      | NO DEFERRAL | Up to <sub>7</sub> year | Up to 2 Jears | <sup>3</sup> <sub>Jears or mo</sub>       |
| Alabama   |             |                         |               |   |
| Alaska  |             |                         |               |   |
| Arizona   |             |                         |               | -   |
| Arkansas  |             |                         |               |   |
| California  |             |                         |               |   |
| Colorado  |             |                         |               |   |
| Connecticut   |             |                         |               |   |
| Delaware  |             |                         |               |   |
| District of Columbia                                  |             |                         |               |   |
| Florida   |             |                         |               |   |
| Georgia   |             |                         |               |   |
| Hawaii  |             |                         |               |   |
| Idaho   |             |                         |               |   |
| Illinois  |             |                         |               |   |
| Indiana   |             |                         |               |   |
| IOWA  |             |                         |               |   |
| Kansas  |             |                         |               |   |
| Kentucky  |             |                         |               |   |
| Louisiana   |             |                         |               |   |
| Maine   |             |                         |               |   |
| Maryland  |             |                         |               |   |
| Massachusetts   |             |                         |               |   |
| Michigan  |             |                         |               |   |
| Minnesota   |             |                         |               |   |
| Mississippi   |             |                         |               |   |
| Missouri  |             |                         |               |   |
| Montana   |             |                         |               |   |
| Nebraska  |             |                         |               |   |
| Nevada  |             |                         |               |   |
| New Hampshire   |             |                         |               |   |
| New Jersey  |             |                         |               |   |
| New Mexico  |             |                         |               |   |
| New York  |             |                         |               |   |
| North Carolina  |             |                         |               |   |
| North Dakota  |             |                         |               |   |
| Ohio  |             |                         |               |   |
| Oklahoma  |             |                         |               |   |
| Oregon<br>Pennsylvania                                |             |                         |               | -   |
| Rhode Island  |             |                         |               | -   |
| South Carolina  |             |                         |               |   |
| South Dakota  |             |                         |               |   |
| Tennessee   |             |                         |               |   |
| Texas   |             |                         |               | -   |
| Utah  |             |                         |               |   |
| Vermont   |             |                         |               |   |
| Virginia  |             |                         |               |   |
| Washington  |             |                         |               |   |
| West Virginia   |             |                         |               |   |
| Wisconsin   |             |                         |               |   |
| Wyoming   |             |                         |               |   |
|   | 7           | 14                      | 8             | 22  |
|   |             |                         |               |   |



Do states still award emergency licenses?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska<sup>4</sup>, Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, Montana<sup>5</sup>, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina
- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota<sup>6</sup>, Ohio<sup>6</sup>, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island<sup>6</sup>, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin
- 4. Alaska does not require subject-matter testing for initial certification.
- 5. Montana does not require subject-matter testing for certification.
- 6. License is renewable, but only if licensure tests are passed.

# Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

# Goal B – Dismissal for Poor Performance

The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.

# **Goal Components**

# (The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should articulate that teachers may be dismissed for ineffective classroom performance. Any teacher that receives two consecutive ineffective evaluations or two such ratings within five years should be formally eligible for dismissal, regardless of tenure status.
- 2. A teacher who is terminated for poor performance should have an opportunity to appeal. In the interest of both the teacher and the school district, the state should ensure that this appeal occurs within a reasonable time frame.
- 3. There should be a clear distinction between the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed for classroom ineffectiveness and the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed or facing license revocation for felony or morality violations or dereliction of duties.

# Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

## Figure 105



# 5-B Analysis: **lowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 😓 Progress Since 2011

## **ANALYSIS**

Iowa does not explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal, nor does the state distinguish the due process rights of teachers dismissed for ineffective performance from those facing other charges commonly associated with license revocation, such as a felony and/or morality violations. The process is the same regardless of the grounds for cancellation, which the state articulates vaguely as "just cause."

Tenured teachers who are terminated may appeal multiple times. After receiving written notice of dismissal, the teacher may, within five days, request a hearing, which must occur within 20 days following receipt of the request. A decision must be rendered within five days. The aggrieved teacher may then file an additional appeal, within 10 days, with an adjudicator, who must schedule a hearing within 40 days and offer a decision within 15 days. A third appeal may also be filed with the district court.

Supporting Research Iowa Code 279.15; 279. 16; 279.17; 279.18; 279.27

#### RECOMMENDATION

Specify that classroom ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.

lowa should explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal so that districts do not feel they lack the legal basis for terminating consistently poor performers.

Ensure that teachers terminated for poor performance have the opportunity to appeal within a reasonable time frame.

Nonprobationary teachers who are dismissed for any grounds, including ineffectiveness, are entitled to due process. However, cases that drag on for years drain resources from school districts and create a disincentive for districts to attempt to terminate poor performers. Therefore, the state must ensure that the opportunity to appeal occurs only once, as it is in the best interest of both the teacher and the district that a conclusion be reached within a reasonable time frame.

# Distinguish between the process and accompanying due process rights for dismissal for classroom ineffectiveness and dismissal for morality violations, felonies or dereliction of duty.

While nonprobationary teachers should have due process for any termination, it is important to differentiate between loss of employment and issues with far-reaching consequences that could permanently affect a teacher's right to practice. Iowa should ensure that appeals related to classroom effectiveness are decided only by those with educational expertise.

#### **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| Figure 106                       | ANDOREN, DEM | ÷ /          |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Do states articulate that        | Viii         | N POL        |
| ineffectiveness is grounds       | , DIS        | ATTO<br>ATTO |
| for dismissal?                   | 200          |              |
| Jor uismissat?                   | OR E         |              |
|                                  | AND, YES     | 2            |
| Alabama                          |              |              |
| Alaska                           |              |              |
| Arizona                          |              |              |
| Arkansas                         |              |              |
| California                       |              |              |
| Colorado                         |              |              |
| Connecticut                      |              |              |
| Delaware<br>District of Columbia |              |              |
| Florida                          |              |              |
| Georgia                          |              |              |
| Hawaii                           |              |              |
| Idaho                            |              |              |
| Illinois                         |              |              |
| Indiana                          |              |              |
| IOWA                             |              |              |
| Kansas                           |              |              |
| Kentucky                         |              |              |
| Louisiana                        |              |              |
| Maine                            |              |              |
| Maryland                         |              |              |
| Massachusetts                    |              |              |
| Michigan                         |              |              |
| Minnesota                        |              |              |
| Mississippi                      |              |              |
| Missouri                         |              |              |
| Montana<br>Nebraska              |              |              |
| Nevada                           |              | 1            |
| New Hampshire                    |              |              |
| New Jersey                       |              |              |
| New Mexico                       |              |              |
| New York                         |              |              |
| North Carolina                   |              |              |
| North Dakota                     |              |              |
| Ohio                             |              |              |
| Oklahoma                         |              |              |
| Oregon                           |              |              |
| Pennsylvania                     |              |              |
| Rhode Island                     |              |              |
| South Carolina                   |              |              |
| South Dakota                     |              |              |
| Tennessee                        |              |              |
| Texas                            |              |              |
| Utah<br>Vermont                  |              |              |
| Virginia                         |              |              |
| Washington                       |              |              |
| West Virginia                    |              |              |
| Wisconsin                        |              |              |
| Wyoming                          |              |              |
|                                  | 29           | 22           |
|                                  | 23           |              |
|                                  |              |              |

# **T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida and Oklahoma clearly articulate that teacher ineffectiveness in the classroom is grounds for dismissal. In both states, teachers are eligible for dismissal after two annual ratings of unsatisfactory performance. Each state has taken steps to ensure that the dismissal process for teachers deemed to be ineffective is expedited. Teachers facing dismissal have only one opportunity to appeal.

1. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not articulated that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.

Do states allow multiple appeals of teacher dismissals?



1. Strong Practice: Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Wisconsin

- 2. Teachers in these states revert to probationary status following ineffective evaluation ratings, meaning that they no longer have the due process right to multiple appeals: Colorado, Indiana, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. District of Columbia, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada<sup>5</sup>, Utah, Vermont
- Though a teacher returns to probationary status after two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations, Nevada does not articulate clear policy about its appeals process.

# Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

# Goal C – Reductions in Force

The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.

# **Goal Component**

(The factor considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should require that districts consider classroom performance and ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off.

# Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

# Figure 108



# 5-C Analysis: **Iowa**

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 ( Progress Since 2011

## **ANALYSIS**

lowa does not address the factors used to determine which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Require that districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off during reductions in force.

Iowa can still leave districts flexibility in determining layoff policies, but it should do so within a framework that ensures that classroom performance is considered.

Ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off. Unlike some states, Iowa does not require that districts consider seniority; however, the state should do more to prevent districts from making decisions solely on this basis.

# **IOWA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Iowa recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states prevent districts from basing layoffs solely on "last in, first out"?

#### J THE ONLY FACTOR BE PERFORMANCE MUST Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware $\square$ District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii $\square$ $\square$ Idaho $\square$ Illinois Indiana IOWA Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota $\square$ Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico $\square$ $\square$ New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina $\square$ South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington

18


22

West Virginia

Wisconsin

Wyoming

Do districts have to consider performance in determining which teachers are laid off?



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts<sup>3</sup>, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio<sup>3</sup>, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington


- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Tenure is considered first.

# T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

**Colorado**, **Florida**, and **Indiana** all specify that in determining which teachers to lay off during a reduction in force, classroom performance is the top criterion. These states also articulate that seniority can only be considered after a teacher's performance is taken into account.

## Figure 111

*Do states prevent districts from overemphasizing seniority in layoff decisions?* 



 Strong Practice: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts<sup>6</sup>, Michigan, Missouri<sup>6</sup>, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio<sup>6</sup>, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington

- 3. Hawaii, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin<sup>7</sup>
- 4. California, Kentucky, New Jersey, Oregon
- 5. Alabama, Alaska<sup>6</sup>, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska<sup>6</sup>, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming
- 6. Nontenured teachers are laid off first.
- 7. Only for counties with populations of 500,000 or more and for teachers hired before 1995.

<sup>2.</sup> Strong Practice: Louisiana, Utah

# Goals and Keywords

| GOAL  | STATEMENT   | KEY WORDS  |
|---|---|--|
|   | AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Te   | achers   |
| <b>1-A:</b> Admission into<br>Teacher Preparation                       | The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong academic records.  | admission requirements, academic<br>proficiency measures, basic skills tests, GPA  |
| <b>1-B:</b> Elementary<br>Teacher Preparation                           | The state should ensure that its teacher preparation<br>programs provide elementary teachers with a broad<br>liberal arts education, providing the necessary<br>foundation for teaching to the Common Core or<br>similar state standards. | license/certification, elementary teachers,<br>early childhood teachers, content tests,<br>elementary coursework/standards,<br>content specialization requirements   |
| <b>1-C:</b> Elementary<br>Teacher Preparation<br>in Reading Instruction | The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.   | license/certification, elementary teachers,<br>early childhood teachers, science of<br>reading tests, science of<br>reading coursework/standards                     |
| <b>1-D:</b> Elementary<br>Teacher Preparation<br>in Mathematics         | The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.  | license/certification, elementary teachers,<br>early childhood teachers, math content<br>tests, math coursework/standards  |
| <b>1-E:</b> Middle School<br>Teacher Preparation                        | The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.   | license/certification, middle school<br>teachers, content tests, K-8 licenses,<br>content specialization requirements  |
| 1-F: Secondary<br>Teacher Preparation                                   | The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.   | license/certification, secondary teachers,<br>secondary social studies, content tests,<br>endorsements   |
| <b>1-G:</b> Secondary Teacher<br>Preparation in Science                 | The state should ensure that secondary science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.   | license/certification, secondary<br>general science, content tests,<br>combination sciences  |
| <b>1-H:</b> Special Education<br>Teacher Preparation                    | The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they are licensed to teach.   | license/certification, special education<br>teachers, content tests, K-12 special<br>education license, elementary special<br>education, secondary special education |
| <b>1-I:</b> Assessing<br>Professional Knowledge                         | The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.  | license/certification, pedagogy,<br>professional standards/knowledge,<br>performance assessments, edTPA  |
| 1-J: Student Teaching   | The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high quality clinical experience.   | student teaching, cooperating teachers,<br>clinical preparation, placements  |
| <b>1-K:</b> Teacher Preparation<br>Program Accountability               | The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.  | teacher preparation programs, program<br>accountability, student achievement,<br>standard of performance, public reporting,<br>national accreditation                |

# Goals and Keywords


| GOAL  | STATEMENT  | KEY WORDS  |
|---|--|--|
|   | AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching I   | Pool   |
| <b>2-A:</b> Alternate<br>Route Eligibility      | The state should require alternate route programs<br>to exceed the admission requirements of traditional<br>preparation programs while also being flexible to the<br>needs of nontraditional candidates. | alternate route programs, admission<br>requirements, GPA, academic proficiency<br>measures, subject-matter test, flexibility/<br>test-out          |
| <b>2-B:</b> Alternate<br>Route Preparation      | The state should ensure that its alternate routes<br>provide efficient preparation that is relevant to<br>the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as<br>adequate mentoring and support.             | alternate route programs, coursework<br>requirements, length of program, student/<br>practice teaching, induction, mentoring                       |
| <b>2-C:</b> Alternate Route Usage and Providers | The state should provide an alternate route that is free from limitations on its usage and allows a diversity of providers.  | alternate routes; subject, grade or<br>geographic restrictions; college or<br>university providers; district-run<br>programs; non-profit providers |
| <b>2-D:</b> Part-Time<br>Teaching Licenses      | The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.   | part-time license/certificate,<br>adjunct license  |
| <b>2-E:</b> Licensure<br>Reciprocity            | The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.   | license reciprocity, license portability,<br>out-of-state teachers, testing<br>requirements, online teachers                                       |
|   | AREA 3: Identifying Effective Teac   | hers   |
| <b>3-A:</b> State<br>Data Systems               | The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.  | longitudinal data systems, definition of teacher of record, teacher production   |
| <b>3-B:</b> Evaluation of Effectiveness         | The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.   | teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness,<br>student learning, classroom observations,<br>surveys, rating categories                              |
| <b>3-C:</b> Frequency of Evaluations            | The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.   | teacher evaluation, evaluation frequency,<br>classroom observations, feedback  |
| <b>3-D:</b> Tenure                              | The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.   | tenure, probationary period, continuing contracts, teacher effectiveness   |
| <b>3-E:</b> Licensure<br>Advancement            | The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.  | probationary license, professional license,<br>license renewal, evidence of teacher<br>effectiveness, coursework requirements                      |
| <b>3-F:</b> Equitable Distribution              | The state should publicly report districts' distribution<br>of teacher talent among schools to identify<br>inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.   | public reporting, aggregate school-level<br>data, evaluation ratings, school report<br>cards, teacher absenteeism rate,<br>turnover rate           |

# Goals and Keywords

| GOAL   | STATEMENT   | KEY WORDS  |
|--|---|--|
|  | AREA 4: Retaining Effective Teacl   | hers   |
| 4-A: Induction                                     | The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.  | mentoring, induction, mentor selection, reduced teaching load, release time  |
| <b>4-B:</b> Professional Development               | The state should ensure that teachers receive<br>feedback about their performance and should<br>require professional development to be based on<br>needs identified through teacher evaluations.            | feedback from observations/evaluations,<br>professional development linked to<br>evaluations results, improvement plans                  |
| <b>4-C:</b> Pay Scales                             | The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.  | teacher compensation, salary schedules,<br>pay scales, steps and lanes, advanced<br>degrees, years of experience, teacher<br>performance |
| <b>4-D:</b> Compensation for Prior Work Experience | The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.  | teacher compensation,<br>relevant work experience  |
| <b>4-E:</b> Differential Pay                       | The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.   | teacher compensation, differential pay,<br>shortage subject areas, high-need schools   |
| 4-F: Performance Pay                               | The state should support performance pay, but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.   | teacher compensation, performance<br>pay, teacher performance, student<br>achievement  |
|  | AREA 5: Exiting Ineffective Teach   | ners   |
| <b>5-A:</b> Extended<br>Emergency Licenses         | The state should close loopholes that allow teachers<br>who have not met licensure requirements to<br>continue teaching.  | emergency licenses, provisional<br>certificates, loopholes,<br>subject-matter tests  |
| <b>5-B:</b> Dismissal for Poor Performance         | The state should articulate that ineffective<br>classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and<br>ensure that the process for terminating ineffective<br>teachers is expedient and fair to all parties. | dismissal, ineffectiveness, poor<br>performance, appeals, due process  |
| <b>5-C:</b> Reductions in Force                    | The state should require that its school districts<br>consider classroom performance as a factor in<br>determining which teachers are laid off when a<br>reduction in force is necessary.                   | reduction in force, layoffs,<br>teacher performance, seniority   |
|  |   |  |

# Teacher Policy Priorities for Iowa

| AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| Require teacher preparation programs to screen candidates prior to admission by using a common test normed to the general college-bound population, and limit acceptance to those candidates demonstrating academic ability in the top 50th percentile.                    | Goal 1-/             |
| Adopt an elementary content test with independently scored subject-matter subtests in each of the core areas.  | Goal 1-I             |
| Require all elementary teacher candidates to pass a rigorous stand-alone science of reading test.  | Goal 1-0             |
| Adopt a rigorous stand-alone math test for all elementary teacher candidates.  | Goal 1-I             |
| Specifically require secondary social studies and science teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.  | Goal 1-I<br>Goal 1-0 |
| Ensure that both elementary and secondary special education teachers possess adequate and appropriate content knowledge for the grades and subjects they teach.  | Goal 1-F             |
| Ensure that cooperating teachers for student teaching placements have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.  | Goal 1-              |
| Hold teacher preparation programs accountable by collecting data that connect student achievement gains to programs, as well as other meaningful data that reflect program performance, and by establishing the minimum standard of performance for each category of data. | Goal 1-I             |
|  | N THE REAL           |
| AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool  |                      |
| Increase admission requirements to alternate route programs, including a high bar for academic proficiency and passage of a subject-matter test.   | Goal 2-/             |
| Establish guidelines for alternate route programs that require preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers. Ensure programs provide intensive induction support to alternate route teachers.  | Goal 2-              |
| Broaden alternate route usage, and allow a diversity of providers for alternate route programs.  | Goal 2-0             |
| Eliminate licensure obstacles for out-of-state teachers.   | Goal 2-              |
|  |                      |





1120 G Street, NW • Washington, DC 20005 Tel: 202-393-0020 Fax: 202-393-0095 Web: www.nctq.org

Subscribe to NCTQ's blog PDQ Solow NCTQ on Twitter 🕒 and Facebook 📑

NCTQ is available to work with individual states to improve teacher policies. For more information, please contact:

> Sandi Jacobs Vice President sjacobs@nctq.org 202-393-0020