# 2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

Kansas





### 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 Foundation
- Carnegie Corporation of New York
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The Joyce Foundation
- The Walton 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.



# **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.

## Kansas 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      | F    | F               |

| Goal Breakdown          | 2013 |
|-------------------------|------|
| ★ Best Practice         | 0    |
| Fully Meets             | 3    |
| Nearly Meets            | 2    |
| Partially Meets         | 5    |
| Meets Only a Small Part | 7    |
| O Does Not Meet         | 14   |

|            | Progress on Goals<br>Since 2011 |    |
|------------|---------------------------------|----|
| •          | Progress has increased          | 2  |
| <b>(2)</b> | No change in progress           | 28 |
| •          | Progress has decreased          | 1  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;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.

| Admission into Teacher Preparation   |   | Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science   |                                   |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Elementary Teacher Preparation   |   | Special Education Teacher Preparation  |                                   |
| Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction   | n 🔘   | Assessing Professional Knowledge   |                                   |
| Teacher Preparation in Mathematics   |   | Student Teaching   |                                   |
| Middle School Teacher Preparation  |   | Teacher Preparation Program Accountability   |                                   |
| Secondary Teacher Preparation  |   |  |                                   |
| Policy Strengths   |   |  |                                   |
| Middle school teachers may not teach of<br>generalist license, and they must appropriately<br>single-subject content test.   |   | All new teachers are required to pass a  | pedagogy tes                      |
| Policy Weaknesses  |   |  |                                   |
| <ul> <li>Teacher candidates are not required to academic proficiency as a criterion for a teacher preparation programs.</li> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a content test with individually score.</li> </ul>   | required to   | <ul> <li>The state offers a K-12 special education certification and does not require any contesting for special education teacher can</li> <li>There are no requirements to ensure that teachers are placed with cooperating teachers.</li> </ul> | ontent<br>ndidates.<br>nt student |
| each of the core content areas, includin   |   |  |                                   |
| Elementary teacher candidates are not<br>pass a science of reading test to ensure  | required to<br>knowledge of   | <ul> <li>The teacher preparation program approv<br/>does not hold programs accountable for</li> </ul>  | al process                        |
| ■ Elementary teacher candidates are not  | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social secontent tests                     | The teacher preparation program approv<br>does not hold programs accountable for<br>of the teachers they produce.  | al process                        |
| <ul> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a science of reading test to ensure effective reading instruction, and preparare not required to address this critical.</li> <li>Although secondary teachers must pass to teach a core subject area, some seco studies teachers are not required to pass for each discipline they are licensed to the secondary teachers.</li> </ul>   | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social is content tests teach.             | ■ The teacher preparation program approv<br>does not hold programs accountable for<br>of the teachers they produce.  | al process                        |
| <ul> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a science of reading test to ensure effective reading instruction, and preparare not required to address this critical.</li> <li>Although secondary teachers must pass to teach a core subject area, some seco studies teachers are not required to pass for each discipline they are licensed to the decidence of the pass of</li></ul> | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social is content tests teach.             | ■ The teacher preparation program approv<br>does not hold programs accountable for<br>of the teachers they produce.  | ral process<br>the quality        |
| <ul> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a science of reading test to ensure effective reading instruction, and preparare not required to address this critical.</li> <li>Although secondary teachers must pass to teach a core subject area, some seco studies teachers are not required to pass.</li> </ul>   | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social is content tests teach.             | The teacher preparation program approvious does not hold programs accountable for of the teachers they produce.  Page 1975   | ral process<br>the quality        |
| <ul> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a science of reading test to ensure effective reading instruction, and preparare not required to address this critical.</li> <li>Although secondary teachers must pass to teach a core subject area, some secon studies teachers are not required to pass for each discipline they are licensed to the secondary teachers.</li> </ul> Area 2: Expanding the Pool Alternate Route Eligibility   | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social is content tests teach.             | The teacher preparation program approvious does not hold programs accountable for of the teachers they produce.  Part-Time Teaching Licenses   | ral process<br>the quality        |
| <ul> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a science of reading test to ensure effective reading instruction, and preparare not required to address this critical.</li> <li>Although secondary teachers must pass to teach a core subject area, some secon studies teachers are not required to pass for each discipline they are licensed to the secondary teachers.</li> <li>Area 2: Expanding the Pool</li> <li>Alternate Route Eligibility</li> <li>Alternate Route Usage and Providers</li> </ul>  | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social is content tests teach.             | The teacher preparation program approvious does not hold programs accountable for of the teachers they produce.  Part-Time Teaching Licenses Licensure Reciprocity   | age 51                            |
| <ul> <li>Elementary teacher candidates are not pass a science of reading test to ensure effective reading instruction, and preparare not required to address this critical.</li> <li>Although secondary teachers must pass to teach a core subject area, some secon studies teachers are not required to pass for each discipline they are licensed to the secondary teachers.</li> </ul> Area 2: Expanding the Pool Alternate Route Eligibility Alternate Route Preparation   | required to knowledge of ration programs topic. s a content test ndary social is content tests teach.  I of Teach | The teacher preparation program approvious does not hold programs accountable for of the teachers they produce.  Part-Time Teaching Licenses   | requirements ch part time,        |

#### Page 71 **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers** State Data Systems Tenure **Evaluation of Effectiveness** Licensure Advancement Frequency of Evaluations **Equitable Distribution Policy Strengths** ■ The state has established a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness and has taken other meaningful steps to maximize the system's efficiency and potential. **Policy Weaknesses** Tenure decisions are not connected to evidence of Although objective evidence of student learning teacher effectiveness. is a significant component of teacher evaluations, Licensure advancement and renewal are not based it is not the preponderant criterion, and the state on teacher effectiveness. has failed to articulate other important evaluation Little school-level data are reported that can help requirements. support the equitable distribution of teacher talent. Annual evaluations for all teachers are not required. **Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers Page 101** Compensation for Prior Work Experience Induction Professional Development Differential Pay Pay Scales Performance Pay **Policy Strengths** Districts are given full authority for how teachers are paid, although they are not discouraged from basing salary schedules solely on years of experience and advanced degrees. **Policy Weaknesses** All new teachers do not receive mentoring or other Teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations are not placed on structured improvement plans. induction support. The state does not support performance pay or Teachers receive feedback from their evaluations, additional compensation for relevant prior work although the state could do more to ensure that all experience, working in high-need schools or teaching teachers' professional development activities are aligned with findings from their evaluations. in shortage subject areas. Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers Page 125 **Extended Emergency Licenses** Reductions in Force Dismissal for Poor Performance **Policy Weaknesses** Performance is not considered in determining which Teachers can teach for up to two years before teachers to lay off during reductions in force. having to pass required subject-matter tests. Ineffective classroom performance is not grounds for dismissal, and tenured teachers who are dismissed have multiple opportunities to appeal.

| igure A              | Overall State<br>Grade 2013 | Overall State   | Overall State<br>Grade 2009 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
|                      | Overal<br>Grade             | Overal<br>Grade | Overa                       |
| Florida              | B+                          | В               | С                           |
| Louisiana            | В                           | C-              | C-                          |
| Rhode Island         | В                           | B-              | D                           |
| Tennessee            | В                           | B-              | C-                          |
| Arkansas             | B-                          | С               | C-                          |
| Connecticut          | B-                          | C-              | D+                          |
| Georgia              | B-                          | С               | C-                          |
| Indiana              | B-                          | C+              | D                           |
| Massachusetts        | B-                          | С               | D+                          |
| Michigan             | B-                          | C+              | D-                          |
| New Jersey           | B-                          | D+              | D+                          |
| New York             | B-                          | С               | D+                          |
| Ohio                 | B-                          | C+              | D+                          |
| Oklahoma             | B-                          | В-              | D+                          |
| Colorado             | C+                          | С               | D+                          |
| Delaware             | C+                          | С               | D                           |
| Illinois             | C+                          | С               | D+                          |
| Virginia             | C+                          | D+              | D+                          |
| Kentucky             | C                           | D+              | D+                          |
| Mississippi          | C                           | D+              | D+                          |
| North Carolina       | С                           | D+              | D+                          |
| Utah                 | С                           | 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                           |
| lowa                 | 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                           |
| VEITHOUL             |                             |                 | _                           |

### 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



**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:



Goal progress has increased since 2011



Goal progress has decreased since 2011



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



### 1-A Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal





Bar Raised for this Goal ( Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas does not require aspiring teachers to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs or any time thereafter.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

■ Require that teacher preparation programs screen candidates for academic proficiency prior to admission.

Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates invest considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates in need of additional support should complete remediation before entering the program to avoid the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars. Kansas should require candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, mathematics and writing prior to program admission.

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

Kansas 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.

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, Kansas 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this response. The state noted that it delegates the designation of admission requirements to the institutions, but indicated that the accreditation process requires all institutions of higher education to have admission criteria for basic academic skills in place. Kansas added that as an NCATE/CAEP state, it will be adhering to the new CAEP standards for stricter admission requirements. Most Kansas IHEs do use PPST, ACT, SAT, or CBEST exams results for admission criteria.



#### 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?




- 1. 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
- 2. 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 nomed to teach | Test nomed to test                      | No test tequited |
|------------------------|--|---------------------|---|------------------|
| Do states measure the  | O C  |                     |   |                  |
| academic proficiency   | of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}}}^{\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}}}$ | 5 BE 2              | 19 Pe                                   | 7 de 1.          |
| teacher candidates?    | 700 M  |                     | 10 1 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | Pof Palie        |
|                        | N 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5                                |                     | tepin<br>giqat                          | est re           |
|                        | 12 8 S   | / <sup>2</sup>      |   | No test required |
| Alabama                |  |                     |   |                  |
| Alaska                 |  |                     |   |                  |
| Arizona                |  |                     |   |                  |
| Arkansas               |  |                     |   |                  |
| California             |  |                     |   |                  |
| Colorado               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Connecticut            |  |                     |   |                  |
| Delaware               |  |                     |   |                  |
| District of Columbia   |  |                     |   |                  |
| Florida                |  |                     |   |                  |
| Georgia                |  |                     |   |                  |
| Hawaii                 |  |                     |   |                  |
| Idaho                  |  |                     |   |                  |
| Illinois               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Indiana                |  |                     |   |                  |
| lowa                   |  |                     |   |                  |
| KANSAS                 |  |                     |   |                  |
| Kentucky               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Louisiana              |  |                     |   |                  |
| Maine                  |  |                     |   |                  |
| Maryland               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Massachusetts          |  |                     |   |                  |
| Michigan               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Minnesota              |  |                     |   |                  |
| Mississippi            |  |                     |   | Ш                |
| Missouri               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Montana                |  |                     |   |                  |
| Nebraska               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Nevada                 |  |                     |   |                  |
| New Hampshire          |  |                     |   |                  |
| New Jersey             |  |                     |   |                  |
| New Mexico<br>New York |  |                     |   |                  |
| North Carolina         |  |                     |   |                  |
| North Dakota           |  |                     |   |                  |
| Ohio                   |  |                     |   |                  |
| Oklahoma               |  | 1                   |   |                  |
| Oregon                 |  |                     |   |                  |
| Pennsylvania           |  |                     |   |                  |
| Rhode Island           |  |                     |   |                  |
| South Carolina         |  |                     |   |                  |
| South Dakota           |  |                     |   |                  |
| Tennessee              |  |                     |   |                  |
| Texas                  |  |                     |   |                  |
| Utah                   |  |                     |   |                  |
| Vermont                |  |                     |   |                  |
| Virginia               |  |                     |   |                  |
| Washington             |  |                     |   |                  |
| West Virginia          |  |                     |   |                  |
| Wisconsin              |  |                     |   |                  |
|                        |  |                     |   |                  |
| Wyoming                |  |                     |   |                  |

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

Figure 5

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
- 2. Kentucky, Texas
- 3. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut<sup>9</sup>, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin<sup>10</sup>
- 4. Louisiana
- 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.
- 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.

# 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



### 1-B Analysis: Kansas







#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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.

Kansas requires candidates to pass the Praxis II test Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, which, unfortunately, not only combines content with a pedagogy assessment but also 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 Kansas would be well aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

Kansas only requires its early childhood education teacher candidates, who are allowed to teach up through grade 3, to pass the Education of Young Children test, which is not a content test.

In addition, Kansas does not require its elementary teacher candidates to earn an academic content specialization.

#### Supporting Research

Praxis Test Requirement

www.ets.org

Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators

http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Licensure%20Documents/CertHandbook8-2011%20FINAL.pdf

#### **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.

Kansas 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.

Kansas 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.

Kansas should either articulate a more specific set of standards or establish 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. Although Kansas does not specify any coursework requirements for general education or elementary teacher candidates, the state has articulated general education standards that require all teacher candidates to be acquainted with a comprehensive list of topics, including biology, earth and space science, music, and fine arts. The state also specifies elementary standards that include children's literature and geography. However, there are a number of gaps, including in world and American history, as well as world, British and American literature.

Require elementary teacher candidates to complete a content specialization in an academic subject area.

In addition to enhancing content knowledge, this requirement would ensure that prospective teachers in Kansas take higher-level academic coursework. The requirement also provides an important safeguard in the event that candidates are unable to successfully complete clinical practice requirements. With an academic concentration (or better still a major or minor), candidates who are not ready for the classroom and do not pass student teaching can still be on track to complete a degree.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that standards revision groups have been convened to update its program standards, and that work groups reference and align a variety of standards during their work, including national and specialized professional association (SPA) standards, National Board standards, Common Core and K-12 curricular standards. The elementary program standards group is aligning the program standards to Common Core standards. Draft program standards have not been released at this time.

Kansas also noted that the Professional Standards Advisory Board will be moving forward with a review of the current licensure content tests for elementary, early childhood and other endorsement areas to determine if the current approved content tests are the most appropriate. Of particular interest to the state is the ETS elementary content test that now provides separate scores for the four core content areas. The Education of Young Children assessment is in the process of regeneration by ETS and will also be examined.

| Figure 7               | EMENTARY CONTENT  SCORE FOR ESPARTENT | CACH SUBJECT   SPAING   SPAING   SPAING   SPAING   SPAING   SOME SUBJECT   SOME SUBJECT   SOME SUBJECT   SAME | Elementary content to | with /           |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------|
| Do states ensure that  | TEWY.                                 | PECT<br>PECT<br>TE   | ore f                 | <i>i</i> /       |
| elementary teachers    | 98                                    | 1,2c/  | s sol                 | . / 2            |
| know core content?     | 18 SE T                               | 25 \ 20 \ 20 \ 20 \ 20 \ 20 \ 20 \ 20 \  | 8 / 9 8               | quir             |
|                        | Z Z Z                                 | ent.   | site i                | / ts             |
|                        | EST V                                 | Elen<br>Par<br>mes   | leme<br>impo          | No test required |
| Alabama                | - Z S /                               | _ გ<br>  |                       |                  |
| Alaska                 |                                       |  |                       | 1                |
| Arizona                |                                       |  | - i                   | $\overline{}$    |
| Arkansas               |                                       | $\overline{\Box}$  | Ī                     | П                |
| California             |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Colorado               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Connecticut            |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Delaware               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| District of Columbia   |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Florida                |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Georgia                |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Hawaii                 |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Idaho                  |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Illinois               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Indiana                |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Iowa                   |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| KANSAS                 |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Kentucky               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Louisiana              |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Maine                  |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Maryland               |                                       |  | 2                     |                  |
| Massachusetts          |                                       |  | 3                     |                  |
| Michigan               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Minnesota              |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Mississippi            |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Missouri               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Montana                |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Nebraska               |                                       |  | 2                     |                  |
| Nevada                 |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| New Hampshire          |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| New Jersey             |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| New Mexico<br>New York |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| North Carolina         |                                       |  | 3                     |                  |
| North Dakota           |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Ohio                   |                                       |  |                       | 4                |
| Oklahoma               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Oregon                 |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Pennsylvania           |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Rhode Island           |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| South Carolina         |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| South Dakota           |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Tennessee              |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Texas                  |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Utah                   |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Vermont                |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Virginia               |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Washington             |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| West Virginia          |                                       |  |                       |                  |
|                        | _                                     |  |                       |                  |
|                        |                                       |  |                       |                  |
| Wisconsin<br>Wyoming   |                                       |  |                       |                  |



#### **TOTAL STATE 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.

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

<sup>3.</sup> Massachusetts and North Carolina require a general curriculum test that does not report scores for each elementary subject. A separate score is

| childhood teachers wh<br>teach elementary grad<br>to pass a content<br>knowledge test? | les \$ 2                              | Content test with | Test with little  | No test required | Not applicable? |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| to pass a content  | S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S | off (             | vith [            | , require        | Polica          |
| knowledge test?  | 50N<br>5CBS<br>4CHS                   |                   | rest, to no       | \                | Nota            |
| Alabama  |                                       |                   | /                 | /                |                 |
| Alaska   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Arizona  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Arkansas   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| California   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Colorado   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Connecticut  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Delaware   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| District of Columbia   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Florida  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Georgia  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Hawaii   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Idaho  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Illinois   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Indiana  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| lowa   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| KANSAS   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Kentucky   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Louisiana  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Maine  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Maryland   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Massachusetts  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Mississippi  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Missouri   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Montana  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Nebraska   | $\Box$                                | $\Box$            |                   | ī                |                 |
| Nevada   |                                       |                   | $\overline{\Box}$ |                  | П               |
| New Hampshire  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| New Jersey   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| New Mexico   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| New York   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| North Carolina   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| North Dakota   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Ohio   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Oklahoma   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Oregon   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Pennsylvania   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Rhode Island   | 2                                     |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| South Carolina   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| South Dakota   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Tennessee  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Texas  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Utah   | 2                                     |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Vermont  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Virginia   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| Washington   |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
| West Virginia Wisconsin  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |
|  |                                       |                   |                   |                  |                 |

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

| Figure 9  | ENGLISH  | SCIENCE  | SOCIAL STUDIES  | FINE ARTS                         |
|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Do states expect<br>elementary teachers<br>to have in-depth<br>knowledge of | American Literature World British Literature Composition Children's Literature Children's Literature | General Physical Science Biology/Life Science                | American History / American History / American Government World History (Mocient) World History (Mocient) World History (Mocient) World History (Mocient) | Geography<br>Art History<br>Music |
| core content?   |  | Chemistry<br>Physics<br>Ceneral H<br>Earth Scio<br>Biology/L | £ \ £ \ £ \ Z \ Z \ Z \ Z \ Z \ Z \ Z \   | Geograph<br>Art Hist              |
| Alabama   |  |  |   |                                   |
| Alaska  |  |  |   |                                   |
| Arizona<br>Arkansas   |  |  |   | *                                 |
| California  |  |  |   | □ □ ■ ★ □ ★                       |
| Colorado  |  |  |   |                                   |
| Connecticut   |  |  | → → □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □   |                                   |
| Delaware  |  |  |   |                                   |
| District of Columbia  |  |  |   |                                   |
| Florida   |  | * 1 * * *  |   | *                                 |
| Georgia   |  |  | * * * -   | *                                 |
| Hawaii  |  |  |   |                                   |
| Idaho   |  |  | * * * -   |                                   |
| Illinois  |  | □ □ ★ ★ ★  |   | * -                               |
| Indiana   |  |  |   | ★ □ ★                             |
| lowa  |  |  |   |                                   |
| KANSAS  |  |  |   | <b>★</b> □ ■                      |
| 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  |  |  |   | <b>★</b> □ ■                      |
| Oregon  |  |  | * * * * * *   | ★ □ ★                             |
| Pennsylvania  |  |  | * • * • • •   | <b>*</b>                          |
| Rhode Island  |  |  | * * * D   |                                   |
| South Carolina  |  |  |   |                                   |
| South Dakota  |  |  |   |                                   |
| Tennessee   |  |  |   | * -                               |
| Texas   |  |  | * * * <b> </b>  | * * *                             |
| Utah<br>Vermont   |  |  | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                                   |
| Virginia  |  | * * * *  | * * * * *   | * 0 0                             |
| Washington  |  |  |   | *   .                             |
| West Virginia   |  |  |   |                                   |
| Wisconsin   |  |  | * * -   |                                   |
|   |  |  |   |                                   |
| Wyoming   |  |  |   |                                   |
| Wyoming   |  |  |   |                                   |

Figure 10
What subjects does Kansas 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: Kansas







#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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.

Kansas 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.

#### **Supporting Research**

Praxis Test Requirements

www.ets.org

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

Kansas 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.

Kansas 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.

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

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas asserted that its program standards for elementary education teachers comprehensively cover the science of reading. The state also contended that its professional education standards establish competencies in reading for all pre-service teachers.

Further, Kansas pointed out that an elementary program standards revision group is in progress and is utilizing the IRA standards for reference/alignment in its revision work. The state also plans to reexamine its elementary content assessment. Kansas noted that it issues a separate school specialist license for Reading Specialist, which districts utilize in elementary school assignments.

#### **LAST WORD**

The five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction are phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Neither the elementary education program standards nor the professional education standards address these components.

| igure 13                   |                   | PARATION<br>JIREMENT | rc /         | TEST<br>REQUIRI  |               |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|
| Do states ensure that      | 5 4               |                      |              | £37              |               |
| elementary teachers        | ORES<br>CIEN      | 94.68                | / 4          |                  | <i>ti</i> / : |
| now the science            | VCS.              | 2t ag<br>8 sci       | ) but        | Mat <sub>e</sub> | / iji         |
| f reading?                 | READING SCIENCE   | Do not address       | 4PPROPRIATE. | Inadequate to    | No reading    |
| Alabama                    |                   |                      | 1            |                  |               |
| Alaska                     |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Arizona                    |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Arkansas                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| California                 |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Colorado                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Connecticut                |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Delaware                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| District of Columbia       |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Florida                    |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii          |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Idaho                      |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Illinois                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Indiana                    |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| lowa                       |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| KANSAS                     |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Kentucky                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Louisiana                  |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Maine                      | $\overline{\Box}$ |                      | П            |                  |               |
| Maryland                   |                   |                      | n            | ā                |               |
| Massachusetts              |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Michigan                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Minnesota                  |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Mississippi                |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Missouri                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Montana                    |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Nebraska                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Nevada                     |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| New Hampshire              |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| New Jersey                 |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| New Mexico                 |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| New York<br>North Carolina |                   |                      | 2            |                  |               |
| North Dakota               |                   |                      | <u> </u>     |                  |               |
| Ohio                       |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Oklahoma                   |                   |                      | -            |                  |               |
| Oregon                     |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Pennsylvania               |                   |                      | - i          | ī                | - H           |
| Rhode Island               |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| South Carolina             |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| South Dakota               |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Tennessee                  |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Texas                      |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Utah                       |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Vermont                    |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Virginia                   |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Washington                 |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| West Virginia              |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Wisconsin                  |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
| Wyoming                    |                   |                      |              |                  |               |
|                            | 25                | 26                   | 17           | 16               | 18            |



#### **TEXAMPLES 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.

<sup>1.</sup> Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.

<sup>2.</sup> Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.

Figure 14

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
- 2. 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.
- $5. \, \text{Teachers}$  have until their second year to pass the reading test.

Figure 15

Do states measure knowledge of the science of

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
- Idaho
- Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, 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.)

- 1. 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).
- 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



### 1-D Analysis: Kansas



State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🕟 Bar Raised for this Goal 🙌 Progress Since 2011





#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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.

Kansas's early childhood education teachers, who are allowed to teach through grade 3, are not required to pass a content test.

Kansas's general education standards require candidates to understand "the role that mathematics plays in everyday life," and they specifically mention "the uses of statistics and probability." The state has also articulated teaching standards that its approved teacher preparation programs must use to frame instruction in elementary mathematics content. These standards address content in mathematics foundations, but although they mention areas such as algebra, geometry and data analysis, the standards lack the specificity needed to ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates.

#### Supporting Research

Praxis Test Requirements www.ets.org

Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators

http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Licensure%20Documents/CertHandbook8-2011%20FINAL.pdf

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

Kansas 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.

Kansas must ensure that new teachers are prepared to teach the mathematics content required by the Common Core State Standards. Although Kansas 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Kansas asserted that its elementary program and general education standards provide competencies in foundations and an appropriate breadth and depth of mathematics content for elementary preservice teachers. The state also reiterated its previous comments regarding the review of its elementary and early childhood content tests.



#### \*\* 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?



- 1. 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
- 2. 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,
- 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.
- 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



### 1-E Analysis: Kansas



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas requires a "late childhood through early adolescence" endorsement (grades 5-8) for all middle school teachers. Candidates must complete a subject-matter major or its equivalent.

All new middle school teachers in Kansas 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, Kansas does not offer a K-8 generalist license.

#### **Supporting Research**

Praxis Test Requirements
www.ets.org
Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators

www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=123

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Ensure meaningful content tests.** 

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

■ Differentiate between single and multiple subject middle school teachers.

Kansas should encourage middle school teachers who plan to teach multiple subjects to earn two minors in two core academic areas, rather than a single major. The state should retain its requirement for a subject-area major for middle school candidates who intend to teach a single subject.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Eigure 20  Do states distinguish middle grade preparation from elementary preparation?  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 Newada New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Hexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Oregon Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   | Figure 20               | £                | CKED        | \$ /          |
|--|-------------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 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 Carolina  South Carolina  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Wisconsin  January  Arkansas  January  Janua | Do states distinguish   | <sup>7</sup> OFE | ed for      | 00/7          |
| 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 Carolina  South Carolina  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Wisconsin  January  Arkansas  January  Janua |                         | <i>S</i>         | Joffe,      | Jere /        |
| Alaska   |                         | SN <sub>Z</sub>  | Cense       | ) ssu         |
| Alaska   | eternemary preparation: | K-8 LIC          | K-8 lii     | K-81/ig       |
| 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  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |                         |                  |             |               |
| Arkansas   |                         |                  |             |               |
| California   | ==                      |                  |             | 1             |
| Colorado   |                         |                  |             |               |
| Delaware   |                         |                  | 2           |               |
| 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  Tennessee  Texas  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Wisconsin  Indiana  In |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |                         |                  |             |               |
| Interest    |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |                         |                  | - i         | $\overline{}$ |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  | -                       |                  | П           | П             |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  | Michigan                |                  |             |               |
| 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  | _                       |                  |             |               |
| 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   | Mississippi             |                  |             |               |
| 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  | Missouri                |                  |             |               |
| 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  | Montana                 |                  |             |               |
| 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   |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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                                 Wisconsin                                 Wyoming  |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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   | •                       |                  |             |               |
| North Carolina  North Dakota  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |                         |                  |             |               |
| North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |                         |                  |             |               |
| Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |                         |                  |             |               |
| Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |                         |                  | _           | 1             |
| Oregon   |                         |                  |             |               |
| 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 Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |                         |                  | _           |               |
| South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |                         |                  |             |               |
| Tennessee Texas  |                         |                  | <del></del> |               |
| Texas  |                         |                  |             |               |
| Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |                         |                  | _           | _             |
| Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |                         |                  |             |               |
| Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  |                         |                  |             |               |
| Washington   |                         |                  |             |               |
| West Virginia  |                         |                  |             |               |
| Wisconsin  | _                       |                  |             |               |
| Wyoming  |                         |                  |             | 1             |
|  |                         |                  |             |               |
|  | j                       | 31               | 5           | 15            |



#### **\*** 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.

<sup>1.</sup> Offers 1-8 license.

<sup>2.</sup> California offers a K-12 generalist license for all self-contained classrooms.

<sup>3.</sup> With the exception of mathematics.

<sup>4.</sup> Oregon offers 3-8 license.

| Figure 21                   |       | No, test does not report | z /                                     | /                                     |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Do middle school teachers   |       | / 6                      | No, K-8 license requires                | No, testing of all site.              |
| have to pass an appropriate |       | 7 te                     | Say / 1762                              | test /                                |
| content test in every core  |       | result,                  | ense,                                   |                                       |
| subject they are licensed   |       | st de                    | 8 lic                                   | sting /                               |
| to teach?                   | YES / | % t.                     | \ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \ | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ |
|                             | ~ /   | ` % /                    | ` 0 /                                   | , 2                                   |
| Alabama                     |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Alaska                      |       |                          |   | <b>1</b>                              |
| 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                    |       | Ц                        |   |                                       |
| Oregon                      |       |                          | 7                                       |                                       |
| Pennsylvania                |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Rhode Island                |       |                          |   |                                       |
| South Carolina              |       |                          |   |                                       |
| South Dakota                |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Tennessee                   |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Texas                       |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Utah                        |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Vermont                     |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Virginia                    |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Washington                  |       |                          |   |                                       |
| West Virginia               |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Wisconsin                   |       |                          |   |                                       |
| Wyoming                     |       |                          |   |                                       |
|                             |       |                          |   |                                       |

- Alaska does not require content tests for initial licensure.
   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.
- 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.
- 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



### 1-F Analysis: Kansas



State Nearly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

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

Unfortunately, Kansas permits a significant loophole to this important policy by allowing a general social studies license, without requiring subject-matter testing for each subject area within the discipline.

The only certification available to secondary social studies teachers is History, Government and Social Studies. Candidates are required to pass the Praxis II Social Studies content test. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the topical areas.

Further, to add an additional field to a secondary license, teachers must also pass a Praxis II content test. However, as stated above, Kansas cannot guarantee content knowledge in each specific subject for secondary teachers who add general social studies endorsements.

#### **Supporting Research**

Praxis Testing Requirements www.ets.org

Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators, 91-1-202, -203, -209

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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—Kansas 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


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



#### \*\* 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
- 2. 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.)
- 3. 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

SINGLE SUBJECT

SOCIAL

STUDIES LICENSES<sup>1</sup>

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

**SOCIAL STUDIES** 

LICENSE WITH

ADEQUATE TESTING<sup>2</sup>

social studies license

without adequate

testing3

- 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.
- 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



# 1-G Analysis: Kansas



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Commendably, Kansas does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. Teachers must be certified in a specific discipline within the subject area of science.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 27                                | Ę  |   | f /                        |  |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| Do states ensure that                    | F-508)   | ENAGE :                                 | Jest Jest                  | 60   |
| econdary general science                 | S S N  | 5 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | Ele-si<br>With             | Scien<br>enses                               |
| eachers have adequate                    | JAN STEEL  |   |                            | neral<br>Solic                               |
| rubject-matter knowledge?                | OFFRS ONLY SWALES BIRCY  ADECNATE ITEMS WITH BIRCY | OFFER GENERAL SCIENCE CO                | Offers only single subject | Offers 8etheral science or without adequires |
| Alabama                                  |  |   |                            |  |
| Alaska                                   |  |   |                            |  |
| Arizona                                  |  | <b>1</b>                                |                            |  |
| Arkansas                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| California                               |  |   |                            |  |
| Colorado                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Connecticut                              |  |   |                            |  |
| Delaware                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| District of Columbia                     |  |   |                            |  |
| Florida                                  |  |   |                            |  |
| Georgia                                  |  |   |                            | 2  |
| Hawaii                                   |  |   |                            |  |
| Idaho                                    |  |   |                            |  |
| Illinois                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Indiana                                  |  |   |                            |  |
| lowa                                     |  |   |                            |  |
| KANSAS                                   |  |   |                            |  |
| Kentucky                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Louisiana                                |  |   |                            |  |
| Maine                                    |  |   |                            |  |
| Maryland                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Massachusetts                            |  |   |                            |  |
| Michigan                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Minnesota                                |  |   |                            |  |
| Mississippi                              |  |   |                            |  |
| Missouri<br>Montana                      |  |   |                            |  |
| Montana<br>Nebraska                      |  |   |                            |  |
| Nevada                                   |  |   |                            |  |
| New Hampshire                            |  |   |                            |  |
| New Jersey                               |  |   |                            |  |
| New Mexico                               |  |   |                            |  |
| New York                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| North Carolina                           |  |   |                            |  |
| North Dakota                             |  |   |                            |  |
| Ohio                                     |  |   |                            |  |
| Oklahoma                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Oregon                                   |  |   |                            |  |
| Pennsylvania                             |  |   |                            |  |
| Rhode Island                             |  | 1                                       |                            |  |
| South Carolina                           |  |   |                            |  |
| South Dakota                             |  |   |                            |  |
| Tennessee                                |  |   |                            |  |
| Texas                                    |  |   |                            |  |
| Utah                                     |  |   |                            |  |
| Vermont                                  |  |   |                            |  |
| Virginia                                 |  |   |                            |  |
| Washington                               |  |   |                            |  |
| West Virginia                            |  | 1                                       |                            |  |
| ) \ (' \ ' \ ' \ ' \ ' \ ' \ ' \ ' \ ' \ |  |   |                            |  |
| Wisconsin                                |  |   |                            |  |
| Wyoming                                  |  |   |                            |  |



#### **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 science that requires candidates to pass individual subtests in biology, chemistry, earth science and physics. These certifications are offered in addition to single-subject licenses.

<sup>1.</sup> Teachers with the general science license may only teach general science courses.

<sup>2.</sup> 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.)

- 1. 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



## 1-H Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas offers a K-12 special education certification, in addition to grade-specific options: K-6, 5-8 and 6-12.

Not only does the state no longer ensure that elementary special education teacher candidates must pass the same subject-matter test as general education candidates, but it also doesn't require adequate content testing for any of its special education teacher candidates.

#### **Supporting Research**

Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=123

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

End licensure practices that fail to distinguish between the skills and knowledge needed to teach elementary grades and secondary grades.

It is virtually impossible and certainly impractical for Kansas to ensure that a K-12 special education teacher knows all the subject matter he or she is expected to be able to teach, especially considering state and federal expectations that special education students should meet the same high standards as other students. While the broad K-12 umbrella may be appropriate for teachers of low-incidence special education students, such as those with severe cognitive disabilities, it is deeply problematic for the overwhelming majority of high-incidence special education students, who are expected to learn grade-level content.

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, Kansas should require a rigorous content test that reports separate passing scores for each content area. Kansas 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.

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, Kansas's current policy of requiring no subject-matter testing is problematic and will not help special education students to meet rigorous learning standards. To provide a middle ground, Kansas 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas asserted that all teachers endorsed in special education will have completed a teacher preparation program to teach general education (elementary or a secondary content area) because special education is an "add-on" endorsement to the general education license.

#### **LAST WORD**

Even though special education teachers must also earn a general education license, there is no guarantee that the content test required for the general education license will appropriately pertain to the grade levels and content areas taught in the special education classroom for teachers on the K-12 license.

| Figure 29                   |              | Offes K-72 and | )<br>/            |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Do states distinguish       | 8            | <i>§</i> / . : | tificat,          |
| between elementary          | 5 5          |                | 2 / 2 / 2         |
| and secondary special       | SNO.         | 5 K- 1         | Sonl              |
| education teachers?         | 15 POE       | 0/kg<br>873de. | Certifi,          |
| Alabama                     | POESWOTOFFRA | , ~ ,<br>      | Offes only a K-72 |
| Alaska                      |              |                |                   |
| Arizona                     |              |                |                   |
| Arkansas                    |              |                |                   |
| California                  |              |                |                   |
| Colorado                    |              |                |                   |
| Connecticut                 |              |                |                   |
| Delaware                    |              |                |                   |
| District of Columbia        |              |                |                   |
| Florida                     |              |                |                   |
| Georgia                     |              |                |                   |
| Hawaii                      |              |                |                   |
| Idaho                       |              |                |                   |
| Illinois                    |              |                |                   |
| Indiana                     |              |                |                   |
| lowa                        |              |                |                   |
| KANSAS                      |              |                |                   |
| Kentucky                    |              |                |                   |
| Louisiana                   |              |                |                   |
| Maine                       |              |                |                   |
| Maryland                    |              |                |                   |
| Massachusetts               |              |                |                   |
| Michigan                    |              |                |                   |
| Minnesota                   |              |                |                   |
| Mississippi                 |              |                |                   |
| Missouri                    |              |                |                   |
| Montana                     |              |                |                   |
| Nebraska<br>Nevada          |              |                |                   |
|                             |              |                |                   |
| New Hampshire               | 1            |                |                   |
| New Jersey<br>New Mexico    |              |                |                   |
| New York                    |              |                |                   |
| North Carolina              |              | _              |                   |
| North Carolina North Dakota |              |                |                   |
| Ohio                        |              |                |                   |
| Oklahoma                    |              |                |                   |
| Oregon                      |              |                |                   |
| Pennsylvania                |              |                |                   |
| Rhode Island                |              |                |                   |
| South Carolina              |              |                |                   |
| South Dakota                |              |                |                   |
| Tennessee                   |              |                |                   |
| Texas                       |              |                |                   |
| Utah                        |              |                |                   |
| Vermont                     |              |                |                   |
| Virginia                    |              |                |                   |
| Washington                  |              |                |                   |
| West Virginia               |              |                |                   |
| Wisconsin                   |              |                |                   |
| Wyoming                     |              |                |                   |
|                             | 16           | 7              | 20                |
|                             | 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?

| for special education teachers:   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| ry Subject-Matter Test  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana,<br>Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York,<br>Pennsylvania <sup>1</sup> , Rhode Island, Texas,<br>West Virginia <sup>2</sup> , Wisconsin |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado, Idaho, North Carolina   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary Subject-Matter Test(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New York <sup>3</sup>   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania <sup>1</sup> ,<br>Rhode Island, West Virginia <sup>2</sup>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |

- 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:

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.)

 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



## 1-I Analysis: Kansas





State Meets Goal Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

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

#### **Supporting Research**

http://www.ets.org/praxis/ks/requirements/

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

■ Verify that commercially available tests of pedagogy actually align with state standards. Kansas should ensure that its selected test of professional knowledge measures the knowledge and skills the state expects new teachers to have.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



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
- 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



## 1-J Analysis: Kansas



State Partly Meets Goal



( Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas commendably requires its candidates to complete at least 12 weeks of student teaching. The state also articulates that teacher preparation programs may only assign student teachers to "cooperating accredited or approved educational agencies." However, the state does not address the qualifications of cooperating teachers.

#### **Supporting Research**

Regulations and Standards for Kansas Educators www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Licensure%20Documents/CertHandbook8-2011%20FINAL.pdf Institutional Handbook for Program Approval www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Licensure%20Documents/progapprovalhdbk2012.pdf

#### **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 Kansas 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.
- Use evidence from the state's teacher evaluation system to select cooperating teachers. Kansas requires objective measures of student growth to be a significant criterion of its teacher evaluations. The state should therefore utilize its evaluation results, which provide evidence of effectiveness in the classroom, in the selection of effective cooperating teachers.
- 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 34                  | HER   | PLOENT EACHING<br>STS AT LEAST TO WEES |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Do states ensure a         | \$\display \text{2} \display \display \text{2} \display \display \text{2} \display \d | ACHIN<br>ST 70                         |
| high-quality student       | 84 77<br>1845<br>1855   |  |
| teaching experience?       | COOFE<br>SPIECTE  | STUDE!<br>LASTS A;                     |
| Alabama                    |   |  |
| Alaska                     |   |  |
| Arizona                    |   |  |
| Arkansas<br>California     |   |  |
| Colorado                   |   |  |
| Connecticut                |   |  |
| Delaware                   |   |  |
| District of Columbia       |   |  |
| Florida                    |   |  |
| Georgia                    | Ī   |  |
| Hawaii                     | П   |  |
| Idaho                      |   |  |
| Illinois                   |   |  |
| Indiana                    |   |  |
| lowa                       |   |  |
| KANSAS                     |   |  |
| Kentucky                   |   |  |
| Louisiana                  |   |  |
| Maine                      |   |  |
| Maryland                   |   |  |
| Massachusetts              |   |  |
| Michigan                   |   |  |
| Minnesota                  |   |  |
| Mississippi                |   |  |
| Missouri                   |   |  |
| Montana                    |   |  |
| Nebraska                   |   |  |
| Nevada                     |   |  |
| New Hampshire              |   |  |
| New Jersey<br>New Mexico   |   |  |
|                            |   |  |
| New York<br>North Carolina |   |  |
| North Dakota               |   |  |
| Ohio                       |   |  |
| Oklahoma                   |   |  |
| Oregon                     |   |  |
| Pennsylvania               |   |  |
| Rhode Island               |   |  |
| South Carolina             |   |  |
| South Dakota               |   |  |
| Tennessee                  |   |  |
| Texas                      | $\overline{\Box}$   |  |
| Utah                       |   |  |
| Vermont                    |   |  |
| Virginia                   |   |  |
| Washington                 |   |  |
| West Virginia              |   | 1                                      |
| WCSt VIIgilla              |   |  |
| Wisconsin                  | Ш   |  |
|                            |   |  |




#### **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.

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

Figure 35


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



- 1. Strong Practice: Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Tennessee
- 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
- 5. 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.)

- 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, subject-matter 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** State Meets Goal Louisiana 10 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Colorado, Delaware 1, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina 1, Ohio 1, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee, Texas States Partly Meet Goal Indiana 1, Kentucky, Massachusetts 1, Michigan, Nevada, South Carolina, Washington 1, Wisconsin 1 18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, California 1, Illinois, Iowa, KANSAS 1, 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 **1**:13

## 1-K Analysis: Kansas



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

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

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

The state does collect some objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs. Programs must submit evidence of candidates' effects on learning. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies and employer surveys. However, the state does not apply any transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval.

Further, in the past three years, no programs in the state have been identified as low performing—an additional indicator that programs lack accountability.

The state's website does not include a report card that allows the public to review and compare program performance; it merely provides a link to the information posted by Title II.

In Kansas, there is some overlap of accreditation and state approval. Members of NCATE/CAEP and the state make up the review team and decisions are made jointly; state members must complete NCATE/ CAEP training. Kansas conducts its own program reviews.

#### **Supporting Research**

91-1-70a

Institutional Handbook for Program Approval http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=295#ER 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, Kansas 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, such as:

- 1. Evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching;
- Satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison;
- Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including academic proficiency, subject matter and professional knowledge tests;
- 4. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests; and
- 5. 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.

Kansas 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.

Kansas 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| Figure 38                         | OBECTIVE PROGRAM.<br>SPECIFIC ON TO COLL F. |   |                                |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Do states hold tooshor            | \$ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\   |   | NAGY VAN                       |
| Do states hold teacher            | 7/E<br>2/4/2                                | 7.25 X                                      | VBL/                           |
| preparation programs accountable? | SPECIFIC<br>SPECIFIC                        | MINIMUM<br>STANDARDS FOR<br>PERFORMANCE COR | DATA PUBLICLY AVALUBLEON WEBS. |
| Alabama                           |   | <b>■</b> ¹                                  |                                |
| Alaska<br>Arizona                 |   |   |                                |
| Arkansas                          |   |   |                                |
| California                        |   |   |                                |
| Colorado                          |   |   |                                |
| Connecticut                       |   |   |                                |
| Delaware                          |   | П   |                                |
| District of Columbia              | $\overline{\Box}$                           | П   | $\overline{\Box}$              |
| Florida                           |   |   | 2                              |
| Georgia                           |   |   |                                |
| Hawaii                            |   |   |                                |
| Idaho                             |   |   |                                |
| Illinois                          |   |   |                                |
| Indiana                           |   |   |                                |
| Iowa                              |   |   |                                |
| KANSAS                            |   |   |                                |
| Kentucky                          |   |   | 2                              |
| Louisiana                         |   |   | 2                              |
| Maine                             | <b>1</b>                                    |   |                                |
| Maryland                          | 3   |   |                                |
| Massachusetts                     |   |   |                                |
| Michigan                          |   | 1   |                                |
| Minnesota                         |   |   |                                |
| Mississippi                       | 1<br>— 1                                    |   |                                |
| Missouri<br>Montana               | 1   |   |                                |
| Nebraska                          |   |   |                                |
| Nevada <sup>1</sup>               |   |   |                                |
| New Hampshire                     |   |   |                                |
| New Jersey                        | 1   |   |                                |
| New Mexico                        |   |   |                                |
| New York                          | - i   |   |                                |
| North Carolina                    |   |   | 2                              |
| North Dakota                      |   |   |                                |
| Ohio <sup>1</sup>                 |   |   |                                |
| Oklahoma                          |   |   |                                |
| Oregon                            |   |   |                                |
| Pennsylvania                      | 1   |   |                                |
| Rhode Island                      |   |   |                                |
| South Carolina <sup>1</sup>       |   |   |                                |
| South Dakota                      |   |   |                                |
| Tennessee                         |   |   |                                |
| Texas                             |   |   |                                |
| Utah                              |   |   |                                |
| Vermont                           |   |   |                                |
| Virginia                          | 1 1 m                                       |   |                                |
| Washington                        |   |   |                                |
| West Virginia                     | 1 1 m                                       |   |                                |
| Wisconsin                         |   |   |                                |
| Wyoming                           |   |   |                                |
|                                   | 36  | 4   | 19                             |



#### **\*\*** 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.

 $<sup>1. \</sup> For \ traditional \ preparation \ programs \ only.$ 

<sup>2.</sup> State does not distinguish between alternate route programs and traditional preparation programs in public reporting.

<sup>3.</sup> For alternate routes only.

Figure 40

#### 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

| 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   |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wisconsin Idaho Interval Columbia Interval In |    |    |
| 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   Coklahoma   Coregon   Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   Count of the count of t |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wissonin Wissonin Wisconsin  Indiana India |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wisconsin Idaho Interval Columbia Interval In |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wissonsin Wissonsin Wissonsin Wissonsin Wisconsin Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wissonsin Wisconsin Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming   |    |    |
| Ildaho 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming  |    |    |
| Illinois Indiana Iowa KANSAS Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wyoming   Myoming   Missouria   Myoming   Missouria   Myoming   Missouria   Massachuse   Massachu |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wyoming  |    |    |
| 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 Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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  Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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  Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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 Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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 Wyoming   |    |    |
| 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   Ohio   Oklahoma   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Oregon   Pennsylvania   Oregon   |    |    |
| New York  North Carolina  North Dakota  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wyoming  |    |    |
| North Carolina  North Dakota  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |    |    |
| North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |    |    |
| Ohio   |    |    |
| Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |    |    |
| Oregon   |    |    |
| Pennsylvania   |    |    |
| Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |    |    |
| South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |    |    |
| South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |    |    |
| Tennessee  |    |    |
| Texas  |    |    |
| Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   |    |    |
| Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  |    |    |
| Virginia   |    |    |
| Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming   |    |    |
| West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  |    |    |
| Wisconsin Wyoming  |    |    |
| Wisconsin Wyoming  |    |    |
| Wyoming  |    |    |
|  |    |    |
|  | 31 |    |
| ,  | 51 | 13 |

Figure 41

What is the relationship between state program

approval and national

<sup>1.</sup> National accreditation can be substituted for state approval.


<sup>2.</sup> For institutions with 2,000 or more full-time equivalent students

## **Area 2 Summary**



# How States are Faring in Expanding the Pool of Teachers

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

## 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.
- 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** 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 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

## 2-A Analysis: Kansas







#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas Restricted Teacher License Alternative Pathway requires either a minimum GPA of 2.5 or a 2.75 in the last 60 semester credit hours. Candidates are also required to have a degree or equivalent coursework in the content area they plan to teach.

Candidates must pass a subject-matter test for admission. However, the content exam cannot be used to test out of content coursework requirements.

#### **Supporting Research**

Kansas Education Regulations 91-1-203 Restricted Teacher License Alternative Pathway http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=320

#### **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 or 2.75 in the last 60 credit hours does not serve as a sufficient indicator of past academic performance. At a minimum, Kansas 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.

#### Offer flexibility in fulfilling coursework requirements.

Kansas is commended for passing regulations that require candidates to pass a subject-matter test. The state should also allow any candidate who already has the requisite knowledge and skills to demonstrate such by passing a rigorous test. Exacting coursework requirements could dissuade talented individuals who lack precisely the right courses from pursuing a career in teaching.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


|                           | ACADEMIC STANDARD FOR   | TER COR       | NO MAJOR REQUIRED IN LEEU OF MAIN BE USED |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| re states' alternate      | 7/C5/<br>V4.55          | MAT           | \$ 8 %<br>2 8 %                           |
| outes selective yet       | 45.5%<br>13.5%<br>10.0% | REQ.          | TEST A                                    |
| exible in admissions?     | 74 ADV 40.              | SUBECT-MATTER | 1 2 2 1                                   |
| Alabama                   |                         |               | *   |
| Alaska                    |                         |               |   |
| Arizona<br>Arkansas       |                         |               |   |
| California                |                         | $\overline{}$ |   |
| Colorado                  |                         |               | <b>-</b>                                  |
| Connecticut               | *                       |               |   |
| Delaware                  |                         |               |   |
| District of Columbia      | *                       | *             | *   |
| Florida                   |                         | *             | *   |
| Georgia                   |                         |               | *   |
| Hawaii                    |                         |               |   |
| Idaho                     |                         |               |   |
| Illinois<br>Indiana       |                         |               |   |
| lowa                      |                         |               | <u> </u>                                  |
| KANSAS                    |                         | <b>+</b>      | - Â                                       |
| Kentucky                  |                         |               |   |
| Louisiana                 |                         | *             | *   |
| Maine                     |                         | *             | *   |
| Maryland                  |                         |               |   |
| Massachusetts             |                         | *             | *   |
| Michigan                  | *                       |               | *   |
| Minnesota<br>Mississippi  |                         |               |   |
| Missouri                  |                         |               |   |
| Montana                   |                         |               |   |
| Nebraska                  |                         |               |   |
| Nevada                    |                         |               |   |
| New Hampshire             |                         |               |   |
| New Jersey                | *                       | *             |   |
| New Mexico<br>New York    |                         |               |   |
| North Carolina            |                         |               | <u> </u>                                  |
| North Dakota              |                         |               | $\widehat{}$                              |
| Ohio                      |                         | *             | *   |
| Oklahoma                  |                         | *             | *   |
| Oregon                    |                         |               |   |
| Pennsylvania              |                         | *             |   |
| Rhode Island              | *                       |               | *   |
| South Carolina            |                         |               |   |
| South Dakota<br>Tennessee |                         |               |   |
| Texas                     |                         |               | <b>*</b>                                  |
| Utah                      |                         |               |   |
| Vermont                   |                         |               |   |
| Virginia                  |                         | *             |   |
| Washington                |                         | *             | *   |
| West Virginia             |                         | *             |   |
| Wisconsin                 |                         |               |   |
| Wyoming                   |                         |               |   |



#### \*\* 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?



**EXCEEDS THAT** OF TRADITIONAL PROGRAMS FOR ALL ROUTES/ MAIN ROUTE1


of traditional programs for some routes<sup>2</sup>

for all routes<sup>3</sup> No academic standard for any route4

- 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.

Figure 45

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
- 4. 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.



#### Background

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

### 2-B Analysis: Kansas



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Bar Raised for this Goal



**Progress Since 2011** 

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas provides no specific guidelines about the nature or quantity of coursework for its alternate route. There is no limit on the amount of coursework that can be required overall, nor on the amount of coursework a candidate can be required to take while also teaching.

While the state does not require practice teaching, each district is required to provide mentoring support for teachers in the Restricted Teacher License Alternative Pathway.

Alternate route coursework must be completed in two years, at which time candidates are eligible for standard licensure.

#### **Supporting Research**

Restricted Teaching License Alternative Pathway http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=320

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Establish coursework guidelines for alternate route preparation programs.

The state should articulate guidelines regarding the nature and amount of coursework required of candidates. Requirements should be manageable 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. The state should also ensure that the program can be completed within two years.

Ensure that new teachers are supported in the first year of teaching.

Kansas should also provide induction guidelines to ensure that new teachers will receive the support they need to facilitate their success in the classroom. Effective 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

The state added that institutions of higher education (IHEs) collaborated on a set of courses addressing the professional education standards when the restricted license alternative pathway was initially implemented by regulation. Kansas does not dictate coursework for either traditional or alternative route programs. IHEs are given the flexibility to establish coursework that builds candidate competencies required by the professional education and program content standards. IHEs that continue to offer the alternative route utilize a program of online coursework of 18-21 credit hours that is completed over two years (spread over four regular semesters and one to two summer sessions). Candidates may contact more than one IHE to see which program best accommodates their needs.

|              |                                       | XORX                                   | / ပွ                                   | . / 5                |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
|              | / %                                   | 5 /                                    | £ / £.                                 | 04/                  |
| ~ Š          | · / ¿ð                                | 4B/E                                   |  | £56                  |
| CIEN<br>PSEW | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | \ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ |  | / I/S <sub>N</sub> : |
| COUL         | $R_{\ell,\ell_1}$                     |  | \ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ | MIENSIVESUPPORT      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              | *                                     | *                                      | *                                      |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      | *                                      |                      |
| *            | *                                     | *                                      |  | *                    |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
| *            |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
| *            | *                                     | *                                      | *                                      |                      |
| *            | *                                     | *                                      | *                                      | *                    |
|              |                                       |  | *                                      |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  | *                    |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  | <u> </u>             |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  | _                    |
|              | *                                     | *                                      | *                                      | *                    |
|              | *                                     | n                                      | *                                      | ĥ                    |
|              |                                       |  | *                                      |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
| *            | *                                     | *                                      |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  | *                    |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
| *            |                                       |  | *                                      |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
| *            | <u>*</u>                              | <u>*</u>                               | *                                      | <u>*</u>             |
|              |                                       |  | *                                      |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  | <b>*</b>             |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  | <u></u>                                |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
| *            | <b>+</b>                              |  | *                                      |                      |
| *            | *                                     |  | $\Box$                                 | *                    |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  | *                                      |                      |
| *            |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  | *                    |
|              | *                                     | *                                      |  | *                    |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |
|              |                                       | *                                      |  |                      |
|              |                                       |  |  |                      |



### **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.

## 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.)

- 1. 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.
- 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



### 2-C Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas limits the usage and providers of its alternate route.

Alternative licensure in Kansas is available for secondary content teachers and for a limited number of K-12 subject-area teachers.

Kansas universities are the only institutions authorized to provide alternate route programs.

#### **Supporting Research**

K.A.R 91-1-203

http://www.ksde.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=udIX44w5XnA%3d&tabid=320

Restricted Teaching License Alternative Pathway

http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=320

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

#### Broaden usage for all alternate routes.

Kansas 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.

#### Encourage diversity of alternate route providers.

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

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

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


| Figure 49                             | Ross                                  | S / SERC   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Are states' alternate                 | 4 GE AC                               | PROV.  |
| routes free from                      | 75,5                                  | \ \rangle \ran |
| limitations?                          | BROAD USAGE ACROSS CEOGRAPH CARES AND | DIVERSITY OF PROVIDER  |
| Alabama                               |                                       |  |
| Alaska                                |                                       |  |
| Arizona                               | *                                     | *  |
| Arkansas                              |                                       | *  |
| California                            | *                                     | *  |
| Colorado                              | *                                     | *  |
| Connecticut                           |                                       |  |
| Delaware                              |                                       | *  |
| District of Columbia                  |                                       |  |
| Florida                               | *                                     | <b>*</b>   |
| Georgia                               | *                                     | *  |
| Hawaii<br>Idaho                       |                                       |  |
| Illinois                              |                                       |  |
| Indiana                               |                                       |  |
| lowa                                  | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * |  |
| KANSAS                                |                                       |  |
| Kentucky                              | <u> </u>                              |  |
| Louisiana                             |                                       |  |
| Maine                                 |                                       |  |
| Maryland                              | <u> </u>                              | •  |
| Massachusetts                         | <u> </u>                              | - <del>-</del>   |
| Michigan                              | <u> </u>                              | · ·  |
| Minnesota                             | *                                     |  |
| Mississippi                           |                                       |  |
| Missouri                              |                                       |  |
| Montana                               | *                                     |  |
| Nebraska                              |                                       |  |
| Nevada                                |                                       | *  |
| New Hampshire                         | *                                     | <u> </u>   |
| New Jersey                            | *                                     |  |
| New Mexico                            | *                                     |  |
| New York<br>North Carolina            |                                       | *  |
| North Dakota                          |                                       |  |
| Ohio                                  |                                       | *  |
| Oklahoma                              |                                       |  |
| Oregon                                |                                       | <b>★</b>   |
| Pennsylvania                          | * * *                                 | <u> </u>   |
| Rhode Island                          | *                                     | <b>*</b>   |
| South Carolina                        | Î                                     | *  |
| South Dakota                          |                                       |  |
| Tennessee                             | *                                     | *  |
| Texas                                 | *                                     | *  |
| Utah                                  | *                                     |  |
| Vermont                               | *<br>*<br>*<br>*                      |  |
| Virginia                              | *                                     | *  |
| Washington                            | *                                     | *  |
| West Virginia                         |                                       | *  |
| Wisconsin                             |                                       | *  |
| Wyoming                               |                                       |  |
| For some alternate routes For most of | or most widely 🌟 F                    | !! .!*   |



#### **TEXAMPLES 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

| igure 51                                   | ST ONC                 | SUBJECT.               | 5 / 53                                  |                    |                   | ORK<br>VORK                | /              |                 | HING.       | IDERS                  |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|
| What are the<br>characteristics of states' | PREREQUISITE OF STRONG | VERIECATION OF SUBJECT | AVAUABUITY OF TEST                      | EFECENT COURSENACE | RELEVANT COURSEUL | REASONABLE<br>PROCRAM LENG | PRACTICE TEACH | INTENSIVE MENTS | BROAD USAGE | DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS |
| alternate routes?                          | PREREC<br>ACADEN       | VERIFIE<br>MATTER      | 1 4 4 V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V | EFFICIEN           | RELEVA,           | REASO<br>PROGR             | PRACT          | INTEN           | BRO4D,      | DIVERSI                |
| Alabama                                    |                        |                        | *                                       |                    |                   |                            |                |                 |             |                        |
| Alaska                                     |                        |                        |   |                    | *                 | *                          | *              |                 |             |                        |
| Arizona                                    |                        | *                      | *                                       |                    |                   | *                          | *              |                 | *           | *                      |
| Arkansas                                   |                        | *                      | *                                       | *                  | *                 | *                          |                | *               |             | *                      |
| California                                 |                        |                        |   |                    |                   | *                          |                |                 | *           | *                      |
| Colorado                                   |                        |                        | *                                       | *                  |                   | *                          |                |                 | *           | *                      |
| Connecticut                                | *                      |                        |   | *                  | *                 | *                          | *              |                 | *           | *                      |
| Delaware                                   |                        |                        |   | *                  | *                 | *                          | *              | *               |             | *                      |
| District of Columbia Florida               | *                      | *                      | *                                       |                    |                   |                            | *              |                 | *           | *                      |
|  |                        | *                      | *                                       |                    |                   | *                          |                |                 | *           | *                      |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii                          |                        |                        | _                                       | *                  | *                 | *                          |                | *               | *           | *                      |
| Idaho                                      |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            |                |                 |             |                        |
| Illinois                                   |                        |                        | *                                       |                    |                   |                            |                |                 | *           | *                      |
| Indiana                                    |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            | *              |                 | *           | *                      |
| lowa                                       |                        |                        | *                                       |                    |                   | *                          | *              |                 |             |                        |
| KANSAS                                     |                        | *                      |   |                    |                   | *                          |                |                 |             |                        |
| Kentucky                                   |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            |                | *               | *           | *                      |
| Louisiana                                  |                        | *                      | *                                       |                    |                   |                            |                |                 | *           | *                      |
| Maine                                      |                        | A                      | *                                       |                    |                   |                            |                |                 |             |                        |
| Maryland                                   |                        | <b>*</b>               |   |                    | *                 | *                          | *              | <u></u> ★       | *           | *                      |
| Massachusetts                              |                        | *                      | *                                       |                    | *                 |                            | <del>^</del>   |                 | <u></u>     | <b>*</b>               |
| Michigan                                   | *                      | *                      | *                                       |                    |                   |                            | *              |                 | *           | *                      |
| Minnesota                                  | *                      | <del></del>            | <b>→</b>                                |                    |                   | *                          | $\Box$         |                 | *           |                        |
| Mississippi                                |                        | *                      | *                                       | *                  | *                 | *                          |                |                 |             |                        |
| Missouri                                   |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            |                | *               |             |                        |
| Montana                                    |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            |                | ô               | *           |                        |
| Nebraska                                   |                        |                        |   | *                  |                   |                            | *              |                 | n           |                        |
| Nevada                                     |                        |                        |   | ĥ                  |                   | *                          | ô              |                 |             | *                      |
| New Hampshire                              |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            |                |                 | *           | *                      |
| New Jersey                                 | *                      | *                      |   | *                  | *                 | *                          | *              | *               | *           | Ô                      |
| 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                              |                        | *                      | *                                       |                    |                   | *                          |                | *               | *           | *                      |
| vvest viigiilia                            |                        | <b>*</b>               |   |                    | <b>*</b>          | <b>*</b>                   |                | *               |             | <b>★</b>               |
| Wisconsin                                  |                        |                        |   |                    |                   |                            |                |                 |             |                        |
| Wisconsin<br>Wyoming                       |                        |                        |   |                    |                   | *                          |                |                 |             | Ô                      |

## 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.
- 3. 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



## 2-D Analysis: Kansas



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas offers a Visiting Scholar teaching license to individuals who demonstrate "exceptional talent or outstanding distinction in one or more subjects or fields." The state does not provide additional guidelines for obtaining a Visiting Scholar license or about the intent of the certificate.

Applicants must have written verification of employment upon licensure from a school district administrator. The state board of education reviews documentation and approves applicants on a case-by-case basis.

#### **Supporting Research**

KSBE Regulations Chapter 91-1-201; 203 Kansas Visiting Scholar Application

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

It is unclear whether the Visiting Scholar license serves as a vehicle for individuals with deep subject-area knowledge to teach a limited number of courses without fulfilling a complete set of certification requirements. It appears that may be the intent of the license; however, state policy does not describe the conditions of employment, whether it is for part-time or full-time teaching or requirements that candidates must fulfill.

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

Although this license is designed to enable distinguished individuals to teach, Kansas should still require a subject-matter test. While documentation provided by the applicant may show evidence of expertise in a particular field, only a subject-matter test ensures that Visiting Scholar teachers know the specific content they will need to teach.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

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

Figure 53 Do states offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part-time? YES Š Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho П Illinois Indiana Iowa **KANSAS** Kentucky Louisiana Maine П П Maryland Massachusetts П Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey П П New Mexico **New York** North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon П П Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah П П Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 10 12 29



#### **TEXAMPLE 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.)

- 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.
- 2. The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet its own testing requirements.
- 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



### 2-E Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Regrettably, Kansas grants a waiver for its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher with three years of experience and a professional license.

Teachers with valid out-of-state certificates may be eligible for Kansas's professional certificate. Applicants must meet the state's requirement of one year of accredited experience or eight semester hours of credit. Transcripts are also required for all applicants. Because Kansas requires completion of an approved teacher preparation program, it appears to analyze transcripts to determine whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route and whether additional coursework will be required. 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.

In addition, Kansas requires out-of-state teachers who completed an alternate route to submit their case to the state's Licensure Review Committee, reinforcing an outdated view that the alternate route to licensure is substandard.

Kansas 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.

Kansas requires all online teachers to be licensed or certified by the state in their content areas.

#### **Supporting Research**

Regulation and Standards for Kansas Educators, Rules 91-1-204(c)(3), -211 http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Licensure%20Documents/CertHandbook8-2011%20FINAL.pdf Virtual Education Requirements http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=455

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

To uphold standards, require that teachers coming from other states meet testing requirements.

Kansas takes considerable risk by granting a waiver for its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher who has three years of teaching experience. The state should not provide any waivers of its teacher tests unless an applicant can provide evidence of a passing score under its own standards. The negative impact on student learning stemming from a teacher's inadequate subject-matter knowledge is not mitigated by the teacher's having experience.

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

Kansas should reconsider its requirement regarding coursework and experience, as it may deter talented teachers from applying for certification. In addition, 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 Kansas.

- Require evidence of effective teaching when determining eligibility for full certification.
  - Rather than rely on transcripts to assess credentials, Kansas 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).
- Accord the same license to out-of-state alternate route teachers as would be accorded to traditionally prepared teachers.


Regardless of whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route, all certified out-of-state teachers should receive equal treatment. State policies that discriminate against teachers who were prepared in an alternate route are not supported by evidence. In fact, a substantial body of research has failed to discern differences in effectiveness between alternate and traditional route teachers.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis. The state added that verification of completion of an approved teacher preparation programs is provided on a form by the program provider, and that a transcript analysis process is not conducted. The provider indicates whether the program was traditional or alternative. Regulations define approved programs and alternative programs, and this determines which licensure applications must be referred to the Licensure Review Committee. In the 2012 school year (cases are still pending for 2013), the number of cases was 70, or .35 of 1 percent of the total number of licenses issued in Kansas. Of these, 64 were alternate route applications.

Figure 55

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
- Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana', 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.
- 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.

What do states require of teachers transferring from other states? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia П Hawaii Idaho П Illinois Indiana Iowa **KANSAS** Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Г Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota П Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island П South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas П П Utah П Vermont П Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 6 44 11

Figure 56

4. Teachers with less than 3 years' experience are subject to transcript review.

<sup>1.</sup> State conducts transcript reviews.

 $<sup>{\</sup>it 2. Recency requirement is for alternate route.}\\$ 

<sup>3.</sup> For traditionally prepared teachers only.

| Figure 57                              | 5                    | State specifies of the route to | ate / sate   |
|--|----------------------|--|--|
| Do states treat out-of-state           | STATE TREATS TEACHES | LESS LESS  | altern<br>S with   |
| teachers the same whether              | 5.4                  |  |  |
| they were prepared in a                | E E                  |  | hers<br>satisfied  |
| traditional or an alternate            | # Z Z Z              | te so  | Pot<br>Pot<br>teal   |
| route program?                         | 2 3 4                | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \  | \ \frac{1}{25} \fr |
| Alabama                                | _                    |  |  |
| Alaska                                 |                      |  |  |
| Arizona                                |                      |  | _  |
| Arkansas                               |                      |  |  |
| California                             |                      |  |  |
| Colorado                               |                      |  |  |
| Connecticut                            |                      |  |  |
| Delaware                               |                      |  |  |
| District of Columbia                   |                      |  | -  |
| Florida                                |                      |  |  |
| Georgia                                |                      |  |  |
| Hawaii                                 |                      |  |  |
| Idaho                                  |                      |  |  |
| Illinois                               |                      |  |  |
| Indiana                                |                      |  |  |
| Iowa                                   |                      |  |  |
| KANSAS                                 |                      |  |  |
| Kentucky                               | П                    |  |  |
| Louisiana                              | - i                  |  |  |
| Maine                                  |                      |  |  |
| Maryland                               |                      |  |  |
| Massachusetts                          | П                    |  | _  |
| 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                           |                      |  |  |
| Tennessee                              |                      |  |  |
| Texas                                  |                      |  |  |
| Utah                                   |                      |  |  |
| Vermont                                |                      |  |  |
| Virginia                               |                      |  |  |
| Washington                             |                      |  |  |
| West Virginia                          |                      |  |  |
| Wisconsin                              |                      |  |  |
| \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ |                      |  |  |
| Wyoming                                | 4                    |  | 41   |



#### **TEXAMPLES 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

State Area Grades



### Topics Included In This Area

- 3-A: State Data Systems 3-D: Tenure
- 3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness 3-E: Licensure Advancement
- 3-C: Frequency of Evaluations 3-F: Equitable Distribution

### 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.)

- 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.
- 2. 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.
- 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



### 3-A Analysis: Kansas



State Nearly Meets Goal 🏻 🥋 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛮 (📛) Progress Since 2011





#### **ANALYSIS**

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

Kansas 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.

Commendably, Kansas defines teacher of record as a licensed educator who is responsible for students' academic goals within a course. The state's teacher-student data link can connect more than one educator to a particular student in a given course, but it does not have in place a process for teacher roster verification.

Kansas does not publish data on teacher production that connects program completion, certification and hiring statistics.

### **Supporting Research**

Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Strengthen data link between teachers and students.

Kansas should put in place a process for teacher roster verification. This is of particular importance for using the data system to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

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. Kansas 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, Kansas will form a rich set of data that can inform policy decisions.


#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 59

Do states' data systems have the basic elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness: unique

needed to assess teacher effectiveness: unique teacher and student identifiers that can be matched to test records over time?



<sup>1.</sup> 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                     |                 | /                | TON TON                     |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Do states' data systems       |                 | o / j            |                             |
| include more advanced         | į               |                  |                             |
| elements needed to assess     | Z.              |                  | 3 / 15                      |
|                               | 0.47.F          | F / 83           | S / S                       |
| teacher effectiveness?        | ADEQUATE TEACHE | CAN CONNECT MODE | TEACHER ROSTER VERIFICATION |
| Alabama                       |                 |                  |                             |
| Alaska                        |                 |                  |                             |
| Arizona                       |                 |                  |                             |
| Arkansas                      |                 |                  |                             |
| California                    | Щ               |                  |                             |
| Colorado                      |                 |                  |                             |
| Connecticut                   |                 |                  |                             |
| Delaware District of Columbia |                 |                  |                             |
| Florida                       |                 |                  |                             |
| Georgia                       |                 |                  |                             |
| Hawaii                        |                 |                  |                             |
| Idaho                         |                 |                  |                             |
| Illinois                      |                 |                  |                             |
| Indiana                       |                 |                  |                             |
| lowa                          |                 |                  |                             |
| KANSAS                        |                 |                  |                             |
| Kentucky                      |                 |                  |                             |
| Louisiana                     |                 |                  |                             |
| Maine                         |                 |                  |                             |
| Maryland                      |                 |                  |                             |
| Massachusetts                 |                 |                  |                             |
| Michigan                      |                 |                  |                             |
| Minnesota                     |                 |                  |                             |
| 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                  |                 |                  |                             |
| Tennessee                     |                 |                  |                             |
| Texas                         |                 |                  |                             |
| Utah                          |                 |                  |                             |
| Vermont                       |                 |                  |                             |
| Virginia                      |                 |                  |                             |
| Washington                    |                 |                  |                             |
| West Virginia                 |                 |                  |                             |
| Wisconsin<br>Wyoming          |                 |                  |                             |
| vvyorning                     |                 |                  |                             |
|                               | 19              | 32               | 24                          |

| Figure 61  Do states track teacher production?  Alabama   | Figure 61            |   | <i>NO</i> <sub>2</sub> / | , Jog         |
|---|----------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|
| Alaska  |                      | 4   | $\frac{5}{3}$ / .        | omt in series |
| Alaska  |                      | 8   |                          | irict f       |
| Alaska  | teacher production?  | E.  | Jep / 197                |               |
| Alaska  |                      | 7. J. | data data                | , b           |
| Alaska  |                      | 7ME<br>74 PL                              | ome<br>ome               | lelati        |
| Alaska  |                      | 24  | / 58                     | / %           |
| Arizona   | Alabama              |   |                          |               |
| Arkansas  | Alaska               |   |                          |               |
| California  | Arizona              |   |                          |               |
| Colorado  | Arkansas             |   |                          |               |
| Connecticut  Delaware  District of Columbia Florida  Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa KANSAS Kentucky Louisiana Maire Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska 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 Wassington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  Wisconsin Wyoming   | California           |   |                          |               |
| Delaware  | Colorado             |   |                          |               |
| District of Columbia  | Connecticut          |   |                          |               |
| Florida   | Delaware             |   |                          |               |
| Georgia   | District of Columbia |   |                          |               |
| Hawaii  | Florida              |   |                          |               |
| Idaho   | Georgia              |   |                          |               |
| Illinois  | Hawaii               |   |                          |               |
| Indiana   | Idaho                |   |                          |               |
| Iowa  | Illinois             |   |                          |               |
| 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 Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  | Indiana              |   |                          |               |
| Kentucky  <   | Iowa                 |   |                          |               |
| Louisiana   | KANSAS               |   |                          |               |
| Maine                                   Maryland                               Massachusetts                               Michigan                               Minnesota                             Mississippi                               Missouri                               Montana                               Nebraska                               Nevada                               New Hampshire                               New Jersey                               New Hexico                               New York                               North Carolina                               North Carolina                               Ohio                                 Oklahoma                                 Oregon                               Pennsylvania                               Rhode Island                               South Carolina                               South Dakota                                 Tennessee                                 Texas                                 Utah                                   Vermont   | Kentucky             |   |                          |               |
| Maryland  | Louisiana            |   |                          |               |
| Massachusetts   <   | Maine                |   |                          |               |
| Michigan  | Maryland             |   |                          |               |
| Minnesota   | Massachusetts        |   |                          |               |
| Mississippi   | Michigan             |   |                          |               |
| Missouri  | Minnesota            |   |                          |               |
| 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                               Wisconsin                               Wyoming  | Mississippi          |   |                          |               |
| 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                               Wisconsin                               Wyoming  | Missouri             |   |                          |               |
| Nevada   <td>Montana</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | Montana              |   |                          |               |
| New Hampshire   <   | Nebraska             |   |                          |               |
| New Jersey  | Nevada               |   |                          |               |
| 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   | New Hampshire        |   |                          |               |
| New York  | New Jersey           |   |                          |               |
| North Carolina  North Dakota  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                           Oklahoma                         Oregon                         Pennsylvania                         Rhode Island                         South Carolina                         South Dakota                         Tennessee                           Texas                           Utah                         Vermont                         Virginia                         Washington                         West Virginia                         Wisconsin                         Wyoming  | New York             |   |                          |               |
| Ohio  | North Carolina       |   |                          |               |
| Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  | North Dakota         |   |                          |               |
| Oregon  | Ohio                 |   |                          |               |
| Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming  | Oklahoma             |   |                          |               |
| Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  | Oregon               |   |                          |               |
| South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  |                      |   |                          |               |
| South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  | Rhode Island         |   |                          |               |
| Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  | South Carolina       |   |                          |               |
| Texas                             Utah                           Vermont                         Virginia                         Washington                         West Virginia                         Wisconsin                         Wyoming  | South Dakota         |   |                          |               |
| Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  | Tennessee            |   |                          |               |
| Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming  | Texas                |   |                          |               |
| Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming   | Utah                 |   |                          |               |
| Washington  | Vermont              |   |                          |               |
| Washington  | Virginia             |   |                          |               |
| West Virginia   |                      |   |                          |               |
| Wisconsin   | _                    |   |                          |               |
|   |                      |   |                          |               |
|   | Wyoming              |   |                          |               |
| 0 8 5/  |                      | c   | 0                        | 27            |
|   |                      | Ö   | 8                        | 5/            |



### **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.

### 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.
- 3. 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



### 3-B Analysis: Kansas



State Partly Meets Goal (1) Progress Since 2011



#### **ANALYSIS**

Although the state requires student performance data to be a factor, Kansas does not require that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.

By 2014-2015, systems must meet the Kansas Educator Evaluation Guidelines established as a condition of the state's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver. Districts are encouraged to use the state's model, Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP) but may submit their own evaluation systems for state approval.

According to these guidelines, evaluation systems must require student growth to be a significant factor. Further, multiple measures must include state assessment results for grades and subjects in which such assessments are administered.

Locally developed evaluation instruments must have at least three performance levels.

Classroom observations are required.

#### Supporting Research

Kansas Statutes 72-9004

http://www.ksde.org/Portals/44/Documents/KEEP%20Handbook%208%20May%2030%20-%202013.pdf

Kansas Educator Evaluation Guidelines

http://www.ksde.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=aKEA1ZNd1KM%3D

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

Kansas's requirement falls short by failing to require that evidence of student learning be the most significant criterion, and the state's vague language leaves room for interpretation as to the actual measure of "significant" in the overall evaluation score. Kansas 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. This can be accomplished by requiring objective evidence to count for at least half of the evaluation score or through other scoring mechanisms, such as a matrix, that ensure that nothing affects the overall score more. Whether state or locally developed, a teacher should not be able to receive a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.

■ Ensure that evaluations also include classroom observations that specifically focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.

Although Kansas 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.

Codify evaluation requirements.

To ensure that teachers are evaluated based on the requirements articulated in the guidelines, Kansas should codify pertinent criteria. This will ensure that student growth data continue to be a part of teacher evaluations even after the expiration of the ESEA waiver.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Figure 63               | REQUIRESTHAT STUDENT<br>PREPONDERMY GROUENT   | A CATERON The contract of the | Goules that student significant significant control of the control | Requires some object. | iden <sub>Ge</sub>       |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| D                       | JAPA<br>JAPA<br>JAPA  | TERIO ST.   | Requires that student<br>schievement student<br>Without critics of the   | ines /                | t detta                  |
| Do states consider      | 4 × 5 × 5 × 5 × 5 × 5 × 5 × 5 × 5 × 5 ×   |   |  | suide<br>Obje,        | iner                     |
| classroom effectiveness | S T T   | that plicit   | s tha  | licit.                | chiev diev               |
| as part of teacher      | Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z<br>Z | wijes<br>Ven<br>2) (e)  | duire in   | iies s                | ent a                    |
| evaluations?            | REQUIRES THAT STUDENT<br>PREPONDERANT CRODENT   | Requires that student cites on lesson lesson lesson lesson lesson les sudent les sudent les son les polities.   | A de significação de se  | Requires some objects | Student achievenent data |
| Alabama                 |   |   |  |                       | 1                        |
| Alaska                  |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Arizona                 |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Arkansas                |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| California              |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Colorado                |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Connecticut             |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Delaware                |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| District of Columbia    |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Florida                 |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Georgia                 |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Hawaii                  |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Idaho                   |   |   |  |                       | 1                        |
| Illinois                |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Indiana                 |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| lowa                    |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| 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                   |   |   |  |                       | '                        |
| Utah                    |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Vermont                 |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Virginia                |   | 2   |  |                       |                          |
| Washington              |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| West Virginia           |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Wisconsin               |   |   |  |                       |                          |
| Wyoming                 |   |   |  |                       |                          |
|                         | 19  | 7   | 9  | 6                     | 10                       |


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.

<sup>2.</sup> Explicitly defined for the 2013-2014 school year.

Figure 64 Type of suriey not specified Is survey data used as part of teacher evaluations? Alabama Alaska<sup>1</sup> Arizona П П П Arkansas California Colorado 2 Connecticut<sup>3</sup> П П Delaware П П District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii П Idaho Illinois  $\Box$ П П Indiana Iowa1 **KANSAS** Kentucky П Louisiana Maine 2 Maryland П П П П Massachusetts Michigan П Minnesota Mississippi П П П Missouri 2 Montana П Nebraska Nevada П П New Hampshire П П П New Jersey П New Mexico П П П New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio П П П П Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina П South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah П Vermont Virginia П Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming П 2 14 11 6 33

Figure 65

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



- 1. 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, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Alabama, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

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

<sup>2.</sup> Explicitly allowed but not required.

<sup>3.</sup> Requires parent or peer surveys; whole-school student learning or student surveys.



### **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 Do states direct how teachers should be evaluated? Alabama Alaska Arizona П Arkansas California П П Colorado Connecticut П Delaware П District of Columbia П П Florida Georgia П Hawaii П П Idaho П П Illinois Indiana Iowa **KANSAS** Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland П П Massachusetts Michigan П П Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana П Nebraska Nevada П П New Hampshire П New Jersey П New Mexico П П New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio П П Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah П П Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming П П 9 12 30

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

| igure 67               |                  | _ /             | EVALUATORS MUST BE .                   | CHERS                |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| What requirements have | MUTPLE EVALUATOR | EVALUATOR TRAIN | Q / H                                  | EVALUATOR CRITICATON |
| states established for | 78               | / *             | 152                                    |                      |
| evaluators?            | 5 FZ4            | / %             | 88.                                    |                      |
|                        | PERS             | / A70           | VA7C                                   | / 0/4                |
|                        | MUL!             | / ×             | ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZ | / N/V                |
| Alabama                |                  | / * ·           |  | <i>7</i> 4/          |
| Alaska                 |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Arizona                | - i              |                 | $\bar{\Pi}$                            | Ē                    |
| Arkansas               | П                |                 | П                                      |                      |
| California             |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Colorado               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Connecticut            |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Delaware               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| District of Columbia   |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Florida                |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Georgia                |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Hawaii                 |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Idaho                  |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Illinois               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Indiana                |                  |                 |  |                      |
| lowa                   |                  |                 |  |                      |
| KANSAS                 |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Kentucky               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Louisiana              |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Maine                  |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Maryland               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Massachusetts          |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota  |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Mississippi            | <u>□</u>         |                 |  |                      |
| Missouri               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Montana                |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Nebraska               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Nevada                 |                  |                 |  |                      |
| New Hampshire          |                  |                 |  |                      |
| New Jersey             |                  |                 | $\Box$                                 |                      |
| New Mexico             | 2                |                 |  |                      |
| New York               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| North Carolina         |                  |                 |  |                      |
| North Dakota           |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Ohio                   | 2                |                 |  |                      |
| Oklahoma               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Oregon                 |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Pennsylvania           |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Rhode Island           |                  |                 |  |                      |
| South Carolina         |                  |                 |  |                      |
| South Dakota           |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Tennessee              |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Texas                  |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Utah                   |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Vermont                |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Virginia               |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Washington             |                  |                 |  |                      |
| West Virginia          |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Wisconsin              |                  |                 |  |                      |
| Wyoming                |                  |                 |  |                      |
|                        | 4                | 34              | 3                                      | 13                   |

<sup>1.</sup> Maryland requires multiple observers for ineffective teachers.

 $<sup>{\</sup>it 2. Multiple evaluators are explicitly allowed but not required.}$ 

## ➤ 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



### 3-C Analysis: Kansas



State Partly Meets Goal (🛑) Progress Since 2011



#### **ANALYSIS**

Regrettably, Kansas does not ensure that all teachers are evaluated annually.

For the first two years of employment, new teachers are required to be evaluated once per semester; each evaluation must be scheduled no later than the 60th day of the semester. During the third and fourth years of employment, teachers in Kansas are required to be evaluated annually. After the fourth year, teachers are evaluated once every three years, not later than February 15 of that particular school year.

### Supporting Research

Kansas Statute 72-9003(d)

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

### Require annual formal evaluations for all teachers.

All teachers in Kansas should be evaluated annually. 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, Kansas should require multiple observations for all teachers, even those who have nonprobationary status. Further, as evaluation instruments become more data driven, it may not be feasible to issue multiple formal evaluation ratings during a single year. Applicable student data will likely not be available to support multiple ratings.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that these are statutory requirements.

Figure 69
Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?




- 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
- ${\it 3. Regulations sunset on September 30, 2014.}$

| Figure 70                   | AWWALEVALUATON | TEACHERS ALL PROBATIONARY TEACHERS        |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---|
| Do states require districts | <i>∑</i> 0,    |   |
| to evaluate all teachers    |                | \$ \ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\  |
| each year?                  | 1564           | \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\    |
|                             | N              | N. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. |
|                             | €9,            | \ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \   |
| Alabama                     |                |   |
| Alaska                      |                |   |
| Arizona                     |                |   |
| Arkansas                    |                |   |
| California                  |                |   |
| Colorado                    |                |   |
| Connecticut                 |                |   |
| Delaware                    |                |   |
| District of Columbia        |                |   |
| Florida                     |                |   |
| Georgia                     |                |   |
| Hawaii<br>Idaho             |                |   |
| Illinois                    |                |   |
| Indiana                     |                |   |
| lowa                        |                |   |
| 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                |                |   |
| Tennessee                   |                |   |
| Texas                       |                |   |
| Utah<br>Vermont             |                |   |
| Virginia                    |                |   |
| Washington                  |                |   |
| West Virginia               |                |   |
| Wisconsin                   |                |   |
| Wyoming                     |                |   |
| ,                           | 28             | 44  |
|                             | 20             | 44  |
|                             |                |   |


Figure 71

Do states require multiple classroom observations?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington
- 2. 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?




- 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.



### \*\* 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
- 2. 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,
- 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.

### 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.
- 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



### 3-D Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



( Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

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

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

### **Supporting Research**

Kansas Statute 72-5445

### **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 evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
  - Kansas 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.
  - Kansas 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.

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

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that these are statutory requirements.

| Alabama Alaska Anizona Arkansas Colorado Connecticut Colorado C | How long before a teacher |            |        |   |                   |      |       | 4RDS                                   |
|--|---------------------------|------------|--------|---|-------------------|------|-------|--|
| Alaska   | earns tenure?             |            | /      | / | /                 |      | /     | \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ |
| Alaska   |                           | <i>خ</i> . |        |   |                   | / ~  | / 5   | \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ |
| Alaska   |                           | 0 PO(I)    | / \$ / |   | Years             | YEAR | YEAR. | STATE<br>NWC,                          |
| Alaska   | Alabama                   | < /        |        |   | ω΄ /              |      |       | . ∡                                    |
| Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Illinois  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Arkansas   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| California   |                           | П          |        |   |                   |      | _     | _                                      |
| Delaware   |                           | П          | - i    |   | $\overline{\Box}$ |      |       |  |
| Delaware   | Colorado                  |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| District of Columbia   | Connecticut               |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Florida  | Delaware                  |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| 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  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Kentucky   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Louisiana  |                           | П          |        |   | _                 |      |       | _                                      |
| Maryland   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Massachusetts  | Maine                     |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Michigan   | Maryland                  |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Minnesota  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Mississippi  | _                         |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Missouri   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Montana  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Nebraska   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Nevada   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| New Hampshire  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| New Jersey   |                           | Н          |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| New Mexico   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| North Carolina   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| North Dakota   | New York                  |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Ohio   | North Carolina            |            |        |   |                   |      |       | 2                                      |
| Oklahoma   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      | _     |  |
| Oregon   |                           |            |        |   | _                 |      |       |  |
| Pennsylvania   |                           |            | _      |   | _                 |      | _     |  |
| Rhode Island   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| South Carolina   |                           |            | _      |   | _                 |      |       |  |
| South Dakota   |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Tennessee  |                           | Н          | _      |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Texas                                   Utah                                   Vermont                                   Virginia                                     Washington                                     West Virginia                                       Wisconsin   |                           | П          |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Utah   |                           |            | _      |   |                   |      | =     |  |
| Virginia   | Utah                      |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Washington   |                           |            |        |   | _                 |      |       |  |
| West Virginia  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
| Wisconsin  |                           |            |        |   | 7                 |      |       |  |
|  | _                         |            | _      |   | _                 |      |       |  |
| wyoming  |                           |            |        |   |                   |      |       |  |
|  | wyoming                   |            |        | Ш |                   |      | Ш     |  |

- 1. Idaho limits teacher contract terms to one year.
- A teacher can receive up to a 4-year contract if deemed proficient on evaluation.
- 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.
- 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.



### **TEXAMPLES 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.

- 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.

| Figure 76                | ENDENCE OF STUDENT                       | _ /                        | /                       |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| How are tenure           | EN7                                      | Some evidence of structure | Jugant Company          |
| decisions made?          | 77.7                                     | (18) / Self                | ered<br>tically         |
| decisions made?          | FOF 15.7                                 |                            | toma,                   |
|                          | NN NO N | evig<br>Biso               | ne si                   |
|                          | EVII<br>LEAR<br>REPO                     | Some                       | Virtually automatically |
| Alabama                  |  | ~<br>                      | / <del>-</del>          |
| Alaska                   |  |                            |                         |
| Arizona                  |  |                            | $\overline{}$           |
| Arkansas                 |  |                            |                         |
| California               |  |                            |                         |
| Colorado                 |  |                            |                         |
| Connecticut              |  |                            |                         |
| Delaware                 |  |                            |                         |
| District of Columbia     |  |                            |                         |
| Florida                  | 1  |                            |                         |
| Georgia                  |  |                            |                         |
| Hawaii                   |  |                            |                         |
| Idaho                    |  |                            |                         |
| Illinois                 |  |                            |                         |
| Indiana<br>Iowa          |  |                            |                         |
| IOWA<br>KANSAS           |  |                            |                         |
| Kentucky                 |  |                            |                         |
| Louisiana                |  |                            |                         |
| Maine                    |  |                            |                         |
| Maryland                 |  | $\Box$                     | Ī                       |
| 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                |  |                            |                         |
| Wyoming                  |  |                            |                         |
| J8                       | 11                                       | _                          | 24                      |
|                          | 11                                       | 9                          | 31                      |

### 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: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



ۻ Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas's requirements for licensure advancement and renewal are not based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Kansas offers an initial, professional and accomplished license. Teachers must complete a performance assessment to obtain their professional license, and then they must renew their licenses every five years by earning 120 professional development points if they have a graduate degree, or 160 professional development points if they do not have a graduate degree, including at least 80 points for college credit. The state's accomplished license is for National Board-Board certified teachers.

### **Supporting Research**

http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=158

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- Require evidence of effectiveness as a part of teacher licensing policy.
  - Kansas 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. While Kansas's performance assessment may be a step in the right direction, there is no indication that objective evidence of student learning is considered part of this assessment.
- Discontinue licensure requirements with no direct connection to classroom effectiveness.

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

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

| Oo states require teachers<br>o show evidence of | OBICCTIVE ENDENCE OF | Some objective evidence | Consideration Biven to class comments | Performance not considered |                         |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| effectiveness before                             | FUND                 |                         | tion Tom                              | 7                          |                         |
| conferring professional                          | 77.6                 | objec<br>dere           | Terper                                | )                          |                         |
| icensure?  | OBJEC<br>EFFECT      | Some objectivy          | Cor.<br>tead<br>Perfor,<br>class      |                            |                         |
| Alabama  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Alaska   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Arizona  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Arkansas   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| California<br>Colorado                           |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Connecticut                                      |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Delaware   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| District of Columbia                             |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Florida  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Georgia  | 1                    | - i                     | $\overline{\Box}$                     |                            |                         |
| Hawaii   | $\overline{\Box}$    | П                       |                                       |                            |                         |
| Idaho  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Illinois   |                      | 2                       |                                       |                            |                         |
| Indiana  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| lowa   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| KANSAS   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Kentucky   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Louisiana  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Maine  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Maryland   |                      | 3                       |                                       |                            |                         |
| Massachusetts                                    |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Michigan   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Minnesota  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| 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                                     |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Tennessee  |                      | Ē                       | - i                                   |                            |                         |
| Texas  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Utah   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Vermont  |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Virginia   |                      |                         |                                       |                            |                         |
| Washington                                       |                      |                         |                                       |                            | Evidence of effecti     |
| West Virginia                                    |                      |                         |                                       |                            | not for conferring      |
| Wisconsin  |                      |                         |                                       |                            | 2. Illinois allows revo |
| Wyoming  |                      |                         |                                       |                            | 3. Maryland uses some   |
|  | 6                    | 4                       | 9                                     | 32                         | systems for renewal     |

- Evidence of effectiveness is required for license renewal but not for conferring of professional license.
- 2. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.
- Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation systems for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.

Figure 79


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



- 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
- 2. 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


Figure 80

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



- 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, Wyoming
- 4. Some required coursework is targeted.

Figure 81 Do states award lifetime licenses?



- 1. 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,
- 2. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
- 3. Although teachers in Connecticut must renew their licenses every five years, there are no requirements for renewal.



### **TEXAMPLE 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.

### 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.)

- 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



### 3-F Analysis: Kansas



State Meets a Small Part of 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. Kansas reports little school-level data that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

Kansas 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. Kansas 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.

Kansas does report the percentage of highly qualified teachers. Commendably, these data are reported for each school, rather than aggregated by district. The state also reports on the percentage of teachers not licensed, not qualified or teaching on a waiver or provisional certificate by school. Kansas is commended for comparing the average percentage of highly qualified teachers in high- and low-poverty schools.

### **Supporting Research**

2012 School Report Card

http://svapp15586.ksde.org/rcard/bldg\_tchrs.aspx?org\_no=D0453&bldg\_no=7020 2011-2012

State Teacher Quality

http://online.ksde.org/rcard/state\_tchrs.aspx?org\_no=D%

### **RECOMMENDATION**

### Report school-level teacher effectiveness data.

Kansas should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance—from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness—publicly available. Given that Kansas requires teacher evaluations to be based to a significant extent on evidence of student learning (see Goal 3-B), such data about the effectiveness of a school's teachers can shine a light on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts.

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

Kansas should collect and report other 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.

As Kansas does with highly qualified teachers, the state should provide comparative data for schools with similar poverty and minority populations. This would yield a more comprehensive picture of gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


| igure 83<br>Oo states publicly report | PERFORMANCE DAT.   | 74 FBOM<br>2005<br>1975<br>1975<br>1975 | MCHER CHAINY  PERCENTAGE OF | PERCENTACE      | PERCENTAGE OF HEN  | ANNUAL TIES. | TEACHER ABSENTE: |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|
| chool-level data                      | ED4                | S                                       | 是自 岩                        |                 | F NE               |              | OVER             |
| bout teachers?                        | 18 N               |   |                             | ر می<br>خی / خی |                    | Ž / į        | 48SE/            |
|                                       | PERFORM<br>TEACHER | AN INDEX FOR EACH SOL                   | PECENT,                     | PERCENTA        | PERCENTAGE OF HIS. | ANNUAL;      | TACHER,          |
| Alabama                               |                    | ш                                       |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Alaska                                |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Arizona                               |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Arkansas                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| California<br>Colorado                |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Connecticut                           |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Delaware                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| District of Columbia                  |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Florida                               |                    | П                                       |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Georgia                               |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Hawaii                                |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Idaho                                 |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Illinois                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Indiana                               |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| lowa                                  |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| KANSAS                                |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Kentucky                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Louisiana                             |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Maine                                 |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Maryland                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Massachusetts                         |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Michigan<br>Minnesota                 |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Mississippi                           |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Missouri                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Montana                               |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Nebraska                              |                    | П                                       | $\overline{\Box}$           |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Nevada                                |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| New Hampshire                         |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| New Jersey                            |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| New Mexico                            |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| New York                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| North Carolina                        |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| North Dakota                          |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Ohio<br>Oklahoma                      |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
|                                       |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Oregon<br>Pennsylvania                |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Rhode Island                          |                    |   |                             |                 |                    | П            |                  |
| South Carolina                        |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| South Dakota                          |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Tennessee                             |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Texas                                 |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Utah                                  |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Vermont                               |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Virginia                              |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Washington                            |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| West Virginia                         |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Wisconsin                             |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
| Wyoming                               |                    |   |                             |                 |                    |              |                  |
|                                       | 9                  | 0                                       | 16                          | 8               | 39                 | 5            | 4                |



### \*\* 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: Arkansas³, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts<sup>4</sup>, Missouri, New York, North Carolina,
- 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, Utah⁵, 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



| 4-A: Induction                | 4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 4-B: Professional Development | 4-E: Differential Pay                       |
| 4-C: Pay Scales               | 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.)

- The state should ensure that new teachers receive mentoring of sufficient frequency and duration, especially in the first critical weeks of school.
- 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.
- 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



### 4-A Analysis: Kansas



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas does not have a state-level policy requiring all new teachers to participate in an induction program. However, districts must adhere to the following guidelines when applying for funding for local induction programs. The two-year mentoring program for new teachers requires mentors to meet the following criteria: 1) completion of at least three consecutive schools years of employment in the same school district, 2) selection by the board on the basis of demonstrating exemplary teaching ability and 3) participation and successful completion of a mentor training program. The program also requires that when matching a mentor teacher and probationary teacher, endorsement areas, grade levels and building assignment are taken into consideration.

Mentors of first-year teachers are paid \$1,000; mentors of second-year teachers receive a stipend in the range of \$300-\$500. Mentors must participate in on-going training and are expected to observe new teachers in the classroom. There are evaluations to assess the effectiveness of the mentor program.

### **Supporting Research**

KAR 91-41-1-4

Kansas Statute 72-1413

Guidelines for the Mentor Teacher Program 2009-2010

http://www.ksde.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=hefP3bMqPT0%3d&tabid=2067

Regulations for the Mentor Teacher Program 2009-2010

http://www.ksde.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=Pg6ZM6DdWSc%3d&tabid=2067

Kansas Policies Mentor Teacher Program 2010-2011

http://www.ksde.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=dQfQEnZSmbs%3d&tabid=2067

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

### Make induction programs mandatory.

Kansas should build on its strong mentor program requirements by directing every district to provide new teachers with high-quality mentoring.

### **KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS**

Kansas noted that stipends for mentors are no longer funded.


| Figure 86                    |                 | MENTORING OF SU | 10 NO.                                   | CAREFULSFILE  | MENTORS MILE | MENTORS/PROGRA   | . /                                   | USEOF VARIETY OF                       |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|---------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Do states have policies that | Š               |                 |  | 20 /<br>20 /  | NOF.         | ETRAL            |                                       | MPEN.                                  |
| articulate the elements of   | 76              | . S. \ . S.     | . 4 \ 6. \ 6. \ 6. \ 6. \ 6. \ 6. \ 6. \ | 55. \ 75. \ 7 |              | 15 / ST          | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ |  |
| effective induction?         | 0 Z             |                 |  |               | , \ \ x\     | Sols S           | PRSA,                                 | \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ |
|                              | MENTORING FOR A | MENT<br>REQUI   | MENT                                     | 24REFL        | MENT         | MENTORS / PROCRA | MENT                                  | Sylvan                                 |
| Alabama                      |                 |                 | •  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Alaska                       |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Arizona                      |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Arkansas                     |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| California                   |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Colorado                     |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Connecticut                  |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Delaware                     |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| District of Columbia         |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Florida                      |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii            |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Idaho                        |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Illinois                     |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Indiana                      |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| lowa                         |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| KANSAS                       |                 | П               |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Kentucky                     |                 |                 |  |               |              | _                | -                                     |  |
| Louisiana                    |                 | ī               | П  |               |              | П                | _                                     |  |
| Maine                        |                 |                 | П  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| 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                 |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Tennessee                    |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Texas                        |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Utah                         |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Vermont                      |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Virginia                     |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Washington                   |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| West Virginia                |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Wisconsin                    |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
| Wyoming                      |                 |                 |  |               |              |                  |                                       |  |
|                              | 31              | 22              | 9  | 24            | 29           | 20               | 20                                    | 21                                     |



### **TEXAMPLE 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?



- 1. 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



### 4-B Analysis: Kansas



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas requires that teachers receive copies of their evaluation documents. Teachers and evaluators must have a face-to-face meeting after each formal observation and have a final conference at the end of the evaluation period. The state also specifies that local boards of education should develop plans for professional development programs "based on identified needs at the individual, building and district levels." Kansas does not require that teachers who receive less than an effective rating be placed on professional improvement plans.

### **Supporting Research**

Kansas Statutes 72-9005; 72-9604

Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol

http://www.ksde.org/Portals/44/Documents/KEEP%20Manual%203%20April%201%20-%202013.pdf

### **RECOMMENDATION**

- Ensure that professional development is aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations.
  - While Kansas does demonstrate an intent to customize professional development based on individual teachers' needs, the state does not go far enough in ensuring that such activities are informed by teachers' evaluations. The state could take its policy a step further by ensuring 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.

Kansas 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.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state also noted that a professional development task force made policy level recommendations adopted by the State Board in 2010. Operationalizing these recommendations is in process and includes requiring high-quality mentoring and support by districts during the novice license period.



### **TEXAMPLES 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.

- 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.

|                          |  | ,                                      | ,   |   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Figure 89                |  | FVALLATION MICHAEL                     | MPROFESSIONEST  TEACHERS WITH POOR RATING | 5 |
| Do states ensure that    |  | 1                                      | 10px                                      |   |
| Do states ensure that    |  | × / 20 6                               | 2 / <del>2</del> 8                        |   |
| evaluations are used to  | FRS  |  |   |   |
| help teachers improve?   | 7. E. C. |  | 1 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 / 10 /    |   |
|                          | 44.7<br>FCE1                                 | \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ | EAC.                                      |   |
| Al-Laura                 | AU TACHERS REGIVE FERN                       |  |   |   |
| Alabama<br>Alaska        |  |  |   |   |
| Arizona                  |  |  |   |   |
| Arkansas                 |  |  |   |   |
| California               |  |  |   |   |
| Colorado                 |  |  |   |   |
| Connecticut              |  |  |   |   |
| Delaware                 |  |  |   |   |
| District of Columbia     |  |  |   |   |
| Florida                  |  |  |   |   |
| Georgia                  |  |  |   |   |
| Hawaii                   |  |  |   |   |
| Idaho                    |  |  |   |   |
| Illinois                 |  |  |   |   |
| Indiana                  |  |  |   |   |
| lowa<br>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                     | П  | $\Box$                                 |   |   |
| Oklahoma                 |  |  |   |   |
| Oregon                   |  |  |   |   |
| Pennsylvania             |  |  |   |   |
| Rhode Island             |  |  |   |   |
| South Carolina           |  |  |   |   |
| South Dakota             |  |  | 2   |   |
| Tennessee                |  |  |   |   |
| Texas                    |  |  |   |   |
| Utah<br>Vermont          |  |  |   |   |
| Virginia                 |  |  |   |   |
| Washington               |  |  |   |   |
| West Virginia            |  |  |   |   |
| Wisconsin <sup>3</sup>   |  |  |   |   |
| Wyoming                  |  |  |   |   |
|                          | 31   | 21                                     | 29  |   |
|                          |  |  |   |   |
|                          |  |  |   |   |

Figure 90


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
- 3. 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>
- 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.)

- 1. While the state may find it appropriate to articulate teachers' starting salaries, it should not require districts to adhere to a state-dictated salary schedule that defines steps and lanes and sets minimum pay at each level.
- 2. 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



### 4-C Analysis: Kansas



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2011

### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas does not address salary requirements, seemingly giving local districts the authority for pay scale and eliminating barriers such as state salary schedules and other regulations that control how districts pay teachers.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

■ Discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees.

While still leaving districts the flexibility to establish their own pay scale, Kansas 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, Kansas should articulate policies that discourage districts from determining the highest steps on the pay scale solely by seniority.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO 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.

on years of service, experience and training.

2. Rhode Island requires that local district salary schedules are based

| igure 93                  | DISTRICTS SET SALAN. | #DULE               | State Sets minimum salans |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Vhat role does the state  |                      | State sets minimum. | alary,                    |
| lay in deciding teacher   | 4/40                 |                     |                           |
| ay rates?                 | £7.5                 | <br> riinir         | minim                     |
|                           | Ş                    | Sets 1              | sets n                    |
|                           | DISTR                | State               | State                     |
| Alabama                   |                      |                     |                           |
| Alaska                    |                      |                     |                           |
| Arizona                   |                      |                     |                           |
| Arkansas                  |                      |                     |                           |
| California                |                      |                     |                           |
| Colorado                  | 1                    |                     |                           |
| Connecticut               |                      |                     |                           |
| Delaware                  |                      |                     |                           |
| District of Columbia      |                      |                     |                           |
| Florida                   |                      |                     |                           |
| Georgia                   |                      |                     |                           |
| Hawaii                    |                      |                     |                           |
| Idaho                     |                      |                     |                           |
| Illinois                  |                      |                     |                           |
| Indiana                   |                      |                     |                           |
| lowa                      |                      |                     |                           |
| KANSAS                    |                      |                     |                           |
| Kentucky<br>. · ·         |                      |                     |                           |
| Louisiana                 |                      |                     |                           |
| Maine                     |                      |                     |                           |
| Maryland<br>Massachusetts |                      |                     |                           |
| Michigan                  |                      |                     |                           |
| Minnesota                 |                      |                     |                           |
| Mississippi               |                      |                     |                           |
| Missouri                  |                      |                     |                           |
| Montana                   |                      | $\overline{\Box}$   |                           |
| Nebraska                  |                      |                     |                           |
| Nevada                    |                      |                     |                           |
| New Hampshire             |                      |                     |                           |
| New Jersey                |                      |                     |                           |
| New Mexico                |                      |                     |                           |
| New York                  |                      |                     |                           |
| North Carolina            |                      |                     |                           |
| North Dakota              |                      |                     |                           |
| Ohio                      |                      |                     |                           |
| Oklahoma                  |                      |                     |                           |
| Oregon<br>Pennsylvania    |                      |                     |                           |
| Rhode Island              | 2                    |                     |                           |
| South Carolina            |                      |                     |                           |
| South Dakota              |                      |                     |                           |
| Tennessee                 |                      |                     |                           |
| Texas                     |                      |                     |                           |
| Utah                      |                      |                     |                           |
| Vermont                   |                      |                     |                           |
| Virginia                  |                      |                     |                           |
| Washington                |                      |                     |                           |
| West Virginia             |                      |                     |                           |
| Wisconsin                 |                      |                     |                           |
| Wyoming                   |                      |                     |                           |
|                           | 27                   | 9                   | 15                        |

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

| Figure 94                   | ٤                    | PROHIBITS ADDITE                         | Leaves pay to die | ,5 /                                  |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Do states prevent districts | REQUIRES PERFORMANCE | HAN                                      | NAL +             | Requires compensation for             |
| rom basing teacher pay o    | n Š                  | REES YEES                                |                   | "Satic                                |
| advanced degrees?           | S PER                | 7 \ S                                    | £ / \$            | mpe, Srees                            |
| idvaniced degrees.          | # S S                |  |                   | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ |
|                             | \$ 0 kg              | 18 8 4 8 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 4 8 8 8 8 8 8 | /sayes            | Requir<br>Vance                       |
| A1 1                        | ~ 4                  | / 40                                     | / % /             | 90                                    |
| Alabama                     |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Alaska                      |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Arizona<br>Arkansas         |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| California                  |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Colorado                    |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Connecticut                 |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Delaware                    |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| District of Columbia        |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Florida                     |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Georgia                     |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Hawaii                      |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Idaho                       |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Illinois                    |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Indiana                     |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| lowa                        |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| KANSAS                      |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Kentucky                    |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Louisiana                   |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Maine                       |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| 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                        | 4                    |  |                   |                                       |
| Vermont                     |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Virginia                    |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Washington                  |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| West Virginia               |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Wisconsin                   |                      |  |                   |                                       |
|                             |                      |  |                   |                                       |
| Wyoming                     | 3                    |  | 32                | 15                                    |

- 1. For advanced degrees earned after April 2014.
- $\hbox{2. Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training". } \\$
- 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.)

1. 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



### 4-D Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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, Kansas 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.


### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS



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, Hawaii³, 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



### 4-E Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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.

A vague state statute does allow the Board of Education of any local school district to pay employment incentives or retention bonuses to teachers.

In addition, teachers who are National Board Certified are eligible to receive a \$1,000 annual incentive bonus. However, this type of differential pay is not tied to high-need schools or subject-area shortages.

### **Supporting Research**

Kansas Statutes 72-8246; 72-1398

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

Consider tying National Board supplements to teaching in high-needs schools.

This differential pay could be an incentive to attract some of the state's most effective teachers to low-performing schools.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

| Figure 98                 |              | HIGH NEED SCHOOLS  | /                            | SHORTAGE<br>SUBJECT |           |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Do states provide         |              |                    |                              | AREAS               |           |
| incentives to teach in    | 1 🗻          | , / &              | / 2                          | / %                 |           |
| high-need schools         | ŽŽ.          | / he /             | / 1 <u>1</u> 1/ <sub>N</sub> | / Ley               | 40        |
| or shortage subject       | FER          | 70,00              | , EFER                       | 102                 | dons      |
| areas?                    | DIFFERENTIAL | 1 Loan fogsiveness | DIFFERENTIAL                 | Loan forgiveness    | Nosupport |
| Alabama                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Alaska                    |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Arizona                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Arkansas                  |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| California                | _            |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Colorado                  |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Connecticut Delaware      |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| District of Columbia      |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Florida                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Georgia                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Hawaii                    |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Idaho                     |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Illinois                  |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Indiana                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Iowa                      |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| KANSAS                    |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Kentucky                  | _            |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Louisiana                 |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Maine                     | 1            |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Maryland<br>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            |              |                    |                              |                     | 2         |
| South Dakota<br>Tennessee |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Texas                     |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Utah                      |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Vermont                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Virginia                  |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Washington                |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| West Virginia             |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Wisconsin                 |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
| Wyoming                   |              |                    |                              |                     |           |
|                           | 22           | 7                  | 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.


<sup>2.</sup> South Dakota offers scholarships to teachers in high-need schools.



### **TEXAMPLE 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?



- 1. 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



### 4-F Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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, Kansas 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.

#### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

| Figure 101           | PERFORMANCE FACTORE | PERCORMANCE BONUES                     | \$ /                    | State supported per- | Juge /                                    |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|---|
|                      | <u> </u>            |  |                         |                      | \$ \ s \                                  |
| Do states support    | 9. E. F.            | / 108:18                               |                         | e sta                | 24° 54° 54° 54° 54° 54° 54° 54° 54° 54° 5 |
| performance pay?     | 2 4 4<br>2 7 7      | \$ 20                                  | (e pa                   | To de                |   |
|                      | 7508<br>758<br>7158 | FORM, VABLE                            | Page,<br>ouman          | inte-sup             | s not s                                   |
|                      | TEACH NA            | \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ | Performance pay permit. | / ** ** ***          | Does not support                          |
| Alabama              |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Alaska               |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Arizona              |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Arkansas             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| California           |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Colorado             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Connecticut          |                     |  |                         |                      | _   |
| Delaware             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| District of Columbia |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Florida              |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Georgia<br>Hawaii    |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Idaho                |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Illinois             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Indiana              |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| lowa                 |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| KANSAS               |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Kentucky             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Louisiana            |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Maine                |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Maryland             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Massachusetts        |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Michigan             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Minnesota            |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Mississippi          |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Missouri             |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Montana              |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
| Nebraska             |                     | 1                                      |                         |                      |   |
| Nevada               |                     |  | 2                       |                      |   |
| New Hampshire        |                     | П                                      | $\overline{\Box}$       | П                    |   |
| New Jersey           |                     |  | $\Box$                  |                      |   |
| New Mexico           |                     | П                                      |                         | П                    |   |
| 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              |                     |  |                         |                      |   |
|                      | 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.

<sup>1.</sup> Nebraska's initiative does not go into effect until 2016.


<sup>2.</sup> 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



### 5-A Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas allows new teachers who have not met all or part of their licensure testing requirements to apply for a one-year, nonrenewable teaching license. Teachers must complete all required tests during the school year in order to upgrade to the conditional teaching license.

Kansas also allows some teachers who have not met its licensure requirements to continue teaching under a two-year prestandard license, referred to as Exchange Teaching. Based on an exchange agreement with nine other states, teachers who have completed an approved teacher education program can teach for two years while completing any licensure deficiencies, including subject-matter assessments.

### **Supporting Research**

Kansas Department of Education One Year Non-Renewable Teaching License Requirements http://www.ksde.org/?tabid=308

Kansas Department of Education Two Year Exchange License Requirements http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=307

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

■ Ensure that all teachers pass required subject-matter licensing tests before they enter the

All students are entitled to teachers who know the subject matter they are teaching. Permitting individuals who have not yet passed state licensing tests to teach neglects the needs of students, instead extending personal consideration to adults who may not be able to meet minimal state standards. Kansas should ensure that all teachers have passed their licensing tests—an important minimum benchmark for entering the profession—prior to entering the classroom.

Limit exceptions to one year.

There might be limited and exceptional circumstances under which conditional or emergency licenses need to be granted. In these instances, it is reasonable for a state to give teachers up to one year to pass required licensure tests. However, Kansas's current policy puts students at risk by allowing out-of-state teachers to teach on exchange certificates for up to two years without passing required subject-matter tests.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Kansas recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that as directed by the State Board of Education, regulations were reviewed to remove barriers for out-of-state applicants. As a result, Kansas has created a system that guarantees access for fully licensed out-of-state applicants to start teaching by providing a series of licenses that allow full-time teaching while providing a time frame to complete any deficiencies such as testing.

### **LAST WORD**

Kansas should require that all teachers, even those previously licensed in other states, meet all of its content testing requirements before entering the classroom. Some states set extremely low standards for passing their licensure tests. Kansas takes considerable risk by granting licenses to all teachers without ensuring that they meet the state's standards. If a conditional license is necessary to put a teacher in the classroom, then the state is urged to allow only one additional year to meet testing requirements. While the state may feel that additional time is warranted to fulfill coursework requirements without overburdening the new teacher, two years is too long to allow an individual to remain in the classroom without proving that he or she has the requisite subject-matter knowledge.


| Figure 103   |             | /             | /              |                                |
|--|-------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| How long can new teachers practice without passing |             |               |                | (or unspecif                   |
| licensing tests?                                   | NO DEFERRAL | Up to 1 year  | Up to 2 years  | 3 Jeas or more for unspecified |
| Alabama  | < /         | 5 ,<br>-      | / <i>5</i> * / | ω,                             |
| Alaska   |             |               |                |                                |
| Arizona  |             |               |                |                                |
| Arkansas   |             |               |                |                                |
| California   | - i         | $\overline{}$ |                |                                |
| Colorado   |             |               |                |                                |
| Connecticut  |             |               |                |                                |
| Delaware   |             |               |                |                                |
| District of Columbia                               |             |               |                |                                |
| Florida  |             |               |                |                                |
| Georgia  |             |               |                |                                |
| Hawaii   |             |               |                |                                |
| Idaho  |             |               |                |                                |
| Illinois   |             |               |                |                                |
| Indiana  |             |               |                |                                |
| lowa   |             |               |                |                                |
| 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<br>Rhode Island                       |             |               |                |                                |
| South Carolina                                     |             |               |                |                                |
| South Dakota                                       |             |               |                |                                |
| Tennessee  |             |               |                |                                |
| Texas  |             |               |                |                                |
| Utah   |             |               |                |                                |
| Vermont  |             |               |                |                                |
| Virginia   |             |               |                |                                |
| Washington   |             |               |                |                                |
| West Virginia                                      |             |               |                |                                |
| Wisconsin  |             |               |                |                                |
| Wyoming  |             |               |                |                                |
| 8  |             |               |                |                                |



**Colorado**, **Illinois**, **Mississippi**, and **New Jersey** require all new teachers to pass all required subject-matter tests as a condition of initial licensure.

Figure 104

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
- 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.)

- 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.
- 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

### How States are Faring in Dismissal for Poor Performance **Best Practice States** Florida, Oklahoma State Meets Goal Indiana States Nearly Meet Goal Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee 20 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska ↑, Arizona ↑, Arkansas ↑, Connecticut ↑, Delaware, Georgia 1, Louisiana 1, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey 1, New Mexico ♠, Ohio, Pennsylvania ♠, Virginia ♠, Washington ↑, West Virginia ↑, Wisconsin, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal Idaho 1, Minnesota 1, New Hampshire, North Carolina 1, Utah 17 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Iowa, KANSAS, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont Progress on this Goal Since 2011: **1**: 16 **\( :** 35 **↓**:0

### 5-B Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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. In fact, Kansas does not articulate specific grounds at all for termination of teachers' contracts.

Tenured teachers who are terminated may appeal multiple times. After receiving written notice of dismissal, the teacher may file an appeal, which must occur within 45 days after the hearing officer is selected. The teacher may then file an additional appeal with the district court. The time frame of this appeal is not addressed by the state.

### **Supporting Research**

Kansas Statute 72-5438; 72-5439; 72-5443

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

- Specify that classroom ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.
  - Kansas 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 is reached within a reasonable time frame.
- Distinguish the process and accompanying due process rights between 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. Kansas should ensure that appeals related to classroom effectiveness are decided only by those with educational expertise.

### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS



### **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.

Figure 106 Do states articulate that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal? Alabama Alaska Arizona П Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut П Delaware П District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii П Idaho П Illinois П Indiana Iowa **KANSAS** Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi П Missouri Montana П Nebraska Nevada П New Hampshire П New Jersey New Mexico П New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island П South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah П Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 29 22

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

Figure 107

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.)

 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



### 5-C Analysis: Kansas



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2011

#### **ANALYSIS**

Kansas 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.
  - Kansas 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, Kansas does not require that districts consider seniority; however, the state should do more to prevent districts from making decisions solely on this basis.


### KANSAS RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Figure 109

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



- 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
- 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.






**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
- 2. Strong Practice: Louisiana, Utah
- 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.

# Goals and Keywords

| GOAL   | STATEMENT   | KEY WORDS  |
|--|---|--|
|  | AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Te   | achers   |
| <b>1-A:</b> Admission into Teacher Preparation                   | The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong academic records.  | admission requirements, academic proficiency measures, basic skills tests, GPA   |
| <b>1-B:</b> Elementary<br>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. | license/certification, elementary teachers<br>early childhood teachers, content tests,<br>elementary coursework/standards,<br>content specialization requirements    |
| 1-C: 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                      |
| 1-D: 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  |
| <b>1-F:</b> Secondary<br>Teacher Preparation                     | The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate gradelevel content.  | license/certification, secondary teachers,<br>secondary social studies, content tests,<br>endorsements   |
| <b>1-G:</b> Secondary Teacher 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, clinical preparation, placements   |
| 1-K: 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 accountability, student achievement, standard of performance, public reporting 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 to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates. | alternate route programs, admission<br>requirements, GPA, academic proficienc<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 provide efficient preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as adequate mentoring and support.             | alternate route programs, coursework<br>requirements, length of program, studer<br>practice teaching, induction, mentoring                         |
| <b>2-C:</b> Alternate Route<br>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 effectivenes<br>student learning, classroom observation<br>surveys, rating categories                                  |
| <b>3-C:</b> Frequency of Evaluations               | The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.  | teacher evaluation, evaluation frequence classroom observations, feedback  |
| 3-D: 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 licens<br>license renewal, evidence of teacher<br>effectiveness, coursework requirements                        |
| <b>3-F:</b> Equitable<br>Distribution              | The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify 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   |
| <b>1-A:</b> 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>1-B:</b> Professional<br>Development       | The state should ensure that teachers receive feedback about their performance and should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.            | feedback from observations/evaluations,<br>professional development linked to<br>evaluations results, improvement plans                  |
| <b>I-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 |
| 4-D: 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  |
| I-E: 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 school  |
| <b>1-F:</b> 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   |
| 5-A: Extended<br>Emergency Licenses           | The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.   | emergency licenses, provisional certificates, loopholes, subject-matter tests  |
| <b>5-B:</b> Dismissal for<br>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. | dismissal, ineffectiveness, poor performance, appeals, due process   |
| 5-C: Reductions                               | 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.                   | reduction in force, layoffs,<br>teacher performance, seniority   |

# Teacher Policy Priorities for Kansas

| AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers  |          |
|--|----------|
| Require that teacher preparation programs 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-  |
| Adopt a rigorous stand-alone math test for all elementary teacher candidates.  | Goal 1-I |
| Specifically require secondary social studies teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.  | Goal 1-  |
| Eliminate the K-12 special education certificate, and ensure that both elementary and secondary special education teachers possess adequate and appropriate content knowledge for the grades and subjects they teach.  | Goal 1-  |
| 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-l |
| AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool  |          |
|  |          |
| Increase admission requirements to alternate route programs, including a high bar for academic proficiency.  | 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-  |
| Require out-of-state teachers to meet the state's own testing requirements.  | Goal 2-  |

| AREA 3: Identifying Effective Teachers  |          |
|---|----------|
| Require student growth to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.  | Goal 3-B |
| Formally evaluate all teachers annually.  | Goal 3-C |
| Ensure that evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.  | Goal 3-D |
| Base licensure advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license and licensure renewal on evidence of effectiveness.   | Goal 3-E |
| Publish aggregate school-level teacher evaluation ratings from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness.   | Goal 3-F |
|   |          |
| AREA 4: Retaining Effective Teachers  |          |
| Require effective induction for all new teachers, including mentoring of sufficient frequency and duration.   | Goal 4-A |
| Link professional development activities to findings in individual teacher evaluations, and place teachers with ineffective or needs improvement ratings on structured improvement plans. | Goal 4-B |
| Discourage districts from basing teacher pay scales primarily on advanced degrees and seniority.  | Goal 4-C |
| Support differential pay initiatives for effective teachers in both shortage subject areas and high-need schools.   | Goal 4-E |
| Support performance pay to recognize teachers for their effectiveness.  | Goal 4-F |
|   |          |
| AREA 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers  |          |
| ■ Ensure that all teachers pass required subject-matter licensing tests before they enter the classroom.  | Goal 5-A |
| Make ineffective classroom performance grounds for dismissal.   | Goal 5-B |
| Use teacher effectiveness as a factor when determining which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force.   | Goal 5-C |

