



Executive Summary

2007

**State Teacher
Policy Yearbook**

Progress on Teacher Quality

Individual State Reports and National Summary

AVAILABLE AT WWW.NCTQ.ORG/STPY

The *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* consists of 52 separate reports: a national summary and individual state reports for each state and the District of Columbia. These reports can be downloaded at: www.nctq.org/stpy. The website also includes a searchable interface to track data included in the yearbook across states.

WELCOME | OVERVIEW | PRIMARY FINDINGS | GOALS | SUPPORTING RESEARCH | METHODOLOGY | REPORTS | MEDIA | NCTQ HOME PAGE

State Teacher Policy Yearbook 2007

Progress on Teacher Quality

How States are Faring
CLICK ON A STATE TO VIEW THE DATA AND GOAL, LINKING TO DOWNLOAD THE STATE REPORT.
CLICK ON A STATE TO VIEW THE DATA AND GOAL, LINKING TO DOWNLOAD THE STATE REPORT.

Download National Report

- Area 1: Meeting NCLB Teacher Quality Objectives
 - Goal A: Equitable Distribution of Teachers
 - Goal B: Elementary Teacher Preparation
 - Goal C: Secondary Teacher Preparation
 - Goal D: Veteran Teachers' Path to HQT
 - Goal E: Standardizing Credentials
- Area 2: Teacher Licensure
- Area 3: Teacher Evaluation and Compensation
- Area 4: State Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs
- Area 5: Alternate Routes to Certification
- Area 6: Preparation of Special Education Teachers

Key for Areas
■ A ■ B ■ C ■ D ■ F

Key for Individual Goals within Each Area
■ Best Practices ■ Meets goal ■ State nearly meets goal
■ None, partially meets goal ■ None, meets a small part of goal
□ State does not meet goal

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

Countless reports have analyzed the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 on teacher quality and student achievement. What many of these reports truly leave behind, however, is the reality that *state* governments—not the *federal* government—have the strongest impact on the work of America’s 3.1 million teachers.

With that in mind, three years ago the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) began the process of analyzing states’ teacher policies. NCTQ analysts sifted through tens of thousands of pages of state codes, regulations and rules, regularly corresponding with state officials who graciously provided their important knowledge and perspectives. Truthfully, what began as an exercise motivated by a mixture of three parts—naiveté, hubris and a strong desire to do some good—ended up as an important lesson in humility and respect for the work of states. To wrestle with the same enormous challenges that states face on a daily basis is to realize how hard it is to achieve the right balance between rigor and flexibility, authority and accountability, inputs and outputs—all within the context of a moving target, the teacher labor market.

The *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* is the first project of its kind to provide a 360-degree detailed analysis of *any and every* policy that states have that impact the quality of teachers, specifically their recruitment, preparation, licensing, evaluation and compensation. In all, the *Yearbook* project is an encyclopedia of individual state reports, totaling more than 5,600 pages of analysis and recommendations in 51 separate reports.

What sets the *Yearbook* apart is not just its daunting length, but how we frame the analyses. We were not interested in producing yet another report from our perch in the nation’s capital lecturing states about what they are doing all wrong; we wanted to be more constructive, providing specific recommendations for making state policies better. While some will (and already have) accused NCTQ of inordinate arrogance for this decision, we can live with that aspersion if the *Yearbook* succeeds in focusing more attention on the contribution and culpability states share for teacher quality.

Informed by research and extensive consultation, strengthened by reflection and a willingness to revise no matter how long it took to get it right, the *Yearbook* offers a blueprint for reform contained in the admittedly awkward number of 27 goals. While we do not pretend that everyone will agree with us, the

Yearbook provides workable and cost-neutral models for reform. It presents an unapologetic, ‘reformist’ agenda because this is what the nation’s teacher-quality problem demands. For the most part, the current system is a mixture of broken, counterproductive and anachronistic policies in need of an overhaul. It’s time to turn in the gas-guzzling clunker in exchange for the hybrid.

With the results now in from our first edition, we know that the work ahead is significant and daunting. States as a group meet or come close to meeting just 21 percent of the goals, with no state meeting even half of the goals. The top-performing state is New Jersey, which meets or nearly meets 44 percent of the goals. New Jersey is closely followed by Massachusetts, Tennessee and Texas. The lowest-performing states are Alaska and Maine, with Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska and Nevada not far behind.

Reflecting on this, one question surfaces. Are we suggesting that states like Alaska and Montana have lower-quality teachers than does New Jersey or Massachusetts? No. There are a number of factors to also consider.

First, while states have more authority and impact over the teaching profession than any other entity, other factors still contribute to teacher quality, such as the overall quality of PK-12 schooling in the state (from which future teachers are produced), a state’s poverty rate, the quality of school leadership, and the salaries districts can afford to pay, to name a few. There are always some factors largely outside the purview of states to change. However, sound teacher policies can mean the difference between having a good teaching force and a mediocre one. It can even mean the difference between a superior force and a good one. Sound policies accommodate the realities that cannot be changed and, in doing so, get the most bang for the buck.

Second, improving teacher quality requires a cohesive strategy. For any number of practical or political reasons, a state may have adopted various strategies for improving teacher quality, but the result is too often scattershot.

The 27 goals presented here, while they may raise dissention, represent a tightly woven approach to solving the nation’s teacher-quality problem. The goals are interdependent, meaning that adopting only one, a few or a handful of the 27 goals may do little to change the teacher-quality equation in a state. For example, one of the *Yearbook’s* goals (Goal 3-C) calls for teachers to be evaluated on an annual basis, a goal that seven states including the District of Columbia meet. However, many of these same states still do not require that these annual teacher evaluations consider a teacher’s effectiveness in the classroom as the preponderant criterion for rating a teacher’s performance (Goal 3-A). Needless to say, it does little good to evaluate a teacher each year if the teacher is not judged on classroom effectiveness.

Having committed ourselves to the task of producing no fewer than 1,377 individual analyses (51 states x 27 goals), we found ourselves looking longingly at the more centralized systems preferred by other countries such as France and China. While we’ll admit to a certain amount of self-interest in this regard, we also came to a point in our knowledge of state policy where we could not identify the philosophical justification for the nation’s cherished decentralized system. If states still believe that there are 51 distinct systems for the teacher profession, it is illusion. In fact, there are generally two or three systems, at most four versions. There are inevitable twists. There are regulatory remnants of times gone by that need to go off the books. There are a few stand-out states that have accomplished remarkable policies such as Massachusetts on teacher preparation and Florida on teacher compensation. But for the most part, states look remarkably similar to one another. We have created in some ways the worst combination of systems, believing our system to be decentralized and erecting the barriers necessary for such a system, but realizing in the end that we’re all in the same leaky boat after all.

METHODOLOGY

GOALS

NCTQ formulated the *Yearbook's* policy goals through a lengthy and comprehensive development and review process.

The *Yearbook* goals were initially developed three years ago by our Board of Directors and distinguished Advisory Board (see our inside back cover for a list of names). These goals were sent out for comment to more than 150 groups and individuals, including education policy groups, foundations, researchers, economists, leading innovators (like the TAP program and Teach For America), and most importantly, teachers.

Influential groups such as the American Federation of Teachers, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association, NCTAF, Teach For America, the National Governors Association and NCATE were provided the goals for review. While some groups did not always agree with every one of our goals, their perspectives made the goals stronger and more balanced.

ANALYSES

NCTQ's analyses are rooted in reviews of official state policies. Specifically, NCTQ defines policies as state laws, regulations, statutes, administrative code, state board of education rulings and teacher licensing commission rulings. NCTQ took great care to utilize the most recent policies, seeking multiple sources to validate that the policies we cite as the basis for our analyses are current. Policies enacted after April 2007 will not be reflected in this edition.

Additional sources of information were also utilized in developing analyses, including information requested by NCTQ from state departments of education, research and data from the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), and the Data Quality Campaign. Individual states' Title II reports were also used as bases for certain analyses. When analyzing state teaching standards, NCTQ also reviewed the standards of professional teaching associations and those of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

NCTQ performed additional research that shaped our analyses as well. For example, we conducted a comprehensive survey of school district personnel officials to gauge the flexibility of state policies regarding teacher reciprocity.

For the most part, the *Yearbook* does not assess states on the quality of policy implementation. Much could be said about what states do or do not do with the laws and regulations that they approve. We came across many regulations that are on the books, particularly in regard to alternative certification, that are rarely practiced or poorly implemented. Analyses may comment on what appears to be a little-used or poorly implemented policy, but these observations do not determine a state's rating. *The Yearbook reflects policy, not practice.*

STATE COLLABORATION

Of the many groups consulted about the *Yearbook*, states provided the most helpful information. At times, they went beyond the call of duty, providing NCTQ's front-line researchers with a tutorial in *State Education Policy 101*. On two occasions, NCTQ requested that states provide a formal review of their state's analysis. Regardless of whether state officials agreed with the goals that NCTQ articulated, most states proved consistently responsive and helpful in providing information, suggestions and citations. Their collaboration was essential. States were provided with their final analysis one month before the release of the *Yearbook*. To the extent possible, even comments resulting from this late-hour review were incorporated.

THE FUTURE OF THE YEARBOOK

We recognize the value that comes from tracking progress, which is why the *Yearbook* will be updated each year. From year to year, NCTQ intends to measure the movement of states toward meeting the goals outlined in the *Yearbook*, with the mission of continuing to collaborate with state leaders and encouraging meaningful progress. As our knowledge and experience grow, so too will the goals. While we expect our core vision and approach to be relatively consistent, we recognize that just as state teacher policies must change with the times, so too must the *Yearbook*. Our commitment to states is fairness and full collaboration throughout this process.

ABOUT THE YEARBOOK GOALS

The *Yearbook* goals meet five criteria:

1. They are supported by the best research available.

The *Yearbook* relies on the best teacher-quality research available. We only considered research that was presented in a refereed journal, book or from a research institute. The research had to be at least quasi-experimental, excluding case studies, adhering to acceptable research methods. The outcome measure had to be improved student achievement. In particular, goals addressing the preparation of teachers and alternate routes relied heavily on research (Goals 1-B, 1-C, 5-A, 5-B, 6-B and 6-C). All of the research used to support the goals is posted on the NCTQ website (www.nctq.org), linked specifically to each goal.

2. They offer practical, not pie-in-the-sky, solutions for improving teacher quality.

While NCTQ does not necessarily disagree with the many reports calling for dramatic and costly changes in how teachers are prepared and compensated, the agenda presented here is feasible regardless of new infusions of funding. In some cases, implementing certain goals requires that states just be willing to be more specific, such as improving their teaching standards (Goals 2-A and 6-A). In other cases, the goals require updating policies to reflect 21st century practices such as annual evaluations of teachers (Goal 3-C) and portability of licenses among states (Goals 2-C and 5-D). Goals call for states to eliminate loopholes that add unnecessary burdens to the teacher preparation process (Goals 1-D, 2-B, 5-B and 6-D).

Central to this philosophy, each goal of the *Yearbook* honors the state earning a “Best Practice” designation. These designations provide the clearest evidence that the *Yearbook* goals are realistic and doable.

3. They take on the teaching profession’s most pressing needs.

Policymakers seek answers to particular problems with both shortages and quality. Six goals would have a significant impact on a state’s ability to attract talented individuals to teach mathematics and science, areas of significant shortages (Goals 1-A, 2-C, 3-D, 5-A, 5-B and 5-D). A whole area (Area 6) is dedicated to the problem of severe shortages and poorly prepared special education teachers. Equally important, the *Yearbook* calls on states to focus much more attention on the need of elementary teachers to receive a broad, liberal arts education (Goal 1-B) and know how to teach reading (Goal 2-D).

4. They are relatively cost neutral.

Without disregarding the need for compensation reform as reflected in our Area 3 goals, the *Yearbook* does not require large commitments of new financial resources. In some cases, implementing these recommendations could be considered reasonable cost-saving measures. In other cases, if implemented concurrently, the recommendations prove cost neutral. On compensation reform, we think that states should at least get out of the way of districts wanting to innovate (Goal 3-D). We do not call for more preparation; we call for more focused preparation (Goals 1-B, 1-C, 4-D, 6-B and 6-C). We urge states to do more screening up front of aspiring teachers, avoiding the significant investment of public tax dollars on

persons who are accepted into schools of education but who do not possess the most basic skills acquired in middle school (Goal 4-A).

5. They respect legitimate constraints on states.

The *Yearbook* goals focus on areas that are within the state's authority to regulate. States often claim that they cannot address certain topics, because they are matters of "local control." This is frequently a matter of tradition more than statute. Many states are extremely reluctant to tell districts (or teacher preparation programs for that matter) what to do. While school districts need and deserve autonomy in many aspects of their operation, local control too frequently becomes a way for states to relegate responsibilities that are most appropriately and efficiently addressed at the state level.

The alternative to "anything goes" does not have to be "one size fits all." By setting clear guidelines and standards and then enforcing them, states signal their minimum expectations. For example, states need not dictate how teacher evaluations are to be conducted, but they can and certainly should insist on annual evaluations and provide basic criteria that must be addressed, such as ensuring that student learning is the preponderant criterion (Goals 3-A and 3-C). Similarly, tenure is a contractual matter between districts and their teachers. Without mandating specific requirements, states can ensure that districts do not provide teachers tenure in too few years to have demonstrated their effectiveness (Goal 3-E).

Executive Summary: Goals

AREA 1 Meeting NCLB Teacher Quality Objectives

- Goal A **Equitable Distribution of Teachers**
The state should contribute to the equitable distribution of quality teachers by means of good reporting and sound policies.
- Goal B **Elementary Teacher Preparation**
The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teacher candidates with a broad liberal arts education.
- Goal C **Secondary Teacher Preparation**
The state should require its teacher preparation programs to graduate secondary teachers who are highly qualified.
- Goal D **Veteran Teachers Path to HQT**
The state should phase out its alternative “HOUSSE” route to becoming highly qualified.
- Goal E **Standardizing Credentials**
The state should adopt the national standard defining the amount of coursework necessary to earn a major or minor.

AREA 2 Teacher Licensure

- Goal A **Defining Professional Knowledge**
Through teaching standards, the state should articulate and assess the professional knowledge of teaching and learning that new teachers need, but steer clear of “soft” areas that are hard to measure.
- Goal B **Meaningful Licenses**
The state should require that all teachers pass required licensing tests before they begin their second year of teaching.
- Goal C **Interstate Portability**
The state should help to make teacher licenses fully portable among states—with appropriate safeguards.
- Goal D **Teacher Prep in Reading Instruction**
The state should ensure that new teachers know the science of reading instruction.
- Goal E **Distinguishing Promising Teachers**
The state license should distinguish promising new teachers.

AREA 3 Teacher Evaluation and Compensation

- Goal A **Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness**
The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.
- Goal B **Using Value-Added**
The state should install strong value-added instruments to add to schools’ knowledge of teacher effectiveness.
- Goal C **Teacher Evaluation**
The state should require that schools formally evaluate teachers on an annual basis.
- Goal D **Compensation Reform**
The state should encourage, not block, efforts at compensation reform.
- Goal E **Tenure**
The state should not give teachers permanent status (tenure) until they have been teaching for five years.

AREA 4 State Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs

- Goal A **Entry Into Preparation Programs**
The state should require undergraduate teacher preparation programs to administer a basic skills test as a criterion for admission.
- Goal B **Program Accountability**
The state should base its approval of teacher preparation programs on measures that focus on the quality of the teachers coming out of the programs.
- Goal C **Program Approval and Accreditation**
The state should keep its program approval process wholly separate from accreditation.
- Goal D **Controlling Coursework Creep**
The state should regularly review the professional coursework that teacher candidates are required to take, in order to ensure an efficient and balanced program of study.

AREA 5 Alternate Routes to Certification

- Goal A **Genuine Alternatives**
The state should ensure its alternate routes to certification are well structured, meeting the needs of new teachers.
- Goal B **Limiting Alternate Routes to Teachers with Strong Credentials**
The state should require all of its alternate route programs to be both academically selective and accommodating to the nontraditional candidate.
- Goal C **Program Accountability**
The state should hold alternate route programs accountable for the performance of their teachers.
- Goal D **Interstate Portability**
The state should treat out-of-state teachers who completed an approved alternate route program no differently than out-of-state teachers who completed a traditional program.

AREA 6 Preparation of Special Education Teachers

- Goal A **Special Education Teacher Preparation**
The state should articulate the professional knowledge needed by the special education teacher and monitor teacher preparation programs for efficiency of delivery.
- Goal B **Elementary Special Education Teachers**
The state should require that teacher preparation programs provide a broad liberal arts program of study to elementary special education candidates.
- Goal C **Secondary Special Education Teachers**
The state should require that teacher preparation programs graduate secondary special education teacher candidates who are “highly qualified” in at least two subjects.
- Goal D **Special Education Teacher and HQT**
The state should customize a “HOUSSE” route for new secondary special education teachers to help them achieve highly qualified status in all the subjects they teach.

Executive Summary: Key Findings

1. STATE POLICIES ARE REMARKABLY INFLEXIBLE AND OUTDATED.

Considering that human capital is the essential component of the teaching profession, states still cling to policies that reflect neither the flexibility nor the reality of today's workforce.

- Most states do not require that teachers receive annual performance evaluations, which is counter to the norm in most professions. Only **14** states require annual evaluations, and only **7** direct districts that they can dismiss teachers after two unsatisfactory evaluations.
- Pay reform has advanced, with **28** states supporting programs that tie teacher pay to district and school needs (differential pay). However, only **12** states fund programs rewarding teachers for classroom effectiveness.
- While significant advancements have been made in developing value-added methodologies, only **15** states have put the necessary components in place to fairly evaluate a teacher's effectiveness through a value-added model.
- Despite the promise of new alternate routes to teacher certification for talented liberal arts graduates and mid-career professionals, only **6** states offer genuine alternate routes.
- In **23** states, current teachers who want to move to other states must navigate a Byzantine path to earn licensure, often having to complete additional coursework or even repeat preparation programs. Only **27** states have set appropriate standards on what constitutes a major for teacher graduates, further complicating the process.

14

states require annual teacher evaluations.

12

states fund performance pay programs.

2. STATES ARE NOT PAYING ENOUGH ATTENTION TO WHO GOES INTO TEACHING.

States provide significant funding to teacher preparation programs, particularly in state-funded universities, yet there is little oversight of candidates' academic caliber.

- Although **41** states require programs to administer a basic skills test, **24** of these states delay testing until completion of the preparation program. Programs that accept aspiring teachers who cannot pass a basic skills test may lower the rigor of their courses, remediating basic skills instead of preparing teachers for the classroom.
- States set insufficient requirements for the academic selectivity of alternate route programs, despite the fact that these programs are premised on the concept that nontraditional candidates must have strong subject-area knowledge and/or above-average academic backgrounds. Only **12** states set a sufficient academic standard for alternate route candidates, one that is higher than what is expected of traditional candidates.
- Only a handful of states recognize new teachers who bring superior academic caliber into the profession. **47** states do not confer beginning teacher licenses that distinguish candidates' academic performance.

47

states *do not* confer licenses that identify superior new teachers.

12

states set sufficient academic standards for alternate route teachers.

3. STATES DO NOT APPROPRIATELY OVERSEE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS.

A major weakness in the teacher-quality equation is linked to the fact that states fail to hold teacher preparation programs accountable for their admissions standards, efficiency of program delivery or, most importantly, the quality of their graduates.

17

states require basic skills testing for program admission.

18

states collect any data on the effectiveness of program graduates.

- States do not ensure that preparation programs only admit teacher candidates with sufficient basic skills to enable them to complete the program. Only **17** states require programs to make basic skills testing a condition of admission.
- States do not hold preparation programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce, but rather continue to use ineffective program approval processes that emphasize inputs. Only **18** states collect any meaningful objective data that reflect program effectiveness. States do an even poorer job of holding alternate route preparation programs accountable.
- **11** states further weaken their approval processes by connecting program approval to accreditation, which is almost wholly focused on inputs rather than outcomes.
- States also fail to prevent programs from requiring excessive professional coursework. NCTQ found programs in **36** states that require the equivalent of more than two full majors of education coursework, which leaves little room for electives and adequate subject-matter preparation.
- States provide even less guidance in the area of preparation of special education teachers. NCTQ found programs in **16** states that require the equivalent of more than three full majors of education coursework—and these were not programs training teachers to work with severely disabled children.

4. STATES USE FALSE PROXIES AS MEASURES OF TEACHER QUALITY.

Across many policy areas, states rely on inappropriate indicators that do not provide meaningful information about teachers' qualifications or effectiveness.

17

states rely on transcript review to determine reciprocal licensure.

28

states' standards place too much emphasis on untestable dispositions.

- The majority of states rely on site visits and syllabi review to determine approval of teacher preparation programs. Only **18** states include any meaningful objective data in their approval process, such as programs' graduates' first-year evaluations or the academic achievement of graduates' students.
- **17** states rely on reviews of college transcripts to decide whether to award licensure to a teacher already licensed in another state. Licensing tests are a more valid way to verify teachers' qualifications; yet only **16** states require all out of state teachers to pass their licensing tests.
- While it is important to define the attributes and attitudes that teachers should have—known as teacher dispositions, they cannot be measured by a licensing test and thus should not be included in state standards. **28** states' standards place too much emphasis on dispositions, rather than focusing on what teachers must know and should be able to do.

5. STATES DO NOT APPRECIATE THE DUAL NATURE OF LICENSING TESTS.

Licensing tests can serve both as the gatekeeper on minimum qualifications and as a tool that helps states to be more flexible. However, while European and Asian systems depend heavily on tests, states in this country are often reluctant to do so.

- At best, states screen only for the most minimal standards when individuals apply to undergraduate teacher preparation programs. Only **17** states require teacher candidates to pass a common

test in basic reading, writing and arithmetic that is estimated to assess middle school level skills. No states require subject-area tests as a criterion for entry, a useful mechanism that would also allow programs to exempt qualified candidates from some core academic requirements.

- While many states require that a teacher have a major in the intended subject area, a rigorous test could serve the same purpose. Only **16** states allow teachers going through an alternate route to take a test to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge, failing to accommodate the diverse backgrounds of the nontraditional candidate.
- While some states require elementary teachers to take a reading course, states have no assurance that these courses deliver the scientifically based reading instruction that teachers need. A test would solve this problem, but **40** states have yet to adopt this simple solution and another **7** have put in place inadequate tests.
- NCLB currently requires middle school teachers to earn a major or pass a test, but the law is problematic. Many teachers are reluctant to take a test after they have been out of college for a while. States could alleviate this problem by requiring programs to prepare and then test middle school teachers in two areas, but only **15** states currently do so.
- While all states have teaching standards, most states do not follow up to make sure teachers learn these standards. **32** states require a test of professional knowledge and only **9** of these states have customized a test to match their own standards. Standards are meaningless unless they can be tested.
- Licensing tests represent the minimal knowledge teachers need. Yet **20** states give some teachers up to three years (or even more!) to pass these tests. That is three years of students being taught by someone who may not possess the basic knowledge needed for the job.
- When deciding what license to grant a teacher from out of state, states are generally reluctant to waive their coursework requirements, but instead grant liberal waivers of testing requirements. **34** states exempt veteran teachers from tests, as if experience could serve as an adequate substitute for subject-matter competency.

4

states have an adequate test in reading instruction.

20

states give teachers up to three years—or more—to pass licensure tests.

6. STATES CONTINUE TO NEGLECT CONTENT PREPARATION FOR TEACHERS.

Despite continuous concern about improving the content preparation of America's teachers, states are still failing to ensure breadth, depth and relevance to the classroom in content preparation.

- States' content standards and coursework requirements for elementary teachers fall well short of the mark, omitting critical areas of knowledge. For example, **18** states make no mention of geometry and **42** states make no mention of American history. Only **3** states require the study of American literature, **6** require children's literature and only **3** require the study of art history.
- While NCLB has succeeded in shoring up much of the content preparation of secondary teachers, states still struggle with middle school teacher qualifications. **23** states still allow some teachers trained for the elementary classroom to teach seventh and eighth grades.
- Few states are doing enough to make sure that future elementary teachers know how to teach reading, arguably the most important job of a teacher. Only **19** states require programs to prepare teachers in the science of reading.

3

states require elementary teachers to study American literature.

42

states *do not* require American history study for elementary teachers.

7. STATES DO NOT ENSURE THAT SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS ARE WELL-PREPARED TO TEACH STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES.

States contribute to special education teacher shortages by providing too little guidance to teacher preparation programs and not taking steps to assist special education teachers in meeting highly qualified requirements.

4

states have clear and explicit standards for special education teachers.

14

states require programs graduate “highly qualified” secondary special education teachers.

- State standards for the preparation of special education teachers are woefully inadequate. A mere **4** states have strong standards that are clear, explicit and comprehensive about what teachers should know in order to teach students with disabilities.
- Few states require special education teachers to have subject-matter knowledge. States shortchange special education students by providing them with teachers who are not prepared to teach them content.
- States are not requiring that teacher preparation programs assume any responsibility for ensuring that secondary special education teachers are highly qualified, leaving the task up to districts instead. Only **14** states require secondary special education teachers to graduate highly qualified in even one content area.
- Unlike most other teachers, a HOUSSE route is needed for secondary special education teachers, so that they can achieve highly qualified status in all the subjects they teach. Not one state has a customized HOUSSE route for new secondary special education teachers.
- States give teacher preparation programs free rein over the professional coursework they require special education candidates to take. Programs that require the equivalent of three majors of professional coursework may be a deterrent to those considering a career in special education.

8. STATE POLICIES ARE NOT GEARED TOWARD INCREASING THE QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF MATH AND SCIENCE TEACHERS.

While states have put in place many boutique initiatives to address these shortages, structural adjustments would provide greater yield.

28

states support differential pay initiatives.

23

states attach too many strings to math and science teacher reciprocity.

- By not focusing on the equitable distribution of teachers, states shortchange the neediest children of qualified math and science teachers. Only **12** states have made even some progress to achieve this goal.
- Alternate route programs provide excellent means by which to recruit and prepare mid-career professionals with backgrounds in science and math. **32** states do not allow someone to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge by means of a test in lieu of their requirement of a major in the subject.
- The harder it is for teachers to move between states, the harder it is for a qualified math and science teacher to find a new job. Yet **23** states attach lots of strings before issuing an equivalent license to a teacher moving from out of state. Even worse, a qualified math and science teacher trying to find a new job but who was prepared in an alternate route may be greeted with an unwelcome sign in **38** states.
- Perhaps most key is the reality that there is such a shortage of math and science teachers because they can earn so much more money in other professions with these skills. **28** states support differential pay initiatives for teachers in shortage areas.

9. STATES' ALTERNATE ROUTES TO TEACHER CERTIFICATION LACK "TRUTH IN ADVERTISING."

Despite the perception of a proliferation of alternate routes, in reality, alternate routes often mirror traditional routes or appear to be emergency certificates in disguise.

- Of the **48** states that claim to offer alternate routes, only **6** states offer a genuine alternate route to licensure. **15** states offer alternate route programs that need significant revision, while **27** states offer disingenuous alternate routes that more closely resemble traditional or emergency routes than alternatives.
- By and large, alternate routes are not designed to meet the needs of nontraditional candidates. Only **16** states have admissions criteria that are flexible and allow individuals to demonstrate content knowledge by passing an examination.
- Only **4** states require alternate route programs to measure and report the academic achievement of the students of alternate route teachers.

48

states *claim* to offer an alternate route to teacher certification.

6

states *offer* a genuine alternate route to teacher certification.

10. THE INTERESTS OF ADULTS FREQUENTLY COME BEFORE THE NEEDS OF THE CHILDREN.

Far too many accommodations are made for teachers in the areas of testing, tenure and evaluations, risking the possibility that too many children could suffer significant academic harm from a bad teacher.

- Only **3** states require teachers to pass licensure examinations before beginning to teach, with many states allowing three or more years to pass exams. This proves unfair to the students in these teachers' classrooms, who may not be learning from knowledgeable educators.
- Only **4** states require classroom effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion for evaluating teacher performance, with other states giving equal weight to factors such as attending faculty meetings.
- With the exception of only **2** states, teachers are not required to work for at least **5** years before earning tenure—which makes it much more difficult to dismiss them if they are ineffective.
- By not judging teacher preparation programs on the classroom effectiveness of their graduates, states are allowing failing programs to continue to produce teachers who may do more harm than good in the classroom. Only **9** states use data regarding the effectiveness of program graduates as a means of determining whether to approve the programs.
- Perpetuating the vicious cycle of poverty, few states have set any benchmarks for recruiting and retaining teachers for high-needs schools.

3

states require teachers to pass licensure tests before entering the classroom.

4

states require classroom effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion for evaluating teacher performance.

Figure 1 Executive Summary
States Successfully Addressing Teacher Quality Goals

AREA 1 Meeting NCLB Teacher Quality Objectives	 Best Practice	 States Meeting Goal
Goal A Equitable Distribution of Teachers		Connecticut
Goal B Elementary Teacher Preparation	Massachusetts	California, Oregon
Goal C Secondary Teacher Preparation		Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia, West Virginia
Goal D Veteran Teachers Path to HQT		Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming
Goal E Standardizing Credentials		Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, New Jersey, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia

AREA 2 Teacher Licensure		
Goal A Defining Professional Knowledge	Colorado, New York, Texas	
Goal B Meaningful Licenses		Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
Goal C Interstate Portability		Alabama, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, South Dakota, Texas, Washington
Goal D Teacher Prep in Reading Instruction	Massachusetts, Virginia	Tennessee, Texas
Goal E Distinguishing Promising Teachers		Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia

AREA 3 Teacher Evaluation and Compensation		
Goal A Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness	Florida	South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas
Goal B Using Value-Added	Tennessee	Ohio
Goal C Teacher Evaluation	Pennsylvania	Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, New York, Oklahoma, Washington
Goal D Compensation Reform	Florida	Iowa
Goal E Tenure	Indiana, Missouri	

Figure 1 (continued) Executive Summary
States Successfully Addressing Teacher Quality Goals







AREA 4 State Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs		 Best Practice	 States Meeting Goal
Goal A	Entry Into Preparation Programs		Connecticut, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia
Goal B	Program Accountability		Alabama ¹ , Louisiana ¹
Goal C	Program Approval and Accreditation		Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
Goal D	Controlling Coursework Creep	New Jersey, Tennessee	
AREA 5 Alternate Routes to Certification			
Goal A	Genuine Alternatives		Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland
Goal B	Limiting Alternate Routes to Teachers with Strong Credentials		Arizona, Arkansas
Goal C	Program Accountability		Kentucky ¹
Goal D	Interstate Portability	Georgia	Alabama, Colorado, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
AREA 6 Preparation of Special Education Teachers			
Goal A	Special Education Teacher Preparation		New Mexico ¹ , North Carolina ¹ , Texas ¹ , Virginia ¹
Goal B	Elementary Special Education Teachers		Massachusetts, Oregon
Goal C	Secondary Special Education Teachers		Michigan ¹ , New Jersey ¹
Goal D	Special Education Teachers and HQT		

¹ While no state met this goal, this state came close.

Figure 2 Area Summary
Grade Chart

	Meeting NCLB Teacher Quality Objectives	Teacher Licensure	Teacher Evaluation and Compensation	State Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs	Alternate Routes to Certification	Preparation of Special Education Teachers	
Alabama	C	B	D	C	C	D	Weak but Progressing
Alaska	D	D	D	F	F	F	Last in Class
Arizona	C	C	D	D	C	F	Unsatisfactory
Arkansas	D	C	C	D	B	D	Weak but Progressing
California	C	C	D	D	C	D	Needs Significant Improvement
Colorado	D	B	D	D	C	D	Needs Significant Improvement
Connecticut	C	D	C	C	C	F	Needs Significant Improvement
Delaware	C	D	C	D	C	D	Needs Significant Improvement
District of Columbia	D	C	D	F	D	F	Languishing
Florida	C	C	B	C	C	F	Weak but Progressing
Georgia	C	C	C	F	B	D	Weak but Progressing
Hawaii	D	D	D	D	F	F	Last in Class
Idaho	D	D	D	F	D	F	Last in Class
Illinois	C	D	D	D	D	D	Unsatisfactory
Indiana	D	D	D	D	D	F	Languishing
Iowa	D	D	C	D	F	D	Languishing
Kansas	C	D	D	D	D	D	Unsatisfactory
Kentucky	D	D	D	D	B	F	Unsatisfactory
Louisiana	C	D	C	C	C	D	Weak but Progressing
Maine	D	D	F	F	D	F	Last in Class
Maryland	D	C	D	F	B	F	Unsatisfactory
Massachusetts	B	B	D	D	C	C	Weak but Ahead of the Class
Michigan	C	C	D	D	D	D	Unsatisfactory
Minnesota	D	D	D	D	F	F	Last in Class
Mississippi	C	C	D	C	C	D	Weak but Progressing
Missouri	D	D	C	D	C	D	Unsatisfactory
Montana	D	D	D	D	F	F	Last in Class
Nebraska	D	D	D	D	F	F	Last in Class
Nevada	D	D	D	D	F	F	Last in Class
New Hampshire	D	D	D	D	C	D	Unsatisfactory
New Jersey	B	C	C	D	B	C	Weak but Ahead of the Class
New Mexico	C	D	C	D	D	D	Unsatisfactory
New York	C	C	C	D	D	D	Needs Significant Improvement
North Carolina	C	D	C	C	D	D	Needs Significant Improvement
North Dakota	C	D	D	D	F	D	Languishing
Ohio	D	C	D	D	D	F	Languishing
Oklahoma	C	C	C	D	C	D	Weak but Progressing
Oregon	C	D	D	D	F	D	Languishing
Pennsylvania	D	D	C	D	D	F	Languishing
Rhode Island	D	D	D	D	F	D	Languishing
South Carolina	C	C	B	C	D	F	Weak but Progressing
South Dakota	C	D	D	D	D	D	Unsatisfactory
Tennessee	C	C	C	B	C	D	Weak but Ahead of the Class
Texas	C	B	C	D	C	C	Weak but Ahead of the Class
Utah	C	D	D	F	D	D	Languishing
Vermont	C	D	D	D	D	F	Languishing
Virginia	C	B	D	C	C	D	Weak but Progressing
Washington	C	C	D	D	C	F	Unsatisfactory
West Virginia	C	C	D	C	D	D	Needs Significant Improvement
Wisconsin	C	F	D	D	F	D	Languishing
Wyoming	D	D	D	D	F	D	Languishing

Figure 3 Goal Summary
Progress Toward Meeting Teacher Quality Goals

						
	Best practice	Fully meets	Nearly meets	Meets in part	Meets small part	Does not meet
Alabama	0	5	3	6	8	5
Alaska	0	1	4	0	6	16
Arizona	0	4	1	4	8	10
Arkansas	0	4	6	3	8	6
California	0	2	3	9	5	8
Colorado	1	4	1	6	9	6
Connecticut	0	7	1	4	6	9
Delaware	0	4	3	5	8	7
District of Columbia	0	2	4	1	5	15
Florida	2	3	4	5	6	7
Georgia	1	5	1	7	6	7
Hawaii	0	2	2	2	8	13
Idaho	0	1	2	8	3	13
Illinois	0	2	3	3	10	9
Indiana	1	2	0	2	6	16
Iowa	0	2	0	6	9	10
Kansas	0	1	2	6	7	11
Kentucky	0	2	3	4	9	9
Louisiana	0	4	6	4	6	7
Maine	0	3	0	3	2	19
Maryland	0	2	2	7	5	11
Massachusetts	2	6	3	4	5	7
Michigan	0	2	3	8	7	7
Minnesota	0	2	1	6	3	15
Mississippi	0	3	3	4	11	6
Missouri	1	2	4	2	7	11
Montana	0	1	1	1	7	17
Nebraska	0	1	2	1	11	12
Nevada	0	1	2	5	3	16
New Hampshire	0	2	2	4	5	14
New Jersey	1	3	8	6	3	6
New Mexico	0	3	1	7	8	8
New York	1	2	6	6	5	7
North Carolina	0	2	3	8	3	11
North Dakota	0	2	2	4	5	14
Ohio	0	4	1	3	8	11
Oklahoma	0	5	4	4	8	6
Oregon	0	3	2	2	6	14
Pennsylvania	1	1	2	6	9	8
Rhode Island	0	1	3	3	6	14
South Carolina	0	4	4	5	7	7
South Dakota	0	4	0	2	8	13
Tennessee	2	5	3	2	8	7
Texas	1	5	4	4	9	4
Utah	0	2	1	5	6	13
Vermont	0	2	2	3	6	14
Virginia	1	3	7	4	9	3
Washington	0	4	4	4	6	9
West Virginia	0	6	2	4	9	6
Wisconsin	0	2	1	5	5	14
Wyoming	0	3	2	4	4	14

Individual State Reports and National Summary

AVAILABLE AT OUR WWW.NCTQ.ORG/STPY

The *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* consists of 52 separate reports: a national summary and individual state reports for each state and the District of Columbia. These reports can be downloaded at: www.nctq.org/stpy. The website also includes a searchable interface to track data included in the yearbook across states.

Acknowledgments

STATES

Our most important partners in this effort have been state education agencies, whose extensive experience has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Every state formally received two different drafts of the *Yearbook* for comment and correction, first in spring 2006 and again in December 2006. States also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but three states graciously responded to our many, many inquiries. While states have not always agreed with our approaches, most have exhibited a remarkable willingness to reflect upon the impact of their current policies—and to acknowledge that the system needs fixing.

FUNDERS

NCTQ owes a great debt of gratitude to the pioneer funders for this first edition of the *State Teacher Policy Yearbook*:

- Achelis Foundation
- Bodman Foundation
- Daniels Fund
- Fisher Family Foundation
- Gleason Foundation
- The Joyce Foundation
- Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation
- Koret Foundation
- The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation
- Martha Holden Jennings Foundation
- Milken Family Foundation
- The Teaching Commission
- Thomas B. Fordham Foundation

The National Council on Teacher Quality does not accept any direct funding from the federal government.

STAFF

NCTQ acknowledges the following individuals for their involvement in preparing this report. Our principal staff was Jess Castle and Sandi Jacobs. Area analysts were Andrew Campanella, Nicole Fernandez, Catherine Kelliher, Whitney Miller, Emma Snyder, and Danielle Wilcox. Research analysts included Emily Cohen, Eric Dang, Paige Donehower, Elizabeth McCorry, Tess Mullen and Nathan Sheely. Thank you to Colleen Hale at Summerhouse Studios who designed the print and web versions of the *Yearbook*.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Clara M. Lovett, *Chair*
President Emerita, *Northern Arizona University*

Stacey Boyd, *Vice-Chair and Treasurer*
Founder, *The Savvy Source for Parents*

Danielle Wilcox, *Secretary and Founding Chair*
Consultant

Chester E. Finn, Jr.
President, *The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation*

Ira Fishman
Partner, *Patton Boggs LLP*

Marti Watson Garlett
Vice President, *Laureate Education, Inc.*

Jason Kamras
2005 *National Teacher of the Year*

Carol G. Peck
former National Superintendent of the Year/President
and CEO, *Rodel Charitable Foundation of Arizona*

Andrew J. Rotherham
Founder and Co-Director, *Education Sector*

Kirk T. Schroder
former President, *Virginia State Board of Education*/
Partner, *Schroder Fidlow, PLC*

Kate Walsh, *President*
National Council on Teacher Quality

ADVISORY BOARD

Steven J. Adamowski, Superintendent
Hartford Public Schools

Roy E. Barnes, former Governor of Georgia
The Barnes Law Group

Alan D. Bersin, former Secretary of Education, California
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

Lawrence S. Braden, Teacher
Saint Paul's School, New Hampshire

Cynthia Brown, Director of Education Policy
Center for American Progress

Cheryl Ellis, School Director
Sugar Creek Charter School, North Carolina

Michael Feinberg, Co-Founder
The Kipp Foundation

Ronald F. Ferguson, Professor
Harvard University

Eleanor S. Gaines, Milken National Educator
Grayhawk Elementary School, Arizona

Michael Goldstein, CEO and Founder
The Match School, Massachusetts

Eric A. Hanushek, Senior Fellow
The Hoover Institution

Frederick M. Hess, Director of Education Policy Studies
American Enterprise Institute

Paul T. Hill, Director
Center on Reinventing Public Education

E.D. Hirsch, Founder and Chair
The Core Knowledge Foundation

Frank Keating, former Governor of Oklahoma
President & CEO, *American Council of Life Insurers*

Paul Kimmelman, Senior Advisor to the CEO
Learning Point Associates

Martin J. Koldyke, Founder and Chair
Academy for Urban School Leadership

Wendy Kopp, Founder and President
Teach For America

Hailly Korman, Teacher
122nd Street Elementary School, Los Angeles

Amy Jo Leonard, Teacher
Turtle Mountain Elementary School, North Dakota

Deborah M. McGriff, Executive Vice President
Edison Schools

Ellen Moir, Executive Director
*New Teacher Center, University of California,
Santa Cruz*

William Moloney, Commissioner of Education
Colorado Department of Education

Robert H. Pasternack, Vice President
Maximus Inc.

James A. Peyser, Chair
Massachusetts Board of Education

Michael Podgursky, Professor
*Department of Economics,
University of Missouri-Columbia*

Michelle Rhee, CEO and President
The New Teacher Project

Stefanie Sanford, Senior Policy Officer
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

Laura Schwedes, Teacher
KIPP: STAR College Prep Charter School

Lewis C. Solmon, President
National Institute for Excellence in Teaching

Thomas Toch, Founder and Co-Director
The Education Sector

Daniel Willingham, Professor
Department of Psychology, University of Virginia



National Council on Teacher Quality

1341 G Street NW, Suite 720, Washington, DC 20005

Tel: 202-393-0020 Fax: 202-478-0838 Web: www.nctq.org

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

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