# 2012 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

# Improving Teacher Preparation in Maryland



# **Acknowledgments**

### **STATES**

State education agencies remain our most important partners in this effort, and their continued cooperation has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Although this year's edition did not require the extensive review that the comprehensive editions require, we still wanted to make sure that we captured all relevant policy changes and that states' perspectives were represented. Every state formally received a draft of the policy updates we identified in July 2012 for comment and correction; states also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but one state responded to our inquiries. We thank the states for their ongoing willingness to engage in dialogue with us.

### **FUNDERS**

The primary funders for the 2012 Yearbook were:

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

■ The Joyce Foundation

Carnegie Corporation of New York

■ 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*Sarah Brody, *Project Assistant*Kathryn M. Doherty, *Special Contributor*Kelli Lakis, *Lead Researcher*Stephanie T. Maltz, *Researcher* 

Thank you to the team at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2012 *Yearbook*. Thanks also to Colleen Hale and Jeff Hale at EFA Solutions for the original *Yearbook* design and ongoing technical support.



# Improving Teacher Preparation in Maryland

The 2012 State Teacher Policy Yearbook puts a spotlight on the critical issue of teacher preparation. The 2011 edition of the Yearbook provided a comprehensive review of all aspects of states' teacher policies, and although considerable progress was noted in areas related to teacher effectiveness, the same could not be said for teacher preparation. While many states have made advancements in teacher evaluation and tenure requirements, teacher preparation has yet to capture states' attention.

Good preparation does not guarantee that teachers will ultimately be effective, but there is much more that can be done to help ensure that new teachers are "classroom ready." This edition of the *Yearbook* offers states a roadmap of their teacher preparation policies, identifying priorities that need critical attention and also identifying low-hanging fruit, policy changes that states can implement in relatively short order.



# Current Status of Maryland's Teacher Preparation Policy

Last year's *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* provided an in-depth analysis of each of the topics identified below. The 2012 score includes any policy changes identified in the last year. The symbol indicates a score increase from 2011.

Yearbook Goal	Торіс	2012 Score
1-A	Admission into Preparation Programs	
1-B	Elementary Teacher Preparation	
1-C	Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction	
1-D	Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics	0
1-E	Middle School Teacher Preparation	
1-F	Secondary Teacher Preparation	
1-G	Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science	
1-H	Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies	
1-I	Special Education Teacher Preparation	
1-J	Assessing Professional Knowledge	
1-K	K Student Teaching	
1-L	Teacher Preparation Program Accountability	0



# 2012 Policy Update for Maryland

Based on a review of state legislation, rules and regulations, NCTQ has identified the following recent policy changes in Maryland:

# Assessing Professional Knowledge

All elementary and secondary teachers must pass a Praxis pedagogy test. It is only a requirement for middle school teachers if they completed certification through transcript analysis or an alternate route program. www.ets.org/praxis

# Maryland Response to Policy Update

States were asked to review NCTQ's identified updates and also to comment on policy changes related to teacher preparation that have occurred in the last year, pending changes or teacher preparation in the state more generally. States were also asked to review NCTQ's analysis of teacher preparation authority (See Figure 20).

Maryland confirmed that the identified update accurately reflects policy changes related to teacher preparation. The state also confirmed that the descriptions in Figure 20 accurately reflect state authority for teacher preparation and licensing.

igure 1		
Delivering well- prepared teachers	2012 Grade	2011 Grade
Alabama	В-	C
Alaska	F	F
Arizona	D-	D-
Arkansas	С	С
California	D	D
Colorado	D	D-
Connecticut	C+	C-
Delaware	D-	D-
District of Columbia	D	D
Florida	B-	B-
Georgia	С	С
Hawaii	D	D
Idaho	D	D
Illinois	D	D
Indiana	B-	C+
lowa	D	D D
12.12	D+	D+
Kansas		
Kentucky	C+	C-
Louisiana	C	С
Maine	D+	D D
MARYLAND	D+	D+
Massachusetts	C+	C+
Michigan	D+	D+
Minnesota	C+	С
Mississippi	С	С
Missouri	D+	D+
Montana	F	F
Nebraska	D-	D-
Nevada	D-	D-
New Hampshire	C-	D
New Jersey	C-	D+
New Mexico	D+	D+
New York	C-	D+
North Carolina	D-	D-
North Dakota	D	D
Ohio	C-	D+
Oklahoma	С	С
Oregon	D-	D-
Pennsylvania	С	С
Rhode Island	С	D+
South Carolina	C-	C-
South Dakota	D	D
Tennessee	B-	B-
Texas	C+	C+
Utah	D	D
Vermont	C-	D+
Virginia	C-	C-
Washington	D+	D+
West Virginia	C-	C-
Wisconsin	D+	D
Wyoming	F	F
Average State Grade	D+	D

# **COMING SOON**

# **NCTQ Teacher Prep Review**

Preparing teachers to be effective and successful in the classroom requires both the strong state policy framework described in the *Year-book* and quality implementation by states' teacher preparation programs.

How are Maryland's programs doing? NCTQ will soon answer that question with our forthcoming review of the nation's higher education-based teacher preparation programs that produce 99 percent of traditionally-prepared teachers. The *Review* will find the programs that are doing the best job preparing tomorrow's educators, those that need to improve and those that need to be radically restructured.

The *Review* will be released in Spring 2013. Find out more at www.nctq.org/p/edschools.

For a sneak peek, see page 6.

# **Teacher Preparation Policy Checklist for States**

1.	Raise admission standards.	<ul> <li>Require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission into teacher preparation programs.</li> <li>Require preparation programs to use a common test normed to the general college-bound population.</li> </ul>
2.	Align teacher preparation with Common Core State Standards.	<ul> <li>Ensure that coursework and subject-matter testing for elementary teacher candidates are well aligned with standards.</li> <li>Ensure that teacher preparation programs prepare elementary teaching candidates in the science of reading instruction and require a rigorous assessment of reading instruction.</li> <li>Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.</li> </ul>
3.	Improve clinical preparation.	<ul> <li>Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.</li> <li>Require summative clinical experience for all prospective teachers that includes at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching.</li> </ul>
4.	Raise licensing standards.	<ul> <li>✓ Eliminate K-8 generalist licenses.</li> <li>✓ Require subject-matter testing for middle school teacher candidates.</li> <li>✓ Require subject-matter testing for secondary teacher candidates.</li> <li>✓ Require middle school and secondary science and social studies teachers to pass a test of content knowledge that ensures sufficient knowledge of the subjects taught.</li> </ul>
5.	Don't lower the bar for special education teachers.	<ul> <li>✓ Do away with K-12 special education teacher licenses.</li> <li>✓ Require special education teachers to pass a subject-matter test for licensure that is no less rigorous than what is required of general education candidates.</li> </ul>
6.	Hold teacher preparation programs accountable.	<ul> <li>Collect data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.</li> <li>Gather other meaningful data that reflect program performance.</li> <li>Establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.</li> <li>Produce and publish an annual report card for each teacher preparation program.</li> </ul>

# **Critical Issues for State Teacher Preparation Policy**

# **Critical Attention:** Admission into Teacher Preparation Programs



Maryland does not ensure that teacher preparation programs admit candidates with strong academic records.

The demands of K-12 classrooms today require teachers with strong academic backgrounds who can positively affect student learning. To ensure that such strong candidates enter classrooms, it is important to set rigorous standards for entry into the teacher pipeline. This begins with teacher preparation program admissions.

Looking to international examples, such top-performing countries as Finland and South Korea admit prospective teacher candidates from the top 10 percent of the college-going population. While a bar that high is a long way from average standards in the United States, it seems reasonable and appropriate that states should limit access to teacher preparation programs to those who are in the top half of the college-going population in terms of academic achievement.

Most states limit their academic screening to basic skills tests, which generally assess only middle school-level skills and which are generally only normed to the prospective teacher population.

At present, Maryland does not require prospective teachers to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs. Rather, the basic skills assessment requirement is delayed until teacher candidates are ready to apply for licensure.

Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, 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, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Illinois

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

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. Maryland should require candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, mathematics and writing prior to program admission. Importantly, candidates should be permitted to submit comparable scores on such rigorous tests as the SAT/ACT/GRE.

Require that programs use a common admissions test normed to the general collegebound population.

Maryland should require programs to use 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 while also facilitating 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, Maryland 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.

# SNEAK PEEK: Teacher Prep Review

Are Maryland's undergraduate teacher preparation programs in the *Review* sufficiently selective?

42% are not sufficiently selective.

The *Review* will be released in Spring 2013. Find out more at www.nctq.org/p/edschools.

New Hampshire is in the process of adopting a requirement that will make the test a condition of admission.

PETNORMETO COLLEGE.
ADMISSION TO PREP PROPERTO Figure 2 Do states appropriately test teacher candidates' academic proficiency? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware П 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 1 23 18 9

# **Critical Attention:** Elementary Teacher Preparation



Maryland does not ensure that new elementary teachers are ready to teach to the Common Core Standards.

To be effective, elementary teacher candidates need liberal arts coursework relevant to the K-6 classroom, and they should also be required to pass a rigorous content test that ensures appropriate subject-matter knowledge.

The Common Core State Standards, adopted by nearly all states including Maryland, represent an effort to significantly raise expectations for the knowledge and skills American students will need for college readiness and global competitiveness. And Maryland, like all states, must ensure that its teachers are prepared to teach to these high standards.

Although a "standards-based" approach grants greater flexibility to teacher preparation programs regarding program design, it is difficult to monitor or enforce absent a rigorous test. Further, alignment of preparation program instruction with student learning standards should be augmented with a broader and deeper content perspective than what will actually be taught in the elementary classroom.

Unfortunately, Maryland's policies fail to ensure that elementary teacher candidates will have the subject-area knowledge necessary to teach to these standards. The state does not require a subject-matter test that reports subscores in all areas, and its coursework requirements lack the specificity to guarantee relevancy to the elementary classroom. In addition, Maryland does not ensure that teachers

will be adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction, another key element of the Common Core

State Standards.

Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, MARYLAND, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, 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

Alabama, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, New Hampshire

Massachusetts

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

Require elementary teacher candidates to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all subjects.

Maryland should ensure that its elementary content test is appropriately aligned with the Common Core State Standards and require 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. Further, Maryland requires elementary teacher candidates to pass the Praxis II "Elementary Education: Instructional Practice and Applications" test, which is not an adequate assessment of content knowledge. The description of topics assessed and sample questions focus almost exclusively on methods and instructional strategies, and although it is a sound approach to assess pedagogical knowledge in the context of specific content areas, that does not mean that such a test measures content knowledge.

Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers and require candidates to pass a rigorous math assessment.

Although Maryland requires mathematics coursework, 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. Maryland should also require a rigorous assessment that reports a separate subscore for and evaluates mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenges candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts.

### ■ Require teacher candidates to pass a rigorous assessment in the science of reading instruction.

Maryland should require a rigorous reading assessment 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 if it is combined with an assessment that also tests general pedagogy or elementary content, it should report a subscore for the science of reading specifically.


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

Maryland should either articulate a specific set of standards or establish more comprehensive coursework requirements for elementary teacher candidates that align with the Common Core 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. Presently, Maryland requires that elementary education candidates complete a minimum of 12 semester hours in science and reading and nine semester hours in both English and social studies, but these requirements are too vague to ensure that teachers will be prepared to teach to the Common Core Standards.

## 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 Maryland take higher-level academic coursework. This 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.

Figure 3 Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of the science of reading?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama<sup>4</sup>, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota<sup>5</sup>, New Hampshire, New Mexico<sup>6</sup>, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina<sup>7</sup>, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
- 5. Based on the limited information available about the test on Minnesota's website.
- 6. Test is under development and not yet available for review.
- 7. North Carolina has adopted a task force recommendation to require the Foundations of Reading test. Rules have yet to be promulgated, including whether the test will be required for initial licensure. Current rules require such tests for professional licensure only.

Figure 4 Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?




- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, New York<sup>4</sup>, North Carolina<sup>5</sup>, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Montana, Nebraska
- 4. New York is in the process of developing a stand-alone math test.
- 5. North Carolina has adopted a task force recommendation to require the Massachusetts Test of General Curriculum, including the math subtest. Rules have yet to be promulgated, including whether the test will be required for initial licensure. Current rules require such tests for professional licensure only.
  - 1. Testing is not required for initial licensure.
  - 2. The required test is a questionable assessment of content knowledge, instead emphasizing methods and instructional strategies.
  - 3. Massachusetts requires a general curriculum test that does not report scores for each elementary subject. A separate score is reported for math (see Figure 4).
  - 4. North Carolina has adopted a task force recommendation to require the Massachusetts Test of General Curriculum. Rules have yet to be promulgated, including whether the test will be required for initial licensure. Current rules require such tests for professional licensure only.
  - 5. Oregon allows "alternative assessment" for candidates who fail twice.

Figure 5  Do states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?  Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Ilowa 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 O'regon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Vorginia Wisconsin Wyoming 9 9 9 29 4	Figure 5		Δ <sub>N</sub> / .	with /	/ Nith	
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South	Do states ensure that	\$	455 / 75 / Fest	, v / i		
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South	Do states ensure triat	W <sub>TE</sub>	te / 68/2	\$60r	/ / .	
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South	elementary teachers	20 8	£/5;		, [j. 6d]	
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire North Carolina North Carolina Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Caro	know core content?	17 A 1 S			, 'eq.	
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire North Carolina North Carolina Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Caro		T WI	eme,	Then!	test /	
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire North Carolina North Carolina Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Caro		450	Sep. El.	Ele,	/ %	
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 New Hampshire New Jersey New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South	Alahama					
Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Ilowa 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 Carol	Alaska				1	
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Ilowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine MARYLAND Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Wisconsin Wisconsin Wisconsin Usitaria Indiana In						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia   Florida   Georgia   Hawaii   Georgia   Hawaii   Georgia   Hawaii   Georgia   Geor						
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						
Maine         2           MARYLAND         2           Massachusetts         3           Michigan	· ·	_				
MARYLAND         2           Massachusetts         3           Michigan         0           Minnesota         0           Mississippi         0           Missouri         0           Montana         0           Nebraska         0           Nevada         0           New Hampshire         0           New Jersey         0           New Mexico         0           New York         0           North Carolina         0           North Dakota         0           Ohio         0           Oklahoma         0           Oregon         0           Pennsylvania         0           Rhode Island         0           South Carolina         0           South Dakota         0           Tennessee         0           Texas         0           Utah         0           Vermont         0           Virginia         0           West Virginia         0           Wyoming         0						
Massachusetts       3         Michigan       3         Minnesota       3         Mississippi       3         Missouri       3         Montana       3         Nebraska       3         Nevada       3         New Hampshire       3         New Hampshire       3         New Hampshire       3         New Mexico       3         New York       3         North Carolina       3         North Dakota       3         Ohio       3         Oklahoma       3         Oregon       3         Pennsylvania       3         Rhode Island       3         South Carolina       3         South Dakota       3         Tennessee       3         Texas       3         Utah       4         Vermont       4         Virginia       4         Washington       4         Wyoming       4				2		
Michigan                                 Minnesota                             Mississippi                             Missouri                             Montana                             Nebraska                             Nevada                               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                               <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td>				3		
Minnesota                               Mississippi                           Missouri                           Montana                           Nebraska                           Nevada                           New Hampshire                           New Jersey                             New Mexico                             New York                             North Carolina                               Ohio                               Oklahoma                               Oregon                               Pennsylvania                                 Rhode Island                               South Carolina                               South Dakota                               Tennessee                                 Texas                               Utah                               Vermont                               Virginia                               West Virginia                                 Wyoming						
Mississippi Missouri  Montana Nebraska  Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin 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 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						
Nebraska  Nevada  New Hampshire  New Jersey  New Mexico  New York  North Carolina  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
New Hampshire  New Jersey  New Mexico  New York  North Carolina  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  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  Wisconsin  Wyoming				2		
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 Mexico  New York  North Carolina  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming	· ·					
New York North Carolina Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wyoming	•					
North Carolina  North Dakota  Ohio  Oklahoma  Oregon  Pennsylvania  Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wyoming						
North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					4	
Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	North Dakota					
Oregon  Pennsylvania Rhode Island  South Carolina South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	Oklahoma					
Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming			5			
Rhode Island  South Carolina  South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming	-					
South Dakota  Tennessee  Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming				2		
Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming	South Dakota					
Texas  Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
Utah  Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
Vermont  Virginia  Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming						
Washington  West Virginia  Wisconsin  Wyoming	Virginia					
West Virginia	_					
Wisconsin	_					
Wyoming $\square$	_					
3 3 L3 4		٥	٥	20	4	
		9	9	23		

Figure 6				IGLISH		/			NCE				OCIA					/	FINE ARTS
Do states expect elementary teachers		ure	Writing/C	Imposition mar/ Children's Literat	lure /			Earth Co.	Biology/Life Science	e /	7	/ / /	World LI:	World H.	World His		///	/	/ /
to have in-depth		<sup>'t</sup> erat	/ Life	amm, iters		/	′ /	'Sical	, S <sub>Cie</sub> ,		,isto	/sto	,0/e/	2/	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	3 3	//		
knowledge of	ć			sitio n's L	// /	\$/,	. / 2		\	, 'é		£ / ,		ž / i	7 / His	Vest 1		5/	
core content?	<sup>4</sup> meri	World/Rriv.	S iti	Children's Liters	Chemis	Physics		Earth C.	8,00	American	4meric	America.	Norla	Morld	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Geograph.	Art Histor	Music	/
Alabama			*																
Alaska																			
Arizona			*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*		*	
Arkansas																			
California			*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*	
Colorado																			
Connecticut										*	*								
Delaware																			
District of Columbia																			
Florida			*		*		*	*	*			*				*			
Georgia			*					*			X					*			
Hawaii																			
Idaho																			
Illinois								T A				T A				X			
Indiana				_		Ц	***					*						*	
lowa								<b>A</b>								<u> </u>			
Kansas						Ц	*	*	*							*			
Kentucky																			
Louisiana																			
Maine																			
MARYLAND Massachusetts																			
Michigan Minnesota																			
Mississippi																			
Missouri																			
Montana								-											
Nebraska			-																
Nevada																			
New Hampshire																			
New Jersey											_		_	_					
New Mexico			*															*	
New York									$\overline{\Box}$										
North Carolina																			
North Dakota	П																		
Ohio																			
Oklahoma			*				*	*	*			*				*			
Oregon			*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	
Pennsylvania																			
Rhode Island																			
South Carolina																			
South Dakota																			
Tennessee			*				*	*	*			*				*			
Texas			*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*	
Utah																			
Vermont																			
Virginia			*		*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Washington			*				*	*	*			*				*		*	
West Virginia																			
Wisconsin																			
Wyoming																			


Figure 7
Where do states set the passing score on elementary content licensure tests<sup>1</sup>?



<sup>1</sup> Based on the most recent technical data that could be obtained; data not available for Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon and Washington. Montana and Nebraska do not require a content test. Colorado score is for Praxis II, not PLACE. Alabama, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Utah and Vermont now require the Multiple Subjects test and Maryland, Nevada and South Carolina now require the Instructional Practice and Applications test. Both are new Praxis tests for which technical data are not yet available; analysis is based on previously required test.

Figure 8

Teacher licensing structure in Maryland



# Critical Attention: Middle School Teacher Preparation



Maryland could do more to ensure that new middle school teachers will be prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

The middle school years are critical to students' education, yet the preparation and licensure requirements for middle school teachers often do not ensure that they are sufficiently prepared to teach grade-level content.

Too many states fail to distinguish the knowledge and skills needed by middle school teachers from those needed by an elementary teacher. Whether teaching a single subject in a departmentalized setting or teaching multiple subjects in a self-contained classroom, middle school teachers must be able to teach significantly more advanced content than what elementary teachers are expected to teach.

Commendably, Maryland does not offer a K-8 generalist license, and all new middle school teachers are required to pass a Praxis II single-subject content test to attain licensure. However, the state 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. This is especially worrisome considering

Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

MARYLAND, Massachusetts, New York

Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia

elementary teachers in the state are only required to pass the Praxis II "Elementary Education: Instructional Practice and Applications" test, which is not even an adequate assessment of content knowledge for elementary teachers.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

■ Ensure that all middle school teachers are prepared to teach grade level content.

Maryland's policy allowing elementary teachers to teach in departmentalized middle schools places students at risk of having teachers who are not adequately prepared to teach core academic areas at the middle school level. This is not mitigated by the requirement that only half of such teachers' time can be spent teaching middle school students.

o states distinguish i	middle oo	K-8 license offered for	100 / p	
rade preparation fro	m ,⊗	/fere	There	
lementary preparati	on? 💥	"nse c	K-8 license offered	
	5/78	8 lice	8 lice	Bible standards procure control for electric scale and the plant of the report of the first of control of the c
	4	self.	/ 4	
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California		1		
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois	2			
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				
Onio Oklahoma			3	
Oregon			4	
Pennsylvania			_	
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				1. California offers a K-12 generalist license
Tennessee				for self-contained classrooms.
Texas				2. Illinois has repealed its K-9 license and is in
Utah				the process of revising middle school certifi- cation requirements.
Vermont				3. With the exception of mathematics.
Virginia				
Washington				4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.
West Virginia				5. Wisconsin offers 1-8 license.
Wisconsin			5	
Wyoming				
	32	5	14	

Do middle school teache nave to pass an appropr	iate	No, test does not all core subscores.	No, K-8 license require	No, testing of all subjects	
content test in every cor		1 4°CO	licens	No, testing of	
ubject they are licensed		ort su		test requi	
o teach?	YES		\	\ \delta	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California				1	
Colorado					
Connecticut Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho			2		
Illinois			3		
Indiana					
Iowa				4	
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine MARYLAND	5				
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					_
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey New Mexico					
New York	6				
North Carolina					1. Ca
North Dakota					to
Ohio					2. Fo
Oklahoma					3. Illi
Oregon			7		is
Pennsylvania					ce
Rhode Island					4. lt i
South Carolina					ca
South Dakota					5. Ma
Tennessee					th
Texas					wi 6. Fo
Utah Vermont					in
Virginia					pa 7.6
Washington					7. Ca m
West Virginia					te:
Wisconsin					Cd
Wyoming					

- Candidates teaching multiple subjects only have to pass the elementary test.
- 2. For K-8 license, Idaho also requires a singlesubject test.
- Illinois has repealed its K-9 license. The state is in the process of revising its middle school certification requirements.
- It is unclear how new legislation will affect testing requirements for middle school candidates.
- 5. 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.
- 7. Candidates opting for middle-level endorsement may either complete a major or pass a content test. Oregon allows "alternative assessment" for candidates who fail twice.

# **Critical Attention:** Secondary Teacher Preparation



Maryland could do more to ensure that new secondary teachers will be prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Secondary teachers must be experts in the subject matter they teach, and only a rigorous test ensures that teacher candidates are sufficiently and appropriately knowledgeable in their content area. Coursework is generally only indicative of background in a subject area; even a major offers no certainty of what content has been covered.

Yet not all states ensure that secondary teachers have sufficient content knowledge in the subjects they are licensed to teach. And nearly all states—even those that do generally require content testing for secondary teachers—allow some science and/or social studies teachers to teach with broad licenses that have significant loopholes.

Most high school science courses are specialized, and the teachers of these subjects are not interchangeable. Nonetheless, most states allow teachers to obtain general science or combination licenses across multiple science disciplines, and, in most cases, these teachers need only pass a general knowledge science exam that does not ensure subject-specific content knowledge. This means that a teacher with a background in biology could be fully certified to teach advanced chemistry or

physics having passed only a general science test—and perhaps answering most of the chemistry or physics questions incorrectly.

Just as with broad field science, most states offer a general social studies license at the secondary level. For this certification, teachers can have a background in a wide variety of fields, ranging from history and political science to anthropology and psychology. Under such a license a teacher who majored in psychology could teach history to high school students having passed only a general knowledge test and answering most—and perhaps all—history questions incorrectly.

Commendably, Maryland requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a Praxis II content test to teach any core secondary subjects. Although Maryland does not offer a general science certification for secondary teachers, it does have a physical science certification, which combines both chemistry and physics. The state also offers secondary certification in general social studies. Teachers with these licenses are not required to pass individual content tests for each discipline they are permitted to teach. Maryland also offers single-subject certifications in geography, history and political science, but candidates are only required to pass the general social studies test.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

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

By allowing a combination certification—and only requiring a comprehensive content exam—Maryland is not ensuring that these secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. The

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming

Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, MARYLAND, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Indiana, Minnesota, Tennessee

state's required assessment combines physics, chemistry and general science and does not report separate scores for each subject area.

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—Maryland 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.

It is unclear at this point how new legislation will affect content test requirements for secondary teachers.

Figure 11  Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area they are licensed to teach?  Alchara								
area they are licensed to teach?	1 Es 1	/o <sub>000</sub>	104doo;	/%				
Alabama		- /						
Alaska								
Arizona Arkansas								
California								
Colorado	Н							
Connecticut	П			_				
Delaware								
District of Columbia								
Florida								
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho								
Illinois								
Indiana								
Iowa <sup>1</sup> Kansas								
Kentucky								
Louisiana								
Maine	Н							
MARYLAND	П							
Massachusetts								
Michigan								
Minnesota								
Mississippi								
Missouri								
Montana								
Nebraska								
Nevada	Ц							
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								
	3	28	34	12				

# **Critical Attention:** Special Education Teacher Preparation



Maryland could do more to ensure that new special education teachers will know the subject matter that they will be required to teach.

Across the country, states are raising performance expectations to ensure that students who graduate from high school are college and career ready. These more rigorous standards apply to special education students just as they do to other students. The challenge of ensuring that teachers are prepared to teach to the new Common Core State Standards is even more pronounced for special education teachers, who typically have had to meet an even lower bar for content preparation than general educators. And certification rules for special education teachers that do not differentiate between teaching at the elementary and secondary levels only exacerbate the problem.

Allowing a generic K-12 special education certification makes it virtually impossible and certainly impractical for states to ensure that these teachers know all the subject matter they are expected to teach; this issue is just as valid in terms of pedagogical knowledge.

While a K-12 special education license may be appropriate for 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.

Commendably, Maryland does not offer a K-12 special education certification. However, this policy is undermined because the state requires an even lower bar for its elementary special education teachers than for its general elementary teachers, who are already held to a low bar that does not ensure that these teachers will be prepared to teach to the Common Core State Standards, as noted in the elementary section. Further, secondary special education teachers are not required to pass content tests.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

Provide a broad liberal arts program of study to elementary special education candidates and require that they pass the same content test as general education teachers.

Maryland should ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess knowledge of the subject matter at hand. Not only should the state require core-subject coursework relevant to the elementary classroom, but it should also require that these candidates pass the same subject-matter test required of all elementary teachers. Failure to ensure that teachers possess requisite content knowledge deprives special education students of the opportunity to reach their academic potential.

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming

Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, MARYLAND, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin

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

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

Offes K. 12 and 81 ade-specific Figure 12 Do states distinguish between elementary and secondary special education teachers? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine **MARYLAND** Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas 1 Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 16 10 25

Figure 13 Which states require subject-matter testing for special education teachers?

Elementary Subject-Matter	Test
Required for an elementary special education license	Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Oregon <sup>1</sup> , Pennsylvania <sup>2</sup> , Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia <sup>3</sup> , Wisconsin
Required for a K-12 special education license	Colorado, Idaho
Secondary Subject-Matter T	est(s)
Tests in all core subjects required for secondary special education license	None
Test in at least one subject required for secondary special education license	Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York <sup>4</sup> , Oregon <sup>1</sup> , Pennsylvania <sup>2</sup> , Rhode Island, West Virginia <sup>3</sup>
Required for a K-12 special education license	None

- 1. Although Oregon requires testing, the state allows an "alternative assessment" option for candidates who fail twice.
- 2. 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.
- 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 dual certification as a reading specialist are similarly exempted from the content test.
- 4. New York requires a multi-subject content test specifically geared to secondary special education candidates. It is divided into three subtests.

# **Critical Attention:** Student Teaching



Maryland does not ensure that teacher preparation programs will provide teacher candidates with a high-quality summative clinical experience.

The importance of clinical practice in teacher preparation has become a major area of focus. Student teaching is the final clinical experience of teacher preparation, and teacher candidates have only one chance to experience the best possible placement. Student teaching will shape candidates' own performance as teachers and help determine the type of school in which they will choose to teach. A mediocre student teaching experience, let alone a disastrous one, can never be undone.

Central to the quality of the student teaching experience is the classroom teacher who serves as the teacher candidate's mentor, or cooperating teacher. Only strong teachers with evidence of their effectiveness, as assessed by objective measures of student learning and the teachers' principals, should be able to serve as cooperating teachers. Yet placement is much more likely to be the luck of the draw. NCTQ's recent study *Student Teaching in the United States* found that three out of four teacher preparation programs fail to require that cooperating teachers must be effective instructors.

Maryland not only fails to articulate any requirements for cooperating teachers, but the state also does not require an adequate duration for the student teaching experience.

Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, 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, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

5

Florida, Indiana, Tennessee

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

■ 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 Maryland 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.

■ Make the state's teacher evaluation system the basis for selecting cooperating teachers.

Maryland requires objective measures of student growth to be the preponderant 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.

■ Require teacher candidates to spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

Maryland should require a summative clinical experience for all prospective teachers. Student teaching should be a full-time commitment, as requiring coursework and student teaching simultaneously does a disservice to both. Alignment with a school calendar for at least 10 weeks ensures both adequate classroom experience and exposure to a variety of ancillary professional activities.

		1	
Figure 14	85		
Do states require	\$\$	\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \&\ \	
the elements of a	\$ B. C.	255	
high-quality student	847 845 WESS	WEB VEB	
teaching experience?	COOPERATING TEACHER	FULL TIME STUDENT LEAST TO WERGS AT	
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana <sup>1</sup>			
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			1. Based on new REPA II regulations.
Virginia			Candidates can student teach for
Washington		2	less than 12 weeks if determined
West Virginia Wisconsin			to be proficient.
Wyoming			
vvyonning			
	3	28	

# **Critical Attention:** Teacher Preparation Program Accountability



Maryland does not hold its teacher preparation programs accountable for the effectiveness of the teachers they produce.

Teacher preparation programs operate by virtue of state approval. As such, it is up to states to connect that approval to accountability measures that ensure that all approved programs meet minimum performance standards. Such an accountability system informs the public—including prospective teachers seeking a program as well as districts hiring graduates—by shining a light on high performers as well as identifying those programs performing poorly.

Further, as more states begin to raise expectations for teachers by way of evaluations focused on effectiveness, there is an even greater need to hold teacher preparation programs accountable for the effectiveness of the teachers they produce. Although the quality of both the subject-matter preparation and professional sequence is crucial, there are also additional measures that can provide the state and the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing when it comes to preparing teachers to be successful in the classroom.

Maryland collects some performance data on its alternate route programs, including principal and teacher satisfaction ratings. The state does not collect this or any other kind of objective, program-specific data for its traditional preparation pro-

grams, nor has it established minimum performance standards that can be used for accountability purposes. Further, Maryland does not provide the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing.

According to Maryland's winning Race to the Top application, the state plans to use student growth measures in its teacher preparation program approval process. The state indicated that it would begin to publish these data by fall 2013 and by fall 2014, would use the data for program improvement, including closing those programs with poor track records. However, there is no evidence to date of specific policy to support and sustain these plans.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

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

As one way to measure whether programs are producing effective classroom teachers, Maryland 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. While Maryland has outlined its intentions to collect this data in its RttT application, the state should codify these requirements.

■ Collect other meaningful, program-level 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 there-

Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, MARYLAND, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas

Florida, Louisiana

fore include other objective measures that show how well all programs are preparing teachers for the classroom, such as:

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

### Establish minimum standards of performance.

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. Maryland should be mindful of setting rigorous standards for program performance, as its current requirement that 80 percent of program graduates pass the state's licensing tests is too low a bar. Programs should be held accountable for meeting rigorous 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.

Maryland should codify policy requiring an annual report card that shows all data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs to 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 teacher preparation program approval.

Maryland has blurred the line between the public process of state program approval and the private process of national accreditation by requiring accreditation for program approval. Maryland requires institutions with 2,000 or more full-time equivalent students to receive and maintain national accreditation through NCATE in conjunction with state program approval. Maryland should not cede its authority and must ensure that it is the state that considers the evidence of program performance, no matter the program size, and makes the decision about whether programs should continue to be authorized to prepare teachers.

Figure 15



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

Figure 16				
_	hor			
Do states hold teac		, 22 /	/ #	
preparation progra	ıms 🖠		7 LEBS	
accountable?	9		VES. VOV.	
		DAR S	DATA PUBLICLY AVAILABLE ON WEE	
	F. 8.	574N	DA7.	
Alabama	~ ~ .	-1 W	2	
Alaska	_			
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado <sup>3</sup>				
Connecticut	_			
Delaware	4			
District of Columbia	_			
Florida			2	
Georgia			2	
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana <sup>5</sup>				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky			2	
Louisiana	-			
Maine <sup>1</sup>				
MARYLAND	4			
Massachusetts				
Michigan	-	1		
Minnesota				
Mississippi	1			
Missouri				
Montana	1			
Nebraska				
Nevada <sup>1</sup>				
New Hampshire <sup>6</sup>				
New Jersey <sup>1</sup>				
New Mexico	_			
New York				
North Carolina			1	
North Dakota	_			
Ohio <sup>1</sup>				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania <sup>1</sup>				
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup>				
South Carolina <sup>1</sup>				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia <sup>1</sup>				
Washington	4			
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
.1,0111116				
	33	5	15	

### **TEACHER PRODUCTION IN MARYLAND**

States have long established requirements for teacher preparation and licensure and have lately turned their attention toward accountability systems for preparation programs. But one topic that has received little attention from states is the issue of 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; the relationship between these numbers has important implications for related policymaking.

States are rightly focused on areas of chronic teacher shortages, such as secondary mathematics and science, but little consideration is given to areas of consistent oversupply, particularly the overproduction in most states of elementary teachers. While it is certainly desirable to produce a big enough pool to give districts choice in hiring, the substantial oversupply in some teaching areas is not good for the profession. Limited resources are squandered on individuals who will not go on to teach, most critically the scarce supply of student teaching placements with effective cooperating teachers. Admissions criteria, licensure requirements and program accountability standards may be unnecessarily depressed if the dots are not connected from graduation to certification to actual employment in a district.

Maryland's "Teacher Staffing Report" provides a model for other states. Published biennially, the report has been tracking staffing trends in the state for almost three decades. While its primary purpose is to determine teacher shortage areas, it also identifies areas of surplus. By collecting hiring data from districts, Maryland has a rich set of data that can inform policy decisions.

The latest edition of the "Teacher Staffing Report" can be found at: http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/certification/progapproval/mtsr.

- 1. Traditional preparation only.
- 2. Reported institutional data do not distinguish between candidates in the traditional and alternate route programs.
- 3. Required, but not yet available.
- 4. Alternate routes only.
- 5. Based on new REPA II regulations.
- 6. New Hampshire is in the process of adopting new reporting requirements.

Figure 17			National acceptation is	
_		Overlap of accrediation	£ / .	, 1,07.al
What is the relationship		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	tion,	de L
between state program	δοW		oval edita	(A)
approval and national	\$ A			
accreditation?	# # O	erlap state	ional	
	572 APPA	\ 0 pu	\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	
Alabama	STATE HAS ITS OWN.			
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California		1		
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine		1		
MARYLAND				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi Missouri		'		
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon			ī	
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia		1		
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	8	31	12	
	J	<i>3</i> i	12	



There are some areas where a small adjustment would result in significantly stronger policy. Here are some issues that represent low-hanging fruit, policies that can be addressed in relatively short order.

- To ensure adequate subject-area knowledge, Maryland should require secondary teachers who obtain a combination science or general social studies certification to pass individual content tests (or a composite test that reports individual subscores) for each discipline they will be licensed to teach, as noted in the secondary critical attention section.
- Maryland should require all elementary special education teacher candidates to pass the same content test as general elementary education candidates. Special education students, like all students, are expected to meet the Common Core State Standards. The state puts special education students at a disadvantage in meeting these expectations if their teachers are held to lower requirements for content knowledge.
- Maryland is encouraged to close the loophole that allows elementary teachers to teach in departmentalized middle schools if at least 50 percent of the teaching assignment is within the elementary education grades. Allowing teachers with only elementary certification to teach middle grades without additional content testing requirements is especially worrisome considering that elementary teachers in the state are only required to pass the Praxis II "Elementary Education: Instructional Practice and Applications" test, which is an inadequate assessment of content knowledge for elementary teachers.
- To ensure that they have strong reading, mathematics and writing skills, Maryland should require that teacher candidates achieve a minimum passing score for each subject tested on the basic skills test. At present, an overall composite score can be used to pass the test, meaning that a candidate might be able to compensate for a poor score in one subject area with better performance on the others.
- As a first step toward using an assessment for admission to a teacher preparation program that compares candidates to the general college-going population, Maryland should allow teacher candidates to submit ACT/SAT/GRE scores that demonstrate academic proficiency.



1. National accreditation can be substituted for state approval.

# **Alternate Routes to Certification**

The policies discussed in the "Critical Attention" section of this report primarily focus on traditional teacher preparation programs because such programs presently train the vast majority of new teachers. Of course, there are some teachers that attain licensure outside of these traditional programs. Alternate routes to certification were developed based on the idea that there should be pathways into the teaching profession for nontraditional candidates who are able to demonstrate strong subject-area knowledge and an above-average academic background.

Unfortunately, most states have considerable work to do to make their alternate routes viable pathways into the teaching profession. Considerable variation remains in both the quality of states' routes and how much of an alternative to traditional preparation such routes actually provide.

A high-quality, genuinely alternative licensure pathway should be rigorous yet flexible in admissions, focused and deliberate in preparation, and open to broad usage across subjects and grades.

State policy for alternate routes to teacher licensure should ensure that:

- Strong academic performance and subject-matter-knowledge testing are prerequisites for program admission.
- Subject-area majors are not required or candidates have the option to test out of any subject-area coursework requirements.
- Coursework is streamlined and not overly burdensome, and it meets the immediate needs of new teachers.
- Program length is reasonable (no more than two years). Practice teaching and/or intensive mentoring is required.
- Limits are not placed on the subjects and/or grades an alternate route teacher can teach, and alternate route providers are not restricted to colleges and universities; districts and nonprofits should be permitted to offer programs as well.


Maryland has one alternate route, the Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program, which has the characteristics of a strong program and provides an accelerated, relevant and flexible pathway into the profession (see Figure 19). The route has no restrictions on use for grades, subject areas or providers.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MARYLAND:**

■ Require all applicants to pass a subject-matter test rather than a basic skills test for admission.

While Maryland is recognized for providing a test-out option for subject-matter coursework requirements, the state should consider requiring all candidates, including those with a major in the subject, to pass a content-knowledge test. Maryland's requirement that alternate route candidates pass a basic skills test is impractical and ineffective, even though the state does allow candidates to use equivalent scores to fulfill this admissions criterion. Basic skills tests measure minimum competency—essentially those skills that a person should have acquired in middle school—and are inappropriate for candidates who have already earned a bachelor's degree.

Figure 18		#/	\$ / 370
Do states provide real alternate pathways to certification?	GENUINE OR NEARLY	Altemate route that	Offered route's disingenous
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			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada	П		
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			
Washington West Virginia			
Wisconsin			




30 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2012

# **Alternate Route Policy Checklist for States**

1.	Set high standards and provide flexibility for meeting them.	<ul> <li>Screen candidates based on academic ability.</li> <li>Set a higher standard for entry than is set for traditional teacher preparation.</li> <li>Require candidates to pass the state's subject-matter licensing test.</li> <li>Don't require a major in the intended subject area; instead, allow candidates to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge on a rigorous test.</li> </ul>
2.	Provide streamlined preparation.	<ul> <li>Limit coursework (ideally to no more than 12 credits a year).</li> <li>Require that the alternate route is an accelerated course of study.</li> <li>Ensure that all coursework requirements target the immediate needs of the new teacher</li> <li>Offer candidates an opportunity to practice teach in a summer training program.</li> <li>Provide intensive mentoring.</li> </ul>
3.	Remove regulatory obstacles.	<ul> <li>✓ Allow for a diversity of alternate route providers.</li> <li>✓ Don't limit the use of alternate routes to shortage areas or to certain grades or subjects.</li> </ul>

Figure 20
Authority for Teacher Preparation in Maryland



# Critical Attention Summary for Maryland




# Red

		AUTHORITY
ADMISSION INTO PREPARATION PROGRAMS	Require that 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.	State Board of Education
ELEMENTARY TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Require all elementary teacher candidates to pass a rigorous content test that assesses knowledge of all subjects.</li> <li>Require preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers, and require candidates to pass a rigorous math assessment.</li> <li>Require a rigorous assessment in the science of reading instruction.</li> <li>Require a content specialization in an academic subject area.</li> </ul>	State Board of Education
STUDENT TEACHING	<ul> <li>Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.</li> <li>Require at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching.</li> </ul>	State Board of Education
TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY	<ul> <li>Collect performance data to monitor programs.</li> <li>Set minimum standards for program performance with consequences for failure to meet those standards.</li> <li>Publicly report performance data.</li> </ul>	Superintendent of Education



# Yellow

		AUTHORITY
MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Ensure all middle school teachers are prepared to teach grade level content.</li> </ul>	State Board of Education
SECONDARY TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Require secondary science and social studies teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.</li> </ul>	State Board of Education
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Require that elementary special education candidates pass the same content test as general elementary teachers.</li> <li>Ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.</li> </ul>	State Board of Education



1420 New York Avenue, NW • Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-393-0020 Fax: 202-393-0095 Web: www.nctq.org

Subscribe to NCTQ's blog PDQ 🔊

Follow NCTQ on Twitter 🕒 and Facebook 🕤

NCTQ is available to work with individual states to improve teacher policies.

For more information, please contact:

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