# 2012 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

# Improving Teacher Preparation in Montana



### **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 Montana

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 Montana'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 year symbol indicates a score increase from 2011.

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



# 2012 Policy Update for Montana

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

No updates were identified for Montana in the area of teacher preparation.

### Montana 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).

Montana declined to review or confirm NCTQ's analysis of policy updates in the area of teacher preparation and state authority for teacher preparation and licensing.

igure 1 Delivering well-		
prepared teachers	2012 Grade	2011 Grade
Alabama	B-	С
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
Kansas	D+	D+
Kentucky	C+	C-
Louisiana	C	С
Maine	D+	D
Maryland	D+	D+
Massachusetts	C+	C+
Michigan	D+	D+
Minnesota	C+	С
Mississippi	C	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	C	С
Oregon	D-	D-
Pennsylvania	C	C
Rhode Island	C	D+
South Carolina	C-	C-
South Dakota	D	D
Tennessee	B-	B-
Texas	C+	C+
Utah	C+	D D
Vermont	C-	D+
	C-	C-
Virginia		
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 **Montana'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



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

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

Texas

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

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. Montana 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.

Montana 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, Montana 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 Montana's undergraduate teacher preparation programs in the *Review* sufficiently selective?

75% are not sufficiently selective.

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

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

PESTNORMED TO 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 П 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



Montana 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—as a condition of licensure—that ensures appropriate subject-matter knowledge.

The Common Core State Standards, adopted by nearly all states including Montana, represent an effort to significantly raise expectations for the knowledge and skills American students will need for college readiness and global competitiveness. And Montana, 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, Montana'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 any subject-matter testing as a condition of licensure,

and its coursework requirements lack the specificity to guarantee relevancy to the elementary classroom. In addition, Montana 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 MONTANA:**

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

Montana should adopt subject-matter testing requirements as a condition of licensure and ensure that its elementary content test is appropriately aligned with the Common Core State Standards. The state should require separate, meaningful passing scores for each area on the test because use of a composite passing score offers no assurance of adequate knowledge in each subject area.

■ 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 Montana's teacher standards require some knowledge in key areas of mathematics, the state should require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers. This includes specific coursework in foundations, algebra and geometry, with some statistics. Montana 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.

Montana 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.

Montana should either articulate a more specific set of standards or establish 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, Montana does not specify any coursework requirements for general education or elementary teacher candidates, and although its standards for elementary teacher preparation programs specify some important topics, they are still far from comprehensive.

### 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 Montana 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	ELEMENTARY CONTENT SCORE FOR SPACE	CACH-SURF PASSING   Elementary Content teer	Elementary content to	/ <i>vit</i>	
Do states ensure that	\$	455 / 75 / Fest	, 6 for	120	
Do states ensure that	W <sub>TE</sub>	te / 68/2	\$60r	· / .	
elementary teachers	20.8	£/5!		راً: الع <sup>ر</sup>	
know core content?	AF S			No test required	
	E KI	arate	nent Posit	test /	
	#\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Elet.	/ %	
Alabama	~	, ,,			
Alaska				1	
Arizona				_	
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland			2		
Massachusetts			3		
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
MONTANA					
Nebraska					
Nevada			2		
New Hampshire			_		
New Jersey					
New Mexico	$\overline{}$				
New York					
North Carolina		$\overline{}$		4	
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon		5			
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina			2		
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	9	9	29	4	
	,				

Figure 6				GLISH		/			NCE				OCIA					/	FINE ARTS
Do states expect elementary teachers		ure	Writing/C	Children's Liters	dure /			Earth Science	Biology/Life Scien	9),	7	/ / /	World LI:	World H.	World Hist		///	/	/ /
to have in-depth		$'^{i}$ e $'^{a}$	h Lite			/	′ /	'sical	, S <sub>G</sub>		/isto	listo/	, joker	2/2/	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	£ £	//		
knowledge of	ź			siti.	// *	\$/,	. / 3	£/ ;	/ <i>[[]</i> / cie]	/ /		£ / ¿		ž / ž	ts / i	kest by			
core content?	4meri	World/Rrin.		Children's Liters	Chemister	Physics	//eyes	Earth Co.	Biolog	American	4meri	America.	World	Norld	\Z\\ \Z\\ \Z\\ \Z\\ \Z\\ \Z\\ \Z\\ \Z\	Geograph.	Art Histor	Music	/
Alabama			*																
Alaska																			
Arizona			*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*		*	
Arkansas																			
California			*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*	
Colorado																			
Connecticut	Ш	Ш		Ц		Ш		Ш		*	*			Ц	Ш			Ш	
Delaware								_											
District of Columbia						Ц												-	
Florida			×		*			X				7							
Georgia								×											
Hawaii Idaho																			
Illinois							4	-	<u></u>			-				-			
Indiana			<u></u>					<u> </u>	-			<u></u>		_				*	
lowa																			
Kansas			<b>→</b>	<u></u>					<u> </u>			4				4			
Kentucky																			
Louisiana																			
Maine																			
Maryland																			
Massachusetts																			
Michigan			4	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<b>*</b>	<u> </u>			<u>+</u>				<u>-</u>			
Minnesota			<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>		ī	<b>+</b>							
Mississippi				ĥ								ĥ							
Missouri																			
MONTANA																			
Nebraska			*																
Nevada																			
New Hampshire																			
New Jersey																			
New Mexico			*															*	
New York																			
North Carolina																			
North Dakota																			
Ohio																			
Oklahoma			*				*	*	*			*				*			
Oregon			*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	
Pennsylvania																			
Rhode Island																			
South Carolina				Ц															
South Dakota																			
Tennessee			*				*	*	*			X				*			
Texas			*				*	*	*	*		*				*	*	*	
Utah																			
Vermont					□		<u> </u>			<u> </u>						<b></b>			
Virginia			*					7	*			1	*			*		□	
Washington			*				*												
West Virginia Wisconsin																			
Wyoming																			
wyoning																			


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 Montana



# **Critical Attention:** Middle School Teacher Preparation



Montana does not 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, including Montana, 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.

Regrettably, Montana allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license.

Montana also does not explicitly require a major or minor in the subject areas that prospective middle school teachers plan to teach, and candidates are not required to pass a subject-matter test to attain licensure.

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

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

### **Eliminate the generalist license.**

Teachers with a K-8 license are less likely to be adequately prepared to teach core academic areas at the middle school level because their preparation requirements are not specific to the middle or secondary levels. By requiring specific middle grades certification, Montana will help ensure that students in those grades have teachers who are appropriately prepared to teach grade-level content, which is different and more advanced than what elementary teachers teach.

### Require content testing in all core areas.

As a condition of initial licensure, all candidates teaching middle grades in Montana should have to pass a subject-matter test in every core academic area they intend to teach.

# ■ Encourage middle school teachers licensed to teach multiple subjects to earn two subjectmatter minors.

This would allow candidates to gain sufficient knowledge to pass state licensing tests and be highly qualified in both subjects, and it would increase schools' staffing flexibility. However, middle school candidates in Montana who intend to teach a single subject should earn a major in that area.

o states distinguish r		K-8 license offered for	\$2.00 \$4.00 \$4.00	
rade preparation fro	m Ş	offere dod	K-8 license offered	
lementary preparation	on? 🕺	nse c	/	
	9/1/6	8 lice	/ 8/l/ce	
	4	self x	/ 4	
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California		1		
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho	,			
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana Maine				
Maryland Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
MONTANA				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma			3	
Oregon			4	
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				California offers a K-12 generalist license for self-contained classrooms.
Tennessee				
Texas				Illinois has repealed its K-9 license and is in     the process of revising middle school certifi-
Utah				cation requirements.
Vermont				3. With the exception of mathematics.
Virginia				4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.
Washington				5. Wisconsin offers 1-8 license.
West Virginia				
Wisconsin			5	
Wyoming				

Do middle school teache nave to pass an appropri		No, test does not all core subscores	No, K.8 license required	No, testing of all subjects	
ontent test in every cor		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	Yect,	6 / 50 pg	
ubject they are licensed	1	test 'T sun	, ? ? [[ , [e]]	testij Guin	
o teach?	YES		\ \(\frac{1}{2}\)\(\f	No, testing or not required	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California				1	
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho			2		
Illinois			3		
Indiana					
lowa				4	
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Massashusatts	5				
Massachusetts					
Michigan Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
MONTANA					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York	6				
North Carolina					1. Candidates teac
North Dakota					to pass the elem
Ohio					2. For K-8 license, I subject test.
Oklahoma					3. Illinois has repea
Oregon			7		is in the process
Pennsylvania					certification req
Rhode Island					4. It is unclear how testing requirem
South Carolina					candidates.
South Dakota					5. Maryland allows
Tennessee					in departmental than 50 percent
Texas					within the elem
Utah					6. For nondepartm in middle childh
Vermont					pass new assess
Virginia					7. Candidates opti
Washington					may either com test. Oregon allo
West Virginia					candidates who
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					

- multiple subjects only have ry test.
- also requires a single-
- ts K-9 license. The state evising its middle school nents.
- legislation will affect for middle school
- mentary teachers to teach middle schools if not less he teaching assignment is ry education grades.
- lized classrooms, generalist education candidates must t with three subtests.
- middle-level endorsement a major or pass a content alternative assessment" for wice.

# **Critical Attention:** Secondary Teacher Preparation



Montana does not 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.

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

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.

Montana does not require secondary teachers to pass content tests. Further, the state offers a secondary broad field science endorsement, which must include a concentration in one discipline—biology, earth science, chemistry or physics. Montana also offers secondary certification in broad field social studies, which must include a concentration in history and government.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

Require subject-matter testing for secondary teacher candidates.

As a condition of licensure, Montana should require its secondary teacher candidates to pass a content test in each subject area they plan to teach to ensure that they possess adequate subject-matter knowledge and are prepared to teach grade-level content.

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

Although coursework plays a key role in teachers' acquisition of content knowledge, it is more important that Montana require an assessment, which is the only way to ensure that teachers possess adequate knowledge of the subject area.

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

Although coursework plays a key role in teachers' acquisition of content knowledge, it is more important that Montana require an assessment, which is the only way to ensure that teachers possess adequate knowledge of the subject area.

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

Figure 11  Do all secondary teach have to pass a content test in every subject		Loophole it	" science	No "I social studies	/
area they are licensed		)phole,	, /ohole ;		
to teach?	£/	07 /	7007	/ %	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa <sup>1</sup>					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota			$\overline{}$		
Mississippi					
Missouri					
MONTANA					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon	П				
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington Wash Virginia					
West Virginia Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
<i>y</i> 0	3	28	34	12	

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



Montana does not 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.

Regrettably, Montana only offers a generic K-12 special education certification. Subject-matter tests are not required.

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

■ Eliminate licenses for special education that do not differentiate between the preparation of elementary teachers and that of secondary teachers.

Montana's current model does little to protect some of its most vulnerable students. Failure to ensure that special education teachers are well trained in specific content areas deprives these students of the opportunity to reach their academic potential. Montana should limit high-incidence special education certifications to elementary or secondary grades.

Provide a broad liberal arts program of study to elementary special education candidates and require that they pass a rigorous content test as a condition of licensure.

Montana 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 a rigorous subject-matter test as a condition of licensure.

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

0

NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2012: 17

### 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, Montana'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, Montana 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.

Figure 12		Offers K-12 and grade-specific	/
Do states distinguish	DOES NOT OFFER A	> / &	/
between elementary	FER		2
and secondary special	7. 0.7 0.0	(s) <sub>1</sub>	/ 's'
education teachers?	SY	S K	.rs or, Ptio,
education teachers.	00°		Offes only a K- 72
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			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	1		
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 York⁴, Oregon¹, Pennsylvania², Rhode Island, West Virginia³
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.
- 3. 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



Montana 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.

Montana not only fails to articulate any requirements for cooperating teachers, but the state also lacks any specific requirements for the duration of 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

Florida, Indiana, Tennessee

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

■ 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 Montana 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.

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

Montana 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.

igure 14	<i>E</i>		
o states require	₹≥	1 × ×	
he elements of a	VC 77	255	
igh-quality student	2	MES. 10.LA WEB	
eaching experience?	COOPERATING TEACHER  FFECTIVE BASED ON	FUL TIME STUDENT LEAST TO WEEKS 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			
Virginia			Based on new REPA II regulations.
Washington			Candidates can student teach for
West Virginia		2	less than 12 weeks if determined
Wisconsin			to be proficient.
VVISCOLISILI			
Wyoming			

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



Montana 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.

Although it does not connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs, Montana does collect some program-specific, objective data that reflect

program performance. The state requires that its preparation programs provide evidence that "data are used to evaluate student performance and modify programs"— including assessments at admissions, verification of content knowledge, student teaching and clinical experience assessments, and follow-up studies. But the state has not established minimum performance standards for each category of data it collects that can be used for accountability purposes. Further, Montana does not provide the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing.

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

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

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

As one way to measure whether programs are producing effective classroom teachers, Montana 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.

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 therefore include other objective measures that show how well programs are preparing teachers for the classroom. Montana should expand its requirements to its alternate routes and also include such measures 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. Programs should then be held accountable for meeting these standards, and there should be consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.


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

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

### Maintain full authority over teacher preparation program approval.

There appears to be considerable overlap between the public process of state program approval and the private process of national accreditation in Montana. While it is not unreasonable that the state may wish to coordinate these processes for institutions also seeking national accreditation, Montana should ensure that it is the state that considers the evidence of program performance and makes the decision about whether programs should continue to be authorized to prepare teachers.

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  Do states hold teach	her ms SECTIVE PROGRAM THE CALL SECTION	. ,	,	
preparation progra	ms ≧		11/5	,
accountable?			DATA PUBLCIY AVAILABLE ON WEB	
accountable:	7kg 247	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	WANG EON EON	
	GFC)	1	474	
	- S	/ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	\ 0,\frac{4}{7}	
Alabama Alaska			2	
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				
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				

### **TEACHER PRODUCTION IN MONTANA**

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.

**Montana teacher production data:** NCTQ was unable to find any published data on teacher production in Montana that connects program completion, certification and hiring statistics.

- 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			/ >
		J.,§	s, ls / sport
What is the relationship	Ž	S / diff	ation I
between state program	500		
approval and national	145/ 14. P.	10 of	d acc
accreditation?	APROVAL PROCEW	Overlap of accreditation	National acceditation is Program approval
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California		1	
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas	$\overline{\Box}$		
Kentucky			
Louisiana		$\overline{\Box}$	
Maine		1	
Maryland	Π̈		
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi	_	1	
Missouri			
MONTANA	ī		
Nebraska			
Nevada	Π̈		
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	ī		
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia		1	
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
Tryoming			
	8	31	12

<sup>1.</sup> 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.

Montana has one alternate route program: Class 5. A high-quality, alternative licensure pathway should be rigorous yet flexible in admissions, focused and deliberate in preparation, and open to broad usage across subjects and grades. Unfortunately, Class 5 fails to meet these criteria and, as a result, is not a genuinely alternate route into the teaching profession (see Figure 19).

### **NEXT STEPS FOR MONTANA:**

■ Set high admissions standards for the Class 5 alternate route and provide flexibility for meeting them.

Candidates for a Class 5 Alternative License are not required to demonstrate prior academic performance, such as a minimum GPA, as an entrance standard. A subject-matter test is not required, nor can one be used to test out of subject-area coursework requirements.

Montana should require that candidates to its alternate routes provide some evidence of good academic performance. The standard should be higher than what is required of traditional teacher candidates, such as a GPA of at least 2.75. Alternatively, the state could require one of the standardized tests of academic proficiency commonly used in higher education for graduate admissions, such as the GRE.

Critically, Montana should also require alternate route candidates to pass a subject-matter test as a condition of program admission because having subject-matter knowledge prior to beginning teaching is fundamental. The concept behind alternate routes is that the nontraditional candidate is able to concentrate on acquiring professional knowledge and skills because he or she has strong subject-area knowledge. Teachers without sufficient subject-matter knowledge place students at risk.

### ■ Ensure that preparation coursework and support target the immediate needs of new teachers.


Montana should articulate guidelines regarding the nature and amount of coursework required of candidates. Current guidelines appear to require candidates to complete a program similar to that of traditional candidates, not a streamlined one designed to meet the immediate needs of new teachers. Requirements should be manageable and contribute to the immediate needs of new teachers. Appropriate coursework should include grade-level or subject-level seminars, methodology in the content area, classroom management, assessment and scientifically based early reading instruction.

Furthermore, Montana should provide more induction guidelines to ensure that new teachers will receive the support they need to facilitate their success in the classroom. Effective strategies include practice teaching prior to teaching in the classroom, intensive mentoring with full classroom support in the first few weeks or months of school, a reduced teaching load and release time to allow new teachers to observe experienced teachers during the school day.

### Eliminate restrictions on alternate route providers.

Although Montana does not limit the usage of its alternate route, it does place restrictions on providers. Montana should specifically authorize alternate route programs run by local school districts and non-profits, as well as institutions of higher education. A good diversity of providers helps all programs, both university- and nonuniversity-based, to improve.

	#/	\$ / 370
GENUINE OR NEARLY	Alternate route that E	Office of route & disingenuous
	, , 	
	_	
	_	
	_	
	_	
	-	




30 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2012 MONTANA

# **Alternate Route Policy Checklist for States**

	Thate Route Follog Cheek	
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 Montana




# Critical Attention Summary for Montana



# Red

		AUTHORITY
ADMISSIONS 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.	Board of Public 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>	Board of Public Education
MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Eliminate the generalist K-8 license.</li> <li>Require middle school candidates to pass a content test in every core area they intend to teach as a condition of licensure.</li> <li>Encourage two subject-matter minors for candidates who are licensed to teach multiple subjects; those who teach single subjects should earn a content major.</li> </ul>	Board of Public Education
SECONDARY TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Require secondary candidates to pass a content test in each subject they are licensed to teach as a condition of licensure.</li> <li>Require secondary science and social studies teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.</li> </ul>	Board of Public Education
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Eliminate the K-12 special education certificate, and require licenses that differentiate between preparation of elementary and secondary teacher candidates.</li> <li>Require that elementary special education candidates pass a rigorous content test as a condition of licensure.</li> <li>Ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.</li> </ul>	Board of Public 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>	Board of Public 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>	Board of Public 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