2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

Maine





Acknowledgments

STATES

State education agencies remain our most important partners in this effort, and their gracious cooperation has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Every state formally received a draft of the *Yearbook* in July 2011 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. While states do not always agree with the recommendations, their willingness to acknowledge the imperfections of their teacher policies is an important first step toward reform.

We also thank the many state pension boards that reviewed our drafts and responded to our inquiries.

FUNDERS

The primary funders for the 2011 Yearbook were:

- Bill and Melinda Gates FoundationCarnegie Corporation of New York
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The Joyce Foundation
- George Gund 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 Michele, *Lead Researcher* Meagan Staffiere Comb, Trisha M. Madden and Stephanie T. Maltz, *Researchers*

Thank you to the team at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2011 Yearbook. Thanks also to Colleen Hale and Jeff Hale at EFA Solutions for the original Yearbook design and ongoing technical support.

National Council on Teacher Quality

Executive Summary

For five years running, the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has tracked states' teacher policies, preparing a detailed and thorough compendium of teacher policy in the United States on topics related to teacher preparation, licensure, evaluation, career advancement, tenure, compensation, pensions and dismissal.

The 2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook includes NCTQ's biennial, full review of the state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession. This year's report measures state progress against a set of 36 policy goals focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers. For the first time, the Yearbook includes a progress rating for states on goals that have been measured over time. An overall progress ranking is also included, showing how states compare to each other in moving forward on their teacher policies.

Maine at a Glance

Overall 2011 Yearbook Grade: 🕒

Overall 2009 Yearbook Grade: F

Area Grades	2011	2009
Area 1 Delivering Well Prepared Teachers	D	F
Area 2 Expanding the Teaching Pool	F	F
Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers	F	F
Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers	C-	C-
Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers	F	F

Overall Progress



How is Maine Faring?

Area 1 Delivering Well Prepared Teachers

Policy Strengths

The state does not offer a K-12 special education certification.

Policy Weaknesses

- Teacher candidates are not required to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- Elementary teachers are not adequately prepared to teach the rigorous content associated with the Common Core Standards.
- Teacher preparation programs are not required to address the science of reading, and candidates are not required to pass a test to ensure knowledge.
- Neither teacher preparation program nor licensure test requirements ensure that new elementary teachers are adequately prepared to teach mathematics.

- All new teachers must pass a pedagogy test.
- Middle school teachers are not sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

D

- Although most secondary teachers must pass a content test to teach a core subject area, some secondary science and social studies teachers are not required to pass content tests for each discipline they intend to teach.
- Requirements for teacher preparation do not ensure a high-quality student teaching experience.
- The teacher preparation program approval process does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Area 2 Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Policy Strengths

Policy Weaknesses

- Admission criteria for alternate routes to certification are not sufficiently selective or flexible for nontraditional candidates.
- Alternate route requirements could do more to meet the immediate needs of new teachers.
- Usage and providers of alternate routes are restricted.
- The state does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.
- Out-of-state teachers are not required to meet the state's testing requirements, and there are additional obstacles that do not support licensure reciprocity.

How is Maine Faring?

Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers

Policy Strengths

Policy Weaknesses

- The state data system does not have the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- Objective evidence of student learning is not the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluations.
- There is no policy addressing the number of times teachers must be evaluated.
- Tenure decisions are not connected to evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- Licensure advancement and renewal are not based on teacher effectiveness.

F

 Little school-level data are reported that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent

Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers

Policy Strengths

- All new teachers receive mentoring.
- While there is a minimum state salary, districts are given authority for how teachers are paid; however, they are not discouraged from basing salary schedules solely on years of experience and advanced degrees.

Policy Weaknesses

- Professional development is not aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations.
- The state does not support performance pay or additional compensation for relevant prior work experience, working in high-need schools or teaching in shortage subject areas.
- Teachers are only offered a defined benefit pension plan as their mandatory pension plan, and pension policies are not portable, flexible or fair to all teachers.
- The pension system is significantly underfunded and requires excessive contributions.
- Retirement benefits are determined by a formula that is not neutral, meaning that pension wealth does not accumulate uniformly for each year a teacher works.

Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Policy Strengths

 A last hired, first fired layoff policy during reductions in force is prohibited.

Policy Weaknesses

- Teachers can teach for up to three years before having to pass required subject-matter tests.
- There is no assurance that teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations will be placed on structured improvement plans or that they will be eligible for dismissal if they fail to improve.
- Ineffective classroom performance is not grounds for dismissal, and the state could do more to ensure that the appeal process for teacher dismissal occurs within a reasonable time frame.

Maine Goal Summary

Goal Breakdown	
Best Practice	0
Fully Meets	2
Nearly Meets	3
Partially Meets	6
Only Meets a Small Part	3
O Does Not Meet	22
Progress on Goals Since 2009	
Area 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers	
1-A: Admission into Preparation Programs	0
1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation	0
1-C: Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction	0
1-D: Teacher Preparation in Mathematics	0
1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation	0
1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation	
1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science	٩
1-H: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies	
1-I: Special Education Teacher Preparation	0
1-J: Assessing Professional Knowledge	•
1-K: Student Teaching	0
1-L: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability	0
Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers	
2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility	٢
2-B: Alternate Route Preparation	0
2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers	
2-D: Part Time Teaching Licenses	0
2-E: Licensure Reciprocity	0

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers		
3-A: State Data Systems		
3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness	0	
3-C: Frequency of Evaluations	\bigcirc	
3-D: Tenure	0	
3-E: Licensure Advancement	0	
3-F: Equitable Distribution	٢	
Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers		
4-A: Induction	•	
4-B: Professional Development	0	
4-C: Pay Scales		
4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience	0	
4-E: Differential Pay	0	
4-F: Performance Pay	0	
4-G: Pension Flexibility		
4-H: Pension Sustainability	٢	
4-I: Pension Neutrality	•	
Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers		
5-A: Licensure Loopholes	0	
5-B: Unsatisfactory Evaluations	0	
5-C: Dismissal for Poor Performance	0	
5-D: Reductions in Force		

About the Yearbook

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has long argued that no educational improvement strategies states take on are likely to have a greater impact than policies that seek to maximize teacher effectiveness. In this fifth edition of the *State Teacher Policy Yearbook*, NCTQ provides a detailed examination of state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession, covering the full breadth of policies including teacher preparation, licensure, evaluation, career advancement, tenure, compensation, pensions and dismissal.

The *Yearbook* is a 52-volume compendium of customized state reports for the 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as a national summary overview, measuring state progress against a set of 36 specific policy goals. All of the reports are available from NCTQ's website at www.nctq.org/stpy.

The 36 *Yearbook* goals are focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive policy framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers. The goals were developed based on input and ongoing feedback from state officials, practitioners, policy groups and other education organizations, as well as from NCTQ's own nationally respected advisory board. These goals meet five criteria for an effective reform framework:

- 1. They are supported by a strong rationale, grounded in the best research available. The rationale and research citations supporting each goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.
- 2. They offer practical rather than pie-in-the-sky solutions for improving teacher quality.
- 3. They take on the teaching profession's most pressing needs, including making the profession more responsive to the current labor market.
- 4. They are, for the most part, relatively cost neutral.
- 5. They respect the legitimate constraints that some states face so that the goals can work in all 50 states.

The need to ensure that all children have effective teachers has captured the attention of the public and policymakers across the country like never before. The *Yearbook* offers state school chiefs, school boards, legislatures and the many advocates who press hard for reform a concrete set of recommendations as they work to maximize teacher quality for their students.

How to Read the Yearbook

NCTQ rates state teacher policy in several ways.

For each of the 36 individual teacher policy goals, states receive two ratings. The first rating indicates whether, or to what extent, a state has met the goal. NCTQ uses these familiar graphics to indicate the extent to which each goal has been met:



A new feature of this year's *Yearbook* is a progress rating for each goal NCTQ has measured over time. These ratings are intended to give states a meaningful sense of the changes in teacher policy since the 2009 *Yearbook* was published. Using the symbols below, NCTQ determines whether each state has advanced on the goal, if the state policy has remained unchanged, or if the state has actually lost ground on that topic.



Some goals are marked with this symbol , which indicates that the bar has been raised for this goal since the 2009 *Yearbook*. With many states making considerable progress in advancing teacher effectiveness policy, NCTQ raised the standards for some goals where the bar had been quite low. As this may have a negative impact on some states' scores, those goals are always marked with the above symbol.

States receive grades in the five goal areas under which the 36 goals are organized: 1) delivering well prepared teachers; 2) expanding the pool of teachers; 3) identifying effective teachers; 4) retaining effective teachers and 5) exiting ineffective teachers. States also receive an overall grade that summarizes state performance across the five goal areas, giving an overall perspective on how states measure up against NCTQ benchmarks. New this year, states also receive an overall progress ranking, indicating how much progress each state has made compared to other states.

As always, the *Yearbook* provides a detailed narrative accounting of the policy strengths and weaknesses in each policy area for each state and for the nation as a whole. Best practices are highlighted. The reports are also chock full of reader-friendly charts and tables that provide a national perspective on each goal and serve as a quick reference on how states perform relative to one another, goal by goal.

Another new feature this year makes it easier to distinguish strong policies from weaker ones on our charts and tables. The policies NCTQ considers strong practices or the ideal policy positions for states are capitalized. This provides a quick thumbnail for readers to size up state policies against the policy option that aligns with NCTQ benchmarks for meeting each policy goal. For example, on the chart below, "BEFORE ADMISSION TO PREP PROGRAM" is capitalized, as that is the optimal timing for testing teacher candidates' academic proficiency.



6 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 MAINE

Goals

AREA 1: DELIVERING WELL PREPARED TEACHERS

1-A: Admission into Preparation Programs

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

1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation

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

1-C: Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction

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

1-D: Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

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

1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation

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

1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation

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

1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

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

1-H: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies

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

1-I: Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they will be required to teach.

1-J: Assessing Professional Knowledge

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

1-K: Student Teaching

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

1-L: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

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

AREA 2: EXPANDING THE POOL OF TEACHERS

2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility

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

2-B: Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide streamlined preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers.

2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from regulatory obstacles that limit its usage and providers.

2-D: Part Time Teaching Licenses

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

2-E: Licensure Reciprocity

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

PAGE 9

PAGE 59

Goals

AREA 3: IDENTIFYING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

3-A: State Data Systems

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

3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness

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

3-C: Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

3-D: Tenure

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

3-E: Licensure Advancement

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

3-F: Equitable Distribution

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

AREA 4: RETAINING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

4-A: Induction

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

4-B: Professional Development

The state should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

4-C: Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience

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

4-E: Differential Pay

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

4-F: Performance Pay

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

4-G: Pension Flexibility

The state should ensure that pension systems are portable, flexible and fair to all teachers.

4-H: Pension Sustainability

The state should ensure that excessive resources are not committed to funding teachers' pension systems.

4-1: Pension Neutrality

The state should ensure that pension systems are neutral, uniformly increasing pension wealth with each additional year of work.

AREA 5: EXITING INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS

5-A: Licensure Loopholes

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

5-B: Unsatisfactory Evaluations

The state should articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations, including specifying that teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations should be eligible for dismissal.

5-C: Dismissal for Poor Performance

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

5-D: Reductions in Force

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

PAGE 81

PAGE 147

PAGE 105

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal A – Admission into Preparation Programs

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

Goal Components

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

- The state should require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. All preparation programs in a state should use a common admissions test to facilitate program comparison, and the test should allow comparison of applicants to the general college-going population and selection of applicants in the top half of that population.
- 3. Programs should have the option of exempting candidates from this test who submit comparable SAT or ACT scores at a level set by the state.

The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

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

Figure 1

How States are Faring in Admission Requirements **Best Practice State** 1 Texas States Meet Goal 11 States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut, Georgia 1, Hawaii 1, Indiana¹, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia 6 States Partly Meet Goal Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa1, Missouri, Nebraska, Washington States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Florida, Wisconsin States Do Not Meet Goal 31 Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, MAINE, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

1:6 ↔:45 ↓:0

Area 1: Goal A Maine Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 🧑 Bar Raised for this Goal 🏾 💮 Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Maine does not require aspiring teachers to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs, instead delaying its basic skills assessment until teacher candidates are ready to apply for licensure.

Supporting Research Maine Department of Education 05-071 Chapter 114

RECOMMENDATION

Require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.

Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates end up investing considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates needing additional support should complete remediation prior to program entry, avoiding the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars.

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

The basic skills tests in use in most states largely assess middle school-level skills. To improve the selectivity of teacher candidates—a common characteristic in countries whose students consistently outperform ours in international comparisons—Maine should require an assessment that demonstrates that candidates are academically competitive with all peers, regardless of their intended profession. Requiring a common test normed to the general college population would allow for the selection of applicants in the top half of their class, as well as facilitate program comparison.

Exempt candidates with comparable SAT or ACT scores.

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine asserted that although it does not require candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for program admission, most of the state's teacher education programs require passage of the Praxis I exam as part of the program admissions process.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although there are a number of states that require teacher candidates to pass a basic skills test as a criterion for admission to a preparation program, **Texas** is the only state that requires a test of academic proficiency normed to the general college bound population rather than just to prospective teachers. In addition, the state's minimum scores for admission appear to be relatively selective when compared to other tests used across the country.

Figure 3

When do states test teacher candidates' basic skills?



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

Figure 2

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



1. Strong Practice: Texas

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

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

Figure 4

Figure 4 Do states appropriately test teacher candidates' academic proficiency?	ST NORMED TO CO.	Test normed only to Report	Test normed only to test	No test required	
	ADA ADA		Le la la	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
Alabama					
AldSKd					
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					
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					
Wyoming					
	1	20	20	10	

Figure 5

Do states measure performance in reading, mathematics and writing?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. California⁴, District of Columbia⁴, Hawaii⁴, Indiana, Iowa, Maine⁴, Maryland, New Hampshire⁴, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁵, Pennsylvania⁴, Rhode Island⁴, Vermont, Virginia
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
- 4. Minimum score must be met in each section.
- 5. Composite score can only be used if passing score is met on two of three subtests.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal B – Elementary Teacher Preparation

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

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

Figure 6

How States are Faring in Elementary Teacher Preparation



0 States Meet Goal

4 States Nearly Meet Goal Indiana 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota 1, New Hampshire



States Partly Meet Goal California, Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington

18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah 1, Virginia, West Virginia

21 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, MAINE, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

1:3 ↔:44 ↓:4



Area 1: Goal B **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Although Maine has adopted the Common Core Standards, the state does not ensure that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach the rigorous content associated with these standards.

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

In addition, Maine outlines two pathways that elementary teacher candidates can utilize to attain endorsement; only one of these pathways requires any coursework for elementary teacher candidates. Those choosing Pathway Two must complete a minimum of six semester hours each in English, science and social studies. However, this coursework is defined too broadly to guarantee that the courses used to meet the requirements will be relevant to the topics taught in the PK-6 classroom.

The state does articulate vague teacher performance standards, which include "knowledge of the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline that the applicant teaches...." Maine does not mention any specific subject-matter requirements making it far too ambiguous to set a meaningful standard for holding either programs or teachers accountable.

Finally, there is no assurance that arts and sciences faculty will teach liberal arts classes to elementary teacher candidates.

Supporting Research

Maine Department of Education Rule 05-071 chapters 114 and 115 Praxis II www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require a content test that ensures sufficient knowledge in all subjects.

Maine should ensure that its subject-matter test for elementary teacher candidates is well aligned with the Common Core Standards, which represent an effort to significantly raise the standards for the knowledge and skills American students will need for college readiness and global competitiveness.

The state should also require separate passing scores for each content area on the test because without them it is impossible to measure knowledge of individual subjects. Further, to be meaning-ful, Maine should ensure that these passing scores reflect high levels of performance.



Provide broad liberal arts coursework relevant to the elementary classroom.

Maine should either articulate a more specific set of standards or establish comprehensive coursework requirements that are specifically geared to the areas of knowledge needed by PK-6 teachers. Further, the state should align its requirements for elementary teacher candidates 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.

Require at least an academic concentration.

An academic concentration, if not a full academic major, would not only enhance Maine teachers' content knowledge, but it would also ensure that prospective teachers have taken higher-level academic coursework. Further, it would provide an option for teacher candidates unable to fulfill student teaching or other professional requirements to still earn a degree.

Ensure that arts and sciences faculty teach liberal arts coursework.

Although an education professor is best suited to teach effective methodologies in subject instruction, faculty from the university's college of arts and sciences should provide subject-matter foundation.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that its "Purpose, Standards and Procedures for the Review and Approval of Preparation Programs for Educator Personnel" is undergoing a comprehensive review with recommendations for change due to the State Board of Education by March 30, 2012. Revisions will include adoption of the Common Core Teaching Standards with alignments to the Common Core Standards. Maine also noted that arts and science faculty teach liberal arts classes in all of Maine's teacher education programs.

Further, the state pointed out that it is committed to transitioning its PK-12 educational systems to standards-based learning environments where individual progress will be performance-based. "Consequently, our educator preparation programs will, of necessity, need to be redesigned so as to produce teachers and school leaders who will be prepared to operate effectively in performance-based learning environments."



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although no state meets this goal, three states have noteworthy policies. **Massachusetts's** testing requirements, which are based on the state's curriculum, ensure that elementary teachers are provided with a broad liberal arts education. **Indiana** and **Utah** are the first two states to adopt the new Praxis II "Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects" content test, which requires candidates to pass separately scored subtests in reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies and science.

Figure 7

Where do states set the passing score on elementary content licensure tests¹?



1 Based on the most recent technical data that could be obtained; data not available for Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, 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. Indiana, Maryland, Nevada, South Carolina and Utah now require new Praxis tests for which the technical data are not yet available; analysis is based on previously required test.

Figure 8 Have states adopted the K-12 Common Core State Standards?



1. Alaska, Minnesota, Nebraska, Texas, Virginia

2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, 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, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 9

What subjects does Maine expect elementary teachers to know?





- State requirements cover subject in depth
- X State does not require subject

Figure 10		ENGLISH	/ SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES	FINE / ARTS
Do states expect		/ e/ /	Clemistry Physics Physics General Physical Science Earth Science Biology/Life Science	American History / American History / American Covernment World History (Ancient) World History (Modern) Non-Western) Geography	
elementary teachers	American Literature	Voidd British Literature Connoustion Children's Literature		American History / American History // American Governmen World History (Ancie World History (Ancie (Non-Western) Geography	
to have in-depth	terat	tite	Scied Science	5tor	
knowledge of	i) ne	Pritis SCC, Sition 75 LI	Lié jeu la	Py Contract of the second s	Log /
core content?	heric	rtdr mpo lidre	Chemistry Physics Ceneral Physica Earth Science Biology/Life Sci	American History, American History, American Governn World History (An World History (Mc (Non-Western) Geography	Art History Music
core content:	¥ / ¥	Vold British Literature Writing Gammar/ Composition Children's Litera-	Chemistry Physics Physics General Physical Science Biology/Life Science	American History I American History I American Government World History (Ancient) World History (Modern) (Non-Western) Geography	× × / × /
Alabama] ★ 🗆			
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas		1 🕁 📥			
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				$\star \star \star \star \star \star \star \star$	
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					* *
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia				$\star \star \star \star \star \star \star \star$	
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					

Subject mentioned

★ Subject covered in depth

18 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 MAINE

Figure 11

Do states expect elementary teachers to complete an academic concentration?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico
- 2. Strong Practice: Indiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma
- California, Connecticut, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia These states require a major, minor or concentration but there is no assurance it will be in an academic subject area.
- 4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyorning



A

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal C – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction

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

Goal Components

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

- To ensure that teacher preparation programs adequately prepare candidates in the science of reading instruction, the state should require that these programs train teachers in the five instructional components shown by scientifically based reading research to be essential to teaching children to read.
- The state should require that new elementary teachers pass a rigorous test of reading instruction in order to attain licensure. The design of the test should ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without knowing the science of reading instruction.

Background

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

Figure 12 How States are Faring in Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction 3 **Best Practice States** Connecticut, Massachusetts, Virginia 5 States Meet Goal Alabama 1, Minnesota 1, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania 1, Tennessee 5 States Nearly Meet Goal California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Texas 14 States Partly Meet Goal Arkansas, Colorado, Indiana 🕇 , Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico¹, Ohio, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Arizona, New York 22 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, MAINE, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:5 😝 : 46 **-**:0

Area 1: Goal C **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Maine does not require that teacher preparation programs for elementary teacher candidates address the science of reading. The state has neither coursework requirements nor standards related to this critical area. Maine only requires graduates of out-of-state elementary teacher preparation programs to complete three credit hours in elementary reading methods; however, this coursework does not explicitly require that teachers receive training in the five essential components of reading instruction.

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maine should require that teacher preparation programs in the state train candidates in the five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

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

Maine should require a rigorous reading assessment tool to ensure that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction before entering the classroom. The assessment should clearly test knowledge and skills related to the science of reading, and 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. Elementary teachers who do not possess the minimum knowledge in this area should not be eligible for licensure.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine asserted that it recognizes approved programs completed by out-of-state applicants through the Interstate Agreement. Further, applicants going through transcript analysis must have not only three semester credit hours in methods of teaching elementary reading, but they must also have three additional semester credit hours from one of the following areas: methods of teaching elementary language arts, children's literature or methods of teaching the writing process.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Eight states meet this goal by requiring that preparation programs for elementary teacher candidates address the science of reading and requiring that candidates pass comprehensive assessments that specifically test the five elements of instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Independent reviews of the assessments used by **Connecticut**, **Massachusetts** and **Virginia** confirm that these tests are rigorous measures of teacher candidates' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction.

Figure 13

Do states require preparation for elementary teachers in the science of reading?



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

Figure 14

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



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota⁴, New Mexico⁵, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania⁵, Tennessee, Virginia
- 2. Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Missouri, New York, Oregon, Texas
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Based on the limited information available about the test on the state's website.
- 5. Test is under development and not yet available for review.

Figure 15		REPARATION	/	TEST	
Do states ensure that	RE	QUIREMENT	s / I	REQUIRE	MENTS
elementary teachers	FULLY ADDRESS H	Do not address reading science	4PPROPRIATE TECT	ī,	,
know the science of	SEE	tess "	17/21	test	test 1
reading?	NC S	s scie	PRIA	uate.	ding
reading:		o no adin	PPRC	gdeg	o rea
Alshausa	4 42		र /] 🗌 Inadequate test	$\Box \qquad N_{o'reading' test}$
Alabama Alaska					
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			1		
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico			2		
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon Pennsylvania			2		
Rhode Island			— '		
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	26	25	9	10	32
			2		-

1. Based on the limited information available about the test on the state's website.

2. Test is under development and not yet available for review.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal D – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

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

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

*	1	natics Best Practice State Massachusetts
•	0	States Meet Goal
•	1	State Nearly Meets Goal
•	5	States Partly Meet Goal California, Florida, Minnesota 1, New Mexico, Utah 1
	30	States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa , Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
0	14	States Do Not Meet Goal Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Louisiana, MAINE, Maryland, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Area 1: Goal D **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009



Maine does not articulate requirements to ensure that elementary teacher candidates have sufficient knowledge of mathematics content.

The state outlines two pathways elementary teacher candidates can use to attain endorsement. However, only one pathway requires any mathematics coursework, and that requirement is only six semester hours in liberal arts mathematics. Furthermore, the state stipulates neither the requisite content of these classes nor that they must meet the needs of elementary teachers.

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

Supporting Research

Rule 05-071, chapter 115, part II www.ets.org/praxis

"No Common Denominator: The Preparation of Elementary Teachers in Mathematics by America's Education Schools," NCTQ, June 2008 http://www.nctq.org/p/publications/docs/nctq_ttmath_fullreport.pdf.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maine 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.

Require teacher candidates to pass a rigorous mathematics assessment.

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Massachusetts is the only state that ensures that its elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of mathematics content. As part of its general curriculum test, the state utilizes a separately scored mathematics subtest that covers topics specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.

Figure 17

Do states articulate appropriate mathematics preparation for elementary teachers?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Massachusetts

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, 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

Figure 18

Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?



1. Strong Practice: Massachusetts

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

3. Montana, Nebraska

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal E – Middle School Teacher Preparation

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

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

Figure 19

How States are Faring in Middle School **Teacher Preparation** 3 **Best Practice States** Arkansas 1, Georgia, Pennsylvania 1 7 States Meet Goal Connecticut, Florida 1, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Carolina 1 States Nearly Meet Goal 8 Alabama, District of Columbia, Indiana, Kansas, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia 11 States Partly Meet Goal Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia 11 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Michigan, Minnesota¹, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming 11 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, MAINE, North Carolina, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 关 : 45 ↓:1 1:5



Area 1: Goal E **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

ANALYSIS

Maine offers a middle-level certificate (grades 5-8) for middle school teachers, and it allows teachers with secondary certificates to teach single subjects in middle school. For these two certificates, only outof-state teachers are required to complete 24 semester hours in an area relevant to the endorsement. Regrettably, the state also allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license. These candidates must only complete a teacher preparation program; the state does not explicitly require a major or minor in the subject areas that the candidates plan to teach.

All new middle school teachers in Maine are also required to pass a Praxis II subject-matter test to attain licensure. However, only candidates who opt for a middle-level or secondary endorsement are required to take subject-specific assessments. Those candidates who plan to teach middle school on the generalist license are only required to pass the general elementary content test, in which subscores are not provided; therefore, there is no assurance that these middle school teachers will have sufficient knowledge in each subject they teach.

Supporting Research

Rule 05-071 Chapter 115, Part II, Sections 1.2 and 1.3

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate K-8 generalist license.

Maine should not allow middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers. These teachers 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 and they need not pass a subject-matter test in each subject they teach. Adopting middle school teacher preparation policies for all such teachers will help ensure that students in grades 7 and 8 have teachers who are appropriately prepared to teach grade level content, which is different and more advanced than what elementary teachers teach.

Strengthen middle school teachers' subject-matter preparation.

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

Require subject-matter testing for middle school teacher candidates.

Maine should require subject-matter testing for all middle school teacher candidates in every core academic area they intend to teach as a condition of initial licensure.



MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine contended that all applicants must meet the 24-credit requirement as they seek a middle-level subject endorsement. The state also allows teachers to use the generalist certificate to teach at the middle level, but these teachers are bound to document the fact that they are highly qualified to teach that content.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The state's issuance of a license should indicate that the bearer is able to teach any subject or grade level covered under that license. By indicating that a teacher with a generalist certificate is "bound to document" that he or she is qualified to teach middle school-level content, Maine acknowledges that there is no such assurance.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Arkansas, Georgia and Pennsylvania ensure that all middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach middle school-level content. Teachers are required to earn at least two content-area minors. Georgia and Pennsylvania also require passing scores on single-subject content tests, and Arkansas requires a subject-matter assessment with separate passing scores for each academic area. Figure 20

Figure 20	2	1 5	,
Do states distinguish mid	dle 🖉	or or	
grade preparation from	<i>t</i> 0	fed ,	P
elementary preparation?		offe, d cl	ffere
eternentary preparation:	k & license nor offereb	Contained classrooms	Kelicense offered
	הט	S light	licer
	× '8	¥ 35 /	×-8
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			
Oklahoma			3
Oregon			4
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			5
Wyoming			
	29	6	16
		-	

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

- 2. Illinois offers K-9 license.
- 3. With the exception of mathematics.
- 4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.
- 5. Wisconsin offers 1-8 license.

Figure 21		Major OR TWO.	5	Less than a major or	No requirement of concer Major or minor of content
What academic preparat	tion		NO.	i l	cont
do states require for a	4	ج	ž	₹jor.	it oi
middle school endorsem	ent 🕺		SKC SH	a me	eme inor
or license?	ð	ర్		han Pmer	quir.
or decripe.	ent ^{VOW} VOVFW	410	TWO MINORS	Less than a maji requirement	No requirement of minor
	¥ ,	¥ /			<u> </u>
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky		1			
Louisiana					
MAINE					
Maryland					
Massachusetts			1		
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska			1		
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota			1		
Ohio					
Oklahoma	_				
Oregon		2			
Pennsylvania Rhode Island		_			
South Carolina					
South Carolina South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia Washington					
Washington West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
wyonning					
	13	3	9	12	14

1. State does not explicitly require two minors, but it has equivalent requirements.

2. Pennsylvania has two options. One option requires a 30 credit concentration in one subject and nearly a minor (12 credits) in three additional subjects; the second option is 21 credits in two subject-area concentrations with 12 credits in two additional subjects.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal F – Secondary Teacher Preparation

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

Goal Components

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

- 1. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a licensing test in every subject they intend to teach.
- 2. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a content test when adding subject-area endorsements to an existing license.

Background

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

Figure 22	
	tes are Faring in Secondary Preparation
2	Best Practice States Indiana, Tennessee
29	 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, MAINE, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
0	States Nearly Meet Goal
8	States Partly Meet Goal District of Columbia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico
0	States Meet a Small Part of Goal
0 12	States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming
P	rogress on this Goal Since 2009:
	New Goal

Area 1: Goal F Maine Analysis

State Meets Goal





ANALYSIS

Maine requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a Praxis II content test to teach any core secondary subjects. Unfortunately, Maine permits a significant loophole to this important policy by allowing both combination science and general social studies licenses, without requiring subject-matter testing for each subject area within these disciplines (see Goals 1-G and 1-H).

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

Supporting Research

Maine Department of Education 05-071 Chapter 115, Part II, Section 1.4

RECOMMENDATION

Require subject-matter testing for all secondary teacher candidates.

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Not only do **Indiana** and **Tennessee** require that secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subjects, but these states also do not permit any significant loopholes to this important policy by allowing secondary general science or social studies licenses (see Goals 1-G and 1-H).

Figure 23

Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area for licensure?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (For more on loopholes, see Goals 1-G and 1-H.)
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming

Figure 24

Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area to add an endorsement?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Tennessee

- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (For more on loopholes, see Goals 1-G and 1-H.)
- Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming
Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal G – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

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

Goal Components

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

- 1. The state should require secondary science teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each science discipline they intend to teach.
- 2. The state should require middle school science teachers to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of science.

Background

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

Figure 25



Area 1: Goal G **Maine** Analysis



State Nearly Meets Goal

ANALYSIS

Although Maine does not offer a general science certification for secondary science teachers, it does offer a secondary endorsement in physical science. The first pathway to certification is completion of a Maine program; the state does not articulate further content requirements. The second, presumably for out-of-state candidates, requires candidates to complete 24 semester hours in an area relevant to the endorsement, which could include chemistry, physics, geology, earth science, soil science, astronomy, meteorology or oceanography. Regrettably, Maine does not specify that chemistry teachers must take a majority of coursework in chemistry or that physics teachers should earn most of their credits in physics. Candidates are also required to pass the Praxis II "Physical Science" test, which combines both physics and chemistry.

Middle school science teachers in Maine have the option of a middle grades science endorsement, and the state similarly outlines two pathways to certification. Commendably, these candidates must pass the Praxis II "Middle School Science" test. Regrettably, however, Maine also allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license (see Goal 1-E).

Supporting Research

Maine Department of Education 05-071 Chapter 115, Part II, sections 1.3, 1.4 Praxis Testing Requirements www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require secondary science teachers to pass tests of content knowledge for each science discipline they intend to teach.

States that allow combination licenses across multiple science disciplines—and require only a comprehensive content test—are not ensuring that these secondary teachers possess adequate subjectspecific content knowledge. Maine's required assessment combines both physics and chemistry and does not report separate scores for each subject. Therefore, a candidate could, for example, answer many physics questions incorrectly on the combination content test, yet still be licensed to teach physics to high school students.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 26	STATE OFFRS OR COMBINATION CENTERAL	State offers Beneral Science Combination Seneral Science Withous addresseneral Science	STATE OFFERS	Sate offer only Construct Sate offer only single subject Science licenses without adoptate testing without	
Do states ensure that	24	Scien Scien	SINC	Vises Intersu	
secondary science teachers	JENE	N SC Teral	test .	V sin	
have adequate subject-	ERS.	THAL 58e	Puate FRS (ESTIP	
matter knowledge?	N BIN	5 WI offe natio		e tes	
matter knowledge:		State omb	Le Crient	State State cienc lequa	
Alabama				State offer sonth COVERS	
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					
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					
5 0	1	20	10	1	
	1	39	10	1	
					-

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

New Jersey does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. Although the state allows a combination physical science certificate, it ensure adequate content knowledge in both chemistry and physics by requiring teacher candidates to pass individual content tests in chemistry, physics and general science. Further, middle school science teachers must pass a science-specific content test.

Figure 27

Do states ensure that middle school teachers have adequate preparation to teach science?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia

- 2. Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Wyoming



Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal H – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies

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

Goal Components

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

- The state should require secondary social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each social studies discipline they intend to teach.
- The state should require middle school social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of social studies.

Background

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



Area 1: Goal H **Maine** Analysis

State Partly Meets Goal



ANALYSIS

Maine only offers a general social studies certification to secondary teachers. Candidates are required to pass the Praxis II "Social Studies" content test. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the topical areas.

Middle school social studies teachers in Maine have the option of a middle grades social studies endorsement. These candidates commendably must pass the Praxis II "Middle School Social Studies" test. Unfortunately, Maine allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license (see Goal 1-E).

Supporting Research

Maine Department of Education 05-071 Chapter 115, Part II, sections 1.3, 1.4 Praxis Testing Requirements www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require secondary social studies teachers to pass tests of content knowledge for each social studies discipline they intend to teach.

States that allow general social studies certifications—and only require a general knowledge social studies exam—are not ensuring that these secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. Maine's required assessment combines all subject areas (e.g., history, geography, economics) and does not report separate scores for each subject area. Therefore, candidates could answer many history questions, for example, incorrectly, yet still be licensed to teach history to high school students.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

ligure 25	14	۲ ۲	و در
Do states ensure that	Ş		al si Puai
secondary social studies	SF N	NIS NIS	³ 0c,
teachers have adequate	E VE		eral out
	225	225	Ber Witt
subject-matter	OU, PH	PFEE SSEE	hers inse
knowledge?	DEFERS GENERAL SOCIAL ADERULATE LICENSE WITT	OFFERS ONLY SING "TH	Offers Beneral Social Stud
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			-
Connecticut			-
Delaware			-
District of Columbia			-
Florida			-
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois Indiana			
lowa			_
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
MAINE			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			1
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	3	47

rdies C

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Not only does **Indiana** ensure that its secondary social studies teachers possess adequate content knowledge of all subjects they intend to teach through both coursework and content testing but the state's policy also does not make it overly burdensome for social studies teachers to teach multiple subjects. Other notable states include **Georgia** and **South Dakota**, which also do not offer secondary general social studies certifications.

Figure 30

Do states ensure that middle school teachers have adequate preparation to teach social studies?



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

Figure 29

1. Massachusetts does not offer a general social studies license, but offers combination licenses.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they will be required to teach.

Goal Components

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

- The state should not permit special education teachers to teach on a K-12 license that does not differentiate between the preparation of elementary teachers and that of secondary teachers.
- 2. All elementary special education candidates should have a broad liberal arts program of study that includes study in mathematics, science, English, social studies and fine arts and should be required to pass a subjectmatter test for licensure that is no less rigorous than what is required of general education candidates.
- 3. The state should require that teacher preparation programs graduate secondary special education teacher candidates who are highly qualified in at least two subjects. The state should also customize a "HOUSSE" route for new secondary special education teachers to help them achieve highly qualified status in all the subjects they teach.

The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

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

Figure 31

How States are Faring in Special Education Teacher Preparation



0 States Meet Goal

1

State Nearly Meets Goal Massachusetts



- 1 State Meets a Small Part of Goal Kansas
- 34 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2009:



Area 1: Goal I **Maine** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal

🕢 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 🤆

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Commendably, Maine does not offer a K-12 special education certification.

However, Maine does not ensure that its elementary special education teacher candidates are provided with a broad liberal arts program of study relevant to the elementary classroom. It also does not require that they pass the same subject-matter test as general education candidates.

Further, Maine fails to require that secondary special education teacher candidates are highly qualified in at least two subject areas, and it does not customize a HOUSSE route for new secondary special education teachers to help them achieve highly qualified status in all subjects they teach.

Supporting Research

Rules for the Department of Education, Chapter 115, Part II, 2.1 Praxis Test Requirements www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

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.

Maine 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.

Ensure that secondary special education teacher candidates graduate with highly qualified status in at least two subjects, and customize a HOUSSE route so that they can achieve highly qualified status in all subjects they plan to teach.

To make secondary special education teacher candidates more flexible and better able to serve schools and students, Maine should use a combination of coursework and testing to ensure that they graduate with highly qualified status in two core academic areas. A customized HOUSSE route can also help new secondary special education teacher candidates to become highly qualified in multiple subjects by offering efficient means by which they could gain broad overviews of specific areas of content knowledge, such as content-driven university courses. Such a route is specifically permitted in the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).



MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine contended that once employed, elementary special education teachers must also pass the general elementary Praxis II as they work to meet HQ status. Some teachers use the HOUSSE rubric.

In addition, secondary special education teachers must also meet HQ requirements in the subjects they teach if they are the teacher of record for that subject.

LAST WORD

To ensure that all special education students are being taught by teachers who have the requisite subject-matter knowledge, passage of a grade-level appropriate content test should be a condition of initial licensure.

Figure 32		Cheis K-12 and Brade-Specific	/
Do states distinguish		⁵ Spe	
between elementary	lov 4 Vov	pele	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
and secondary special	ČČ	and	a K.
education teachers?	VO1	, 12 10	only
eoucation teachers:	BOESNOT OFFERA	Offers, ertifica	a Offers only a K-12
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			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania ¹			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	16	16	19

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Unfortunately, NCTQ cannot highlight any state's policy in this area. Preparation of special education teachers remains a topic in critical need of states' attention. However, it is worth noting that three states-Louisiana, Pennsylvania and Texas—will no longer issue K-12 special education certifications. Only grade-level specific options will be available to new teachers.

Figure 33

Do states require subject-matter testing for elementary special education licenses?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon⁴, Pennsylvania⁵, Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia
- 4. Although Oregon requires testing, the state allows an "alternative assessment" option for candidates who fail the tests twice to still be considered for a license.
- 5. In Pennsylvania, a candidate who opts for dual certification in elementary special education and as a reading specialist does not have to take a content test.

Figure 32 1. Beginning January 1, 2013

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal J – Assessing Professional Knowledge

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

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

Figure 34

0

How States are Faring in Assessing Professional Knowledge



Best Practice States

23 States Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, California,

District of Columbia 1, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, MAINE, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia

States Nearly Meet Goal 2

Maryland, Rhode Island

- States Partly Meet Goal 3 Idaho, North Carolina, Utah
- States Meet a Small Part of Goal 5 Connecticut, Indiana, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Wyoming

18 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii I, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin

Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

1:1 😝 : 49 ↓:1

Area 1: Goal J **Maine** Analysis



State Meets Goal

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

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

Supporting Research www.ets.org/praxis

RECOMMENDATION

Verify that commercially available tests of pedagogy actually align with state standards.

Maine should ensure that its selected test of professional knowledge measures the knowledge and skills the state expects new teachers to have.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

★ EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Twenty-three states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it additionally commends the nine states (Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas) that utilize their own assessments to measure pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Figure 35

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



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia
- 2. Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah⁴, Wyoming
- Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 4. Not required until teacher advances from a Level One to a Level Two license.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal K – Student Teaching

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

Goal Components Figure 36 (The factors considered in determining the states' How States are Faring in Student Teaching rating for the goal.) 1. The state should require that student **Best Practice States** teachers only be placed with cooperating teachers for whom there is evidence of their 2 States Meet Goal effectiveness as measured by consistent gains Florida, Tennessee in student learning. 2. The state should require that teacher State Nearly Meets Goal candidates spend at least 10 weeks Kentucky student teaching. 21 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Hawaii, Background Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, A detailed rationale and supporting research for North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy. Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal 5 Indiana, Michigan, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota 22 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, MAINE, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: New Goal

Area 1: Goal K **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Maine outlines parameters for field experiences and clinical practice in its program approval standards. The state articulates that a clinical practice must be "sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing." However, it does not mention a specific requirement of clock or credit hours.

Maine's "Pathway Two," intended for candidates who did not graduate from a Maine approved program, requires one academic semester or a minimum of 15 weeks of full-time student teaching, or a combination of part-time and full-time student teaching in an amount equivalent to 15 weeks in the endorsement area at the specified grade level.

The state does not articulate any requirements for cooperating teachers.

Supporting Research

Maine Department of Education 05-071 Chapter 114, Section 2.3; Chapter 115, Section 1.2, 1.4, 2.1

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maine 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.

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 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 the student teacher or school district staff.

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

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



MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine asserted that although Chapter 114 may not specify 15 weeks, all approved programs follow the 15-week requirement outlined in Chapter 115.

LAST WORD

As noted in the analysis, the requirements outlined in Chapter 115 only apply to "Pathway Two," and are intended for candidates who did not graduate from a Maine approved program.

Figure 37		* 55
Do states require	405	1014 N
the elements of a		VENESS ON
high-quality student	BAS	O W ESS
teaching experience?		AST N
		STUL
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		
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		1
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	2	29

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although no state has been singled out for "best practice" honors, Florida and Tennessee require teacher candidates to complete at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, and they have taken steps toward ensuring that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

1. Candidates can student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

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



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

Figure 39 Is the summative student teaching experience of sufficient length?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia⁵, Wisconsin
- 2. Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Illinois, Maine, New Mexico, Utah
- 4. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Maryland, Montana
- 5. Candidates can student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal L – Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

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

Goal Components

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

- 1. The state should collect value-added data that connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. The state should collect other meaningful data that reflects program performance, including some or all of the following:

a. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including basic skills, subject matter and professional knowledge tests;

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

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

d. Evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching;

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

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

The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

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

Figure -	40
----------	----

How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation **Program Accountability**



Best Practice State Florida

State Meets Goal Louisiana



States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Colorado 1, Georgia 1, Tennessee, Texas



States Partly Meet Goal Kentucky, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina

- 16 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Illinois¹, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia 1
- 22 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, MAINE, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

1:4 + : 44 ↓:3

Area 1: Goal L **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 🕢 Bar Raised for this Goal 🤅

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

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

Most importantly, Maine does not collect value-added data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

The state also fails to collect other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs, and it does not apply any transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval.

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

Supporting Research

Rules for the Department of Education, 05-071, Chapter 114, Section 3 Title II State Reports https://title2.ed.gov

RECOMMENDATION

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

To ensure that programs are producing effective classroom teachers, Maine should consider academic achievement gains of students taught by the programs' graduates, averaged over the first three years of teaching.

Gather other meaningful data that reflect program performance.

In addition to knowing whether programs are producing effective teachers, other objective, meaningful data can also indicate whether programs are appropriately screening applicants and whether they are delivering essential academic and professional knowledge. Maine should gather data such as the following: average raw scores of graduates on licensing tests, including basic skills, subject matter and professional knowledge tests; satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison; evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching; and five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

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

Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval after appropriate due process.

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

To inform the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing, Maine should present all the data it collects on individual teacher preparation programs.



MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine pointed out that it is the recipient of a multi-year, multi-million dollar grant for the development of its state longitudinal data system (SLDS). The state added that its growth model has been developed, and it enables parents, schools, districts and the state to understand how individual students are progressing from year to year and provides a common measure to show how much growth is needed for each student to reach state standards. This data source is designed to enable the match of individual student records with individual teacher records.

Supporting Research

http://dw.education.maine.gov/education/MEDW/Default.aspx http://dw.education.maine.gov/education/MEDW/GrowthModel/GrowthModelLandingPage.aspx



Figure 41				/		
Do states hold teach preparation prograr accountable?		PRE VININUM STANDARDS FOO	PARATION ³ L/SB3/M NO 107/B/G 107/B	OBJECTITE PROCERMIN.	PREPA	ARATION LISE SUMPLY AND A LISE SUMPLY AND A LIS
	OBJECT SPECIFIC	MINIMUM STANDARDS FO	DATA I	OBIEC	MININ STAND, PERFORM	DATA + AVAILAB
Alabama						1
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						2
District of Columbia						1
Florida						· ·
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho Illinois						
Illinois Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky						1
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						
		_				
	25	5	14	17	2	10

 Reported institutional data do not distinguish between candidates in the traditional and alternate route programs.

 The posted data do not allow the public to review and compare program performance because data are not disaggregated by program provider.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs. The state also relies on other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs, and it applies transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval. Florida also posts an annual report on its website.

Figure 42

Do states use student achievement data to hold teacher preparation programs accountable?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, 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 43

Which states collect meaningful data?

AVERAGE RAW SCORES ON LICENSING TESTS Alabama, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Tennessee, West Virginia

SATISFACTION RATINGS FROM SCHOOLS

Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland¹, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington¹, West Virginia

EVALUATION RESULTS FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES Alabama, Arizona, Delaware¹, Florida, Illiniois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont

STUDENT LEARNING GAINS Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas

TEACHER RETENTION RATES Arizona, Colorado, Delaware¹, Missouri, New Jersey

1. For alternate route only

Figure 44		/	National accreditation	While not technically require (While not technically reach	llred,
What is the relationship	STATE HAS ITS OWN	National accreditation	proval	While not technically required to indicate approval	s credit	, ,
between state program	Sou	edite PD	rie ap ditat	tate, Inicall	fom.	della
approval and national	42 H	or st	acre	thed in the	Table, Ttect	
accreditation?	PLA OVA	ation, lired	tional litute	hile n Ppro	is so	
	ZS A	is s	Nai Subst	While not technically required	While not technically re-	
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arizona ¹						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida						
Georgia						
Hawaii ¹						
Idaho Illinois¹						
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 ¹						
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas ¹						
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
wyoning						
	23	10	4	8	6	

1. According to information posted on NCATE's website.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal A – Alternate Route Eligibility

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





State Meets a Small Part of Goal (=) Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

The admission requirements for Maine's alternate route do not exceed those of traditional programs, although the state is flexible regarding the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Nontraditional candidates must apply for one of Maine's two alternate route certifications: the Conditional Certificate and the Targeted Need Certificate.

Neither the Conditional Certificate nor the Targeted Need Certificate requires candidates to demonstrate prior academic performance, such as a minimum GPA.

Applicants are not required to pass a subject-matter test. The state requires that applicants meet specific coursework requirements for the area they plan to teach. Candidates may apply for a waiver that will substitute a passing score on a subject-matter test or experience teaching at the postsecondary level in lieu of the coursework requirements.

Supporting Research Rule 05-071, Chapter 115, Part I

RECOMMENDATION

Screen all candidates for academic ability.

Maine 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 2.75 or higher. 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.

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

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

Offer additional flexibility in meeting coursework requirements.

Although Maine does allow candidates to test out of coursework requirements, the state should include this option in the regular admission standards for alternate route certification rather than requiring the additional step of applying for a waiver.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine contended that all applicants must pass a subject-matter test for full certification. Candidates may not apply for a waiver to substitute for a test or coursework. A waiver may grant additional time to meet a requirement, but it will not substitute for a required test or coursework.

LAST WORD

NCTQ's recommendation regarding a subject-matter test is that it should be required for admission to an alternate route program. Individuals pursuing alternative certification should have their content expertise well established. NCTQ acknowledges that Maine, like most states, requires subject-matter tests for licensure.

Figure 46	6-	/	/
Are states' alternate	CADEMIC STANDARD MISSION ESTANDARD DITTONAL PREDS FOR	54	NO MUOR RECURED OF TEST CAN BE USED IN LIEU
routes selective yet	EDS EDS	LES LES	
flexible in admissions?	A CAN	IFR S	R REC VS
Jlexible in admissions?	NAL NAL	MAI	2 4 0 2 4 0 2 4 0
	ADE. DITIC	SIECT	NON STON
	र दे हैं	SUBJECT-NAITTER TEST	-20
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			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota ¹			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	13	24	27
		27	L1

Do states require alternate routes to be selective?



- Strong Practice: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee
- Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 48

Do states ensure that alternate route teachers have subject-matter knowledge?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut⁴, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois⁴, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. State does not require test at all, exempts some candidates or does not require passage until program completion. Alaska, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 4. Required prior to entering the classroom.

Figure 46

1. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

Figure 49

Do states accommodate the nontraditional background of alternate route candidates?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut⁶, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Virginia, Washington
- Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Wisconsin
- 5. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 6. Test out option available to candidates in shortage areas only.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal B – Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide streamlined preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers.

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

Figure 50

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Preparation

- 1 Best Practice State
- 4 States Meet Goal Arkansas, Delaware ↑, Georgia, New Jersey
 - 7 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Florida, Maryland¹, Mississippi, Rhode Island¹, South Carolina, Virginia

11 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada , New Mexico, New York, Ohio , South Dakota, West Virginia

- 18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa↓, Kansas↑, Michigan↑, Minnesota↑, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming
 - 10 States Do Not Meet Goal Hawaii, MAINE, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont, Wisconsin

Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

1:8 ↔:42 ↓:1

State Does Not Meet Goal

```
Progress Since 2009
```

ANALYSIS

Maine does not ensure that its alternate route candidates will receive streamlined preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers.

Maine does not require new teachers working under the Conditional Certificate or Targeted Need Certificate to complete an alternate route program.

A teacher must complete six hours of approved study in order to renew the Conditional or Targeted Need Certificates for an additional year. The state provides no specific guidelines about the nature of this coursework, nor is there a limit on the amount of coursework that can be required overall.

All new teachers are assigned a mentor.

Supporting Research Rule 05-071, chapter 115, Part I

RECOMMENDATION

Establish coursework guidelines for alternate route preparation programs.

The state should articulate guidelines regarding the nature and amount of coursework required of candidates. Requirements should be manageable and contribute to the immediate needs of new teachers. Appropriate coursework should include grade-level or subject-level seminars, methodology in the content area, classroom management, assessment and scientifically based early reading instruction.

Provide an induction program to support alternate route teachers.

Maine should offer a highly structured, well-supervised induction program for all alternate route candidates. Effective strategies include practice teaching prior to teaching in the classroom, intensive mentoring with full classroom support in the first few weeks or months of school, a reduced teaching load and release time to allow new teachers to observe experienced teachers during each school day.

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine disagreed with NCTQ's analysis that Maine does not specify the content of the required six courses, "which implies a candidate may take anything; that is not true." The state explained that each candidate is provided with a written evaluation of coursework that must be completed. "They must complete six credits from their remaining requirements of which they have already been informed through their valuation letter. This letter is updated each year they remain working under a conditional or targeted need certificate or a transitional endorsement."

LAST WORD

While Maine does appear to review the transcripts and make determinations about coursework for individual candidates, there does not appear to be any formal policy specific to alternate route candidates that is the basis for these decisions. An approach that holds alternate route candidates to the same coursework requirements as would be expected of traditional candidates is not consistent with the purpose of alternative certification.

Figure 51	STREAMLINED C	× /	/	/	/
Do states' alternate rou	ites	REEVANT COURCE NOR	ž		. /
provide streamlined		200		E I	-Lac
preparation that meets			E E		: dan
the immediate needs of		Å7 C	N48 1111		IVES
new teachers?	REAN	ELA	250	L) AC	TENS
new teachers.	23	FE	REASONABLE PROCRAMLENCE	PRACTICE TEACHING	INTENSIVE SUPPORT
Alabama	_				
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					-
District of Columbia Florida ¹					
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 ²					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	13	12	29	18	13
	15	12	25	10	15

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Connecticut ensures that its alternate route provides streamlined preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers. The state requires a manageable number of credit hours, relevant coursework, a field placement and intensive mentoring. Other notable states include **Arkansas**, **Delaware**, **Georgia** and **New Jersey**. These states provide streamlined, relevant coursework with intensive mentoring.



1. Florida requires practice teaching or intensive mentoring.

2. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Do states curb excessive coursework requirements?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia
- 2. Indiana, Nevada, Wyoming
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 53

Do states require practice teaching or intensive mentoring?



1. Strong Practice: Arizona, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia

- 2. Strong Practice: Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey, New York, West Virginia
- 3. Strong Practice: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida⁶, Maryland, Massachusetts
- 4. Alabama, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 5. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 6. Candidates are required to have one or the other, not both.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal C – Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from regulatory obstacles that limit its usage and providers.

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

Figure 54

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Usage and Providers

Best Practice States 0 26 States Meet Goal Arizona¹, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut 1, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois¹, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan 1, Nevada 1, New Hampshire, New York¹, North Carolina, Ohio¹, Pennsylvania¹, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington 1 States Nearly Meet Goal Minnesota 1, New Jersey, South Dakota, Utah 7 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama 1, Indiana, Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, West Virginia, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal Idaho¹, Mississippi, South Carolina, Vermont 10 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, MAINE, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:12 👄 : 39 4:0

Area 2: Goal C Maine Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Maine limits the usage and providers of its alternate route.

Maine's alternate route is intended for use only as a route of last resort. Teachers may only work in positions designated as having a shortage of fully certified applicants.

Maine gives approval to offer the state's alternate route programs only to institutions of higher education. Coursework requirements are set out only in credit hours, effectively precluding non-higher education providers.

Supporting Research Rule 05-071, Chapter 114, Chapter 115, Part I 2.37

RECOMMENDATION

Broaden alternate route usage.

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

Encourage diversity of alternate route providers

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

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

Figure 55		DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS
Are states' alternate	200	DERS
routes free from	20	Con Parts
limitations?	30	SF P
	100	
	C BE	VERS
Alabama ¹	ر بی ا	
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 New Mexico	-	
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota ²		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	32	29

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

Figure 56

Can alternate route teachers teach any subject or grade anywhere in the state?



Figure 55 and 56

- Alabama offers routes without restrictions for candidates with master's degrees. The route for candidates with bachelor's degrees is limited to certain subjects.
- 2. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 57 Do states permit providers other than





1. Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin

- 2. Strong Practice: California, Colorado, Georgia, North Carolina, Vermont⁵, West Virginia
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho⁶, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi⁶, Missouri⁶, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey⁷, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina⁶, South Dakota, Utah⁶, Wyoming
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 5. Districts can run Peer Review programs only.
- 6. ABCTE is also an approved provider.

PERMITTED¹

7. Permits school districts to provide programs without university partnerships in some circumstances.

Figure 58	GENUINE GENUINE OR NEAD.	# /	Offered route is disingenuous
-		Alternate route that needs	nonu
Do states provide real	, all	t hee	
alternative pathways	NE	Ven Sven	is dis
to certification?	Ő		'ute
		Tate Cant,	Pad Ic
	ENC EN	Shift	Mer
Alabama			U
Alabama Alaska			
Alaska			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
MAINE			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota ¹			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia Wisconsin			
Wyoming	_		
	7	25	18

1. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
| Figure 59 | | (s | ~ I | / | \$ | / | Practice Teaching | <u>رة (</u> | 1 | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|--|
| What are the | PREREOUISITE OF C | VERIFICATION OF SUL | | STREAMLINED CO. | RELEVANT COURSENOR | No. | | AND,
C | DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS | |
| | 4 | PRM 2 | AVAILABILITY OF TEC | | 5 | REASONABLE
PROCRAMLE | F | | i dina | |
| characteristics of | 0
20 | | | s 2 |), and | - 4 | | EVI E | PRC | |
| states' alternate | | | | INE O | 20 | VABL
M LE | | 1240 | Å Å | |
| routes? | DEN | TER C | A A | AM | A A | 550
554 | Ne la | 24 | RSII | |
| | \$\$
\$ | MA IN | ₹°5 | STR | RELE | PRO PR | PR PR | BROAD USAGE | DIN | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Mexico | | | | | | | | | | |
| New York | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Carolina | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Dakota | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ohio | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| Oklahoma
Ora zar | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oregon | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | | | | _ | | | | | | |
| South Carolina | | | | | | | | | | |
| South Dakota | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tennessee | | | | | | | | | | |
| Texas | | | | | | | | | | |
| Utah | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vermont | | | | | | | | | | |
| Virginia | | | | | | | _ | | | |
| Washington | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Virginia
Wisconsin | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wyoming | | | | | | | | | | |
| wyonning | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 13 | 24 | 27 | 13 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 32 | 29 | |

NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011: 71

MAINE

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal D – Part-Time Teaching Licenses

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

Goal Components

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

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

Background

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

Figure 60 How States are Faring in Part Time Teaching Licenses **Best Practice State** 1 Arkansas 2 States Meet Goal Florida, Georgia 5 States Nearly Meet Goal Kentucky, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah States Partly Meet Goal California, Louisiana, Ohio, Oklahoma States Meet a Small Part of Goal 6 Colorado, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, New York, Washington 33 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, MAINE, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: New Goal

Area 2: Goal D Maine Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

ANALYSIS

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part-time?

	YES	No
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California	1	
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas	2	
Kentucky		
Louisiana	1	
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi	2 ²	
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York	2	
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio	1	
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington	2	
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	16	35

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Arkansas offers a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time. Individuals seeking this license must pass a subject-matter test and are also required to complete specially-designed pedagogy training that is not overly burdensome.

1. License has restrictions.

2. It appears that the state has a license that may be used for this purpose; guidelines are vague.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal E – Licensure Reciprocity

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

Goal Components

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

- The state should offer a standard license to fully certified teachers moving from other states, without relying on transcript analysis or recency requirements as a means of judging eligibility. The state can and should require evidence of good standing in previous employment.
- The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet the incoming state's testing requirements.
- 3. The state should accord the same license to teachers from other states who completed an approved alternate route program that it accords teachers prepared in a traditional preparation program.

Background

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

Figure 62 How States are Faring in Licensure Reciprocity 2 Best Practice States Alabama, Texas 0 States Meet Goal 3 States Nearly Meet Goal Idaho, Ohio, Washington 13 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Delaware, Illinois^{*}, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin 15 States Meet a Small Part of Goal

15 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Virginia, Wyoming

18 States Do Not Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, MAINE, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina, Vermont

Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

★:2 ↔:49 ↓:0

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Maine does not support licensure reciprocity for certified teachers from other states.

Although Maine grants waivers to out-of-state teachers for its basic skills and pedagogy tests, it is not clear whether the state requires applicants to meet its standards regarding subject-matter testing.

Teachers with comparable out-of-state certificates are eligible for Maine's professional certificate. Applicants must meet the state's recency requirement of at least five years of experience in the last seven years. Also, because transcripts are required for all applicants, and the "Department will analyze each complete application and provide the applicant with a written statement of any remaining eligibility requirements and the timeframe in which each shall be completed," it appears that out-of-state teachers are subject to transcript analysis. States that reach a determination about an applicant's licensure status on the basis of the course titles listed on the applicant's transcript may end up mistakenly equating the amount of required coursework with the teacher's qualifications.

Maine is also a participant in the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement; however, the latest iteration of this agreement no longer purports to be a reciprocity agreement among states and thus is no longer included in this analysis.

Supporting Research

Maine State Board of Education, 05-071, Chapter 115, Section 5.2

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maine should not provide any waivers of its teacher tests unless an applicant can provide evidence of a passing score under its own standards.

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

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

Accord the same license to out-of-state alternate route teachers as would be accorded to traditionally prepared teachers.

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine asserted that all teachers entering the state must meet its subject-matter test requirements. It added that all out-of-state teachers must also meet the requirement for "teaching the exceptional child in the regular classroom" within a specified period, or upon renewal of the first professional certificate.

LAST WORD

The state should clearly articulate its testing requirements for out-of-state teachers in the code.

1

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alabama and Texas appropriately support licensure reciprocity by only requiring certified teachers from other states to meet each state's own testing requirements and by not specifying any additional coursework or recency requirements to determine eligibility for either traditional or alternate route teachers.

Figure 63

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



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York³, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania³, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington³, Wisconsin
- Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana⁴, Nebraska⁴, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Exception for teachers with National Board Certification.
- 4. No subject-matter testing for any teacher certification.

Figure 64

1. For traditionally prepared teachers only.

2. Transcript review required for those with less than 3 years experience.

Figure 64	NO STRING	Hu	/	
What do states require	,	۲ ب ب	6	
of teachers transferring	, c		Pents	
francista and a state of a	Ę,	142	uiren	
from other states?	33	bt a	, req	
	NES CE	mscr.	Guag	
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Transcript analysis	Recency requirements	
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				
New Mexico	1			
New York North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island	1			
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington	2			
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming	1			
	9	41	12	



		,	,
Figure 65	(0		9 S
Do states treat out-of-stat	STATE REATS TEACHERS	Jate Specifies officient outie trachers for alternate	Date has policies with the for allemant route create observations of the policies with the content of the content of the content of the reactions of the reacti
teachers the same whethe	r <u>F</u>	diffe or alte	ies u ate o te tee
they were prepared in a	EAIS	cifies ints for lers	Poli
traditional or an alternate	HT X	te spe treme treact	e ha ntial i ernai
route program?	No.	star require oute	Star Pote or alt
Alabama	<b>•</b> /	$\square$	
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			-
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			
	6	6	39

## **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers**

### Goal A – State Data Systems

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

#### **Goal Components** Figure 66 (The factors considered in determining the states' How States are Faring in the Development of rating for the goal.) Data Systems 1. The state should establish a longitudinal **Best Practice States** data system with at least the following key components: 35 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, a. A unique statewide student identifier Hawaii, Idahot, Illinoist, Indianat, Iowat, number that connects student data across Kansas¹, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland¹, key databases across years; Massachusetts 1, Minnesota 1, Mississippi, b. A unique teacher identifier system that Missouri, Nebraska 1, New Hampshire 1, New can match individual teacher records with Mexico, New York 1, North Carolina, North individual student records; and Dakota1, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, c. An assessment system that can match Washington 1, West Virginia, Wisconsin 1, individual student test records from year to Wyoming year in order to measure academic growth. 2. Value-added data provided through the States Nearly Meet Goal state's longitudinal data system should be considered among the criteria used to **15** States Partly Meet Goal determine teachers' effectiveness. Alaska, Arizona 1, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia 1, MAINE, Michigan, 3. To ensure that data provided through the Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, state data system is actionable and reliable, South Dakota¹, Texas, Vermont, Virginia the state should have a clear definition of "teacher of record" and require its consistent States Meet a Small Part of Goal 0 use statewide. State Does Not Meet Goal Background California A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy. Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:17 👄 : 33 **↓**:1

### Area 3: Goal A **Maine** Analysis

```
State Partly Meets Goal
```

Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

Maine does not have a data system that can be used to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

However, Maine does have two of three necessary elements that would allow for the development of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. The state has assigned unique student identifiers that connect student data across key databases across years, and it has the capacity to match student test records from year to year in order to measure student academic growth.

Although Maine assigns teacher identification numbers, it cannot match individual teacher records with individual student records.

### **Supporting Research**

Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Develop capacity of state data system.

Maine should ensure that its state data system is able to match individual teacher records with individual student records.

#### Develop a clear definition of "teacher of record."

Maine has not yet established a definition of teacher of record, which is essential in order to use the student-data link for teacher evaluation and related purposes. To ensure that data provided through the state data system are actionable and reliable, Maine should articulate a definition of teacher of record and require its consistent use throughout the state.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine pointed out that it is the recipient of a multi-year, multi-million-dollar grant for the development of its state longitudinal data system (SLDS). The state added that its growth model has been developed, and it enables parents, schools, districts and the state to understand how individual students are progressing from year to year and provides a common measure to show how much growth is needed for each student to reach state standards. This data source is designed to enable the match of individual student records with individual teacher records.

#### Supporting Research

http://dw.education.maine.gov/education/MEDW/Default.aspx http://dw.education.maine.gov/education/MEDW/GrowthModel/GrowthModelLandingPage.aspx

Do state data systems have the capacity to assess teacher effectiveness?



	5	1 -51	~0
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			
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			
	50	35	50

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends the 35 states that have a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.



Key

indicates that the state assigns teacher identification numbers, but it cannot match individual teacher records with individual student records.

# **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers**

## Goal B – Evaluation of Effectiveness

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

### **Goal Components**

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

- The state should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion or specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Evaluation instruments, whether state or locally developed, should be structured to preclude a teacher from receiving a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.
- 2. Evaluation instruments should require classroom observations that focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.
- 3. Teacher evaluations should consider objective evidence of student learning, including not only standardized test scores but also classroom-based artifacts such as tests, quizzes and student work.
- 4. The state should require that evaluation instruments differentiate among various levels of teacher performance. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.

The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

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

## Figure 68

How States are Faring in Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness 0 Best Practice States



O States Do Not Meet Goal District of Columbia, Iowa, MAINE, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia

#### Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

### Area 3: Goal B **Maine** Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Bar Raised for this Goal

Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

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

Maine policy holds local superintendents responsible for evaluating teachers. The state is required to provide examples of teacher evaluation models, which districts can opt to use, or they can create their own. However, models must include multiple measures. If a district chooses to include student assessments as part of teacher evaluations, it must use one of the models developed by the state.

#### Supporting Research

Maine Revised Statutes Title 20-A, Section 1055 and 13802

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

Maine should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion, or it should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Whether state or locally developed, a teacher should not be able to receive a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.

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

Maine should not only require that its evaluations include classroom observations, but also the state should specifically articulate that these observations focus on effectiveness of instruction. The primary component of a classroom observation should be the quality of instruction, as measured by student time on task, student grasp or mastery of the lesson objective and efficient use of class time.

Utilize evaluation ratings that meaningfully differentiate among various levels of teacher performance.

Although the state's pilot program has identified four levels of performance, Maine should ultimately require districts to utilize similar multiple rating categories in their own evaluation instruments.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 69	Chines That STUDENT ACHINE THAT STUDENT THE PREDUNT COOL	Teacher evaluations are to be	Teacher evaluations much	_ /	
Do states consider	DEN	RITER RITER	owth	Student achievement data	
classroom effectiveness	102 251	4NT tions	evide	ment	
as part of teacher	S THA	Valua Valua evem	Valua ective	o thieve	
evaluations?	UIRE EVEN	her e icanti t achi	ther e te obj t lean	ent ac quirec	
	ACH FE	Teac Signit tuden	Teac incluc tuden	Stud Dot re	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia ¹					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas				-	
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
MAINE					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire				_	
New Jersey				_	
New Mexico New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
wyonning .			7		
	12	5	7	27	

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ has not singled out any one state for "best practice" honors. Many states have made significant strides in the area of teacher evaluation by requiring that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion. Because there are many different approaches that result in student learning being the preponderant criterion, all 10 states that meet this goal are commended for their efforts.

#### Figure 70

Using state data in teacher evaluations

States with Requirements for Student Achievement Data but Lacking Data System Capacity

Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, Nevada

#### States with Data System Capacity but No Student Achievement Requirements

Alabama, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

#### Figure 69

1. District of Columbia Public Schools requires that student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.

# *Sources of objective evidence of student learning*

Many educators struggle to identify possible sources of objective student data. Here are some examples:

- Standardized test scores
- Periodic diagnostic assessments
- Benchmark assessments that show student growth

■ Artifacts of student work connected to specific student learning standards that are randomly selected for review by the principal or senior faculty, scored using rubrics and descriptors

• Examples of typical assignments, assessed for their quality and rigor

■ Periodic checks on progress with the curriculum coupled with evidence of student mastery of the curriculum from quizzes, tests and exams

#### Figure 72

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



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

Figure 73		State-designed teacher evaluation with diacher	.ş /	District designed gusta	ź /	
Do states direct how	Single Statewide teacher		District. designed. District opt-in Consistent designed. System Ifamework/c::th starbsstem	District designed System	te n	
teachers should be	feact	ache	d sys	er solo	h sta	
	tem	th di	ith s	Teri	ð A	
evaluated?	atey 1 sys	ssign n wi	t des	desi,	□ No state policy	
	tle st iatio,	te-de latio	stric siste ewo,	trict, mal	tate	
	Sing	Sta _l Stal	lig Coli	Disi	N0 3	
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida			1			
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho			1			
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky			1			
Louisiana			1			
MAINE						
			1			
Maryland			1			
Massachusetts		2				
Michigan		<b>1</b>				
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska			1			
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania Dhada Island						
Rhode Island		2 2				
South Carolina		2 ²				
South Dakota						
Tennessee		2 2				
Texas		2 ²				
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
	9	10	24	5	3	

1. State approval required.

2. The state model is presumptive; districts need state approval to opt out.

# **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers**

# Goal C – Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

#### **Goal Components**

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

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

#### Background

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

### Figure 74 How States are Faring in Frequency of Evaluations **Best Practice States** 0 9 States Meet Goal Alabama 1, Idaho, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee 1, Washington 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Colorado 1, Delaware 1, Florida 1, Georgia, Indiana¹, Minnesota¹, New York, North Carolina¹, Ohio¹, Pennsylvania, Utah¹, Wyoming 9 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana 1, Maryland, Michigan 1, Nebraska, South Carolina, West Virginia States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Arkansas, Missouri 18 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, MAINE, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:13 ↓:1 👄 : 37

### State Does Not Meet Goal

#### **ANALYSIS**

Maine does not address the number of times teachers must be evaluated.

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

#### Base evaluations on multiple observations.

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

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

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

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?



	OF AL	OF A
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware ¹		
District of Columbia ²		
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		<b>.</b>
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Carolina South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	22	43

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although not awarding "best practice" honors for frequency of evaluations, NCTQ commends all nine states that meet this goal not only by requiring annual evaluations for all teachers, but also for ensuring that new teachers are observed and receive feedback during the first half of the school year.

#### Figure 76

# Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?



#### Figures 75 and 76

- Although highly effective teachers are only required to receive a summative evaluation once every two years, the student improvement component is evaluated annually.
- 2. All District of Columbia Public Schools teachers are evaluated at least annually.

Figure 77
Do states require classroom observations?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska⁴, Arkansas, Colorado⁴, Delaware, Florida⁴, Georgia, Kentucky⁴, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri⁴, Nevada⁴, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon⁴, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia⁴
- Arizona, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin
- District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. For new teachers.

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



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

# **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers**

# Goal D – Tenure

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

#### **Goal Components**

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

- A teacher should be eligible for tenure after a certain number of years of service, but tenure should not be granted automatically at that juncture.
- 2. Evidence of effectiveness should be the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
- The state should articulate a process, such as a hearing, that local districts must administer in considering the evidence and deciding whether a teacher should receive tenure.
- 4. The minimum years of service needed to achieve tenure should allow sufficient data to be accumulated on which to base tenure decisions; five years is the ideal minimum.

The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

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

### Figure 79 How States are Faring on Tenure **Best Practice State** 1 Michigan 1 States Meet Goal 2 Colorado 1. Florida 1 States Nearly Meet Goal 5 Delaware 1, Nevada 1, Oklahoma 1, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee 1 3 States Partly Meet Goal Illinois¹, Indiana¹, New York¹ States Meet a Small Part of Goal 9 Connecticut, Idaho¹, Kentucky, Massachusetts 1, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire 1, North Carolina, Ohio 31 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, MAINE¹, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:15 + : 36 1:0

## State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 🕢 Bar Raised for this Goal 🕜 Progress Since 2009

#### **ANALYSIS**

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

Although Maine increased its probationary period, teachers in Maine are now awarded tenure automatically after a three-year probationary period, absent an additional process that evaluates cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness.

#### Supporting Research

Maine Revised Statutes Title 20-A, Part 6, Chapter 503, Section 13201

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### End the automatic awarding of tenure.

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

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

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

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

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

#### Require a longer probationary period.

Maine should extend its probationary period, ideally to five years. This would allow for an adequate collection of sufficient data that reflect teacher performance.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

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

### How long before a teacher earns tenure?

	No policy	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 YEARS	5 YEARS	STATE ONLY AWARDS ANNUAL CONTRACTS
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							
New Mexico							
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota							
Ohio							
Oklahoma				1			
Oregon							
Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island							2
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas							
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia							
Washington							
West Virginia							
Wisconsin							
Wyoming							
	1	1	5	32	4	5	3

 Teachers may also earn career status with an average rating of at least effective for a four-year period and a rating of at least effective for the last two years.

2. Teachers who receive two years of ineffective evaluations are dismissed.

#### EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING IS THE PREPONDERANT CRITERION Figure 81 Jome evidence of student learning is considered How are tenure Virtually automatically decisions made? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California $\square$ Colorado Connecticut $\square$ Delaware District of Columbia $\square$ Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana lowa $\square$ Kansas Kentucky $\square$ Louisiana MAINE $\square$ Maryland Massachusetts $\square$ Π Michigan Minnesota Mississippi $\square$ Missouri Montana $\square$ Nebraska Nevada $\square$ New Hampshire New Jersey $\square$ New Mexico New York $\square$ North Carolina North Dakota Ohio $\square$ $\square$ Oklahoma 2 Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina $\square$ South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming $\square$ 8 4 39

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

**Michigan** has increased its probationary period to five years and requires that evidence of effectiveness be the primary criterion in awarding tenure.





#### Figure 81

- 1. No state-level policy; however, the contract between DCPS and the teachers' union represents significant advancement in the area of teacher tenure.
- The state has created a loophole by essentially waiving student learning requirements and allowing the principal of a school to petition for career-teacher status.

# **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers**

## Goal E – Licensure Advancement

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

#### **Goal Components**

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

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

The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

#### Background

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



### Area 3: Goal E **Maine** Analysis

### State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 🕢 Bar Raised for this Goal 💮 Progress Since 2009

#### **ANALYSIS**

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

In Maine, to advance from a Provisional Certificate to a Professional Certificate, teachers are required to meet the academic and professional education requirements of the various endorsements and meet the state standards for professional growth leading to competency, which includes communication skills, subject-matter knowledge and classroom instruction. Teachers must also receive a recommendation from the support system that an initial professional certificate be issued.

Maine does not include effectiveness as a factor in the renewal of a professional license. Maine teachers must renew their professional licenses every five years by completing six credits of approved study taken during the lifetime of the previous authorization.

#### Supporting Research

Rule Chapters for the Department of Education, 05-071-115 http://maine.gov/sos/cec/rules/05/chaps05.htm http://www.maine.gov/education/cert/index.html

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

#### Discontinue license renewal requirements with no direct connection to classroom effectiveness.

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

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis. The state also cited Chapter 118 as relevant to this goal.

#### LAST WORD

Referenced in Goal 4-A, Chapter 118 describes the state's induction program. Districts must set up Professional Learning Communities Support Systems (PLCSS), which require each provisional teacher to develop a professional plan, get support and have classroom observations, among other things. The PLCSS does play a role in whether a teacher should advance to a professional certificate; however, the standards outlined for the professional plan do not include evidence of effectiveness.

		1	Derionization bit of the control of	1
Figure 84	BIECTIVE ENDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESSIS REQUIRED		her	less
Do states require teacher		Some objective evidence of effectiveness is considence of	o teac man fectivi	Perfomance not considered
to show evidence of	ENCE S REQ	Viden	iven t Perfo	onsig
effectiveness before	EVID	tive e is cor	e but assro	not c
conferring professional	TUEN	objec eness	sidera, "manc 1 to c	hance
licensure?	OBJE FECT	Some	Con Derfor Of tig	erfon
Alabama		'ē'/		4
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois ¹				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
MAINE				
Maryland ²				
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				
NY				
Wisconsin				
Wisconsin Wyoming	3	3	11	34

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

#### Figure 85

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



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

#### Figure 84

- 1. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.
- 2. Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation system for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.

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



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

#### Figure 87

Do states award lifetime professional licenses?



1. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia

2. Strong Practice: 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 Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

# **Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers**

# Goal F – Equitable Distribution

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

Goal Components	Figure 88
(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)	How States are Faring on Equitable Distribution
The state should make the following data publicly available:	★ 0 Best Practice States
1. An "Academic Quality" index for each school that includes factors research has found to be associated with teacher effectiveness, such as:	<ul> <li>0 States Meet Goal</li> <li>0 States Nearly Meet Goal</li> </ul>
a. percentage of new teachers;	6 States Partly Meet Goal
<ul> <li>b. percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once;</li> </ul>	Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina
<ul> <li>c. percentage of teachers on emergency credentials;</li> </ul>	<b>36</b> States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado,
d. average selectivity of teachers' undergraduate institutions; and	Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho <b>1</b> , Indiana, Kansas,
e. teachers' average ACT or SAT scores;	Kentucky, Louisiana, <mark>MAINE</mark> , Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi,
2. The percentage of highly qualified teachers disaggregated by both individual school and by teaching area;	Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania 1, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah 1, Vermont 1, Virginia, Washington,
<ol> <li>The annual teacher absenteeism rate reported for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school;</li> </ol>	West Virginia, Wisconsin
<ol> <li>The average teacher turnover rate for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school, by district and by reasons that teachers leave.</li> </ol>	<b>9</b> States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Wyoming
Background	Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

### State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🬔 Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

Providing comprehensive reporting may be the state's most important role for ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers among schools. Maine reports little school-level data that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

Maine does not collect or publicly report most of the data recommended by NCTQ. The state does not provide a school-level teacher quality index that demonstrates the academic backgrounds of a school's teachers and the ratio of new to veteran teachers. Maine also does not report on teacher absenteeism or turnover rates.

Maine does report on the percentage of highly qualified teachers. These data are reported for each school, rather than aggregated by district. However, these data have not been updated since 2008. The state also compares the percentage of highly qualified teachers at high- and low-poverty schools state-wide. Maine collects data about teacher experience, but does not make them available to the public.

#### **Supporting Research**

2009 Highly Qualified Teacher Summary Report http://www.maine.gov/education/hqtp/0809hqtsummary.pdf Maine's State Teacher Quality Equity Plan 2008-2009 http://www.maine.gov/education/hqtp/equityplan030107.pdf

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Use a teacher quality index to report publicly about each school.

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

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

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

#### Provide comparative data based on school demographics.

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

#### Ensure that data are current.

It is important to keep data updated and current in order to provide the public with an accurate picture of teacher distribution across schools in districts. Maine should update the data it reports on the percentage of highly qualified teachers at the school level, as it has not done so since 2008.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 89	AN MOEX THAT MOEX FOR ASOCIATED DES EACH SCHOOL FAICHER D. WIT, ACTOR OOL	/	PERCENTIACE OF NEW.	ŝ	/	/	
Do states publicly	SCHC	PREENTAGE OF TEACH	Sec.	CHER	ANNUAL TURNOVES	TEACHER ABSENTEESN PAT	4 /F
report school-level	र्ट स रह		The state	V HA	s s	r Rd	
data about teachers?	PES, WITH		PF NE		North	ENTE	
Gata about teachers:	A CLU			A CE	27	ABS	
	AN NUEX FOR EACH THAT NUEX FOR EACH ASSOCIATED UDES FICH	RCEN	GENT	PERCENTAGE OF HIGHIN	MUA	CHEN	
	A S S S	EME	PER	AUN CUR		EA EA	
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							
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia							
Washington							
West Virginia							
Wisconsin							
Wyoming		10					
	0	18	10	41	6	5	

#### EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

No state has an outstanding record when it comes to public reporting of teacher data that can help to ameliorate inequities in teacher quality. However, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island and South Carolina report more school-level data than other states.

 Ideally, percentage of new teachers and percentage of teachers on emergency credentials would be incorporated into a teacher quality index.

# **Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers**

# Goal A – Induction

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

#### **Goal Components**

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

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

#### Background

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

### Figure 90



### Area 4: Goal A **Maine** Analysis

#### State Nearly Meets Goal

### Progress Since 2009

#### **ANALYSIS**

Maine requires that all new teachers receive mentoring. The state's induction program mandates that mentors be assigned to new teachers for a period of two years.

Mentors are chosen by a school leadership committee comprised of faculty, in which the principal has input. All mentors must have at least three years of experience and must successfully complete the stateapproved training program. Although it is not required that mentors have experience in grade level and subject matter similar to the new teachers, the committee does consider grade level, content, location and compatibility of individual style.

Mentor compensation is not specified, but standards provide that "incentives exist for mentors." Standards also require that adequate time is provided for mentors and new teachers to meet weekly and "observe in the classroom periodically." An evaluation of the program is conducted annually by the induction committee.

#### **Supporting Research**

Maine's Guide to New Educator Induction http://www.maine.gov/education/teacherinduction/forms/inductionguide.pdf Maine Chapter 118 Guidance http://www.maine.gov/education/teacherinduction/ch118.html

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Expand guidelines to include other key areas.

While still leaving districts flexibility, Maine should articulate minimum guidelines for a high-quality induction experience. The state should require that mentors spend sufficient time with new teachers, especially in the first critical weeks of school.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.
Figure 91 Do states have policies that articulate the elements of effective induction?	MENTORING FOR ALL	MENTORING SUFER	The second s	CARENI SELECTION	MENTORS MUST	MENTONS PROBANED BE EVALUATER OCRAM	MENTOR IS COMM.	USE OF A VARETY OF EFFE CTUVE
Alabama			/ ~ æ		/ ∹ 		/ ~ ,	/ ~<
Alaska								
Arizona								
Arkansas								
California								
Colorado								_
Connecticut Delaware								-
District of Columbia								
Florida								
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho								
Illinois								
Indiana								
lowa								
Kansas	<u> </u>			_	_		_	
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								
	30	18	9	17	28	12	21	17

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

#### Figure 92

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



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

# Goal B – Professional Development

# The state should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

#### **Goal Components** Figure 93 (The factors considered in determining the states' How States are Faring on Professional rating for the goal.) Development 1. The state should require that evaluation **Best Practice State** 0 systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance. 10 States Meet Goal 2. The state should direct districts to align Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, professional development activities with Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Wyoming findings from teachers' evaluations. States Nearly Meet Goal 7 Background Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, New York, Texas A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy. 10 States Partly Meet Goal Colorado, Hawaii, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia 12 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Utah 12 States Do Not Meet Goal District of Columbia, Iowa, MAINE, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009:

New Goal

## Area 4: Goal B Maine Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

Maine does not have state-level policy that connects professional development to teachers' evaluations.

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

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



## **EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE**

Ten states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, Louisiana is commended for clearly articulating that the feedback provided to a teacher in a post-observation conference must include a discussion of a teacher's strengths and weaknesses.

#### Figure 94

#### Do teachers receive feedback on their evaluations?



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

# Do states require that teacher evaluations inform professional development?



- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Wyoming
- 2. Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Texas
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi⁴, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 4. Mississippi requires professional development based on evaluation results only for teachers in need of improvement in school identified as at-risk.

# Goal C – Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

### **Goal Components**

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

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

#### Background

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

### Figure 97 How States are Faring in Pay Scales **Best Practice States** 2 Florida¹, Indiana¹ 1 State Meets Goal Idaho 1 State Nearly Meets Goal Minnesota 29 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, MAINE, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal 3 Illinois, Rhode Island, Texas States Do Not Meet Goal 15 Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:3 👄 : 48 4:0

## Area 4: Goal C Maine Analysis

## State Partly Meets Goal 🛛 🕞 Progress Since 2009

### ANALYSIS

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

Supporting Research Maine Revised Statutes Title 20-A, Section 13406

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

Figure 98 What role does the state play in deciding teacher	um ule	Sets minimum sal.	DISTRICTS SET SALARY
pay rates?	Sets minimum salary schedule	Sets minimu	DISTRICTS SCHEDULE
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado ¹			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
MAINE			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island ²			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
wyonning	10	•	27
	16	8	27

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

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

		COURTS PERFORMANCE TO COUNT MORE THAN ADVANCED DECREES		
-	gure 99	N N N N N N	1	Requires compensation for advanced degrees
	o states discourage	E TH E TH		'nsat, 'rees
di	stricts from basing	PER MOR	to ^{etio} r	deg deg
te	acher pay on advanced	ED	pay tiscr	reco ncec
de	egrees?	20 20 20 20	ict d	Puire adva,
	- 4	2 Q Q	Le. dist	for e
	Alabama	/	<pre></pre>	
	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			
	New Mexico			
	New York			
	North Carolina			
	North Dakota			
	Ohio			
	Oklahoma			
	Oregon			
	Pennsylvania		1	
	Rhode Island		· ·	
	South Carolina South Dakota			
	Tennessee			
	Texas		2	
	Utah			
	Vermont			
	Virginia			
	Washington			
	West Virginia			
	Wisconsin			
	Wyoming			
	, <u>,</u>			
		3	32	16

1. Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training".

2. Texas has a minimum salary schedule based on years of experience. Compensation for advanced degrees is left to district discretion.

#### 116 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 MAINE

# Goal D – Compensation for Prior Work Experience

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

#### **Goal Components**

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

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

#### Background

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

### Figure 100

How States are Faring in Compensation for Prior Work Experience **Best Practice State** North Carolina State Meets Goal 1 California States Nearly Meet Goal 4 States Partly Meet Goal Delaware, Georgia, Texas, Washington States Meet a Small Part of Goal 45 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, 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 Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:0 ↔:51 4:0

# Area 4: Goal D Maine Analysis

### State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

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

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

## T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

#### Figure 101

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



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

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, 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 Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

# Goal E – Differential Pay

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

### **Goal Components**

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

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

#### Background

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

### Figure 102 How States are Faring on Differential Pay **Best Practice State** 1 Georgia 12 States Meet Goal Arkansas, California, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas States Nearly Meet Goal 3 Maryland, Virginia, Washington 8 States Partly Meet Goal Colorado, Hawaii 4, Idaho 1, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming 10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Connecticut, Illinois, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont 17 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, District of Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, MAINE, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, West Virginia Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:2 + : 45 4:4

## Area 4: Goal E **Maine** Analysis

### State Does Not Meet Goal

#### ANALYSIS

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

Teachers who are National Board Certified are eligible to receive a \$3,000 annual supplement. However, this differential pay is not tied to high-needs schools or subject-area shortages.

Supporting Research Maine National Board for Professional Teaching Standards http://www.nbpts.org/resources/state_local_information/ME

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 103 Do states provide		HIGH NEED SCHOOLS	/	SHORTAGE	£ /
incentives to teach in				AREAS	
high-need schools	4	Tess	4	less	
	DIFFERENTIAL	Loan Forgiveness	DIFFERENTIAL PAY	Loan Forgiveness	No support
or shortage subject	FER	For	FER	For	ddns
areas?	242	Loa	TA A	Loal	No No
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut ¹					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
MAINE					
Maryland ²					
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 ³					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia			4		
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	21	7	17	11	17

- Connecticut offers mortgage assistance and incentives to retired teachers working in shortage subject areas.
- Maryland offers tuition reimbursement for teacher retraining in specified shortage subject areas and offers a stipend for alternate route candidates teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 3. South Dakota offers signing bonuses and scholarships to fill shortages in high-need schools.
- Shortage subject area differential pay is limited to the Middle School Teacher Corps program.

## **★** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

**Georgia** supports differential pay by which teachers can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects. The state is especially commended for its new compensation strategy for math and science teachers, which moves teachers along the salary schedule rather than just providing a bonus or stipend. The state also supports differential pay initiatives to link compensation more closely with district needs and to achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers. Georgia's efforts to provide incentives for National Board Certification teachers to work in high-need schools are also noteworthy.

#### Figure 104

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



 Strong Practice: Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia

2. Colorado, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

3. Idaho, Pennsylvania, Utah

4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia

# Goal F – Performance Pay

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

### **Goal Components**

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

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

#### Background

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



## Area 4: Goal F Maine Analysis

### State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

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

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



**T** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

Figure 106 Do states support performance pay?	PERFORMANCE FACTORES	PERORNANCE BOW	Performance Pay Permis	) Die State State-Sponsored perfo Pay intrativee of perfo	Does not support	- And
	PERFON INTO 54 ALL TEAC	PERFORM AVAILABL	Performa encourage	State-S Pay initi districts	Does no. Performa	
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 ¹						
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						
	3	4	12	5	27	

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

# Goal G – Pension Flexibility

# The state should ensure that pension systems are portable, flexible and fair to all teachers.

#### **Goal Components**

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

- Participants in the state's pension system should have the option of a fully portable pension system as their primary pension plan by means of a defined contribution plan or a defined benefit plan that is formatted similar to a cash balance plan.
- 2. Participants in the state's pension system should be vested no later than the third year of employment.
- 3. Defined benefit plans should offer teachers the option of a lump-sum rollover to a personal retirement account upon termination of employment that includes, at minimum, the teacher's contributions and accrued interest at a fair interest rate. In addition, withdrawal options from either defined benefit or defined contribution plans should include funds contributed by the employer.
- 4. Defined benefit plans should allow teachers to purchase time for unlimited previous teaching experience at the time of employment. Teachers should also be allowed to purchase time for all official leaves of absence, such as maternity or paternity leave.

#### Background

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



## Area 4: Goal G **Maine** Analysis

## State Partly Meets Goal ( Progress Since 2009

#### **ANALYSIS**

Maine only offers a defined benefit pension plan to its teachers as their mandatory pension plan. This plan is not fully portable, does not vest until year five and does not provide any employer contribution for teachers who choose to withdraw their account balances when leaving the system. It also limits flexibility by restricting the ability to purchase years of service. However, the state is commended for offering a fully portable supplemental savings plan.

Vesting in a defined benefit plan guarantees a teacher's eligibility to receive lifetime monthly benefit payments at retirement age. Nonvested teachers do not have a right to later retirement benefits; they may only withdraw the portion of their funds allowed by the plan. Maine's vesting at five years of service limits the options of teachers who leave the system prior to this point.

Teachers in Maine who choose to withdraw their contributions upon leaving only receive their employee contributions plus interest. This means that those who withdraw their funds accrue no benefits beyond what they might have earned had they simply put their contributions in basic savings accounts. Therefore, teachers leaving the pension system would have saved only 7.65 percent of their salary plus interest (see Goal 4-H), which is significantly below the level conventionally recommended by retirement advisers for individuals not also contributing to Social Security.

While Maine's mandatory contribution rate allows for flexibility in teachers' retirement savings, it also means that the state needs to educate teachers on what happens if they leave the system and encourage savings in other portable supplemental plans. Further, teachers who remain in the field of education but enter another pension plan (such as in another state) will find it difficult to purchase the time equivalent to their prior employment in the new system because they are not entitled to any employer contribution.

Maine limits teachers' flexibility to purchase years of service. The ability to purchase time is important because defined benefit plans' retirement eligibility and benefit payments are often tied to the number of years a teacher has worked. Maine's plan allows teachers to purchase time for previous teaching experience, up to 10 years. While better than not allowing any purchase at all, this provision disadvantages teachers who move to Maine with more teaching experience. The state's plan also grants 30 days of creditable service per year for each unpaid leave of absence but does not allow teachers to purchase the full time for leaves of absence, which is a tremendous disadvantage to any teacher who needs to take a leave for paternity or maternity care, or for other personal reasons.

The state is commended for offering a fully portable supplemental savings plan, known as MaineSTART. MaineSTART consists of a 457 deferred compensation plan and a 401(a) defined contribution plan, both ways to enhance teachers' retirement savings.

#### Supporting Research

Maine PERS Benefits for Teachers, Benefits Handbook http://www.mainepers.org/PDFs/handbooks/Teacher_Booklet.pdf

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### Offer teachers a pension plan that is fully portable, flexible and fair.

Maine should offer teachers for their mandatory pension plan the option of either a defined contribution plan or a fully portable defined benefit plan, such as a cash balance plan. A well-structured defined benefit plan could be a suitable option among multiple plans. However, as the sole option, defined benefit plans severely disadvantage mobile teachers and those who enter the profession later in life. Because teachers in Maine do not participate in Social Security, they have no fully portable retirement benefits that would move with them in the event they leave the system.

#### Increase the portability of its defined benefit plan.

If Maine maintains its defined benefit plan, it should allow teachers that leave the system to withdraw matching employer contributions. The state should also allow teachers to purchase time for approved leaves of absence and decrease the vesting requirement to year three. A lack of portability is a disincentive to an increasingly mobile teaching force.

#### Offer an employer contribution to the supplemental retirement savings plan.

While Maine at least offers teachers the option of a supplemental defined contribution savings plan, this option would be more meaningful if the state required employers also to contribute.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Accrued Liability: The value of a pension plan's promised benefits calculated by an actuary (actuarial valuation), taking into account a set of investment and benefit assumptions to a certain date.

Actuarial Valuation: In a pension plan, this is the total amount needed to meet promised benefits. A set of mathematical procedures is used to calculate the value of benefits to be paid, the funds available and the annual contribution required.

Amortization Period: The gradual elimination of a liability, such as a mortgage, in regular payments over a specified period of time.

**Benefit Formula:** Formula used to calculate the amount teachers will receive each month after retirement. The most common formula used is (years of service x final average salary x benefit multiplier). This amount is divided by 12 to calculate monthly benefits.

**Benefit Multiplier:** Multiplier used in the benefit formula. It, along with years of service, determines the total percentage of final average salary that a teacher will receive in retirement benefits. In some plans, the multiplier is not constant, but changes depending upon retirement age and/or years of service.

**Defined Benefit Plan:** Pension plan that promises to pay a specified amount to each person who retires after a set number of years of service. Employees contribute to them in some cases; in others, all contributions are made by the employer.

**Defined Contribution Plan:** Pension plan in which the level of contributions is fixed at a certain level, while benefits vary depending on the return from investments. Employees make contributions into a tax-deferred account, and employers may or may not make contributions. Defined contribution pension plans, unlike defined benefit pension plans, give the employee options of where to invest the account, usually among stock, bond and money market accounts.

**Lump-sum Withdrawal:** Large payment of money received at one time instead of in periodic payments. Teachers leaving a pension plan may receive a lump-sum distribution of the value of their pension.

**Normal Cost:** The amount necessary to fund retirement benefits for one plan year for an individual or a whole pension plan.

Pension Wealth: The net present value of a teacher's expected lifetime retirement benefits.

**Purchasing Time:** A teacher may make additional contributions to a pension system to increase service credit. Time may be purchased for a number of reasons, such as professional development leave, previous out-of-state teaching experience, medical leaves of absence or military service.

Service Credit/Years of Service: Accumulated period of time in years or partial years for which a teacher earned compensation subject to contributions.

**Supplemental Retirement Plan:** An optional plan to which teachers may voluntarily make tax-deferred contributions in addition to their mandatory pension plans. Employees are usually able to choose their rate of contribution up to a maximum set by the IRS; some employers also make contributions. These plans are generally in the form of 457 or 403(b) programs.

**Vesting:** Right an employee gradually acquires by length of service to receive employer-contributed benefits, such as payments from a pension fund.

*Sources*: Barron's Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms, Seventh Edition; California State Teachers' Retirement System http://www.calstrs.com/Members/Defined%20Benefit%20Program/glossary.aspx; Economic Research Institute, http://www.eridlc.com/resources/index.cfm?fuseaction=resource.glossary

Figure 109		Defined benefit plan only Contribution such plan with	ined	CHOICE OF DEFINED BEAUE	õ. /
What type of pension	Defined benefit.	1	u det tal plan		DEFINED CONTRIBUTION
systems do states offer		làn _{va}	mem	ED Br	Inon Inon
teachers?	*. <del>4</del>	eft pi	Ndrt _	DEFIN	
teachers?	bene	tbene tion s	olan	50	
	fined	efinec tribu	brid,	FOIC INFED	IN O
	$D_{e_l}$	48	Hybrid plan	C H	22
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California ²					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana ³					
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					
Ohio⁴					
Oklahoma					
Oregon ⁵					
Pennsylvania Rhode Island					
South Carolina ⁶					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah ⁷					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington ⁸					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	25	17	4	4	1

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alaska provides a fair and flexible defined contribution pension plan for all teachers. This plan is also highly portable, as teachers are entitled to 100 percent of employer contributions after five years of service. South Dakota's defined benefit plan has some creative provisions, which makes it more like a defined contribution plan. Most notably, teachers are able to withdraw 85 percent of their employer contributions after three years of service. In addition, Florida, Ohio, South Carolina and Utah are noteworthy for offering teachers a choice between a defined benefit or hybrid plan and a defined contribution plan.

- 1. A hybrid plan has components of both a defined benefit plan and a defined contribution plan.
- 2. California offers a small cash balance component but ended most of the funding to this portion as of January 1, 2011.
- 3. Indiana also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 4. Ohio also offers the option of a hybrid plan and offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 5. Oregon also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 6. South Carolina also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 7. Utah offers a choice between a defined contribution or a hybrid plan.
- 8. Washington offers a choice between a defined benefit or a hybrid plan.

#### How many years before teachers vest?

#### Figure 110

Do states offer teachers an option other than a nonportable defined benefit plan?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska, Florida, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado³, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, lowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Although not fully portable, the state's defined benefit plan has some notable portability provisions.

- 1. For teachers who join the system on or after January 1, 2012.
- 2. Florida's defined benefit plan does not vest until year eight; teachers vest in the state's defined contribution plan after one year.
- 3. For teachers who join the system on or after July 1, 2012.
- 4. Ohio's defined benefit plan does not vest until year five; teachers vest in the state's defined contribution plan after one year.
- 5. Oregon offers a hybrid plan in which teachers vest immediately in the defined contribution component and vest in the defined benefit component after five years.
- 6. South Carolina's defined benefit plan does not vest until year five; teachers vest immediately in the state's defined contribution plan.
- 7. Based on Washington's Plan 2. The state also offers a hybrid plan ears.

in which teachers vest immediately in the defined contribution component and vest in the defined benefit component after 10 years
132 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 MAINE

	3 YEARS OR LESS	4 to 5 years	6 to 9 years	10 years
Alabama			,	
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware ¹				
District of Columbia				
Florida ²				
Georgia				
Hawaii ³				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa ³				
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				
Ohio⁴				
Oklahoma				
Oregon⁵				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina ⁶				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington ⁷				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	3	29	3	16
	5	29	5	10

Figure 112		Only their own	s /	Their own contribution Part of the emotibution	THER ON PLUS MICHEST THER ON CONTRECT AND FLUE INPOLOSING CONTREUTION OVER BUTTON PLUS INTEREST
What funds do states p	permit		Their own contribution plus interest	ţ;	Riburn Riburn
teachers to withdraw f		· / .	ontr _i ibut	tribu	OVEL OVEL
their defined benefit p		5	ontr	con con	
		i, o,	lest (	the .	The second
if they leave after	s th ribu	the contract of the contract o	eir ol inte	t of	
five years? ¹	Les Cont	Ĵ ^l uo	Their own con plus interest	Cont Par	
Alabama					
Alaska ²					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California ³					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa ⁴					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
MAINE					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan⁵					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada ⁶					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio ⁷					
Oklahoma					
Oregon ⁸					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina ⁹					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah ¹⁰					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington ¹¹					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	4	5	34	6	1
		-		-	

- States' withdrawal policies may vary depending on a teacher's years of service. Year five is used as a common point of comparision.
- As of July 1, 2006, Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan to new members, which allows teachers leaving the system after five years to withdraw 100 percent of the employer contribution.
- 3. California has a defined benefit plan with a small cash balance component, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions and any employer contributions plus earnings from their cash balance component, regardless of their actions regarding their defined benefit account.
- 4. Once vested, Iowa teachers may withdraw an employer match equal to one-thirtieth of their years of service. Effective July 1, 2012 teachers vest at seven years of service, so a teacher leaving at year five would not be entitled to any employer contribution.
- 5. Michigan only offers a hybrid plan. Exiting teachers may withdraw their own contributions and accrued earnings immediately and the employer contributions to the defined contribution component once vested at year four. Michigan teachers may withdraw their own contributions and accrued interest from the defined benefit component but may not withdraw the employer contribution.
- 6. Most teachers in Nevada fund the system by salary reductions or forgoing pay raises and thus do not have direct contributions to withdraw. The small mintority that are in a contributory system may withdraw their contributions plus interest.
- 7. Ohio has two other pension plans. Ohio's defined contribution plan allows teachers with at least one year of service who are leaving the system to withdraw 100 percent of the employer contribution. Exiting teachers with at least five years of experience in Ohio's combination plan may withdraw their employee-funded defined contribution component and the present value of the benefits offered in the defined benefit component.
- Oregon only has a hybrid retirement plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions plus earnings from their defined contribution component; they still receive the employer-funded defined benefit payments at retirement age.
- South Carolina also has a defined contribution plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw 100 percent of their contributions and employer contributions, plus earnings.
- 10. Utah offers a hybrid pension plan, which only has employee contributions when the costs exceed the guaranteed employer contribution. When costs are less than the employer contribution, the excess is contributed to the employee account and refundable after vesting.
- 11. Washington also has a hybrid plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions plus earnings from their defined contribution component; they still receive the employer-funded defined benefit payments at retirement age.

Do states permit teachers to purchase time for previous teaching experience?¹



- Purchasing time does not apply to defined contribution plans. In states that offer multiple plans or a hybrid plan, the graph refers to the state's defined benefit plan or the defined benefit component of its hybrid plan. Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan and is not included.
- Strong Practice: California, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Hawaii, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oregon

#### Figure 114

# Do states permit teachers to purchase time for leaves of absence?¹



- Purchasing time does not apply to defined contribution plans. In states that offer multiple plans or a hybrid plan, the graph refers to the state's defined benefit plan or the defined benefit component of its hybrid plan. Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan and is not included.
- Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota
- Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
- Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin

# Goal H – Pension Sustainability

# The state should ensure that excessive resources are not committed to funding teachers' pension systems.

### **Goal Components**

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

- 1. The state should ensure that its pension system is financially sustainable, without excessive unfunded liabilities or an inappropriately long amortization period.
- 2. Mandatory employer and employee contribution rates should not be unreasonably high, as they reduce teachers' paychecks and commit district resources that could otherwise be spent on salaries or incentives.

#### Background

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



### State Meets a Small Part of Goal

Progress Since 2009

#### ANALYSIS

As of June 30, 2010, the most recent date for which an actuarial valuation is available, Maine's pension system for teachers is 65.9 percent funded and has an amortization period of 17 years. This means that if the plan earns its assumed rate of return and maintains current contribution rates, it would take the state 17 years to pay off its unfunded liabilities. While its amortization period meets regulatory benchmarks, Maine's funding level is too low. The state's system is not financially sustainable according to actuarial benchmarks.

In addition, Maine commits excessive resources toward its teachers' retirement system. The current employer contribution rate of 17.28 percent is too high. The rate is determined by the Maine constitution, Maine statutes and the system's funding policy, which mandate employer contributions to be the normal cost plus periodic payments sufficient to fully fund, on an actuarial basis, the State Employee and Teacher Retirement Program by the year 2028. In addition, the state of Maine is required by law to contribute "a percentage of its unallocated General Fund Surplus, if sufficient, at the end of its fiscal year to the System, in order to reduce any unfunded pension liability for state employees and teachers." While this rate allows the state to pay off liabilities within the required 30-year period, it does so at great cost, precluding Maine from spending those funds on other, more immediate means to retain talented teachers. The mandatory employee contribution rate to the defined benefit plan of 7.65 percent is reasonable.

#### **Supporting Research**

Maine Public Employees Retirement System, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010; http://www.mainepers.org/PDFs/other%20publications/10cafr.pdf

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **Ensure that the pension system is financially sustainable.**

The state would be better off if its system was over 95 percent funded to allow more protection during financial downturns. However, Maine should consider ways to improve its funding level without raising the contributions of school districts and teachers. In fact, the state should work to decrease employer contributions. Committing excessive resources to pension benefits can negatively affect teacher recruitment and retention. Improving funding levels necessitates, in part, systemic changes in the state's pension system. Goals 4-G and 4-I provide suggestions for pension system structures that are both sustainable and fair.

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do state pension systems meet standard benchmarks for fi

igure 116		
Do state pension	ENT	FAR
systems meet standard	'ERC	102 100 100
penchmarks for	80	ATIC A
financial health?	ESS	
	EUNC UNC	MAXIUMUN 30 YEAR
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 ²		
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 ³		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	16	26

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

South Dakota, Tennessee and Wisconsin provide financially sustainable pension systems without committing excessive resources. The systems in these states are fully funded without requiring excessive contributions from teachers or school districts.

### Figure 117 Are state pension systems financially sustainable?¹



1. Cannot be determined for Michigan or Utah, which recently opened new systems.

- 2. Strong Practice: Alaska, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana⁴, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

4. Based on Indiana's current plan only.

- 1. The amortization period is set to be under 30 years; however, the amortization period is not determined because the state is not meeting its annual required contribution.
- 2. Michigan opened a new system in July 2010.
- 3. Utah opened a new system in July 2011.

### Figure 118 *Real Rate of Return*

The pension system funding levels reported here are based on each state's individual actuarial valuation, which use a series of varying assumptions. One of these assumptions concerns rate of return, which greatly affects a system's funding level. If investment returns fall short of assumptions, the fund will have a deficit; if returns are greater than expected, the fund will have a surplus. Higher assumed rates involve more risk, while rates closer to inflation (typically in the 3-5 percent range) are safer.

Most state pension funds assume a rate between 7.5 percent and 8.25 percent. A state using a 7.5 percent rate will report a lower funding level than if it had used 8.25 percent, even though its liabilities remain the same. Many states report that they do meet or exceed an eight percent rate of return over the life of the plan.

However, some economists argue that states' assumed rates of return are too high, and should instead be closer to four percent. They caution that the risk associated with states' higher rates is borne by taxpayers, with the result that tax rates rise to fund pension deficits. A rate closer to four percent would make the vast majority of the nation's pension systems less than 50 percent funded. In light of the current market situation, the debate over the rate of return is particularly timely. With no current consensus by experts or policymakers, NCTQ used states' self-reported numbers rather than recalculate all funding levels based on a standard rate of return. Considering how many states' systems NCTQ found in questionable financial health without using the lower rates some economists prefer, it is clear this is an issue that demands policymakers' attention.

#### Figure 119

1. Alaska has only a defined contribution pension system.

 Indiana's current plan is 94.7 percent funded. However, when the current plan is combined with its closed plan, the funding level drops to 44.3 percent.

Figure 119

How well funded are state pension systems?

	Euroding Loval
	Funding Level
Alaska ¹	N/A
District of Columbia	118.3%
Washington	116%
New York	103.2%
Wisconsin	99.8%
South Dakota	96.3%
Delaware	96%
North Carolina	95.9%
Indiana ²	94.7%
Tennessee	90.6%
Wyoming	87.5%
Georgia	87.2%
Florida	86.6%
Utah	85.7%
Oregon	83.2%
Texas	82.9%
Nebraska	82.4%
lowa	80.8%
Virginia	80.2%
Arizona	79%
Idaho	78.9%
Michigan	78.9%
Minnesota	78.5%
California	78%
Missouri	77.7%
Pennsylvania	75.1%
Alabama	74.7%
Arkansas	73.8%
Nevada	71.2%
North Dakota	69.8%
South Carolina	67.8%
Vermont	66.5%
MAINE	65.9%
New Mexico	65.7%
	65.4%
Maryland	
Montana	65.4%
Colorado	64.8%
Mississippi	64.2%
Massachusetts	63%
Connecticut	61.4%
Hawaii	61.4%
Kentucky	61%
Ohio	59.1%
New Hampshire	58.5%
New Jersey	57.6%
Oklahoma	56.7%
Kansas	56%
Louisiana	54.4%
Illinois	48.4%
Rhode Island	48.4%
West Virginia	46.5%

# What are the current employer¹ contribution rates to state pension systems?

#### Employer contribution rate

Social Security (+6.2%)	0%	5% 	10% 	15% 	20% 	25% 	30% 	35% 
Alabama	10							
Alaska	12.6							
Arizona	10.1							
Arkansas	14							
California	10.3							
Colorado	14.8							
Connecticut	19.2							
Delaware	9.3							
District of Columbia	0							
Florida	3.8							
Georgia ²	10.3							
Hawaii ³	15							
Idaho	10.4							
Illinois ³	12.7							
Indiana	7.5							
lowa	8.1							
Kansas	9.4							
Kentucky	17.8							
Louisiana	23.7				-			
MAINE	17.3							
Maryland	15.5							
Massachusetts ³	22.6							
Michigan ⁴	N/A					•		
Minnesota ³	6.2							
Mississippi	12		_					
Missouri	14.5							
Montana	10							
Nebraska	8.9							
Nevada	11.9		-					
New Hampshire	10.7							
	N/A							
New Jersey ⁵ New Mexico			_	_				
New York	9.9							
North Carolina	11.1							
North Dakota	13.1							
	8.8							
Ohio	14			_	_			
Oklahoma	14.5			_				
Oregon	13.9		_					
Pennsylvania ³	5.6		_				_	
Rhode Island ⁶	22.3			_				
South Carolina	9.2	_						
South Dakota	6							
Tennessee	6.4							
Texas ⁷	6.6							
Utah	10							
Vermont	7.4							
Virginia	8.8							
Washington	9.2							
West Virginia	29.2							
Wisconsin	4.8							
Wyoming	7.1							

#### Figure 120

What is a reasonable rate for pension contributions?

- 4-7 percent each for teachers and districts in states participating in Social Security
- 10-13 percent each for teachers and districts in states not participating in Social Security

Analysts generally agree that workers in their 20's with no previous retirement savings should save, in addition to Social Security contributions, about 10-15 percent of their gross income in order to be able to live during retirement on 80 percent of the salary they were earning when they retired. While the recommended savings rate varies with age and existing retirement savings, NCTQ has used this 10-15 percent benchmark as a reasonable rate for its analyses. To achieve a total savings of 10-15 percent, teacher and employer contributions should each be in the range of 4-7 percent. In states where teachers do not participate in Social Security, the total recommended retirement savings (teacher plus employer contributions) is about 12 percent higher to compensate for the fact that these teachers will not have Social Security income when they retire. In order to achieve the appropriate level of total savings, teacher and employer contributions in these states should each be in the range of 10-13 percent.

#### Sources:

http://www.schwab.com/public/schwab/resource_center/expert_insight/retirement_strategies/planning/ how_much_should_you_save_for_retirement_play_ the_percentages.html https://personal.vanguard.com/us/insights/retirement/ saving/set-retirement-goals

- 1. The employer contribution rate includes the contributions of both school districts and state governments, where appropriate.
- 2. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years. Some school districts in Georgia do not contribute to Social Security.
- 3. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years.
- 4. Michigan opened a new system in July 2010 and employer contributions are not yet reported.
- New Jersey reports its contributions as a flat dollar amount, and a percentage could not be calculated.
- 6. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years. Most, but not all, school districts in Rhode Island contribute to Social Security.
- 7. The contribution rate is set to decrease in 2012.

# Do states require excessive contributions to their pension systems?



- Strong Practice: Alaska, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey⁵, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 3. Michigan⁶
- 4. Arizona, Hawaii, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island
- 5. While not excessive, the employer and state contribution are quite low. The most recent total employer contribution was only 5.4 percent of the actuarially-determined annual required contribution.
- 6. Employer contribution rates to Michigan's new system have not yet been reported.

#### Figure 123

- 1. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years.
- 2. Teachers contribute 9.4 percent to the defined benefit component and are automatically enrolled to contribute 2 percent to the defined contribution component; teachers may change the latter rate.
- 3. The contribution rate is set to increase in 2012 and decrease in 2014.
- 4. Teachers share in the employer contribution through salary reductions or foregoing equivalent pay raises.
- 5. For teachers hired after July 1, 2011, the contribution ranges from 7.5-12.3 based on a variety of factors.
- 6. Teachers in the hybrid plan must make a mandatory contribution if the employer contribution does not cover system costs.
- 7. For the defined benefit plan; the rate varies for the defined contribution plan from a minimum of 5 percent.

### Figure 123

# How much do state pension systems require teachers to contribute?

Teacher contribution rate

Social Security (+6.2%) 10% 0% 5% 15% 20% Alabama¹ 7.3 Alaska 8 Arizona 11.4 Arkansas 6 California 8 Colorado 8 Connecticut 7.3 Delaware¹ 3 District of Columbia 8 Florida 3 Georgia 5.5 Hawaii¹ 6 Idaho 6.2 Illinois 9.4 Indiana 3 lowa 5.4 Kansas 6 Kentucky 10.9 Louisiana 8 MAINE 7.7 Maryland 7 Massachusetts 11 Michigan² 11.4 Minnesota¹ 6 Mississippi 9 Missouri 14.5 Montana 7.2 Nebraska³ 8.8 Nevada⁴ 11.9 New Hampshire 7 New Jersey¹ 6.5 New Mexico 11.2 New York 3.5 North Carolina 6 North Dakota¹ 7.8 Ohio 10 Oklahoma 7 Oregon 6 Pennsylvania⁵ 7.5 Rhode Island 9.5 South Carolina 6.5 South Dakota 6 Tennessee 5 Texas 6.4 Utah⁶ 0 Vermont 5 Virginia 5 Washington⁷ 4.8 West Virginia 6 Wisconsin 6.2 Wyoming

# **Area 4: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers**

# Goal I – Pension Neutrality

# The state should ensure that pension systems are neutral, uniformly increasing pension wealth with each additional year of work.

#### **Goal Components**

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

- The formula that determines pension benefits should be neutral to the number of years worked. It should not have a multiplier that increases with years of service or longevity bonuses.
- 2. The formula for determining benefits should preserve incentives for teachers to continue working until conventional retirement ages. Eligibility for retirement benefits should be based on age and not years of service.

#### Background

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



## Area 4: Goal I **Maine** Analysis

### State Nearly Meets Goal

#### Progress Since 2009

#### **ANALYSIS**

Maine's pension system is based on a benefit formula that is not fully neutral, meaning that each year of work does not accrue pension wealth in a uniform way until teachers reach conventional retirement age, such as that associated with Social Security.

Teachers' retirement wealth is determined by their monthly payments and the length of time they expect to receive those payments. Monthly payments are usually calculated as final average salary multiplied by years of service multiplied by a set multiplier (such as 1.5). Higher salary, more years of service or a greater multiplier increases monthly payments and results in greater pension wealth. Earlier retirement eligibility with unreduced benefits also increases pension wealth, because more payments will be received.

To qualify as neutral, a pension formula must utilize a constant benefit multiplier and an eligibility timetable based solely on age, rather than years of service. Basing eligibility for retirement on years of service creates unnecessary and often unfair peaks in pension wealth, while allowing unreduced retirement at a young age creates incentives to retire early. Plans that change their multipliers for various years of service do not value each year of teaching equally. Therefore, plans with a constant multiplier and that base retirement on an age in line with Social Security are likely to create the most uniform accrual of wealth.

Maine's pension plan is commended for utilizing a constant benefit multiplier of 2 percent and for setting a standard retirement age, regardless of years of service, for retirement without a reduction in benefits. Teachers with at least five years of service on July 1, 2010, may retire at age 62 with unreduced benefits. Teachers with less service must reach age 65 to retire with unreduced benefits. However, Maine's eligibility timetable for early retirement is based on years of service. Only teachers with at least 25 years of service may retire at any time, with a reduction in benefits. While the state did increase the age for unreduced retirement, all teachers are still being paid unreduced benefits by the state before Social Security's retirement age, and these provisions fail to treat all teachers equally.

#### Supporting Research

http://www.mainepers.org/PDFs/handbooks/Teacher_Booklet.pdf

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### End retirement eligibility based on years of service.

Maine should change its practice of only allowing teachers with 25 years of service to retire early with a reduction in benefits. While its policy is more neutral than most states, If retirement at an earlier age is offered to some teachers with a reduction in benefits, it should be offered to all teachers regardless of years of service.

#### Align eligibility for retirement with unreduced benefits with Social Security retirement age.

Maine allows teachers to retire before conventional retirement age. As life expectancies continue to increase, teachers may draw out of the system for many more years than they contributed. This is not compatible with a financially sustainable system (see Goal 4-H).

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maine recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. However, the analysis has been updated subsequent to the state's review to reflect recent policy changes.
Do states base retirement eligibility on age, which is fair to all teachers?¹



- 1. This only refers to determining retirement eligibility, not retirement benefits.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alaska, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey
- 3. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

#### Figure 126

- 1. All calculations are based on a teacher who starts teaching at age 22, earns a starting salary of \$35,000 that increases 3 percent per year, and retires at the age s/he is first eligible for unreduced benefits. The calculations use states' current benefit formulas and do not include cost of living increases. The final average salary was calculated as the average of the highest three years of salary, even though a few states may vary from that standard. Age 65 was used as a point of comparision because it is the miminum eligibility for unreduced Social Security benefits.
- 2. Does not apply to Alaska's defined contribution plan.
- 3. Minnesota provides unreduced retirement benefits at the age of full Social Security benefits or age 66, whichever comes first.
- California's formula has many options for retirement. A teacher with 40 years of experience at age 62 would reach Califorina's maximum allowable multiplier of 2.4 percent.
- 5. Age 60 is the earlier teachers hired on or after July 1, 2012 may retire. Teachers hired prior to this point may retire at age 55.
- Massachusetts's formula has many options for retirement. A teacher with 35 years of experience at age 57 would reach Massachusetts's maximum allowable benefit of 80 percent.

Fi	gure 126	Total amount in benefits paid Per teacher from the benefits paid retirement until age 6 time of	29 Fattlest etitement age that a teaching at two started teaching at two started foceive uneduced benefits
Η	ow much do states	e tim 55	Tred Tred Tred Final
p	ay for each teacher	11 be	e 22 e 22 e 22 e 22 e 22
	nat retires with	ount er fro, untij	r whi r whi educ
u	nreduced benefits at	al an each nent	ttiest ache hing e un
	n early age? ¹	Total amount in L Per teacher from ti retirement until age	Ea a té teac ceiv
	Alaska ²		~
	Illinois	\$0	67
	MAINE	\$0	65
	Minnesota ³	\$0	66
	New Hampshire	\$0	65
	New Jersey	\$0	65
	Washington	\$0	65
	Tennessee	\$238,654	52
	Michigan	\$289,187	60
	California ⁴	\$310,028	62
	Indiana	\$317,728	55
	Hawaii⁵	\$337,385	60
	Kansas	\$337,385	60
	Oregon	\$361,536	58
	North Dakota	\$385,583	60
	Oklahoma	\$385,583	60
	Maryland	\$413,808	56
	Wisconsin	\$416,007	57
	Rhode Island	\$430,013	59
	New York	\$440,819	57
	Texas	\$443,421	60
	South Dakota	\$447,707	55
	Virginia	\$468,982	56
	Louisiana	\$481,979	60
	Florida	\$485,257	55
	Vermont	\$486,832	56
	Montana	\$518,228	47
	Connecticut	\$520,009	57
	Utah	\$520,009	57
	lowa Idaho	\$551,428 \$551,743	55
	North Carolina	\$551,743 \$568,555	56
	South Carolina	\$568,555	52 50
	Nebraska	\$577,687	55
	West Virginia	\$577,687	55
	Delaware	\$577,927	52
	District of Columbia	\$585,737	52
	Massachusetts ⁶	\$594,296	57
	Georgia	\$624,786	52
	Mississippi	\$624,786	52
	Alabama	\$625,747	47
	Colorado	\$650,011	57
	Pennsylvania	\$650,011	57
	Wyoming	\$655,506	54
	Arizona	\$664,340	55
	Arkansas	\$681,789	50
	Ohio	\$687,265	52
	New Mexico	\$734,124	52
	Nevada	\$780,983	52
	Missouri	\$789,343	51
	Kentucky	\$791,679	49

## 酒

What kind of multiplier do states use to calculate retirement benefits?¹



- 1. Alaska has a defined contribution plan, which does not have a benefit multiplier.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wyoming

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

**Alaska** offers a defined contribution pension plan that is neutral, with pension wealth accumulating in an equal way for all teachers for each year of work. In addition, **Illinois**, **Minnesota** and **New Jersey** offer a defined benefit plan with a formula multiplier that does not change relative to years of service and does not allow unreduced benefits for retirees below age 65. Illinois and New Jersey are further commended for ending their previous practices of allowing teachers to retire well before Social Security age without a reduction in benefits.

### Double-Dipping: Cure the Disease, Not the Symptom

Benefit recipients in teacher pension plans have recently been under scrutiny for "double-dipping," when individuals receive a pension and salary at the same time. This can occur when teachers reach retirement eligibility, yet wish to keep working without losing pension wealth. Teachers can retire, start receiving their monthly benefits and then return to teaching. The restrictions on a teacher's ability to return to work vary from state to state. Policies can include waiting periods, limitations on earnings or restrictions to working in difficult-to-fill positions.

Some descriptions portray teachers working while collecting their pensions as greedy or somehow taking advantage, when in fact they are just following the system that is in place. When a teacher reaches retirement eligibility in a defined benefit system, her pension wealth peaks and, after that, wealth accrual slows or even decreases because every year a teacher delays retirement, she loses a year of pension benefits. For example, if a teacher could retire with 60 percent of her salary at age 56, then every year she teaches past that point she is, in effect, working for only 40 percent of her pay because she is not receiving her pension. This puts relatively young teachers and the districts who wish to retain them in a difficult position. Districts want to keep effective teachers in schools, but the financial reality for teachers is hard to pass up.

Retirees returning to work are also an issue for defined benefit pension system funding because contributions are not being made to the system that would be made if those positions were held by non-retirees. This adds to the funding imbalances that many states' defined benefit systems face.

Some states have created Deferred Retirement Option Plans (DROP) in which retirees can have their benefits placed in a savings account while they return to work and, once they retire again, they can receive the lump sum in their DROP accounts and resume their monthly benefits.

Returning to work would not be a large policy issue if systems did not allow teachers to retire with unreduced benefits at such relatively young ages and if pension wealth accrual were more neutral. An effective teacher should be able to keep teaching and at the same time know that her pension wealth will not erode. More systemic fixes—like the ones outlined in the *Yearbook*—are needed. Calls to prohibit double-dipping are not addressing the real problem.

### Goal A – Licensure Loopholes

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

### **Goal Components**

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

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

### Background

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

### Figure 129 How States are Faring on Closing Licensure Loopholes **Best Practice States** Colorado, Illinois 1, Mississippi, New Jersey States Meet Goal Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina, Virginia 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Kentucky 1, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma 1, Rhode Island 1, Utah 1, West Virginia States Partly Meet Goal 2 Iowa, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Michigan, Vermont States Do Not Meet Goal 26 Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, MAINE, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 4:0 1:5 👄 : 46

### Area 5: Goal A **Maine** Analysis

### State Does Not Meet Goal

### ANALYSIS

Maine offers a one-year, conditional certificate to teachers who have not met certain requirements, including passing state licensing tests. This certificate can be renewed twice, and a passing score on all obligatory tests is required only during the third and final review period.

The state also offers a special Targeted Needs Certificate, a one-year credential that may also be renewed twice, to individuals who are teaching in a designated shortage area. Holders of this certificate must pass all required assessments prior to the issuance of the third certificate, meaning that individuals teaching under this certificate may teach for two full years without passing all required tests.

#### Supporting Research

Rule Chapter for the Department of Education, 05-071 Chapter 115 Part I, Sections 5.4 and 5.5 http://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/rules/05/chaps05.htm

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

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

#### Limit exceptions to one year.

There might be limited and exceptional circumstances under which conditional or emergency licenses need to be granted. In these instances, it is reasonable for a state to give teachers up to one year to pass required licensing tests. Maine's current policy puts students at risk by allowing for the issuance of conditional certificates that are valid for one year but that can be renewed for a second year before teachers are required to pass required licensing tests.

### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

	Figure 131					
	-					
	How long can new tea					
	practice without passi	ng	/	/	a Jears or More	
	licensing tests?	] _ NO DEFERRAL	Up to 7 Jear	Up to 2 years	r mo	5
		EFER.	J _{ve}	ک _ی	spec o	
uire		Q	p to	Þ to	3. 7. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	
tter	Alabama	<				
	Alaska					
	Arizona					
	Arkansas					
	California					
	Colorado					
	Connecticut					
	Delaware					
	District of Columbia					
	Florida					
2	Georgia					
ses ³	Hawaii					
	Idaho					
	Illinois					
	Indiana					
	lowa ¹					
	Kansas					
	Kentucky					
	Louisiana					
	MAINE					
	Maryland					
	Massachusetts					
	Michigan					
	Minnesota					
ject	Mississippi					
	Missouri					
t nd,	Montana ²					
	Nebraska ³					
	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					
	Utah⁴					
	Vermont					
	Virginia					
	Washington					
	West Virginia					
opear	Wisconsin					
	Wyoming⁵					
		9	14	8	18	

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

#### Figure 130

### Do states still award emergency licenses?¹



- 1. Not applicable to Montana and Nebraska, which do not require subject matter testing.
- Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁵, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wyorning
- Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin
- 4. Strong Practice: Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia
- 5. License is renewable, but only if licensure tests are passed.

#### Figure 131

- 1. Iowa only requires subject-matter testing for elementary teachers.
- 2. Montana does not require subject-matter testing.
- 3. Nebraska does not require subject-matter testing.
- There is a potential loophole in Utah, as alternate route teachers appear able to delay passage of subject-matter tests.
- 5. Wyoming only requires subject-matter testing for elementary and social studies teachers.

### Goal B – Unsatisfactory Evaluations

The state should articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations, including specifying that teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations should be eligible for dismissal.

Goal Components	Figure 132		
(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)	How States are Faring on Consequences for Unsatisfactory Evaluations		
<ol> <li>The state should require that all teachers who receive a single unsatisfactory evaluation be placed on an improvement plan, whether or not they have tenure.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>2 Best Practice States Illinois¹, Oklahoma</li> <li>11 States Meet Goal</li> </ul>		
<ol> <li>The state should require that all teachers who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations or two unsatisfactory evaluations</li> </ol>	Alaska, Arkansas ↑, Colorado ↑, Delaware ↑, Florida, Indiana ↑, Louisiana, New Mexico, New York ↑, Rhode Island ↑, Washington		
within five years be formally eligible for dismissal, whether or not they have tenure.	<b>6</b> States Nearly Meet Goal Georgia, Hawaii, Michigan <b>1</b> , North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas		
Background A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.	<ul> <li>13 States Partly Meet Goal California, Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts 1, Minnesota 1, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada 1, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee 1, Utah, West Virginia</li> </ul>		
	<b>5</b> States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Idaho 1, Ohio 1, Virginia, Wyoming 1		
	14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama↓, District of Columbia, Kansas, Kentucky, MAINE, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin		
	Dur muse on this Coal Since 2000		
	Progress on this Goal Since 2009:		
	1:15 ↔:35 ↓:1		

### Area 5: Goal B Maine Analysis

State Does Not Meet Goal

### Progress Since 2009

### **ANALYSIS**

Maine does not have a policy regarding teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations.

### RECOMMENDATION

Require that all teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations be placed on improvement plans.

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

### Make eligibility for dismissal a consequence of unsatisfactory evaluations.

Teachers who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations or have two unsatisfactory evaluations within five years should be formally eligible for dismissal, regardless of whether they have tenure. Maine should adopt a policy that ensures that teachers who receive such unsatisfactory evaluations are eligible for dismissal.

### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

		EUCIRLE FOR DISMISSAL AFTER	- I	1
Figure 133	MAPROVENENT PLANAFTER	AFTE SY		No articulated consequences
What are the	V AF	ठें हैं		rence.
consequences for	PLA	e suite	भू	lbəs ₁
teachers who receive	VSA7	NSA D	luen	
unsatisfactory	DVEN	S LE U	Juse	ulate
	SINC SINC		her G	artic
evaluations?	72	42.2	Other consequences	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho			1	
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
MAINE				
Maryland				
Massachusetts			2	
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				3
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada			4	
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina		5		
North Dakota				
Ohio			6	
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	27	17	8	17

- Teachers could face nonrenewal based on evaluation results, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal after multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- While results of evaluations may be used in dismissal decisions, there are no specific criteria for a teacher's eligibility for dismissal.
- 3. Improvement plans are only used for teachers in identified "Schools At Risk." Those same teachers are also eligible for dismissal for multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal.
- 5. Teachers in low performing schools can be dismissed after one negative rating.
- Local school boards must include procedures for using evaluation results for the removal of poorly performing teachers.

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

**Illinois** and **Oklahoma** both require that teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations be placed on improvement plans. Teachers in Illinois are then evaluated three times during a 90-day remediation period and are eligible for dismissal if performance remains unsatisfactory. In addition, new legislation in Illinois allows districts to dismiss a teacher without going through the remediation process if that teacher has already completed a remediation plan but then receives an unsatisfactory rating within the next three years. Oklahoma's improvement plan may not exceed two months, and if performance does not improve during that time, teachers are eligible for dismissal.

#### Figure 134





- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington
- 2. Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho³, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada⁴, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Teachers could face nonrenewal based on evaluation results, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal after multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- 4. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal.



### Goal C – Dismissal for Poor Performance

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

#### **Goal Components** Figure 135 (The factors considered in determining the states' How States are Faring in Dismissal for Poor rating for the goal.) Performance 1. The state should articulate that teachers **Best Practice State** may be dismissed for ineffective classroom Oklahoma performance. 2. A teacher who is terminated for poor 2 States Meet Goal performance should have an opportunity to Florida¹, Indiana¹ appeal. In the interest of both the teacher and the school district, the state should States Nearly Meet Goal 6 ensure that this appeal occurs within a Colorado¹, Illinois¹, Michigan¹, New York¹, Rhode Island 1. Tennessee 1 reasonable time frame. 3. There should be a clear distinction between States Partly Meet Goal 8 the process and accompanying due process Arizona¹, Delaware¹, Hawaii¹, rights for teachers dismissed for classroom Massachusetts 1, Nevada 1, Ohio 1, Wisconsin, Wyoming ineffectiveness and the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers States Meet a Small Part of Goal dismissed or facing license revocation for felony Louisiana, New Hampshire, Virginia, or morality violations or dereliction of duties. West Virginia 30 States Do Not Meet Goal Background Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, A detailed rationale and supporting research for Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, MAINE, this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy. Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington Progress on this Goal Since 2009: 1:16 ↔:35 4:0



### Area 5: Goal C **Maine** Analysis

### State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2009

### ANALYSIS

In Maine, tenured teachers who are terminated have at least one opportunity to appeal. After the board notifies the teacher of dismissal, the teacher has up to 15 days to request a hearing with the school board. The state does not specify a time frame for the hearing.

Maine does not explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal, nor does the state distinguish the due process rights of teachers dismissed for ineffective performance from those facing other charges commonly associated with license revocation, such as a felony and/or morality violations. In fact, the state makes "just cause for dismissal or nonrenewal" a negotiable item under state labor law.

#### **Supporting Research**

Maine Revised Statutes Title 20-A, Part 6, Chapter 503, Section 13201

### RECOMMENDATION

Specify that classroom ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.

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

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

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

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

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

#### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

ligare 190				
Do states articulate	DISMISSAL DCH		2 /	
hat ineffectiveness is	I	ý / I	JU Z	
rounds for dismissal?	202			
	ZH S	E E	2	
	ES, J	ALU,		
	×ă /		~ ~	
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona			1	
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			2	
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			3	
Washington				
West Virginia			3	
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	9	13	38	
		.5	50	

Oklahoma clearly articulates that teacher ineffectiveness in the classroom is grounds for dismissal and has taken steps to ensure that the dismissal process for teachers deemed to be ineffective is expedited. Teachers facing dismissal have only one opportunity to appeal.

#### Figure 137

Do states allow multiple appeals of teacher dismissals?



- 1. Strong Practice: Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Wisconsin
- 2. Teachers in these states revert to probationary status following ineffective evaluation ratings, meaning that they no longer have the due process right to multiple appeals: Colorado, Indiana, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois⁵, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. District of Columbia, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada⁶, Utah, Vermont
- 5. The teacher is responsible for the cost of the second appeal.
- 6. Though a teacher returns to probationary status after two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings, the state does not articulate clear policy about its appeals process.

#### Figure 136

1. It is left to districts to define "inadequacy of classroom performance."

- 2. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not articulated that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.
- 3. Dismissal policy includes dismissal for unsatisfactory evaluations, but the state's evaluation system does not measure teacher effectiveness (see Goal 3-B).

### Goal D – Reductions in Force

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

### **Goal Components**

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

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

### Background

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

### Figure 138



### Area 5: Goal D Maine Analysis

### 🔵 Sta

State Partly Meets Goal



### ANALYSIS

In Maine, the factors used by districts to determine which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force consider a teacher's seniority and are decided at the district level. The factors negotiated at the district level "may include, but shall not be limited to, seniority."

#### Supporting Research Maine Revised Statutes Title 20-A, Part 6, Chapter 503, Section 13201

### RECOMMENDATION

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

Maine should give districts the flexibility to determine their own layoff policies, but it should do so within a framework that ensures that classroom performance is considered.

### MAINE RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS



Do states prevent districts from basing layoffs solely on "last in, first out"? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana MAINE Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nev Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York New York New York New York New York New Jersey New Mexico New York New York North Carolina Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Ca	ligule 155		1
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa	Do states prevent	252	a a
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa	districts from basing	E M	
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa		4NC FRE	<u>র্</u> ট্র্র্ট
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa		VSID,	
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa	m, jiistout ?	LON CON	FDE
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa		BE	3E
AlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMissispipiMissispipiMissouriMontanaNevrakaNew HampshireNew YorkNew KasaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOhioOklahomaIndianaIndinaIndinasiIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndinaIndicipanMarylandIndicipanMichiganIndicipanMinnesotaIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipanIndicipa	Alabama		
ArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMarylandMississippiMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JarseyNew HampshireNew YorkNew YorkNorth DakotaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaWest VirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWest VirginiaWisconsinWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Alaska		
ArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMarylandMississippiMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JarseyNew HampshireNew YorkNew YorkNorth DakotaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaWest VirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWest VirginiaWisconsinWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Arizona		
ColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew JerseyNew KarcoNew YorkNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTernesseeTernesseeTernesseeTernesseeVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Arkansas		
ColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew JerseyNew KarcoNew YorkNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTernesseeTernesseeTernesseeTernesseeVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
ConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMarylandMississippiMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JarseyNew JarseyNew JarseyNew JarseyNew KarsaNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaVirginiaWashingtonWashingtonWascosiniSouth CarolinaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth Carolina <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>			
DelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMarylandMichiganMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JarseyNew JarseyNew JarseyNew JarseyNew JarseyNew JarseyNorth CarolinaOhioOhioOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahWashingtonWashingtonWisconsinWisconsinWisconsinYirginiaSouth CarolinaSouth Carol			
FloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNevadaNew HampshireNew YorkNew YorkNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
FloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNevadaNew HampshireNew YorkNew YorkNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
HawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIowaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMontanaNevadaNew HampshireNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyoming			
HawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIowaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMontanaNevadaNew HampshireNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyoming			
IdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMissouriMontanaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOhioOklahomaOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth			
IllinoisIndianaIowaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNew JarseyNew HampshireNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth Carolina <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>			
IndianaIowaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew YorkNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWisconsinWorkInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterseInterse <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td>			-
Iowa		_	
KentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
KentuckyLouisianaMAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
MAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
MAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming	-		
MAINEMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Louisiana		
MassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaItennesseeTexasVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming	MAINE		
MassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaItennesseeTexasVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Maryland		
MinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Massachusetts		
MissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Michigan		
MissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Minnesota		
MissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming	Mississippi		
MontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
New HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming	Montana		
New HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
New HampshireNew JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
New JerseyNew MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming			
New MexicoNew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
New YorkNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
North CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
North DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyoming			
OhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
OklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
OregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
Pennsylvania   Rhode Island   South Carolina   South Dakota   Tennessee   Texas   Utah   Vermont   Virginia   Washington   West Virginia   Wisconsin   Wyoming			
Rhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming	-		
South CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
South DakotaTennesseeTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
Tennessee    Texas    Utah    Vermont    Virginia    Washington    West Virginia    Wisconsin    Wyoming			
TexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming	South Dakota		
UtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming	Tennessee		
VermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming			
VirginiaImage: Constraint of the second	Utah		
WashingtonImage: Constraint of the second secon	Vermont		
WashingtonImage: Constraint of the second secon	Virginia		
West VirginiaImage: Construct of the second sec			
WisconsinImage: Image: Ima			
Wyoming			
11 1/	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		17
		11	17

### T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

#### Figure 140

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



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio³, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

3. Tenure is considered first.



### Figure 141 Do states prevent districts from overemphasizing seniority in layoff decisions?

- 1. Strong Practice: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri⁶, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Strong Practice: Idaho, Utah
- 3. Hawaii, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin⁷
- 4. California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon
- Alabama, Alaska⁶, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia⁶, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts⁶, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska⁶, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
- 6. Nontenured teachers are laid off first.
- 7. Only for counties with populations of 500,000 or more and for teachers hired before 1995.

### **Board of Directors**

Barbara O'Brien, Chair Senior Fellow, The Piton Foundation

Stacey Boyd Chief Executive Officer, The Savvy Source for Parents Chester E. Finn, Jr. President. The Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Ira Fishman Managing Director, NFL Players Association

Marti Watson Garlett

Founding Dean of the Teachers College, Western Governors University Former Vice President, Academic Programs and Professional Licensure, Laureate Education, Inc.

Henry L. Johnson Former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Consultant, Center for Results, Learning Forward Donald N. Langenberg Chancellor Emeritus, University System of Maryland Clara M. Lovett President Emerita, Northern Arizona University Carol G. Peck Former President and Chief Executive Officer, Rodel Charitable Foundation of Arizona Former National Superintendent of the Year John L. Winn Florida Education Commissioner, Retired Kate Walsh

President, National Council on Teacher Quality

### **Advisory Board**

• Steven J. Adamowski, Connecticut State Board of Education • Sir Michael Barber, Pearson • Roy E. Barnes, former Governor, State of Georgia • McKinley A. Broome, Woodholme Elementary School • Cynthia G. Brown, Center for American Progress • David Chard, Southern Methodist University • Andrew Chen, EduTron • Jean Clements, Hillsborough Classroom Teachers Association • Celine Coggins, Teach Plus • Pattie Davis, Fairview Middle School • Jo Lynne DeMary, Virginia Commonwealth University • Michael Feinberg, The KIPP Foundation • Michael Goldstein, The Match School, Massachusetts • Eric A. Hanushek, The Hoover Institution • Joseph Hawkins, Westat • Frederick M. Hess, American Enterprise Institute • Paul T. Hill, Center on Reinventing Public Education • E.D. Hirsch, Core Knowledge Foundation • Michael Johnston, Colorado State Senate • Barry Kaufman, BK Education Consulting Services • Frank Keating, former Governor, State of Oklahoma • Joel I. Klein, News Corporation • Martin J. Koldyke, Academy for Urban School Leadership • Wendy Kopp, Teach For America • James Larson, Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School • Tom Lasley, Edvention • Amy Jo Leonard, Turtle Mountain Elementary School • Deborah M. McGriff, NewSchools Venture Fund • Ellen Moir, New Teacher Center • Robert N. Pasternack, Voyager Expanded Learning • Michael Podgursky, University of Missouri-Columbia • Michelle Rhee, StudentsFirst • Stefanie Sanford, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation • Audrey Soglin, Illinois Education Association • Daniel Willingham, University of Virginia • Suzanne Wilson, Michigan State University

# **National Council on Teacher Quality**

C

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 Solow NCTQ on Twitter B 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