# 2012 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

# Improving Teacher Preparation in Minnesota

# State Policies in Need of Attention

 Admission into Preparation Programs
 Elementary Teacher Preparation
 Middle School Teacher Preparation
 Special Education Teacher Preparation
 Student Teaching
 Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

National Council on Teacher Quality

#### Acknowledgments

#### **STATES**

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

#### **FUNDERS**

The primary funders for the 2012 Yearbook were:

- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- Carnegie Corporation of New York
- The Joyce Foundation
- The Walton Family Foundation

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

#### STAFF

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

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



## Improving Teacher Preparation in Minnesota

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

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



## Current Status of Minnesota's Teacher Preparation Policy

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

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

O DOES NOT MEET ONLY A SMALL PART DARTIALLY MEETS ONLY MEETS FULLY MEETS

## 2012 Policy Update for Minnesota

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

#### Special Education Teacher Preparation

Minnesota now requires that preparation programs prepare special education teachers in the science of reading. However, special education teachers are not required to pass the general elementary test, which adequately assesses knowledge of the science of reading. The Minnesota Teacher Licensure Examination (MTLE) special education test does not include items on the science of reading. *Minnesota Administrative Rules* 8710.5000

#### Assessing Professional Knowledge

The Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) is a requirement for both program approval and program completion. *http://aacte.org* 

#### Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

Alternate route teacher preparation programs must now report "aggregate program data on pass rates for the MTLE pedagogy and content exams (at the subtest level)" and "task specific aggregate scores for the Teacher Performance Assessment." A new teacher survey and supervisor survey are also required. These data must be reported in the first three years of a program's operation and every two years thereafter. Title II data that includes candidate information and program completion rates are also required annually. http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/EdExc/BoardTeach/

### Minnesota Response to Policy Update

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

Minnesota was helpful in providing NCTQ with additional information about policy changes related to teacher preparation. The state noted that the special education licensure test required of all special education teachers is currently being redesigned to align to revised licensure standards, and a portion of this test is devoted to the read-ing standards.

Minnesota added that all programs, not just alternate routes, will be held to data requirements as part of its redesigned program accountability system: Program Effectiveness Reports for Continuing Approval (PERCA). The framework was approved in August 2011, and Minnesota is in the final stages of "fleshing out" the system and then will await further Standards Board action in December of 2012.

Minnesota also pointed out that the authorizing legislation for its alternate routes specifies that these are twoyear, field-based programs, and that there is a requirement of 200 instructional hours prior to teaching. The state took issue with NCTQ's assertion in the 2011 *Yearbook* that it requires a "considerable amount of coursework before [alternate route teachers] begin teaching."

In addition, Minnesota was helpful in providing NCTQ with further information about state authority for teacher preparation and licensing.

		/
Delivering well-	2012	2011
orepared teachers	Grade	Grade
Alabama	B-	с
Alaska	F	F
Arizona	D-	D-
Arkansas	C	C
California	D	D
Colorado	D	D-
Connecticut	C+	C-
Delaware	D-	D-
District of Columbia	D	D
Florida	B-	B-
Georgia	C	C
Hawaii	D	D
Idaho	D	D
Illinois	D	D
Indiana	B-	C+
lowa	D	D
Kansas	D+	D+
Kentucky	C+	C-
Louisiana	C	C
Maine	D+	D
Maryland	D+	D+
Massachusetts	C+	C+
Michigan	D+	D+
MINNESOTA	C+	C
Mississippi	C	C
Missouri	D+	D+
Montana	F	F
Nebraska	D-	D-
Nevada	D-	D-
New Hampshire	C-	D
New Jersey	C-	D+
New Mexico	D+	D+
New York	C-	D+
North Carolina	D-	D-
North Dakota	D	D
Ohio	C-	D+
Oklahoma	C	C
Oregon	D-	D-
Pennsylvania	C	C
Rhode Island	C	D+
South Carolina	C-	C-
South Dakota	D	D
Tennessee	B-	B-
Texas	C+	C+
Utah	D	D
Vermont	C-	D+
Virginia	C-	C-
Washington	D+	D+
West Virginia	C-	C-
		D
Wisconsin	111	
Wisconsin Wyoming	D+ F	F

#### COMING SOON

### NCTQ Teacher Prep Review

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

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

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

For a sneak peek, see page 6.

# **Teacher Preparation Policy Checklist for States**

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

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

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



Minnesota does not ensure that teacher preparation programsadmit candidates with strong academic records.

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

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

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

At present, Minnesota does not require prospective teachers to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs. Rather, the

basic skills assessment requirement is delayed until teacher candidates are ready to apply for licensure.

#### **NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:**

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

Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates invest considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates in need of additional support should complete remediation before entering the program to avoid the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars. Minnesota should require candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, mathematics and writing prior to program admission. Importantly, candidates should be permitted to submit comparable scores on such rigorous tests as the SAT/ACT/GRE.

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

Minnesota should require programs to use an assessment that demonstrates that candidates are academically competitive with all peers, regardless of their intended profession. Requiring a common test normed to the general college population would allow for the selection of applicants in the top half of their class while also facilitating program comparison.

**e**dates are acacommon test the top half of

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

Illinois

Texas

#### Consider requiring candidates to pass subject-matter tests as a condition of admission into teacher programs.

In addition to ensuring that programs require a measure of academic performance for admission, Minnesota might also want to consider requiring content testing prior to program admission as opposed to at the point of program completion. Program candidates are likely to have completed coursework that covers related test content in the prerequisite classes required for program admission. Thus, it would be sensible to have candidates take content tests while this knowledge is fresh rather than wait two years to fulfill the requirement, and candidates lacking sufficient expertise would be able to remedy deficits prior to entering formal preparation.

## **SNEAK PEEK:** Teacher Prep Review

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

## **55%** are not sufficiently selective.

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

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

Figure 2 Do states appropriately test teacher candidates' academic proficiency?	TEST NORMED BOUND PORNED TO CC.	Test north of the set	Test normed only to test.	n of pres or after Pres program quired	
,	BOUND	Test noi Candidate to prep pr	Test nor Candidate Complex:	No test re	
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			1		
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	1	23	18	9	

## Critical Attention: Elementary Teacher Preparation

Minnesota could do more to ensure that new elementary teachers are ready to teach to the Common Core Standards.

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

Minnesota has not adopted the Common Core State Standards as most states have done, but it must still ensure that its students have the knowledge and skills they will need for college readiness and global competitiveness. And Minnesota, like all states, must ensure that its teachers are prepared to teach to these high standards.

Although a "standards-based" approach is advantageous in that it grants greater flexibility to teacher preparation programs regarding program design, absent a rigorous test, this approach is difficult to monitor or enforce. Further, alignment of preparation program instruction with student learning standards should be augmented with a broader and deeper content perspective than what will actually be taught in the elementary classroom. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Alabama, California, Connecticut, Indiana, **MINNESOTA**, New Hampshire

Massachusetts

Commendably, Minnesota requires that elementary teacher candidates pass each

of the three subtests that comprise the elementary education content test, which includes the equivalent of stand-alone science of reading and math assessments. However, subscores are not reported for other core subject areas, and the state's requirements for math coursework lack the specificity to guarantee relevancy to the elementary classroom.

#### NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:

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

Although Minnesota is on the right track by administering a three-part licensing test, thus making it harder for teachers to pass if they fail some subject areas, the state is encouraged to further strengthen its policy and require separate passing scores for each core subject on its multiple-subject test.

#### Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers, and ensure that math assessment is rigorous.

Although Minnesota requires some knowledge in key areas of mathematics, the state should require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers. This includes specific coursework in foundations, algebra and geometry, with some statistics. Minnesota should also ensure that its mathematics assessment evaluates candidates' knowledge beyond an elementary school level, challenges their understanding of underlying concepts and requires candidates to apply knowledge in nonroutine, multistep procedures.

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

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

#### Figure 3

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



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

Do states ensure that elementary teachers know core content?



Figure 4

Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?



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

know core content?	ELEMENTAR TEST WITH SI SCORE FOD	Elementary Separate pas	Elementary , composite so	No test requ	
	ST W	Eleme Para, The su	lemer, mpos	Vo tes	
	205	ري ج ا	νöγ Γ		
Alabama Alaska				1	
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland			2		
Massachusetts			3		
Michigan					
MINNESOTA					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada			2		
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina				4	
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon		5			
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina			2		
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	9	9	29	4	

Figure 6		ENGLISH	/	SCIENCE	SOCIAL STUDIES	FINE / ARTS
Do states expect		Writing/Lifeature Composition Children's Liters		General Physical Science Earth Science Biology/Life Science	American Histopy I American Histopy I American Government World History (Ancient) World History (Modern) (Non-Western) Geose	
elementary teachers	Ure	ar/	nre	Scie	Y VII / Ce	
to have in-depth	terat	1 Lite	5 / /	Sical Scie	in the second	
	ın Li	ritist rition ition	6	Phys. lience	m H m H histo este	Ny Loo
knowledge of	erica	dB	sig	eral ogy	erica erica orid H n-W	hist Sic
core content?	American Literature	Mriting Cammary Writing Cammary Composition Children's Liters	Chemistry, Physics	General Physical Scient Earth Science Biology/Life Science	American History / American History / American History / Incie World History (Mode, World History (Mode, (Non-Western) Geose	oʻaphy Art History Musić
Alabama		1 🛨 🗖				
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida		) 🛨 🗖				
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois		🛨 📕				
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan		<b>•</b>				
MINNESOTA				ê ê ê .		
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska		1 ★ 🗆				
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico		] ★ 🗆				
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma		) ★ 🔲 👘		* \star ★ -		
Oregon		] ★ 🗌		* * *	$\star \star \star \star \star \star \star \star$	
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee				* * *	- 📮 📮 ★ 🔳 🔲 🗖 🖈	
Texas		★ 🔳		* * *	* * * = = - *	* *
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia				* * *	* * * * * * *	
Washington				* * *		
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						

10 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2012 MINNESOTA Subject mentioned

★ Subject covered in depth

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



#### Figure 8

#### Teacher licensing structure in Minnesota



## Critical Attention: Middle School Teacher Preparation



 Minnesota does not ensure that new middle school teachers will be prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

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

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

Regrettably, Minnesota allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist elementary license, if they are in self-contained classrooms. For middle-level endorsements, candidates must earn a minor in each subject area of licensure.



Middle school generalists on an elementary license are only required to pass the general content test for elementary education.

#### NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:

#### Eliminate the elementary generalist license for middle school teachers.

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

#### Require content testing in all core areas.

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

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

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

Figure 9		K-8 license offered for self.contained dassrooms	/
Do states distinguish mie		for oom	
grade preparation from		ered lassr	ered
elementary preparation	2 3EV	e of	e off
elementary preparation	, LEN	icens Intaii	icens
	1.8.1	K-8/1	K-Blicense offered
	· /	5	
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			
	32	5	14
	-	-	

- 1. California offers a K-12 generalist license for self-contained classrooms.
- 2. Illinois has repealed its K-9 license and is in the process of revising middle school certification requirements.
- 3. With the exception of mathematics.
- 4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.
- 5. Wisconsin offers 1-8 license.

Figure 10		/	/	/	
Do middle school teachers		No, test does not all core subscores fro	No, K-8 license requires	No, testing of all subjects	
have to pass an appropriat		ot Sfor	ie din	est list	
content test in every core	C	core	ects Prse	ota	
		subs Subs	<sup>8</sup> lice	sting uirec	
subject they are licensed	6	Vo, t Port	L'e	o, te t req	
to teach?	VES	all'e	N Ino		
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California				1	
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho			2		
Illinois			3		
Indiana					
lowa				4	
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine Mars land					
Maryland	<sup>2</sup>				
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
MINNESOTA					
Mississippi Missouri					
Montana Nebraska				-	
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey New Mexico					
New York	6				
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon			7		
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	25	4	15	7	
	25	-	15	,	

1. Candidates teaching multiple subjects only have to pass the elementary test.

- 2. For K-8 license, Idaho also requires a singlesubject test.
- 3. Illinois has repealed its K-9 license. The state is in the process of revising its middle school certification requirements.
- 4. It is unclear how new legislation will affect testing requirements for middle school candidates.
- 5. Maryland allows elementary teachers to teach in departmentalized middle schools if not less than 50 percent of the teaching assignment is within the elementary education grades.
- 6. For nondepartmentalized classrooms, generalist in middle childhood education candidates must pass new assessment with three subtests.
- 7. Candidates opting for middle-level endorsement may either complete a major or pass a content test. Oregon allows "alternative assessment" for candidates who fail twice.

## Critical Attention: Secondary Teacher Preparation



 Minnesota is on track to ensure that new secondary teachers will be prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

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

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

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

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

Indiana, MINNESOTA, Tennessee

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

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

Commendably, Minnesota requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subjects. Minnesota does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. Although the state only offers a general social studies certification, teachers with this license must pass a general content test that is divided into two individually scored subtests. The first subtest combines social studies skills, world history, and U.S. and Minnesota history; and the second subtest combines geography, government and citizenship, economics, and behavioral sciences.

#### NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:

#### **Require a passing score for each discipline on the social studies assessment.**

By including two individually scored subtests on its new social studies assessment for secondary teachers, Minnesota is doing more than most states to ensure requisite content knowledge in all social studies disciplines. The state is encouraged to further strengthen its testing policy by requiring a passing score for each subject area that candidates are licensed to teach.

#### Figure 11 Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area they are licensed

Figure 11		Loophole in sei		No <sup>30Cial studies</sup>
Do all secondary tead	chers		ಲ್ಟಿ	24r
have to pass a conten	t	j j	e,	<sup>2</sup> cia
test in every subject		Ę	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
area they are licensed	1 /	hole	hole	
to teach?	LES	doc	1doc	2
	7.1	~ /	7	<
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut		-		
Delaware		_		
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia		_		
Hawaii Idaho		-		
Illinois		-		
Indiana				
lowa <sup>1</sup>				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
MINNESOTA				
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				
	3	28	34	12

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

## Critical Attention: Special Education Teacher Preparation



Minnesota does not ensure that new special education teachers will know the subject matter that they will be required to teach.

Across the country, states are raising performance expectations to ensure that students who graduate from high school are college and career ready. These more rigorous standards apply to special education students just as they do to other students.

The challenge of ensuring that teachers are prepared to teach to these new standards is even more pronounced for special education teachers, who typically have had to meet an even lower bar for content preparation than general educators. And certification rules for special education teachers that do not differentiate between teaching at the elementary and secondary levels only exacerbate the problem.

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

While a K-12 special education license may be appropriate for low-incidence special education students, such as those with severe cognitive disabilities, it is

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



0

deeply problematic for the overwhelming majority of high-incidence special education students who are expected to learn grade-level content.

Regrettably, Minnesota only offers a generic K-12 special education certification, in addition to an early education special education teacher certification.

#### NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:

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

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

## Require elementary special education candidates to pass the same content test as general education teachers.

Minnesota should ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess knowledge of the subject matter at hand and require that these candidates pass the same subject-matter test required of all elementary teachers.

Figure 12		Pecific	/
Do states distinguish	ম	de-s	
between elementary	FER	dera dera	2
and secondary special	10 10 10	is)	(hal
education teachers?	SNC	atio,	ation at
education teachers:	K-12 CERTIFICA	Offes K 12 and Brade Specific	Offers only a K-12 certification 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	1		
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee	1		
Texas Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	16	10	25
	10	10	25

Ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

Secondary special education teachers are frequently generalists who teach many core subject areas. While it may be unreasonable to expect secondary special education teachers to meet the same requirements for each subject they teach as other teachers who teach only one subject, Minnesota's current policy of requiring no subject-matter testing is unacceptable and will not help special education students to meet rigorous learning standards. To provide a middle ground, Minnesota should consider a customized HOUSSE route for new secondary special education teachers and look to the flexibility offered by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which allows for a combination of testing and coursework to demonstrate requisite content knowledge in the classroom.

> 1. Although the state does issue a K-12 certificate, candidates must meet discrete elementary and/or secondary requirements.

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

Elementary Subject-Matter	Test			
Required for an elementary special education license	Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Oregon <sup>1</sup> , Pennsylvania <sup>2</sup> , Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia <sup>3</sup> , Wisconsin			
Required for a K-12 special education license	Colorado, Idaho			
Secondary Subject-Matter Test(s)				
Tests in all core subjects required for secondary special education license	None			
Test in at least one subject required for secondary special education license	Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York⁴, Oregon¹, Pennsylvania², Rhode Island, West Virginia³			
Required for a K-12 special education license	None			

1. Although Oregon requires testing, the state allows an "alternative assessment" option for candidates who fail twice.

2. In Pennsylvania, a candidate who opts for dual certification in elementary or secondary special education and as a reading specialist does not have to take a content test.

3. West Virginia also allows elementary special education candidates to earn dual certification in early childhood, which would not require a content test. Secondary special education candidates earning dual certification as a reading specialist are similarly exempted from the content test.

4. New York requires a multi-subject content test specifically geared to secondary special education candidates. It is divided into three subtests.

## Critical Attention: Student Teaching



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

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

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

Minnesota commendably requires candidates to complete at least 10 full weeks of student teaching. However, the state fails to articulate any requirements for cooperating teachers.

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

48

Florida, Indiana, Tennessee

#### NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:

# Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

In addition to the ability to mentor an adult, cooperating teachers in Minnesota should also be carefully screened for their capacity to further student achievement. Research indicates that the only aspect of a student teaching arrangement that has been shown to have an impact on student achievement is the positive effect of selection of the cooperating teacher by the preparation program, rather than by the student teacher or school district staff.

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

Minnesota requires objective measures of student growth to be a significant criterion of its teacher evaluations. The state should therefore utilize its evaluation results, which provide evidence of effective-ness in the classroom, in the selection of effective cooperating teachers.

Figure 14	Q-	/
Do states require	ACHE V	52
the elements of a	E G G G G	S 15A
high-quality student	ATIN BASE IESS	TE ST
teaching experience?	THE	NIL IN OL
teaching experience.		AST SAST
Alabama		3
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana <sup>1</sup>		
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		2
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	3	28

1. Based on new REPA II regulations.

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

## Critical Attention: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability



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

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

Further, as more states begin to raise expectations for teachers by way of evaluations focused on effectiveness, there is an even greater need to hold teacher preparation programs accountable for the effectiveness of the teachers they produce. Although the quality of both the subject-matter preparation and professional sequence is crucial, there are also additional measures that can provide the state and the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing when it comes to preparing teachers to be successful in the classroom. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, MINNESOTA, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

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

Florida, Louisiana

Although it does not connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs, Minnesota does require the collection and annual reporting of some program-specific objective data that reflect program performance for its alternate routes, and the state appears to have plans to do the same for its traditional preparation programs. These data will include aggregate pass rates for licensure exams and surveys of new teachers and their supervisors. Minnesota has not established minimum performance standards for each category of data it collects that can be used for accountability purposes, nor does it provide the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing.

#### **NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:**

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

As one way to measure whether programs are producing effective classroom teachers, Minnesota should consider the academic achievement gains of students taught by programs' graduates, averaged over the first three years of teaching. Data that are aggregated to the institution (e.g., combining elementary and secondary programs) rather than disaggregated to the specific preparation program are not useful for accountability purposes. Such aggregation can mask significant differences in performance among programs.

#### Collect other meaningful, program-level data that reflect program performance.

Although measures of student growth are an important indicator of program effectiveness, they cannot be the sole measure of program quality for several reasons, including the fact that many programs may have graduates whose students do not take standardized tests. The accountability system must therefore include other objective measures that show how well all programs are preparing teachers for the classroom, such as:

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

#### Establish minimum standards of performance.

Merely collecting the types of data described above is insufficient for accountability purposes. The next and perhaps more critical step is for the state to establish precise minimum standards for teacher preparation program performance for each category of data. Programs should then be held accountable for meeting these standards, and there should be consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.

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

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



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas

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



#### **TEACHER PRODUCTION IN MINNESOTA**

States have long established requirements for teacher preparation and licensure and have lately turned their attention toward accountability systems for preparation programs. But one topic that has received little attention from states is the issue of teacher production. From the number of teachers who graduate from preparation programs each year, only a subset are certified and only some of those certified are actually hired in the state; the relationship between these numbers has important implications for related policymaking.

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

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

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

Minnesota teacher production data: NCTQ was unable to find any published data on teacher production in Minnesota that connects program completion, certification and hiring statistics. In its annual "Education Statistics Summary," Minnesota publishes only the total number of new teachers (newly licensed and first teaching assignment) for that particular year.

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





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

- To ensure adequate subject-area knowledge, Minnesota should require secondary teachers who obtain certification in general social studies to pass individual content tests (or a composite test that reports individual subscores) for each discipline they will be licensed to teach, as noted in the secondary critical attention section.
- As a first step toward using an assessment for admission to a teacher preparation program that compares candidates to the general college-going population, Minnesota should allow teacher candidates to submit ACT/ SAT/GRE scores that demonstrate academic proficiency.



1. National accreditation can be substituted for state approval.

## **Alternate Routes to Certification**

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

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

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

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

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

Minnesota passed new alternate route legislation in 2011. The new law increases admissions standards and requires all alternate route candidates to pass a content knowledge test prior to admission. While Minnesota provides for a reasonable program length and allows for broad usage of alternate routes, the program has some room for significant improvement, particularly regarding coursework requirements, providing new teachers with support and allowing a diversity of alternate route providers (see Figure 19).

#### NEXT STEPS FOR MINNESOTA:

#### Eliminate basic skills test and reconsider use of pedagogy test as an admissions requirement.

Minnesota's requirement that alternate route candidates pass a basic skills test is impractical and ineffective for candidates who already have a college degree. Basic skills tests measure minimum competency—essentially those skills that a person should have acquired in middle school—and are inappropriate for candidates who have already earned a bachelor's degree.

Minnesota also requires both a content-area test and pedagogy examination prior to alternate route admission. While the requirement that applicants demonstrate subject-matter knowledge as a condition of entry is entirely appropriate, the state might want to reconsider requiring a pedagogy test as a

prerequisite. The idea behind the alternate route is that nontraditional candidates could acquire professional knowledge and skills as part of the alternate route program, rather than assume that applicants would already have those skills.

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

Minnesota requires that alternate route candidates take a considerable amount of coursework (programs provide a minimum of 200 instructional hours) but provides no specific guidelines about the nature of the coursework except to say that it should be research-based and focused on best practices. There is also no limit on the overall amount of coursework.

While requiring some preparation prior to entering the classroom is important, Minnesota should ensure that all coursework requirements are manageable for career changers and other nontraditional candidates and contribute to the immediate needs of new teachers. Appropriate coursework should focus on grade-level or subject-level seminars, methodology in the content area, classroom management, assessment and scientifically based early reading instruction.

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

#### Encourage diversity of alternate route providers.

Minnesota now allows for the creation of new teacher training programs. School districts or charter schools may create and implement a teacher training program, although the program must be in partnership with a college or university. However, nonprofit providers are prohibited from operating an alternate route independently. A school district may partner with a nonprofit only after the district has consulted with a college or university. Minnesota should specifically authorize alternate route programs run by local school districts and nonprofits, as well as institutions of higher education. Districts should be able to provide training without a required partnership with colleges and universities. A good diversity of providers helps all programs, both university- and nonuniversity-based, to improve.

Figure 18	GENLINKE OR NEARIL	Alternate Oute that FOUTE	Offered Toute is disingen	SILO
Do states provide real	2	Log +	lents Benu	2
alternate pathways to	EARI		<sup>DVen</sup> disij	
certification?	N N		Ite is	
certification.	VE AI	nate Cant.	or ba	
	JENU ENUN	Alter, İgnifi	)ffere	
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				_
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland Massachusette				
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				
	6	26	19	

<i>(hat are the character f states' alternate rou</i>	istics ర tes? రి	ERFORMA,	WIEDGE		JURGE	DMJC.	SACHING	it WTORIN	C PROL
	istics tes? istics tes? istics istics istics istics istics istics istics istics istics istics	VERIFICATION OF SUIL	AVAILABILITY OF TECT	STREAMLINED CO.	RELEVANT COURSENOR	PROGRAM LEN.	PRACTICE TEACHING	BROAD USAGE	DIVERSITY OF PROV
Alabama	×	*	*	ر م					
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		*	*			*		*	<b>★</b>
West Virginia		*			*	*	*		*
Wisconsin									<b>★</b>
Wyoming									

# Alternate Route Policy Checklist for States

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

Figure 20 Authority for Teacher Preparation in Minnesota



# Critical Attention Summary for Minnesota

PREPARATION

	Red		
			AUTHORITY
	ADMISSION INTO PREPARATION PROGRAMS	Require that preparation programs screen candidates prior to admission by using a common test normed to the general college-bound population and limit acceptance to those candidates demonstrating academic ability in the top 50th percentile.	Individual Institutions
	MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Eliminate the generalist K-8 license.</li> <li>Require middle school candidates to pass a content test in every core area they intend to teach.</li> <li>Encourage two subject-matter minors for candidates who are licensed to teach multiple subjects; those who teach single subjects should earn a content major.</li> </ul>	Board of Teaching
	SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Eliminate the K-12 special education certificate, and require licenses that differentiate between preparation of elementary and secondary teacher candidates.</li> <li>Require that elementary special education candidates pass the same content test as general elementary teachers.</li> <li>Ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.</li> </ul>	Board of Teaching
	STUDENT TEACHING	Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.	Board of Teaching
	TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY	<ul> <li>Collect performance data to monitor programs.</li> <li>Set minimum standards for program performance with consequences for failure to meet those standards.</li> <li>Publicly report performance data.</li> </ul>	Board of Teaching
	Yellow		
-			AUTHORITY
	ELEMENTARY TEACHER PREPARATION	<ul> <li>Require all elementary teacher candidates to pass a rigorous content test that assesses knowledge of all subjects.</li> <li>Require preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers, and ensure math test is rigorous.</li> <li>Require a content specialization in an academic subject area.</li> </ul>	Board of Teaching
	Green		
			AUTHORITY
	SECONDARY TEACHER		Board of Teaching



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 Sollow 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