2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

Maryland





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 2013 for comment and correction; states also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but two states responded to our inquiries. While states do not always agree with our recommendations, their willingness to engage in dialogue and often acknowledge the imperfections of their teacher policies is an important step forward.

FUNDERS

The primary funders for the 2013 Yearbook were:

Bill and Melinda Gates FoundationCarnegie Corporation of New York

- The Joyce Foundation
- The Walton Family Foundation
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The National Council on Teacher Quality does not accept any direct funding from the federal government.

STAFF

Sandi Jacobs, *Project Director* Adrienne S. Davis, *Project Assistant* Kathryn M. Doherty, *Special Contributor* Kelli Lakis, *Lead Researcher* Stephanie T. Maltz and Lisa N. Staresina, *Researchers* Phil Lasser, *Research Assistant*

Special thanks to Leigh Zimnisky, Brittany Atkinson and Justin Rakowski at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2013 *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

The 2013 *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* includes the National Council on Teacher Quality's (NCTQ) 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 31 policy goals focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers.

Maryland at a Glance



Overall 2013 Yearbook Grade

Overall 2011 Yearbook Grade: D+

Area Grades	2013	2011
Area 1 Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers	D+	D+
Area 2 Expanding the Teaching Pool	C-	C+
Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers	C-	С
Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers	C-	C-1
Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers	F	F

Goal Breakdown	2013	Progress on Goals
🛧 Best Practice	0	Since 2011
Fully Meets	1	Progress has increased 0
Nearly Meets	7	No change in progress 31
Partially Meets	6	
Meets Only a Small Part	7	Progress has decreased 0
O Does Not Meet	10	

¹ State teacher pension policy is no longer included in the State Teacher Policy Yearbook. So that Area 4 grades can be compared, 2011 grades have been recalculated to exclude the pension goals. Overall 2011 grades were not recalculated, as the impact was negligible.

How is **Maryland** Faring?



How is **Maryland** Faring?



Figure A	Overall _{State} Grade 2013	Overall _{State} Grade 2017	Overall State Grade 2009
Florida	B+	В	С
Louisiana	в	C-	C-
Rhode Island	В	B-	D
Tennessee	В	B-	C-
Arkansas	B-	С	C-
Connecticut	B-	C-	D+
Georgia	B-	C	C-
Indiana	B-	C+	D
Massachusetts	B-	С	D+
Michigan	B-	C+	D-
New Jersey	B-	D+	D+
New York	B-	С	D+
Ohio	B-	C+	D+
Oklahoma	B-	B-	D+
Colorado	C+	С	D+
Delaware	C+	С	D
Illinois	C+	С	D+
Virginia	C+	D+	D+
Kentucky	С	D+	D+
Mississippi	С	D+	D+
North Carolina	С	D+	D+
Utah	С	C-	D
Alabama	C-	C-	C-
Arizona	C-	D+	D+
Maine	C-	D-	F
Minnesota	C-	C-	D-
Missouri	C-	D	D
Nevada	C-	C-	D-
Pennsylvania	C-	D+	D
South Carolina	C-	C-	C-
Texas	C-	C-	C-
Washington	C-	C-	D+
West Virginia	C-	D+	D+
California	D+	D+	D+
District of Columbia	D+	D	D-
Hawaii	D+	D-	D-
Idaho	D+	D+	D-
MARYLAND	D+	D+	D
New Mexico	D+	D+	D+
Wisconsin	D+	D	D
Alaska	D	D	D
lowa	D	D	D
Kansas	D	D	D-
New Hampshire	D	D-	D-
North Dakota	D	D	D-
Oregon	D	D-	D-
Wyoming	D	D	D-
Nebraska	D-	D-	D-
South Dakota	D-	D	D
Vermont	D-	D-	F
Montana	F	F	F

How to Read the Yearbook

GOAL SCORE

The extent to which each goal has been met:

*	Best Practice
	Fully Meets
	Nearly Meets
	Partially Meets
	Meets Only a Small Part
\bigcirc	Does Not Meet

PROGRESS INDICATOR

Whether the state has advanced on the goal, policy has remained unchanged or the state has lost ground on that topic:

\mathbf{O}	Goal progress has increased since 2011
\bigcirc	Goal progress has decreased since 2011
Ð	Goal progress has remained the same since 2011

BAR RAISED FOR THIS GOAL Indicates the criteria to meet the goal have been raised since the 2011 Yearbook.

READING CHARTS AND TABLES:

Strong practices or the ideal policy positions for the states are capitalized:





Area 1 Summary

How States are Faring on Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 1-A: Admission into Teacher Preparation
- **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: Special Education Teacher Preparation
- 1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge
- 1-J: Student Teaching
- 1-K: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

Goal A – Admission into Teacher Preparation

The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong 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. The selection of applicants should be limited to the top half of that population.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 1 How States are Faring in Admission Requirements Best Practice States 2 Delaware 1, Rhode Island 1 State Meets Goal Texas States Nearly Meet Goal Mississippi¹, New Jersey¹, Utah¹ 11 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky¹, North Carolina, South Carolina¹, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin 13 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama 🕇 , Arkansas, Florida, Illinois 🌉 , Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan¹, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire 1, Oklahoma 1, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania 21 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, MARYLAND, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

↑:12 🔶:38 ↓:1

1-A Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 💦 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 ۻ Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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

Proposal Guidelines for New/Modified Educator Preparation Programs http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/certification/progapproval/Program_Approval_Section.htm **Basic Skills Testing Information** http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/certification/certification_branch/testing_information/praxis1

RECOMMENDATION

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

Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates invest considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates in need of additional support should complete remediation before entering the program to avoid the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars. Maryland should require candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, mathematics and writing prior to program admission.

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

Maryland 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.

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

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

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

For admission to teacher preparation programs, **Rhode Island** and **Delaware** require a test of academic proficiency normed to the general collegebound population rather than a test that is normed just to prospective teachers. Delaware also requires teacher candidates to have a 3.0 GPA or be in the top 50th percentile for general education coursework completed. Rhode Island also requires an average cohort GPA of 3.0, and beginning in 2016, the cohort mean score on nationally-normed tests such as the ACT, SAT or GRE must be in the top 50th percentile. In 2020, the requirement for the mean test score will increase from the top half to the top third.

Figure 2

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



1. Strong Practice: Delaware, Rhode Island, Texas

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

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

Figure 3

When do states test teacher candidates' academic proficiency?



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

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

Figure 4		1, PE/		1.1
Destates			E	r afte
Do states measure the	50	Tillsson ULATIONEGE Test normed to PREP PROG TO Candidates only teacher admissions only teacher	rogr	No test equired
academic proficiency of	10 M	of AT A to t		No test required
teacher candidates?	Na Q	The NUT	top 1	n of n of
		iissi st n dida	ist nc	bletic
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2 0 4 4 7 8 4 7 8 4 7			Lov Lov
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		1		
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	3	26	14	Q
	5	26	14	8

1. Candidates in Oklahoma also have the option of gaining admission with a 3.0 GPA.

Do states require a minimum GPA for admission to teacher prep?



1. Strong Practice: Delaware, Mississippi⁶, New Jersey⁶, Oklahoma⁷, Pennsylvania⁸, Rhode Island⁶, Utah

- 3. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut⁹, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin¹⁰
- 4. Louisiana
- 5. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 6. The 3.0 GPA requirement is a cohort average; individual candidates must have a 2.75 GPA.
- 7. Candidates in Oklahoma also have the option of gaining admission by passing a basic skills test.
- 8. Students can also be admitted with a combination of a 2.8 GPA and qualifying scores on the basic skills test or SAT/ACT.
- 9. Connecticut requires a B- grade point average for all undergraduate courses.
- 10. The GPA admission requirement is 2.5 for undergraduate and 2.75 for graduate programs.

^{2.} Kentucky, Texas

Goal B – Elementary Teacher Preparation

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

Goal Components

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

- 1. The state should require all elementary teacher candidates, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all core subjects.
- 2. 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.)
- 3. 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 ensures that prospective teachers have taken higher level academic coursework.



The components for this goal have changed since 2011. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 6

How States are Faring in Elementary Teacher Preparation



Best Practice State Indiana 2 States Meet Goal

- Connecticut¹, New Hampshire¹
- 11 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama¹, Arkansas¹, District of Columbia¹, Florida¹, Idaho¹, Kentucky¹, New Jersey¹, Rhode Island 1, Texas 1, Utah 1, Virginia 1

5

14 States Partly Meet Goal California, Delaware 1, Georgia, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York 1, North Carolina¹, Oklahoma, Oregon¹, Pennsylvania¹, South Carolina¹, Vermont¹, West Virginia 1

- States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona¹, Colorado, Mississippi, New Mexico, Washington
- 18 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, MARYLAND, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio¹, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

4:0



ANALYSIS

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

Maryland requires candidates to pass the Praxis II Elementary Education: Instructional Practice and Applications test. Regrettably, this is not an adequate assessment of content knowledge. The description of topics assessed and sample questions focus almost exclusively on methods and instructional strategies, and although it is a sound approach to assess pedagogical knowledge in the context of specific content areas, such a test does not measure content knowledge.

Early childhood education (PK-3) candidates are required to pass the Praxis II Early Childhood: Content Knowledge test.

Maryland also requires that elementary education candidates either complete a major in interdisciplinary studies or in an academic field taught in elementary education or complete at least 48 semester hours of content coursework.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirement www.ets.org COMAR 13A.12.02.04, 13A.12.01.13

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maryland should require both a rigorous content test as a condition of certification and separate, meaningful passing scores for each area on the test. Use of a composite passing score offers no assurance of adequate knowledge in each subject area. A candidate may achieve a passing score and still be seriously deficient in a particular subject area.

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

Maryland should either articulate a more specific set of standards or establish comprehensive coursework requirements for elementary teacher candidates that align with the Common Core State 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. Maryland requires elementary education candidates to complete a minimum of 12 semester hours of science, and nine semester hours of both English and social studies. (For mathematics requirements, see Goal 1-D.) Unfortunately, the state's coursework requirements lack the needed specificity to guarantee relevancy to the elementary classroom. Maryland relies on NCATE/CAEP standards, suggesting that the state uses the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards for approving its elementary programs. Unfortunately, ACEI standards fall far short of the mark by offering no mention of world and American history; world, British and American literature; American government; or grammar and composition. ACEI standards do mention important topics in science, but even in those areas, the standards consist mainly of extremely general competencies that programs should help teacher candidates to achieve.

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

Maryland's policy requiring elementary candidates to earn an academic major is undermined because it may be met with an interdisciplinary major. Unlike an academic major, an interdisciplinary major will not necessarily enhance teachers' content knowledge or ensure that prospective teachers have taken higher-level academic coursework. Further, it does not provide an option for teacher candidates unable to fulfill student teaching or other professional requirements to still earn a degree, as an academic major does.

Close the loophole that allows teachers to add elementary grade levels to an existing license without demonstrating content knowledge.

Maryland allows teachers to add elementary certification to their professional certificate by either obtaining 30 credits distributed across English, social studies, math and science, with at least six credits in each content area, or passing the elementary content test. The state is urged to require that all teachers who add the elementary grade levels to their certificates pass a rigorous subject-matter test to ensure content knowledge of all subject areas before they are allowed in the elementary classroom. Of particular concern is the fact that teachers already teaching at other grade levels may only be prepared to teach a single subject and not the multiple subjects required at the elementary level.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that the Common Core State Standards are a required element of its teacher preparation programs. The state added that elementary teachers are required to earn 12 credits each of science and math, and that candidates must complete a major in an academic content area or elementary education.

Figure 7	CORFOL	Separate passing content tees	Iementary content to composite score for with Composite score for the to composite score for the sc	with
Do states ensure that	ENT	t test	Tre fo	19
elementary teachers	UNO A	SUB SUB	o soc	P
know core content?	SEPA		Cor.	quire
	TENT WITH	Tent; ate	entar Site	est re
	CORE TEL	Eler, Separ	Elem, ompo	No test required
Alabama		, °, U		
Alaska				1
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut Delaware				
Delaware District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
MARYLAND			2 ²	
Massachusetts			3	
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi			_	
Missouri Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada			2	
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina			3	
North Dakota Ohio				4
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	19	9	19	4

EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Indiana ensures that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades possess the requisite subjectmatter knowledge before entering the classroom. Not only are elementary teacher candidates required to pass a content test comprised of independently scored subtests, but the state also requires its early childhood education teachers-who are licensed to teach up through grade 3-to pass a content test comprised of four subtests. Elementary teacher candidates in Indiana must also earn either a major or minor in an academic content area.

1. Alaska does not require testing for initial licensure.

- 2. The required test is a questionable assessment of content knowledge, instead emphasizing methods and instructional strategies.
- 3. Massachusetts and North Carolina require a general curriculum test that does not report scores for each elementary subject. A separate score is reported for math.

4. Only teachers of grades 4 and 5 are required to pass content test.

Do states require early Alabama

teach elementary grades $E S $	Do states require early	E				
Alaska	childhood teachers who		ţţ			
Alaska	teach elementary grade	es EE	core	ittle	ired .	'ble
Alaska	to pass a content	LB JE NI	int te site s	vith, onte	,requ	Pplica
Alaska	knowledge test?	Sec. S.	Conte Pinpo,	rest,	o tes	Vot a
Alaska	5		~~~/	~ <u>2</u>	~ /	
Arizona	Alabama					
Arkansas	Alaska					
California	Arizona					
Colorado	Arkansas					
Connecticut	California					
Delaware	Colorado					
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Ildinois Indiana Inva Indiana Iowa Kansas Maine Maine Massachusetts Minesota Minesota Montana Nevada New Hampshire New Hampshire New York New York North Dakota Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington Washington <td>Connecticut</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Connecticut					
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Idaho Indiana Indiana Indiana Indiana Indiana Iowa Kansas Kansas Kansas Maine Maine Maine Maine Maine Maine Minesota Minssouri Mississippi Montana Nevada New Hampshire New York North Dakota Ohio Ohio Okahoma Oregon South Dakota Ten	Delaware					
Georgia	District of Columbia					
Hawaii	Florida					
Idaho Image:	Georgia					
Illinois Indiana Iowa Iowa Kansas Kansas Kansas Kansas Kansas Iuisiana Maine Maine Maine Massachusetts Missouri Missouri Missouri Nevada New Jarsey New Mexico New York North Dakota	Hawaii					
Indiana Iowa Iowa Kansas Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Iowa Maine Maine Maine Maine Maine Maine Maine Iowasachusetts Iowassachusetts Indikingan Minnesota Minnesota Missouri Montana Nebraska New Jarsey Iowa New Mexico New Mexico North Carolina North Dakota Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2² South Carolina Iomasee	Idaho					
Iowa Iowa Kansas Iowa Kentucky Iowa Louisiana Iowa Maine Iowa Maine Iowa Maine Iowa Maine Iowa Maine Iowa Massachusetts Iowa Minesota Iowa Minesota Iowa Missouri Iowa Montana Iowa Nevada Iowa New Hampshire Iowa New Vork Iowa North Carolina Iowa North Dakota Iowa Ohio Iowa Okahoma Iowa Rhode Island Iowa Iowa Iowa Washington Iowa Washington Iowa Wisconsin Iowa Wyoming Iowa	Illinois					
Kansas Image: Constraint of the second o	Indiana					
Kentucky	lowa					
Louisiana Image	Kansas					
Maine Image Image Image Marketts Image Image Image Michigan Image Image Image Minnesota Image Image Image Minnesota Image Image Image Mississippi Image Image Image Missouri Image Image Image Montana Image Image Image Nebraska Image Image Image New Ada Image Image Image New Hampshire Image Image Image New Jersey Image Image Image New Mexico Image Image Image New York Image Image Image North Carolina Image Image Image Oklahoma Image Image Image Oregon Image Image Image Image Pennsylvania Image Image Image Image South Carolina Image <	Kentucky					
MARYLAND Image: Constraint of the second	Louisiana					
Massachusetts Image: Constraint of the second s	Maine					
Michigan Image: Constraint of the second	MARYLAND					
Minnesota	Massachusetts					
Missouri Montana Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Iterative South Carolina Iterative Vermont Vermont Virginia West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	Michigan					
Missouri Montana Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Iterative South Carolina Iterative Vermont Vermont Virginia West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina 1 Pennsylvania 1 Pennsylvania 1 South Carolina 1 1 Vermont 1 Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	Mississippi					
Nebraska Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina 1 South Carolina 1 Pennsylvania 1 1 South Carolina 1 <t< td=""><td>Missouri</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Missouri					
Nevada Image: Constraint of the second	Montana					
New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina Image: South Carolina Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	Nebraska					
New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina South Carolina 1 Pennessee 1 Tennessee 1 Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina South Carolina Image: South						
New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina South Dakota Image: South Dakota <td< td=""><td>New Jersey</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	New Jersey					
North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina South Dakota 1 Tennessee 1 Texas Utah 2 Vermont 1 Virginia 1 Washington Wisconsin Wyoming						
North DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode Island2South CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeItakaVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyoming						
Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Itah 2 Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
OklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode Island2South CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasUtah2VermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming						
Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island 2 South Carolina South Dakota South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
Rhode Island 2 South Carolina	_					
South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wisconsin Wyoming	-		Ц			
South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah 2 Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wisconsin Wyoming		L ²				
Tennessee Texas Utah 2 Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
Texas Image: Constraint of the second sec						
Utah 2						
Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming						
Washington Image: Constraint of the second se						
West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	_					
Wisconsin Wyoming	_					
Wyoming	-					
6 12 16 4 13	wyonning					
		6	12	16	4	13

1. These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.

2. May pass either multiple subjects (subscores) or content knowledge (no subscores) test.

Figure 9				GLISH		/		SCIE										FINE / ARTS	
Do states expect			Writing(Canton) Literature	/ /	' /		/	Earth Sci	1 /	/		/	World L:	World History (Ancient)		>/			/
elementary teachers		World.n.	eratu	Children's Liter	eure	/		^{',Sc} ie	Biology/Life Scie.	u Ce	American J	American History II	^m e	Anci	Mod				
to have in-depth		itera	sh Lit	iter.			' /	Vsica,	ن ب ب ر ب		tisto,	tisto,	ofe'	50	Lio.	tor)		. / /	
knowledge of	ć		Priti.	Ssition Physics	/ / ,	ŝ / "		<u>لم الم الم الم الم الم الم الم الم الم ا</u>	WLife	- Je			Ξ / Ξ			Phy West		\$ / /	
core content?	meri	orta	Writi		Chennics	Physics	ener	Earth Sci	iolog	meri	meri	meri	Vorld	ortd	Worl	Geography	Art Histor	Music	
	र 	2	/-0	767	6	/ व 	/ G	/ ⁴	43/	ব ,	/ र 	/ रू 		/ ,	/-<	5/0/	रि	_	
Alabama Alaska			*																
Arizona			-				-	-	-							*		*	
Arkansas																			
California			-				-	-	 ★	-	+	-	-	-				*	
Colorado			Ê				Â	$\widehat{\Box}$	$\widehat{\Box}$	n	$\widehat{\Box}$	Ê	$\widehat{\Box}$			Â			
Connecticut										*	*								
Delaware			*			*		*	*	*	*	*	*						
District of Columbia			*			*		*	*	*	*	*	*						
Florida			*		*		*	*	*			*				*			
Georgia			- 🖈				*	*	*	*	*	*				*			
Hawaii																			
Idaho			*			*		*	*	*	*	*	*						
Illinois			*				*	*	*			*				*			
Indiana			*				*	*	*			*	*	*		*		*	
lowa																			
Kansas			*	*			*	*	*			*				*			
Kentucky																			
Louisiana Maine																			
MARYLAND																			
Massachusetts																			
Michigan			-	-			-	-	-			*				*			
Minnesota			-	÷		*	÷	÷	÷			÷				$\hat{\Box}$			
Mississippi			$\hat{\Box}$				Ê		Ê										
Missouri			*			\star	*	*	*	*		\star		\star		*	*		
Montana																			
Nebraska			*																
Nevada																			
New Hampshire																			
New Jersey																			
New Mexico			*															*	
New York																			
North Carolina																			
North Dakota Ohio																			
Oklahoma			*				*	*	*			•				*			
Oregon			-				$\frac{1}{2}$	+	÷.	*	-	-		*		*		*	
Pennsylvania			÷			*	*	+	÷	$\hat{\mathbf{x}}$		+		Ê		*			
Rhode Island			$\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$			$\mathbf{\star}$		*	$\mathbf{\hat{\star}}$	±	*	*	*			Ê			
South Carolina																			
South Dakota																			
Tennessee			*			*	*	*	*			*				*			
Texas			*			*	$\mathbf{\pi}$	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*	
Utah			*			*		*	*	*	*	*	*						
Vermont			*																
Virginia			*		*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Washington			X			*		X	*			X				*		*	
West Virginia			*																
Wisconsin Wyoming						*			*	*									
wyonning																			
												Subje	ect m	entio	ned	★ Su	bject c	overed in de	pth

What subjects does Maryland expect elementary teachers to know?



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

3. California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, 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, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

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.)

- 1. The state should require that new elementary teachers, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, 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 five instructional components shown by scientifically based reading research to be essential to teaching children to read.
- 2. The state should require that teacher preparation programs prepare candidates in the science of reading instruction.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy



1-C Analysis: **Maryland**State Partly Meets Goal Bar Raised for this Goal Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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.

In its Reading Course Revision Guidelines, Maryland requires teacher preparation programs to address the science of reading. Programs must provide training in the five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. The state also requires reading coursework for all teacher candidates: 12 credit hours for early childhood and elementary teacher candidates and six credit hours for secondary teacher candidates.

Teacher candidates or current certificate holders with certifications in early childhood, elementary or special education at the early childhood or elementary levels may test out of state reading requirements by passing the Praxis II Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary test.

Supporting Research Reading Course Revision Guidelines http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/certification/progapproval/RC.htm Code of Maryland Regulations 13A.12.02.04 Praxis Test Requirements www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require all teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous assessment in the science of reading instruction.

Maryland 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 address all five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. If the test 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.

Maryland should also require all early childhood education teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous assessment to ensure that they are adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction before entering the classroom.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland reiterated that it requires 12 credits in reading, and that coursework must be grounded in scientifically based reading research. Courses must be approved by the state.

Figure 13		EPARATIO UIREMEN	TS /	TEST REQUIRE	
Do states ensure that	FULLY ADDRESS READING SCIENCE	Do not address reading science	APPROPRIAT	Inadequate to.	No reading test
elementary teachers	SCI P	addr. Scien	Riaz	the t	ing te
know the science	DING	not ting	of a	tequ,	read,
of reading?	5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	D G G G	4 PP	Inac	>°
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					
Minnesota Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina			2		
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma Oragan					
Oregon Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	25	26	17	16	18

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Fifteen states meet this goal by requiring that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades pass comprehensive assessments that specifically test the five elements of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Independent reviews of the assessments used by **Connecticut** and **Massachusetts**, confirm that these tests are rigorous measures of teacher candidates' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction.

Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
 Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.

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



- Strong Practice: Alabama⁴, California, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina⁵, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont
- Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming
- 4. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
- 5. Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.

Figure 15

Do states measure knowledge of the science of reading for early childhood teachers who can teach elementary grades?



- Strong Practice: Alabama⁵, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Idaho
- Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming
- 4. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.
- 5. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum

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, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, 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.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 16 How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation in Mathematics **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal Arkansas 1, Florida 1, Indiana, Kentucky 1, New York 1, North Carolina 1, Texas 1, Virginia 1 15 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama¹, Connecticut¹, Delaware¹, District of Columbia 1, Idaho 1, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire 1, New Jersey 1, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina 1, Utah, Vermont 1, West Virginia 1 State Partly Meets Goal California 21 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, MARYLAND, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wyoming 6 States Do Not Meet Goal Colorado, Hawaii I, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Wisconsin **Progress on this Goal Since 2011:** 1:20 ↔:30 4:1

1-D Analysis: Maryland

State Meets a Small Part Goal 🕋 Bar Raised for this Goal 😝 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland requires that all new elementary teachers pass a general elementary subject-matter test, the Praxis II. This commercial test lacks a specific mathematics subscore, so one can 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.

Maryland's early childhood education teachers, who are allowed to teach through grade 3, are required to pass the early childhood general content test, which also does not report a math subscore.

Maryland requires elementary teaching candidates to earn at least 12 semester hours of credit in mathematics. However, the state stipulates neither the requisite content of these classes nor that they must meet the needs of elementary teachers. Maryland also relies on NCATE/CAEP standards, suggesting that it uses Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards for approving its elementary programs. ACEI standards address content in mathematics foundations, but these standards lack the specificity needed to ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver other mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirement www.ets.org COMAR 13A.12.02.04 www.acei.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require all teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous mathematics assessment.

Maryland 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.

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

Maryland must ensure that new teachers are prepared to teach the mathematics content required by the Common Core State Standards. Although ACEI standards require some knowledge in key areas of mathematics, Maryland 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 coursework.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that it is a Common Core state, and that the Common Core math standards are required content for all teacher preparation programs.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Eight states meet this goal by requiring that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades earn a passing score on an independently scored mathematics subtest. **Massachusetts's** MTEL mathematics subtest continues to set the standard in this area by evaluating mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenging candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts.

Figure 17

Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas⁴, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia

 Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- 3. Alaska⁵, Hawaii, Montana, Ohio⁶
- 4. Test is not yet available for review.
- 5. Testing is not required for initial licensure.
- 6. Only teachers of grades 4 and 5 are required to pass an adequate content test.

Figure 18

Do states measure knowledge of math of early childhood teachers who can teach elementary grades?



1. Strong Practice: Florida, Indiana, New York, Virginia

- Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming

4. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.

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 require that new middle school teachers pass a licensing test in every core academic area that they are licensed to teach.
- 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 encourage middle school candidates who are licensed to teach multiple subjects to earn minors in two core academic areas rather than earn a single major. Middle school candidates licensed to teach a single subject area should earn a major in that area.

Background

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

Figure 19

How States are Faring in Middle School **Teacher** Preparation



Best Practice States Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Carolina

19 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa1, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Ohio 1, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island 1, Texas 1, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia



States Nearly Meet Goal MARYLAND, New York, North Carolina¹, Tennessee

States Partly Meet Goal Massachusetts, Minnesota, Wisconsin

States Meet a Small Part of Goal 7 Michigan, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming

14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii I, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:5 👄 : 45 ↓:1



ANALYSIS

Maryland requires middle school education certification (grades 4-9) for all middle school teachers. These teachers are only required to complete a teacher preparation program; the state does not explicitly require a major or minor in these subject areas.

All new middle school teachers in Maryland are also required to pass a Praxis II single-subject content test to attain licensure.

However, the state allows elementary teachers to teach in departmentalized middle schools, if not less than 50 percent of the teaching assignment is within the elementary education grades. This is especially worrisome considering that elementary teachers in the state are only required to pass the Praxis II "Elementary Education: Instructional Practice and Applications" test, which is not even an adequate assessment of content knowledge for elementary teachers.

Commendably, Maryland does not offer a K-8 generalist license.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirement www.ets.org COMAR 13A.12.02.05

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

Ensure meaningful content tests.

To ensure meaningful middle school content tests, Maryland should make certain that its passing scores reflect high levels of performance.

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 it would increase schools' staffing flexibility. However, middle school candidates in Maryland who intend to teach a single subject should earn a major in that area.

Close the loophole that allows teachers to add middle grade levels to an existing license without demonstrating content knowledge.

Maryland allows teachers to add middle-level areas with either 15 credits in the content area and 15 credits in a content-related area, or a passing score on a content test. The state is urged to require that all teachers who add the middle grade levels to their certificates pass a rigorous subject-matter test to ensure content knowledge of all subject areas before they are allowed in the classroom.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that current middle school preparation programs require candidates to be certified in two areas and pass a test in both areas.

Figure 20	FFERED	br boms	/
Do states distinguish middle grade preparation from elementary preparation?	K-8 UCENSE NOT OFFERED	As license offered for self-contained dassrooms	k-8 license offered
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			1
Arkansas			
California		2	
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			3
Oregon			4
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			1
Wyoming			
	31	5	15

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey and South Carolina ensure that all middle school teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach middle school-level content. None of these states offers a K-8 generalist license and all require passing scores on subject-specific content tests. Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina explicitly require at least two content-area minors, and New Jersey requires a content major along with a minor for each additional area of certification.

1. Offers 1-8 license.

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

3. With the exception of mathematics.

4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.

		,	,	,
Figure 21		No. test does not report	5	
Do middle school teachers		40	No, K-8 license required	No testing of all subjects
have to pass an appropriate		of rep	ure s requii	test "
content test in every core		Ses n	ense	and a
subject they are licensed		est d	k-8 lic leme	estin quire
to teach?	YES	No.1	No.	No, i Dot re
	~ /	ر » /		
Alabama				1
Alaska Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				2
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho			3	
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
MARYLAND	4			
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York	5			
North Carolina	6			
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon			7	
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah Vermont				
Virginia Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	26	-		
	26	3	16	6

- 2. Candidates teaching multiple subjects only have to pass the elementary test. Single-subject credential does not require test.
- 3. For K-8 license, Idaho also requires a single-subject test.
- 4. 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.
- 5. For nondepartmentalized classrooms, generalist in middle childhood education candidates must pass new assessment with three subtests.
- 6. Teachers may have until second year to pass tests, if they attempt to pass them during their first year.
- 7. Candidates opting for middle-level endorsement may either complete a major or pass a content test.

^{1.} Alaska does not require content tests for initial licensure.

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 are licensed to teach.
- 2. The state should require secondary social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each social studies discipline they are licensed to teach.
- 3. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 22

How States are Faring in Secondary Teacher Preparation 3 Best Practice States



Best Practice States Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee



States Meet Goal Minnesota, South Dakota

28 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri [↑], New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon [↑], Pennsylvania, Rhode Island [↑], South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

States Partly Meet Goal District of Columbia, Iowa[↑], Louisiana, MARYLAND, Mississippi, Nebraska[↑], Nevada, New Mexico



8

State Meets a Small Part of Goal North Carolina

9 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii 1, Montana, New Hampshire, Washington, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

★:6 ↔:44 ↓:1

1-F Analysis: Maryland

State Partly Meets Goal 🛛 (Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a Praxis II content test to teach any core secondary subjects.

Unfortunately, Maryland 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.

General social studies candidates must pass the Praxis II Social Studies: Content and Interpretation test. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the topical areas. Maryland also offers secondary certifications in geography and political science. These candidates are required to pass the same general content test. (For the state's science loophole, see Goal 1-G.)

To add an additional subject or field to a secondary license, teachers in Maryland may either complete coursework requirements (up to 30 credits, depending on the area) or submit a passing score on a content test.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirement www.ets.org COMAR 13A.12.02.06; .13 Adding Endorsement www.msde.maryland.gov/MSDE/divisions/certification/certification_branch/faq

RECOMMENDATION

Require subject-matter testing for all secondary teacher candidates.

Maryland wisely requires subject-matter tests for most secondary teachers but should address any loopholes that undermine this policy (see Goal 1-G).

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

By allowing a general social studies certification—and only requiring a general knowledge social studies exam—Maryland is not ensuring that its secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. The state's required assessment combines all subject areas (e.g., history, geography, economics) and does not report separate scores for each subject area.

Require subject-matter testing when adding subject-area endorsements.

Maryland should require passing scores on subject-specific content tests, regardless of other coursework or degree requirements, for teachers who are licensed in core secondary subjects and wish to add another subject area, or endorsement, to their licenses. While coursework may be generally indicative of background in a particular subject area, only a subject-matter test ensures that teachers know the specific content they will need to teach.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis. The state also indicated that beginning in September 2013, secondary history teachers will have to pass the Praxis II World and United States History: Content Knowledge test.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia, Indiana and Tennessee require that all secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subject—both as a condition of licensure and to add an additional field to a secondary license. Further, none of these states offers secondary certification in general social studies; all teachers must be certified in a specific discipline. Also worthy of mention is **Missouri**, which now requires its general social studies teachers to pass a multi-content test with six independently scored subtests.

Figure 23

Does a secondary teacher have to pass a content test in every subject area for licensure?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina⁴, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin [For more on loopholes, see Goal 1-G (science) and Figure 25 (social studies).]
- Alaska, Arizona⁵, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Montana, New Hampshire⁵, Washington, Wyoming⁶
- 4. Teachers may also have until second year to pass tests, if they attempt to pass them during their first year.
- 5. Candidates with a master's degree in the subject area do not have to pass a content test.
- 6. Only secondary comprehensive social studies teachers must pass a content test.

Figure 24

Does a secondary teacher have to pass a content test in every subject area to add an endorsement?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Minnesota, Tennessee

- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin (Science is discussed in Goal 1-G.)
- Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Washington, Wyoming

Figure 25



1. Strong Practice: Georgia, Indiana, South Dakota, Tennessee

- 2. Strong Practice: Minnesota⁴, Missouri
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma⁵, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Minnesota's test for general social studies is divided into two individually scored subtests.
- 5. Oklahoma offers combination licenses.

Goal G – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that secondary 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 in each science discipline they are licensed to teach.
- 2. If a general science or combination science certification is offered, the state should require teachers to pass a subject-matter test in each science discipline they are licensed to teach under those certifications.

Background

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

Figure 26 How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Science **Best Practice State** 1 Missouri 1 13 States Meet Goal Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia 1 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona¹, Arkansas States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Illinois, Maine, MARYLAND, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah States Meet a Small Part of Goal 28 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:4 ↔:47 4:0

1-G Analysis: **Maryland**State Partly Meets Goal Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland does not offer a general science certification for secondary teachers. However, the state does have a physical science certification. Candidates must pass the Praxis II Chemistry, Physics and General Science test.

Supporting Research Praxis Testing Requirements www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require secondary science teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed 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. Maryland's required assessment combines both physics and chemistry and does not report separate scores for each subject. Therefore, a candidate could answer many physics questions, for example, incorrectly on the combination content test yet still be licensed to teach physics to high school students.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis

Figure 27	L.	OFERS GENERAL STENC	. /	Offers Beneral Science or without adenice secon	
Do states ensure that	SUBI			, s	జ
secondary general science	NOLE		TEST te-sul vithou	icienc Isec	testi
teachers have adequate	MY S		V sing Nses v	Peral s	dle
subject-matter knowledge?	ESCO ELLCO MELCO	PER CI	rs onl ce lice, ite tes	^{rs} Ber inatio it ade	
subject matter knowledge.	E SE	E S E	Scien. Gequi	Offe Comb Vithou	
Alabama	OFFES ONLY SNOLE-SUBJECT	/	Offers only single subject	2	
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida				2	
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					
	10	5	1	35	

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Missouri ensures that its secondary science teachers know the content they teach by taking a dual approach to general secondary science certification. The state offers general science certification but only allows these candidates to teach general science courses. Missouri also offers an umbrella certification-called unified sciencethat requires candidates to pass individual subtests in biology, chemistry, earth science and physics. These certifications are offered in addition to single-subject licenses.

1. Teachers with the general science license may only teach general science courses.

2. Georgia's science test consists of two subtests.
Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal H – Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they are licensed 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.
- All elementary special education candidates 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 ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

Background

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

Figure 28 How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Social Studies n **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama¹, New York¹, Rhode Island¹, Texas 1 8 States Partly Meet Goal Idaho¹, Iowa¹, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin 10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Connecticut 1, Illinois, Maine, MARYLAND, North Carolina¹, Oregon, Tennessee 1, Vermont, Virginia 1 29 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas I, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas I, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:9 👄 : 39 4:3

1-H Analysis: Maryland

State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🔶 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland does not offer a K-12 special education certification.

However, the state does not require content testing for any of its special education teacher candidates.

Supporting Research Praxis Test Requirements www.ets.org Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.12.02.20

RECOMMENDATION

Require that elementary special education candidates pass a rigorous content test as a condition of initial licensure.

To ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess sufficient knowledge of the subject matter at hand, Maryland should require a rigorous content test that reports separate passing scores for each content area. Maryland should also set these passing scores to reflect high levels of performance. 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 teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

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

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that any "teacher of record"—that is, the teacher responsible for teaching specific content—must be certified in the content being taught. Special educators who do not hold content certification may serve as resource or team teachers but are not allowed to teach content, if certification in the content is lacking. The state added that Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs (MAAPPs) require that special educators at the secondary level be certified in a content area as well as in special education.

LAST WORD

While special educators should be valued for their critical role in working with students with disabilities and special needs, they are identified by the state not as "special education assistants" but as "special education teachers," presumably because the state expects them to provide instruction to children. Providing instruction to children who have special needs requires both knowledge of effective learning strategies and some knowledge of the subject matter at hand. Failure to ensure that teachers are well trained in content areas deprives special education students of the opportunity to reach their full academic potential.

51 20		/	/
Figure 29	DOESNOT OFERA	Offers K. 22 and Back-specific cents.	ation(s)
Do states distinguish	FERA	NON PLON	Offers only a K-12
between elementary		cific,	in a l
and secondary special education teachers?	PESN 2 CER	fers k de-sp	fers o tificati
education teachers?	0×	0 er8	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	1		
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			
	16	7	28

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Unfortunately, NCTQ cannot award "best practice" honors to any state's policy in the area of special education. However, two states-New York and Rhode Island-are worthy of mention for taking steps in the right direction in ensuring that all special education teachers know the subject matter they are required to teach. Both states require that elementary special education candidates pass the same elementary content tests, which are comprised of individual subtests, as general education elementary teachers. Secondary special education teachers in New York must pass a newly developed multisubject content test for special education teachers comprised of three separately scored sections. Rhode Island requires its secondary special education teachers to hold certification in another secondary area.

Figure 30

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

Elementary Subject-Matter Test					
Required for an elementary special education license	Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania ¹ , Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia ² , Wisconsin				
Required for a K-12 special education license	Colorado, Idaho, North Carolina				
Secondary Subject-Matter Test(s)					
Tests in all core subjects required for secondary special education license	New York ³				
Test in at least one subject required for secondary special education license	Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania ¹ , Rhode Island, West Virginia ²				
Required for a K-12 special education license	None				

1. 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.

2. 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 a dual certification as a reading specialist are similarly exempted.

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

Figure 29:

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

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Assessing Professional Knowledge

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

Goal Component

(The factor 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 31

How States are Faring in Special Education **Teacher Preparation** Best Practice States 28 States Meet Goal Alabama¹, Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana 1, Iowa¹, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island¹, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington 1, West Virginia States Nearly Meet Goal MARYLAND, North Carolina 3 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Pennsylvania¹, Utah States Meet a Small Part of Goal 3 Massachusetts, Missouri, Wyoming **15** States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: (⇔:43 **1**:7 ↓:1



ANALYSIS

Maryland requires all new elementary and secondary and early childhood education teachers to pass a popular pedagogy test from the Praxis series in order to attain licensure. It is only a requirement for middle school teachers if they completed certification through transcript analysis or alternate route programs.

Maryland is part of the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) consortium and began a pilot program in Spring 2011.

Supporting Research http://www.ets.org/praxis

RECOMMENDATION

Require that all new teachers pass a pedagogy test.

Maryland should verify that all new teachers, including all new middle school teachers, meet professional standards through a test of professional standards.

Ensure that performance assessments provide a meaningful measure of new teachers' knowledge and skills.

While Maryland is commended for considering the use of a performance-based assessment, the state should proceed with caution until additional data are available on the Teacher Performance Assessment. Additional research is needed to determine how the edTPA compares to other teacher tests as well as whether the test's scores are predictive of student achievement. The track record on similar assessments is mixed at best. The two states that currently require the Praxis III performance-based assessment report pass rates of about 99 percent. Given that it takes significant resources to administer a performance-based assessment, a test that nearly every teacher passes is of questionable value.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends the many states that require a pedagogy assessment to verify that all new teachers meet professional standards.

Figure 32

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



1. Strong Practice: California, Illinois⁵, New York, Tennessee⁶, Washington

2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina⁷, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia

3. Connecticut, Maryland, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Utah⁸, Wyoming

- 4. Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin
- 5. Beginning in 2015.

6. Teachers may pass either the edTPA or a Praxis pedagogy test.

7. Teachers have until their second year to pass if they attempt to pass during their first year.

8. Not required until teacher advances from a Level One to a Level Two license.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal J – Student Teaching

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

Goal Components

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

- The state should require that student teachers only be placed with cooperating teachers for whom there is evidence of their effectiveness as measured by consistent gains in student learning.
- 2. The state should require that teacher candidates spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

Background

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

Figure 33 How States are Faring in Student Teaching 3 **Best Practice States** Florida, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee State Meets Goal Massachusetts 1 States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut¹, Kentucky 24 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware 1, Georgia 1, Hawaii, Illinois 1, Iowa, Kansas, Maine 1, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri 1, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal Indiana, Michigan, Oregon, South Dakota 17 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Louisiana, MARYLAND, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: •:42 ↓:1 1:8

1-J Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland requires candidates to complete a teaching experience in one of two ways: a supervised experience (defined as an internship, practicum or student teaching) in a public or accredited nonpublic school setting at the appropriate age or grade level, or one year of a successful full-time teaching experience in a public or accredited nonpublic school setting at the appropriate age or grade level.

The state's institutional performance criteria articulate that teacher candidates must have "extensive field-based preparation in PK-12 schools with diverse populations, which includes an internship within two consecutive semesters that at a minimum has 100 full days in a school."

Maryland does not articulate any requirements for cooperating teachers.

Supporting Research COMAR 13A.12.02.04, -.06 Maryland Institutional Performance Criteria (based on the Redesign of Teacher Education) www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/certification/progapproval/Program_Approval_Section.htm

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

Use evidence from the state's teacher evaluation system to select cooperating teachers.

Maryland 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 effectiveness in the classroom, in the selection of effective cooperating teachers.

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

Maryland should require a summative clinical experience for all prospective teachers. Student teaching should be a full-time commitment, as requiring coursework and student teaching simul-taneously 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.

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.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that it requires 100 days—20 weeks—of internship. Schools with semester-abroad programs must require a 10-week internship in a public school setting in the state.

LAST WORD

The state's requirement of a 100-day internship does not ensure a full-time 10-week student teaching experience. It may well be the state's intent and institutions' practice to provide such a clinical experience, but Maryland's code appears to leave significant room for different interpretations and noncompliance with this intention.

Figure 34	COOPERATING SELECTE BASED TAQUER EFFECTIVENESS ON	STUBENT FEACHING LASTS AT LEAST TO WEEKS
Do states ensure a	LINC MASEC ESS	EAST
high-quality student	PERA TED 6 IVEN	DENT
teaching experience?	SELEC SELEC	STUL LASTA
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		
	5	32

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida, Rhode Island and Tennessee not only require teacher candidates to complete at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, but they also all require that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

1. West Virginia allows candidates to 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, Illinois, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Tennessee

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

Figure 36

Is the student teaching experience of sufficient length?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia⁵, Wisconsin

- 2. Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Illinois, New Hampshire, Utah
- 4. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Maryland, Montana
- 5. West Virginia allows candidates to student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal K – 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.)

- The state should collect data that connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs. Such data can include value added or growth analyses conducted specifically for this purpose or evaluation ratings that incorporate objective measures of student learning to a significant extent.
- 2. The state should collect other meaningful data that reflect program performance, including some or all of the following:

a. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including academic proficiency, 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 and

d. 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.
- 5. The state should retain full authority over its process for approving teacher preparation programs.

Background

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

Figure 37

How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation Program Accountability



Best Practice States



State Meets Goal Louisiana





States Partly Meet Goal Indiana¹, Kentucky, Massachusetts¹, Michigan, Nevada, South Carolina, Washington¹, Wisconsin¹

- 18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, California 1, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas 1, Maine 1, MARYLAND, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire 1, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia
 - 14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:13 ↔:38 ↓:0

1-K Analysis: Maryland

State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🔶 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

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

Most importantly, Maryland does not collect or report data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

The state does collect some objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of its alternate route programs. The state requires Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs to submit an annual data report that includes principal satisfaction ratings (90 percent or higher is deemed to be as good as or better than other first-year teachers); participants' satisfaction with the training and support received in the program, including their preparedness to teach upon completion; and data from interm supervisors and residency mentors. Maryland also requires that programs move up in their level of program development according to MAAP Guidelines, although the state does not specify any consequences for programs that fail to progress.

However, the state does not collect this data for its traditional teacher preparation programs and only collects programs' annual summary licensure test pass rates (80 percent of program completers must pass their licensure exams). The 80 percent pass-rate standard, while common among many states, sets the bar quite low and is not a meaningful measure of program performance.

Further, in the past three years, no programs in the state have been identified as low performing—an additional indicator that programs lack accountability.

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

As part of Race to the Top, Maryland plans to make objective outcomes a central component of its teacher preparation program approval process. However, there is no evidence to date of specific policy to support these plans.

Maryland requires institutions with 2,000 or more full-time equivalent students to receive and maintain national accreditation through NCATE/CAEP in conjunction with state program approval.

Supporting Research

MD Institutional Performance Criteria http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/2C7FFCC4-3F21-4B62-9406-311B06CDF2DB/30568/InstitutionalPerformanceCriteria111011.pdf Title II State Reports https://title2.ed.gov www.ncate.org

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

that preparation programs are held accountable as part of Race to the Top, it is urged to codify these requirements and specify that they apply to alternate route programs as well as to traditional teacher preparation programs.

Gather other meaningful 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:

- 1. Evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching;
- 2. 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;
- 4. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests; and
- 5. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

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

Merely collecting the types of data described above is insufficient for accountability purposes. The next and perhaps more critical step is for the state to establish precise minimum standards for teacher preparation program performance for each category of data. Maryland should be mindful of setting rigorous standards for program performance, as its current requirement that 80 percent of program graduates pass the state's licensing tests is too low a bar. Programs should be held accountable for meeting rigorous standards, and there should be consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.

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

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

Maintain full authority over the process for approving teacher preparation programs.

Maryland should not cede its authority and must ensure that it is the state that considers the evidence of program performance, no matter the program size, and makes the decision about whether programs should continue to be authorized to prepare teachers.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that all 23 preparation programs must have a full state evaluation by the Program Approval Branch, and that CAEP (NCATE) accreditation is not possible without state approval. Joint visits ensure this. The Teacher Preparation Improvement Plan (TPIP) requires programs to report on areas of improvement identified during the state /CAEP visits on an annual basis. Intern performance and student performance in professional development schools are also reported.

Maryland added that schools have been on probation in the past, but because it is a small state, intensive technical assistance has been successful in achieving full program approval for those on probation.

Figure 38	24M. LECTER	Qay	EBSITE
<i>Do states hold teacher preparation programs accountable?</i>	OBJECTURE PROCRAM. SPECIFIC DATA COLLECT	MINIMUM STANDARDS FEREORNANCE CAR	DATA PUBLICY AVAILABLOUN AVAILABLE ON WEBSITE
Alabama		1	
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			2 ²
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			2
Louisiana			2
Maine	1		
MARYLAND	3		
Massachusetts			
Michigan		1	
Minnesota			
Mississippi	1		
Missouri			
Montana	1		
Nebraska			
Nevada ¹			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	1		
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			2
North Dakota			
Ohio ¹			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania	1		
Rhode Island			
South Carolina ¹			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont	1		
Virginia Washington			
West Virginia	1		
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
J - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	26		
	36	4	19

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ is not awarding "best practice" honors to any state's policy in the area of teacher preparation program accountability. However, the following states should be commended for collecting data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs: Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee and Texas.

Figure 39

Do states connect student achievement data to teacher preparation programs?



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

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia³, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland³, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York³, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Included in state's Race to the Top plan, but not in policy or yet implemented.

1. For traditional preparation programs only.

2. State does not distinguish between alternate route programs and traditional

preparation programs in public reporting.

3. For alternate routes only.

Which states collect meaningful data?

STUDENT LEARNING GAINS Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

EVALUATION RESULTS FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas

AVERAGE RAW SCORES ON LICENSING TESTS

Alabama, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia

SATISFACTION RATINGS FROM SCHOOLS

Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, MARYLAND¹, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

TEACHER RETENTION RATES

Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas

1. For alternate route only

1. National accreditation can be substituted for state approval. 2. For institutions with 2,000 or more full-time equivalent students

National accreditation is required for program approval Figure 41 Overlap of accreditation and state approval STATEHAS ITS OWN What is the relationship between state program approval and national accreditation? Alabama Alaska \square Arizona Arkansas California \square Colorado Connecticut \square \square Delaware \square District of Columbia \square Florida \square Georgia Hawaii \square Idaho \square \square Illinois Indiana lowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana \square \square Maine \square MARYLAND \square Massachusetts Michigan \square Minnesota \square Mississippi Missouri \square Montana \square Nebraska Nevada \square \square New Hampshire \square New Jersey \square \square New Mexico \square \square New York \square North Carolina North Dakota Ohio \square Oklahoma \square Oregon Pennsylvania \square Rhode Island South Carolina \square South Dakota Tennessee Texas \square Utah \square \square Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia \square Wisconsin Wyoming

7

31

13



Area 2 Summary

How States are Faring in Expanding the Pool of Teachers

State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility
- 2-B: Alternate Route Preparation
- 2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers
- 2-D: Part-Time Teaching Licenses
- 2-E: Licensure Reciprocity

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

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.

Goal Components

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

- With some accommodation for work experience, alternate route programs should set a rigorous bar for program entry by requiring that candidates take a rigorous test to demonstrate academic ability, such as the GRE.
- 2. All alternate route candidates, including elementary candidates and those having a major in their intended subject area, should be required to pass the state's subject-matter licensing test.
- 3. Alternate route candidates lacking a major in the intended subject area should be able to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge by passing a test of sufficient rigor.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 42

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Eligibility

Best Practice States 2 District of Columbia, Michigan State Meets Goal Minnesota 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey 1, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington 11 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas 1, Virginia 15 States Meet a Small Part of Goal California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, MARYLAND, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia 9 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:2 :49 📕 : 0

2-A Analysis: Maryland

State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🕋 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 😩 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

The Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP) has three options for entry. All options require a minimum GPA of 2.75 for admission. MAAPP Option one, referred to as the test-out option, requires that candidates have a 2.75 GPA overall. Option two and three only require the minimum GPA in the major or content core area.

Candidates to MAAPP are required to pass a test of basic skills. The state will accept equivalent scores on the SAT, ACT, or GRE in lieu of the basic skills requirement. Applicants are not required to take a subject-matter test for admission to MAAP.

Admission options two and three of MAAPP require individuals to have a major or to have completed 30 hours of relevant coursework. The state has changed the first option for entry to allow candidates to test out of subject-matter coursework requirements with a passing score on a content test.

Supporting Research

Guidelines for Implementing Approved Alternative Preparation Programs http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/6662E011-70C1-44A0-BD5E-693AE1267EC0/24613/GuidelinesforImplementingApprovedAlternativePrepar.pdf

How to Become a Teacher as a Career Change or Recent College Graduate http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/6662E011-70C1-44A0-BD5E-693AE1267EC0/33689/HowtoBecomeaTeacher102012.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Increase academic requirements for admission.

While a minimum GPA requirement is a first step toward ensuring that candidates are of good academic standing, the current standard of 2.75 does not serve as a sufficient indicator of past academic performance. Some accommodation in this standard may be appropriate for career changers. At a minimum, Maryland should set a standard for academic proficiency higher than for traditional candidates. A rigorous test appropriate for candidates who have already completed a bachelor's degree, such as the GRE, would be ideal.

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

While Maryland is recognized for providing a test-out option for coursework requirements, the state should consider requiring all candidates, including those with a major in the subject, to pass a content-knowledge test. 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.

Eliminate basic skills test requirement.

The state's requirement that alternate route candidates pass a basic skills test is impractical and ineffectual, although Maryland is recognized for allowing candidates to use equivalent scores to fulfill this admission criterion. Basic skills tests measure minimum competency—essentially those skills that a person should have acquired in middle school—and are inappropriate for candidates who have already earned a bachelor's degree. Passage of a basic skills test provides no assurance that the candidate has the appropriate subject-matter knowledge needed for the classroom.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

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

Figure 44

Do states require alternate routes to be selective?



- 1. Strong Practice: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Rhode Island
- 2. Alabama, Illinois⁵, Indiana, Kentucky⁶, New York, Pennsylvania
- 3. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah
- 5. Illinois' routes are in the process of converting to a single new license.
- 6. Only one of Kentucky's eight alternate routes has a 3.0 GPA requirement.

Do states accommodate the nontraditional background of alternate route candidates?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maine, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

2. Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Washington

3. Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia

4. Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

5. Hawaii, Idaho, New Mexico, North Dakota

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal B – Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide efficient preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as adequate mentoring and support.

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 6 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, classroom management techniques).
- 4. The state should require intensive induction support, beginning with a trained mentor assigned full time to the new teacher for the first critical weeks of school and then gradually reduced over the course of the entire first year. 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. Ideally, candidates would also have an opportunity to practice teach in a summer training program.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Figure 46

How States are Faring in Alternate **Route Preparation Best Practice States** 2 Delaware, New Jersey 2 States Meet Goal Arkansas, Georgia States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut, MARYLAND, Mississippi, South Carolina 15 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, California, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia 20 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wyoming 8 States Do Not Meet Goal Hawaii, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:0 👄 : 51 📕 : 0 Background

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

2-B Analysis: Maryland

State Nearly Meets Goal

⊼ Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 🧲 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program (MAAPP) candidates must complete a minimum of 90 hours of study that may consist of a combination of semester hours and clock hours and include elementary reading processes and acquisition or secondary teaching reading in the content areas. The training also must include a focus on the teaching and learning skills necessary for immediate success as a teacher of record, including classroom management, lesson planning, and state and local school system priorities.

Candidates complete a four-to-eight-week preservice training program that includes a supervised internship. The state requires teachers to receive intensive coaching or mentoring throughout the two-year program.

Upon completion of the program, teachers are eligible for a Standard Professional Certificate.

Supporting Research

Guidelines for Implementing Approved Alternative Preparation Programs http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/6662E011-70C1-44A0-BD5E-693AE1267EC0/24613/GuidelinesforImplementingApprovedAlternativePrepar.pdf COMAR 13A.12.01.07

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that new teachers are not burdened by excessive requirements.

Alternate route programs should not be permitted to overburden the new teacher by requiring multiple courses to be taken simultaneously during the school year. Setting minimum requirements, without established maximums, does not ensure that the new teacher will be able to complete the program in an appropriate amount of time without being overburdened by coursework.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state added that candidates take content seminars that immediately are useful and supportive in the classroom setting. This "job embedded" approach has been successful in keeping teachers in alternative preparation beyond the initial two years of service.

Figure 47		140	ę /	1.	1
Do states' alternate routes provide efficient preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers?	EFFICIENT COURSEWORK	RELEVANT COURSEMORY	REASONABLE PROGRAM LENGTH	PRACTICE TEACHING	INTENSIVE SUPPORT
needs of new teachers:	4 ¹ 0	FF KF	* 4	40 /	-
Alabama					
Alaska		*	*	*	
Arizona			*	*	
Arkansas	*	*	*		*
California					
Colorado Connecticut	X		X		
Delaware	—	.	- <u>-</u>	- X	
District of Columbia				*	
Florida			↓		
Georgia	+	+	÷		+
Hawaii	$\widehat{\Box}$	Â	Â		
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana				*	
lowa			*	*	
Kansas			*		
Kentucky					*
Louisiana					
Maine					
MARYLAND		*	*	*	*
Massachusetts		*		*	
Michigan				*	
Minnesota			—		
Mississippi Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska	→			→	
Nevada					
New Hampshire			<u> </u>		
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			*		
For some alternate routes	mostwidel	used altern	ata routas	For all alt	orpato routos

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Delaware and New Jersey ensure that alternate routes provide efficient preparation that meets the needs of new teachers. Both states require a manageable number of credit hours, relevant coursework, a field placement and intensive mentoring.

🖌 For some alternate routes 🛛 📕 For most or most widely used alternate routes 📩 For all alternate routes

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal C – Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from limitations on its usage and allows a diversity of 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 48

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Usage and Providers



Best Practice States

23 States Meet Goal

Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, MARYLAND, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington



States Nearly Meet Goal Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania↓, South Carolina↑, Utah

12 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas↓, Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Hawaii, Idaho, Missouri, South Dakota

7 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:1 ↔:47 ↓:3



ANALYSIS

Maryland does not limit the usage or providers of its alternate route programs.

Maryland is commended for having no restrictions on the usage of its alternate route programs with regard to subject, grade or geographic areas.

Maryland sets out coursework requirements in clock hours and allows for a diversity of program providers, authorizing colleges, universities, school districts and nonprofit organizations, such as The New Teacher Project and Teach For America, to operate programs.

Supporting Research

Maryland Rule 13A.12.01.07

Guidelines for Implementing Approved Alternative Preparation Programs http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/6662E011-70C1-44A0-BD5E-693AE1267EC0/24613/GuidelinesforImplementingApprovedAlternativePrepar.pdf

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 49	Sos	FRS /	
Are states' alternate routes free from	BROAD USAGE AROS SUBJECTS GRADE AROS GEOGRAPHICARES AND	DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS	
limitations?	RR SUP	DIVE	
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			
Ohio	*	*	
Oklahoma		*	
Oregon			
Pennsylvania		*	
Rhode Island South Carolina	*	*	
South Carolina South Dakota		*	
Tennessee	□ ★		
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia	★ ★ ★		
Washington		*	
West Virginia		-	
Wisconsin		÷	
Wyoming			
For some alternate routes For most or used alternate		or all alternate route	25

T 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 commends all states that pemit both broad usage and a diversity of providers for their alternate routes.

Figure 50

Do states provide real alternative pathways to certification?



1. Strong Practice: Connecticut, Florida, New Jersey, Rhode Island

2. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

3. Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 51	PREREQUISITE OF STRONG	VERIFICATION OF SUBJECT			ž.	ORK	/	ں ب	RING	DERS
What are the	PERFOR	ION OF S	ITY OF TH	OURSEN	COURSEL	BLE EAU	TEACL.	MENT		DF PROVI
characteristics of states alternate routes?	PREREQUI	VERIFICAT MATTER KN	AVAUABUTY OF TEST	EFFICIENT COURSENCE	RELEVANT COURSEIL	REASONABLE PROCRAM LEAD	PRACTICE TEACUL	INTENSIVE MENTS	BROAD USACE	DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS
Alabama		< /	*	4				· · · ·		
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		- 2 -	*			*		*	÷	*
West Virginia		÷.	Ô		*	*		*		÷.
Wisconsin										÷.
Wyoming										
						*				

🛛 For some alternate routes 📕 For most or most widely used alternate routes 🔺 For all alternate routes

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

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 license individuals with content expertise as part-time instructors.
- All candidates for a part-time teaching license should be required to pass a subjectmatter test.
- 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 52

How States are Faring in Part Time Teaching Licenses



Best Practice State Georgia

- 2 States Meet Goal Arkansas, Florida
 - States Nearly Meet Goal Kentucky, Michigan 1, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah



3 States Partly Meet Goal California, Louisiana, Oklahoma

10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania¹, Washington, Wisconsin

28 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, MARYLAND, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:2 ↔:49 ↓:0

2-D Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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.

Maryland 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.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

		1	1
Do states offer a license		Restricted or vague	
Do states offer a license		L vage	. /
with minimal requirements		ffere	
that allows content experts to teach part-time?	S	stric nse	
to teach part-time!	YES	lice.	No Vo
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			
	10	40	20
	10	12	29

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia 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 will be assigned a mentor.

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

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.)

- 1. 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 effective teaching in previous employment.
- The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet its own testing requirements.
- 3. The state should accord the same license to teachers from other states who completed an approved alternate route program as it accords teachers prepared in a traditional preparation program.
- 4. Consistent with these principles of portability, state requirements for online teachers based in other states should protect student interests without creating unnecessary obstacles for teachers.

Background

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

Figure 54

How States are Faring in Licensure Reciprocity **Best Practice States** 2 Alabama, Texas States Meet Goal North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island States Nearly Meet Goal Delaware 1, Indiana 1, Oklahoma 1, Washington, Wisconsin 22 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho4, Illinois, Iowa¹, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming 12 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, MARYLAND, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Carolina States Do Not Meet Goal 7 California, District of Columbia, Kansas, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, Vermont Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:5 🛏 : 45 ↓:1

2-E Analysis: Maryland

State Meets a Small Part of Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Regrettably, Maryland grants a waiver of its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher who has completed a state-approved program and has at least two years of experience.

Teachers with valid, comparable out-of-state certificates may be eligible for Maryland's professional certification. Those who completed a traditional preparation program and earned a professional license may apply for Maryland's equivalent license. However, transcripts are required for all applicants. It is not clear whether the state analyzes transcripts to determine whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route or whether additional coursework will be required.

Maryland requires all teachers employed by a virtual school to be certified by the state..

Supporting Research Code of Maryland Regulations, 13A.12.01.04, -.07 HB 1362 (2010)

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maryland takes considerable risk by granting a waiver for its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher who has two years of teaching experience. The state should not provide any waivers of its teacher tests unless an applicant can provide evidence of a passing score under its own standards. The negative impact on student learning stemming from a teacher's inadequate subject-matter knowledge is not mitigated by the teacher's having experience.

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

Maryland should consider discontinuing its requirement for the submission of transcripts. 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 Maryland.

Require evidence of effective teaching when determining eligibility for full certification.

Rather than rely on transcripts to assess credentials, Maryland should instead require that evidence of teacher effectiveness be considered for all out-of-state candidates. Such evidence is especially important for candidates who come from states that make student growth at least a significant factor of a teacher evaluation (see Goal 3-B).

Ensure that requirements for out-of-state online teachers are not burdensome.

Maryland should balance the interests of its students in having qualified online instructors with making certain that these requirements do not create unnecessary obstacles for out-of-state teachers.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that it accepts new out-of-state graduates with Maryland tests, and it accepts certified experienced teachers with an out-of-state certification and evidence of satisfactory performance. The state added that it requires transcripts to assure complete documentation, but it does not analyze these documents. Further, teachers in brick-and-mortar, blended instruction and those providing computer or virtual courses to students (e.g., home and hospital, advanced placement) are required to be certified if they work in public schools, nonpublic special education schools or juvenile justice centers.

LAST WORD

The submission of transcripts should be unnecessary for certified out-of-state teachers, unless the state has some reason to suspect that the certifying state routinely certifies teachers who do not have a degree.



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



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska³, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine⁴, Massachusetts³, Minnesota, New York⁵, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas³, Utah, Washington⁶, Wisconsin
- 2. Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana⁷, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Allows one year to meet testing requirements.
- 4. Maine grants waiver for basic skills and pedagogy tests.
- 5. Waiver for teachers with National Board Certification; all others given two years to meet testing requirements.
- 6. Waiver for teachers with National Board Certification.
- 7. No subject-matter testing for any teacher certification.

- 1. State conducts transcript reviews.
- 2. Recency requirement is for alternate route.
- 3. For traditionally prepared teachers only.
- 4. Teachers with less than 3 years' experience are subject to transcript review.

Figure 56	UCENSE RECIPROCI	HUM	ots
	%OC	Submission of trans	Recency requiements
What do states require of	REC.		requi
teachers transferring from	NSE	nissi	15ue
other states?	NOS	2rrp1	Rece
Alabama		· _ `	
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa		1	2
Kansas		1	
Kentucky		1	
Louisiana			
Maine		1	
MARYLAND			
Massachusetts		1	
Michigan			
Minnesota		1	
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York	3		
North Carolina North Dakota		1	
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania		1	
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah		1	
Vermont		1	
Virginia			
Washington	4		
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming	3		
	6	44	11

Figure 57		State Specifics difference	ate ate
Do states treat out-of-state	EACL	DLESS Iffere	alterr, es wij creat
teachers the same whether	STATE TREATS TEAC	V ARI S for	rs of polici ial to rs alte
they were prepared in a	LYR	Speci meni	these for the section of the section
traditional or an alternate	PAR PAR	State State quire te te	State State bstac bstac
route program?	PREFS	^{o se j} o	185
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas California			
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 Dhada Jaland			
Rhode Island South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	4	6	41

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alabama and Texas appropriately support licensure reciprocity by requiring that certified teachers from other states meet Alabama's and Texas's own testing requirements, and by not specifying any additional coursework or recency requirements to determine eligibility for either traditional or alternate route teachers. Also worthy of mention is Delaware for its reciprocity policy that limits the evidence of "successful" experience it will accept to evaluation results from states with rigorous requirements similar to its own.
Area 3 Summary



How States are Faring in Identifying Effective Teachers





Topics Included In This Area

- 3-A: State Data Systems
- **3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness**
- **3-C: Frequency of Evaluations**

- 3-D: Tenure
- 3-E: Licensure Advancement
- 3-F: Equitable Distribution

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

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

1. The state should establish a longitudinal data system with at least the following key components:

a. A unique statewide student identifier number that connects student data across key databases across years;

b. A unique teacher identifier system that can match individual teacher records with individual student records and

c. An assessment system that can match individual student test records from year to year in order to measure academic growth.

- Student growth or value-added data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be considered among the criteria used to determine teachers' effectiveness.
- To ensure that data provided through the state data system is actionable and reliable, the state should have a clear definition of "teacher of record" and require its consistent use statewide.
- 4. Data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be used to publicly report information on teacher production.



The components for this goal have changed since 2011. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 58

How States are Faring in State Data Systems



Best Practice States Hawaii, New York

0 States Meet Goal



19 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona ↑, Arkansas, Connecticut ↑, Delaware, District of Columbia ↑, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, MARYLAND, Michigan ↑, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas ↑, Washington, Wyoming

25 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska , California , Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana , Nebraska, Nevada , New Hampshire, New Jersey , New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon , South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont , Virginia , West Virginia, Wisconsin

2

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Pennsylvania

3 States Do Not Meet Goal Maine, Oklahoma , South Dakota

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:13 ↔:36 ↓:2



ANALYSIS

Maryland now has a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Maryland has all three necessary elements 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 has assigned unique teacher identifiers that enable it to match individual teacher records with individual student records. It also has the capacity to match student test records from year to year in order to measure student academic growth.

Maryland does not have a teacher of record definition. The state's teacher-student data link cannot connect more than one educator to a particular student in a given course, and it does not have in place a process for teacher roster verification.

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.

Supporting Research Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org Teacher Staffing Report http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/certification/progapproval/mtsr.htm

RECOMMENDATION

Develop a definition of "teacher of record" that can be used to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

To ensure that data provided through the state data system are actionable and reliable, Maryland should articulate a definition of teacher of record and require its consistent use throughout the state. The state's definition should reflect instruction rather than grading, and Maryland should develop a process for teacher roster verification as well as an ability to link more than one educator to a particular student.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states' data systems have the basic elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness: unique teacher and student identifiers that can be matched to test records over time?



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

2. Colorado, Maine, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota

Figure 60

Do states' data systems include more advanced elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness?



Figure 61		~ /	. /
	SOME TEACHER PROFILE	Some data published i	d mit not
Do states track	PROD	ished	No redited data published
teacher production?	CHER		^{bta} pu
	E TEA PUBL	re dat ected	ated
	20v	Son	No rei
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			
	6	8	37

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Hawaii and New York have all three necessary elements of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. Both states have developed definitions of "teacher of record" that reflect instruction. Their data links can connect multiple teachers to a particular student, and there is a process for teacher roster verification. In addition, Hawaii and New York publish teacher production data. Also worthy of mention is Maryland for its "Teacher Staffing Report," which serves as a model for other states. The report's primary purpose is to determine teacher shortage areas, while also identifying areas of surplus.

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 should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Evaluation instruments, whether state or locally developed, should be structured so as 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.
- The state should encourage the use of student surveys, which have been shown to correlate strongly with teacher effectiveness.
- 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.

Background

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

Figure 62

How States are Faring in Evaluation of Effectiveness



Best Practice States

19 States Meet Goal Alaska¹, Colorado, Connecticut¹, Delaware, Florida, Georgia¹, Hawaii¹, Louisiana¹, Michigan, Mississippi¹, Nevada, New Mexico¹, North Carolina¹, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania¹, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Wisconsin¹

5 Sta Ariz

States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, MARYLAND, New Jersey, New York, Virginia

16 States Partly Meet Goal Arkansas, District of Columbia¹, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas¹, Kentucky¹, Maine¹, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri¹, Oregon¹, South Carolina¹, South Dakota¹, Utah, West Virginia¹, Wyoming¹



States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, California, Idaho↓, Iowa↑, Nebraska, Texas, Washington↓

4 States Do Not Meet Goal Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:22 ↔:27 ↓:2

3-B Analysis: Maryland

🚽 State Nearly Meets Goal 🛛 💮 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Although the state requires student performance data to be a significant factor, Maryland stops short of requiring that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations. Districts may either adopt the state model or use the state's framework to develop their own. Models developed by districts must be approved by the state.

By school year 2013-2014, student growth must account for a "significant" portion of a teacher's performance evaluation and must be one of the multiple measures used. No single criterion is allowed to count for more than 35 percent of the total performance evaluation.

The state's model requires student growth to count for 50 percent of the evaluation score. For elementary and middle school teachers providing instruction in state-assessed grades and content, student growth consists of aggregate assessment scores, student learning objectives and the schoolwide index. For all remaining teachers, student growth consists of student learning objectives and the schoolwide index.

A minimum of three rating levels must be used: highly effective, effective and ineffective.

Classroom observations are required.

The regulations pertaining to new evaluation requirements are set to expire on September 30, 2014.

Supporting Research Education Reform Act of 2010 COMAR 13a.07.09

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/E479C243-AF58-4BD0-B4E8-46677F7757A0/33345/MDTeacher-PrincipalReport_041212_rev0912_pdf

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maryland's evaluation system falls short by failing to require that evidence of student learning be the most significant criterion. The state 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. This can be accomplished by requiring objective evidence to count for at least half of the evaluation score or through other scoring mechanisms, such as a matrix, that ensure that nothing affects the overall score more. 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.

Although Maryland requires classroom observations, the state should articulate guidelines that ensure that the 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.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states consider	
classroom effectiveness	
as part of teacher	
evaluations?	

Figure 63	REQURES THAT STUDENT ACHEVENENT AN STUDENT PREPONDERANT ROUDENT	Requires the student actives the student criteron actives with a student criterion (explicit) das is a spore.	Requires that student achievement grudent "Significant" Growth is 3	explicit unon a contract the state of the st	Student estime "ure evidence Student estievenent data
Do states consider	anti anti	TER I	Requires that student achievement student "significant" criticant is 3	times	"t dat
	141	Stud Town	Prov	Buid	ing the
classroom effectiveness	TES T MEN FRAN	that ent/e	es this	Plicit	d lie
as part of teacher	OVD HEVE	Pulite even ion (e	equir Nieve, Difica,	uires.	tent a
evaluations?	PREP. RF	Requires that Student achievement growth criterion (explicit/dent	R ^{sig} With	Requires some objection	Student achie Not required
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					
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					1
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia		2			
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	10	-		-	10
	19	7	9	6	10

1. The state has an ESEA waiver requiring an evaluation system that includes student achievement as a significant factor. However, no specific guidelines or policies have been articulated.

2. Explicitly defined for the 2013-2014 school year.

Figure 64			· /	¹ Jpe of surpose	, pa	
<i>Is survey data used as part</i>					Sureys not specifie	Paj
of teacher evaluations?	S.C.		, /		ⁿ not _s	
-,	Student surveys	Parent surveys	Peer surveys	Surve	not p	
	udent	lient s	er su	De OF	'reys	
	25	-0 -0	٩	2	3	
Alabama						
Alaska ¹						
Arizona				2		
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado	2	2	2			
Connecticut ³ Delaware						
District of Columbia	2	2				
Florida						
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa ¹						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine			2			
MARYLAND						
Massachusetts						
Michigan Minnesota	2					
Mississippi	2					
Missouri	2	2	2			
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico	2	2				
New York	2	2				
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma Orogon						
Oregon Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin Wyoming						
wyonning						
	14	11	6	2	33	

Figure 65

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



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

2. Alabama, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

1. Input from students, teachers and peers is required, but there is no explicit indication that this must come from surveys.

2. Explicitly allowed but not required.

3. Requires parent or peer surveys; whole-school student learning or student surveys.

Do states direct how teachers should be evaluated?

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ has not singled out any one state for "best practice" honors. Many states continue to make 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 19 states that meet this goal are commended for their efforts.

teachers should be evaluated? Alabama Alaska Airzona Arizona Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Mine Mississippi Missouri Missouri Montana Nevada New Hampshire New Mexico North Carolina North Dakota	
Alaska Arizona Arkansas California California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Michigan Minesota Mississippi Minesota Minesota Missouri Montana Nevada New Hampshire New York New York North Carolina	
Arkansas Image: California California Image: Colorado Connecticut Image: Colorado Delaware Image: Colorado District of Columbia Image: Colorado Florida Image: Colorado Georgia Image: Colorado Hawaii Image: Colorado Idaho Image: Colorado Illinois Image: Colorado Indiana Image: Colorado Iowa Image: Colorado	
California	
ColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMaineMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMinnesotaMississippiMontanaNevadaNevadaNevadaNevadaNev JerseyNew YorkNorth DakotaNorth Dakota	
ConnecticutImage: ConnecticutDelawareImage: ConnecticutDistrict of ColumbiaImage: ConnecticutFloridaImage: ConnecticutGeorgiaImage: ConnecticutHawaiiImage: ConnecticutIdahoImage: ConnecticutIdahoImage: ConnecticutIllinoisImage: ConnecticutIndianaImage: ConnecticutIndianaImage: ConnecticutIndianaImage: ConnecticutIndianaImage: ConnecticutIowaImage: ConnecticutKansasImage: ConnecticutKansasImage: ConnecticutIowaImage: ConnecticutKansasImage: ConnecticutKansasImage: ConnecticutIowaImage: ConnecticutKansasImage: ConnecticutMaineImage: ConnecticutMaineImage: ConnecticutMassachusettsImage: ConnecticutMassachusettsImage: ConnecticutMissouriImage: ConnecticutMissouriImage: ConnecticutMissouriImage: ConnecticutMew JaccoImage: ConnecticutNew MexicoImage: ConnecticutNew YorkImage: ConnecticutNorth DakotaImage: Connecticut	
Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Massachusetts Michigan Minesota Mississippi Missouri Montana New Hampshire New Hampshire New Mexico New York North Carolina	
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa	
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Iowa Kansas Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maine Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Missouri Montana Nevada Nevada New Hampshire New Hampshire New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
Georgia Hawaii Idaho Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa	
Hawaii Image: Constraint of the second	
Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Io	
Illinois	
Indiana Iowa Iowa Kansas Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maine MaryLAND Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska New Hampshire New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
Iowa Image: Constraint of the second sec	
Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maine MaryLAND Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Minnesota Missouri Montana Nebraska New Jarsey New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maine MARYLAND Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
Louisiana Maine Maine MARYLAND Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Minnesota Mississispi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
Maine Image: Constraint of the second of	
MARYLAND Image: Constraint of the second	
Massachusetts Image: Constraint of the sector of the s	
Michigan Image: Constraint of the second	
Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
Mississippi Image: Constraint of the second sec	
Missouri Image: Constraint of the second	
Missouri Image: Constraint of the second	
Nebraska Image: Constraint of the system New Hampshire Image: Constraint of the system New Jersey Image: Constraint of the system New Mexico Image: Constraint of the system New York Image: Constraint of the system North Carolina Image: Constraint of the system North Dakota Image: Constraint of the system	
Nevada Image: Constraint of the second s	
New Hampshire Image: Constraint of the sector of the sec	
New Jersey Image: Constraint of the second	
New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota	
New York North Carolina North Dakota	
North Carolina Image: Constraint of the second	
North Dakota	
Ohio 🗖 🗖	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah 🗌 🗌	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	
9 12 30	

e evaluation model ossible opt-out

1. New Hampshire is in the process of developing a state model/criteria for teacher evaluations.

Figure 67		/		HERS
What requirements have	MULTPLE EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR TRAIL	EVALUATORS MUST RE	EVALUATOR CENTRICHER
states established for	242		Nin Isa	The state
evaluators?	LA.	The second	Ser S	EF B
	ERS	l ¹	EV,	ð
	SERV	ALLY	VALU. VEBI	41 CVA
	200		14	
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
MARYLAND	1			
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi	2			
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York	2			
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
wvoming				

Maryland requires multiple observers for ineffective teachers.
 Multiple evaluators are explicitly allowed but not required.

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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 68

How States are Faring in Frequency of Evaluations **Best Practice States** 0 12 States Meet Goal Alabama, Delaware 🕇 , Hawaii 🕇 , Idaho, Mississippi¹, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington 15 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut 1, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana¹, New Mexico¹, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia¹, Wisconsin¹, Wyoming 8 States Partly Meet Goal Kansas, Kentucky, MARYLAND, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, South Carolina States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Arkansas, Iowa1, Maine1, Virginia1 11 States Do Not Meet Goal California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:11 ⊨ : 38 J:2

3-C Analysis: Maryland

📘 State Partly Meets Goal 🛛 (E) Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Tenured teachers are evaluated on a three-year cycle, at least once annually. In the first year of the cycle, both professional practice and student growth are evaluated. If highly effective or effective, then the second- and third-year evaluations use the professional practice rating from the previous year and student growth is based on the most recent data. A teacher may request a new review of professional practice along with student growth. Evaluation of a teacher's professional practice must be based on at least two observations.

Nontenured teachers and those rated ineffective must be evaluated annually on student growth and professional practice.

The regulations pertaining to these requirements are set to expire on September 30, 2014.

At the time of sunset, it appears that frequency may revert to the other regulation still on the books, which only requires teachers holding advanced degrees to be evaluated twice during the five-year validity of their license.

Supporting Research COMAR 13a.07.09.04, -06; 13a.07.04.02

RECOMMENDATION

Base evaluations on multiple observations.

To guarantee that annual evaluations are based on an adequate collection of information, Maryland 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. Maryland 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.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland asserted that it requires a mentoring relationship for new teachers for the first three years before tenure is awarded, and that additional support is required for teachers who are struggling in the classroom. The state added that feedback from mentors and evaluators is part of the observation process. Twenty-three public school systems are using the Danielson Framework, which provides teachers with a multilevel rubric and describes effective teaching behaviors, and one school system has developed its own observation tool. All observation tools and evaluation systems must be approved by the state.

Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland³, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

2. Alaska, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia

3. Regulations sunset on September 30, 2014.

Figure 70

Figure 70	AWVUAL EVALUATION	ANNUAL EVALUATION OF ALL PROBATIONARY TEACHERS
Do states require districts	ð	¹ CHE
to evaluate all teachers	LAN V T	ANN
each year?	TRA FLA	410)
	ANNUAL JEALL VE	ANNUAL LL PROB.
Alabama	× 0	× ₹
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		
	28	44
	20	

Figure 71

Do states require multiple classroom observations?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington

 Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. California, District of Columbia, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming

Figure 72

What is the determining factor for frequency of observations?



1. Alabama, District of Columbia⁶, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island

2. Alaska, Arkansas⁷, California⁷, Colorado, Florida, Kansas⁷, Minnesota⁷, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma⁷, Oregon, Pennsylvania⁷, South Carolina, South Dakota⁷, Utah⁷, Washington, West Virginia⁸

- 3. Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio
- 4. Arizona⁹, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts⁷, Nevada, Tennessee, Texas⁷, Virginia⁷, Wisconsin⁷
- 5. Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming
- 6. Depends on LEA requirements.
- 7. Frequency is based on evaluation cycle, not year.
- 8. No observations required after year 5.
- 9. Second observation may be waived for tenured teachers with high performance on first observation.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ is not awarding "best practice" honors for frequency of evaluations but commends **Alabama**, **Hawaii**, **Idaho**, **Mississippi**, **New Jersey**, **Tennessee** and **Washington**. These states not only require annual evaluations and multiple observations for all teachers, but they also ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback during the first half of the school year.

Figure 73

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



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota³, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia
- Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia⁴, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. New teachers must be evaluated early in the year; observations not explicit.
- 4. Teachers in their first year are informally evaluated early in the year.

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 minimum years of service needed to achieve tenure should allow sufficient data to be accumulated on which to base tenure decisions; four to five years is the ideal minimum.

Background

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

Figure 74 How States are Faring in Tenure **Best Practice States** 2 Connecticut¹, Michigan 3 States Meet Goal Colorado, Florida, Louisiana 1 States Nearly Meet Goal 7 Delaware, Hawaii 1, Nevada, New Jersey 1, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee 7 States Partly Meet Goal Arizona¹, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina¹, Virginia¹ States Meet a Small Part of Goal 7 Idaho, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, Washington 25 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, MARYLAND, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming **Progress on this Goal Since 2011:** 1:7 👄 : 44 🦊 : O

3-D Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

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

Teachers in Maryland are awarded tenure automatically after a three-year probationary period, absent an additional process that evaluates cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Supporting Research Annotated Code of Maryland 6-202(b)(1)

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.

Maryland 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.

Maryland 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.

Maryland should extend its probationary period, ideally to five years. This would allow sufficient time to collect data that adequately reflect teacher performance.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland contended that tenure is not awarded automatically, and that teachers in public schools cannot achieve tenure without evidence of satisfactory, or effective, evaluations.

LAST WORD

The state has not presented any evidence that an additional process evaluating cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness is required for tenure.

Figure 75		/	/	/	/	/	/
<i>How long before a teacher earns tenure?</i>							STATE ONLY A WARDS ANNUAL CONTRACTS
	4		/				CON!
	No Policy	¹ Year	2 Years	³ years	4 YEARS	5 YEARS	STATE ANNUA
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							2
North Dakota							
Ohio						3	
Oklahoma				4			
Oregon Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island							5
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas							
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia				6			
Washington				7			
West Virginia							
Wisconsin Wyoming							
	1	1	4	32	4	6	3

- 1. Idaho limits teacher contract terms to one year.
- 2. A teacher can receive up to a 4-year contract if deemed proficient on evaluation.
- 3. Teachers must hold an educator license for at least seven years and have taught in the district at least three of the last five years.
- 4. 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.
- 5. While technically not on annual contracts, Rhode Island teachers who receive two years of ineffective ratings are dismissed.
- 6. Local school board may extend up to five years.
- 7. At a district's discretion, a teacher may be granted tenure after the second year if he/she receives one of the top two evaluation ratings.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Connecticut and Michigan appropriately base tenure decisions on evidence of teacher effectiveness. In Connecticut, tenure is awarded after four years and must be earned on the basis of effective practice as demonstrated in evaluation ratings. Michigan requires a probationary period of five years, with teachers having to earn a rating of effective or highly effective on their three most recent performance evaluations. Both states require that student growth be the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluations.

Figure 76	EVDENCE OF STUDENT READMING STUDENT REPONDENTHE	7	/
How are tenure	DENI	TERIC Iden.	
decisions made?	E STU	of sti	ered ered
decisions made:	FOF	tence Onsi	tome
	DENC NINC	e evic	Wy ar
	LEAK REPC	Som eami	Virtua
Alabama		Some evidence of student	Virtually automatically
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		2	
North Dakota Ohio			
Oklahoma	3		
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	11	9	31

1. Florida only awards annual contracts.

- 2. North Carolina has recently eliminated tenure. The state requires some evidence of effectiveness in awarding multipleyear contracts.
- 3. Oklahoma 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 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 licenses.

Background

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



3-E Analysis: Maryland

State Partly Meets Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland's requirements for licensure advancement are based in part on evidence of teacher effectiveness, but requirements for license renewal are not.

Maryland offers four types of teacher certifications. The Professional Eligibility Certificate is issued to teachers not currently employed in the state. The Standard Professional Certificate I (SPC I) is issued to those already employed by a local school system. To advance to the Standard Professional Certificate II (SPC II), teachers must complete the SPC I, have three years of "satisfactory professional experience," six semester hours of credit and a professional development plan for the Advanced Professional Certificate (APC). To advance to the APC, teachers must have three years' full-time, school-related experience; six semester hours of credit; and either a master's degree or a minimum of 36 semester hours of postbaccalaureate coursework. It appears that there are renewal restrictions on the first three types of certifications, ultimately requiring teachers to advance to the APC.

Maryland does not include effectiveness as a factor in the renewal of a professional license. Maryland teachers must renew their professional or standard licenses every five years by completing six semester hours of acceptable credit at an accredited institution of higher learning.

Supporting Research

http://www.msde.maryland.gov/MSDE/divisions/certification/certification_branch/certification_inf/types/overview COMAR 13A.12.01.02(31)

RECOMMENDATION

Require evidence of effectiveness for licensure decisions.

Maryland commendably connects its teacher evaluation system (see Goal 3-B) to licensure advancement. However, states must consider carefully how to use this evidence, as the standard for denying licensure—the right to practice in the state—should not necessarily be the same standard that might result in termination from a particular position. Further, the state should also factor evaluation evidence into decisions about license renewal.

Discontinue licensure requirements with no direct connection to classroom effectiveness.

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

End requirement tying teacher advancement to master's degrees.

Maryland should remove its mandate that teachers obtain a master's degree for any level of license advancement. Research is conclusive and emphatic that master's degrees do not have any significant correlation to classroom performance. Rather, advancement should be based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland referenced a state code indicating that renewal of educator certification must be directly related to teaching assignment.

Supporting Research COMAR 13A.12.01.05C

LAST WORD

NCTQ acknowledges that the state does require coursework or professional development related to teaching assignment. This is still quite vague and leaves significant room for interpretation.

Figure 78	OBJECTIVE ENDENCE OF	~ /		
Do states require teachers	ć	Some objective evidence	y 2.	out 1 to ered
to show evidence of	ENCE	Niden, KEQ	siven anco	n tiec
effectiveness before	EVID.	tive e	tion, form	ective Pot q
conferring professional	VEN	2bjec tered	sider er pe. Nano	m eff
licensure?	BIEC	ome onsic	Effort Con	100m
	04	Some objective is considered	Consideration Biven to teacher Performance	Performance not considered
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia	1			
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois		2		
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
MARYLAND		3		
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				
	-	4	•	22
	6	4	9	32

1. Evidence of effectiveness is required for license renewal but not for conferring of professional license.

2. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.

3. Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation systems for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.

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

Figure 80

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



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



- 1. Strong Practice: Hawaii, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Tennessee
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Georgia, Minnesota
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina⁴, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyorning
- 4. Some required coursework is targeted.

Do states award lifetime licenses?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut³, 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
- 2. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
- 3. Although teachers in Connecticut must renew their licenses every five years, there are no requirements for renewal.

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

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

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

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

- 1. The state should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance —from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness as described in Goal 3-B publicly available.
- 2. In the absence of such an evaluation system, the state should make the following data publicly available:

a. An "Academic Quality" index for each school that includes factors research has found to be associated with teacher effectiveness such as:

- percentage of new teachers;
- percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once;
- percentage of teachers on emergency credentials:
- average selectivity of teachers' undergraduate institutions and
- teachers' average ACT or SAT scores

b. The percentage of highly qualified teachers disaggregated by both individual school and by teaching area.

c. The annual teacher absenteeism rate reported for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school.

d. The average teacher turnover rate for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school, by district and by reasons that teachers leave.

Background

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

Figure 82



3-F Analysis: Maryland



```
Progress Since 2011
```

ANALYSIS

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

Maryland does not require districts to publicly report aggregate school-level data about teacher performance, nor does the state collect and publicly report most of the other data recommended by NCTQ. Maryland 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. Maryland also does not report on teacher absenteeism but does report county-level data on teacher mobility among districts within the state.

Maryland reports the percentage of highly qualified teachers. Commendably, these data are reported for each school, rather than aggregated by district. The state reports the percentage of teachers with specific types of certificates at the school level. The state reports the percentage of teachers by years of experience at the county level.

Supporting Research

2013 Maryland School Report Cards http://www.mdreportcard.org Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2012-2014 http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/F3F5D904-0F5E-4FC7-87CE-464FC17DABB5/33624/Maryland-TeacherReport20122014.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Report school-level teacher effectiveness data.

The state should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance—from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness—publicly available. Given that Maryland requires teacher evaluations to be based to a significant extent on evidence of student learning (see Goal 3-B), such data about the effectiveness of a school's teachers can shine a light on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts.

Publish other data that facilitate comparisons across schools.

Maryland 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.

Providing comparative data for schools with similar poverty and minority populations would yield an even more comprehensive picture of gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers.

Report data at the school level.

Maryland should ensure that it is reporting all currently collected data at the school level, rather than aggregated by district.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland pointed out that the state accepted American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funding, and that in order to comply with all requirements related to Phase II State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF), the state collects and reports publicly the following data:

- A description of all 24 local education agencies' (LEA) evaluation systems for both teachers and principals
- Teacher performance data at the district and school levels
- Principal performance data at the district level

Maryland stated that all 24 LEAs are required to report evaluation information publicly on their individual school system websites.

Maryland asserted that it also reports student data on the Maryland State Assessment (MSA) for reading and math for elementary and middle school students. The results of the High School Assessments (HSA) are also published for each high school. School systems and the public can use these data to compare schools across the state.

Supporting Research

http://marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/arra/sfsf2.html

LAST WORD

ARRA reporting was necessary for short-term federal compliance and does not represent state policy going forward. As noted on the website the state cited in its response, this reporting was concluded in 2011.

Alabama	Figure 83		* 3	200	2 ON	HERS			4
Alaska	Do states publicly report school-level data	FDAT	CUATIONS OREACH SCL	WITH CTORS	REDENTIALS	JEW TEAC	ICHERS IL	VOVER RATE	TPA NSIS
Alaska	about teachers?	PERFORMAN	AN MDEX H THAT MDEX H ASSOCIATED	PERCENTAGE	PERCENTAGE	PERCENTAGE	ANNUAL TUDA	TEACHER ABSE	
Arkansas	Alabama								
Arkansas Image: Colorado Image:	Alaska								
California	Arizona								
Colorado									
Connecticut									
Delaware									
District of Columbia									
Florida									
Ceorgia									
Hawaii									
Idaho Image: Sector of the sector of t	-								
Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Indiana Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Iowa Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Kansas Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois MaryLAND Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Massachusetts Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Mississippi Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois Missouri Illinois Illinois Illinois Illinois New Hampshire Illinois Illinois <									
Indiana Image: Imag									
Iowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky									
Louisiana									
Maine									
MARYLAND									
Massachusetts Image: Constraint of the second of the									
Michigan I<									
Minnesota									
Mississippi I <td< th=""><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	-								
Missouri Image: Constraint of the cons									
Montana Image: Constraint of the const									
Nebraska Image: Constraint of the cons									
Nevada Image: Image									
New Hampshire									
New Jersey Image: Constraint of the second of the seco									
New York Image: Constraint of the second of the seco									
North CarolinaImage: Constraint of the second o	New Mexico								
North DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWisconsinWyoming	New York								
Ohio Image: Construction of the second	North Carolina								
Oklahoma I<	North Dakota								
OregonIIIIIPennsylvaniaIIIIIRhode IslandIIIIISouth CarolinaIIIIISouth DakotaIIIIITennesseeIIIIITexasIIIIIUtahIIIIIVermontIIIIIWashingtonIIIIIWest VirginiaIIIIIWisconsinIIIIIWyomingIIIII	Ohio								
Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Image: South Carolina Tennessee Image: South Carolina Image: South Carolina <t< th=""><td>Oklahoma</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Oklahoma								
Rhode Island Image: Constraint of the sector of the	Oregon								
South Carolina South Dakota Cennessee Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wisconsin Wyoming									
South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Image: South Constraints Wisconsin Image: South Constraints Wyoming									
Tennessee Texas Utah Overmont Overmont <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									
Texas Utah Vermont Image: Strain Str									
UtahImage: Constraint of the second seco									
Vermont Image: Constraint of the second									
Virginia Image: Constraint of the cons									
Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming									
West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming									
Wisconsin Wyoming	-								
Wyoming	_								
9 0 16 8 39 5 4	Wyoming								
		9	0	16	8	39	5	4	

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although not awarding "best practice" honors for this goal, NCTQ commends the nine states that meet the goal for giving the public access to teacher performance data aggregated to the school level. This transparency can help shine a light on on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts and help to ensure that all students have access to effective teachers.

Figure 84

Do states publicly report school-level data about teacher effectiveness?



- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas³, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts⁴, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida⁵, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah⁵, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Reporting of teacher effectiveness data will begin in 2017.
- 4. Massachusetts' evaluation system is not based primarily on evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- 5. Reports data about teacher effectiveness at the district level.

Area 4 Summary



How States are Faring in Retaining Effective Teachers



Topics Included In This Area

- 4-A: Induction
- 4-B: Professional Development
- 4-C: Pay Scales

- 4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience
- 4-E: Differential Pay
- 4-F: Performance Pay

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-need 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.
- 2. 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.
- 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 85



4-A Analysis: Maryland

State Nearly Meets Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland requires that all new teachers receive mentoring. The state requires that each local school system design a program incorporating components established by the state, including: an orientation program for new teachers prior to the start of the school year, mentor support such as regularly scheduled meetings during noninstructional time, opportunities for new teachers to observe and coteach with skilled teachers with follow-up discussions of the experiences, ongoing professional learning activities, and ongoing formative review of new teacher performance such as classroom observation.

Local school systems are encouraged, but not required, to provide a reduction in teaching schedule during induction. All new teachers must participate in induction activities until they achieve tenure. Experienced teachers new to Maryland must participate for one year. The maximum ratio of mentors to mentees is one mentor to 15 mentees. Mentors should have the following skills: knowledge of adult learning theory and peer coaching techniques, the knowledge base and skill to address performance evaluation criteria and outcomes to be met by each mentee, an advanced professional certificate or be retired from the local school system, a positive reference from principal or supervisor. Maryland is commended for also requiring mentors who are either current or retired teachers, to have obtained evaluation ratings of satisfactory or effective. Local school systems will evaluate their teacher induction programs.

Supporting Research

Teacher Induction Fact Sheet

http://www.msde.maryland.gov/NR/rdonlyres/841ABD3D-FC95-47AB-BB74-BD3C85A1EFB8/32256/FS88_2011_.pdf Code of Maryland Annotated Regulations (COMAR) 13A.07.01-.06

RECOMMENDATION

Expand guidelines to include other key areas.

While still leaving districts flexibility, Maryland 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. It should also require mentors to be trained in a content area or grade level similar to that of the new teacher.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland was helpful in providing the facts that enhanced this analysis.

Figure 86		MENTORING OF SILE	 	CAREFUL SELEC	MENTORS MILES	G.	/	USE OF A VARETY OF EFFECT	
Do states have policies that	MENTORING FOR A.		RATICE RATIC		OFM	MENTORS / PROGRAM	Sha	PENSA CFEFE	Siles
articulate the elements of	Ğ.	S S		55			MIE	Rely COM	ū.
effective induction?					S MIL	a single	24BE	IN SAL	
	VTO TEA			EFUL	Jon	NTOR TBE	Jog (LCT KO	
	MENTORING FOR	FRE	PEG.	ঠ	VE	MUS WE	MEN	52	
Alabama									
Alaska									
Arizona									
Arkansas									
California Colorado									
Connecticut									
Delaware									
District of Columbia									
Florida									
Georgia									
Hawaii									
Idaho									
Illinois									
Indiana									
lowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky									
Louisiana Maine									
Maine									
MaryLand Massachusetts									
Michigan									
Minnesota									
Mississippi									
Missouri									
Montana									
Nebraska									
Nevada									
New Hampshire									
New Jersey									
New Mexico New York									
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									
	31	22	9	24	29	20	20	21	
			-						
T EXAMPLE 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 87

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



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia

2. Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal B – Professional Development

The state should ensure that teachers receive feedback about their performance and require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

Goal Components

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

- 1. The state should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.
- 2. The state should require that all teachers who receive a rating of ineffective/ unsatisfactory or needs improvement on their evaluations be placed on an improvement plan.
- 3. The state should direct districts to align professional development activities with findings from teachers' evaluations.

Background

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

Figure 88

How States are Faring in Professional Development

 2 Best Practice States Louisiana, North Carolina 14 States Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia 4 States Nearly Meet Goal Illinois, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Utah 13 States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Oregon,
 Arizona 1, Arkansas, Colorado 1, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maine 1, Michigan, Mississippi 1, New Jersey 1, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia 1, West Virginia 1 4 States Nearly Meet Goal Illinois, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Utah 1 13 States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Hawaii 1, Indiana, Kentucky,
 Illinois, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Utah 13 States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Hawaii Indiana, Kentucky,
Georgia, Hawaii 🕇 , Indiana, Kentucky,
Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wyoming
7 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Idaho, Kansas, MARYLAND, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania ¹ , South Dakota ¹
11 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin
Progress on this Goal Since 2011:
1:11 ↔:39 ↓:1
••••••••••

4-B Analysis: Maryland



State Meets a Small Part of Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland requires that teachers receive written evaluation reports following an evaluation. Maryland also requires that evaluation systems developed by districts include "focused professional development, resources, and mentoring" for teachers rated ineffective or nontenured teachers. The state's evaluation process does not specify that professional development be linked to evaluation findings.

Supporting Research COMAR 13A.07.04.02; 13A.07.09.04

Maryland Code 6-202 Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook http://msde.state.md.us/tpe/TPE_Guidance_Version3_092013.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

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

Although Maryland requires teachers to receive copies of their evaluations, this only ensures that teachers will receive their ratings, not necessarily feedback on their performance. Maryland should specify that teachers should receive specific feedback on identified strengths and areas that need improvement.

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

While Maryland has taken steps to ensure that teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations receive coordinated professional development based on these findings, the state should strengthen this policy by requiring that all teachers receive professional development that is aligned with their evaluation results.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland stated that the Education Reform Act of 2010 requires mentoring "to provide the employee comprehensive guidance and instruction" with standards that include among others "'geared to the needs of each employee and includes feedback."

Alabama

Alaska

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



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Louisiana and North Carolina require that teachers receive feedback about their performance from their evaluations and direct districts to connect professional development to teachers' identified needs. Both states also require that teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations are placed on structured improvement plans. These improvement plans include specific performance goals, a description of resources and assistance provided, as well as timelines for improvement.

Alaska			<u> </u>
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			2 ²
Tennessee			
Texas Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin ³			
Wyoming			
	31	21	29

1. Improvement plans are required for tenured teachers only.

- 2. Improvement plans are required only for teachers teaching for four years or more.
- Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system includes many of these elements, but is still in the pilot stage. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-2015.

Do teachers receive feedback on their evaluations?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, California, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania
- Alabama, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin⁴
- 4. Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system requires that teachers receive feedback, but it is still in the pilot stages. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-15.

Figure 91

Do states require that teacher evaluations inform professional development?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas
- Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin⁴
- 4. Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system requires that evaluations inform professional development, but it is still in the pilot stages. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-15.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

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 statedictated salary schedule that defines steps and lanes and sets minimum pay at each level.
- 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 92



4-C Analysis: Maryland



Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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 allows each county board to appoint all teachers and "set their salaries."

Supporting Research Maryland Education Code 4-103

RECOMMENDATION

Discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees.

While still leaving districts the flexibility to establish their own pay scale, Maryland 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, Maryland should articulate policies that discourage districts from determining the highest steps on the pay scale solely by seniority.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland 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 prioritizing 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 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.

		HED	sche
What role does the state	، د	S S	alary
play in deciding teacher	1(4p		um s,
pay rates?	ETS	linim	inim
<i>p</i> - <i>y</i> - <i>i</i>	755	ets m	ets m
	DISTRICTS SET SALARY	State sets minimum	Satesets minimum salary sch
	Ĭa	25	25
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado	1		
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
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	2		
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	27	9	15

DUIE

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.

Figure 94		/	Leaves pay to dist.	. /
De states a mouent districte	TO COUNES PERFORMANCE	PROHIBITS ADDITION	LPAN ES	Requires compensation advanced degrees ation for
Do states prevent districts	RMA			t disc
from basing teacher pay on	EREC 10p	Point For	^{ED} D _I	Dense Serse
advanced degrees?	PES P		1 P	degree gree
		ADL	es pe	Tuires
	8 0 J	శ రై	rea,	Reg
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		1		
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island			2	
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas			3	
Utah	4			
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
tryoning				
	3	1	32	15

1. For advanced degrees earned after April 2014.

- 2. Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training".
- 3. Texas has a minimum salary schedule based on years of experience. Compensation for advanced degrees is left to district discretion.
- 4. Beginning in 2015-2016.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

> Goal D – Compensation for Prior Work Experience

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

Goal Component

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

 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 95 How States are Faring in Compensation for Prior Work Experience **Best Practice State** North Carolina State Meets Goal California State Nearly Meets Goal Louisiana States Partly Meet Goal Delaware, Georgia, Texas, Washington State Meets a Small Part of Goal 1 Hawaii **43** States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, 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 2011: 1:1 关 : 50 4:0

4-D Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 (🚍) Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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, Maryland 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.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

T EXAMPLE 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 96

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



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

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, 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

3. Hawaii's compensation is limited to prior military experience.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 97

How States are Faring in Differential Pay



4-E Analysis: Maryland

State Nearly Meets Goal 🛛 🔶 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland does not support differential pay by which a teacher can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects. However, the state does offer a program of tuition reimbursement for retraining in the areas of mathematics and science if the teacher agrees to teach in the public school system for at least two years following certification. Also, the state has adopted an Alternative Teaching Program, where candidates enrolled in an alternative teacher preparation program can earn a per diem stipend by agreeing to teach mathematics or science or special education in a state public school for at least three years.

Maryland does support differential pay for those teaching in high-need schools. The state offers an annual \$2,000 stipend for teachers who are National Board Certified and working in schools designated as "challenged, reconstitution-eligible, or reconstituted." A stipend of up to \$1,000 is available for National Board Certified teachers working in a school without comprehensive needs.

Supporting Research

Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.07.07.01 Maryland Education Code 6-120 Teach MD Incentives http://www.msde.maryland.gov/MSDE/divisions/certification/certification_branch/teach_md/teach_md_incentives

RECOMMENDATION

Expand differential pay initiative for teachers in subject-shortage areas.

Although the state's tuition reimbursement program is a desirable recruitment and retention tool for teachers early in their careers, Maryland should expand its program to include those who are already part of the teaching pool. A salary differential is an attractive incentive for every teacher.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

The state added that one of Maryland's Race to the Top projects was the development of guidance for school systems in terms of teacher performance compensation. The committee was composed of LEA representation, teachers, principals and union leadership.

At this point, because of the economic context, districts have not been able to implement this guidance, as no additional funding has been available.

Supporting Research

http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/race_to_the_top/pc

		HIGH NEED SCHOOLS	/	SHORTAGE SUBJECT	. /
Do states provide				AREAS	
incentives to teach in		J / S	~	5	
high-need schools	DIFFERENTIAL	Vene Vene	DIFFERENTIAL PAY	Vene	*
or shortage subject	EREN	⁶ 0 ¹ gi	EREN	^O rgi	No _{support}
areas?	₹ E	an ,	DIFF 4Y	n, nec	lo st
	~ Q`	Loan fogiveness	-	Loan foggiveness	<
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 Minningia di					
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					2 ²
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
vvyonning					
	22	7	15	11	20

 Maryland also offers tuition reimbursement for teacher retraining in specified shortage subject areas and offers a stipend for alternate route candidates teaching in subject shortage areas.

2. South Dakota offers scholarships to teachers in high-need schools.

T EXAMPLE 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 compensation strategy for math and science teachers, which moves teachers along the salary schedule rather 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.

Figure 99

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



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

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

3. Pennsylvania, Utah

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

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

> 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 100

How States are Faring in Performance Pay **Best Practice States** 2 Florida. Indiana **16** States Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii1, Louisiana¹, Maine¹, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi¹, New York¹, Ohio¹, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah State Nearly Meets Goal California 5 States Partly Meet Goal Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia State Meets a Small Part of Goal Nebraska 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, MARYLAND, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: •:42 📕 : 3 1:6

4-F Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 🜔 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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, Maryland 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..

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland noted that the state developed with Race to the Top (RTTT) funding a manual for teacher compensation. This manual was developed collaboratively with a stakeholder group consisting of school system leadership, teachers and principals and union representation. Unfortunately, the recent economic downturn has prohibited the school system from implementing the strategies developed.

		,	1	,	1
Figure 101	PERFORMANCE FACTORED INTO SALARNCE FACTORED TEACHERS	PERFORMANCE BONUES	Performance pay permiting of the pay permitting of th	State Supported perf.	lance
Do states support	ACTC	Surres 1		State supported performance	no soo
performance pay?	V FOR	CEB ALL	Pay p	Inted p	offer or sci
perjormance pay?	RMA	MAN	ed by	tippo, Ttivec	t sup
		RFOR AILAB	Semo Monnage	tate.s Vinti	er districts of sche Does not support Performance Pay
	+ < Å	A P	Performance pay permitta.	Seles	e astrics or ered in mar Does net suport Performance pay
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		1			
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					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	6	2	8	9	26
	0	2	0	9	20

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.

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

2. Nevada's initiative does not go into effect until 2015-2016.

Area 5 Summary



State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 5-A: Extended Emergency Licenses
- 5-B: Dismissal for Poor Performance
- 5-C: Reductions in Force

REA 5 GR

MARYLAN

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Goal A – Extended Emergency Licenses

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.
- 2. 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 102

How States are Faring in Licensure Loopholes **Best Practice States** 4 Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, New Jersey 3 States Meet Goal Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina 14 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Iowa1, Kentucky, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah, West Virginia States Partly Meet Goal New York, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Michigan, Vermont 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, MARYLAND, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:1 ⇔:50 4:0

5-A Analysis: Maryland



Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland allows teachers who have not met the state's licensure requirements to teach under a conditional certificate. A local school system may request a conditional certificate if it is unable to fill the position with a qualified person who holds a professional certificate. The conditional certificate is valid for two years.

Supporting Research

Maryland State Department of Education: Certification Types http://www.msde.maryland.gov/MSDE/divisions/certification/certification_branch/certification_inf/types/overview COMAR 13A.12.01.08 http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/comarhtml/13a/13a.12.01.08.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. Maryland 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. Maryland's current policy puts students at risk by allowing teachers to teach on conditional certificates for two years without passing required licensing tests.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 103		/	/	6
How long can new teachers practice without passing liconsing tosts?	7			^{3)east} ornoe (orunspected)
licensing tests?	NO DEFERRAL	Up to ₇ year	Up to 2 Jears	³ years or mo
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				
	7	14	8	22



Do states still award emergency licenses?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska⁴, Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, Montana⁵, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina
- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁶, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island⁶, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin
- 4. Alaska does not require subject-matter testing for initial certification.
- 5. Montana does not require subject-matter testing for certification.
- 6. License is renewable, but only if licensure tests are passed.

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Goal B – 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

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

- The state should articulate that teachers may be dismissed for ineffective classroom performance. Any teacher that receives two consecutive ineffective evaluations or two such ratings within five years should be formally eligible for dismissal, regardless of tenure status.
- 2. A teacher who is terminated for poor performance should have an opportunity to appeal. In the interest of both the teacher and the school district, the state should ensure that this appeal occurs within a reasonable time frame.
- 3. There should be a clear distinction between the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed for classroom ineffectiveness and the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed or facing license revocation for felony or morality violations or dereliction of duties.

Background

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

Figure 105



5-B Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal 🛛 (🔁 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland 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. The process is the same regardless of the grounds for dismissal, which include immorality, misconduct, insubordination, incompetency and willful neglect of duty.

Tenured teachers who are dismissed have multiple opportunities to appeal. After receiving written notice of dismissal, the teacher has 10 days to file the first appeal to the county board. The state does not specify a time frame for this hearing, only that it must occur "promptly." The teacher may then file an additional appeal with the state board. The time frame of this appeal is not addressed by the state.

Supporting Research Code of Maryland 6-202

RECOMMENDATION

Specify that classroom ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.

Euphemistic terms such as "incompetency" are ambiguous at best and may be interpreted as concerning dereliction of duty rather than ineffectiveness. Maryland should explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal so that districts do not feel they lack the legal basis for terminating consistently poor performers. Without this specification, Maryland's efforts to improve its evaluation framework (see Goal 3-B) may be undermined.

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 is 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 non-probationary 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 affect a teacher's right to practice. Maryland should ensure that appeals related to classroom effectiveness are decided only by those with educational expertise.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 106		No Notron Policy
Do states articulate that	5	
ineffectiveness is grounds	U P	LEN A
for dismissal?	POUR ELVI:	र /
jor distribut.	YES THI	2
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		1
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		
	29	22

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida and Oklahoma clearly articulate that teacher ineffectiveness in the classroom is grounds for dismissal. In both states, teachers are eligible for dismissal after two annual ratings of unsatisfactory performance. Each state 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.

1. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not articulated that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.

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, Illinois, 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, Nevada⁵, Utah, Vermont
- Though a teacher returns to probationary status after two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations, Nevada does not articulate clear policy about its appeals process.

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Goal C – 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 Component

(The factor 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: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 108



5-C Analysis: Maryland

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Maryland does not have policy that addresses the factors used by districts to determine which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Maryland can still leave districts flexibility in determining layoff policies, but it should do so within a framework that ensures that classroom performance is considered.

Ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off.

Unlike some states, Maryland does not require that districts consider seniority; however, the state should do more to prevent districts from making decisions solely on this basis.

MARYLAND RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Maryland recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states prevent districts from basing layoffs solely on "last in, first out"?

J THE ONLY FACTOR BE PERFORMANCE MUST Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware \square District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii \square \square Idaho \square Illinois Indiana lowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine MARYLAND Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota \square Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico \square \square New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina \square South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington

18

22

West Virginia

Wisconsin

Wyoming

Figure 109

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



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts³, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio³, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Tenure is considered first.

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 111

Do states prevent districts from overemphasizing seniority in layoff decisions?



 Strong Practice: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts⁶, Michigan, Missouri⁶, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington

- 3. Hawaii, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin⁷
- 4. California, Kentucky, New Jersey, Oregon
- 5. Alabama, Alaska⁶, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska⁶, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, 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.

^{2.} Strong Practice: Louisiana, Utah

Goals and Keywords

GOAL	STATEMENT	KEY WORDS
	AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Te	achers
1-A: Admission into Teacher Preparation	The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong academic records.	admission requirements, academic proficiency measures, basic skills tests, GPA
1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, providing the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core or similar state standards.	license/certification, elementary teachers, early childhood teachers, content tests, elementary coursework/standards, content specialization requirements
1-C: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction	The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.	license/certification, elementary teachers, early childhood teachers, science of reading tests, science of reading coursework/standards
1-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.	license/certification, elementary teachers, early childhood teachers, math content tests, math coursework/standards
1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.	license/certification, middle school teachers, content tests, K-8 licenses, content specialization requirements
1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.	license/certification, secondary teachers, secondary social studies, content tests, endorsements
1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science	The state should ensure that secondary science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.	license/certification, secondary general science, content tests, combination sciences
1-H: Special Education Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they are licensed to teach.	license/certification, special education teachers, content tests, K-12 special education license, elementary special education, secondary special education
1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge	The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.	license/certification, pedagogy, professional standards/knowledge, performance assessments, edTPA
1-J: Student Teaching	The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high quality clinical experience.	student teaching, cooperating teachers, clinical preparation, placements
1-K: 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.	teacher preparation programs, program accountability, student achievement, standard of performance, public reporting, national accreditation

Goals and Keywords

GOAL	STATEMENT	KEY WORDS
	AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching I	Pool
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.	alternate route programs, admission requirements, GPA, academic proficiency measures, subject-matter test, flexibility/ test-out
2-B: Alternate Route Preparation	The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide efficient preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as adequate mentoring and support.	alternate route programs, coursework requirements, length of program, student/ practice teaching, induction, mentoring
2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers	The state should provide an alternate route that is free from limitations on its usage and allows a diversity of providers.	alternate routes; subject, grade or geographic restrictions; college or university providers; district-run programs; non-profit providers
2-D: Part-Time Teaching Licenses	The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.	part-time license/certificate, adjunct license
2-E: Licensure Reciprocity	The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.	license reciprocity, license portability, out-of-state teachers, testing requirements, online teachers
	AREA 3: Identifying Effective Teac	hers
3-A: State Data Systems	The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.	longitudinal data systems, definition of teacher of record, teacher production
3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness	The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.	teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness, student learning, classroom observations, surveys, rating categories
3-C: Frequency of Evaluations	The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.	teacher evaluation, evaluation frequency, classroom observations, feedback
3-D: Tenure	The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.	tenure, probationary period, continuing contracts, teacher effectiveness
3-E: Licensure Advancement	The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.	probationary license, professional license, license renewal, evidence of teacher effectiveness, coursework requirements
3-F: Equitable Distribution	The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.	public reporting, aggregate school-level data, evaluation ratings, school report cards, teacher absenteeism rate, turnover rate

Goals and Keywords

GOAL	STATEMENT	KEY WORDS
	AREA 4: Retaining Effective Teacl	hers
4-A: Induction	The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.	mentoring, induction, mentor selection, reduced teaching load, release time
4-B: Professional Development	The state should ensure that teachers receive feedback about their performance and should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.	feedback from observations/evaluations, professional development linked to evaluations results, improvement plans
4-C: Pay Scales	The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.	teacher compensation, salary schedules, pay scales, steps and lanes, advanced degrees, years of experience, teacher performance
4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience	The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.	teacher compensation, relevant work experience
4-E: Differential Pay	The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.	teacher compensation, differential pay, shortage subject areas, high-need schools
4-F: Performance Pay	The state should support performance pay, but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.	teacher compensation, performance pay, teacher performance, student achievement
	AREA 5: Exiting Ineffective Teach	ners
5-A: Extended Emergency Licenses	The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.	emergency licenses, provisional certificates, loopholes, subject-matter tests
5-B: 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.	dismissal, ineffectiveness, poor performance, appeals, due process
5-C: 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.	reduction in force, layoffs, teacher performance, seniority

Teacher Policy Priorities for Maryland

	AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers	
1	Require that teacher 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.	Goal 1-A
ŀ	Adopt an elementary content test with independently scored subject-matter subtests in each of the core areas.	Goal 1-B
•	Require all elementary teacher candidates to pass a rigorous stand-alone science of reading test.	Goal 1-C
•	Adopt a rigorous stand-alone math test for all elementary teacher candidates.	Goal 1-D
•	Specifically require secondary science and social studies teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.	Goal 1-F Goal 1-G
•	Ensure that both elementary and secondary special education teachers possess adequate and appropriate content knowledge for the grades and subjects they teach.	Goal 1-H
•	Ensure that cooperating teachers for student teaching placements have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning, and require teacher candidates to spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.	Goal 1-J
ŀ	Hold teacher preparation programs accountable by collecting data that connect student achievement gains to programs, as well as other meaningful data that reflect program performance, and by establishing the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.	Goal 1-K
		的成果出
	AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool	
1	Increase admission requirements to alternate route programs, including a high bar for academic proficiency and passage of a subject-matter test.	Goal 2-A
•	Require out-of-state teachers to meet the state's own testing requirements.	Goal 2-E
	AREA 3: Identifying Effective Teachers	
•	Ensure that evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.	Goal 3-D
•	Base licensure advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license and licensure renewal on evidence of effectiveness.	Goal 3-E
•	Publish aggregate school-level teacher evaluation ratings from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness.	Goal 3-F

AREA 4: Retaining Effective Teachers	
Link professional development activities to findings in individual teacher evaluations, and place teachers with ineffective or needs improvement ratings on structured improvement plans.	Goal 4-B
Discourage districts from basing teacher pay scales primarily on advanced degrees and seniority.	Goal 4-C
Support performance pay to recognize teachers for their effectiveness.	Goal 4-F
AREA 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers	
Ensure that all teachers pass required subject-matter licensing tests before they enter the classroom.	Goal 5-A
Make ineffective classroom performance grounds for dismissal.	Goal 5-E
Use teacher effectiveness as a factor when determining which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force.	Goal 5-0
	Ly Fal



1120 G Street, 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 🕒 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