

**California State University Summit:
Transformative Change in the Preparation of Teachers
“Teacher Preparation: Reform and Improvement”
Remarks of Dr. Martha J. Kanter, Under Secretary
U.S. Department of Education**

Good morning. Thank you, Chancellor Reed, for your generous introduction.

The Obama administration has a robust and progressive college access, affordability, quality and completion agenda. I could talk a great deal about our accomplishments and plans in all of those areas.

But I am excited to focus on teacher education this morning, because it’s critically important to America’s future. For too long, it has been neglected. And there are promising changes underway.

The best teacher preparation programs are based on strong and substantial field experience in local schools across our nation, field experience that informs coursework in student learning and classroom management and prepares candidates to teach diverse students in high-need settings.

Quality programs are research-based. New research on learning, especially coming from our nation’s cognitive/neuro science experts, must be supported and, most importantly, applied in teaching and learning

throughout our institutions and in our K-12 schools. Dr. Susan Fuhrman, the new president of Teachers' College at Columbia told me that "our challenge is to apply [our research] findings so instruction becomes as much about learning as teaching. Teachers in preparation need to learn how children learn in various specific subjects and what instructional paths and strategies make sense." She pointed to Deborah Ball's work in content specific pedagogy and made the point that this type of research stands in stark contrast to the traditional content of teacher preparation programs that have largely focused on generic skills like classroom management.

Quality teacher education programs must ensure not only that students master the subject matter, but that candidates are taught how to apply the best research we have and make far better use of data to drive what is taught and, most importantly, what is learned. Most of all, quality programs have a single-minded focus on improving K-12 student learning outcomes.

California is a leader in improving the quality of its teacher education programs. CSU pioneered performance-based assessments of teacher candidate readiness. We think these are very promising. Stanford's

Linda Darling Hammond and Ray Pechone deserve a lot of credit for their work on performance-based teacher assessments.

NCATE, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, is launching an ambitious effort to transform teacher preparation by focusing it on clinical practice. California and seven other states are working together to put NCATE's blue ribbon ideas into practice.

I want to assure you that your work here in California and the work of NCATE and AACTE have the attention of the Obama administration. We're continually studying what you've accomplished and we've already learned a great deal from you which has helped us enormously in crafting our proposals.

Budget Proposal

I have news in that regard. This morning President Obama is releasing a budget that includes a major investment in teacher preparation.

Over the next five years, we're proposing to invest over \$1 billion dollars in a strategy that would reward good teacher preparation programs, improve struggling ones,

and have states either turn around or shut down those that are doing a poor job.

Step one in carrying out a strategy to “reward the good, improve the mediocre, and turn-around or shut down the poor performers” is to build an infrastructure that identifies high, mid, and low-performing teacher preparation programs.

There are over 1,400 institutions of higher education that offer teacher preparation programs nationwide. States identify only 38 as having low-performing or at-risk programs. And a quarter of those are located in our territories, not our states. As you can see, our accountability system needs reform.

The Department of Education has plans to reach out across the nation and begin a regulatory review process and provide financial support to states that take action to identify to high and low performing teacher preparation programs based on outcomes.

We want to give states funds to develop and adopt performance-based assessments of teacher candidates like those that you have pioneered here in California, the first state to require such assessments for licensing.

Passing a paper-and-pencil test doesn't tell you whether a teacher candidate is ready to teach on day one.

To identify top-tier programs, low-performing ones, and improve teacher preparation programs, we want states to look at learning outcomes like performance assessments, teacher candidate effectiveness in improving K-12 student achievement; employment outcomes like hiring, placement, and retention rates; and customer satisfaction outcomes like candidate and principal satisfaction with teacher preparation programs. We want to make sure that outcomes information is given back to schools of education to improve their programs and services as well as to accreditors, states, researchers and practitioners.

I want to make clear that we need better regulation, we need to improve what we have - not necessarily more regulation. We're going to look at eliminating some Higher Education Act Title II reporting requirements that are unnecessarily burdensome for schools of education.

For example, we think that the federal government should not require schools of education to report whether they demand a Myers-Briggs personality test of teacher candidates. There are 440 questions we ask schools of

education to report on every year. We will need your help in keeping the essential and getting rid of the rest, like we were doing with the FAFSA reporting for determining Pell grant eligibility.

Step two in carrying out a strategy is to support and encourage the development of model teacher preparation programs.

For the best programs in our nation, the President's budget will create the Presidential Teaching Fellowship program with \$185 million dollars proposed for the 2012 budget year, and \$200 million a year for each of the next four years through 2016.

Highly talented students attending the strongest teacher preparation programs in each state would be awarded scholarships of up to \$10,000 dollars each, with a priority for those with financial need. Presidential Teaching Fellows will have to be prepared to teach a high-need subject, such as math, science, ESL, or special education -- and commit to teach at least three years in a high-need school.

For mid-range teacher preparation programs at high-priority institutions, the President's 2012 budget will invest in promising reforms. The Gus Hawkins Centers of

Excellence program created in 2008 under the Higher Education Reauthorization has never been funded. President Obama is proposing \$40 million to establish these Centers of Excellence for Minority Serving Institutions.

This new investment seeks to increase the talent pool of effective minority educators by expanding and reforming teacher education programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, Tribal Universities and other higher education institutions serving a substantial number of racial minorities.

Right now, 38 percent of all school children are black or Latino. Only 14 percent of teachers are black or Latino. Only 2 percent are African American males. The Secretary is firmly committed to increasing the number of effective minority teachers.

Minority serving institutions prepare half of all minority teachers. We want them to grow and become national models of excellence.

We want them to have heightened selectivity *and* exit standards; clinically-based programs; close partnerships with school districts and/or non-profits that place teacher candidates; and to provide extensive training to all

candidates in evidence-based methods of instruction for diverse learners.

Finally, step three in a strategy to “reward the good, improve the mediocre, and turn around or shut down the weakest performers” is for the states to implement a policy of truth and consequences for the lowest performing programs.

This is the tough love part of our plan. The newly proposed Presidential Teaching Fellowship program includes a state set-aside of up to 25 percent of the funds to modernize their teacher preparation accountability systems, cover the cost of performance-based licensure tests, and help low-performing programs turn around. If states take the money, they’ve got to be willing to eventually shut down persistently poor performing programs.

Dr. Linda Darling Hammond recently told us persistently poor performing programs that cannot improve need to “go away.” AACTE’s President Sharon Robinson has said the same thing. We’ve also heard it from school of education deans talking about their own programs *and* about alternative route programs that aren’t getting results.

This is the Secretary's view as well. He wants really low performing teacher preparation programs to "shape up or shut down," and we support this stance.

Recovery Act

We're not new to prioritizing education, students or teachers as an investment. Education was the single largest recipient of Recovery Act funds. Most of that money saved hundreds of thousands of teacher jobs over the last two years.

With Recovery Act funds, this past December we awarded 12 new Teacher Quality Partnership grants. Almost \$100 million is being directed at reforming traditional university teacher preparation programs and creating teacher residency programs for professionals from other fields entering the teaching profession.

These residency programs will follow the medical model in which residents are placed in schools with comprehensive induction and extensive support. Teaching residents will be paid a living wage and expected to teach for three years in a partnering high-need school.

We also recently announced awards of over \$400 million dollars for the teacher and leader incentive fund grants. The first two years of funding for a five-year \$1.2 billion dollar program will help to strengthen the teaching profession by rewarding excellence and attracting teachers and principals to high-need, hard-to-staff areas. Awards were made to rural and urban districts. But the winning districts had the best comprehensive plans to develop, reward, and support effective teachers and principals in high-need schools. And those plans had to be anchored in evaluations that include multiple measures, including student growth.

Finally, to recruit more teachers, we created a new TEACH.gov website dedicated to providing information and resources for students and prospective teachers. In the coming years, a million teachers are expected to retire. We have an historic opportunity to bring a new generation into the classroom and elevate the entire profession. We ask your help in directing your professors, prospective students and current students to the website and your advice for working with the nation's 15,000 school districts to identify job openings and effective recruitment processes, and to use the site as a link to new research

and high-impact practices that will be used to strengthen the teaching profession as a whole.

Promising Programs

So far I've outlined what the Department of Education is doing to support the development of high-quality teacher education. But Secretary Duncan and I also recognize the important work that states are doing to reform and improve teacher education.

Secretary Duncan recently said, "It's a simple but obvious idea—colleges of education and district officials ought to know which teacher preparation programs are effective and which need fixing. Transparency, longitudinal data, and competition can be powerful tonics for programs stuck in the past."

Here is one story about how data and transparency can change teacher education. Through research conducted in Tennessee, policymakers know that Vanderbilt produces some of the best teachers in the state overall. But here's what's really powerful. The research shows that that a Vanderbilt graduate who teaches mathematics is highly likely to be among the most effective teachers in the state in raising math

achievement. Yet only 9 percent of English language arts teachers who graduate from Vanderbilt are among the most effective teachers in raising English language arts achievement.

This data clarified for Vanderbilt that it needed to strengthen its English language arts program. This type of evidence also can inform hiring decisions. We want all states, all teacher preparation programs, and all hiring school districts to have that kind of powerful data.

It's good news that several states are now using their longitudinal data systems to track and compare the impact of new teachers from teacher preparation programs on student achievement over a period of years.

Louisiana has already implemented a statewide program to assess the impact of new teachers on student learning. And Tennessee and Florida are well on their way to building these longitudinal data systems that will enable them to track and compare the impact of new teachers on student achievement back to their teacher preparation programs. Louisiana already has years of data on new teachers, not only in math and English, but also in reading, science, and social studies. Ohio has the Ohio Teacher Quality Partnership, a longitudinal study of teacher

education graduates and their impact on students.

Colorado has incorporated the improvement of teacher prep programs into its new strategic plan.

Georgia is developing a set of program effectiveness measures for their teacher and leader preparation programs that will consider not only K-12 student growth data, but measure the transition from initial certification to full certification, three-year retention rates, and demonstration of content knowledge.

Delaware will link preparation programs to their graduates' evaluation ratings under new evaluation systems—which include both student learning and other important measures of teaching practice. The states also will be sharing more detailed data with teacher prep programs on the evaluations of their graduates, enabling teacher educators to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their programs.

In 2012, Minnesota will become the first state to assess all new teachers' performance. They will be building on California's PACT assessments of teacher-candidate readiness, which the CSU system pioneer and has adopted throughout its system. As in the CSU system, independent evaluators in Minnesota will grade videos of

aspiring teachers' abilities to prepare a lesson, execute meaningful curriculum, and tailor instruction to a diverse group of students.

We need to make all of this information available to the public—to help prospective teachers select the best training programs to enroll in, and to help principals and districts choose the institutions from which they would like to recruit new teachers. Every state and district should be sharing this kind of detailed data with teacher preparation programs. This must become the norm—we believe that these improvements will move us from the status quo to systemic reform that will dramatically benefit students, teachers, schools, institutions of higher education and states!

National Academies Study/IES Response

Last year, the National Research Council published the report of the Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs called *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy*. They asked the Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) to respond and take the lead in conducting research to support the improvement of schools of education.

Recommendations include:

- first, sponsoring an independent evaluation of teacher education approval and accreditation throughout the U.S.;
- second, coordinating existing data collection efforts and encouraging new ones, with the goal of developing a national education data network that incorporates comprehensive data related to teacher education; and
- third, focusing research on the benefits of particular kinds of teacher knowledge and clinical experiences and the factors that affect the quality of entering teacher candidates.

We agree that additional research on topics that have the highest potential effects on improving outcomes for students is needed, but we can't simply establish integrated data networks that would be purely descriptive. Instead, higher education and the federal government should be working to develop a formative tool to improve our programs, and gather data on which approaches to teacher preparation lead to greater student success.

As a result, IES is conducting multiple research approaches to help identify and determine approaches to

teacher preparation and accreditation that could lead to improved student outcomes. These overall approaches include:

(1) identifying teacher practices that improve student outcomes and should be taught during teacher preparation and considered during accreditation,

(2) evaluating teacher training and accreditation practices, and

(3) developing and testing research-based teacher training methods.

IES currently has efforts underway to develop and rigorously test classroom practices that improve student learning of specific content knowledge and skills. Several IES research grant programs support this work, including programs of research on teacher quality with a focus on reading and writing or mathematics and science education.

Another way to determine teacher practices that result in improved student outcomes is an empirically-driven approach that relies on observation, surveys, administrative records and student learning. The goal is to both identify practices linked to better student outcomes

through evaluation and to develop instruments that can be used to assess teacher candidates and teachers.

In 2009, IES awarded a grant to the Harvard University Graduate School of Education for the National Center for Teacher Effectiveness: Validating Measures of Effective Math Teaching. This national research and development center is carrying out a focused program of research on upper elementary mathematics instruction.

In 2010, IES launched a new research program on the Analysis of Longitudinal Data. Capitalizing on the development of statewide longitudinal data systems, researchers track graduates of specific teacher preparation programs and compare their students' gains in performance as a way of comparing the programs.

Finally, to develop and test teacher research-based training methods, IES is looking at developing and testing better teacher preparation methods and how best to transfer better practices to teachers. For example, they are looking at how initial reading skills develop and how best to teach these skills to young children and how to implement instructional practices to teach these skills effectively in classroom settings.

Furthermore, within IES, the National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE) plans to conduct “A Study of Promising Teacher Preparation Programs” to be awarded by September 2011. This study will look at teacher preparation programs with features thought to be promising such as significant clinical experiences with substantive feedback. It will include an in-depth look at preparation activities and candidate experiences prior to becoming a teacher of record. It will also follow them to their first assignment as the teacher of record and look at the performance of their graduates' classroom compared to novice teachers' classroom performance in the same schools that attended other preparation programs (without those features or with much less emphasis on them).

Finally, I want to point out that we are encouraging states to expand their State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) to include teacher data. We have required this expansion since FY 2010 in SLDS grants. At least 20 states are now engaged in this type of data collection.

We know there are many questions about how teachers are being prepared and how they ought to be prepared. But we can't treat teacher preparation as an afterthought or an add-on. As Michael Feuer, dean at

George Washington University notes: it's all about "credibility, the notion that one of the conditions that makes it more likely for research-based evidence to influence policy and practice is its objectivity and independence." As he talks about validity and reliability in assessing the quality of research, he underscores the need for credibility. Nationally, our research and our applications need to be reliable, valid, and credible so that we can develop and implement policies that will improve the preparation of effective teachers, improve the evaluation of our programs and improve both the methodologies themselves and how we use them.

NCATE Panel

The work to improve the quality of teacher education also is happening because of a coordinated national effort of leaders in the field. The Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning, convened by NCATE to improve student learning, is a promising example. Its report from last fall states that America "needs an entire system of excellent [teacher preparation] programs, not a cottage industry" of exemplary initiatives. It calls for ending the insidious

practice of accrediting university-based preparation programs in the absence of rigorous evidence of the impact that graduates have on student learning in the classroom. In the very first sentence, the report states, "The education of teachers in the United States needs to be turned upside down." It goes on to recommend making clinical practice the center of teacher preparation.

NCATE also called for linking student outcomes back to the teacher preparation programs where their teachers trained. And like Secretary Duncan, the NCATE panel called on university-based preparation programs to be more accountable for their programs and recommended that school districts need to be much more aggressively involved in teacher preparation.

Partnerships between schools of education and districts are often neglected. But they are key to ensuring that programs are matched with the districts' needs. Finally, NCATE also called for higher education institutions to develop and implement alternative reward structures for faculty. Unfortunately, the compensation and tenure system at education schools does too little to value work in schools. That needs to change.

When NCATE released the report, Secretary Duncan urged the group to keep up their work. He said: “Persist in your efforts—don't lose faith or hedge on your core reform goals as you move toward implementing your report's recommendations.” This is a message we can all take to heart.

Chancellor Reed deserves recognition for his significant contributions to CSU and for his service to NCATE's Blue Ribbon panel. Under his leadership, California has become one of the first eight states to sign letters of intent to implement their new agenda and be a part of the eight-state alliance that will examine and implement comprehensive strategies to transform teacher education.

California State University

Here at the California State University system, you understand that message. You are leading the way in the reform of teacher preparation programs. Your work is ensuring that students who go through your schools of education become teachers who understand both the theory and the practice of teaching. Your students will be the ones who will be able to effectively apply what they

have learned when they come face-to-face with students from diverse backgrounds and various developmental levels who will fill their own classrooms once they graduate.

The key to your success is tracking students after they graduate. Students who complete your preparation programs are invited to participate in comprehensive online exit evaluations that pose questions about the quality of their teacher preparation, including their instructors, their subject-matter coursework, their coursework on teaching practices, and their fieldwork experiences, and your individual campuses can add their own program-specific questions.

Their employers are asked to evaluate their candidates and provide feedback that helps CSU improve your teacher preparation programs.

And your P-12 clinical partnerships aimed at preparing new teachers are closing achievement gaps that will yield valuable information about the relationships between teacher preparation and student achievement gains in your schools.

I also want to commend your partnerships with California's community colleges. They will help students,

especially those from culturally diverse communities, gain new pathways to teaching.

Your Urban Teaching Fellows program, just one of the many excellent programs on your campuses, will enable community college students to work in after-school programs while completing 2-year and then 4-year college degrees. The future teachers in the program contribute to closing the achievement gap among the low-income children served in California's large state-funded after-school programs while having significant early clinical experiences.

Closing Remarks

Let me end my remarks by praising you for holding this summit. It is a major opportunity to explore and build on efforts that are underway to reform teacher preparation programs. Tomorrow's teachers must be prepared to take on the responsibility of tomorrow's students -- students from increasingly diverse economic, racial, linguistic, and academic backgrounds. We must remember that our students are living in the knowledge economy...and so are we.

The education that millions of Americans got in the

past simply won't prepare today's children for success in the 21st Century. The teacher education programs that prepared today's educators need dramatic modernization.

Education, as President Obama has said, "is no longer just a pathway to opportunity and success—it's a prerequisite to success." We are convinced that we must do a far better job to prepare teachers as we educate our way to a better economy, to a more prosperous democracy and to a more civil and inclusive society.

Together, let's raise the bar to create better teacher preparation programs, spend our time sharing ideas, understanding innovative approaches, and preparing to use this information to challenge the status quo. Our students, our schools, our states and our country depend on it.

Thank you.