

Strengthen Teaching and Leadership

Teachers have the greatest impact on student learning; leaders create the conditions to ensure good teaching.

Our Vision:

An approach that puts student success at the center must ensure that every student in every classroom is taught by an effective teacher, that teachers are well-prepared and practice as professionals, and that teaching is supported by high-quality leadership from principals and superintendents and reinforced by all other school and district staff. This is by far the most effective way to improve student learning.

Research clearly shows that providing students with a quality teacher is the most important contribution a school system can make to support a student's academic success. It is essential that California provides every child with a well-prepared, highly effective teacher if the state is to ensure that every child has a real opportunity to achieve the high expectations the state has set. And California must provide those teachers with the resources and support necessary to ensure that they can be successful — starting with effective preparation and including mentoring, professional development, constructive evaluations, appropriate compensation, and the materials and classroom conditions that promote high-quality teaching and learning.

Effective classroom instruction and school success can occur only with the support of other school and district personnel led by a set of quality education leaders, including principals and superintendents. These education leaders are called on to guide their schools and districts in myriad ways, performing deeply challenging yet essential roles: setting a vision; using assessment effectively; understanding instructional strategies; managing budgets, personnel, and facilities; and otherwise leading their educational communities in successful educational delivery and continuous improvement.

With so much dependent on the quality, preparation, and effectiveness of education personnel, it is incumbent on the state to ensure that it recruits the best candidates, supports their efforts to provide excellent classroom instruction, and treats them as professionals — including compensating them as such.

California's Current Reality

Many excellent, dedicated teachers are educating California's children today, but there remains much room for improvement. In today's labor market, it is increasingly difficult to attract and retain effective teachers and other education personnel. The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (CFTL) has suggested that, while the state has made progress in reducing the number of under-prepared teachers in recent years, the current teacher workforce is aging, and the state should expect increased retirements in the next decade. It predicts that by 2016–17, California will need to attract and retain some 100,000 people to

teacher positions.¹ This constitutes roughly one-third of the 2005–06 teacher workforce.² The state’s current teacher training programs will not meet that demand for new teachers. Moreover, CFTL reports a disturbing trend: Enrollment in teacher preparation programs in 2004–05 was approximately 15 percent lower than in 2001–02.³ Without dramatic change, California is at risk of once again placing tens of thousands of under-prepared people in classrooms to teach the state’s children, and history repeatedly has demonstrated that the distribution of qualified and effective teachers will likely enhance the very educational disparities California hopes to overcome. The challenge will be particularly significant in some of the faster-growing regions of the state, including the Inland Empire and Central Valley counties.⁴

Research suggests that the effects of quality teaching and substandard teaching on children are long-lived.⁵ In fact, the achievement gap can be dramatically reduced — and even eliminated — when disadvantaged students have access to effective teachers.⁶ And yet, all too often, the students who need high-quality, effective teachers the most are least likely to have access to them.⁷ California’s current education system has a tendency to perpetuate and exacerbate social inequities instead of living up to its charge and providing every student the means necessary to be successful in education and, ultimately, in their lives.

While no similarly detailed data exists regarding the demand for new administrators, anecdotal evidence suggests that even higher percentages of principals, superintendents, and other education leaders will retire or leave the system within the next decade. (In part, this may result from educators becoming administrators later in their careers than they become teachers.)

The next generation of potential teachers, principals, and superintendents will have different needs and opportunities than their predecessors. Historically, teaching — with administrators drawn from the teaching ranks — was one of the few career options for talented women and minorities, resulting in K–12 education benefiting from the dedicated service of these individuals. In today’s labor market, those limitations no longer apply. College graduates, regardless of gender or ethnicity, have a variety of choices, often with much higher initial and long-term salaries; better-equipped facilities; ongoing professional development; teamwork and collegiality; and more opportunities for career advancement than are available in the field of public education. Unfortunately, many young people believe that teaching holds little career advancement and poor compensation.⁸ In addition, the current salary schedule fails to recognize labor market realities, differentiate between more challenging work environments, or reward successful teachers. Moreover, while it was previously common for teachers to pursue lifelong careers in teaching, incoming educators are more likely to have multiple professions, making it less likely that enough of them will accrue the experience necessary to provide seasoned teaching and leadership in their schools.

To accomplish the goal of attracting so many quality teachers and administrators in the face of these challenges, California must ensure that education is an attractive profession, especially for the most talented and promising prospective candidates, and that these candidates are provided multiple pathways and fewer impediments to becoming an educator.

The quality of programs that prepare educators must be substantially improved. Too many educators arrive at schools ill-prepared for the realities they face in the classroom or in administrative roles; this reality is reflected in surveys of both these novices and their supervisors. The university-based training models used in California for decades have not been sufficiently responsive to the needs identified by K–12 educators, especially in terms of alignment to K–12 standards, or by the increasingly diverse pool of candidates who require more flexible delivery structures to make their participation viable. Programmatic change is essential — though all forms of program delivery must meet the most rigorous standards — if teacher and administrator quality is to improve in ways that meet current and future challenges.

Improving teacher and administrator support and working conditions also are necessary steps to promote the retention of educators. Current high levels of teacher turnover have a significant impact on the quality of instruction. The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning reports that over the last decade, annual attrition rates for teachers who are not eligible for retirement have averaged 4.6 percent and have been as high as 6.8 percent.⁹ Most of this attrition occurs among teachers in their first several

years of teaching. And while some level of attrition is necessary because many new teachers will determine that teaching is not the right career for them, many believe that the current attrition rates are too high. The impact of a high attrition rate is twofold. First, it means that a greater proportion of the teaching force is in its first years of teaching. Research from the Getting Down to Facts project shows that teachers in their first two to three years of teaching are less effective than they are thereafter.¹⁰ Reducing teacher turnover in the state would decrease the proportion of faculty who are generally less-effective novices. Second, in addition to the impact of turnover on teaching effectiveness and resulting student performance, teacher and administrator turnover also has an impact on school budgets. Quantitatively, researchers estimate that the United States is facing nearly 200,000 teacher vacancies each year due to high attrition rates among new teachers and the retirement of baby boomer teachers, as well as increases in student enrollment due to immigration, population redistribution, and regional growth — resulting in a cost to the nation of \$4.9 billion annually.¹¹ Since the costs of this continual training and recruitment reduce resources available to serve students directly, cutting these costs over time can allow for education funds to be used more efficiently to improve instruction.

The need to mitigate these challenges simultaneously provides a constructive opportunity to dramatically improve the educational workforce in a relatively short period of time. If California is serious about that objective, the state needs bold new strategies to attract, develop, motivate, and retain talented people as teachers and education leaders — strategies that make it possible for those educators to excel. The Committee proposes extensive changes throughout the state’s education personnel policies. These changes generally can be grouped into two categories: (1) professionalizing teaching and education leadership through integrated programs that address all aspects of preparation, practice, and compensation; and (2) expanding and improving the quality of teacher and administrator training programs to meet the needs of schools and the demand for educators over the next decade. Following these integrated recommendations, the Committee provides numerous other teacher- and administrator-related recommendations.

Teacher and Administrator Professional Practice Model

The Committee believes that people will be drawn to educating California’s children if they are treated as true professionals. Interviews with incoming teachers suggest that to attract and retain the best and brightest, public education will have to provide multiple pathways into the profession; support teamwork; provide career advancement; and offer differentiated salaries based on a teacher’s roles, responsibilities, and performance.¹² Professionalizing teaching in these ways will not occur simply by improving existing programs that support teachers or administrators; the state has to go to the heart of the matter, significantly changing every aspect of the professional experience that educators encounter throughout their careers. The Committee envisions a new approach that changes many of the common practices of the state’s teacher and administrator training and professional development programs, performance evaluations, career advancement opportunities, and compensation policies — as well as day-to-day practice in classrooms, schools, districts, and county offices. The Committee believes that a new professional practice model for teachers and administrators can serve as the cornerstone of continuous improvement in schools, by providing the exceptional teachers, principals, and superintendents who will help ensure students are meeting the state’s standards and becoming successful members of California’s economy, society, and democracy. To do this, the Committee strongly believes that its recommendations should:

- **Create the right support, opportunities, and incentives.** California must ensure teachers are continually supported to succeed in and continually improve their craft; have opportunities to advance as professionals without leaving teaching; and are rewarded for their quality work.
- **Be locally driven with state guidance.** Throughout this report, the Committee has emphasized that to meet the unique needs of California’s diverse communities as the state moves forward with systemic reform in K–12, there needs to be a balance between local authority and state oversight and guidance. This principle holds true as California thinks about professionalizing teaching. Local leaders, including school boards, superintendents, and unions, need to adapt any proposed model to fit their community’s preferences and circumstances, and the state needs to provide general parameters to help support successful implementation.

- **Ensure appropriate accountability.** Every individual in California’s education system — from state leaders to local educators — needs to be accountable for his or her part in ensuring that students achieve. The methods used to ensure accountability must be fair and appropriate. Teachers should be evaluated on what counts most — growth in student achievement — as well as clearly articulated standards of practice.

Learning from the research and national models

Because teaching is the most critical school-based factor affecting student achievement, the Committee believes it is important to draw from convincing research as well as proven models from across the nation to support efforts to secure effective, high-quality teaching for every student. In other countries and other states, a number of professional models are being explored to provide enhanced conditions of practice for teachers.

The various professional practice and professional compensation models differ in their mixtures of strategies targeted to enhancing teachers’ success. Based on research findings, reviews of best practices, and its own internal deliberations, the Committee considers the integration of four specific elements — multiple career paths; ongoing, applied, targeted professional development; evaluation and accountability; and professional compensation — to offer the greatest promise for improving teaching in ways that will enhance student achievement.

- **Multiple career paths.** Historically, the only way for a teacher to advance or take on leadership responsibilities was to leave the classroom to become an administrator. The Committee agrees with successful models of professional practice that, by contrast, allow teachers to pursue a variety of positions throughout their careers — as career teachers, lead teachers, mentor teachers, and master teachers, for example — depending on their interests, abilities, and accomplishments, that allow them to continue to teach and work in the realm of teaching. In such a model, these advanced teachers may assume leadership roles within the school and be rewarded for their increased authority and responsibility with additional compensation. This model also stands in contrast to the prevailing single-salary schedule used in California, which often is based on years of service, college credits, and professional development units — all of which are suggested by research to be poor predictors for the purposes of identifying an effective teacher.¹³
- **Ongoing, job-embedded, targeted professional development.** Generic professional development has a mixed track record because it often is not relevant to a specific teacher’s — or school’s — needs. Instead, professional development should be targeted. First, all professional development should be based on the district’s vision and the school’s related learning goals. Second, it should meet the individual needs of teachers and optimally be tailored using the teacher’s professional evaluation results and student outcome data.

Professional development also should be ongoing and job-embedded: Thus, school schedules should be structured to allow teachers to meet, learn, plan, mentor, and work collaboratively with one another; and professional development should take advantage of times when students are participating in programs such as art and physical education so that grade-level teams of teachers can come together to participate jointly in this professional development. This time is an investment: It provides teachers an opportunity to improve their craft and ultimately increase students’ academic achievement.

While the breadth of the research on K–12 professional development paints a mixed picture, on closer inspection, some successful strategies support student achievement. In a recent article, Heather Hill found that successful professional development models provide adequate time; present targeted information; and are relevant and aligned with district/school goals and curricular materials.¹⁴ In addition, while more research is needed, allowing teachers from the same school to actively participate in professional development together is promising.

- **Evaluation and accountability.** The Committee believes that teachers should be evaluated on a regular basis to identify their strengths and promote improvements in their practice. Many safeguards should be implemented to ensure consistency and fairness: While some local flexibility may be allowed, evaluations should be based on a standard framework

and be conducted by teams who are well-trained and coordinated to ensure consistency. The involvement of peers, along with principals, in conducting evaluations further promotes receptivity and a sense of fairness by the teachers being reviewed; California itself briefly conducted the Peer Assistance and Review process, but program funding and implementation were erratic, leading to uneven outcomes. The Committee was particularly impressed by models that combined evaluation against adopted professional standards with consideration of growth in student achievement. In a recent study by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, the authors found “that the scores from standards-based performance evaluation systems can have a substantial positive relationship with student achievement and that the instructional practices measured by these systems contribute to student learning.”¹⁵ The Committee favors using the achievement growth of individual teachers’ students in concert with schoolwide assessments to gauge the impact teachers have had during the course of the year while promoting teamwork within the school.

- **Professional compensation.** The compensation of professionals rewards them for their successes, as well as for their roles and responsibilities; the Committee believes that standard should apply to teachers in ways that have not occurred to date. In addition to their base level of compensation, all teachers should be eligible for augmented compensation based on their complex principal/peer evaluations — again, measuring their performance against professional standards and student and school outcomes. Teachers who undertake roles in addition to their classroom teaching, such as mentoring and school leadership, should receive additional compensation for those responsibilities. The Committee also endorses providing financial incentives to attract effective teachers (as determined by their evaluations) to “hard-to-staff” schools and subjects. This multifaceted approach to compensation would differ significantly not only from current salary structures, but also from simplistic “merit-pay” programs that have been pursued in the past.

Providing increased pay for master and mentor teachers, as well as other proposed salary augmentations, likely would alter the current compensation structures in many school districts. Transitioning from the traditional single-salary schedule to a professional pay structure that is based on knowledge, skills, and performance measured by professional standards can occur gradually, depending on local needs. Allan Odden and Marc Wallace (2007) describe a series of steps that districts can pursue that will allow them to graft new elements to their existing pay structures, eventually allowing them to completely transition to a new compensation model.¹⁶ That transition includes initially providing salary augmentations on top of the district single-salary schedule; new dollars would be invested in performance incentives until these incentives become a major determinant of a teacher’s pay. The Committee finds that this type of transition would be most appropriate to constructive implementation of such a compensation structure, insofar as it assures that targeted new resources are used to augment salaries rather than redirect existing funding for salaries.

While continued research is needed, these types of workforce policies have demonstrated many promising results. In a review of the existing research, both Dan Goldhaber (2006) and Susanna Loeb and Luke Miller (2007) found that output-based, performance-focused compensation policies have a positive impact on student achievement.¹⁷ For example, in a study for the National Bureau of Economic Research, performance incentives were found to be significantly correlated with increased student achievement and were as — or more — cost effective than other reforms reviewed.¹⁸

Recent research from Harvard University on the “Next Generation of Teachers” suggests that these are the types of supports and incentives sought by new teaching candidates. This research found that the new generation is generally more entrepreneurial than its predecessors. “Rather than rejecting differentiated pay, they expect their salaries to reflect, in some fair way, their growth and success as teachers. Over time, they hope for opportunities to advance in their work and to exercise greater influence in their schools and profession.”¹⁹ Providing this next generation of teachers these types of opportunities is the ultimate goal of these changes. And as a package, these reforms would change the focus of the school to support needs and provide opportunities for each teacher to succeed and then recognize those who have been able to succeed.

A comprehensive approach

In isolation, multiple career paths; targeted professional development; evaluation and accountability; and professional compensation, enacted as described above, can positively impact teaching and learning — but it is how these strategies build on and reinforce one another that makes this comprehensive approach effective. For example, while providing incentives — such as those offered through a professional compensation structure — can motivate educators, that mechanism could be viewed as arbitrary and unfair if teachers are not evaluated consistently by well-trained evaluators using valid and reliable measures and if they are not given the support necessary to improve their practice and thereby qualify to receive the additional compensation. Similarly, it would be inadequate to hold out the promise of career advancement without the support of appropriate professional development that builds their capacity for these new roles and responsibilities or sufficient compensation for undertaking them.

Teacher Advancement Program

The Committee’s recommendations for professional practice models mirror the theory behind the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). TAP leverages four strategies — multiple career paths, professional development, evaluation, and performance-based compensation — that research suggests can improve the quality of teaching. What makes TAP distinct and effective is that it integrates these components holistically, so teachers are treated and supported as professionals. While the TAP model has an implementation framework based on sound research, it also provides the flexibility to adjust the program to meet local needs. Teachers are active participants in the development process and are influential in shaping the program; in fact, because their buy-in is critical to success, in most TAP schools, the teachers voted on whether to implement the program. TAP encourages teamwork, not competition: There are no caps on the number of teachers in a school who can receive the incentives, and evaluations include schoolwide student achievement goals. Sandra Feldman, former president of the American Federation of Teachers, has said that TAP “exemplifies the principle of putting teacher compensation in the context of improving student achievement ...”²⁰

Early results revealed by local measurements and by the TAP evaluation are impressive. TAP schools outperformed comparison schools in all six states that were reviewed, as measured by individual student achievement gains from one year to the next. In addition, almost two-thirds of TAP teachers were able to help their students make greater gains than teachers in comparison schools. At Andersen Open Elementary of Minneapolis, after just one year of TAP, student proficiency on the Basic Skills Test soared from 39 to 62 percent in reading and from 29 to 39 percent in math. In Columbus, OH, after just one year of TAP, South High School outperformed its peers: The number of students scoring proficient or above increased by 1.5 percentage points in reading and 9.7 percent in math, while peer schools declined by an average of 12 percentage points in reading and made no gains in math.

Teacher attrition at TAP schools also has been reduced: For example, in Bell Street Middle School, SC, turnover rates that previously ranged 30–40 percent annually have consistently been less than 10 percent since the third year of TAP implementation.²¹

TAP’s evaluation included a teacher survey and compared responses to other national teacher surveys. The findings indicate that “TAP teachers support the four elements of TAP, and their support grows the longer they are in the program ... TAP teachers found their professional development to be more useful in improving their effectiveness in the classroom than teachers nationwide ... [and] performance pay has neither led to competition nor susceptibility to principal bias in TAP schools.”²² Some 70 percent of TAP teachers reported “high levels of collegiality” at their schools.

This compelling model has been adopted by and tailored to meet the unique needs of over 180 traditional, charter, and private schools and is still growing in 14 states and the District of Columbia.

The Committee was particularly impressed by one approach that integrates those four elements and is being successfully implemented throughout the nation: the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). The TAP model uses a variety of research-based strategies in a holistic approach to improve student achievement. It fosters a culture of collaboration and continuous improvement and rewards teachers for their success. Through this approach, teachers are supported and students benefit. (A general description of TAP is provided in the sidebar “Teacher Advancement Program”; a more extensive discussion of TAP and its results is provided in Appendix I.)

A comprehensive strategy to recruiting and retaining skilled, knowledgeable teachers resonates. In 2004, the Teaching Commission, a diverse group of leaders in government, business, and education, reached consensus and made recommendations that included all four components described here.²³ In addition, in 2007, the Working Group on Teacher Quality endorsed a holistic compensation model such as that which the Committee finds compelling.²⁴

While the Committee believes that incorporating these four elements into one program will support teachers throughout the system and invigorate the profession, the state will need to make additional investments to implement this model. Extrapolating from the statewide professional practice and compensation categorical program implemented in Minnesota (described in the sidebar “Minnesota Models Statewide Professional Practice”), the Committee estimates the full cost of implementing this type of comprehensive professional practice model for teachers and administrators — including professional compensation, incentive pay for master and mentor teachers and teachers in hard-to-staff schools, designing and implementing a rigorous evaluation system, providing targeted professional development, and monitoring the system over time to ensure that the program is effective — will be approximately \$500 per pupil, given California’s circumstances.

Minnesota Models Statewide Professional Practice

In 2005, Minnesota implemented a statewide categorical program — based on the TAP model — that provides districts with incentive grants to implement a comprehensive professional practice model. The Quality Compensation for Teachers program (Q Comp) combines career advancement; targeted professional development; a locally agreed-upon peer observation process for every teacher that is based on skills, responsibilities, and student academic growth; and a restructured compensation system that “unties” compensation solely from considerations of seniority and education course credits and moves to one that is based on professional standards of performance.

For 2007–08, Minnesota set aside enough funding to fund Q Comp (the primary cost of which is the performance-based compensation augmentations) for districts serving about 50 percent of students statewide. School districts also can levy up to an additional \$70 per student locally; this local levy is not required to receive state funds and is partially equalized by the state.

Since participation in Q Comp is voluntary, each district must opt into the program, and it must have local union support. To date, districts have submitted implementation plans to the state for approval; those districts for which plans have been approved have begun to implement the program. As of summer 2007, 37 districts and 14 charter schools had joined Q Comp, and additional districts have expressed interest.

Because the Minnesota program incorporates the general principles and elements of the TAP model favored by this Committee, that state’s legislation and implementation approach create a template on which California’s model could be built.

Keys to successful implementation

The Committee's review of best practices across the nation identified several additional factors that are key to successful implementation of a professional practice model.

First, it is critical that teachers support professionalization reforms. Jim Guthrie, professor at Vanderbilt University and former principal researcher for Policy Analysis for California Education, recognized the importance of teacher buy-in in his work with districts implementing such programs when he noted that "I just put myself in their shoes. All of a sudden, you are going to change the rules, and you're not going to talk to me?" A standard framework that is based on sound research should be developed and provided by the state, while still encouraging educators to tailor the program to meet their unique local needs.

Schools also need to be able to build on their existing infrastructure and human capital and have the flexibility to make what could be fundamental changes. This may include modifications to the typical school schedule, team-oriented approaches to instruction, or new leadership roles for teachers.

District support is essential to help ensure the long-term viability of any such program. District leaders can help by implementing data systems, securing professional development opportunities based on the needs identified by the school, demonstrating the political will to stay the course, and dedicating the financial and human resources necessary to maintain the program.

The state also has an important role to play in supporting the implementation of comprehensive professional practice and compensation reform. Dan Goldhaber (2006) identifies several roles for the state, including investing in longitudinal data and analysis systems that link teachers to students in ways that can provide valid and reliable data to local districts and allow the state to evaluate the efficacy of state policies.²⁵ In addition, by providing a flexible framework and some funding for implementing these programs, the state can potentially serve as a political buffer for local school districts exploring this approach. Flexibility in implementation also allows the state to learn from a variety of models and refine state policy over time.

Overcoming the stigma of merit pay

In considering these policies, the Committee was not unaware that California has had a troubled history with alternative compensation models. Previous alternative compensation proposals in California, such as merit pay, were criticized for being poorly implemented, inherently unfair, unstable, ineffectively funded, and illogical insofar as they were driven by a state-level measure of local teachers' performance based on a single indicator. Other states also have implemented merit-pay schemes that were based only on test scores or placed arbitrary quotas on the number of teachers who could receive performance-based awards — both of which have been widely regarded as inappropriate or insufficient. The Committee does not disagree with many of these criticisms of more simplistic proposals that have been pursued here or elsewhere in the past; it does not endorse such proposals for California's educators.

While prior alternative compensation models have been controversial, there is growing interest in exploring more comprehensive approaches to compensation that provide educators with appropriate support and incentives. Teachers themselves are open to rethinking the traditional compensation models.²⁶ And some public opinion research suggests that parents support increased pay for effective teachers, principals, and superintendents and see it as one of the most effective ways to improve schools.

In its extensive review, the Committee found evidence that sophisticated models of differential compensation, when implemented well, can serve as a strong incentive for recruitment and retention in the profession and can promote enhanced effectiveness of teachers. The Committee observed several models that incorporate compensation reform in a manner that

attempts to address the weaknesses of prior initiatives. When multiple indicators of performance — not just state assessments — are used to reward effective teachers with additional pay and identify relevant training opportunities to enhance their craft, when the evaluation process is designed so that the results are consistent no matter who is conducting the evaluation, and when the model is developed and implemented locally in consultation with teachers, educators can trust in the fairness and benefit from the incentives that stem from these changes.

Denver and New York City Show Other Compensation Reform Models

Denver ProComp Demonstrates Taxpayer Support for Compensation Reform

Denver's Professional Compensation System for Teachers (ProComp) was pilot-tested by the district for four years. In 2005, Denver citizens voted to approve a \$25 million tax increase to fully implement the plan. ProComp includes compensation enhancements, in the form of both one-time bonuses and permanent salary increases, based on set criteria that apply to four component areas, as follow: (1) market incentives to teach in hard-to-staff schools and subject areas; (2) growth in student achievement, which includes both individual teacher and schoolwide targets; (3) teacher knowledge and skills, such as college coursework, professional development units and National Board certification; and (4) the results of professional evaluations by the school's principal or other building administrator. Teachers hired before 2006 were given an opportunity to opt in to ProComp, while all new teachers employed after 2006 are automatically enrolled. Denver also has secured a five-year, \$22.6 million federal grant through the Teacher Incentive Fund to develop a professional compensation system for principals; that work is under way.

An early evaluation of Denver's ProComp suggests that the program has not been in effect long enough to make conclusive findings about the program's impact on student achievement. However, the early work in pilot schools found that the program increased the schools' and district's focus on student achievement; teachers believed that collaboration had not be adversely effected; and pilot teachers were less fearful of performance-based compensation than were their district counterparts in non-ProComp schools.²⁷

New York City Recently Adopts Performance-Based Compensation

The New York City school system also recently adopted a performance-based compensation plan, developed in conjunction with the United Federation of Teachers, that will be implemented at 200 lower-performing schools in 2007 and will increase to encompass 400 schools in 2008. The bonus funding will be provided to schools based on the school's gains in student achievement. Each school that meets its schoolwide performance targets will receive \$3,000 per teacher. Once the funding is distributed to the school site, a four-member team — two lead teachers, the principal, and a principal's appointee — will determine the precise distribution of the funding across the staff. The funding can be distributed evenly or targeted to exceptional teachers, depending upon the decision of this team. The team may not use seniority as a criterion for receipt of bonus funding.

It also is critical that *all* teachers have an opportunity to receive any form of financial incentives — above and beyond base pay — that are associated with performance. The Committee would not recommend professional compensation absent inherent links to targeted professional development and critical supports, such as peer coaching by mentor or master teachers, that can strengthen every teacher's knowledge and talents. And those who help their peers also should be rewarded for those roles. The purpose of effective professional compensation is not to single out winners and losers, but to treat teachers as professionals in order to recruit, retain, and support the best and the brightest.

A 2007 report, written by 18 of the nation's most accomplished teachers (including teachers of the year, National Board-certified teachers, Milken award recipients) for the Center of Teaching Quality, came to many of the same conclusions. The study proposed radical changes in the way teachers have traditionally been compensated, including rewarding small teams of teachers who raise student achievement together; rewarding teachers who accept challenging assignments in high-needs schools and strengthen connections between school and community; and redesigning pay systems so that teacher success, not seniority or

graduate degrees, determines maximum teacher pay. The group also said that accomplished teachers must have an important voice in any new agreements, which should be negotiated at the local level.²⁸

A number of major school districts, including Denver, Columbus, and New York, and several states, such as Florida, Idaho, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Texas, are implementing various forms of professional compensation. Many use a hybrid approach that includes multiple measures of teacher quality. The sidebar “Denver and New York City Show Other Compensation Reform Models,” on previous page, showcases some multifaceted models from which California can learn as it implements the compensation element of a comprehensive professional practice model.

Finally, some argue that performance-based compensation does not belong in a collaborative environment, such as an effective school setting. However, research shows that the availability of opportunities for advancement and increased compensation are important to current and prospective teachers, as is the case for candidates in other professions. In fact, Susanna Loeb *et al.* (2007) note that a significant body of research demonstrates that teachers, like workers in other occupations, consider wages when deciding whether to teach, where to teach, and whether to quit the profession.²⁹ This stands in contrast to an often-overstated contention that, because working conditions and other factors are so critical to a teacher’s effectiveness, salary is not a significant motivating factor in determining whether to teach.

This body of evidence and these successful practices elsewhere show great promise. The failures of the past must not be allowed to preclude California from moving forward in fair and appropriate ways that show promise of enhancing the professionalism of teaching and providing proper incentives toward and rewards for effective performance.

Recommendation 1.1: Implement a Professional Model of Teaching in California

Based on the compelling research and lessons being learned from across the country, the Committee recommends that a new professional practice model of teaching be progressively implemented in schools throughout California to better support the effectiveness of all teachers and reward them appropriately. This professional model integrates four key elements: career advancement opportunities for teachers; ongoing, job-embedded, targeted professional development; evaluations based on professional standards; and professional compensation. The state should establish broad tenets or standards for all elements of the program, consistent with the parameters described below, and then specific implementation steps should be developed locally in partnership between a district’s and/or school’s leadership and its teachers’ union — allowing local educators the flexibility to shape the program to meet their local needs. The Committee specifically recommends that the state provide additional, targeted resources beyond existing levels of General Fund support for schools where the model is implemented in whole, primarily to support discrete salary augmentations for the professional compensation element of the model, as well as for planning time and training. The essential elements of the teacher professional practice model recommended by the Committee are:

- **Career advancement opportunities for teachers.** The Committee recommends implementing a new system that will provide opportunities for teachers to assume more responsibility and instructional leadership roles within the school as they become more skilled — while still teaching. Over time, teachers would have opportunities to advance from inductees to career, mentor, or master teachers, depending on their interests and abilities. As they progress in their careers, teachers’ qualifications, roles, and responsibilities would increase, with commensurate compensation provided. This model incorporates a shared leadership approach that requires the school principal and the master and mentor teachers to work collaboratively to establish the school’s goals and its approaches to providing a high-quality, standards-based education to every child.
- **Ongoing, job-embedded, targeted professional development.** The Committee further recommends that teachers be provided opportunities for professional development that are targeted at the specific development needs of the teacher and

focused on the instructional needs of that teacher's students. This professional development optimally would be provided during the school day, organized for grade-level teams, with the guidance and oversight of master and mentor teachers.

- **Evaluation based on professional standards.** The Committee's recommended practice model also includes meaningful accountability for teachers, based on appropriate local evaluation of their performance as measured against clearly articulated standards of practice and based on the achievement growth of their students. The professional standards would be developed by the state and allow for limited local interpretation; the Committee recommends that these be modeled on the professional standards of the TAP program. The system must be designed to improve instruction, not to separate teachers into "winner" and "loser" categories. Each evaluation should provide constructive feedback that helps guide an individual teacher's professional growth so that each teacher will have an opportunity to improve his or her teaching. Administrators and master teachers who are trained in effective evaluation techniques would conduct teacher performance reviews, which would include observation multiple times over the course of a school year. The evaluation process must ensure reliability regardless of who is conducting the evaluation to ensure that teachers perceive the system as "fair."
- **Professional compensation linked to performance.** In addition to career advancement, the Committee recommends that teachers be eligible to earn additional compensation, beyond their base salary, that is based on their performance. This compensation model would directly reward teachers for their roles and responsibilities, for gains in student academic achievement (at the school and classroom levels), and for other performance evaluation results, such as the demonstrated advancement of their skills and knowledge. Incentives should be available to all teachers (and to the principal) at a school, regardless of the subject area or grade taught. Compensation structures also should provide higher rewards for effective teachers teaching in a district's hard-to-staff schools and subject areas.

This new approach to professionalizing teaching in California stands in sharp contrast to the current system in which (1) teachers have little career advancement opportunity without leaving the classroom, (2) professional development entails a few one-size-fits-all pre-service days at the start of the school year that generally are regarded as low quality, (3) teachers' evaluations are largely meaningless after their second year of service, and (4) compensation is based solely on a teacher's years of experience and education level.

The Committee believes that this professional model will make it more rewarding to be a teacher, allowing good teachers to learn better teaching strategies and advance professionally without leaving the classroom. It will hold teachers accountable for their performance while allowing them to earn higher salaries. It will provide local communities necessary latitude to meet their unique needs and ultimately, and most importantly, will benefit the students of California.

Recommendation 1.2: Implement a Professional Model of Education Leadership in California

The Committee recommends phased statewide implementation of a professional practice model for education leaders to support their growth and development, reward their accomplishment, and hold them accountable. The Committee's recommendation consists of three key components, mirroring those for teachers in Recommendation 1.1:

- **Ongoing, job-embedded professional development and support.** The Committee recommends that principals, superintendents, and other education leaders be provided ongoing professional development that can prepare them for success in the multiple leadership roles they are expected to carry out. This professional development should be targeted at the specific development needs of the administrator, as well as the needs of the school or district, as appropriate. Administrators also should receive other professional support, including improved training and induction programs discussed in detail in Recommendation 1.5.

- **Evaluation based on professional standards.** The Committee recommends that meaningful accountability be applied to education leaders in schools and districts, based on appropriate local evaluation of their performance as measured against clearly articulated standards of practice and based on the achievement growth of students within their jurisdictions. The professional standards would be developed by the state and allow for limited local interpretation. Here, again, the evaluation system must be designed to foster the improvement of performance, providing constructive feedback toward each administrator’s professional growth.
- **Professional compensation linked to performance.** The Committee further recommends that education leaders be eligible to earn additional compensation, beyond their base salary, that is based on their performance. In part, this compensation model would reward administrators for gains in student academic achievement within their jurisdictions, for addressing the needs of parents, staff, and other stakeholders, and for other performance evaluation results. As with the Committee’s teacher proposals, administrator compensation structures also should provide higher rewards for effective principals serving in a district’s hard-to-staff schools.

This model for professionalizing education leadership will make these positions more attractive to high-quality candidates. It will enhance their capacity to succeed and, in doing so, will help balance the state’s accountability system, which already holds principals accountable for success without addressing capacity-building or incentives that support it.

Recommendation 1.3: Narrow the Teacher and Administrator Quality Gap

Even as California implements professional models that will enhance the effectiveness of personnel in all schools, the state must take specific actions to rectify the harsh disparities between the qualifications and effectiveness of educators working in schools serving low-income children and those serving more affluent communities. Research has shown that teachers like to return to communities that are similar to those in which they grew up or in communities near where they attended college.³⁰ This makes it difficult to recruit and retain teachers in some hard-to-staff communities. For example, some of the areas of the state that are experiencing high enrollment growth, such as the Inland Empire, have college attendance rates below the statewide average; fewer college graduates in the area, in turn, increase the difficulty of recruiting and retaining teachers there in the future. Central urban areas face similar problems related to the employment of teachers. The state must consider this circumstance when developing programs to assist hard-to-staff schools and districts. Programs such as the New Teacher Project (discussed below) develop creative ways to bring people into the profession to teach in urban schools serving impoverished communities, including the recruitment of a diverse set of midcareer professionals. The state should take advantage of such efforts. The Committee recommends that the state and districts employ multiple strategies to help close the teacher and administrator quality gap, including:

1.3.1: Provide incentive pay

The Committee specifically recommends that additional compensation be provided to reward teachers and principals who are demonstrated to be effective (pursuant to the professional models above) and who teach and lead in schools that serve high concentrations of low-income and minority students.

1.3.2: Identify and plan to mitigate the disparity in educator quality

An initial concern is that these disparities of quality often go unaddressed; therefore, the Committee recommends implementation of specific identification and planning processes to ensure that efforts are being targeted at alleviating the teacher and administrator quality gap. Public reporting of school-level finance information, which already is statutorily required, will help districts publicly identify schools that are in need of improvement. School districts will first determine, and then report publicly, which schools have the greatest shortages of effective teachers; these needs assessments would include comparisons

of teacher effectiveness in chronically underperforming schools and those that are meeting state performance goals. Districts then will develop and publish mitigation plans to address the identified needs.

1.3.3: Use targeted student-centered funds for promising practices

The hard-to-staff schools that suffer from the educator quality gap generally serve the students who will generate targeted additional funding under the student-centered finance model the Committee recommends implementing statewide (as described in the Finance chapter). Therefore, the Committee recommends that districts apply some of those resources to implement their local mitigation plans, as well as to pursue practices likely to increase the number of effective educators who are particularly needed in those schools:

- Improve the overall working conditions of the school, consistent with survey data that describe working conditions as one of the most prominent considerations in determining where teachers work; and
- Provide the necessary supports to reduce attrition from the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program. This “grow-your-own” program draws on the diverse pool of committed individuals already serving in these communities and helps them become teachers, while addressing two reported barriers: the length of the program and the dual pressures of working while studying for a bachelor’s degree and then a credential.

1.3.4: Expand alternative teacher and administrator training programs to provide high-quality candidates

As discussed in detail below, the Committee recommends several alternative teacher and administrator training programs — building on existing, standards-based alternatives — that will bring into teaching a set of candidates who are more diverse than those who usually participate in traditional preparation routes. To some extent, these new alternative routes will specifically target teachers making commitments to work in hard-to-staff schools.

1.3.5: Create a Teach for California program

The Committee recommends the creation of the Teach for California program, a public-private partnership specifically designed to bring the best and the brightest from the nation’s top universities into California’s hard-to-staff schools. Building on the successful model of Teach for America (a national nonprofit that helps districts recruit and train teachers), the state would support the recruitment, pedagogical training, and placement of these high-achieving candidates through several routes, including the apprenticeship program — the traditional intern program — or through a summer “boot-camp” approach, dependent on the candidates’ interests and needs. Candidates would be recruited from the nation’s most competitive universities; they would then come to California for training and would commit to teach for at least two years in hard-to-staff schools.

The New Teacher Project

The New Teacher Project (TNTP) works in partnership with several large urban school districts, including Baltimore, New York City, Philadelphia, and Washington, DC, to improve their recruitment and retention of teachers in hard-to-staff schools. For example, in Baltimore, TNTP and the Baltimore City Public School System are working in partnership on a systemic approach to confronting teacher training and recruiting needs at the district’s lowest-performing schools. TNTP not only identifies and trains hundreds of high-achieving career-changers to become teachers, but also builds capacity in these schools to develop effective hiring procedures. Instead of taking a passive role, TNTP actively recruits teachers, trains them, and then helps to place them in schools with the greatest need. This approach has recruited a diverse, high-quality group of teachers. College candidates have high college grade point averages, many with master’s degrees; many TNTP recruits teach in hard-to-staff subjects, such as math, science, and special education.

Expanding the Quality and Supply of New Teacher Candidates

As noted above, California faces dramatic shortages of teachers over the course of the next decade. However, the summary conclusion of the Getting Down to Facts studies finds that “California does not have a coherent system for supporting the entry, development, and retention of quality teachers and administrators.”³¹ The Committee believes that the state must do a better job of supporting these objectives throughout the system. The Committee’s recommendations to professionalize teaching and administration would provide support for educators after they have entered the system, by helping each teacher and administrator improve their craft through rigorous evaluation and targeted professional development.

Research from the Teachers College, Columbia University, Finds That Teacher Education Programs Are Deficient

A study conducted by Arthur Levine, who recently left the presidency of Teachers College, Columbia University, to become president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, concludes that a majority of teacher education graduates are prepared in university-based programs that suffer from low admission and graduation standards.³² Their faculties, curricula, and research are disconnected from school practice and practitioners. Program quality varies widely, with most teachers prepared in lower-quality programs. Both state and accreditation standards for maintaining quality are ineffective.

“Too often, teacher education programs cling to an outdated, historically flawed vision of teacher education that is at odds with a society remade by economic, demographic, technological, and global change. Equally troubling, the nation is deeply divided about how to reform teacher education to most effectively prepare teachers to meet today’s new realities ...” Levine says.

Many students are graduating from teacher education programs without the skills and knowledge they need to be effective teachers, according to both these graduates and their employers. More than three out of five teacher education alumni surveyed (62 percent) report that schools of education do not prepare their graduates to cope with the realities of today’s classrooms. Fewer than half of principals surveyed thought that schools of education were preparing teachers very well or moderately well to integrate technology into their teaching (46 percent); use student performance assessment techniques (42 percent); and implement curriculum and performance standards (41 percent). Only about one-third of principals said that their teachers are very or moderately well-prepared to maintain order in the classroom (33 percent) or address the needs of students with disabilities (30 percent). A shockingly low percentage of principals said that their teachers were very or moderately well-prepared to meet the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds (28 percent); work with parents (21 percent); and help students with limited English proficiency (16 percent).

This section investigates the training that teacher candidates receive prior to entering the K–12 system (pre-service preparation), and the next section analyzes administrator training. The Committee finds that pre-service training is often lacking and makes recommendations to improve teacher and administrator pre-service preparation throughout the state. Others have reached the same conclusion. Research by Arthur Levine (see “Research from the Teachers College, Columbia University, Finds That Teacher Education Programs Are Deficient”) suggests that neither teachers nor administrators believe that current teacher education programs effectively train teachers for the situations they will face when entering the classroom. Congress also shares this concern regarding the quality of teacher preparation programs and has commissioned the National Research Council to conduct a two-year study on teacher preparation programs in the United States.³³

Similar to other areas of education policy, even when the overall quality is not what the state wants or expects, there are promising practices on which to build. The sidebar “Promising Models of Teacher Preparation” cites models of teacher preparation that can inform the broader system and recent developments to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher candidates prior to their entering the profession.

Promising Models of Teacher Preparation

Alternatives to traditional training programs are emerging across the state. Among them are several “grow-your-own” approaches for preparing effective teachers, including:

San Diego-based High Tech High has attracted outstanding teacher candidates with deep content knowledge, many with advanced degrees and real-world experience they can bring to the classroom. However, many of these candidates lack a teacher credential. To meet the needs of these content experts, and because of a discontent with available teacher training options, High Tech High formed a partnership with the University of San Diego to develop a successful teacher intern program as an alternative route for these professionals to earn their credentials. Building on the success that intern program experienced over several years, in summer 2007, High Tech High opened a graduate school of education and is in the process of attaining accreditation for it.

Paula Codeiro, the dean of the education school at the University of San Diego, says: “The model of project-based learning, workplace learning, the [student] internships they have — it’s unique. If you go to any university, you might not get the kind of training you need ... You certainly won’t get it as intensely and customized.”³⁴ As testimony to the appeal of this program insofar as it meets the needs of its candidates, one student has said, “I wouldn’t have [come here] if I had to enroll in school just the standard way. This makes it so much easier.”

Elk Grove Unified School District’s Teacher Education Institute, a partnership with San Francisco State University’s School of Education, allows the district to offer its own teaching credentials. Then-superintendent David Gordon (a member of this Committee) has described the impetus for the program as follows: “When we were unsatisfied with the quality of teachers we were getting, I asked, ‘Why don’t we run our own credentialing program?’ People said we couldn’t possibly do that — but we did it. It was much more effective than what we got from the traditional system.”

The purpose of the Teacher Education Institute is to “prepare effective teachers for the culturally and linguistically diverse classroom of the district,” emphasizing the following qualities: (1) teach to increasingly high standards for students, (2) understand the developmental and cultural needs of students, (3) develop appropriate curriculum, (4) manage the classroom, (5) plan, implement, and evaluate instruction in all subject areas, and (6) partner with the parents and community.

Participants receive 11 months of coursework taught by university faculty and district employees and intensive hands-on experience of observing and student teaching in the classroom with master teachers and principals serving as mentors. Students are grouped into cohorts so that they participate in the program with a known set of colleagues — in response to the district’s identification of teacher isolation as one of the primary impediments to success among novices. The teacher coaches, selected as the district’s most effective professionals, receive additional compensation as an incentive to mentor in addition to their other responsibilities. The district hires over 75 percent of program graduates.

Implementing the Performance Assessment for California Teachers

As one important step toward improving the quality of teacher preparation, California recently implemented the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), which assesses teacher candidates. In the future, passage of PACT will be required for prospective teachers to earn a preliminary teaching credential. PACT is based on the state-adopted set of 13 specific requirements and teaching performance expectations, including:

- Making subject matter comprehensive to students.
- Assessing student learning.
- Engaging and supporting students in learning.
- Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students.
- Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning.
- Developing as a professional educator.

Based on a candidate's student teaching and other training, universities determine how well a candidate performs in each of these 13 areas. Implementation of this assessment could be a positive step for the state, if the results of PACT predict whether a candidate becomes an effective teacher. In some respects, this program can be similar to an effective teacher evaluation program administered once a teacher enters the profession. However, the state will need to verify that this assessment is, in fact, improving the quality of teacher candidates and university training programs. Assuming the state develops a longitudinal student-teacher database and implements a growth measure for the state's assessment, the state will need to verify the predictive nature of this exam by linking the results of the PACT assessment with the future test score gains achieved by the teacher's students. If verified in this way, PACT could contribute to the cycle of continuous improvement the Committee recommends the state develop.

Using technology to promote teacher quality

As California seeks alternative approaches to improving many aspects of the teacher continuum, it also should look to emerging technologies that can support innovative avenues to improve the quality of teaching in California through various forms of professional development and peer support. California already has the primary infrastructure in place, and models of effective use already exist in Michigan and Canada. In LearnCanada, for example, virtual communities of peers can observe each other working, share knowledge, make constructive suggestions and discuss common issues. Such uses of technology can accelerate learning for individuals, support additional "telementoring," and foster the emergence of and broad access to best practices and new knowledge. These technologies can be especially useful in California to overcome time and/or geographical constraints to create opportunities for more teachers to: participate in quality professional development sessions; link with peers and mentors at comparable schools or across districts; or access the latest research-based methodologies.

Improving alternative pathways into teaching

Both of the state's current routes into teaching — a standard fifth-year university preparation program or a teacher intern program — have been criticized for not fully meeting the needs of schools and districts, for different reasons. Current teacher training programs are largely targeted at students who have just completed their undergraduate degrees. The fifth-year university programs often are criticized for being out of touch with and unable to adjust to district's needs, and teachers complain that those programs do not provide them with the applied skills they require to be successful in the classroom at the beginning of their careers. Many of them, especially those at public universities, also require that candidates attend full time during the day, which limits the candidate pool to those who can give up their existing employment while preparing to become a teacher. While the intern program has been successful at (1) quickly increasing the supply of teachers, (2) recruiting a more diverse group of teacher candidates, and (3) improving the retention rates in the profession, the intern programs do have their shortcomings, beginning with the fact that children in the classrooms they serve are being taught by someone who has not yet met minimal qualifications.

Interns are often critical of their programs because they generally must teach full time as they complete pedagogic coursework on nights and weekends' while also participating in mentoring activities. Thus, while candidates face the most difficult year of their teaching career during the day, they have coursework at nights and on weekends, leaving little time to prepare for classes or grade papers. Finally, because they are teaching full time, these interns have insufficient time to observe master teachers or perform clinical classroom work.

Getting Down to Facts summarizes the research on various pre-service preparation options. "There is little evidence on the effects of pre-service education requirements, and that which does exist is mixed. There is strong evidence, however, that pre-service requirements affect the pool of potential teachers. Intern routes with reduced pre-service coursework tend to attract a larger pool of candidates. While there is much to learn about which requirements improve teaching and which deter good teachers from entering the classroom, the evidence so far suggests that policies that address pre-service requirements can have substantial impacts."³⁵

Recommendation 1.4: Improve the Quality and Expand the Supply of New Teacher Candidates

The Committee recommends a series of changes to strengthen the quality of teacher candidates entering the profession. To improve the current teacher training program offerings, the Committee recommends three alternative pathways that, when combined with current programs, will offer teacher candidates at a variety of stages in their careers a continuum of training options that best match their needs. In the short term, these new training programs will help to meet the demands for new teachers to replace retirees. In the long term, these programs will provide competition to the current teacher training, which will force all of the programs to improve their quality. Because these new training programs are superior to current programs, the Committee believes that, over time, the new programs will replace many of the traditional training programs and eliminate the need for the existing intern program.

The Committee, however, recommends that data and program evaluations be used to verify these expectations. In fact, as with other recommendations, data-driven improvements will play an important role in improving the quality of *all* teacher training programs over time. The Committee recommends that data be provided to each teacher training program on the effectiveness of its recently trained teacher candidates and that these data be provided publicly to inform the pre-service program selection decisions of future teacher candidates.

1.4.1: Create an Integrated Teacher Training Program that incorporates the best traits of teacher internships and traditional teacher training

The Committee recommends that the state empower the State Board of Education (under the current governance structure), and subsequently the Secretary of Education (under the new governance structure discussed in the Governance and Accountability chapter), to authorize county superintendents, school districts, higher education institutions, or teacher's unions to develop pre-service teacher training programs that combine the best elements of the traditional training programs with the benefits of the teacher intern program, pursuant to rigorous program accreditation standards. These integrated training programs would build on the structure of the current internship option but would allow participants a more gradual assumption of teaching duties over the duration of the program. Specifically, the training provider would administer a teacher preparation program that provides coursework and student teaching components similar to those of a traditional university program. This training would be more rigorous than that of the intern program because the candidates would not be engaged in the full-time teaching load that interns must carry.

This applied preparation model would provide substantially more observation/clinical time than current programs offer. In addition, the program could integrate the educational philosophy of the district, making the training more relevant to the candidates as they transition to being full-time teachers the following year. The training provider would be able to adjust the level of support that individual candidates need to be successful. Each candidate would be matched with a master teacher who would play a critical role in the training process, helping the candidate understand both the culture of the district and the art of teaching. Because the district or county would have an inherent interest in ensuring that only the most competent candidates successfully complete the process, the district and/or county could help counsel some candidates out of the profession while recruiting the best candidates as permanent teachers. The state would provide a level of financial support — similar to that which it currently provides to the California State University system to train teachers — to offset additional employment costs of freeing candidates from the classroom for part of the school day and would allow the provider to charge a modest tuition (primarily to ensure that only the most committed candidates apply).

1.4.2: Create a teacher apprenticeship program in targeted schools

Building on the Integrated Training Program described above, the Committee further recommends the creation of a preparation program — also offered by county offices of education, districts, higher education institutions, or unions — that would provide candidates a stipend while they participate in an apprenticeship offered exclusively in hard-to-staff schools. The program would attempt to recruit candidates who live or grew up in the targeted school’s community and are therefore more likely to have a continuing commitment to that community. Similar to the Integrated Training Program, the candidates would be matched with a master teacher who would play a significant role in their training. Their preparation would combine practical training and theoretical training. By training these teachers in low-income communities, the candidates would learn classroom management strategies and other skills that are specific to these types of schools.

The Committee believes that this type of program would be more effective in recruiting diverse candidates than current loan-forgiveness or scholarship programs, because it would provide greater financial support to candidates in the short term. Also, the program likely would improve candidates’ likelihood of long-term success by eliminating the financial incentive to begin full-time teaching with little or no preparation and by exposing and specifically training candidates for a high-needs school environment.

1.4.3: Empower county superintendents to grant exceptional candidates an exemplary credential

Building on the premise of the existing “eminence credential,” the Committee recommends that California recognize that many exceptional teaching candidates could immediately, or with little additional training, be outstanding teachers. By way of example, the Committee heard numerous examples of prospective candidates with advanced degrees and experience *teaching* in college or university settings who nevertheless would need to participate in a full one-year university program or a two-year internship to receive a credential and teach in California’s K–12 schools. California’s current bureaucratic system of credentialing often requires such candidates to go back to school to meet additional coursework requirements — a requirement based on assessments (conducted by higher education institutions) that may serve the interests of the institutions involved more than the needs of the candidate. Many candidates in these situations choose not to return to college, and rather pursue other careers. Each time the public schools lose one of these outstanding candidates, it is a likely loss for hundreds of students.

The Committee recommends allowing districts and county superintendents to use their professional judgment and common sense to determine whether a candidate is competent to teach effectively pursuant to California’s standards. Specifically, a candidate would have to identify a school district that determines the candidate to be highly qualified. The district would then submit the candidate to the county superintendent for review, and the superintendent could grant the candidate an exemplary credential. To be eligible for this process, the candidate would be required to prove his or her subject-matter competence through

either an exam or college degree, and the county superintendent would evaluate the candidate's other work and teaching experience to make a final determination.

As quality assurance, the Committee further recommends that the state limit the number of exemplary credentials that may be authorized at any time, as well as their duration, and that the state use outcome data on these teachers' performance to hold county superintendents accountable for the quality of the teachers to whom they granted an exemplary credential. Because these teachers are expected to be truly exemplary and have entered the profession using this innovative credentialing approach, the Committee believes that these candidates do not need the same level of guarantee for tenure. As such, the Committee recommends that these teachers not receive tenure until their credential is renewed after a five-year period. This provides the district and the county superintendent the opportunity to ensure that this candidate is truly exemplary and prepared to serve in any school in the state prior to their receiving tenure.

1.4.4: Support an EnCorps program for math and science teachers

The Committee recommends the creation of a statewide EnCorps program to assist recent or prospective retirees from the business community who have real-world experience in math and science to train to become teachers of those subjects. Americans are retiring earlier, and 55 percent of upcoming retirees who indicate their intent to continue working express an interest in teaching.³⁶ This group of highly educated individuals affords the state an opportunity to bring into teaching a pool of candidates who possess the subject-matter knowledge to make great teachers in critical shortage areas. These candidates only require pedagogic training to attain their credential.

The EnCorps program, begun in 2007 with the initial support of the Sherry Lansing Foundation and the New Schools Venture Fund, brings together active corporate sponsors — the initial set includes IBM, Qualcomm, Chevron, Bank of America, and eight others — in a public-private partnership that will help the corporations' retirees receive the preparation, training, and ongoing transitional support they need to become and remain teachers. The state can partner with this effort through its expansion of alternative pathways into the teaching profession, including the intern program, the integrated teacher training programs, and exemplary credential recommended earlier. In addition, the Committee recommends the state provide financial support in the form of tuition grants or other appropriate mechanisms to these candidates who commit to teaching in a hard-to-staff school for at least five years.

1.4.5: Reform accreditation and credentialing processes and eliminate the Commission on Teaching Credentialing

The Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CTC) has three principal functions: (1) accrediting teacher preparation programs, (2) credentialing teachers, and (3) monitoring teacher conduct. While the Committee believes that the state or an appointed entity of the state will be needed to continue each of these operations, far more efficient processes can be used to achieve the ultimate goal — improving the quality of teaching — than the current approaches taken by CTC and that, ultimately, an independent agency is not needed to carry out those functions. Committee members heard extensive criticism about how CTC is carrying out its processes and found particularly compelling a report by the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), *Modernizing the Functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing*. Based largely on the specific findings of that report, the Committee recommends dramatically altering the first two functions of CTC, reassigning to an alternative entity responsibility for the third, and in the process, eliminating CTC.³⁷ Through this process, the responsibilities currently overseen by CTC would be transferred to the California Department of Education (CDE).

The Committee makes three specific recommendations related to revising the oversight of teacher and administrator preparation; taken in concert, these would eliminate any need for CTC:

- **Revise education program accreditation.** Currently the state’s required accreditation process for teacher programs supplements the regional and national systems for institutions — all of California’s university programs are regionally accredited by either the Western Association of Schools and Colleges or the North Central Accreditation Association; approximately one-quarter of universities also are nationally accredited. The state’s process of accrediting university-based teacher and administrator preparation programs was temporarily discontinued in the early 2000s because of budget constraints. During the last review period, CTC and accreditation teams visited 73 campuses and accredited all of them. The current system has several shortcomings that have been highlighted in the recent LAO report; in a statutorily required evaluation of the state’s accreditation system by the American Institutes for Research (AIR); and in some cases, in CTC-prepared documents on the issue.³⁸ The cited shortcomings include the following:
 - *Standards are vague, and the reviews are subjective.* While the current standards appear complex (institutions must meet 10 general preconditions, program-specific preconditions, eight common standards, 19 program standards, and 116 program elements), the AIR evaluation concluded that these standards were vague and that the reviews were subjective, with different review teams employing different interpretations of the standards. This problem was exacerbated by the difficulty of finding and retaining qualified reviewers.
 - *The system is almost entirely input-oriented.* Rather than focus on the effective preparation of teachers, the reviews examine the inputs available at an institution, as a presumed proxy for a quality program offering. For example, in the most recent accreditation visit to California State University, Los Angeles, the accreditation team conducted 991 interviews including faculty, administrators, candidates, graduates, and employers of graduates. In addition, team members reviewed 15 different types of documents. Despite all this gathering of information, almost none of the data were related to outcomes. As documented by CTC: “little in the way of outcome data has been collected to determine institutional effectiveness.”
 - *Basic process is inadequate.* Because the reviews focus on the institution instead of individual programs, an institution’s accreditation may be renewed even if some of its programs are poor. Also, the reviews occur too infrequently, ranging from every five to seven years apart (longer in the recent past because of budget cuts). Finally, the quality of the information that universities submitted to reviewers varied dramatically enough that AIR concluded that it affected the validity of the accreditation decisions.

Because of these shortcomings, the Committee believes that the current accreditation process is ineffective, and also is costly as a result of the quantity of institutional staff time involved in the accreditation process. Rather than maintain this system, the Committee recommends the state implement a streamlined, performance-based accreditation system that focuses on outcomes.

Under the new system, teacher and administrator preparation programs would report annual summary data on various outcomes, including average scores on state-required teacher assessments (see discussion of PACT, above), graduation rates, employment rates, three-year retention rates, and employer satisfaction rates. These data would annually determine the accreditation status of each program at each university. Based on that data, programs that did not meet expectations would be given a period to improve their quality or face the loss of accreditation. The state could then provide technical assistance to these struggling programs so that they might improve.

This approach to accreditation would dramatically refocus schools of education on the quality of the candidates that they produce and on supporting those candidates as they transition into the public school system. The Committee recommends that this streamlined accreditation function be transferred to the CDE.

- **Deregulate the teacher credentialing process to remove unnecessary barriers.** The current process of credentialing teachers is overly complex, inefficient, and riddled with wasteful bureaucratic steps and redundancies. Each additional requirement that has been added to the credentialing process over time was intended to improve the quality of

teachers that make it through the process. At times, the state may not have recognized that the additional requirements might actually discourage a potential candidate from pursuing a career in teaching; while each additional requirement might only demand modest additional effort for a teacher candidate, when the requirements are taken in their entirety, the burdens are so great that some exceptional candidates may choose an alternative career path. Over time, the regulatory environment has made it increasingly difficult to become a teacher. Yet, the perceived quality of teachers — or of the relevance of these requirements or their preparation to quality — has changed little.

The Committee believes it is time to reverse the trend and begin to reduce the barriers to receiving a credential, while at the same time increasing the focus on the effectiveness of teachers once they are in the classroom. The credentialing process should be deregulated. Following transfer of CTC responsibilities and authority, as described above, the State Board of Education (if this occurs prior to the implementation of the Committee’s recommendations for the overhaul of state governance) or the Secretary of Education (if the transfer occurs after the governance changes) should consider deregulation efforts that include: reducing course requirements, such as eliminating requirements for individual courses on education technology and on the U.S. Constitution; streamlining teacher testing requirements; and allowing the completion of a college major to demonstrate subject-matter competency. The Committee further recommends reducing the number of credentials by consolidating them into categories and streamlining the fingerprinting process so that candidates are only fingerprinted one time instead of three, as is current practice.

- **Transfer teacher conduct monitoring.** The Committee recommends that the function of monitoring teacher conduct be maintained and that it be transferred to CDE — to receive direction from the State Board of Education under the current governance structure, or the Secretary of Education pursuant to the Committee’s proposed governance reorganization. Specifically, an advisory committee should be established by the relevant managing entity, to perform specific conduct reviews in a similar manner as the current process. The CTC staff currently involved in this particular activity also would be transferred to CDE to continue the function.

Louisiana Overhauls and Monitors Its Schools of Education

Starting in 2000, the state required all of its teacher preparation institutes to overhaul their education programs. Following the movement to statewide K–12 standards, the teacher preparation institutes were mandated to redesign their programs to align to the new education approach.³⁹ Since 2003, the state has been tracking the teachers educated in these programs. For each teacher, the state evaluation has measured the growth in each newly trained teacher’s students’ achievement using value-added assessments. Using these data and other measures, the state is able to provide information to the schools of education on the effectiveness of its teachers. Early results for the state’s alternative education programs suggest that the redesign has improved the quality of preparation that teachers have received. (Since the alternative routes help teachers enter the classroom more quickly, data already are available.) Over the next few years, the state will acquire information on the teachers trained at each of the 22 teacher preparation schools in the state.

Challenges to Attract, Train, and Retain Quality Administrators

In undertaking the needed efforts to train and retain principals and other site administrators, the state faces all of the same challenges previously discussed in the context of teachers. While no specific data are available for California, national data show that the workforce of principals is aging. Over the last decade, the median age of a principal rose from 48 to 51.⁴⁰ Moreover, recruiting and retaining teachers into hard-to-staff schools requires that the state support the development of strong school leadership, so administrator reform also is integral to teacher reform. Research shows that one of the key traits that beating-the-

odds schools (schools with student achievement that exceeds that of other schools serving similar students) have in common is strong administrative leadership.⁴¹ The Getting Down to Facts research found education leadership development in California to be severely lacking. The report by Linda Darling-Hammond of Stanford University concludes that administrator preparation programs are of uneven quality and that the state's infrastructure for professional development for administrators needs strengthening.⁴²

The new professional practice model proposed in Recommendation 1.2 will support the recruitment of a new generation of administrators and provide them with professional development supports and incentives that parallel those teachers would receive. Today's principal is expected to be an educational visionary, assessment expert, instructional strategies expert, disciplinarian, community builder, crisis manager, communications expert, budget guru, facility manager, special programs administrator, and legal expert. While the Committee's finance and governance recommendations would provide principals with greater autonomy by reducing the amount of paperwork and regulations with which they must comply, principals would be asked to play a greater leadership role in the new governance structure the Committee proposes. Such expectations are daunting to the veteran administrator, let alone to the new administrator attempting to learn his/her job, build relationships, and lead the school. For hard-to-staff schools, where leaders also are expected to dramatically change the local culture in a short time, these challenges make it even more difficult to attract and retain high-quality principals and other administrators, as well as superintendents of the districts that support those most challenged schools. And yet, one of the key working condition variables that impact teacher retention is an effective administrator who supports teachers.

New Leaders for New Schools Helps Train the Next Generation of Leaders

New Leaders for New Schools, a national nonprofit organization that operates in the Bay Area, helps districts to recruit and retain school leaders through several programs.⁴³ It operates a summer institute that provides a rigorous five-week training taught by national education and business leaders. Following the summer institute, the future leader participates in a yearlong, full-time, paid residency in an urban public school, where she works alongside a mentor principal; the residency is linked with intensive academic studies to further develop her leadership skills. With the support of a veteran mentor principal, the future leader is able to attain firsthand experience of how to lead in an urban school environment. Following this year in residency, the future leader is supported by ongoing coaching and mentoring when she becomes a principal. Early indications show that these new leaders are effective once they enter the schools. RAND currently is conducting a multiyear evaluation of the program.

Recommendation 1.5: Expand and Strengthen Administrator Training

It is not surprising that the state faces a shortage of highly skilled principals; and absent intervention, those shortages are likely to grow in the future. Therefore, the Committee recommends an array of strategies to promote the availability of a growing cadre of professional education leaders. As described in Recommendation 1.2, principals and superintendents will participate in the professional practice model that will provide them with enhanced training, support, rigorous evaluation, and performance incentives to enable them to be more successful professionals. In addition, the Committee recommends enacting in the near future three specific changes for administrators, as well as deregulating administrator preparation programs and credentials in ways similar to those the Committee proposes for teacher credentials. Specific recommendations are:

1.5.1: Authorize county-district integrated training

There exists a high level of discontent with credentialing requirements and the quality and relevance of existing administrator training programs that mirrors the discontent with teacher training programs — which led to the Committee's extensive recommendations above. The requirements associated with administrator training restrict districts from targeting their

promising teachers and developing them into administrators, if that is their career preference. Even if district leaders are able to convince a promising candidate to return to college in the evenings, weekends, and summers to pursue an administrator credential, they find that years later, when the candidate attains the credential and is ready to become an administrator, the candidate does not have the skills needed to be effective.

The Committee believes that an alternative approach that focuses more on the necessary skills to be effective would improve the preparation of these candidates. Specifically, the State Board of Education — or the Secretary of Education under the proposed new governance structure — should be empowered to authorize county superintendents or school districts to develop and deliver comprehensive training programs for principals and administrators. In this way, superintendents could identify their best candidates and then train them to make the transition from full-time classroom teaching to school leader or to rise within the ranks of administration. This program would mirror the Integrated Teacher Training Program in order to provide effective support and to ensure that candidates are not overwhelmed by their full-time duties as they are training for new responsibilities. The state would financially support the new program, providing counties or districts with levels of funding similar to what it currently provides CSU to conduct this training.

1.5.2: Create administrator “induction” support

The state currently provides teachers with ongoing training and support during their first two years of teaching (the “induction” period), through the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program (BTSA). This program provides both a mentor and continued professional training for the new teachers. The Committee recommends creating a similar program for administrators. Partnering a new principal, assistant superintendent, or other school or district administrator with a seasoned veteran counterpart to support the novice through his or her first year would both increase the retention rate of new education leaders and improve the quality of their training and, ultimately, their effectiveness.

1.5.3: Develop a school turnaround training program

Becoming a leader in a school that has struggled in the past or has been labeled as low-performing or failing for multiple years is one of the most difficult challenges in education. To enter this type of school and be a positive leader of change requires training beyond the education and curriculum-management preparation that a principal normally would receive. Just as with revitalizing a failing business, part of the focused training required to turn around a low-performing school addresses managing change and leading staff through those changes. As discussed in the Governance and Accountability chapter of this report, California must build capacity to address the needs of a large number of low-performing schools and districts in the state. One of the most important elements of building capacity is the training of leaders who can guide those individual school (and district) transformations. The state must develop an intensive model of preparation specifically for these types of leaders.

Based on a similar program administered by the University of Virginia (see sidebar “Virginia’s Partnership for Leaders in Education”), the Committee recommends the state support a joint venture between the School of Education and the School of Business at a University of California campus to develop a group of school turnaround experts. This program would use the management techniques used to turn around failing businesses to train candidates to turn around failing schools. In the Virginia program, the turnaround expert must successfully turn around a failing school to receive the full accreditation of the program. Similar to the experience in Virginia, this type of training led by the University of California would help the state to improve schools one at a time.

Virginia's Partnership for Leaders in Education

At the University of Virginia, the Graduate School of Business and the School of Education have formed a partnership to deliver an executive education program specifically designed for the needs of a cadre of experts who are charged with turning around consistently low-performing schools. This program combines business management skills with the education school's programs. The program focuses on leadership challenges, strategic change, data-driven decision making, communications, conflict management, sustaining transformation, and leveraging resources. Candidates receive training and earn a credential as an education turnaround specialist. Participants generally are principals who are looking to improve their skills to address the difficulties faced in turning around low-performing schools. To earn this credential, a candidate must not only complete the required coursework, but also must successfully help turn around a failing school, as demonstrated by improved student performance and attaining NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress. Early indications show that principals trained in this program have been able to successfully go on to meet the achievement goals required to receive the credential.

Supporting the Development of the Teacher Workforce

In its investigations, the Committee identified several additional practices that show great promise of enhancing the effectiveness of efforts to recruit, prepare, and professionally develop educators to support California's schools into the future. Too little has been done to attract candidates much earlier in their education careers and to provide them with experiences that can help them decide whether teaching is the right career to pursue — before they invest too much of their time and of their and the state's resources in pursuit of a credential and professional employment opportunities. Also, just as the Committee found elsewhere in the education system, little has been done to evaluate the effectiveness of professional preparation and development programs and to weed out those that are far less effective than others.

Recommendation 1.6: Promote Efficiency in Recruitment and Training Efforts

Several opportunities exist to ensure that the state's and prospective teachers' resources are used more effectively in expanding the teaching pool. The Committee recommends that the state take specific actions to attract candidates earlier and give them experiences to assist with their career choices; to identify and promote the most effective mechanisms for preparing teachers; and to more effectively use resources to support classroom teachers.

1.6.1: Create a college tutoring program to support struggling K–12 students

The Committee recommends the creation of a program that partners K–12 school districts with nearby campuses of either the community colleges or the California State University to provide tutors for struggling K–12 students — while exposing these postsecondary students to the teaching environment as a recruitment mechanism. The state would support this program in geographical areas that have shortages of teachers in core subjects, such as math and science.

First, the community colleges or the California State University would identify a diverse set of students who would be interested in pursuing careers in education. These institutions would jointly develop postsecondary coursework to develop these students' tutoring skills and train them in the specific curriculum of the school district participating in the partnership. Each participating institution would enter into a partnership with a K–12 school, placing the postsecondary students in paid positions to tutor struggling students. Cross-age tutoring programs have been shown to be among the most cost-effective educational interventions.

This program will benefit all participants. College students would have an opportunity to explore a career in education and have a part-time job that is personally rewarding and provides income. Students who are eligible for financial aid could perform this job within their work-study programs. Participating colleges and universities would gain an important tool for recruiting students into the field of education. For the state, generally, past experience in school-based programs suggests that the inclusion of community colleges in this program will enhance the likelihood of bringing a more diverse set of college students into careers in education, and these opportunities may inspire community college students to want to transfer to four-year universities. Most importantly for the immediate needs of K–12 schools, this program will help students who are struggling most intensely in core academic subjects. Since the tutoring will be provided by college students from similar backgrounds as the K–12 students, there is an opportunity to engage struggling students in a way that traditional interventions do not provide.

Finally, this program provides school districts an opportunity to identify outstanding and engaged college students to be candidates in the newly created apprenticeship programs.

1.6.2: Evaluate all teacher training programs

The Committee recommends that as the teacher database becomes operational, the state evaluate the effectiveness of all teacher training and professional development programs - including current university and district models and the new models proposed in this report. Getting Down to Facts summarizes the need for better experimentation, evaluation, and analysis, noting that “while states have implemented slews of teacher policies, they have systematically evaluated very few of them. If this approach does not change, policymakers will be in no better position to learn from experience in the future than they are today.”⁴⁴

Throughout the accreditation process, all fifth-year university-based programs, intern and apprenticeship programs, and any additional state or local professional development programs should be evaluated to determine whether these programs create and support the type of educators that California needs to train and develop. These evaluations will provide an opportunity for these programs to improve and will create a process to eliminate or restructure programs that are not shown to be effective. This type of an evaluation program will support the cycle of continuous improvement the Committee wants the state to create throughout the educational enterprise.

1.6.3: Transition the Peer Assistance and Review program into the new teacher professional practice model

The Committee considers the evaluation and support of teachers by their peers, as well as by school principals, to be critical to improving the quality of teaching in California schools, and includes that as a component of the new teacher professional practice model (see Recommendation 1.1). For this reason, the Committee recommends phasing out the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program and transferring the program’s funding to support the professional model. The PAR program was originally implemented in limited locations and budgets varied from year to year. As a result, PAR generally has not met its initial intent to help to identify and support veteran teachers who need improvement. Instead, much of the PAR funding has been used to partially fulfill the required local match for the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program. The Committee believes it appropriate to transition PAR into the much-improved version of that which PAR intended, within the teacher professional practice model.

Endnotes

¹ The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning generally updates these numbers as part of its annual fall publication. This estimate is from Camille Esch, Christopher Chang-Ross, Daniel Humphrey, Patrick Shields, Juliet Tiffany-Morales, Marjorie Wechsler, and Katrina Woodworth (2005) *The Status of the Teaching Profession 2005* Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, Santa Cruz, CA.

² Guha, Roneeta, Ashley Campbell, Daniel Humphrey, Patrick Shields, Juliet Tiffany-Morales, and Marjorie Wechsler (2006) *California's Teaching Force 2006: Key Issues and Trends*, The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, Santa Cruz, CA.

³ Wechsler, Marjorie, Juliet Tiffany-Morales, Ashley Campbell, Daniel Humphrey, Debbie Kim, Patrick Shields, and Haiwen Wang (2007) *The Status of the Teaching Profession 2007*, The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, Santa Cruz, CA.

⁴ WestEd has a forthcoming report investigating the regional needs for teachers. Investigating the projected enrollment growth in the state, it finds that the areas of the state that are fastest growing may have more difficulty meeting their demand for teachers than some of the urban areas that have historically had difficulty meeting teacher demand.

⁵ Jordan, Heather, Robert Mendro, and Dash Weerasinghe "Teacher Effects on Longitudinal Student Achievement," (Dallas Independent School District, 1997); from *Thinking K-16: Good Teaching Matters: How Well-Qualified Teachers Can Close the Gap* 3, No. 2 (Washington, DC: Education Trust, Summer 1998); Sanders, William, and Sandra Horn "Research Findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Database: Implications for Educational Evaluation and Research," *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12, No. 3 (1998); 247–256; and Haycock, Kati, *Thinking K–16: Good Teaching Matters: How Well-Qualified Teachers Can Close the Gap* 3, No. 2 (Washington, DC: Education Trust, Summer 1998).

⁶ Hanushek, Eric, John Kain, and Steven Rivkin, (1998) *Teachers, Schools and Academic Achievement*, working paper for the National Bureau of Economic Research (Cambridge, MA).

⁷ Guha, Roneeta. *et al.* (2006).

⁸ Peter D. Hart Research, A series of focus groups of college freshmen and college-bound high school seniors (May 25–26, 1999).

⁹ Esch et al. (2005).

¹⁰ Loeb, Susanna, and Luke Miller (2007). *A Review of State Teacher Policies: What Are They, What Are Their Effects, and What Are Their Implications for School Finance?* Getting Down to Facts, Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice, Stanford University.

¹¹ Alliance for Excellent Education (2005) "Teacher Attrition: A Costly Loss to the Nation," *Issue Brief*, (Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education) as referenced in Levine, Arthur (2006), *Educating School Teachers*, The Education Schools Project (www.edschools.org/teacher_report.htm).

¹² Johnson, Susan Moore (2004) *Finders and Keepers: Helping New Teachers Survive and Thrive in Our Schools*, Jossey-Bass: New Jersey.

¹³ Loeb, Susanna, and Luke Miller (2007).

¹⁴ Hill, Heather (2007). "Learning in the Teaching Workforce," *Excellence in the Classroom*, The Future of Children, Princeton-Brookings (www.futureofchildren.org).

¹⁵ Heneman, Herbert, III, Anthony Milanowski, Steven Kimball, and Allan Odden (2005) *Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation as a Foundation for Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Policy Briefs. RB-45, p. 5

¹⁶ Odden, Allan, and Marc Wallace (2007) *Rewarding Teacher Excellence: A Teacher Compensation Handbook for State and Local Policy Makers*, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Madison, WI.

¹⁷ Goldhaber, Dan (December 2006) *Teacher Pay Reforms: The Political Implications of Recent Research*, Center for American Progress; and Loeb, Susanna, and Luke Miller (2007).

¹⁸ Lavy, Victor (2004) *Performance Pay and Teachers' Effort, Productivity and Grading Ethics*, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

¹⁹ Johnson, Susan Moore (2004) *Finders and Keepers: Helping New Teachers Survive and Thrive in Our Schools*, Harvard University, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

²⁰ Feldman, Sandra (2004) "Rethinking Teacher Compensation: Equitable Pay for Teachers is Part and Parcel of Improving Student Performance," *AFT On Campus*, American Federation of Teachers.

²¹ Solmon, Lewis, J. Todd White, Donna Cohen, and Deborah Woo (2007) *The Effectiveness of the Teacher Advancement Project*, National Institute for Effectiveness in Teaching (www.talentedteachers.org).

²² Solmon, Lewis, *et al.* (2007), p. 32.

²³ The Teaching Commission (2004) *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action* (<http://ftp.ets.org/pub/corp/tcreport.pdf>).

²⁴ National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (2007) *Creating a Successful Performance Compensation System for Educators* (www.talentedteachers.org/pubs/successful_performance_pay_july_2007.pdf).

²⁵ Goldhaber, Dan (2006).

²⁶ Public Agenda (2003) *An Assessment of Survey Data on Attitudes about Teaching, Including the Views of Parents, Administrators, Teachers, and the General Public*, compiled for The Teaching Commission.

²⁷ Community Training and Assistance Center (CTAC) (2004) *Catalyst for Change: Pay for Performance in Denver Final Report* (www.ctacusa.com/denver-vol3-final.pdf).

²⁸ Center for Teaching Quality (2007) *Performance-Pay for Teachers: Designing a System that Students Deserve*.

²⁹ Loeb, Susanna, and Luke Miller (2007).

³⁰ For example see Donald Boyd, Hamilton Lankford, Susanna Loeb, and James Wycoff (2005) "The Draw of Home: How Teachers' Preferences for Proximity Disadvantaged Urban Schools," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*.

³¹ Loeb, Susanna, Anthony Bryk, and Eric Hanushek (2007) *Getting Down to Facts: School Finance and Governance in California*. Getting Down to Facts, Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice, Stanford University.

³² Levine, Arthur (2006) *Educating School Teachers*, The Education Schools Project (www.edschools.org/teacher_report.htm).

³³ The National Research Council is conducting the following project that is due in the near future — "Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States." Information about the project can be found at www8.nationalacademies.org/cp/CommitteeView.aspx?key=183.

³⁴ *Education Week* (2007) "Learning Where They Teach: Pursuing Its Own Vision of Classroom Quality, a Charter School Chain Is Staking out Turf on the Teacher-Training Terrain," July 18, 2007.

³⁵ Loeb, Susanna, and Luke Miller (2007).

³⁶ The MetLife Foundation and Civic Ventures study (2005) of older adults' intentions for retirement (www.civicventures.org/publications/surveys/new_face_of_work/nfw_exec_summary.pdf).

³⁷ Legislative Analyst's Office (2006) *Modernizing the Functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing*.

³⁸ These documents include Legislative Analyst’s Office (2006) *Modernizing the Functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing*; American Institutes for Research (2003) *Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework Policies and Procedures*, March 2003; and *Proposal for Revision of the Commission’s Accreditation Policies and Procedures*, Agenda notes for meeting of December 3–4, 2003, Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

³⁹ Noell, George, Bethany Porter, and R. Maria Patt, *Value Added Assessment of Teacher Preparation in Louisiana 2004–2006*, Conducted for the Louisiana Board of Regents (www.regents.state.la.us).

⁴⁰ Olsen, Lynn (2007) “Getting Serious About Preparation” in *Leading for Learning, Education Week*.

⁴¹ For one of many examples of a research showing the importance of strong school leadership, see Michael Kirst, Ed Haertel, and Trish Williams (2005) “Similar Schools, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better,” *EdSource*. Also see Robert Marzano, Timothy Waters and Brian McNulty (2005) *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*, Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.

⁴² Darling-Hammond, Linda (2006) *Leadership Development in California*, Getting Down to Facts, Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice, Stanford University.

⁴³ For more information on New Leaders for New Schools, visit www.nlins.org.

⁴⁴Loeb, Susanna, and Luke Miller (2007).