# Item 15:

# Updates to the Implementation of the Effective Preparation Framework

#### **DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

**SUMMARY:** This item provides the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) the opportunity to discuss next steps to operationalize the Effective Preparation Framework (EPF) 1.0 in alignment with the Board's directives to redesign the educator preparation program (EPP) continuing approval review, develop a vetted list of professional services and technical assistance providers, and update the Commendation Category 4: Innovative EPP selection process in alignment with the EPF 1.0. The item also provides the SBEC the opportunity to review a proposed update to the language of the EPF 1.0 in response to stakeholder feedback.

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY:** The statutory authority for educator preparation program quality is the Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.031 and the statutory authority for the continuing approval review processes and preparation program sanctions are TEC, §21.0443 and §21.0451 respectively.

The full text of statutory citations can be found in the statutory authority section of this agenda.

**FUTURE ACTION EXPECTED:** TEA staff anticipates presenting an update to the Board at the February 2024 meeting.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION:** The SBEC's mission statement and commitment to quality educator preparation for future teachers is:

SBEC is dedicated to improving student achievement and ensuring the safety and welfare of Texas school children by upholding the highest level of educator preparation, performance, continuing education, and standards of conduct.

In alignment with this mission, the SBEC has been consistently focused on ensuring that future educators across Texas receive high-quality educator preparation, to ensure that Texas teachers are well-prepared to meet the needs of their students. With this focus on upholding the highest level of educator preparation, the SBEC requested that TEA staff and stakeholders develop a framework that distinguishes effective preparation practices that yield improved outcomes for school children, future educators, local school districts, and EPPs. Since Spring 2021, TEA staff has collaborated with the SBEC and stakeholders to develop EPF 1.0.

# **Update to Language in EPF 1.0**

Based on stakeholder feedback heard during the July 2023 SBEC meeting, the EPF 1.0 has been updated to reflect extended pre-service practice in lieu of yearlong clinical practice. See attachment 1 for the updated language.

# Discussion of Next Steps and Timelines to Operationalize the EPF

During the July 20, 2023, SBEC work session and the July 21, 2023, meeting, the SBEC discussed and provided guidance to TEA staff on opportunities to operationalize the EPF 1.0. The Board had the opportunity to reflect on current continuing approval review processes, learn more about the Quality Review Pilot run by TEA staff in Spring 2023, and engage with a panel of EPPs who have participated in programmatic reviews focused on evaluating program quality for continuous improvement purposes. The following are key ideas and considerations that surfaced from the discussion during the July work session:

- Carefully consider the timeline and timing of the continuing approval reviews to allow the EPPs to effectively collect the documents needed and arrange time for the reviewers to engage with LEAs, Teacher Candidates, and recent alumni.
- Clearly articulate items that are foundational and areas that are aspirations (for improvement purposes only), through active collaboration with stakeholders.
- Differentiate reviews based on the accreditation status of programs and consider giving "credit" for certain reporting requirements based on additional accreditations that programs have received outside of SBEC accreditation.
- Redesign the continuing approval review grounded in SBEC requirements and EPF and hold all EPPs accountable in a uniform manner.

As on outcome of the work session and discussion during the July meeting, the Board directed TEA staff to begin to operationalize the EPF 1.0 framework through the following actions:

- Redesign the continuing approval review process in alignment with the EPF, to provide substantive feedback to EPPs on areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. This could include developing an RFP for a vendor to support the redesign process.
- Develop a vetted list of third-party technical assistance and professional services
  providers who provide training and support to EPPs aligned with the EPF levers. This
  vetted list could be used by the TEA when providing training opportunities for EPPs and
  could be used by the SBEC when leveraging sanctions on an EPP as outlined in 19 TAC
  §229.5(b) and TEC §21.0451.
- Update the Commendations Category 4: Innovative EPP selection process to identify and recognize programs annually that demonstrate implementation of key EPF actions at the highest levels of quality.

TEA staff plan to continue discussion of key policy decisions and design considerations to implement these directives, as well as related key actions and proposed timelines for implementation.

**PUBLIC AND STUDENT BENEFIT:** The public and student benefit anticipated as a result of the recommendations would be more rigorous, relevant, and reliable preparation of educators for entry into the profession, and retention of these qualified professionals for years to come.

# **Staff Member Responsible:**

Jessica McLoughlin, Senior Director, Educator Quality Melissa Yoder, Director, Quality Preparation and Staffing Ebony Love, Director, EPP Continuous Improvement

# Attachment:

Effective Preparation Framework 1.0

## **ATTACHMENT**

**Effective Preparation Framework 1.0** 

# **Effective Preparation Framework**

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) works to improve outcomes for all public-school students in the state by providing leadership, guidance, and support to school systems, working towards the vision that every child in Texas is an independent thinker who graduates as an engaged, productive citizen prepared for success in college, a career, or the military.

The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and a wide range of stakeholders have shared a consistent desire to define a Texas vision for highquality educator preparation and support Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) to improve the quality of their preparation program. In the summer of 2021, the SBEC charged TEA staff with developing a framework to support this vision. That fall, TEA worked with Educate Texas to convene the Texas Teacher Preparation Regulatory Committee, made up of over twenty (20) practitioners from around the state to develop an initial draft Effective Preparation Framework (EPF) based on recommendations from SBEC's Educator Preparation Stakeholder Group (EPSG). The EPSG has convened on numerous occasions in 2022, continuing to engage diverse stakeholders, including a wide range of EPPs, to refine and strengthen the EPF.

Updated EPF 09.08.2023

The goal of the EPF is to support EPP continuous improvement through a shared vision for high-quality educator preparation and an aligned approval review process. It is grounded in evidence-based best practices that Texas EPPs engages in daily. The purpose is for EPPs to use the EPF as an aspirational goal so that their practices reflect quality, resulting in well-prepared teacher candidates who are equipped to engage and support the diverse population of students in Texas. The EPF will also provide the foundation for the alignment of statewide resources and support to the needs of Texas EPPs.

The EPF consists of five foundational **LEVERS** that EPPs pull to ensure that novice teachers are well-prepared and have demonstrated the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse student population of Texas: EPP Leadership and Planning, Talent Recruitment and Management, P-12 Partnership, Curriculum, and Instruction and Support. The levers work together as an integrated whole. A set of **ESSENTIAL ACTIONS** for each lever describe what the most effective EPPs do to support powerful educator preparation, and for each essential action, **KEY PRACTICES** define high-level performance with specificity.

# **EPP Leadership and Planning**

Establish systems that create a culture of training, monitoring, and coaching of the teacher candidate.

#### **Essential Action 1: Vision, Mission, Guiding Principles**

- 1. Program establishes a vision, mission, and guiding principles for educator preparation with alignment among all key stakeholders including the EPP, partnering district(s), and community organizations.
  - 1.1. Establishes a vision for teacher candidate success and a mission that is informed by community needs and based on prioritization of teacher preparation and development of priority teacher competencies.
  - 1.2. Establishes guiding principles and commitments to foster mindsets and operating norms centered on continuous improvement to achieve the vision.
  - 1.3. Consistently partners with key internal and external stakeholders (i.e., district partners, key organizational leadership, teacher candidates and alumni etc.), for feedback and support to build commitment to the program's vision, mission, and guiding principles.
  - 1.4. Consistently communicates and reinforces the vision for teacher candidate success, mission, and programmatic guiding principles with key internal and external stakeholders.
  - 1.5. Communicates a vision for coaching and development of faculty/instructors and staff (including field supervisors) as a foundational practice to address teacher candidate success.

## **Essential Action 2: Strategic Planning**

- 2. Program develops and refines a multi-year strategic plan with high-leverage strategies to support the achievement of vision-aligned goals.
  - 2.1. Engages key internal leadership and external partners to develop multiyear top-line goals centered on teacher preparation quality, using baseline data as a starting point.
  - 2.2. Articulates strategic priorities in a coherent theory of action to accomplish the vision for teacher preparation goals.
  - 2.3. Develops a roadmap for key systems that will enable the execution of the theory of action for accomplishing the vision and aligned goals.
  - 2.4. Develops a multi-year strategic plan that is aligned to the key strategies and theory of action and supported by program leadership partner leadership.

#### **Essential Action 3: Implementation, Monitoring, and Reflection**

- 3. Program engages in a cycle of implementation, monitoring, and reflection on progress toward goals and the leading actions in the strategic plan.
  - 3.1. Provides access to, training on, and integration of data systems in practice for all preparation program staff and faculty to support the cycle of strong implementation practices.
  - 3.2. Implements key strategies aligned to the topline goals and their timebound objectives.
  - 3.3. Prioritizes the ongoing collection of reliable, leading, formative measures and uses that data to inform practice.
  - 3.4. Monitors progress toward goals for faculty/instructors and staff (including field supervisors) related to coherence and successful implementation of partnership practice, talent recruitment and management, curriculum, and training, and instructional and support.
  - 3.5. Measures timebound objectives that support prioritized goals for all faculty and staff, measuring performance relative to intended priority outcomes.

3.6. Establishes performance routines that strengthen the practice of individual faculty and staff (including field supervisors) to address and achieve prioritized outcomes.

#### **Essential Action 4: Continuous Improvement Practices**

- 4. Program demonstrates a programmatic-wide commitment to continuous improvement in mindsets, practices, and enabling conditions for systematic collection, analysis, and use of most important data to make programmatic decisions.
  - 4.1. Enables a culture of continuous improvement by providing training to faculty/instructors and staff (including field supervisors) on continuous improvement practices and reinforces a culture of transparency, feedback, prioritizing research-based best practices, and use of leading teacher candidate performance measures to inform practice.
  - 4.2. Defines clear roles and responsibilities for monitoring the quality of the teacher preparation program, including monitoring the efficacy of data review practices.
  - 4.3. Systematically collects reliable teacher candidate performance data, K-12 partnership feedback, faculty performance data, and teacher candidate outcomes data to enable meaningful continuous improvement practices. A variety of data are collected, analyzed, and used, in the aggregate (i.e., for a cohort of teacher candidates) and disaggregate (in ways that are appropriate for the program), to assess the quality of the curriculum and related coursework and practice-based training so that the program and teacher candidates may continuously focus on improvement.
  - 4.4. Conducts a regular analysis of key data points relating to programmatic goals in partnership with LEA partners to make decisions and apply support to improve teacher candidate outcomes and program quality.
  - 4.5. Provides ongoing and responsive training, feedback, and support to program faculty and staff (including field supervisors to improve program practices that address objectives and goals for teacher candidate success (for example: teacher educator pedagogy for practice-based preparation, effective coaching, and feedback practices, etc.)
  - 4.6. Regularly monitors and performance manages the organizational approach to continuous improvement for its utility and efficacy to improve and reach intended programmatic outcomes.

# **Talent Recruitment and Management**

Strategically recruit, select, retain, and support teacher candidates through successful competition of a preparation program.

#### **Essential Action 1: Admission Standards**

- 1. Program's admission standards are rigorous and equitable, requiring teacher candidates to show potential and/or fit for the teaching profession.
  - 1.1. Aligns admission standards with the program's vision, mission, and goals, and ensures standards reflect rigor and equity for the teaching profession.
  - 1.2. Uses multiple measures (i.e., screening tools, standardized test scores, pre-selection GPA, essays, interviews, micro-teaching auditions, resumes, work experience, and dispositional surveys) in its admission process that require teacher candidates to demonstrate potential and/or fit for teaching.

#### **Essential Action 2: Recruitment and Selection**

- The needs of partner school(s) and LEAs inform program's teacher candidate recruitment and selection decisions.
  - 2.1. Uses state, district, and partnership data to set goals for recruitment and selection of teacher candidates that address partner teacher quality needs and shortage areas (i.e., subjects, grade levels, school settings) and reflect the student demographics of partner LEAs and schools.
  - 2.2. Implements specific strategies (i.e., financial assistance, academic support, flexible schedules) to attract teacher candidates for high needs and/or shortage areas in their local and partner districts.
  - 2.3. Recruits and selects teacher candidates based on a set of normed criteria and offers counseling and support in the areas of need as identified by partner LEAs and schools.
  - 2.4. Collects data, reflects, and adjusts their efforts to recruit, select, and support teacher candidates that meet partner(s) needs and reflect the communities in which they will serve.

#### **Essential Action 3: Demonstration of Teacher Candidate Proficiency**

- 3. Program provides teacher candidates with regular opportunities to demonstrate proficiency of priority competencies in the Texas Teacher Standards including knowledge and skills aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) Educator Code of Ethics, Texas Teacher Standards, State certification exams, and applicable teacher evaluation systems.
  - 3.1. Designs and/or adopts evaluation instruments to measure the proficiency of practice-based knowledge and skills to reflect the iterative process for teacher candidate development.
  - 3.2. Consistently assesses teacher candidates using valid, reliable, fair, calibrated, and consistent evaluation instruments to monitor progress toward priority competencies.
  - 3.3. Establishes quality monitoring benchmarks throughout the program to evaluate teacher candidate performance so that early support and intervention efforts may be implemented. Alternative certification and residency programs collaborate with district partners to identify intervals of the benchmarks.
  - 3.4. Uses multiple, varied measures (e.g., formative, performance, competency-based) to assess teacher candidate progress and provide continuous improvement opportunities for teacher candidates.
  - 3.5. Designs and implements intervention plans that include targeted and defined supports that address challenges and growth opportunities for teacher candidates based on data from regular progress monitoring benchmarks.

# P-12 Partnership

Create a strong collaborative partnership between EPPs and LEAs for alignment in coaching and supporting teacher candidates.

### **Essential Action 1: Program-LEA Partnerships**

- 1. Program establishes formal partnerships with LEAs that include collaborative teacher candidate recruitment, training, placement, hiring, and support for new teachers.
  - 1.1. Establishes an articulated partnership agreement that includes data-informed shared vision and goals, areas of mutual interdependence, and detailed roles and responsibilities.
  - 1.2. Aligns preparation curriculum and training with LEA partner curricular materials and coaching protocols.
  - 1.3. Collaboratively select schools with LEA partners for all practice-based experiences, focusing on supporting schools that serve historically underserved communities.
  - 1.4. Provide targeted, personalized support for teacher candidates' transition to induction with LEA partners and long-term coaching to support new teachers' professional goals and growth in their early years of teaching.
  - 1.5. Codifies high-quality mentor teacher selection criteria (i.e., effective practitioners, proficient coaches) with LEA partner and co-selects high-quality mentor teachers.
  - 1.6. Embeds high-quality faculty/instructors and staff (including field supervisors) within the LEA partner sites who consistently support, coach, and evaluate teacher candidates. Expects faculty/instructors and staff (including field supervisors) to engage in training aligned with the program and LEA partners' instructional priorities, including professional development opportunities to ensure the program's goals, instruction, and teacher candidate evaluation tool(s), coaching and feedback practice are aligned with their partner schools' vision, goals and coaching.

## **Essential Action 2: Collaborative Governance**

- 2. Program and LEA partner engage in ongoing collaborative governance structures that include exchanging data and information to plan, monitor, and improve partnership activities that support new teachers.
  - 2.1. Collects quantitative and qualitative data with LEA partner that includes multiple sources of high-quality internally and externally validated data that informs and fosters partnership activities to support new teachers.
  - 2.2. Shares data (i.e., teacher performance data) and productively uses the data with LEA partner to create partnership action plans with measurable goals and monitors ongoing progress that supports new teachers' professional growth.

# Curriculum

Design standards-aligned curriculum that focuses on the integration of high-quality best practices and early exposure to the classroom and working with students of diverse needs.

#### **Essential Action 1: Standards-Aligned Curriculum**

- 1. Program develops a curriculum that is based on an identified set of grade-banded and content-specific competencies that enable teacher candidates to engage in practice-based preparation in research-informed, evidence-based, and standards-based instructional practices for various learning environments.
  - 1.1. Purposefully sequences to build from basic skills to more complex ones and reflects the iterative nature of learning to be an effective teacher.
  - 1.2. Prepares teacher candidates in the foundations of instructional delivery, supporting them to adapt, plan and/or internalize, and deliver lessons that are standards-based, data-informed, relevant, and differentiated to engage and support all students.
  - 1.3. Prioritizes teacher candidate development in the highest leverage instructional practices (i.e., use of formative and summative assessment practices, student questioning, etc.) to provide engaging, differentiated, and rigorous instruction that improves student outcomes.
  - 1.4. Uses relevant and rigorous subject matter content grounded in the TEKS to promote teacher candidate development in the highest leverage instructional practices and content-specific pedagogy.
  - 1.5. Builds teacher candidates' curriculum literacy by developing their awareness, understanding, and use of high-quality K-12 instructional materials.
  - 1.6. Integrates ethical and professional standards that support teacher candidates to become an ethically responsible, collaborative, student-centered educator through reflection and professional growth.

## **Essential Action 2: Integration of Practice-Based Experiences in Curriculum**

- Program integrates intentional practice-based experiences throughout the curriculum and embeds
  meaningful opportunities for teacher candidates to practice skills via analysis, representation, and
  enactment of teaching throughout the program including field-based experiences and pre-service practice.
  - 2.1. Structures all practice-based experiences to include opportunities to practice curriculum-based lesson planning and internalization, delivering instruction, and administering and analyzing assessment across supervised opportunities to directly interact with students, using high-quality K-12 instructional materials during coursework and practice-based experiences.
  - 2.2. Includes opportunities for practice in increasingly more authentic and developmentally rigorous ways, including analysis (i.e. examining teaching/instruction), representations (i.e. role-play/engagement with illustrations of instruction), and enactments (i.e. teaching) of instructional pedagogies, and includes opportunities for teacher candidates to self-reflect, ask questions, and adjust practice based on feedback from field supervisors, mentor teachers, and campus leadership.
  - 2.3. Structures early practice-based experiences, such as field-based experiences, to provide teacher candidates with opportunities to work with diverse student populations in multiple classrooms across the grade bands for which they are seeking certification. Scaffold pre-service practice opportunities to include co-teaching and a gradual release of instructional responsibility to the teacher candidate over time and as they demonstrate proficiency in key competencies.

## **Essential Action 3: Curriculum Meeting Diverse Student Needs**

3. Program designs the curriculum to effectively prepare teacher candidates to meet the diverse academic and developmental needs of all students.

- 3.1. Develops teacher candidates' understanding of, and application of principles from, the cognitive and developmental needs of all students.
- 3.2. Includes evidence-based practices for building positive relationships with students and families to develop a comprehensive understanding of their prior academic learning and assets (i.e., strengths, individual experiences, interests, and culture).
- 3.3. Includes evidence-based practices for providing safe, supportive, inclusive, and academically challenging learning environments.
- 3.4. Prepares all teacher candidates to understand and use evidence-based practices to meet the needs of emergent bilingual students, multilingual learners, gifted learners, and students who receive special education services or with a 504 plan.



# **Instruction and Support**

Implementation of aligned curriculum in a practice-based setting while monitoring, coaching, and supporting teacher candidates.

## Essential Action 1: Commitment to Faculty/Instructor Professional Development and Support

- 1. Program establishes expectations and a system for data-informed training for their faculty/instructors and staff to best meet the needs of their teacher candidates and the school communities in which they serve.
  - 1.1. Commits to and communicates a culture of coaching training staff as a component of their overall vision for quality teacher preparation through embedding high-quality faculty/instructors and staff within the LEA partner sites who consistently support, coach, and evaluate teacher candidates.
  - 1.2. Provides training and ongoing calibration for faculty/instructors and staff on teacher candidate observation, feedback and coaching and teacher candidate evaluation.
  - 1.3. Provides ongoing professional development on research-based practices to include but not limited to coteaching, curriculum literacy, and teacher educator pedagogy such as practice-based preparation experiences.
  - 1.4. Consistently examines and uses data to inform, train and consistently provide individualized feedback and support for their faculty/instructors and staff.

#### **Essential Action 2: Design of Competency-Driven Practice-Based Experiences**

- 2. Program designs and delivers coherent practice-based experiences aligned to the curriculum, the Texas Teacher Standards, and the program's teacher competency framework.
  - 2.1 Incorporates practice-based experiences that are explicitly tied to program curriculum and competencies.
  - 2.2 Scaffolds practice-based experiences and provides teacher candidates with opportunities to apply learning from the program curriculum throughout their entire preparation experience, including but not limited to: analysis (i.e., examining teaching/instruction), representations (i.e., role-play/engagement with illustrations of instruction), and enactments (i.e., teaching) of instructional pedagogies.
  - 2.3 Coaches and monitors teacher candidate development aligned to the program curriculum and competencies and assesses teacher candidate content knowledge, pedagogical skills, dispositions, and professionalism throughout practice-based experiences.

#### **Essential Action 3: Implementation of Competency - Driven Practice-Based Experiences**

- Program ensures that teacher candidates meaningfully practice and demonstrate proficiency in priority teaching competencies throughout the continuum of practice-based experiences, including field-based experiences and pre-service practice.
  - 3.1 Structures early practice-based experiences, such as field-based experiences, to provide teacher candidates with opportunities to work with diverse student populations in multiple classrooms across the grade bands for which they are seeking certification.
  - 3.2 Structures early practice-based experiences to include sheltered practice opportunities such as but not limited to: analysis (i.e., examining teaching/instruction), representations (i.e., role-

- play/engagement with illustrations of instruction), and enactments (i.e., teaching) of instructional pedagogies.
- 3.3 Structures practice-based experiences to include opportunities to develop foundational curriculum literacy to include: curriculum-based lesson planning and internalization, delivering instruction, and administering and analyzing assessment.
- 3.4 Scaffolds pre-service practice opportunities to include co-teaching alongside a cooperating teacher and a gradual release of instructional responsibility to the teacher candidate over time and as they demonstrate proficiency in foundational teacher competencies.

#### **Mentor and Cooperating Teacher Training**

Program ensures that teacher candidates are supported and coached by trained mentor and cooperating teachers. Program ensures that teacher candidates are supported and coached by trained supervisors, faculty/instructors, and high-quality mentor and cooperating teachers.

3.1. Trains mentor and cooperating teachers on policies and practices of the program and establishes structures to support the mentor's ability to co-teach and coach the teacher candidate. Provides training on the candidate evaluation tool and process and on-going calibration opportunities between the mentor teacher, the field supervisor and relevant campus leadership. Establishes clear communication protocols with campus leadership to ensure mentor support structures are implemented and acted upon throughout the course of the teacher candidate's pre-service practice.

#### **Essential Action 4: Formative Coaching Practices**

- 4. Program provides teacher candidates with regular, actionable formative feedback, coaching, and support during practice-based experiences.
  - 4.1. Provides aligned coaching and feedback from multiple supportive personnel that is detailed and supported by evidence, growth-oriented, actionable, and aligned to specific TEKS, teacher competencies, and the educator preparation curriculum.
  - 4.2. Utilizes a universal observation feedback protocol that guides the candidate to reflect on areas of strength, identify a gap in their own practice and subsequent student learning, create a clear action step to improve practice, plan and practice the skill, and identify their next steps with their coach.
  - 4.3. Provides written feedback in multiple settings throughout the program (i.e., rehearsals during methods courses, pre-service practice in PK-12 classrooms) and given in a timely manner (i.e., within 48 hours).

#### **Essential Action 5: Extended Pre-Service Practice in a Clinical Teaching Setting**

- 5. Program implements extended pre-service practice opportunities for teacher candidates alongside highquality cooperating teachers in settings that are representative of the schools and students they will serve.
  - 5.1. Provides pre-service practice field placement(s) that is jointly selected by the program and LEA partner, informed by partnership goals and agreements, and offer learning environments that are conducive to mastering teacher competencies.
  - 5.2. Structures extended pre-service practice that spans at least 30 weeks total and includes multiple opportunities for observations, co-teaching, and evaluation under the guidance of a high-quality cooperating teacher.
  - 5.3. Provides opportunities for teacher candidates to experience the beginning and end of the school year and other major milestones.
  - 5.4. Collaboratively establishes staffing models with LEA partner that enables sustainable funding of compensation for teacher candidates during their pre-service practice.

# **Definitions**

#### §228.2. Definitions

Benchmarks--A record similar to a transcript for each candidate enrolled in an educator preparation program documenting the completion of admission, program, certification, and other requirements.

Clinical teaching--A supervised educator assignment through an educator preparation program at a public school accredited by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) or other school approved by the TEA for this purpose that may lead to completion of a standard certificate; also referred to as student teaching.

Co-teaching: A practice in which two or more teachers share instructional responsibility for a single group of students primarily in a single classroom or workspace for specific content or learning objectives using one of seven models defined by St. Cloud State University as appears on the National Coteaching Association website.

Performance task--A learning activity or assessment that requires candidates to apply their learning and perform to demonstrate proficiency, which yields tangible products or performance that serves as evidence of learning and are evaluated by standard rubrics or criteria, and that does not include multiple-choice assessments.

Pre-service Teaching - An educator assignment supervised by an educator preparation program accredited and approved by the State Board for Educator Certification prior to a candidate meeting the requirements for issuance of intern and probationary certificates.

Additional terms:

Theory of Action: an organization's approach to leveraging key strategies to meet intended outcomes.

# **Bibliography**

Lever: Talent Recruitment and Management

- Bastian, K. C., Lys, D., & Pan, Y. (2018). A framework for improvement: Analyzing performance-assessment scores for evidence-based teacher preparation program reforms. Journal of Teacher Education, 69(5), 448–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118755700
- Bastian, K. C., Patterson, K. M., & Pan, Y. (2018). Evaluating teacher preparation programs with teacher evaluation ratings: Implications for program accountability and improvement. Journal of Teacher Education, 69(5), 429–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117718182
- Brock, M. E., & Carter, E. W. (2017). A meta-analysis of educator training to improve implementation of interventions for students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 38(3), 131–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932516653477
- Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016). The changing nature of the role of the university supervisor and function of preservice teacher supervision in an era of clinically rich practice. Action in Teacher Education, 38(4), 410–425. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1226203
- Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2020). A framework for naming the scope and nature of teacher candidate supervision in clinically based teacher preparation: Tasks, high-leverage practices, and pedagogical routines of practice. The Teacher Educator, 55(2), 214–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2019.1682091

- Burns, R. W., Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Jacobs, J. (2015). High-quality teaching requires collaboration: How partnerships can create a true continuum of professional learning for educators. The Educational Forum, 79(1), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2014.971990
- Butler, B. M., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentor teachers during student teaching. Action in Teacher Education, 34(4), 296–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.717012
- Cuthrell, K. C., Lys, D. B., Fogarty, E. A., & Dobson, E. E. (2016). Using edTPA data to improve programs. In D. Polly (Ed.), Evaluating teacher education programs through performance-based assessments (pp. 67–79). IGI Global. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/using-edtpa-data-to-improve-programs/146029
- Goldhaber, D. (2019). Evidence-based teacher preparation: Policy context and what we know. Journal of Teacher Education, 70(2), 90–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118800712
- Goldhaber, D., Cowan, J., & Theobald, R. (2017). Evaluating prospective teachers: Testing the predictive validity of the edTPA. Journal of Teacher Education, 68(4), 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117702582
- MET Project. (2010). Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching Project. In Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED528382
- Morgan, B. M., Rodriquez, A. D., Jones, I., Telez, J., & Musanti, S. (2020). Collaboration of researchers and stakeholders: Transforming educator preparation. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 9(3), 182–189. https://doi.org/doi:10.5430/jct.v9n3p182
- Peck, C. A., & McDonald, M. (2013). Creating "cultures of evidence" in teacher education: Context, policy, and practice in three high-data-use programs. The New Educator, 9(1), 12–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2013.751312
- Risko, V. J., & Reid, L. (2019). What really matters for literacy teacher preparation? The Reading Teacher, 72(4), 423–429. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1769
- Sayeski, K. L., Hamilton-Jones, B., Cutler, G., Earle, G. A., & Husney, L. (2019). The role of practice and feedback for developing teacher candidate's opportunities to respond to expertise. Teacher Education and Special Education, 42(1), 18–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417735876
- Schles, R. A., & Robertson, R. E. (2019). The role of performance feedback and implementation of evidence-based practices for preservice special education teachers and student outcomes: A review of the literature.

  Teacher Education and Special Education, 42(1), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417736571
- Sloan, T. (2013). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Implementation of a teaching performance measure. The New Educator, 9(1), 29–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2013.751313
- Sweigart, C. A., Landrum, T. J., & Pennington, R. C. (2015). The effect of real-time visual performance feedback on teacher feedback: A preliminary investigation. Education and Treatment of Children, 38(4), 429–450. http://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2015.0024
- Walsh, M. E., & Backe, S. (2013). School–university partnerships: Reflections and opportunities. Peabody Journal of Education, 88(5), 594–607. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.835158
- Worrell, F., Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., & Pianta, R. (2014). Assessing and evaluating teacher preparation programs. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/ed/schools/teaching-learning/teacher-preparation-programs.pdf Bastian, K. C., Henry, G. T., Pan, Y., & Lys, D. (2016). Teacher candidate performance assessments: Local scoring and

- implications for teacher preparation program improvement. Teaching and Teacher Education, 59, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.008
- Worrell, F., Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., & Pianta, R. (2014). Assessing and evaluating teacher preparation programs. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/ed/schools/teaching-learning/teacher-preparation-programs.pdf

#### **Lever**: P-12 Partnerships

- Burns, R. W., Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Jacobs, J. (2015). High-quality teaching requires collaboration: How partnerships can create a true continuum of professional learning for educators. The Educational Forum, 79(1), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2014.971990
- Damrow, A. L., & Sweeney, J. S. (2019). Beyond the bubble: Preparing preservice teachers through dialogue across distance and difference. Teaching and Teacher Education, 80, 255–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.02.003
- del Prado Hill, P., Friedland, E. S., & Phelps, S. (2012). How teacher candidates' perceptions of urban students are influenced by field experiences: A review of the literature. Action in Teacher Education, 34(1), 77–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.642290
- Morgan, B. M., Rodriquez, A. D., Jones, I., Telez, J., & Musanti, S. (2020). Collaboration of researchers and stakeholders: Transforming educator preparation. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 9(3), 182–189. https://doi.org/doi:10.5430/jct.v9n3p182
- Walsh, M. E., & Backe, S. (2013). School–university partnerships: Reflections and opportunities. Peabody Journal of Education, 88(5), 594–607. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.835158
- Worrell, F., Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., & Pianta, R. (2014). Assessing and evaluating teacher preparation programs. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/ed/schools/teaching-learning/teacher-preparation-programs.pdf

#### **Lever**: Curriculum

- Alexander, M. (2019). Pedagogy, practice, and mentorship: Core elements of connecting theory to practice in teacher educator preparation programs. Journal of Educational Supervision, 2(2), 83–103. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.2.6
- Baroody, A. E., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Larsen, R. A., & Curby, T. W. (2014). The link between responsive classroom training and student—teacher relationship quality in the fifth grade: A study of fidelity of implementation. School Psychology Review, 43(1), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2014.12087455
- Bastian, K. C., Lys, D., & Pan, Y. (2018). A framework for improvement: Analyzing performance-assessment scores for evidence-based teacher preparation program reforms. Journal of Teacher Education, 69(5), 448–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118755700
- Berkeley, S., Regan, K., Dimitrov, D., Guckert, M., & Ray, S. (2016). Teachers' basic knowledge of reading instruction: Insights from a teacher preparation program. Teacher Educators' Journal, 9, 23–48. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1095634
- Bouton, B. (2016). Empathy research and teacher preparation: Benefits and obstacles. SRATE Journal, 25(2), 16–25.

- Cuthrell, K. C., Lys, D. B., Fogarty, E. A., & Dobson, E. E. (2016). Using edTPA data to improve programs. In D. Polly (Ed.), Evaluating teacher education programs through performance-based assessments (pp. 67–79). IGI Global. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/using-edtpa-data-to-improve-programs/146029
- de Jong, E., & Naranjo, C. (2019). General education teacher educators and English language learner teacher preparation: Infusion as curricular change. The New Educator, 15(4), 331–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2019.1663331
- Grossman, P., Ronfeldt, M., & Cohen, J. J. (2012). The power of setting: The role of field experience in learning to teach. In APA educational psychology handbook, Vol 3: Application to learning and teaching (pp. 311–334). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13275-023
- Janssen, F., Westbroek, H., & Doyle, W. (2014). The practical turn in teacher education: Designing a preparation sequence for core practice frames. Journal of Teacher Education, 65(3), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113518584
- Kim, S., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2020). When preparation matters: A mixed method study of in-service teacher preparation to serve English learners. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 32(3), 231–254. https://www.mwera.org/MWER/volumes/v32/issue3/V32n3-Kim-GRADUATE-STUDENT-INQUIRY.pdf
- Liu, A., Toma, S., Levis-Fitzgerald, M., & Russell, A. A. (2020). The role of a summer field experience in fostering STEM students' socioemotional perceptions and social justice awareness as preparation for a science teaching career. Berkeley Review of Education, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.5070/B89244648
- McCombes-Tolis, J., & Feinn, R. (2008). Comparing teachers' literacy-related knowledge to their state's standards for reading. Reading Psychology, 29(3), 236–265. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ799467
- McLeskey, J., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M. T., Maheady, L., & Lewis, T. J. (2019). What are high-leverage practices for special education teachers and why are they important? Remedial and Special Education, 40(6), 331–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932518773477
- Nagro, S. A., & deBettencourt, L. U. (2017). Reviewing special education teacher preparation field experience placements, activities, and research: Do we know the difference maker? Teacher Education Quarterly, 44(3), 7–33. https://www.jstor.org/stable/90010901
- Nelson, J., Papola-Ellis, A., & Giatsou, E. (2020). Developing literacy-minded educators: Authentic field-based teacher preparation. Literacy Research and Instruction, 59(1), 17–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2019.1662861
- Peck, C. A., & McDonald, M. (2013). Creating "cultures of evidence" in teacher education: Context, policy, and practice in three high-data-use programs. The New Educator, 9(1), 12–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2013.751312
- Rimm-Kaufman, S., & Hamre, B. (2010). The role of psychological and developmental science in efforts to improve teacher quality. Teachers College Record, 112(12), 2988–3023. https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16046
- Risko, V. J., & Reid, L. (2019). What really matters for literacy teacher preparation? The Reading Teacher, 72(4), 423–429. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1769
- Risko, V. J., Roller, C. M., Cummins, C., Bean, R. M., Block, C. C., Anders, P. L., & Flood, J. (2008). A critical analysis of research on reading teacher education. Reading Research Quarterly, 43(3), 252–288. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.3.3

- Salinger, T., Mueller, L., Song, M., Jin, Y., Zmach, C., Toplitz, M., Partridge, M., & Bickford, A. (2010). Study of Teacher Preparation in Early Reading Instruction. NCEE 2010-4036. In National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Study+of+teacher+preparation+in+early+reading+instruction&id=ED512150
- Sampson, M. B., Linek, W. M., Raine, I. L., & Szabo, S. (2013). The influence of prior knowledge, university coursework, and field experience on primary preservice teachers' use of reading comprehension strategies in a year-long, field-based teacher education program. Literacy Research and Instruction, 52(4), 281–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2013.808296
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. Journal of Teacher Education, 52(2), 94–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487101052002002
- Villegas, A. M., SaizdeLaMora, K., Martin, A. D., & Mills, T. (2018). Preparing future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. The Educational Forum, 82(2), 138–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420850
- Waajid, B., Garner, P. W., & Owen, J. E. (2013). Infusing social emotional learning into the teacher education curriculum. International Journal of Emotional Education, 5(2), 31–48. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1085617
- Wang, J., & Sneed, S. (2019). Exploring the design of scaffolding pedagogical instruction for elementary preservice teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(5), 483–506. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2019.1583035
- Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., Braaten, M., & Stroupe, D. (2012). Proposing a core set of instructional practices and tools for teachers of science. Science Education, 96(5), 878–903. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21027
- Yuan, H. (2018). Preparing teachers for diversity: A literature review and implications from community-based teacher education. Higher Education Studies, 8(1), 9–17. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1168438

#### **Lever:** Instruction and Support

- Alexander, M. (2019). Pedagogy, practice, and mentorship: Core elements of connecting theory to practice in teacher educator preparation programs. Journal of Educational Supervision, 2(2), 83–103. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.2.6
- Anderson, L. M., & Stillman, J. A. (2013). Student teaching's contribution to preservice teacher development: A review of research focused on the preparation of teachers for urban and high-needs contexts. Review of Educational Research, 83(1), 3–69. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312468619
- Bastian, K. C., Patterson, K. M., & Pan, Y. (2018). Evaluating teacher preparation programs with teacher evaluation ratings: Implications for program accountability and improvement. Journal of Teacher Education, 69(5), 429–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117718182
- Brock, M. E., & Carter, E. W. (2017). A meta-analysis of educator training to improve implementation of interventions for students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 38(3), 131–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932516653477
- Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016). The changing nature of the role of the university supervisor and function of preservice teacher supervision in an era of clinically rich practice. Action in Teacher Education, 38(4), 410–425. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1226203

- Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2020). A framework for naming the scope and nature of teacher candidate supervision in clinically based teacher preparation: Tasks, high-leverage practices, and pedagogical routines of practice. The Teacher Educator, 55(2), 214–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2019.1682091
- Butler, B. M., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentor teachers during student teaching. Action in Teacher Education, 34(4), 296–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.717012
- Goldhaber, D., Krieg, J. M., & Theobald, R. (2017). Does the match matter? Exploring whether student teaching experiences affect teacher effectiveness. American Educational Research Journal, 54(2), 325–359. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217690516
- Goldhaber, D. (2019). Evidence-based teacher preparation: Policy context and what we know. Journal of Teacher Education, 70(2), 90–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118800712
- Goldhaber, D., Krieg, J. M., & Theobald, R. (2020). Exploring the impact of student teaching apprenticeships on student achievement and mentor teachers. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 13(2), 213–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2019.1698087
- Goldhaber, D., Krieg, J., Naito, N., & Theobald, R. (2020). Making the most of student teaching: The importance of mentors and scope for change. Education Finance and Policy, 15(3), 581–591. https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp\_a\_00305
- Kazemi, E., Ghousseini, H., Cunard, A., & Turrou, A. C. (2016). Getting inside rehearsals: Insights from teacher educators to support work on complex practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 67(1), 18–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115615191
- McGee, I. E. (2019). Developing mentor teachers to support student teacher candidates. SRATE Journal, 28(1), 23–30. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1203423
- Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373711420865
- Ronfeldt, M. (2015). Field placement schools and instructional effectiveness. Journal of Teacher Education, 66(4), 304–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115592463
- Singh, D. K. (2017). Role of clinical practice in teacher preparation: Perceptions of elementary teacher candidates. Education, 138(2), 179–189. https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/prin/ed/2017/00000138/0000002/art00006
- Sweigart, C. A., Landrum, T. J., & Pennington, R. C. (2015). The effect of real-time visual performance feedback on teacher feedback: A preliminary investigation. Education and Treatment of Children, 38(4), 429–450. http://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2015.0024
- Worrell, F., Brabeck, M., Dwyer, C., Geisinger, K., Marx, R., Noell, G., & Pianta, R. (2014). Assessing and evaluating teacher preparation programs. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/ed/schools/teaching-learning/teacher-preparation-programs.pdf