

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 high-quality educator preparation and support Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) to improve. 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.

The goal of the EPF is to support EPP continuous improvement through a shared vision for high-quality educator preparation and an aligned continuing approval review process. It is grounded in evidence-based best practices that Texas EPPs engage 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 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.

Effective Preparation Framework

EPP Leadership and Planning

Essential Action 1: Vision, Mission, Guiding Principles

1. **Program establishes a vision, mission and guiding principles for educator preparation with alignment between all key stakeholders including the EPP, partnering district(s) and organizations community.**
 - 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 in order to achieve the vision.
 - 1.3. Consistently partners with key internal and external stakeholders (i.e. district partners, key organizational leadership, 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.

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 supported by the key strategies and theory of action, program leadership, and partner leadership.

Essential Action 3: Monitoring and Reflection

3. **Programs engage in continuous improvement of implementation by monitoring and reflecting 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.
 - 3.2. Develops and monitors goals for faculty and staff related to coherence and successful implementation of partnership practice, talent recruitment and management, curriculum and training, and instructional and support.
 - 3.3. Develops and monitors a clear measurement of timebound objectives that support prioritized goals for all faculty and staff, measuring performance relative to intended priority outcomes.

Effective Preparation Framework

- 3.4. Prioritizes the ongoing collection of reliable, leading, formative measures and uses that data to inform practice.
- 3.5. Establishes performance routines that strengthen the practice of individual faculty and staff 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 on continuous improvement practices and reinforcing a culture of transparency, feedback, prioritizing research-based best practices, and use of leading 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 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 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 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 candidate outcomes and program quality.
 - 4.5. Provides access to quality, responsive training, feedback, and support to program faculty/staff to improve program practices identified in regular data analysis.
 - 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

Essential Action 1: Admission Standards

1. **Program's admission standards are rigorous and equitable, requiring 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 candidates to demonstrate potential and/or fit for teaching.

Essential Action 2: Recruitment and Selection

2. **Program's teacher candidate recruitment and selection decisions are informed by the needs of partner school(s) and local education agencies.**
 - 2.1. Uses state, district, and partnership data to set goals for recruitment and selection of 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 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 candidates that meet partner(s) needs and reflect the communities in which they will serve.

Essential Action 3: Demonstration of 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, 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 proficiency of practice-based knowledge and skills to reflect the iterative process for candidate development.
 - 3.2. Consistently assesses 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 candidate performance so that early support and intervention efforts may be implemented.

Effective Preparation Framework

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 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 candidates based in data from regular progress monitoring benchmarks.

P-12 Partnership

Essential Action 1: Program-LEA Partnerships

- 1. Program establishes formal partnerships with LEAs that include collaborative 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 partner for all practice-based experiences, focusing on schools that serve historically underserved communities.
 - 1.4. Provide targeted, personalized support for candidates' transition to induction with LEA partner 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.

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

Essential Action 1: Standards-Aligned Curriculum

1. **Program develops a curriculum that is based in an identified set of grade-banded and content-specific competencies that enable candidate 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 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 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 candidate development in the highest leverage instructional practices and content specific pedagogy.
 - 1.5. Builds 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 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

2. **Program integrates practice-based experiences throughout the curriculum and embeds meaningful opportunities to practice skills via analysis, representation, and enactment of teaching throughout the program.**
 - 2.1. Includes opportunities to practice internalization and delivery of lessons, 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 to receive feedback and adjust practice.
 - 2.3. Includes authentic, job-related, and job-embedded opportunities, beginning early in the program.

Effective Preparation Framework

Essential Action 3: Curriculum Meeting Diverse Student Needs

3. **Program designs the curriculum to effectively prepares candidates to meet the diverse academic and developmental needs of all students.**
 - 3.1. Develops 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, personal experiences, interests, culture).
 - 3.3. Includes evidence-based practices for providing safe, supportive, inclusive, and academically challenging learning environments.
 - 3.4. Prepares all 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

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 as a component of their overall vision for quality teacher preparation.
 - 1.2. Consistently examines data to inform the selection of training and support for their faculty/instructors and staff.
 - 1.3. Uses data to inform and consistently provide individualized feedback and support for their faculty/instructors and staff.
 - 1.4. Expects faculty/instructors to engage in training aligned with the program and LEA partners' instructional priorities, including professional development opportunities to ensure the program's goals and instruction are aligned with their partner schools' vision and goals.

Essential Action 2: Competency-Based 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 candidates with opportunities to apply learning from program curriculum throughout their entire preparation experience.

Effective Preparation Framework

- 2.3 Coaches and monitors candidate development aligned to the program curriculum and competencies and assesses candidate content knowledge, pedagogical skills, dispositions, and professionalism throughout practice-based experiences.

Essential Action 3: Continuum of Practice-Based Experiences

3. **Program ensures that 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 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 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.
 - 3.3 Scaffolds pre-service practice opportunities to include co-teaching and a gradual release of instructional responsibility to the candidate over time and as they demonstrate proficiency of key competencies.
 - 3.4 Provides candidates with opportunities to reflect, ask questions, and get feedback from field supervisors, mentor teachers, and campus leadership.

Essential Action 4: Supervisor, Faculty/Instructor, and Mentor Teacher Training

4. **Program ensures that teacher candidates are supported and coached by trained supervisors, faculty/instructors, and high-quality mentor teachers.**
 - 4.1. Embeds high-quality faculty/instructors and field supervisors within the LEA partner sites who consistently support, coach, and evaluate teacher candidates.
 - 4.2. Trains mentor teachers in the policies and practices of the program and establishes structures to support the mentor's ability to coach and coteach with the teacher candidate.
 - 4.3. Trains all relevant supportive personnel (field supervisors, faculty/instructors, mentor teachers) on the teacher candidate evaluation tool, coaching and feedback practices.

Essential Action 5: Formative Coaching Practices

5. **Program provides teacher candidates with regular, actionable formative feedback, coaching and support during practice-based experiences.**
 - 5.1. Provides feedback that is detailed and supported by evidence, growth-oriented, actionable, and aligned to specific TEKS, teacher competencies, and the educator preparation curriculum.
 - 5.2. Provides formative feedback and coaching from multiple, supportive personnel (i.e., EPP faculty/ instructor, program-level supervisor, campus-level supervisor and administrator, mentor teacher) who have consistent expectations for teacher candidate growth.
 - 5.3. Generates opportunities for teacher candidates to reflect on high-quality teaching practices, their own teaching and effects on students' learning, and continuous improvement for both the teacher candidate and students through feedback and coaching.

Effective Preparation Framework

- 5.4. Provides 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 6: Yearlong Pre-Service Practice

6. Program implements at least a yearlong pre-service practice opportunity for teacher candidates alongside high-quality mentor teachers in settings that are representative of the schools and students they will serve.

- 6.1. Provides pre-service practice settings that are 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.
- 6.2. Structures pre-service practice that spans at least two complete semesters and includes multiple opportunities for observations, co-teaching, strategic evaluation and at least one full semester of practice under the guidance of a high-quality mentor teacher.
- 6.3. Provides opportunities for candidates to experience the beginning and end of the school year.
- 6.4. Collaboratively establishes staffing models with LEA partner that enable sustainable funding of stipends for candidates during their pre-service practice.

Bibliography

Lever: EPP Planning and Leadership

EDF, 2021

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>

Effective Preparation Framework

- 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., Rodriguez, 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>

Effective Preparation Framework

- 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 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/10.1080/1547688X2013.751313>
- 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/10.1080/0161956X2013.835158>
- 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>

Effective Preparation Framework

- Morgan, B. M., Rodriguez, 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>

Effective Preparation Framework

- 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

Effective Preparation Framework

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., Saiz de La Mora, 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>

Wajid, 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/10.1080/1046560X2019.1583035>

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>

Effective Preparation Framework

- 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., Ghouseini, 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>

Effective Preparation Framework

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/2017/00000138/00000002/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>