

Student Success: Statewide P-16 Systems



SHEEO

Table of Contents

Preface	v
Authors' Biographies	vii
Executive Summary	1
Early Outreach	9
Curriculum and Assessment Systems	27
High Quality Teaching	37
Student Financial Assistance	47
Data and Accountability Systems	63
Appendix	71
Case Study Teams	77

Preface

The SHEEO P-16 Initiative, which has produced these essays, was conceived in the summer of 2000 in discussions of SHEEO staff, the SHEEO K-16 Committee, and staff of the U.S. Department of Education. As we proceeded we found ourselves naturally attracting and being attracted to colleagues in other associations working on the same agenda – improving access to and success in higher education. Most prominently, these include our partners in the policy component of the Pathways to College Project – The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), and the College Board.

The project has received support from four U.S. Department of Education programs – GEAR-UP, Higher Education Act Title II – Teacher Quality Enhancement, PT3-Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology, and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education. The project also received support from the Pathways to College project; Pathways to College is a consortium of 19 organizations and associations focused on improving the participation and success of under-represented groups in higher education. Pathways, described in more detail in the appendix, has been supported by a growing group of private foundations and the U.S. Department of Education.

The initiative has included "case studies" of P-16 activities in five states – California, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, and Rhode Island – organized primarily by the staff of each state's higher education agency. It also has included full-day discussions of P-16 issues involving educators and policymakers in Washington, Tennessee, Montana, and Indiana. The project also is sponsoring four two-day regional seminars (now in progress), each of which will help policymakers from a dozen or so states develop strategies for improving student participation and success. All of these activities have informed these policy essays.

The biographical sketches that follow introduce the authors of the essays, who collectively have accumulated many years of wide-ranging policy experience. While we have different perspectives, we share a passionate belief that only comprehensive, well-integrated state systems can meet the educational needs of the next generation. We have influenced each other, and we have many intellectual debts, especially to those who participated in the project. (A list of participants in the state case studies and of others who have contributed in various ways is contained in the appendix.) Despite the many contributions from our colleagues and friends, the authors of each of the essays bear sole responsibility for the views therein.

Paul E. Lingenfelter
Executive Director
State Higher Education Executive Officers



High Quality Teaching

by Edward Crowe

As the United States continues to grapple with challenges associated with student learning and student achievement gains in our K-12 system, part of the problem often derives from policies and practices concerning current teacher quality. Systemic reforms in the way our nation recruits, trains, supports, and licenses teachers are essential if students are to acquire the knowledge and skills they need. Even though federal policy under the "No Child Left Behind" legislation of 2002 has received great attention, the fact remains that authority and responsibility for teacher quality resides generally with the states. The governance and financing of public higher education is also a state responsibility. Even the nation's independent colleges and universities, although not governed by states, are subject to state laws and regulatory policies that affect their teacher preparation programs.

Teacher supply, demand, and quality issues are appropriately regarded as state-level issues – particularly in the era of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which requires state testing of K-12 students. Numerous reports and commissions continue to say that much more needs to be done to ensure that every student has a caring, qualified, and competent teacher. Since most new teachers in the United States will continue to be produced by college and university preparation programs, state higher education systems have the opportunity and the responsibility to use the policy levers available to them to reform our teacher preparation system.

The premise of this State Higher Education Executive Officer (SHEEO) policy brief is that teacher quality improvement efforts are more likely to be effective when they take place in the context of a statewide P-16 agenda. Higher education systems, state agencies, and institutions are important players in a state's teacher preparation system. But many other entities have significant roles, including state departments of education, professional standards boards, regional and local K-12 agencies, legislators, governors, and community groups. Through this web of organizational relationships and the matrix of P-16 issues touched on below, it is possible for committed leaders and organizations to meet the promise of excellent teaching for every child. Drawing on the experience of many states, this report will suggest ways that states can set and meet challenging teacher quality policy goals.

On the basis of SHEEO P-16 site visits to five states as well as many other sources of information and experience, it can be said with certainty that there is no secret formula for success. Knowing what to do is *not* the missing ingredient. What is lacking is rather the political will to begin the change process and sustain it over a long period of time. The will to change is also a rare commodity. This policy brief will highlight key issues, strategies, and policy levers. Along the way it will point to states or systems implementing what appear to be good policies and practices. Recommendations and suggestions to states will be made to guide or jump-start effective reforms. Some emerging issues that create opportunities for – and pose significant threats to – higher education will also be considered.

Why does this work matter? Research published in the last few years makes a compelling empirical case that the quality of teaching has a profound and lasting effect on K-12 student learning. If teachers do, in fact, make a difference – as most parents and students have always believed – and if most new teachers in the United States will, for the foreseeable future, come from college and university preparation programs, then the higher education community has a wonderful opportunity to make good on the promise of providing future generations of Americans with the quality education they need to succeed. The problem is that so little improvement has actually occurred in the preparation of teachers. The hope is that by acting systemically, states can do better so children will do better.

This alignment of student and teacher standards is a basic building block of coherent state policy.

What is High Quality Teaching?

States that are making progress on giving every child access to excellent teaching usually start with a firm focus on K-12 student learning goals and challenges. Generally it is the standards for these students and their performance on assessment tests that frame a state's policy approach to improving teaching quality. North Carolina, for instance, has set school performance and improvement goals based on student assessments. Equipping teachers and administrators

with the knowledge and skills they need to be effective in this context has led to system-wide and campus-based teacher preparation program reforms. In Louisiana, a realistic view of what all students are able to do – matched up with what education and business leaders believe they ought to be able to do – is driving a comprehensive teacher quality policy effort.

Teachers need both a thorough command of their subject(s) and a deep understanding of how to teach content to all kinds of students with different learning styles.

The next step is to think clearly about the skills and abilities teachers need to help students achieve at high levels. This alignment of student and teacher standards is a basic building block of coherent state policy. A robust definition of high quality teaching makes all the difference here. The recent report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children* (2003), offers a comprehensive definition of high quality teaching (www.nctaf.org). While there is ongoing national debate (see Paige 2002) about whether a mastery of subject matter in itself can produce good teaching, most states recognize that teachers need both a thorough command of their subject(s) *and* a deep understanding of how to teach content to all kinds of students with different learning styles. A state that has reached some consensus about the elements of high quality teaching can then begin to audit its educational policies to see how the definition is embedded in:

- Licensing standards
- Teacher tests
- Preparation program approval criteria
- Induction program design
- Content of the teacher preparation program
- Professional development policies and practices

How Can States Take Steps to Promote High Quality Teaching?

State policies on teacher quality should be built on core elements of excellent teaching and the preparation of high quality teachers. These descriptors of high quality preparation apply to traditional and "alternative" programs, even if the programs have different ways of incorporating elements of quality into their design.

Prospective teachers must develop a strong foundation of knowledge in the subjects they are preparing to teach.

- College and university preparation programs must do much more to ensure that their graduates have mastered content knowledge in the subjects they will teach.
- State higher education policy can help make it possible for arts and sciences faculty to be deeply involved in program redesign and implementation, in close collaboration with education faculty.¹ At the same time, senior campus leaders must be strongly committed to the success of this collaboration.

Teacher candidates must also learn how to teach their subjects; the science of child development and how children learn ought to be mastered and tested before candidates are licensed. This should also be at the core of mentoring and induction programs.

- Developing and acquiring these skills calls for close partnerships between higher education institutions and schools.
- It also requires engagement of arts and sciences faculty.

One component of quality teaching is that teachers understand and know how to use student assessment data to gauge a student's progress in the classroom. Teachers must be able to integrate this information with their content knowledge and teaching skills to develop strategies that respond to individual learning needs.

- The integral role of data in assessing teaching and learning entails new strategies for collecting and sharing this information between schools and preparation programs. Preparation pro-

grams must build continuous improvement mechanisms that are driven by regular use of these data.

- Making sure that decisions are based on evidence requires greater collaboration among all faculty engaged in preparing teachers, as well as closer ties between the program and schools where students are assessed.
- Decisions based on evidence can only be made through improved accountability systems at the state level that generate and share the relevant information.
- Each of these steps calls for rethinking university policies and practices in ways that must be led and supported by institutional leaders.

Without the integration of knowledge and skills achieved in a carefully supervised clinical practice setting, the education and training of new teachers is incomplete.

Student teachers need well-designed and extensive clinical experiences so that the issues and challenges of effective teaching are not surprises to them when they enter the profession as new teachers.

- A real school-university partnership built on mutual respect and shared goals is crucial.
- The Carnegie Corporation emphasizes in *Teachers for a New Era* (2001) that: "Excellent teaching is a clinical skill... Clinical practice in schools takes place in complex public environments and entails interaction with pupils, colleagues, administrators, families and communities... Exemplary teacher education provides for clinical education in a clinical setting."
- Without the integration of knowledge and skills achieved in a carefully supervised clinical practice setting, the education and training of new teachers is incomplete.

- The lack of clinical skills and solid clinical experience also feeds the high levels of burnout and turnover found among new teachers throughout the country.

The effective integration of technology into curriculum and instructional practices on the university campus and in the school classroom is essential for teachers to know and use technology successfully in their teaching and assessment practices.

- Among other things, incorporating technology calls for professional development for university faculty, access to technology by faculty and students, and appropriate curriculum redesign to make effective use of technology in teaching, learning, and assessment.
- An important result of progress in this area is the potential for technology, used wisely, to increase student engagement in learning, promote greater access to high quality content and curriculum materials, and foster more effective learning by K-12 students through these and other means.

Successful teaching practices develop over time, so new graduates need extensive mentoring and support for the first few years of their careers. Many observers believe that these programs are an investment to reduce high rates of teacher turnover and to promote teacher career development.

- Successful mentoring and induction programs require close collaboration between higher education and K-12 schools.
- Higher education must be willing (and funded) to accept extended responsibility for program graduates. This principle applies equally to all alternate pathway providers.
- Redesigned school practices are also needed to foster effective mentoring.

Many state licensure systems now recognize the importance of this novice period in the new teacher's career by establishing mentoring and induction periods, with an initial or provisional license granted. The idea is to promote skills development and effective support strategies. Some states even fund these pro-

grams so that new teachers have compensated time away from the classroom to reflect and consult the mentor, in addition to periodic performance assessments of their growth and development. University-based preparation programs are being asked to take on extended responsibilities during this stage of the new teacher preparation process, and good school-university partnerships are quite important to the success of this undertaking. They cooperate with each other – and often with state assessment officials – to assess the teaching performance of these new graduates and help them be successful.

**Many state licensure systems
now recognize the importance of
this novice period
in the new teacher's career
by establishing mentoring and
induction periods.**

Program accountability should apply to all parts of the university involved in teacher preparation. Meaningful accountability is based on outcome measures used to determine whether the program is producing high quality teachers; the specific rewards and sanctions that will be applied to the program; how these accountability measures will apply to all units involved in teacher preparation activities, including arts and sciences as well as education; and the role of senior university leaders in implementing accountability policies.

- *Teachers for a New Era*, drawing on the work of Sanders and others (1995, 1996; Wright et al. 1997), requires its grantees "to evaluate the ongoing effectiveness of the teacher education program based in part on evidence of pupil learning that has occurred under the tutelage of teachers who are graduates of the program." This is meaningful accountability because it promotes the use of real outcomes data for diagnostic and program improvement purposes.
- As more states develop the information system capacity to link student testing data with information about the teachers of each K-12 student, it will be possible to do a better job of measuring

program strength by the learning gains of students taught by program graduates. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will advance the day when this linkage is possible in every state through its focus on regular testing of K-12 students.

- The federal Title II "report cards" for institutions and states are a start in the accountability process, but serious efforts to use these and other data are needed by states, higher education institutions, accrediting bodies, and school districts.
- Additional information available through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accrediting Commission (TEAC) – in addition to the information gained from examining the K-12 student performance of program graduates – all provide invaluable insights for designing continuous improvement strategies.

P-16 is Essential for Teacher Quality Improvements

The SHEEO P-16 case studies examined six issue areas in each of the states visited during the 2001-02 academic year. While the policy focus of this strategy brief is teacher quality, how states deal with the other five issues can make a big difference to the success of teacher quality policy initiatives.

Early outreach programs require quality teaching at all levels of the system to be effective. Students who need early outreach programs are often enrolled in schools that do not get – and cannot keep – the best teachers. Stronger content knowledge, pedagogy and clinical skills delivered by the state's preparation programs are essential to institutionalize the benefits of early outreach activities. Over time students who benefit from successful early outreach programs can be strong recruits into teacher preparation programs.

Curriculum and assessment reform driven by commitment to standards-based education also depends on teacher quality improvements for good results. Alignment of student and teacher standards, a precondition for effective teacher preparation, is necessary here as well. The use of assessments as diagnostic tools at the school and classroom levels is crucial, and teachers must be able to shape their teaching to meet

the needs of students with a variety of learning styles and ability levels.

Data and accountability systems are essential to understand how the current system does – or more likely does not – produce high quality teachers able to help all students be successful. Good data systems can track K-12 student transitions across levels of the system, enabling policymakers to detect and address problems that may relate to teacher preparation, professional development or support systems.

Financial aid programs often are used to attract new candidates into teaching. The proliferation of small programs with a huge range of policy objectives, however, can work at cross-purposes with other state goals. Financial aid inducements to prospective teachers overlook the impact on teacher retention that good preparation and better working conditions can have.

State leadership is crucial to success. It is a key causal agent of effective reform in every state that makes progress on the teaching quality issue. There are many challenges here, including initial engagement, staying power and the impact of leadership transitions on policy continuity. The many states where leadership involvement in teaching quality is manifested primarily by rhetoric would do well to look to the states where real engagement and significant reform have occurred.

Strategies and Policy Levers: What States and SHEEO Agencies Can Do

Look at the Data

A good starting point is to evaluate what state policymakers know about the status of teaching. Relevant data include: supply and demand information in the aggregate and by subject areas and grade levels; teacher turnover; the extent of out-of-field teaching; and the incidence of waivers, "emergency" or "temporary" certificates, and other means by which state rules have been bypassed to meet shortages. Quality issues are also part of the status of teaching: pass rates, classroom performance, and program quality are important indicators. The federal Title II report cards (www.title2.org) are a good resource.

Some states are serious about teaching quality and accountability issues. North Carolina has an annual report card produced by its public university system with an extensive set of measures that deal with pro-

duction and quality of teachers. Louisiana has constructed an accountability system that relies partly on the federal data but also brings important state data to bear. Institutional performance has funding and other consequences in that state. Maryland's Student Outcome and Achievement Report (SOAR) system and other information from a variety of agencies enable P-16 leaders to have a comprehensive understanding of teacher quality and student learning issues in their state.

K- or P-16 partnerships appear to be successful forums in many states for dealing with teacher quality policy issues. SHEEO agencies have been active and essential components of these efforts in many states, and there is potential for even greater involvement along these lines. These groups have proven to be good places for discussions about data that lead to agreement on strategies and next steps for teacher preparation reform. Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission is a good example, as is the Maryland K-16 Partnership. Georgia, Ohio, and other states also provide examples and lessons.

Relevant data include supply and demand information; teacher turnover; the extent of out-of-field teaching; and the incidence of waivers, "temporary" certificates, and other means to meet shortages.

Engage arts and sciences faculty

While SHEEO coordinating boards have fewer direct levers to stimulate campus-based action than do their governing board counterparts, there are ways to raise the issue of arts and science faculty engagement in teacher preparation. Review and approval of degree programs, periodic program review activities and "technical assistance" in the form of conferences, P-16 meetings, and direct advice to campuses are all tools used by SHEEO agencies. Arkansas, for example, convened the heads of all mathematics and science departments at their institutions of higher education –

meeting together for the first time ever – to brief department chairs on state K-12 student learning standards and the implications for teacher preparation programs, professional development courses, and continuing education activities within the institutions. Other states – including North Carolina, Georgia and Louisiana – have initiated redesigns of teacher preparation programs that seek to help new teachers gain a greater mastery of content knowledge; these programs also require extensive arts and sciences involvement to impart that knowledge.

For education faculty as well as their arts and sciences counterparts, faculty reward systems can often be a barrier to effective teacher preparation programs. While these policies typically are campus responsibilities, SHEEO agencies can identify models that promote change and help their campus academic colleagues to work through the implications.

Funding Policies

Without getting into the "cash cow" debate of whether or not teacher preparation programs are operated to generate more money than they cost to run, SHEEO agencies can look at how the state funding formula recognizes teacher preparation as an "academically taught clinical practice profession," in the words of the Carnegie Corporation's *Teachers for a New Era* program (www.carnegie.org). There is general consensus that students preparing for teaching careers need much more clinical experience than most programs provide. And most states have policies that require some form of induction program (analogous to residency in the medical world) for novice teachers in their first year or two of teaching. Both sets of experiences are intended to enhance teaching skills, help teachers master the intricacies of classroom management, and enable teachers to make the leap from academic content knowledge *to the use of that subject matter knowledge* for teaching.

The problem is that few institutions adequately support the costs of these pre-service and post-graduate clinical experiences, and few states provide the resources to schools or to universities to do the job well. If states and institutions expect faculty to be in the schools working with students and new graduates (as indeed they should), there are important workload and compensation issues that must be addressed, for arts and sciences faculty as well as those in the colleges of education. A key first step is to make sure that clinical experiences are a core component of the training program instead of a weakly funded afterthought.

Accomplishing this step will require that the cost of clinical experience be built into the state and campus funding formulas (a comparison with nursing education would be relevant.) SHEEO agencies can make a difference here by working with campuses to identify their resource allocation patterns for clinical training. A good data resource to deal with these issues is the Delaware Cost Study, run by Michael Middaugh at the University of Delaware (Middaugh, 2001; also see www.udel.edu). A number of SHEEO agencies participate in the Delaware project by providing credit hour and faculty compensation data.

**An important first step is to
make sure that clinical experiences
are a core component
of the training program instead
of a weakly funded afterthought.**

Use of Resources

One of the striking things observed in the course of the five P-16 site visits that set the stage for this strategy brief is the extent to which states are making effective use of soft-money resources to leverage change. Louisiana, Rhode Island, Maryland and North Carolina have aggressively sought federal funds for teacher preparation reform efforts. Sources of support have included the National Science Foundation, the Title II Teacher Quality Program, GEAR UP, and Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (PT3). In these and other states, external funds have been used to start or strengthen *systemic* change efforts, and the states have successfully avoided the "projectitis" that often plagues grant programs. Important state goals have been advanced using these funds; broad P-16 partnerships have become the means of bringing key players to the table, and significant progress has been made on challenging issues. For all those pursuing this strategy, of course, the critical question is how to sustain progress by allocating or reallocating public funds to the same goals. Here there are also some excellent examples for SHEEO agencies to consider: Georgia, North Carolina, Ohio, Louisiana, Pennsylvania and others have started programs with external funds and taken the tough step of moving state resources to keep things going. SHEEO agencies also have integrated professional development grants

funded by "No Child Left Behind" into their teacher quality improvement efforts.

Policy Alignment

Because teacher quality is a P-16 issue, progress depends on the willingness of higher education policy-makers to align key policies and practices with standards for students and teachers. All states now have learning standards for K-12 students, on which these students are assessed in what can be high-stakes tests (passing required for promotion or graduation). For these to work and to be fair to all students, their teachers must be trained and supported in ways that ensure they have the knowledge and skills to help their students reach the standards set for them. This requires higher education leaders to reexamine their standards for teacher preparation programs, look at the content of those programs course-by-course, and hold programs accountable for quality outcomes. Louisiana and North Carolina, among the states visited by SHEEO, have taken significant strides in this direction.

School administrators must also have the skills to help teachers be effective and successful. Both Georgia and North Carolina are taking big steps to make sure that programs to train administrators are designed and delivered with today's schools in mind. For North Carolina, this has meant abolishing all master's degree programs for educators and redesigning them from the ground up, based on standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and on those of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). States that are unwilling to take these kinds of actions affecting teacher preparation programs will simply perpetuate a disjunction between the skills and performance expected of its teachers and the standards to which a state holds its K-12 students accountable. NCTAF's 2003 report, *No Dream Denied*, makes a compelling case for the interconnection between schools as successful learning communities and high quality teaching that produces improved student achievement (www.nctaf.org).

Emerging Issues

There has never been a better time to focus on the essentials in teacher preparation. The needs are great, the challenges many. But as the states implementing successful P-16 agendas understand, the rewards to higher education of an education system that works at *all levels* are worth the effort. Positive reasons for act-

ing are many, but there are also serious threats on the horizon that make the case even more compelling.

**There is no secret formula
for success;
the missing ingredient all too often
is the will to take
and sustain the actions necessary
to produce quality teachers
for our nation's schools.**

Even though most new teachers in the United States continue to be prepared at programs housed in colleges and universities, the fastest-growing aspect of teacher preparation is the alternative pathway to teaching. Four-year institutions offer some of these programs, but they also are housed in community colleges, school districts, and non-profit organizations such as Teach for America. In addition, many such programs are offered by profit-making entities. Growth has been stimulated by the need for teachers and frustration at the pace of change in traditional (and tradition-bound) higher education. The Bush Administration has taken a decisive stand in favor of "alternative certification" that downplays the quality and role of traditional providers. The administration's position is embodied in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), in its approach to reauthorization of the Higher Education Amendments (HEA), in education rules and regulations, and in the directing of federal education funds to organizations that are committed to alternative certification and highly critical of traditional approaches to teacher preparation.

The critics are winning the argument and will likely win the "war" between competing approaches to preparing teachers if those charged with setting and implementing policies for public colleges and universities don't step up to their responsibilities. The rhetoric of change and commitment must be matched by real action – policy changes, resource expenditures, and meaningful accountability. There are plenty of examples of how to do these things – institutions of higher education such as those in Carnegie's *Teachers for a New Era* program; state higher education systems and agencies like those discussed in this strategy brief, and others noted in the resource list at the end of this document –

all exemplify steps in the right direction. Here, again, the NCTAF report, *No Dream Denied*, offers a coherent analysis of the link between high quality teaching and strong teacher preparation programs; the report provides specific recommendations to universities and states on ways to improve teacher quality and reduce the high levels of teacher turnover that plague the nation's schools. As noted earlier, there is no secret formula for success; the missing ingredient all too often is the will to take and sustain the actions necessary to produce excellent teachers for our nation's schools.

Conclusion: High Stakes for Higher Education

This strategy brief has suggested a wide range of important steps that state higher education systems can take to promote high quality teaching for every child. The biggest step – and the beginning of real progress – is to accept and acknowledge responsibility for the issue of teaching quality.

SHEEO has received generous support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to work with thirteen state higher education systems on teacher quality. Each state system chosen for this project has agreed to target an important area of policy for which it has both clear responsibility and the ability to make a real difference. The activities pursued by each state must also result in measurable outcomes used by the state and by SHEEO to gauge progress.

The states involved in this Carnegie-funded SHEEO teacher quality project are Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Other states can benefit from the experience of this group, in addition to that of other states mentioned in this strategy brief. SHEEO can also help with advice or information about this and related national initiatives such as the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, work of the Education Commission of the States, projects underway through the Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, and other efforts to promote high quality teaching.

The stakes in this work are high for children. They are also quite serious for higher education. As noted above, there is widespread skepticism that American higher education cares enough about the success of K-12 schools to make fundamental reforms in the ways that teacher preparation programs are designed, delivered, funded, and held accountable. National founda-

tions, states, and the federal government are turning away from higher education and investing resources elsewhere out of frustration at the pace and sustainability of campus-based reform.

The sun may be starting to set on traditional teacher preparation programs as school districts, states, and the U.S. Department of Education look to – and provide funding and policy support for – alternative pathways to teaching. The challenges to higher education, then, are clear: first, these systems and institutions must take K-12 student achievement seriously enough to produce better state policies and practices related to teaching quality; and second, higher education must capitalize on the threat to current practices as a serious spur to action.

**The sun may be starting to set
on traditional teacher preparation
programs as school districts,
states, and the U.S. Department of
Education look to alternative
pathways to teaching.**

Endnotes

¹ Rhode Island, for example, has developed an innovative way to stimulate this work: the state higher education board has sponsored a series of academic dialogues, each of which involves arts and sciences, education, and K-12 faculty in a particular subject area.

References

Carnegie Corporation of New York. 2001. *Teachers for a New Era: A National Initiative to Improve the Quality of Teaching*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York. Also available at www.carnegie.org.

Education Trust. 2001. *Interpret with Caution: The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*. Washington, DC: The Education Trust; www.edtrust.org.

Kain, J.F. and D.M. O'Brien. 1998. "A Longitudinal Assessment of Reading Achievement: Evidence for the Harvard/UTD Texas Schools Project." Dallas, Texas:

UTD Texas Schools Project, University of Texas at Dallas.

Mendro, R.L., H.R. Jordan, E. Gomez, M.C. Anderson, and K.L. Bembry. 1998. "An Application of Multiple Linear Regression in Determining Longitudinal Teacher Effectiveness." Paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Middaugh, Michael. 2001. *Understanding Faculty Productivity: Standards and Benchmarks for Colleges and Universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. 2003. *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Paige, Rod. 2002. *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education; see also www.title2.org.

Rivkin, S.G., E.A. Hanushek, and J.F. Kain. 2002. *Teachers, Schools and Academic Achievement*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Rowan, B., R. Correnti, and R.J. Miller. Forthcoming. "What Large-Scale Survey Research Tells Us About Teacher Effects on Student Achievement: Insights from the *Prospects* Study of Elementary Schools." Forthcoming in *Teachers College Record*.

Sanders, W.L. and S.P. Horn. 1995. "The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS): Mixed Model Methodology in Educational Assessment." In A.J. Shinkfield and D. Stubblebeam, eds., *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice*. Boston, Massachusetts: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sanders, W.L. and J.C. Rivers. 1996. *Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Academic Achievement*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Value Added Research and Assessment Center.

Wright, S.P., S.P. Horn, and W.L. Sanders. 1997. "Teacher and Classroom Context Effects on Student Achievement: Implications for Teacher Evaluation." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11: 57-67.

Appendix

The Pathways to College Network

The Pathways to College Network is an alliance of private and corporate foundations, nonprofits, educational institutions, and the U.S. Dept. of Education. Launched in December 2000 and with funding commitments expected to total over \$2 million over the first three years of the project, the mission of the Pathways Network is to focus research-based knowledge and resources on improving college preparation, access, and success for under-served population, including low-income, underrepresented minority, and first-generation students. The associations involved in Pathways represent regional, cultural, and national interests. They include:

- ACT, Inc.
- American Council on Education (ACE)
- American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF)
- ASPIRA , Inc.
- The College Board
- Council for Opportunity in Education
- Education Commission of the States (ECS)
- The Education Resources Institute (TERI)
- Institute for Educational Leadership (IEF)
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC)
- National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
- National College Access Network (NCAN)
- National Council for Community and Educational Partnerships (NCCEP)
- National Urban League
- Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL)
- State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
- University of California System – EMP Collaborative
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)

The Pathways to College Network is convened by Occidental College and funded by the following providers:

- Daniels Fund
- Ford Foundation
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- GE Fund
- The James Irvine Foundation
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation
- KnowledgeWorks Foundation
- Lucent Technologies Foundation
- Lumina Foundation for Education
- U.S. Department of Education
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)
- Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE)
- Nellie Mae Education Foundation
- Sallie Mae Fund

Four organizations comprising the policy component of the Pathways to College Network participated in the case studies, and in planning and implementing the state meetings and regional forums related to this project. These organizations and their key staff participants are:

The College Board

The College Board is a national nonprofit membership association whose mission is to prepare, inspire, and connect students to college and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 4,200 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three million students and their parents, 22,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admission, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Staff from The College Board who participated in this project include: Michelle Booth Cole, Rafael J. Magallan, and Lezli Baskerville.

Education Commission of the States (ECS)

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) is an interstate compact created in 1965 to improve public education by facilitating the exchange of information, ideas and experiences among state policymakers and education leaders. As a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization involving key leaders from all levels of the education system, ECS creates unique opportunities to build partnerships, share information and promote the development of policy based on available research and strategies. Staff members who participated in this project include: Terese Rainwater, Spud Van de Water, and Carl Krueger

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

The mission of SHEEO, the national association of state higher education executives, is to help the states develop and sustain excellent systems of higher education. Its fifty-six members are the CEOs of statewide governing and coordinating boards for higher education. Former SHEEO Associate Executive Director, Esther Rodriguez initiated the development of the P-16 Initiative, and other SHEEO staff with significant participation include: Tricia Coulter, Paul Lingenfelter, Hans L'Orange, Gail Miller, Alene Russell, Mary Sweeney, Richard Voorhees, and Susan Winter.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education is a regional organization created to facilitate resource sharing among the higher education systems of the West. Fifteen states are members of WICHE, an interstate compact created by formal legislative action of the states and the U.S. Congress. Staff members who participated include: Sharon Bailey, Cheryl Blanco, and David Longanecker.

The SHEEO K-16 – Teacher Development Committee provided support and guidance to this project from its conception to its completion. Members of the committee during this period include:

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Years served</u>
Robert Barak, Interim Executive Director, Board of Regents, State of Iowa	2001-2002
Diane Barrans, Executive Director, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education	2001-2002
Linda Blessing, Executive Director, Arizona Board of Regents	2000-2002
Hans Brisch, Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	2000-2003
Molly Corbett Broad, President, University of North Carolina	2000-2003
Don W. Brown, Commissioner of Higher Education, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board	2000-2003
Roderick Chu, Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents	2000-2003
Robert Clarke, Chancellor, Vermont State Colleges	2001-2002
Richard A. Crofts, Commissioner of Higher Education, Montana University System	2000-2001
Kathryn Dodge, Executive Director, New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission	2002-2003
Sandra Espada-Santos, Executive Director, Puerto Rico Council on Higher Education	2000-2001
Gregory G. Fitch, Executive Director for Higher Education, Idaho Board of Education	2000-2001
Warren H. Fox, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission	2001-2002
Cecelia H. Foxley, Commissioner of Higher Education, Utah System of Higher Education	2000-2003
Judith I. Gill, Chancellor, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education	2000-2003
Bruce D. Hamlett, Executive Director, New Mexico Commission on Higher Education	2000-2002
Judy G. Hample, Chancellor, Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education	2002-2003
Lu Hardin, Director, Arkansas Department of Higher Education	2001-2002
Thomas Henry, Executive Director, Wyoming Community College Commission	2000-2001

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Years served</u>
William R. Holland, Commissioner of Higher Education, Rhode Island Office of Higher Education Vice-Chair 2000-01	2000-2002
Jim Horne, Commissioner, Florida Board of Education	2002-2003
Karen R. Johnson, Secretary of Higher Education, Maryland Higher Education Commission	2002-2003
Daniel J. LaVista, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education	2002-2003
Valerie F. Lewis, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Higher Education	2000-2002
Katharine C. Lyall, President, University of Wisconsin System	2001-2003
Michael E. Malone, Executive Director, Alabama Commission on Higher Education	2002-2003
Frank Meehan, Acting Deputy Secretary for Postsecondary & Higher Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education	2002-2003
Thomas C. Meredith, Chancellor, Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Vice-Chair 2002-03	2002-2003
Robert L. Moore, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission	2002-2003
J. Michael Mullen, Chancellor, West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission	2001-2003
Gregory Nichols, Executive Director, Board of Regents, State of Iowa	2002-2003
Jane Nichols, Chancellor, University & Community College System of Nevada Chair 2002-03; Vice-Chair 2001-02	2000-2003
Phyllis Palmiero, Executive Director, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia	2002-2003
Gerald Patton, Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education, New York State Education Department	2000-2002
Robert T. Perry, Executive Director, South Dakota Board of Regents	2000-2001
William Proctor, Executive Director, Florida Council for Education Policy Research and Improvement	2000-2003
Judith Ramaley, President, University of Vermont	2000-2001

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Years served</u>
Paul Risser, Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	2003
E. Joseph Savoie, Commissioner of Higher Education, Louisiana Board of Regents	2000-2003
Rolin Sidwell, Deputy Director, Office of Postsecondary Education, Washington DC	2002-2003
Kala Stroup, Commissioner of Higher Education, Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education Chair 2000-2002	2000-2002
James E. Sulton, Jr., Executive Director, New Jersey Commission on Higher Education	2002-2003
Joseph Westphal, Chancellor, University of Maine System	2002-2003
Quentin Wilson, Commissioner of Higher Education, Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education	2002-2003



State Higher Education Executive Officers
700 Broadway, Suite 1200, Denver, Colorado, 80203-3460
(303) 299-3685
www.sheeo.org