Supporting Educator Quality in Oregon

Linda Darling-Hammond
Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education
Stanford University

November 2, 2012

Summary of Recommendations

Recruitment

Recommendation #1: Fund the Minority Recruitment Act and create incentives to recruit high-ability candidates to teach in high-need communities and fields.

Preparation

Recommendation #2: Strengthen program approval by encouraging national professional accreditation and creating common data sources that can inform reviews.

Recommendation #3: Strengthen performance assessments for teachers and create such assessments for administrators.

Recommendation #4: Strengthen clinical preparation and school-university partnerships by setting standards and funding innovative models.

Mentoring

Recommendation #5: Support high-quality induction by providing matching funds to districts that offer programs meeting standards for high-quality mentoring programs.

Professional Development

Recommendation #6: Create a set of Regional Centers to promote educator effectiveness by offering high-leverage opportunities for professional learning.

Recommendation #7: Make professional learning standards more meaningful and create a Clearinghouse for guiding and organizing professional learning opportunities.

Evaluation and Career Development

Recommendation #8: Support the design and implementation of new educator evaluation systems through focused technical assistance and research.

Recommendation #9: Support the use of National Board Certification to develop teachers, reward excellence, distribute talent, and improve schools.

Recommendation #10: Support career pathways that develop expertise and enable leadership by creating a career development framework and sharing knowledge about best practices.

Supporting Educator Quality in Oregon

Around the world, there is growing recognition that expert teachers and leaders are perhaps the most important resource for improving student learning, and the highest-achieving nations make substantial investments in teacher quality. A McKinsey study of twenty-five of the world's school systems, including ten of the top performers, found that investments in teachers and teaching are central to improving student outcomes. They found that the top school systems emphasize 1) getting the right people to become teachers; 2) developing them into effective instructors and; 3) ensuring that the system is able to deliver the best possible instruction for every child.[1]

Nations that currently lead the world in international rankings of student achievement, such as Finland, South Korea, and Singapore, attribute their success to their substantial investments in teacher and school leader preparation and development. In these and other top-ranked nations, critical initiatives have taken the form of:

- Universal high-quality teacher education, completely at government expense including a living stipend. In nations like Finland, this preparation includes at least a year of practice teaching in a model school connected to a university.

- Mentoring for all beginners in their first years of teaching from expert teachers, coupled with a reduced teaching load and shared planning time.

- Ongoing professional learning, embedded in 15 to 25 hours a week of planning and collaboration time at school, plus an additional 2 to 4 weeks of professional learning time to attend institutes and seminars, visit other schools and classrooms, conduct action research and lesson studies, and participate in school retreats.

- Teacher leadership opportunities for expert teachers to be engaged in leading curriculum development, professional development, and mentoring / coaching, and for some to be recruited and trained as principals or other school administrators in high-quality programs, also at state expense.

- Equitable, competitive salaries (often with additional stipends for hard-to-staff locations) that are comparable with other professions, such as engineering.[2]

By contrast, U.S. investments in teacher quality are paltry – having declined substantially since the 1970s – and they are highly unequal. As a result:

- Teacher education is typically uneven in duration and quality: While some educators receive excellent preparation, others receive much less, in terms of both quality and quantity of coursework and clinical training before they teach or step into leadership

[1] M. Barber & M. Mourshed (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. London: McKinsey and Company.
[2] L. Darling-Hammond (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future.* New York: Teachers College Press.

posts. This variability is smaller in Oregon than in some other states, but observers note that not all programs prepare candidates equally well for the challenges of 21st century teaching, including the need to teach a wide range of diverse learners to more demanding learning standards. In Oregon as elsewhere in the U.S., most teachers receive little financial support to prepare for an occupation that will pay them a below-market wage, and the state invests little in preparation institutions. Hence, the quality of preparation depends in part on what candidates can afford to spend and what universities are willing and able to invest. Leadership education is even more uneven in quality. In addition, the least prepared teachers and school principals are typically assigned to the highest need students and schools. Not infrequently, teachers in these contexts are placed in teaching assignments that do not match their preparation and licensure.

- Mentoring for beginners is spotty. While Oregon has a small fund (about $5 million), recently enacted for mentoring of beginning teachers, it is not adequate to support the costs of a trained mentor to coach novices in every school. (By comparison, two decades ago, Oregon was spending $10 million on its mentor teacher program, later lost to budget cuts.) Mentoring is often managed more as an informal buddy system in the first year, rather than a systematic in-classroom coaching process that unfold over the first two to three years of practice. As a result, relatively few beginning teachers receive the benefits of intensive, high quality mentoring in the state. Novice school leaders rarely receive mentoring in Oregon, unlike states that have developed policies to provide it.

- Professional development time and opportunities are sorely underfunded. Most state programs supporting professional learning for teachers and administrators have taken deep cuts over the last decade; some have disappeared altogether. Oregon teachers, like those nationally, have little time for professional collaboration or learning – usually only about 3 to 5 hours per week of individual planning time, much less than that available to teachers in other countries for joint planning that allows them to share practices and learn from each other. School leaders typically have even fewer opportunities for ongoing professional learning. It is worth noting that there has been progress in some Oregon districts that have implemented weekly collaborative planning or Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). The challenge is to make what is now the exception, the norm.

- Leadership pathways are, in most districts, poorly defined and supported. There are relatively few opportunities for expert teachers to share practices with their peers or to take on leadership roles. Most teachers are still isolated from each other, teaching in egg-crate classrooms and performing the same functions after 30 years as they did when they first entered. In Oregon, while districts supported by Chalkboard and other local initiatives have made begun to develop new possibilities, a teaching career has not yet evolved that regularly supports the spread of expertise or enhanced compensation. Pathways to the principalship and other career options for expert teachers with leadership potential are not well-established at the state or district level.

- Salaries are inequitable, with those in the most well-heeled districts paid more and supported with better working conditions. This leads to a variable teaching force, with the

poorest children with the greatest learning needs typically receiving the least well-prepared teachers.

While Oregon has some very well-prepared and supported teachers and principals, especially in some forward-looking districts, many others are under-prepared and under-supported for the challenging demands of the jobs they have been asked to do.

Furthermore, the knowledge teachers need to reach all students in today's schools has increased considerably. Teachers not only need deep and flexible knowledge of the content areas they teach, they also need to know how children learn at different stages so they can build a productive curriculum that will build on students' prior knowledge and experiences; how to adapt instruction for the needs of new English language learners and students with special needs; how to assess learning continuously so they can diagnose students' needs and respond with effective teaching strategies; and how to work collectively with parents and colleagues to build strong school programs.[3]

Within this context, expectations for learning are rising. Like most states in the nation, Oregon has adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and an ambitious new assessment system (SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium or SBAC). The Common Core standards emphasize higher-level skills and abilities not emphasized in the previous generation of Oregon standards, including more emphasis on writing, research, and the use of evidence, careful reading of complex texts, complex problem-solving, reasoning, data management, and communication. The CCSS are also interdisciplinary: stressing the use of language and mathematics skills in content disciplines like science, history / social studies, and the arts. In addition, Oregon has already begun work to integrate these standards into career and technical education. These changes in standards and assessment will require major changes in curriculum and instruction as well, if students are to be enabled to succeed.

School principals need the knowledge and skills to facilitate this work by understanding and supporting strong instruction, supporting teacher development and ongoing improvement in practice. They must also be able to develop a learning organization with a strong collegial professional community focused on the needs of all students, to create strong relationships with parents and communities, to address inequities and facilitate high expectations for all personnel, and to manage change.

As more and more expectations are placed on teachers and administrators, there have not been noticeable changes in the length or nature of most preparation programs. Sometimes these additional sets of knowledge and skills are addressed through ongoing endorsements or possible specializations that can be acquired later in the career. There are always hopes that professional development will materialize to cover the additional areas of expertise that are desired. However, the basic initial licensure requirements and the programs that enact them are currently constrained, and there is less potential for adding more content to already over-packed MAT programs. It is clear that greater investments in both pre- and in-service development for educators will be needed to achieve the goals the state has set for itself.

---

[3] L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The critical need for investments in teacher and administrator learning has been made clear over and over again in efforts at educational change. Those who have worked to improve schools have found that every aspect of school reform -- the creation of more challenging curriculum, the use of more thoughtful assessments, the invention of new model schools and programs -- depends on highly-skilled educators who are well-supported in healthy school organizations. In the final analysis, there are no policies that can improve schools if the people in them are not armed with the knowledge and skills they need. It is also true, however, the great educators cannot thrive in schools that are not healthy and that support good teaching and learning.

This work is particularly important in the state's highest-need schools. As Harvard researcher Richard Elmore argues, "with little or no investment in capacity, low-performing schools get worse relative to high-performing schools…You can't improve a school's performance or the performance of any teacher or student in it, without increasing the investment in teachers' knowledge, pedagogical skills, and understanding of students. This work can be influenced by an external accountability system, but it cannot be done by that system."

How Oregon Can Invest Strategically in Educator Quality

Fortunately, Oregon stands poised to create a systemic approach to building a strong teaching and school leadership profession. Such a system will ensure that educators can become highly effective and equitably distributed, have strong reasons to stay in the career, and use their skills where they are needed most – both in classrooms and communities serving the most underserved students and in capacities where they can affect whole school reform.

In 2010, an Oregon Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development was convened to "develop a proposal for a seamless system of professional development that begins with career preparation and continues through employment as an education professional." Forward-looking legislators recognized the critical importance of such a system to improve student achievement. The Task Force was able to conceptualize the elements of a coherent system and developed a strong set of recommendations for raising standards for teacher education and curriculum, connecting universities and PK-12 schools in the cause of stronger clinical preparation models; and developing assessment systems that can provide more meaningful accountability. (See figure 1, below.) These are incorporated in this report, along with other analyses and recommendations that have surfaced in the course of this study.

Source: Adapted from H. Rosselli (2010).

What Matters for Teacher Effectiveness

The issues that Oregon has begun to take up can make a major difference in student achievement. For example, a large-scale study of high school student achievement in North Carolina found that students' achievement growth was significantly higher if they were taught by a teacher who graduated from a competitive college, was fully prepared upon entry (rather than entering through the state's alternative "lateral entry" route), had higher scores on the teacher licensing test, was certified in his or her teaching field, had taught for more than two years, or was National Board certified.[4] Moreover, the researchers found that the combined influence on achievement growth of having a teacher with most of these qualifications as compared to one with few of them was larger than the effects of race and parent education combined -- a very substantial contribution to student learning. However, in North Carolina, as in most states, minority and low-income students typically are assigned much less experienced and well-qualified teachers than students in predominantly white and more affluent schools.

Similarly, a large-scale study in New York City found that students' achievement growth in elementary and middle school mathematics was most enhanced by having a fully certified teacher who had graduated from a university-based pre-service teacher education program, who

[4] Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H.F., & Vigdor, J.L. (2007). How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement? (NBER Working Paper 12828). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

had a strong academic background, and who had more than two years of experience.[5] Students' achievement was hurt most by having an inexperienced teacher on a temporary license—again, a teaching profile most common in high-minority, low-income schools.

When New York City raised salaries significantly in response to a court order that equalized district funding, greatly reduced emergency hiring, and took steps to improve teacher retention in high-need schools, the profile of teachers in high-poverty schools shifted substantially, with increases in the proportions of certified, experienced, and better prepared teachers. Analyses showed that, in combination, improvements in these qualifications reduced the gap in achievement between the schools serving the poorest and most affluent student bodies by 25 percent. These findings suggest that changing the mix of teachers available to students can influence achievement, and policies which tackle the twin problems of inadequate and unequally distributed teacher quality can help reduce the achievement gap.[6]

These studies also suggest that **state policies should seek to recruit candidates with strong academic ability, prepare them well before they enter the classroom, ensure that they are placed within their field of certification, and support them so that they stay long enough to gain the experience that further enhances their effectiveness. Beyond those early years, helping teachers acquire the skills that are assessed through National Board certification would also enhance the effectiveness of the teaching force. And making these kinds of teachers available to *all* children would greatly equalize educational opportunity.** The recommendations in this report address all of these issues.

Recruitment

There are few recruitment incentives for teachers in Oregon to meet the needs for teachers in shortage fields and locations or to continue to expand diversity in the educator workforce, as the student population becomes more diverse. Some universities have created innovative recruitment models on a small scale; however, there is a need for a much more systemic approach supported by the state.

Recommendation #1: Fund the Minority Recruitment Act and create incentives to recruit a diverse pool of high-ability candidates to teach in high-need communities and fields.

Oregon has changed substantially in its population and its needs over the last two decades. A growing population of economically disadvantaged students and students of color in the state is at the heart of a large and persistent achievement gap. Today, minority students in Oregon's K12 system make up 33.7% of the total population; however, only 6.53% of the teachers are members of racial/ethnic minority groups. Teacher education programs in the Oregon University System have modestly increased the numbers of minority graduates but at a rate far less is needed.

---

[5] Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2008, September). *Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement* (NBER Working Paper No. W14314). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://www.nber.org/papers/w14314.pdf?new_window=1

[6] Boyd, D., Grossman,P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., and Wyckoff, J. (2006). How Changes in Entry Requirements Alter the Teacher Workforce and Affect Student Achievement. *Education Finance and Policy 1, 2* 176-216.

In 1991 the Oregon Legislature passed the Minority Recruitment Act and established the goal of creating a professional educator workforce in the PK12 schools that is approximately as diverse as the student population. The Act directs the Education and Workforce Policy Advisor to report biennially to the Legislative Assembly. The Act was never funded and reports have not always been completed. The last report was submitted in 2011. That report reveals a very large gap between the goal of the Minority Recruitment Act and reality. "Between 2001 and 2011, the discrepancy between Oregon's minority students and minority teachers has grown from 15.2% to 27.26%." (Minority Teacher Act Report, 2011, p. 31)

The funding intended by that Act is needed to support "teacher cadet" programs to launch early recruitment efforts in secondary schools and to support efforts at universities to recruit and prepare a diverse population of teachers and school administrators. High schools offer an important opportunity for recruitment in the light of Oregon's career-related learning experience diploma requirement. Teaching Cadet models and even High School Academies for Teaching can offer opportunities to study psychology, learning, and child development as well as to learn peer tutoring skills, become teaching assistants and tutors within and beyond the school day, and engage in internships and community service in educational settings.

Recruitment efforts should include candidates of color, those with diverse language backgrounds, and those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds who will be able to provide role models for students and informational resources to their colleagues to help build culturally responsive strategies. There are good models in Oregon such as Portland State University's Bilingual Teacher Pathway Program and Portland Teacher Program, but such efforts need to be expanded to produce more graduates for the entire state. Funds are also needed to ensure that these educators-in-training receive the support they need to be successful and to remain in the profession.

In addition, it is important to be able to **offer subsidies and expand programs for recruitment and training** of a diverse pool of high-ability educators for high-need fields and high-need locations. Although there are currently not overall shortages of teachers in the state, Oregon must address spot shortages of well-qualified teachers in specialized fields (math, physical science, special education, bilingual education / ESL instruction) and high-need schools in both urban and rural areas.

Whereas high-achieving countries underwrite all of the costs of high-quality teacher and principal preparation and often offer additional wages those who go to high-need areas, in Oregon, as in other states, there are few supports for educator education or distribution.

The most successful state strategy for addressing these needs has been the North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program, which underwrite preparation for high-ability candidates who prepare and commit to teaching in high-need schools and locations for at least 4 years. Research found that the program recruited a disproportionate number of male, minority, and math and science teachers and kept them in teaching at rates of over 75% after 4 years or more.[7] North

[7] For research on the North Carolina Teaching Fellows, see G.T. Henry, K.C. Bastian, A.A. Smith (2012). Scholarships to recruit the "best and brightest" into teaching: Who is recruited, where do they teach, how effective are they, and how long do they stay? *Educational Researcher, 41* (3): 83-92.

Carolina has also created a **Principal Fellows Program** that underwrites training for principals that allows them to complete a full-year clinical internship as well as a masters degree in approved programs. Clinical internships support success in the principalship, and this kind of training model is much needed in Oregon.

To ensure a steady stream of talent into high-need subjects and schools, Oregon should underwrite the training costs of high-ability candidates who will become well-prepared to teach or lead in high-need fields and locations for a minimum of four years -- the point at which individuals typically have become skilled and commit to the profession, as repayment for the state investment in their preparation.

Oregon could also **create new pathways into teaching that align the resources of community colleges and state universities** with supports for candidates willing to commit to working in high-need schools. The state can promote stability, diversity, and competence in the educator workforce through direct, focused outreach and expansion of the role of community colleges, articulated with state university programs, as a pipeline for teacher preparation. "Grow your Own" programs are an important part of a recruitment strategy that will develop educators who are grounded in their communities and committed to long-term careers in schools.[8]

Teacher Preparation

Oregon has 20 institutions that prepare new teachers and administrators. Each of the university programs must be approved by the Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), undergoing a program review every seven years. Eight of the institutions are also accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The NCATE and TSPC accreditation processes both involve self-study reports in which institutions provide data on their candidates' performance linked to standards, followed by a visit by a team of educators that includes reviews of records, performance data, employer satisfaction survey results, and syllabi, as well as interviews with candidates, alumni, school partners, university officials, and faculty. The team's report includes a final recommendation that is then acted upon by the respective accrediting agency.[9]

While these processes provide a useful vehicle for focusing program efforts and evaluating quality, stakeholders believe that there is still a substantial range on quality across Oregon programs and room for improvement in helping programs meet the new challenges teachers and leaders face. There are three major ways to leveraging program quality:

- through stronger accreditation practices
- through licensing policies that create incentives for attention to key knowledge and skills
- through investments in strategies that improve the quality of preparation.

Oregon has done important groundwork to support productive efforts in all three of these areas. The first step was recent adoption by TSPC of program accreditation standards for all

[8] E.A. Skinner, M.T. Garreton, B.D. Schultz (2011). *Grow Your Own Teachers: Grassroots Change for Teacher Education. Teaching for Social Justice.* NY: Teachers College Press.
[9] HB 3619 Task Force Report

Oregon educator preparation programs that very closely mirror the expectations of national accreditation agencies. Another aspect of Oregon's strong foundation was the recent decision to adopt the new INTASC standards to guide licensing and accreditation, as well as ongoing teacher evaluation on the job. These standards focus on what teachers should know and be able to do, rather than on course credits or seat time. This creates the opportunity to make teacher education more performance-based.

Recommendation #2: Strengthen program approval by encouraging national professional accreditation and by creating common data sources that can inform reviews of all programs.

All professions other than teaching require preparation programs to be nationally accredited, and use the accrediting process to leverage quality. In teaching, national professional accreditation is voluntary in most states, and state approval is relatively infrequent (it has been every seven years in Oregon), historically based on data volunteered by the programs themselves. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education -- soon to become the Council for Accreditation of Education Professionals (CAEP) -- has incorporated both INTASC's and the National Board's challenging teaching standards, and it now requires evidence of teacher performance and outcomes in promoting student learning as part of the accreditation process.

In a move to increase the rigor of program evaluation, Oregon has recently adopted new standards that mirror the CAEP standards and a process that will require the same level of assessment. TSPC strengthened its partnership agreement with that accrediting body and has taken a lead in partnering with NCATE and several other states to improve clinical experiences for teacher candidates. However, national professional accreditation is still voluntary in Oregon. Some states have required professional accreditation of all programs as a means to stimulate improvement focused on outcomes. Others have encouraged it by paying programs' fees to participate in the national accreditation process.

A second way to strengthen the accreditation process is to develop the capacity for common data elements that can be collected across the state for all institutions, such as a statewide graduates' survey that reports on the kinds of preparation candidates have received and their perceptions of their preparedness, as well as the perceptions of employers about the skills and readiness of the new teachers they hire. TSPC has piloted such surveys and could create this capacity with a modest investment of funds. One efficient way to handle a survey of graduates is as a component of the process of applying for a license, with an on-line capacity to quickly and efficiently upload and report basic analyses. It is also desirable to ask graduates to evaluate their preparation after they have been teaching for some time. Some states are planning to do this when candidates apply for their continuing license, after the probationary period. This can also be done (although at somewhat greater cost) by mounting a separate survey when graduates are a year or two into practice.

Employer surveys can also be conducted on-line and, if they are kept brief, become a routine part of reporting expectations. This set of surveys of graduates and employers would provide both valuable data to institutions to support their continuous improvement efforts, in a

much more efficient manner than the current efforts of each institution to mount such studies individually. In addition, it would provide much more complete and comparable information to TSPC and NCATE/ CAEP for use in the program approval / accreditation process to flag strengths and areas for improvement. Such data could be disaggregated by institution and compared to state averages for candidates prepared in Oregon and those prepared in other states.

A third means to strengthen programs and to inform the accreditation process is to include common performance assessments of what candidates demonstrate they know and can do in the classroom, as discussed below.

Recommendation #3: Strengthen performance assessments for teachers and create such assessments for administrators.

Oregon was the pioneering leader of one of the nation's first performance assessments for teachers: the Oregon Teacher Work Sampling (TWS) System, which asks pre-service teachers to describe their work around a unit of instruction and to collect evidence of student learning. This system has served the state well in helping to provide teacher educators with useful information about teacher performance. The TWS focuses new teachers on how they influence student learning, which improves their ability to plan for and assess learning and, hopefully, to adapt their instruction accordingly. There is evidence from recent research that Oregon student teachers make a positive impact on PK-12 student learning, which improves over the months they are in the classroom.[10]

However, the TWS could be improved to offer more robust evaluation and common data to inform licensing and accreditation. Improvements could take advantage of advances that have occurred in the country in recent years with new assessments (the PACT in California, the BEST portfolio in Connecticut, and the edTPA nationally). These portfolios include more information about teaching, through the use of videotapes of classroom instruction that are tied to curriculum plans and reflections, evidence of student learning (work samples and full class data for key assignments and curriculum goals), and evidence about developing academic language as part of the literacy development that affect all subject areas.

While many programs do require some of these components, a recent survey of Oregon institutions regarding the Teacher Work Sampling systems revealed that fewer than half require or suggest a videotaped component and not all evaluate whether candidates can use assessment results or attend to literacy, two of the seven aspects of teaching to be evaluated. While nearly all programs (97%) train scorers, and two-thirds of programs choose exemplars to use to benchmark scoring, fewer than one-third have assessments scored by a second rater, and only 7% have any external raters participate in scoring.[11]

Preparation and licensing could be strengthened if they were guided by a teacher performance assessment which comprehensively measures teaching skills in a fashion that can be comparably scored across programs and institutions. Oregon could accomplish this by revising the TWS to offer a more comprehensive assessment accompanied by a system of reliable

[10] Waggoner, Carroll, & Weitzel (2010)
[11] Oregon TWS Questionnaire Responses

scoring, or by participating in a nationally available teacher performance assessment. Fortunately, efforts are already underway to revise the TWS. Modest investments in assessment refinement, validation, scoring calibration, and integration into program approval and licensing could greatly improve teacher effectiveness through a tool that leverages ongoing system improvements.

A similar approach is used in some other states for licensing principals. For example, Connecticut requires prospective principals to observe a videotape of a teacher teaching, conduct a valid evaluation of practice and recommend useful next steps and professional development strategies, as well as to propose a school improvement plan for a local school based on evidence about the school and its needs and progress. These assessments are also used for program accreditation and have been found to be strong levers for improving principal preparation and mentoring, as well as determining readiness to assume leadership roles.[12]

Oregon might also consider a performance assessment for principal licensing based on standards for school leaders and their related indicators. These standards should also become the basis for designing and accrediting principal preparation programs. A thoughtful performance assessment could leverage greater confidence in candidates and stronger guidance for preparation programs.

Recommendation #4: Strengthen clinical preparation and school-university partnerships by funding the component of HB 3474, signed in 2011, which authorizes a fund to support university-district partnerships to create more intensive school-based clinical experiences for pre-service teachers, and by increasing the credit hour reimbursement rate for teacher education programs in the state university system so that it is comparable to that of other schools that train individuals for clinical professions.

Studies of effective teacher and principal preparation programs point repeatedly to the powerful learning that occurs when candidates learn to teach or lead in well-designed and carefully-selected clinical settings under the direct guidance of expert practitioners while taking coursework that is practice-focused and tightly aligned.[13] To assure that these experiences become the norm, rather than the exception, the TSPC could enact standards for clinical experiences that define the activities and the quality expected of those experiences, including the training and capacity of cooperating teachers or leaders, their availability for coaching, and the duration of the experience, as well as the kinds of tasks candidates should undertake.

A recent report from Oregon's Distinguished Educators Council recommended

- Requiring a full-year residency (minimum 30 weeks of clinical experience over a school year) in all teacher preparation programs; and

[12] Darling-Hammond, LaPointe et al. (2007).

[13] Boyd, D.J., Grossman, P.L., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher Preparation and Student Achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 31*(4), 416-440. Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://epa.sagepub.com/content/31/4/416.short; Darling Hammond, L., Bransford, J., LePage, P., & Hammerness, K. (2007). *Powerful Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; S.L.Davis & L. Darling-Hammond (2012). The Impact of Principal Preparation Programs: What Works and How We Know, Planning and Changing, 41 (1-2); Darling-Hammond, LaPointe et al. (2007)

- Providing for high-quality "cooperating" teachers in all teacher preparation programs by ensuring appropriate training for this role, stipends and reduced teaching responsibilities.[14]

In addition, it is important to build the capacity for high-quality clinical work. One vehicle for these experiences is the professional development school, where candidates take coursework focused on teaching challenging content to diverse learners while engaged in practice teaching with expert teachers. Like teaching hospitals in medicine, school-university partnerships like these are designed to model and develop state-of-the-art practice, to serve as sites for research by school and university-based faculty, and to ensure that strong practical learning occurs. These schools also engage in intensive professional learning for veteran teachers and may become hubs of professional development for their districts. Highly-developed models have been found to increase teacher effectiveness and raise student achievement.[15] Several Oregon universities have developed networks of such schools -- and in fact have developed professional development districts -- to promote learning by candidates, schools, and universities together.

These kinds of partnerships create new ways for colleges and school systems to work together around instructional reform, creating greater common ground and leveraging improvements in both settings. In many communities, a growing number of new teachers are prepared in partnership schools associated with local universities, thus providing direct pathways from training to hiring and creating a cadre of new teachers who are prepared to undertake immediately the kinds of teaching the district is seeking to encourage.

The Educator Preparation Fund created in HB 3474 was designed to provide resources to Oregon universities to improve their work with K12 schools, recruit more minority candidates, and address national accreditation standards. It would enable school/university partners to explore ways to align their work to mutual benefit, create a seamless system of professional preparation and professional development, and leverage existing resources to improve both educator preparation and ongoing professional development.

In addition to funding HB 3474, the Oregon Board of Higher Education has approved a proposal for the 2013 Legislature to improve teacher preparation among its six teacher preparation programs. This proposal addresses several issues mentioned above including recruitment and preparation of minorities, improvement of clinical experiences, and improvement in data collection and analysis. Similar to the HB 3474 Educator Preparation Program, this OUS proposal for Innovative Practices in Educator Preparation seeks to:

> ...create a seamless system of professional preparation and development in partnership with PK-12 educators – teachers, administrators, counselors and other professionals working in PK-12 schools to include: developing visible, high-impact, high-quality models for educator internships that prepare candidates to effectively work with diverse learners; improving the exchange of data to improve educator preparation, hiring,

[14] Distinguished Educators Council (2012). *Making Oregon a Great Place to Teach: Recommendations from Oregon's Distinguished Educators*. Portland: Chalkboard Project.
[15] Darling-Hammond & Bransford

induction, and evaluation; and increasing the involvement of OUS universities in supporting educators throughout their careers.

Finally, the ways in which Oregon funds teacher preparation deserve further consideration. In addition to the fact that funding for Oregon's public higher education system is inadequate, as it is in many other states today, the formula funding for teacher education does not acknowledge teaching as the clinical profession it is and must increasingly become. Clinical preparation in professions requires investment in the creation of sites for practice (like teaching hospitals in medicine) and the support of cooperating teachers and university supervisors while candidates learn to practice under expert supervision. This has been acknowledged in the funding of medical education and other professional schools, but not yet in the funding of education schools.

For example, the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) of the Oregon University System places Education is at the lowest level of state funding while Architecture; Visual and Performing Arts; English Language and Literature; Communications; Foreign Languages and Literature; Interdisciplinary Studies; Parks, Recreation, Leisure and Fitness; Home Economics, and Health Professions are at the next highest level. More highly supported areas include Agricultural Business, Agricultural Sciences; Biological and Physical Sciences; Mathematics; Computer and Information Science; Engineering; Engineering-related Technologies; Science Technologies, Pharmacy; Veterinary Medicine; and Law.

In terms of the demands of organizing and providing strong clinical experiences, teacher education should be considered at least as equivalent to the Health Professions, such as nursing, and should incur reimbursement at a level that supports that work, while being held to standards that ensure the work is well-conducted.

Mentoring

A strong preparation system is just the beginning of career-long growth and development. New teachers and leaders can either become highly competent in their first years on the job - or they may develop counterproductive approaches or leave the profession entirely - depending on the kind and quality of help they encounter when they enter. The early years of practice are a linchpin time that can make all the difference in both keeping and developing expert educators. Attitudes and beliefs developed during induction are carried for a career. Induction serves a key role in developing new members of the profession into the work habits, expectations, and commitments that are expected by parents, students, and the public, as well as colleagues and supervisors.[16]

Nationwide it is estimated that about 30% of beginning teachers leave the profession within the first five years, and this proportion reaches 50% or more in some urban and rural

[16] Parkay, Currie, and Rhodes (1992), Professional Socialization: A Longitudinal Study of First-Time High School Principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 43-75.

districts.[17] This is wasteful, both because of the lost investments in individuals who have prepared to teach and because research shows that teacher effectiveness improves dramatically over the first three years of a teacher's career.[18] At the school level, teacher turnover results in significant loss of student achievement, because of the instability it creates, as well as the revolving door of beginning teachers.[19] In addition, the costs of replacing a teacher who leaves in the early part of the career range from $15,000 to $20,000, at a national cost of more than $7 billion annually, an unfortunate way to spend scarce resources that should be used to improve teachers' effectiveness.[20] An Oregon-based study on the loss of early career teachers estimated that attrition costs the state at least $40 million per year.[21] For all of these reasons, retaining well-prepared teachers makes economic sense.

Studies have long shown that teachers who receive high-quality induction programs stay in the profession at significantly higher rates, accelerate new teachers' professional growth, and improve student learning. In a review of 15 empirical studies regarding the impact of induction programs, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) describe having a mentor teacher, common planning time with teachers in the same subject, and regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers as some of the most important features of successful induction.[22]

Recommendation #5: Support high-quality induction models by providing matching funds to districts that offer programs which meet the standards for high-quality mentoring programs. In addition, to build local capacity, support state-sponsored training for expert mentors who work with new teachers and new principals.

Oregon's current teacher mentoring program is a small step in the right direction. It establishes the expectation that teachers should receive mentoring and provides modest funds toward that end. While many local programs offer general orientation and link teachers to a buddy who can offer advice, they do not necessarily offer the most important support beginning teachers need: in-classroom coaching by highly skilled and trained mentors over at least the first two years of practice.

It is critical, as well, to create strong induction for school administrators. A growing number of states are ensuring that new principals receive quality coaching and mentoring from experienced administrators. This will support the development of the principal workforce to meet the heightened expectations of Oregon's school leaders.

---

[17] L. Darling-Hammond (2010). Recruiting and Retaining Teachers: Turning Around the Race to the Bottom in High-Need Schools, Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (JoCI), 4 (1), pp. 16-32. Retrieved on 8/8/12 from http://www.joci.ecu.edu doi:10.3776/joci.2010.v4n1p16-32.

[18] Darling-Hammond (2010), Recruiting and Retaining Teachers; Kain, J.F. & Singleton, K. (1996). Equality of educational opportunity revisited. New England Economic Review (May-June): 87-111.

[19] Ronfeldt et al. (2012).

[20] National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) (2009). The High Cost of Teacher Turnover. Washington, DC: Author.

[21] ECONW citation to be added.

[22] Ingersoll, R. and Strong, M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research. *Review of Education Research*. Vol. 81(2), 201-233. Retrieved 8/3/12, from https://www.polkfl.net/staff/professionaldevelopment/documents/impact_induct_mentor_programs_beg_tchrs.pdf

Effective professional acculturation of teachers and leaders requires thoughtful investments in induction focused on rigorous standards for programs, clear criteria for competency, opportunities for personalized learning, and state capacity to support effective systems. To create successful induction programs in every district, Oregon will need to develop an infrastructure that can support:

- ***Regular mentoring*** within the educator's context by a carefully selected and trained mentor to accelerate the development of beginning teachers and leaders;
- ***Personalized learning*** that is integrated with school and district goals;
- ***Competency indicators*** that guide the mentoring process;
- Seamless ***integration with pre-service preparation and an on-going career continuum*** that provides multiple options for growth and sharing of expertise.

To accomplish this, Oregon will need an ***effective infrastructure*** at the state, regional and local levels to help districts design high-quality programs, train mentors, and learn about best practices. This will require orchestrating the efforts of the State Education Department, the Teacher Professional Standards and Practices Commission (to create standards for mentoring programs), universities (to connect pre-service with induction and to help train mentors), and local districts. As described below, a regional infrastructure can help extend state capacity for this work. The state will also need to ***ensure adequate resources***, including dedicated time for participants and mentors to engage in coaching and other professional learning.

In the context of local flexibility, this could be done by ***enforcing standards for quality induction programs*** through the funding and accreditation systems. That is: in order to receive state matching funds and to have their induction programs accredited, districts would need to develop programs that meet quality standards and ensure the kinds of mentoring and support that are known to enable more effective learning and practice.

Professional Development

Currently, professional development in Oregon is primarily local in design, funding, and implementation, except for a few districts that are able to get access to learning opportunities through public - private initiatives, like those sponsored by Chalkboard, the Oregon Leadership Network, and other opportunities sponsored by nonprofits, or the modest opportunities provided by the Department of Education. For those in remote parts of the state, the challenges are equally great but the opportunities are much more sparse. As demands increase, it is critical that learning opportunities for educators keep pace.

Recommendation #6: Create a set of Regional Centers to promote educator effectiveness by offering high-leverage opportunities for professional learning.

In order to support its goals for student achievement, Oregon needs to build an infrastructure for professional learning that can reach to all corners of the state and connect universities, schools, and districts with sources of expertise, research, and demonstrations of best practice. A concept for Regional Centers has emerged that holds tremendous potential for beginning to build this infrastructure. If Oregon could create 4-6 such centers, it could begin to

leverage greater access to learning for teachers in pre-k through 12, leaders and instructional support personnel, and higher education faculty (in teacher and leader education, for example). These Centers could engage in capacity-building and support linkages across all sectors of the education enterprise (districts, schools of education, Community-Based Early Learning Hubs), supporting many of the policies and strategies outlined in this paper. They could offer both face-to-face and technology-based professional development and curriculum resources for teachers, leaders, mentors, and higher education faculty; disseminate research on what works; provide technical assistance; and facilitate collaborations among schools of education, educators in pre-k through 12 settings, and ESDs.

Regional centers could assist with many needs, for example:

- Launching a statewide research and dissemination network that studies emerging practices and models, disseminates evidence-based practices and helps schools/districts take practices to scale through both virtual and face-to-face engagement

- Supporting programs (with technical assistance, networking, and access to research on productive models) that recruit potential educators as early as middle school level; mentor them when they reach the classroom; and help launch new career pathways and leadership opportunities, such as those supported by CLASS, Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education, and school district collaboration grants.

- Partnering with colleges and universities to develop and study innovative partnerships that significantly strengthen clinical experiences for PK-12 candidates and result in well-prepared new educators.

- Developing an Oregon PK-20 Professional Development Network that
  - Trains and supports mentors and provides mentorship and support for new teachers and leaders, through Oregon's Mentoring Program;
  - Supports educators in developing and implementing meaningful, rigorous curriculum, high impact practices, and assessments that promote college and career readiness;
  - Coordinates and provides statewide access to professional development opportunities for educators and instructional support personnel responsive to the learning needs of P-20 students.
  - Assists K-12 districts in implementing and sustaining systems for ongoing, meaningful performance evaluation that lead to continuous improvement for educators.

In particular, the Regional Centers should be a central part of **an orchestrated strategy to ensure learning opportunities around Common Core State Standards** and other new learning standards. This strategy could draw on an approach like the Subject Matter Projects (e.g. the National Writing Project) which develop networks of teachers sharing and learning practices within content areas. The ODE and the new Regional Centers should orchestrate the

resources of professional teachers associations (OCTM, OCTE, etc.), universities, and others to develop subject-specific learning resources and professional development opportunities for the new standards, train specialists and coaches for districts, and orchestrate on-line and face-to-face learning opportunities for teachers and administrators to support implementation.

Recommendation #7: Make professional learning standards more meaningful and create a clearinghouse for guiding and organizing professional learning opportunities.

Today, it is critical for each state to build a professional learning system that is grounded in our growing knowledge of effective professional learning: sustained, content-embedded, collegial, and connected to practice; focused on student learning, and aligned with school improvement efforts. Studies show that one-shot workshops are ineffective at changing teaching and leadership practices, while effective professional learning can dramatically improve student achievement.[23]

In addition, research on states where professional learning is highly developed shows that they tend to have a number of features in common, including:

- professional development standards and a state-level organization or professional board that oversees professional teaching standards and professional development
- well-developed induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers,
- supports and incentives for professional learning, including professional development plans for teachers, schools, and districts that are funded and monitored,
- state policies and systems that review the quality of professional learning opportunities,
- orchestration of state efforts with professional associations and intermediary organizations that help extend the reach of state agencies, offer learning supports of many kinds, and provide a voice for local stakeholders and outside experts.[24]

Oregon took several steps toward a state system when its State Board of Education endorsed the national standards for professional learning developed by Learning Forward and when SB 443 established a Professional Development Commission. Although the Commission is not currently functioning due to budget cuts, it could provide a basis for future work since it is still authorized and has a mandate to do this work. To create a more coherent and functional professional learning system, Oregon could:

- ***Articulate professional learning expectations*** for educators linked to credential renewal and orchestrated through Individual Learning Plans. In addition to traditional learning opportunities, like courses and professional development institutes, learning should include job-embedded opportunities like participating in National Board Certification;

[23] Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad.* Dallas, TX. National Staff Development Council.

[24] Ann Jaquith, Dan Mindich, Ruth Chung Wei, and Linda Darling-Hammond (2010). *Teacher Professional Learning in the United States: Case Studies of State Policies and Strategies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education and Learning Forward.

serving as a mentor; scoring student, teacher, or administrator performance assessments; and engaging in professional learning community activities.

- Establish an ***aligned infrastructure*** by:

  1) ***Organizing professional development funding and evaluation around standards and criteria*** that define what effective professional learning is (i.e. those already endorsed by Oregon's State Board of Education),

  2) Creating a ***Master Plan for Professional Learning*** to guide master plans at the county, district, and school levels,

  3) Coordinating and developing ***high-quality growth opportunities,*** including those that ***leverage technology*** for professional learning, and

  4) Creating a ***portal / clearinghouse*** through ODE and TSPC to share information about the availability and quality of professional development for pre-k through 12 educators. This could be accompanied by consumer ratings and commentary about professional learning opportunities to share information and drive up quality.

- Create an ***evaluation framework*** for state, county, and local boards to assess their policies and offerings in light of the Professional Learning Standards, and a ***voluntary review process*** that examines the quality of professional learning systems, identifies and disseminates promising practices, and provides support for improvement.

- Provide ***consistent, high-leverage resources*** for professional learning by creating incentives for schools to establish ***time for collaborative planning and learning*** within the teaching day and dedicating ***a consistent share of the state education budget*** to professional learning investments, like the 2% that Missouri commits each year.

In many high-achieving nations, there is a system-wide commitment to job-embedded learning and collaboration time for every educator. In Oregon, it is time to make this issue visible and to work toward a set of solutions that provide this opportunity for educators in every district. Should there be disparities in opportunities for meaningful growth and supports from Bend to Beaverton to Burns? Should effectiveness supports like embedded time be determined by geography…or rather by a sustained statewide commitment?

One key aspect of creating job-embedded time for collaboration and professional learning is to set a goal for professional learning time that begins to approach the time allotted in high-achieving nations: for example, 10 hours per week and 10 days of professional learning time per year. Another support could take the form of state technical assistance, which offers research about models of successful school redesign and also provides opportunities for school networking. Finally, when resources become available, incentives could be offered in the form of challenge grants for restructuring time or matching grants for the professional learning time made available.

Recommendation #8: Support the Design and Implementation of new Educator Evaluation Systems through focused technical assistance and research.

Oregon has taken a leap forward in guiding teacher and administrator evaluation in SB 290 and the additional guidance developed by ODE in response to federal ESEA Flexibility waiver. Districts' new educator evaluation and support systems must be based on:

- **Standards of professional practice** adopted by the state for teachers and administrators;
- **Differentiated performance levels** defined by research-based rubrics aligned to the standards;
- **Multiple measures** of performance in the areas of professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth, evaluated with multiple sources of data;
- **An evaluation and professional growth cycle** that includes reflection, goal setting, observations, formative assessment, and summative evaluation; and
- **Aligned professional learning** designed to meet educators' needs for professional growth and improve practice and impact on student learning.

Within these broad parameters, which will bring more commonality of practice across the state, there is still room for substantial variability, creativity, and innovation across districts. There is also the probability that these substantially new practices will lead to many design questions, implementation challenges, and possibilities for both advancement and wrong turns.

If Oregon's districts are to successfully integrate new standards-based approaches to evaluating practice with carefully-developed evidence of student learning and professional contributions, they will need substantial assistance. It will be critically important for the state to learn what its most successful districts are already doing where they have built systems that meet these expectations and to share that knowledge more widely, as well as to offer statewide training opportunities -- led by successful district leadership teams (including administrators and teacher leaders) as well as other experts -- on the many challenging aspects of the new systems:

- understanding INTASC standards,
- selecting or building research-based rubrics,
- recommended strategies for observation and feedback,
- strategies for training evaluators and for achieving inter-rater reliability,
- lessons about how to assemble and evaluate valid, authentic, and useful evidence of student learning, and
- lessons about how to develop professional learning aligned to evaluation, among others.

The state should be prepared to support, in collaboration with its universities and other knowledgeable partners, the training of evaluators. This work can be facilitated by regional centers that address the geographic isolation of rural districts, as well as some on-line training.

In addition, as other states have learned from sometimes bitter experience, it will be critical for the state to learn quickly what is working and what is not, and to make formative adjustments along the way. This will require a plan for ongoing research, analysis, redirection, and refinement focused on both how various approaches do - or do not - support accurate

judgments; improvement in practice and collaboration among educators; incentives to retain strong educators; means to identify, assist, and where necessary, remove educators who cannot meet the standards; and incentives for working with high-need students.

Research should identify fixes that are needed in the design and implementation of systems, as well as supports from the state that will improve results. At the end of the day, it will be important to ensure that new evaluations contribute to better teaching and learning, rather than to just adding logistical difficulties and educational tensions to already overburdened schools.

Recommendation #9: Support the use of National Board Certification to develop teachers, reward excellence, distribute talent, and improve schools. Appropriate $2 million to support teachers pursuing Certification and authorize the fund outlined by HB 3474 that can receive private donations at the Teachers Standards and Practices Commission to subsidize teacher candidates to obtain National Board Certification and receive recognition for having achieved it.

Like Board Certification in medicine, National Board Certification raises the bar for knowledge and skill in teaching. Research indicates that teachers who have earned National Board Certification are more effective in promoting student learning than those who have not.[25] Candidates earning NBC must prepare a professional portfolio that includes a videotaped exemplar of the candidate's teaching and explanation of his or her instructional choices, as well as multiple samples of student work, a description of the way in which the work was analyzed, actions taken to support struggling students, and a review of students' subsequent progress. Both the intensive process of undergoing the certification, and the rigorous review provided by the independent standards board, are powerful factors ensuring that NBC teachers possess the content and pedagogical knowledge to effectively teach diverse students.

Furthermore, teachers learn as they complete the Board certification process. Teachers frequently say that pursuing certification was one of the most powerful professional development experiences they have ever had. Thus investing in the fees that support this process is an investment in growing more effective teachers and spreading more rigorous standards throughout the profession. Furthermore, many states recognize Board Certified teachers with a stipend that pays them more, often spread out over several years of teaching, to encourage such teachers to stay in the profession.

Nationally, NBC teachers are inequitably distributed across schools, with poor, minority, and lower performing students far less likely to be taught by a NBC teacher than their more

---

[25] Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H.F., & Vigdor, J.L. (2007). *How and Why Do Teacher Credentials Matter for Student Achievement?* Retrieved 8/7/12, from http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001058_Teacher_Credentials.pdf.; L. Bond, T. Smith, W. Baker, & J. Hattie (2000). The certification system of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: A construct and consequential validity study (Greensboro, NC: Center for Educational Research and Evaluation); Cavaluzzo, L. (2004). Is National Board Certification an effective signal of teacher quality? (National Science Foundation No. REC-0107014). Alexandria, VA: The CNA Corporation; Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2005). Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? Seattle, WA: University of Washington and the Urban Institute; Smith, T., Gordon, B., Colby, S., & Wang, J. (2005). An examination of the relationship of the depth of student learning and National Board certification status (Office for Research on Teaching, Appalachian State University). Vandevoort, L. G., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Berliner, D. C. (2004). National Board certified teachers and their students' achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 12*(46), 117.

affluent, higher-performing peers.[26] One creative approach to equalizing access to quality teaching was successful in California, through state incentives to encourage Board Certified teachers to locate in high-need schools. In 1998, California enacted a policy to pay any teacher who earned NBC a one-time bonus of $10,000 and, in July 2000, to award NBCTs who teach in low-performing schools a bonus of $20,000 over a period of four years. A national study found that this enabled many more low-income communities to engage Board certified teachers and more high-need students to have access to them.[27]

Board certification has also proved useful as a school turnaround strategy. A number of schools across the country have realized exceptional achievement gains by supporting participation of all faculty in the NBC program—and the National Board's "Take One" program for teachers with less than 3 years of experience—in a concerted effort to focus on improving the quality of teaching.

Oregon should consider investing in proven policies to encourage teachers to become National Board certified and to further encourage Board Certified teachers to choose high-need schools, and to extend this incentive to National Board certified principals -- a new program of the Board launched in 2012 -- as well as incentivize districts to implement policies that will engage in the whole-school development of National Board Certified Teachers for improving practice in high-need (and other) schools.

Recommendation #10: **Support Career Pathways that Develop Expertise and Enable Leadership.**

As we enter an era of educational re-invention, we will need to develop a legion of leaders and change agents who share these commitments and who are enabled -- through redesigned, collaborative work organizations -- to inspire the groundbreaking transformations needed to support each and every student each and every day in fulfilling his or her best promise.

Leadership in education cannot be limited to the ways in which formal roles in the bureaucracy were designed a century ago. Many of the conventional ways of leading school and districts must be rethought if high levels of excellence and adaptations to meet the needs of all students are to occur. This will require a new vision for how schools are regulated, designed, and led by policymakers, administrators, and teachers -- all of whom will have new leadership roles to play. Oregon must create an educational system that builds capacity for success and inspires motivated and talented teachers and administrators to lead schools with an unrelenting focus on student success.

Teachers at every stage of their careers require ongoing high-quality support to strengthen their pedagogical skills and knowledge. This support consists of job-embedded, targeted professional development; formative assessment of instruction; mentoring and coaching by experienced, trained professionals; and facilitation of collaboration through professional

[26] Humphrey, D. C., Koppich, J. E. & Hough, H. J. (2005). Sharing the wealth: National Board Certified Teachers and the students who need them most. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(18). Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/123

[27] Humphrey et al. (2005).

learning communities. At the same time, many accomplished teachers have the desire and capability of providing professional support to their colleagues, and prefer to continue working in the classroom rather than becoming administrators.

Unfortunately, in most school districts, teachers with these ambitions lack opportunities to learn and exercise new skills; they are not given time away from their classroom to assist their colleagues; and there are no formalized career options that provide additional compensation. This has two negative consequences. Beginning and veteran teachers are unable to obtain much needed professional development, coaching and mentoring from accomplished colleagues. And, the absence of career paths for accomplished educators causes many of them to leave the profession, or the classroom, prematurely.

The good news is that a growing number of school districts in Oregon and throughout the nation have adopted successful career advancement programs for their most accomplished teachers. Recognizing that there are relatively few opportunities for expert teachers to share practices with their peers or to take on leadership roles, in 2011, Oregon's legislature enacted SB 252, to support districts in developing new career pathways and compensation model for teachers and administrators. Oregon has taken initial steps in a number of districts to enable the teaching career to evolve beyond its longstanding model in which teachers work in egg-crate classrooms, performing the same functions after 30 years as they did when they first entered the profession.

Chalkboard's efforts in this regard have been most noteworthy. More than twenty CLASS districts have begun to create new possibilities for the teaching career, providing new roles and responsibilities with additional compensation while teachers are allowed to remain in the classroom. These include formal teacher leadership positions for master teachers, staff development leaders, project leaders, and school site leaders, as well as informal leadership opportunities. Nationally, many programs like these have had a positive impact on student achievement[28] and on retaining many effective teachers. [29]

By creating new leadership opportunities, Oregon's professionals educators can break down the isolation and silos that exist in schools and districts. To capitalize on the learning that has occurred in some districts and to disseminate promising practices, Oregon can:

-- **Create a Career Development Framework** supported by research, technical assistance, and training opportunities to support new leadership roles for teachers, describing a continuum of career options incorporating standards, a range of opportunities for professional growth, and conditions for success.

---

[28] See, for instance, Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2008). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Denver, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://www.mcrel.org/pdf/LeadershipOrganizationDevelopment/5031RR_BalancedLeadership.pdf; REL West (2010). *A Review of Teacher Leadership Positions in Five Districts.* San Francisco: WestEd. Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://relwest-archive.wested.org/system/memo_questions/45/attachments/original/Teacher_20Leader_20Positions_20June_202010_1_.pdf

[29] Behrstock, E., & Clifford, M. (2009). *Leading Gen Y teachers: Emerging strategies for school leaders.* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://secc.sedl.org/orc/resources/February2009Brief.pdf

-- Provide districts with research, case studies, and technical assistance on the utilization of teacher leaders including:

- Budget and compensation considerations: For example, what restricted funds (e.g., Title 1) and general funds could be used to compensate teacher leaders?

- Contract and policy options: For example, what kinds of innovative collective bargaining agreements have been negotiated? What types of hybrid positions might be developed to allow teacher leaders to continue teaching while providing leadership support to their colleagues? How might teacher leadership be formalized? How might stipends and other forms of compensation be offered to teacher leaders?

- Selection, training, support, and evaluation of teacher leaders: What qualifications should teacher leaders possess? Who should be part of the selection process? What training opportunities should be offered to teacher leaders and who will offer them? How, and by whom, should teacher leaders be evaluated?

- Development of leadership that spreads expertise: What kinds of roles for teacher leaders are most effective in enabling them to share what they know and to support other teachers in also sharing their expertise? How can teacher leadership benefit the profession as a whole and the success of students?

- Implementation strategies for small, medium, and large districts: What are the unique challenges of districts of different size and how can these differences be accommodated? What examples are available of successful approaches?

-- Create regular venues for innovative educators to share with colleagues lessons in creating new leadership opportunities, career pathways, and compensation models. This can be done through periodic conferences, on-line and face-to-face networking, the development of field visits across schools and districts, as well as the publication of accounts about what has been done and with what effects.

Much of the knowledge and skill to develop these options and to support the recommendations in this report exists in Oregon's schools right now. The challenge is to organize those resources, develop and disseminate good ideas, and support those who are doing the work.

Oregon has adopted a commitment to ensure that: "What the best and wisest parent wants for his or her child, that must the community want for all of its children." With the advances that Oregon is making in building a new, more coherent educational system, and with the support of so many critical stakeholders, the prospects for success are promising.