Tennessee Educator Preparation Policy

State Board of Education Workshop
October 30, 2014
The Pathway to Effective Teaching

- Effective Educator Preparation Programs
- Streamlined Licensing System
- Evaluation & Professional Development
- Student Achievement
Overview

Context

Policy Overview

Key Adjustments
Calls for Change and Improvement

“An analysis of the 2011, 2012, and 2013 Report Card effect scores indicates that several programs have consistently produced teachers that underperform veteran and other beginning teachers in the state.”

THEC Report Card, November 2013

“[We] insist that preparation be judged by outcomes and impact on P-12 student learning and development—results matter; “effort” is not enough.”

CAEP Standards Commission, June 2013
Terminology

- **Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)** – The entity approved to deliver preparation programs in the State of Tennessee.

- **Specialty Area Program (SAP)** – The subject-specific program situated within an approved EPP.

- **Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)** – The agency authorized by the US Department of Education to accredit educator preparation providers in the US.

- **Specialized Professional Associations (SPA)** – The national organizations that develop standards for specific content areas. Many of these organizations offer SAP-level recognition.
Recent History of Program Approval in TN

1988 Policy Direction from SBE

1989 NCATE Partnership Agreement signed

2001 NCATE Standards significantly revised

2013 CAEP Standards Approved
Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers

Number of Program Completers

- 1–39
- 40–149
- 150–299
- 300 +
Current Provider Approval Status

- Nationally Accredited: 59%
- State Approved: 36%
Roles and Responsibilities

- **State Board of Education**
  - Approve policy
  - Approve recommendations (based on findings from review team and recommendations of Advisory Committee of Educator Preparation*)

- **Tennessee Department of Education**
  - Implement policy
  - Issue guidance
  - Propose recommendations to the State Board of Education

---

*Formerly Commissioner’s Advisory Committee for Unit and Program Approval*
Roles and Responsibilities

Set Policy (SBE)

Implement Policy (TDOE)

Recommend SBE Approval Actions (TDOE)

Approve or Deny Providers and Programs (SBE)
Stakeholder Engagement

- Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) Engagement
  - TACTE (voted to support)
  - Community Discussions
  - Survey
  - Specialty Area Meetings

- ACTEC August 2014
Overview

Context → Policy Overview → Implementation
Who Can Train Educators in Tennessee?

Educator Preparation Providers include:

- IHE – Institution of Higher Education
- ERO – Education Related Organization
- LEA – Local Education Agency
# Standards for Educator Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider (EPP)</strong></td>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>CAEP - TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Education</strong></td>
<td>TN-developed (adapted from previous InTASC standards)</td>
<td>InTASC standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Program (SAP)**    | TN-developed (based on previous SPA standards) | • Academic Student Standards  
|                      |                                              | • SPA Standards  
|                      |                                              | • Provider-Proposed (TDOE Approved)          |
| **Annual Reporting** | Not Applicable (limited)                     | Applicable (in development)                  |
Overview of Review Process

Provider Applies

Conditional Approval
(up to 5 years)

Full Approval
(reviewed every 7 years)

Annual Reporting

Annual Reporting

Comprehensive Review
Annual Reporting

- Meet or Exceed Expectations: Continue annual reporting
- Below Expectations: Interim Review

Annual Report
## Admissions Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum GPA</th>
<th>Assessment of General Knowledge</th>
<th>Assessment of Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praxis I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate</td>
<td>2.75 (3.0 last 60)</td>
<td>B.A/B.S*</td>
<td>Major Praxis II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 hours &amp; Program of Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cohort GPA** - In addition to the minimum GPA required for candidate admission, the provider must also report the average GPA of the cohort. The expectation is that the cohort will have an average GPA of at least 3.0.

**Appeals Process**
- Appeals process must be documented and on file at TDOE.
- EPPs must submit an appeals report that provides information and rationale for candidates admitted based on appeal.

*EPPs that offer post-baccalaureate programs must ensure that candidates have completed coursework that covers the general education standards.*
# Transition Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCATE Standards</td>
<td>Existing Provider</td>
<td>Existing Provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP Standards</td>
<td>New Provider</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports – Data Collection Only</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
<td>All Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports – Data Collection &amp; Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Working Group

- **Role**
  - Advise the TDOE on implementation
    - Procedures
    - Tools
    - Metrics and Benchmarks
  - Communicate with EPP Community

- **Composition – (20-25 members)**
  - Provider faculty/staff
  - District leaders
  - TN education stakeholders

- **Selection**
  - Prospective members submit application
  - TDOE reviews and selects members
Implementation Working Group

- **Subgroups (5 members per group)**
  - Tool Development (2 groups)
  - Review Process (1 group)
  - Annual Reporting (2 groups)

- **Frequency**
  - Full Group – Quarterly
  - Subgroups – As needed

- **Duration**
  - Initial working group – 18 months (Winter 2015 – Summer 2016)
  - Second working group (if needed)
2014-15 Differentiated Pay Plan Summary

State Board of Education Workshop
October 30, 2014
This work is an integral part of our strategy to ensure that there is an effective teacher in every classroom.
Differentiated Pay Policy
Differentiated Pay Policy

- General Assembly passed differentiated pay law in 2007.
- State Board of Education passed differentiated pay policy in 2013.
Communication and Technical Assistance
The department engaged with the following groups throughout the planning year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOSS</th>
<th>TEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASBO</td>
<td>TASPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSBA</td>
<td>MASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Fiscal Workshops</td>
<td>Superintendents Study Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Leader Council</td>
<td>Teach Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Advisory Council for Alternative Education</td>
<td>School Counseling Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE Regional Meetings</td>
<td>Battelle for Kids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A series of deep-dive planning sessions were held for a cohort of 30 interested districts.

Session 1
Compensation as part of Human Capital Strategy
Defining your Value Proposition

Session 2
Human Capital System Choices & Impact
District X

Session 3
Fiscal Considerations and Trade-offs
Budget Hold ‘em

Session 4
Plan Review and Feedback
Building Support and Communication

www.erstrategies.org
The department also provided a series of tools and resources to all districts

- Support available to all districts included:
  - Regional planning sessions in each CORE office
  - Differentiated Pay Resource Guide
  - Planning webinar series
  - Online compensation design and financial modeling tool
  - Planning support from Battelle for Kids
  - Individual consulting from TDOE staff
Summary of Plans and Promising Practices
Districts submitted plans containing various combinations of differentiated pay elements

- Performance: 57
- Roles: 111
- Hard-to-Staff: 69
- Salary Structure Modifications: 42
Districts submitted plans containing various combinations of differentiated pay elements.
More than one-third of districts implemented performance-based plans

- 57 districts developed either individual, school, or district performance awards

- Individual Bonuses, 28
- School and District Bonus, 1
- School Bonus, 5
- Individual and School Bonus, 6
- Alternative Salary Schedule, 5
- Alternative Salary Schedule with Bonuses, 9
- District Bonuses, 3
The structure of performance-based plans varied according to district needs and goals

- 14 districts are implementing alternative salary schedules
  - **Wilson County:** Yearly base pay increases of $250-$700; raise base salary by almost $4,000

- 34 districts are implementing individual bonuses
  - **Henderson County:** Eligible for bonuses of $300-$500
  - **Jefferson County:** $25,000 yearly bonus pool for eligible teachers

- 15 districts are implementing school and district bonuses
  - **Union City:** $400 bonus for school level growth scores
  - **Warren County:** Bonus if the district meets the majority of AMOs
Districts submitted plans containing various combinations of differentiated pay elements.
Districts created a variety of new roles for teacher leaders

- 111 districts included compensation for additional roles and responsibilities in their plans

- Teacher leaders
  - **Sullivan County**: 102 new teacher leader and community leader roles
  - **Maury County**: $1500 stipend for new RTI² coordinators

- Mentors
  - **Marion County**: Level 4 and 5 teacher mentors to support new teachers

- Tutors
  - **Alamo City**: Stipend for Level 4 and 5 math and reading teachers to serve as afterschool tutors
Districts submitted plans containing various combinations of differentiated pay elements
Nearly half of districts included hard-to-staff incentives in their plans

- 69 districts offered hard-to-staff school or subject incentives

School Incentives
- **Carter County**: Stipend for high performing teachers who transfer to a lower-performing school

Subject Incentives
- **Rutherford County**: $3,000 signing bonus for physics, chemistry, and math
Districts submitted plans containing various combinations of differentiated pay elements

- Performance: 57
- Roles: 111
- Hard-to-Staff: 69
- Salary Structure Modifications: 42
More than one-fourth of districts adopted changes to their salary schedules

- 35 districts modified the experience and education criteria in their previous salary schedules

- Alternative Salary Schedules
  - **14 Districts**: Modified years of experience and/or advanced degrees as a determining factor for increasing base pay

- Other Modifications
  - **Alcoa City**: Consolidated from 10 to 3 advanced degree lanes
  - **Hawkins County**: Advanced degrees must be aligned to current duties
Looking Ahead
The department will continue to support districts in revising and expanding the scope of their pay plans

- District plans and salary schedules posted on the department website

- Implementation support is available for districts throughout the 2014-15 school year

- Department staff will provide technical assistance to districts throughout 2014-15:
  - Individual consulting
  - November Compensation Convening
  - Human capital support on recruitment and selection
This work is an integral part of our strategy to ensure that there is an effective teacher in every classroom.

- Preparation
- Recruitment
- Hiring
- Evaluation and Development
- Compensation
- Advancement Opportunities