

Center on
GREAT TEACHERS & LEADERS

at American Institutes for Research ■

Time for Action

Building the Educator Workforce
Our Children Need Now

November 2016



Time for Action

Building the Educator Workforce Our Children Need Now

NOVEMBER 2016

Angela Minnici, Ph.D.

Director of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders and Vice President of Policy, Practice, and Systems Change at American Institutes for Research

Mary-Dean Barringer

Strategic Initiative Director for Education Workforce at the Council of Chief State School Officers and a Project Lead at the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders

Bryan Hassel, Ph.D.

Co-Director of Public Impact and Project Lead at the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders

The authors gratefully acknowledge the significant writing support of Stephanie Dean at Public Impact, and the helpful quality assurance reviews of Mike Siebersma from Northwest Comprehensive Center and Beth Howard-Brown from Southeast Comprehensive Center.

1 | Overview

In 2015, states developed plans to address equity gaps in students' access to effective educators and are now drafting consolidated applications for federal funds that will be allocated under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Both of these processes have prompted states to engage with stakeholders, analyze root causes of persistent challenges, and devise new strategies to meet ambitious goals for student success. States are now putting into place plans that will serve as the basis of their federal education spending for at least several years. This is the time to rethink systems and strategies, and to focus funds and effort on what matters most for learning: great teachers and leaders for every student and school.

Prioritizing great teachers and leaders is not just about using Title II funding. Every aspect of a state's plans, from setting and meeting high academic standards, to dramatically improving the state's lowest performing schools, to meeting the needs of diverse learners, hinges on the ability of the educator workforce to propel student learning to new heights. Decades of experience and education research indicate that states must **strengthen and organize the educator workforce to implement change successfully.**

The need to focus intently on talent comes at a time when nearly every state is under pressure to address educator pipeline challenges. Though these challenges look different in each state, they involve shortages of educators that leave students with inequitable access to great teachers and leaders. Pipeline challenges require states to think deeply about their systems for attracting, preparing, supporting, keeping, and extending the reach of great teachers and leaders—the state's talent system. Recent decades have made it clear that incremental change on top of business as usual will not give students access to the teachers and leaders they need to leap ahead (Hassel & Hassel, 2010).

This is the time for chief state school officers to assert bold leadership—it is a time for vision and focus. Chiefs need to establish a clear vision for educator talent in their states and ensure that ESSA plans focus resources and energy on activity that makes dramatic progress toward that vision. ESSA has given states more flexibility. With that freedom comes the responsibility to take a fresh look at what is needed and what is working, and to cease investments that have not been advancing the ball fast enough or far enough.

The ideal will differ according to state context—states have differing levels of authority and responsibility for aspects of the talent system, and in some states districts manage the pipeline from beginning to end. This brief describes a vision of a talent system that provides great teachers and leaders for all, key actions states can take to build such a system, and gold standard guidance for ESSA planning.

2 | The Vision: A Talent System That Gives Every Student Great Teachers Every Year

Strategic talent management requires states, districts, and preparation programs to understand K–12 talent needs, and recruit and select accordingly. The state and districts must then manage talent through the phases of a teacher career, and the opportunities in those phases and beyond for multiple roles and paths (leadership, administration, alternative teaching roles, and classroom teaching). An effective talent system will identify teachers who are excelling, plateauing, and struggling. Professional coaching and growth opportunities can bolster the likelihood that a teacher transitions successfully to the next phase (The University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, & Public Impact, 2016). Opportunities for teacher leadership can ensure that the strongest teachers have greater influence over their peers and the students they serve.

The components of talent systems—such as hiring criteria, advanced roles and criteria, career paths, compensation and evaluation—are not simple for states to tackle; they are full of thorny issues related to tradition, turf, politics, and limitations on funding and capacity. A clear vision of an ideal talent system must map out a plan that will be achieved over time. In recent years, states have endeavored to improve components of their talent systems, sometimes by their own initiation and other times in response to mandates with defined parameters. States now need to outline their desired vision of an ideal talent system, and a strong vision will have four characteristics:

- **Ambitious.** Most states are far from the goal of providing every student access to great teachers every year, especially in high-need schools. For state chiefs, setting the vision starts with committing to that goal and committing to bold strategies with real potential to meet it. This work entails more than just trying harder to fill today's teaching slots with an improved pipeline. It also means changing the way schools are organized so that great teachers take responsibility for supporting their peers and propelling all students to new levels of learning.

***What should states do?** Set a goal to give all students access to great teachers every year. Make the goal public, solicit input to understand what it will take to achieve it, and demonstrate commitment to making the changes needed to meet that goal in the coming years.*

- **Comprehensive and coherent.** States need a vision of a talent system that is comprehensive from career entrance to exit, addressing the full array of pipeline-strengthening elements: attract, prepare, develop, support, retain, and extend the reach of talent. **All elements** of the framework should be covered, and states need to assess whether any elements are ignored or addressed insufficiently. States also need to consider whether the talent system forms a

coherent set of strategies across **phases of a teacher's career**. For example, the state might have a strategy in place to retain teachers early in their careers with induction and mentoring, but ignoring retention of more veteran teachers risks unnecessary loss of key talent.

What should states do? *Outline current strategies against the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders Talent Development Framework (www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/14-2591_GTL_Talent_Dev_Framework-ed_110714.pdf). Look for gaps in element coverage, including whether elements are covered across phases of a teacher's career.*

- **Attuned to change and innovation in the field.** States need to communicate how teaching and leading is changing, and describe the talent characteristics that are needed for classrooms of the future. This sets new professional expectations for current teachers and ensures that prospective teachers—from various segments of the workforce—understand how teaching and school leadership differ from their past school experiences.

What should states do? *To accomplish this task, states need to include the voices and perspectives of teachers and leaders who are on the front edge of change in the field, successfully implementing new teacher leader roles, and who are driving student growth with blended instruction and personalized learning strategies. ESSA planning presents an opportunity to engage these important stakeholder voices.*

- **Focused on high-leverage strategies.** States must be strategic in their investments. Dollars are limited, and stretched state education agencies need to ensure that funds and people power are directed at activities that yield the greatest benefits. The highest leverage strategies affect multiple elements of talent development, not just one. They aim to improve talent for the long term, sustainably. This goal often requires states to envision new structures. Talent systems will fall short if limited only to strategies that fit current structures, such as one-teacher-one-classroom, in-person teaching. Some current structures will need to flex to maximize educator talent in pursuit of greater student outcomes.

What should states do? *Use the GTL Center Implementation Playbook (<http://www.gtlcenter.org/learning-hub/equitable-access-supports/implementation-playbook>) to take stock of strategies that are working and those that are not achieving desired results. As states develop their ESSA plans, they can hone the key elements of their talent strategy by identifying and pursuing the highest leverage strategies, pressing for needed changes in the short and long term.*

The talent pinch that districts feel cannot be alleviated without prioritization against a long-term view of what needs to be accomplished. A state may need some temporary measures to address current inequities in students' opportunities to learn, but most

of the state's focus and investment should be directed toward the longer term vision for change. States will need to invest in long-term strategies that might not produce immediate student learning outcomes but establish structures and mechanisms to achieve those outcomes over time. This means crafting solutions for sustainability and potential to strengthen the pipeline in multiple ways and taking stock of interim indicators to determine whether efforts are playing out as hoped.

3 | Key State Actions to Build a Talent System

With a clear vision of the desired talent system in place, state leaders will be poised to take bold action in pursuit of that vision. Here we review the three spokes of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders talent system and consider typical strategies that states use for each area; what it looks like when strategies are comprehensive, coherent, and high leverage; and how states can use ESSA to progress toward their vision of a great educator workforce.

Attract and Prepare

Strong educator talent systems will appeal to individuals who demonstrate the potential to be great teachers and will be designed to select those individuals from a pool of applicants. The system will then provide meaningful, applicable training to prepare emerging educators for the demands of the role they will assume, ensuring that students benefit from the new teachers' efforts from day one.

State strategies to **attract** teachers tend to take three forms: (1) short-term financial incentives meant to entice individuals to enter the profession or work in a hard-to-staff school, (2) efforts to expose high school students and college underclassmen to teaching as a career option, and (3) efforts to ease licensure requirements for career changers and out-of-state transfers. These programs often go in and out of existence without the state having a clear understanding of how they affected the talent system.¹

The majority of educators are **prepared** for the profession at an institution of higher education. State efforts to monitor preparation programs have historically been limited to program approval and evaluation that occurs every several years and denies few programs, or use national voluntary accreditation as a proxy for program effectiveness. Many states are discovering that their approval of programs is a key leverage point and are now taking a stronger role to ensure that teacher preparation contributes to the talent system. For example, Massachusetts now requires preparation providers to provide evidence that their training meets a state need and is effective, which has prompted the closure of programs unable to meet these requirements.²

Although states face a short-term need to fill vacancies, state leaders must not let that overshadow the long-term effort to cultivate new educator talent. There are no quick fixes to improve perceptions about the teaching and school leadership professions, pay and advancement opportunities within those roles, or preservice preparation. Any state that relies on short-term strategies alone will continue to face these challenges into the future.

To attract and prepare teachers within a comprehensive, coherent, and high-leverage talent system, states need to consider the following actions:

- **Develop a clear sense of your state’s educator workforce needs.** Efforts to recruit, select, and prepare teachers will remain scattershot until the state maps out its needs and focuses activity on those needs. States can develop projections of teacher supply and demand, which vary in terms of geography, contextual factors such as poverty, subject areas, and student populations. For example, Massachusetts commissioned 10-year projections of teacher supply and demand to shed light on the state’s workforce needs (Levin, Berg-Jacobson, Atchison, Lee, & Vontsolos, 2015). Arkansas, Louisiana, and Missouri are developing teacher shortage predictor tools, which might not capture oversupply but highlight anticipated gaps in the workforce.³
- **Monitor whether your state attracts and retains its target population in the educator workforce.** Make clear the characteristics your state seeks in candidates and then monitor whether those candidates enter and remain in the profession. The state can bring coherence to efforts to attract and prepare educators when these data are brought into focus and efforts are evaluated on how they contribute to the overall goal. For example, if a state seeks to increase the percentage of top high school graduates who enter teacher preparation and top college graduates who enter and stay in teaching, all efforts should report on their contribution to those goals. If a state seeks to build a more diverse educator workforce—including efforts to recruit minority and retired military candidates and to help local communities grow their own educator workforces—data on the resulting change in diversity should be evaluated to assess which programs move the needle toward the state’s goal.
- **Promote and require improvement in educator preparation through program evaluation, state approval, and national accreditation.** State leaders need to ensure that needed changes are made in teacher preparation, such as aligning coursework with clinical experience and ensuring that all candidates are trained in K–12 classrooms under the leadership of great teachers.⁴ States must analyze data from program graduates to assess whether their training equipped them to achieve desired outcomes with students. In a recent 50-state scan of policies related to teacher preparation, 13 states were found to monitor the impact of program completers on students (or have plans in place to do so by

fall 2017) (Teacher Preparation Analytics, 2016). Reporting these data publicly, as is done through annual report cards in North Carolina and Tennessee, calls attention to the current status of educator preparation. But Florida and Massachusetts have the highest leverage strategy in place: these states consider indicators of program effectiveness when approving preparation programs to train educators (Mitchel & Aldeman, 2016).

- **Elevate the status of the profession in pay and leadership potential.** The field of education needs to compete for talent with other professions—most of which offer opportunities to progress in responsibility and pay as skill and effectiveness increases. To be more attractive, teaching must include opportunities for meaningful career growth. States need to encourage or require districts to create sustainable career pathways within teaching that give great teachers responsibility for more students and sizable pay supplements for those roles that are affordable within expected resources. When roles are sustainably designed, potential and existing teachers are able to envision and strive toward a professional future in the classroom.⁵ Promising models include Turnaround Teacher Teams (T3), a cohort staffing model that provides differentiated pay for teachers in leadership roles and offers teams of teachers job-embedded support. Opportunity Culture sites create staffing models that offer similar similar roles, further boosting the attractiveness of strong teacher leader roles by carving out sizable pay supplements from sustainable sources, creating career paths that last and have the potential to factor into the professional decisions that individuals make in the short term and long term. These roles are being created in districts of varying size, including small rural districts.

Develop and Support

Talent systems should help teachers understand their professional learning needs and provide built-in support and opportunities to improve their practice. To do this successfully, systems must include assessment of teaching practice, feedback to individuals, and professional learning geared to both better use strengths and support continuous improvement. When a talent system incorporates these elements effectively, professional learning becomes part of the daily routine.

One-time workshops are widely agreed to be a low-impact strategy to **develop** teachers. Research has shown that students are more likely to make significant gains when their teacher is engaged in sustained, intensive professional learning (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). In the past, states have encouraged districts to use federal Title II dollars for professional development and class-size reductions. In practice, this approach has resulted in millions of teachers taking part in one-time workshops. A much smaller number, just over 400,000 teachers,

took part in “daily learning activities” and less than 4% of Title II funds were allocated to mentoring and induction programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2012).

Another common strategy funded with Title II dollars has been instructional coaching, an activity hoped to offer more “in-time” and ongoing **support** for teachers. Based on a survey of districts, it is estimated that Title II has funded coaching for more than 1.8 million teachers each year. Unfortunately, most coaching is not designed to provide the intensive support that teachers need. Coaching loads often include too many teachers to allow coaches to provide the intensive support that is required to change or strengthen instructional practice.⁶ The result is insufficient activity—for example, in one survey teachers reported receiving roughly 6 hours of coaching per year (TNTP, 2015) and another found that just 12% of teachers are coached on a weekly basis (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014).

State actions that develop and support teachers within a comprehensive, coherent, and high-leverage talent system:

- **Know what funds support professional learning strategies.** It is common for multiple types of professional learning activities to be sprinkled across many accounting codes, making it impossible for districts and states to assess the cost effectiveness of any approach (Odden, Archibald, Fermanich, & Gallagher, 2002). States need to consider such codes and reporting requirements to ensure sufficient data are collected to analyze professional learning expenditures.
- **Develop guidance to help districts focus spending on effective professional learning and coaching.** Research suggests it can take an average of 20 separate instances of practice before an educator has mastered a new skill, and that number increases along with the complexity of the skill (Joyce & Showers, 2002). States can encourage districts to follow what research suggests will be most effective, such as keeping instructional coaching loads in check and ensuring that coaches have time to work with their teachers multiple times each week. State leaders can base guidance to districts on the six pillars outlined in *Coaching for Impact* (The University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, & Public Impact, 2016).
- **Offer examples and technical assistance to help schools and districts carve out time for professional learning.** Districts and schools face a challenging task to create schedules that build professional learning into the daily and weekly teaching routine. However, schools across the nation are designing Opportunity Culture models that do just this. The state can create opportunities for districts to apply for technical assistance to create such models and can highlight examples of districts that are orchestrating job-embedded professional learning using teams led by great teachers.⁷ These strategies encourage districts to redirect Title II dollars to structural change that improves instruction and teacher working conditions.

- **Ensure that evaluation systems support professional growth for educators (not just accountability).** States have made big changes to evaluation systems for teachers and school leaders in recent years, largely in response to federal criteria for Race to the Top grants and Elementary and Secondary Education Act waivers. Many states have been faced with backlash because of concerns that the evaluation will be used for punitive action only, with no potential upside for teachers. State leaders need to ensure that teacher and leader evaluation systems are focused on feedback, support, continuous improvement, and opportunity to advance along a career path (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2016).
- **Ensure that schools have the leadership structures needed to support teacher growth.** Principals must be equipped to serve as instructional leaders of their schools, and principals of low-performing schools must be adept as turnaround leaders. States need to catalyze the development of training that helps principals use distributed leadership techniques and form an instructional leadership team of teacher leaders. Principals need to be equipped to train teacher leaders to lead instructional teams, and to help those teams set goals and monitor progress to those goals. For principals of turnaround schools, training should cultivate competencies—patterns of thinking, feeling, speaking, and acting—that are correlated with successful turnaround efforts.⁸ States and districts interested in strengthening their preparation and support for principals can consult the Framework for Principal Talent Management (<http://www.air.org/resource/framework-principal-talent-management>) developed by AIR for the George W. Bush Institute. The Framework outlines innovative policies and practices for improving the way districts attract, support, and retain effective principals who drive improvements in student achievement and other critical school and student outcomes.

Retain and Extend

A strong talent system hangs on to solid and top performers and creates opportunities for the strongest teachers to influence their peers and reach more students. A talent system with these characteristics gives teachers the ability to form career aspirations while remaining in the classroom.

Teachers of all ages today choose to leave the classroom for many reasons, such as seeking higher pay and professional growth potential, feeling pressure without the support or authority to meet demands of the job, frustration with leadership and constant change, and needing flexibility that the job does not offer. Common strategies that states and districts use to **retain** teachers are to offer teaching positions in more desirable classrooms and longevity pay. These strategies do not contribute to an ideal talent system—one exacerbates inequitable access to experienced teachers and one rewards individuals for time spent in the system, rather than the impact of their contribution.

Some states and districts are creating teacher leadership roles in an effort to **extend** the impact of top teachers to their peers. Yet a recent study found that teacher leaders are rarely being deployed effectively to develop peers and reach more students (Bierly, Doyle, & Smith, 2016). Department chair roles are common but typically focus on administrative functions and not instructional coaching. Some teacher leadership programs are in name only, giving teachers a title and having them engage in some short-term activity but not actually changing their role within the school. Teachers might become leaders of a professional learning collaborative, but that role is typically limited to organizing meetings without authority or responsibility to help peers take action as a result of the conversations. Meanwhile, principals face a near impossible challenge to provide every teacher with the support needed to improve instruction.

State actions that retain and extend the reach of great teachers within a comprehensive, coherent, and high-leverage talent system:

- **Offer well-paid career advancement opportunities for teachers.** Districts should not expect top teachers to give 20 to 30 years in the same role. Rather, districts should give excellent teachers greater instructional responsibility and pay more for these expanded roles. More students will gain access to instruction led by the most effective teachers. States can encourage districts and schools to create such roles to retain high performers in the classroom and generate classroom-based aspiration for teachers who are performing in the large middle of the bell curve. They can provide funding and technical assistance to support the design work needed to transition to these new roles (Dean, Hassel, Hassel, & Steiner, 2016). Denver Public Schools has spread team teacher roles across the district, offering great teachers the chance to continue teaching while spending significant time supporting peers. Similar structures are in place in Opportunity Culture sites across seven states and in other districts exploring such hybrid roles.⁹
- **Prepare excellent teachers to lead their peers.** Teachers whose students achieve greater than expected growth and who demonstrate competencies needed to lead adults can become instructional leaders within their schools. States should offer training to help emerging and current teacher leaders cultivate the skills and strategies needed to be effective instructional leaders. Such training is most effective when it involves people who will assume similar roles within their schools and when it includes ongoing opportunities for role-alike leaders to learn and collaborate. This also helps build a bench of future school leaders who have experience being responsible for learning across a broader swath of students and teachers.
- **Rethink state policies that limit schools' ability to change roles, career paths, pay, and schedules.** Districts cannot offer classroom-based career advancement without restructuring the way schools are staffed, the way students are organized in the school day, and the way current funds are

allocated. State leaders need to assess whether any current policies or funding restrictions prevent districts and schools from doing this work. States need to communicate with innovating districts to understand any barriers that exist and clear any misperception that might exist.

4 | Using Consolidated Plans to Drive High-Leverage Talent Systems

States have an opportunity to advance their visions of talent systems under ESSA, but the fact is that most dollars flow through the state to local districts to spend. State leaders need to ensure that they are developing ESSA plans and communicating in ways that focus activity on their vision. State leaders can use five key strategies in ESSA planning to articulate a clear vision of a talent system and direct activity toward it.

- **Ensure that districts understand their funding flexibility.** States will need to identify and dispel myths about how districts are required to or prohibited from using ESSA funds. Such myths can prevent districts from undertaking more innovative work, relying instead on traditional expenditures like professional development workshops and class-size reduction.
- **Provide guidance to districts on how to spend their funds.** States need to articulate how districts could use their federal dollars to build a strong talent system that is aligned with the state's vision. Without such guidance, districts are likely to continue doing what is familiar, such as spending their significant Title II funds on one-shot staff development and class-size reduction. Guidance can help districts consider new strategies and shows that the state would approve district plans that include such activity. Likewise, guidance can discourage ineffective spending.
- **Align the district plan template with the state's vision.** States can influence district planning by constructing a template that requires districts to explain how their plans align with the state's vision for a talent system and how they will use ESSA funds on high-leverage and long-term strategies. For example, the state could include a question that asks districts to explain how they will assess their talent needs or how they will provide job-embedded professional learning opportunities for all teachers.
- **Direct state-controlled funds to districts that align with the state's priorities.** States have direct control over a relatively small portion of ESSA funds but can use those funds as an incentive for districts to adopt key strategies. One example is for the state education agency to identify a set of "priority actions" in the district plan template, such as working with higher education to establish year-long residencies for teacher candidates enrolled in traditional preparation programs. If the district plan commits to this activity, the state will allocate additional dollars from its set aside.

- **Provide technical assistance to overcome impediments to the state’s vision.**

In recent years, states have put a great deal of effort into the transition to college- and career-ready standards, ramp up of new educator evaluation systems, and school improvement activity. States must now step back and determine if there are areas of technical assistance that need to be built to help districts progress toward the state’s vision of a talent system.

Which ESSA funds can states use to pursue an ideal talent system?

	Available State Set-Aside	What Could States Do With These Funds?
Title I, Part A	States must reserve 7% of these funds to support school improvement activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provide technical assistance to help schools and districts redesign roles and schedules to retain great teachers and carve out time for professional learning ■ Invest in the pipeline of great leaders for high-need schools ■ Direct additional funds to districts and schools that pursue the state’s preferred talent strategies ■ Evaluate whether strategies are working
Title II, Part A	SEAs may retain 5% of these funds for state activities related to supporting effective instruction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fund or offer technical assistance to help districts and schools design school models that pay great teachers more and offer job-embedded professional learning for all teachers ■ Align educator evaluation with opportunities for professional growth ■ Improve the preparation of teacher and school leaders
	States may retain an additional 3% of these funds for state activities related to principals and other school leaders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fund training for teacher leaders and school leader to use distributed leadership to improve instruction
Title IV, Part A	States may retain 5% of these funds for state activities related to student support and academic enrichment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Use technology to extend instruction by great teachers to students, wherever they reside in the state

5 | Conclusion

States need to establish long-term goals that result in an ideal talent system. Stop-gap measures might be needed, but the majority of state and district investment should be directed toward the ideal. When determining short-term strategies, states must distinguish between those that lack leverage toward the ideal and those that can move the needle and lead to lasting change.

Shortages in particular make for alarming headlines, creating public pressure on state and district leaders to fill vacancies. Many chiefs are leading their agency's ESSA planning within that context. The chief's voice needs to convey the vision of an ideal talent system as the only way to fully address shortages and equity gaps. Chiefs must emphasize the importance of taking near-term action to build toward that vision. This means calling attention to trade-offs and guarding against investment in strategies that allow the talent system to remain weak. Chiefs must communicate the vision clearly within their state education agency as well as to the governor and state legislature. Elected officials feel pressure to produce results within political cycles, and chiefs must try to prevent policymaking that is focused on the near term to the detriment of long-term change.

Chiefs also need to ensure that their state education agencies help local districts understand how they can use available dollars to improve the way schools are organized, the roles people play, the way time is used, and the way dollars are spent. In addition, chiefs need to ensure that their state education agency uses all levers available to redirect current ineffective spending to structural change that is needed and strategies that are known to work. When states and districts spend significant Title II dollars on sit-and-get professional development and class-size reduction, precious funds are squandered on investments with little return rather than used to build a more effective talent system.

States must be highly strategic in their investment of state-managed funds. Dollars are limited, and stretched state education agencies need to ensure that funds and people power are being directed at activities that build toward the ideal talent system.¹⁰ States have now analyzed root causes of gaps in students' access to effective teachers and have identified strategies to close that gap. As outlined in the *GTL Center Implementation Playbook* (<http://www.gtlcenter.org/learning-hub/equitable-access-supports/implementation-playbook>), states need to take stock of strategies that are working and those that are not achieving desired results. As states develop their ESSA plans, they can hone the key elements of their talent systems by identifying and pursuing strategies that progress toward the ideal, pressing for needed changes in the short and long term.

References

- Bierly, C., Doyle, B., & Smith, A. (2016). *Transforming schools: How distributed leadership can create more high-performing schools*. Boston, MA: Bain & Company. Retrieved from http://www.bain.com/Images/BAIN_REPORT_Transforming_schools.pdf
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2014). *Teachers know best: Teachers' views on professional development*. Seattle, WA: Author. Retrieved from http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/learning/teacher_views_on_pd/
- Boyd, D., Goldhaber, D., Lankford, H., & Wyckoff, J. (2007). The effect of certification and preparation on teacher quality. *The Future of Children*, 17(1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795877.pdf>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2016). *Principles for teacher support and evaluation systems*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/Principles%20for%20Teacher%20Support%20and%20Evaluation%20Systems.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., 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. Retrieved from <http://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/nsdcstudy2009.pdf>
- Dean, S., Hassel, B. C., Hassel, E. A., & Steiner, L. (2016). *ESSA: New law, new opportunity: A brief guide to excellence for state leaders*. Chapel Hill, NC: Author. Retrieved from http://publicimpact.com/web/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/ESSA_New_Law_New_Opportunity-Public_Impact.pdf
- Dean, S., Hassel, E. A., & Hassel, B. C. (2016). *Paid educator residencies, within budget: How new school models can radically improve teacher and principal preparation*. Chapel Hill, NC: Public Impact. Retrieved from http://opportunityculture.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Paid_Educator_Residencies_Within_Budget-Public_Impact.pdf
- Hassel, B. C., & Hassel, E. A. (2010). *Opportunity at the top: How America's best teachers could close the gaps, raise the bar, and keep our nation great*. Chapel Hill, NC: Public Impact. Retrieved from http://www.opportunityculture.org/images/stories/opportunity_at_the_top-public_impact.pdf
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Leachman, M., & Mai, C. (2014). *Most states still funding schools less than before the recession*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Retrieved from <http://www.cbpp.org/research/most-states-still-funding-schools-less-than-before-the-recession>

- Levin, J., Berg-Jacobson, A., Atchison, D., Lee, K., & Vontsolos, E. (2015). *Massachusetts study of teacher supply and demand: Trends and projections*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from <http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Massachusetts-Study-of-Teacher-Supply-and-Demand-December-2015.pdf>
- Mitchel, A. L., & Aldeman, C. (2016). *Peering around the corner: Analyzing state efforts to link teachers to the programs that prepared them*. Washington, DC: Bellwether Education Partners. Retrieved from http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/Bellwether_TeacherPrep_Final.pdf
- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2015). *Clinically oriented teacher preparation*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from <http://nctrresidencies.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/NCTR-COTP-Final-Single-Pgs.pdf>
- Odden, A., Archibald, S., Fermanich, M., & Gallagher, H. A. (2002). A cost framework for professional development. *Journal of Education Finance*, 28(1), 51–74. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40704157>
- Odden, A., Goetz, M., & Picus, L. O. (2008). Using available evidence to estimate the cost of educational adequacy. *Education Finance and Policy*, 3(3), 374–397.
- Rinehart, J. S., Short, P. M., Short, R. J., & Eckley, M. (1998). Teacher empowerment and principal leadership: Understanding the influence process. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 608–630.
- Teacher Preparation Analytics. (2016). *Accountability in teacher preparation: Policies and data in the 50 states & DC*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/50StateScan092216.pdf>
- The University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, & Public Impact. (2016). *Coaching for Impact: Six pillars to create coaching roles that achieve their potential to improve teaching and learning*. Retrieved from www.learningforward.org/coaching-for-impact/
- TNTP. (2015). *The mirage: Confronting the hard truth about our quest for teacher development*. Brooklyn, NY: Author. Retrieved from http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP-Mirage_2015.pdf
- U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *Findings from the 2011–12 Survey on the Use of Funds Under Title II, Part A*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/finalfindings32312.pdf>

End Notes

- ¹ For example, see the lack of evidence base found for policies related to teacher certification in Boyd, Goldhaber, Lankford, and Wyckoff (2007).
- ² Massachusetts is one of 13 states that are part of the Network for Transforming Educator Preparation, coordinated by the Council of Chief State School Officers.
- ³ Arkansas and Missouri are working on this with the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, and Louisiana is separately undertaking this work.
- ⁴ For a report on how 22 teacher education programs shifted from traditional teacher training models to more clinical approaches, see the National Center for Teacher Residencies (2015). For a brief outlining how districts and teacher preparation providers can create paid, full-time, yearlong residencies led by excellent teachers within Opportunity Culture school models, see Dean, Hassel, and Hassel (2016).
- ⁵ Lack of diverse career opportunities has been found to be a significant source of dissatisfaction within the profession. For example, see Rinehart, Short, Short, and Eckley (1998).
- ⁶ One study recommends that coach-to-teacher ratios not exceed one coach per 200 students (Odden, Goetz, & Picus, 2008).
- ⁷ See opportunityculture.org for examples, resources, and results.
- ⁸ States can learn more about the competencies associated with successful turnarounds through a series of professional learning modules developed through a partnership of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, The Center on School Turnaround, Public Impact, and University of Virginia Darden/Curry Partnership for Leaders in Education; see <http://www.gtlcenter.org/technical-assistance/professional-learning-modules/recruit-select-and-support-turnaround-leader-competencies>. For a toolkit designed to help principals lead instruction through a team of teacher leaders, see <http://opportunityculture.org/tools-for-principals-in-opportunity-culture-schools/>
- ⁹ Opportunity Culture districts and schools extend the reach of excellent teachers to more students, giving teachers greater instructional responsibility for more pay. Salary supplements are sustainably funded from existing dollars. For information on the latest results of Opportunity Culture sites, see <http://www.opportunityculture.org/dashboard>.
- ¹⁰ According to this 2014 report from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 30 of 47 states provided less funding for K–12 in 2014–15 than in 2007–08. Although most states (27) increased K–12 funding from 2013–14 to 2014–15, at least 11 did not increase enough to make up for postrecession cuts (Leachman & Mai, 2014).

Center on
GREAT TEACHERS & LEADERS

at American Institutes for Research ■

www.gtlcenter.org



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

www.air.org

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW | Washington, DC | 20007-3835 | 877.322.8700

Copyright © 2016 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B120021. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders is administered by American Institutes for Research and its partners: the Council of Chief State School Officers and Public Impact.