2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

Virginia

OVERALL GRADA

DH



Acknowledgments

STATES

State education agencies remain our most important partners in this effort, and their gracious cooperation has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Every state formally received a draft of the *Yearbook* in July 2011 for comment and correction; states also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but one state responded to our inquiries. While states do not always agree with the recommendations, their willingness to acknowledge the imperfections of their teacher policies is an important first step toward reform.

We also thank the many state pension boards that reviewed our drafts and responded to our inquiries.

FUNDERS

The primary funders for the 2011 *Yearbook* were:

- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
- Carnegie Corporation of New York
- George Gund Foundation
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The Joyce Foundation


The National Council on Teacher Quality does not accept any direct funding from the federal government.

STAFF

Sandi Jacobs, *Project Director*Sarah Brody, *Project Assistant*Kathryn M. Doherty, *Special Contributor*Kelli Michele, *Lead Researcher*

Meagan Staffiere Comb, Trisha M. Madden and Stephanie T. Maltz, Researchers

Thank you to the team at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2011 *Yearbook*. Thanks also to Colleen Hale and Jeff Hale at EFA Solutions for the original *Yearbook* design and ongoing technical support.



Executive Summary

For five years running, the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has tracked states' teacher policies, preparing a detailed and thorough compendium of teacher policy in the United States on topics related to teacher preparation, licensure, evaluation, career advancement, tenure, compensation, pensions and dismissal.

The 2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook includes NCTQ's biennial, full review of the state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession. This year's report measures state progress against a set of 36 policy goals focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers. For the first time, the Yearbook includes a progress rating for states on goals that have been measured over time. An overall progress ranking is also included, showing how states compare to each other in moving forward on their teacher policies.

Virginia at a Glance

Overall 2011 Yearbook Grade:



Overall 2009 Yearbook Grade: D+

Area Grades	2011	2009
Area 1 Delivering Well Prepared Teachers	C-	С
Area 2 Expanding the Teaching Pool	С	С
Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers	F	D-
Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers	С	С
Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers	D+	D+

Overall Progress



Highlights from recent progress in Virginia include:

Performance pay

How is Virginia Faring?

Area 1 Delivering Well Prepared Teachers



Policy Strengths

- Teacher preparation programs are required to address the science of reading, and teacher candidates must pass a test to ensure knowledge.
- Middle school teachers may not teach on a K-8 generalist license, and they must appropriately pass a single-subject content test.

Policy Weaknesses

- Not all teacher candidates are required to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- Elementary teachers are not adequately prepared to teach a broad range of elementary content.
- Neither teacher preparation program nor licensure test requirements ensure that new elementary teachers are adequately prepared to teach mathematics.
- Although most secondary teachers must pass a content test to teach a core subject area, some secondary social studies teachers are not required to pass content tests for each discipline they intend to teach.

- The state offers a K-12 special education certification.
- A pedagogy test is not required as a condition of
- Requirements for teacher preparation do not ensure a high-quality student teaching experience.
- The teacher preparation program approval process does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Area 2 Expanding the Pool of Teachers



Policy Strengths

- Admission requirements for alternate routes to certification include evidence of subject-matter knowledge and offer flexibility for nontraditional candidates.
- Requirements for alternate route preparation are appropriately streamlined, although more could be done to meet the immediate needs of new teachers.
- There are no restrictions on alternate route usage or providers.

Policy Weaknesses

- The state does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.
- Out-of-state teachers are not required to meet the state's testing requirements, and there are additional obstacles that do not support licensure reciprocity..

How is Virginia Faring?

Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers

Policy Strengths

Policy Weaknesses

- The state data system does not have the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- Objective evidence of student learning is not the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluations.
- Annual evaluations for all teachers are not required.
- Tenure decisions are not connected to evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- Licensure advancement and renewal are not based on teacher effectiveness.
- Little school-level data are reported that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers



Policy Strengths

- All new teachers receive mentoring.
- Districts are given full authority for how teachers are paid, although they are not discouraged from basing salary schedules solely on years of experience and advanced degrees.
- Teachers can receive additional compensation for working in high-need schools or shortage subject areas, and teachers in some districts can receive performance pay.

Policy Weaknesses

- Professional development is not aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations.
- The state does not support additional compensation for relevant prior work experience.
- Teachers are only offered a defined benefit pension plan as their mandatory pension plan, and pension policies are not portable, flexible or fair to all teachers.
- The pension system requires excessive resources.
- Retirement benefits are determined by a formula that is not neutral, meaning that pension wealth does not accumulate uniformly for each year a teacher works.

Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers



Policy Strengths

All teachers of core-subject areas must pass all required subject-matter tests as a condition of initial licensure.

Policy Weaknesses

- There is no assurance that tenured teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations will be placed on structured improvement plans or that they will be eligible for dismissal if they fail to improve.
- Ineffective classroom performance is not grounds for dismissal, and the state could do more to ensure that the appeal process for teacher dismissal occurs within a reasonable time frame.
- Performance is not considered in determining which teachers to lay off during reductions in force.

Virginia Goal Summary

Goal Breakdown		
Best Practice	1	Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers
Fully Meets	5	3-A: State Data Systems
Nearly Meets	4	3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness
Partially Meets	6	3-C: Frequency of Evaluations
Only Meets a Small Part	8	3-D: Tenure
O Does Not Meet	12	
Progress on Goals Since 2009 1 0 0 28 8 2 7		3-E: Licensure Advancement
T V V V ZO GOAL !		3-F: Equitable Distribution
Area 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers		Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers
1-A: Admission into Preparation Programs	0	4-A: Induction
1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation	•	4-B: Professional Development
1-C: Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction	*	4-C: Pay Scales
1-D: Teacher Preparation in Mathematics	•	4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience
1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation	•	4-E: Differential Pay
1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation		4-F: Performance Pay
1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science		4-G: Pension Flexibility
1-H: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies		4-H: Pension Sustainability
1-I: Special Education Teacher Preparation	0	4-I: Pension Neutrality
1-J: Assessing Professional Knowledge	\circ	Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers
1-K: Student Teaching	0	5-A: Licensure Loopholes
1-L: Teacher Preparation Program		5-B: Unsatisfactory Evaluations
Accountability Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers		5-C: Dismissal for Poor Performance
2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility	•	5-D: Reductions in Force
2-B: Alternate Route Preparation	•	
2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers	•	
2-D: Part Time Teaching Licenses	0	
2-E: Licensure Reciprocity	0	

About the Yearbook

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) has long argued that no educational improvement strategies states take on are likely to have a greater impact than policies that seek to maximize teacher effectiveness. In this fifth edition of the State Teacher Policy Yearbook, NCTQ provides a detailed examination of state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession, covering the full breadth of policies including teacher preparation, licensure, evaluation, career advancement, tenure, compensation, pensions and dismissal.

The Yearbook is a 52-volume compendium of customized state reports for the 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as a national summary overview, measuring state progress against a set of 36 specific policy goals. All of the reports are available from NCTQ's website at www.nctq.org/stpy.

The 36 Yearbook goals are focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive policy framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers. The goals were developed based on input and ongoing feedback from state officials, practitioners, policy groups and other education organizations, as well as from NCTQ's own nationally respected advisory board. These goals meet five criteria for an effective reform framework:

- 1. They are supported by a strong rationale, grounded in the best research available. The rationale and research citations supporting each goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.
- 2. They offer practical rather than pie-in-the-sky solutions for improving teacher quality.
- 3. They take on the teaching profession's most pressing needs, including making the profession more responsive to the current labor market.
- 4. They are, for the most part, relatively cost neutral.
- 5. They respect the legitimate constraints that some states face so that the goals can work in all 50 states.

The need to ensure that all children have effective teachers has captured the attention of the public and policymakers across the country like never before. The Yearbook offers state school chiefs, school boards, legislatures and the many advocates who press hard for reform a concrete set of recommendations as they work to maximize teacher quality for their students.

How to Read the Yearbook

NCTQ rates state teacher policy in several ways.

For each of the 36 individual teacher policy goals, states receive two ratings. The first rating indicates whether, or to what extent, a state has met the goal. NCTQ uses these familiar graphics to indicate the extent to which each goal has been met:









A new feature of this year's *Yearbook* is a progress rating for each goal NCTQ has measured over time. These ratings are intended to give states a meaningful sense of the changes in teacher policy since the 2009 *Yearbook* was published. Using the symbols below, NCTQ determines whether each state has advanced on the goal, if the state policy has remained unchanged, or if the state has actually lost ground on that topic.








Some goals are marked with this symbol , which indicates that the bar has been raised for this goal since the 2009 *Yearbook*. With many states making considerable progress in advancing teacher effectiveness policy, NCTQ raised the standards for some goals where the bar had been quite low. As this may have a negative impact on some states' scores, those goals are always marked with the above symbol.

States receive grades in the five goal areas under which the 36 goals are organized: 1) delivering well prepared teachers; 2) expanding the pool of teachers; 3) identifying effective teachers; 4) retaining effective teachers and 5) exiting ineffective teachers. States also receive an overall grade that summarizes state performance across the five goal areas, giving an overall perspective on how states measure up against NCTQ benchmarks. New this year, states also receive an overall progress ranking, indicating how much progress each state has made compared to other states.

As always, the *Yearbook* provides a detailed narrative accounting of the policy strengths and weaknesses in each policy area for each state and for the nation as a whole. Best practices are highlighted. The reports are also chock full of reader-friendly charts and tables that provide a national perspective on each goal and serve as a quick reference on how states perform relative to one another, goal by goal.

Another new feature this year makes it easier to distinguish strong policies from weaker ones on our charts and tables. The policies NCTQ considers strong practices or the ideal policy positions for states are capitalized. This provides a quick thumbnail for readers to size up state policies against the policy option that aligns with NCTQ benchmarks for meeting each policy goal. For example, on the chart below, "BEFORE ADMISSION TO PREP PROGRAM" is capitalized, as that is the optimal timing for testing teacher candidates' academic proficiency.



Goals

AREA 1: DELIVERING WELL PREPARED TEACHERS

PAGE 9

1-A: Admission into Preparation Programs

The state should require undergraduate teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with good academic records.

1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core Standards.

1-C: Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.

1-D: Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.

1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

1-H: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies

The state should ensure that social studies teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

1-I: Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they will be required to teach.

1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge

The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.

1-K: Student Teaching

The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high-quality clinical experience.

1-L: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

AREA 2: EXPANDING THE POOL OF TEACHERS

PAGE 59

2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility

The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

2-B: Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide streamlined preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers.

2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from regulatory obstacles that limit its usage and providers.

2-D: Part Time Teaching Licenses

The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.

2-E: Licensure Reciprocity

The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.

Goals

AREA 3: IDENTIFYING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

PAGE 81

3-A: State Data Systems

The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.

3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness

The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

3-C: Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

3-D: Tenure

The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

3-E: Licensure Advancement

The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

3-F: Equitable Distribution

The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.

AREA 4: RETAINING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

PAGE 105

4-A: Induction

The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.

4-B: Professional Development

The state should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

4-C: Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience

The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.

4-E: Differential Pay

The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.

4-F: Performance Pay

The state should support performance pay but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.

4-G: Pension Flexibility

The state should ensure that pension systems are portable, flexible and fair to all teachers.

4-H: Pension Sustainability

The state should ensure that excessive resources are not committed to funding teachers' pension systems.

4-I: Pension Neutrality

The state should ensure that pension systems are neutral, uniformly increasing pension wealth with each additional year of work.

AREA 5: EXITING INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS

PAGE 147

5-A: Licensure Loopholes

The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.

5-B: Unsatisfactory Evaluations

The state should articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations, including specifying that teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations should be eligible for dismissal.

5-C: Dismissal for Poor Performance

The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.

5-D: Reductions in Force

The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.

Goal A – Admission into Preparation Programs

The state should require undergraduate teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with good academic records.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. All preparation programs in a state should use a common admissions test to facilitate program comparison, and the test should allow comparison of applicants to the general college-going population and selection of applicants in the top half of that population.
- Programs should have the option of exempting candidates from this test who submit comparable SAT or ACT scores at a level set by the state.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal A **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal Raised for this Goal





Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia requires that approved undergraduate teacher preparation programs accept teacher candidates who have passed a basic skills test, the Praxis I. Although the state sets the minimum score for this test, it is normed just to the prospective teacher population.

Virginia also allows candidates to qualify by means of equivalent scores on the SAT or ACT.

Unfortunately, the state's policy has a glaring loophole. Programs are permitted to accept candidates who have not met the minimum score set by the state and provide such candidates with "the opportunity to address any deficiencies."

Supporting Research

Code of Virginia 23-9.2:3.6

Entry Assessment to Virginia Approved Programs

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/educator_preparation/college_programs/entry_assessment.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation

Virginia would have a sound policy but for the loophole that allows programs to essentially waive this requirement for candidates as they see fit. Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates end up investing considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates needing additional support should complete remediation prior to program entry, avoiding the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars.

Require preparation programs to use a common test normed to the general college-bound population.

The basic skills tests in use in most states largely assess middle school-level skills. To improve the selectivity of teacher candidates—a common characteristic in countries whose students consistently outperform ours in international comparisons—Virginia should require an assessment that demonstrates that candidates are academically competitive with all peers, regardless of their intended profession. Requiring a common test normed to the general college population would allow for the selection of applicants in the top half of their class, as well as facilitate program comparison.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia cited the pertinent section of the Code that states, in part: "That the Board of Education shall prescribe an assessment of basic skills for individuals seeking entry into an approved education program and shall establish a minimum passing score for such assessment. The Board also may prescribe other requirements for admission to Virginia's approved education programs in its regulations. Candidates who fail to achieve the minimum score established by the Board of Education may be denied entrance into the relevant education program on the basis of such failure; however, if enrolled in the program, they shall have the opportunity to address any deficiencies."

Virginia also noted that it sets the passing scores for Praxis I, and they are among the nation's highest scores for those states using this test.


LAST WORD The cited section of the Code indicates that candidates "may" be denied entry into a preparation program if they fail the basic skills test, and those who enroll may "address any deficiencies." Clearly, a loophole exists for those candidates who do not earn a passing score on the Praxis I assessment.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although there are a number of states that require teacher candidates to pass a basic skills test as a criterion for admission to a preparation program, Texas is the only state that requires a test of academic proficiency normed to the general college bound population rather than just to prospective teachers. In addition, the state's minimum scores for admission appear to be relatively selective when compared to other tests used across the country.


Figure 2 Do states require a test of academic proficiency that is normed to the general college-going population?



1. Strong Practice: Texas

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming

Figure 3 When do states test teacher candidates' basic skills?




- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachussets, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming

TESTNORMED TO COLLEGE.
ADMISSION TO PREP PROPERTO Figure 4 Do states appropriately test teacher candidates' academic proficiency? Alabama Alaska Arizona П П П Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware П District of Columbia Florida П П Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi П Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico П New York North Carolina П North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee П П Texas Utah Vermont **VIRGINIA** П Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 1 20 20 10

Figure 5

Do states measure performance in reading, mathematics and writing?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- California⁴, District of Columbia⁴, Hawaii⁴, Indiana, Iowa, Maine⁴, Maryland, New Hampshire⁴, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁵, Pennsylvania⁴, Rhode Island⁴, Vermont, Virginia
- 3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
- 4. Minimum score must be met in each section.
- Composite score can only be used if passing score is met on two of three subtests.

Goal B – Elementary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core Standards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that its approved teacher preparation programs deliver a comprehensive program of study in broad liberal arts coursework. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours to ensure appropriate depth in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts. (Mathematics preparation for elementary teachers is discussed in Goal 1-D.)
- 2. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all subjects.
- 3. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to complete a content specialization in an academic subject area. In addition to enhancing content knowledge, this requirement also ensures that prospective teachers have taken higher level academic coursework.
- 4. Arts and sciences faculty, rather than education faculty, should in most cases teach liberal arts coursework to teacher candidates.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal B **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not ensure that its elementary teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach a broad range of elementary content.

Virginia requires candidates to pass the Praxis II general elementary content test, which does not report teacher performance in each subject area, meaning that it is possible to pass the test and still fail some subject areas, especially given the state's low passing score.

Although the state does not specify general education requirements, all elementary teacher candidates in Virginia must complete a major in interdisciplinary studies or in Virginia's core academic areas, which include English, history and social sciences (i.e., history, government, geography and economics) and science. These are sensible indicators of important curricular areas, but there is no guarantee that the courses used to meet these requirements will be relevant to the PK-6 classroom.

Because elementary education candidates must earn an arts and sciences degree, this ensures that liberal arts coursework is commendably taught by arts and sciences faculty.

Finally, Virginia has articulated elementary teaching standards that are better than those found in many states and allude to important areas of academic knowledge. For example, in the area of history and social sciences, elementary teacher candidates are expected to understand:

- The contributions of ancient civilizations to American social and political institutions;
- Major events in Virginia history from 1607 to the present;
- Key individuals, documents and events in United States history; and
- The evolution of America's constitutional republic, its ideas, institutions and practices.

However, the state's standards do leave gaps in a number of important areas, namely American, world, British and children's literature.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code 8 VAC 20-542-110

Praxis II

www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require a content test that ensures sufficient knowledge in all subjects.

Virginia should require separate passing scores for each content area on the test because without them it is impossible to measure knowledge of individual subjects. Further, to be meaningful, Virginia should ensure that these passing scores reflect high levels of performance.

Provide broad liberal arts coursework relevant to the elementary classroom.

Although Virginia outlines a more specific set of content standards than most states, the state should either articulate an even more specific set of standards or establish more comprehensive coursework requirements that are specifically geared to the areas of knowledge needed by PK-6 teachers. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts.

Require at least an academic concentration.

Virginia's policy requiring elementary candidates to earn an academic major is undermined because it may be met with an interdisciplinary major. Unlike an academic major, an interdisciplinary major will not necessarily enhance teachers' content knowledge or ensure that prospective teachers have taken higher-level academic coursework. Further, it does not provide an option for teacher candidates unable to fulfill student teaching or other professional requirements to still earn a degree, as an academic major does.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia asserted that content outlined in student standards must be addressed in the elementary program as well as the outlined competencies. Each content area must include the knowledge, skills and processes of history and the social sciences disciplines as defined in the state's Standards of Learning, and how the standards provide the necessary foundation for teaching that content area.

The state also noted that individuals with a degree from a regionally accredited college or university with an interdisciplinary major may not have student-taught. If the individual is eligible for an alternate route, he or she must meet all content requirements for licensure even though that individual has an interdisciplinary major.

Virginia reiterated that individuals seeking an endorsement in elementary education must have an arts and sciences degree, and that these courses are taught by arts and sciences faculty.


Supporting Research

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/licensure/index.shtml

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although no state meets this goal, three states have noteworthy policies. **Massachusetts's** testing requirements, which are based on the state's curriculum, ensure that elementary teachers are provided with a broad liberal arts education. **Indiana** and **Utah** are the first two states to adopt the new Praxis II "Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects" content test, which requires candidates to pass separately scored subtests in reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies and science.


Figure 7
Where do states set the passing score on elementary content licensure tests¹?



¹ Based on the most recent technical data that could be obtained; data not available for Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon and Washington. Montana and Nebraska do not require a content test. Colorado score is for Praxis II, not PLACE. Indiana, Maryland, Nevada, South Carolina and Utah now require new Praxis tests for which the technical data are not yet available; analysis is based on previously required test.

Figure 8

Have states adopted the K-12 Common Core State Standards?



- 1. Alaska, Minnesota, Nebraska, Texas, Virginia
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 9
What subjects does **Virginia** expect elementary teachers to know?





Figure 10			EN	IGLISH		/		SCIE				S	OCIA					FINE / ARTS
Do states expect			ر.	/ /	/		/	Earth Science	. / /	/ /		/	/ *	World H.	World His	./	/ /	/ / /
elementary teachers		ll'e	/ Jate	/ <u>;</u> ; /	/ پی	/	/	Scie ₇	/ /	/ بع	>	/=	, _{men}	7cie	1000	/ /	/ / /	
		erat _t	Life,		ž / /	/	/	.je /	ني / په	Ş /	story.	\ z̄c /	set /	\ \Z \	/Š/	33	//	/ /
to have in-depth		. \ <u>`</u>	‡s <u>;</u>	\$ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	/ /	/ ح	_ / .	£/.	ر. رايو / ويارو	/	# /	#/	: / في	<i>(</i>)	10,10	este,	\	> / /
knowledge of	.j.			00 / Fe /	/ .t	טַ. / 'פּ	/ 2	10 / 4		/ ;	<u> </u>	[g / :[.		$\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{p_{l}}$		A' A	/ / <i>#</i>	/ پي /
core content?	4	World/p.	Writing/C	Children's Liter	Chemics	Physics	/ ર્હું	Earth Sc.	Biology/Life C.	47,	Amax:	America History II	World L.	/ \$ /	/ૐ≷	Geography	Art Histor	Music
Alabama			*															
Alaska																		
Arizona			*				*	*	*	*		*				*		*
Arkansas																		
California			*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*
Colorado																		
Connecticut										*	*							
Delaware																		
District of Columbia																		
Florida			*		*		*	*	*			*				*		
Georgia			*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*		
Hawaii																		
Idaho																		
Illinois			*				*	*	*			*				*		
Indiana			*				*	*	*			*	*	*		*		*
Iowa																		
Kansas			*	*			*	*	*			*				*		
Kentucky																		
Louisiana																		
Maine																		
Maryland																		
Massachusetts				_														
Michigan			*		Ш	Ц	*	*	*			*		Ц				
Minnesota			*	*			*	*	*									
Mississippi									-									
Missouri									-									
Montana Nebraska			<u></u>				-											
Nevada																		
New Hampshire					Н													
New Jersey																		
New Mexico			4			H						Н						*
New York			$\hat{\Box}$					_				Н						
North Carolina	П				П							П			П			
North Dakota			П												П			
Ohio								$\overline{\Box}$										
Oklahoma																		
Oregon			*				*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
Pennsylvania																		
Rhode Island																		
South Carolina																		
South Dakota							Ų											
Tennessee			*				*	*	*			*				*		
Texas			*				*	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*
Utah																		
Vermont																		
VIRGINIA			*		*		*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		
Washington							*	*	*			*				*		*
West Virginia											Ц							
Wisconsin																		
Wyoming															Ш			
												CL.				c	L:	vered in depth

Figure 11

Do states expect elementary teachers to complete an academic concentration?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico
- 2. Strong Practice: Indiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma
- California, Connecticut, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri,
 New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia
 These states require a major, minor or concentration but
 there is no assurance it will be in an academic subject area.
- 4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal C – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. To ensure that teacher preparation programs adequately prepare candidates in the science of reading instruction, the state should require that these programs train teachers in the five instructional components shown by scientifically based reading research to be essential to teaching children to read.
- 2. The state should require that new elementary teachers pass a rigorous test of reading instruction in order to attain licensure. The design of the test should ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without knowing the science of reading instruction.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal C **Virginia** Analysis



Best Practice State



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

In its standards for elementary teacher preparation, Virginia requires teacher preparation programs to address the science of reading. Programs must provide training in the five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Virginia also requires pre-kindergarten, elementary and special education teachers to pass the Virginia Reading Assessment. This test is aligned with the English Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools and the National Reading Panel's five essential components of effective reading instruction. Reviews have rated this test as one of only a small number in the country that actually verifies a teacher candidate's knowledge in scientifically based reading instruction.

Supporting Research

8VAC20-542-110 http://www.va.nesinc.com/VA6_overview.asp

Stotsky, S. (2006). Why American Students Do Not Learn to Read Very Well: The Unintended Consequences of Title II and Teacher Testing. Third Education Group Review 2, No. 2; Rigden, D.W. (2006). Report on Licensure Alignment with the Essential Components of Effective Reading Instruction. Washington, DC: Reading First Teacher Education Network.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE


Eight states meet this goal by requiring that preparation programs for elementary teacher candidates address the science of reading and requiring that candidates pass comprehensive assessments that specifically test the five elements of instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Independent reviews of the assessments used by Connecticut, Massachusetts and Virginia confirm that these tests are rigorous measures of teacher candidates' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction.

Figure 13 Do states require preparation for elementary teachers in the science of reading?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 14 Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of the science of reading?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota⁴, New Mexico⁵, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania⁵, Tennessee,
- 2. Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Missouri, New York, Oregon, Texas
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Based on the limited information available about the test on the state's website.
- 5. Test is under development and not yet available for review.

Figure 15	DE	REPARATIO	/	TEST	
Do states ensure that	KE	QUIREMEN	15	REQUIRE	MENIS
elementary teachers	Š	y / 2 %		7ES1 ,	\ / <u>*</u>
know the science of	JAQ 5		/ {	A 1.E	g / g
reading?	7. ₹ 4. ₹	2 2 2 2	/ %	tenb	/ dipe
3	77 TE	D ₀ ,1	100 A	Madequate tag	/ %
Alabama	READING CORESS	Do not address	4 PPROPRIE		No reading test
Alaska					
Arizona	$\overline{\Box}$				
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota			1		
Mississippi	_				
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico			2		
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania			2		
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
VIRGINIA					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	26	25	9	10	32

Based on the limited information available about the test on the state's website.

^{2.} Test is under development and not yet available for review.

Goal D – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require teacher preparation programs to deliver mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates. This content should be specific to the needs of the elementary teacher (i.e., foundations, algebra and geometry with some statistics).
- 2. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to pass a rigorous test of mathematics content in order to attain licensure.
- Such test can also be used to test out of course requirements and should be designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of mathematics.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal D **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia relies on both coursework requirements and its standards for teacher preparation programs as the basis for articulating its requirements for the mathematics content knowledge of elementary teacher candidates.

The state requires that all elementary teacher candidates complete a major in interdisciplinary studies or in Virginia's core academic areas, which includes mathematics. However, Virginia specifies neither the requisite content of these classes nor that they must meet the needs of elementary teachers.

Virginia has also articulated teaching standards that its approved teacher preparation programs must use to frame instruction in elementary mathematics content. The state's standards appropriately address content in mathematics foundations, but although they mention such areas as algebra, geometry and statistics, the standards lack the specificity needed to ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver this mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates.

Finally, Virginia requires that all new elementary teachers pass a general subject-matter test, the Praxis II. This commercial test lacks a specific mathematics subscore, so one can likely fail the mathematics portion and still pass the test. Further, while this test does cover important elementary school-level content, it barely evaluates candidates' knowledge beyond an elementary school level, does not challenge their understanding of underlying concepts and does not require candidates to apply knowledge in nonroutine, multistep procedures.

Supporting Research

8VAC20-542-110

www.ets.org/praxis

"No Common Denominator: The Preparation of Elementary Teachers in Mathematics by America's Education Schools," NCTQ, June 2008 http://www.nctq.org/p/publications/docs/nctq_ttmath_fullreport.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.

Although Virginia requires knowledge in some key areas of mathematics, the state should require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers. This includes specific coursework in foundations, algebra and geometry, with some statistics.

■ Require teacher candidates to pass a rigorous mathematics assessment.

Virginia should assess mathematics content with a rigorous assessment tool, such as the test required in Massachusetts, that evaluates mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenges candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts. Such a test could also be used to allow candidates to test out of coursework requirements. Teacher candidates who lack minimum mathematics knowledge should not be eligible for licensure.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia asserted that it requires programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers because programs must address the Standards of Learning student standards. The Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs specifically require that programs must include understanding of the mathematics relevant to the content identified in the Standards of Learning and how the standards provide the foundation for teaching mathematics in elementary grades.

LAST WORD


Although Virginia requires that teacher preparation programs prepare elementary teacher candidates to teach to the state's elementary student standards, it is quite hard to monitor or enforce, absent a licensing test that 1) is directly aligned with state student learning standards and 2) reports teacher performance in each subject area, so that teachers cannot fail a subject area or two and still pass the test.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Massachusetts is the only state that ensures that its elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of mathematics content. As part of its general curriculum test, the state utilizes a separately scored mathematics subtest that covers topics specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.


Figure 17 Do states articulate appropriate mathematics preparation for elementary teachers?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Massachusetts

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 18 Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?



1. Strong Practice: Massachusetts

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Montana, Nebraska

Goal E - Middle School Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should encourage middle school candidates who intend to teach multiple subjects to earn minors in two core academic areas rather than earn a single major. Middle school candidates intending to teach a single subject area should earn a major in that area.
- The state should not permit middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers.
- 3. The state should require that new middle school teachers pass a licensing test in every core academic area they intend to teach.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal E **Virginia** Analysis



State Nearly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia requires a middle education (grades 6-8) endorsement for middle school teachers. Candidates must earn a major in interdisciplinary studies or its equivalent.

All new middle school teachers in Virginia are also required to pass a single-subject Praxis II content test to attain licensure; a general content knowledge test is not an option.

Supporting Research

8VAC20-542-20

www.ets.org/praxis

RECOMMENDATION

■ Differentiate between single and multiple subject middle school teachers.

Virginia is commended for not allowing middle school teachers to teach on a K-8 generalist license. However, it should encourage middle school teachers who plan to teach multiple subjects to earn two minors in two core academic areas, rather than a single major. Virginia should retain its requirement for a subject-area major for middle school candidates who intend to teach a single subject.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia asserted that candidates are encouraged to obtain two areas of concentration, and most individuals do obtain two areas on their license. The option for one area is available, and it is used primarily for individuals coming to Virginia from other states who have only one area on a license.



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Arkansas, Georgia and Pennsylvania ensure that all middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach middle school-level content. Teachers are required to earn at least two content-area minors. Georgia and Pennsylvania also require passing scores on single-subject content tests, and Arkansas requires a subject-matter assessment with separate passing scores for each academic area.

o states distinguish m rade preparation fron	_	K.8 license offered for	Solicense offered
lementary preparatio	n? 🕺	offe,	offer
	-ENS	cense	ense
	178-5	K-8 elf-co	\
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California		1	
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware District of Columbia	-		
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			2
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			П
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			3
Oregon			4
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah Vermont			
VIRGINIA			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			5
Wyoming			
	29	6	16

^{1.} California offers a K-12 generalist license for self-contained classrooms.

^{2.} Illinois offers K-9 license.

^{3.} With the exception of mathematics.

^{4.} Oregon offers 3-8 license.

^{5.} Wisconsin offers 1-8 license.

Figure 21	tion		280	/ [loose
What academic prepara	tion	/ /		, 9	
do states require for a	Q	۶ / ۶	2 / 5	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	ent or
middle school endorsen	nent 😤	/ %		na,	
or license?	nent %0%0/kW	MAJOR OR TWO	TWOMINORS	Less than a major or	No requirement of content
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky		1 n			
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland			1		
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska			1		
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio			1		
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania		2			
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
VIRGINIA					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	13	3	9	12	14

^{1.} State does not explicitly require two minors, but it has equivalent requirements.

Pennsylvania has two options. One option requires a 30 credit concentration in one subject and nearly a minor (12 credits) in three additional subjects; the second option is 21 credits in two subject-area concentrations with 12 credits in two additional subjects.

Goal F – Secondary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a licensing test in every subject they intend to teach.
- 2. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a content test when adding subject-area endorsements to an existing license.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal F **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a Praxis II content test to teach any core secondary subjects. Unfortunately, Virginia permits a significant loophole to this important policy by allowing a general social studies endorsement, without requiring subject-matter testing for each subject area within the discipline (see Goal 1-H).

Further, to add an additional field to a secondary license, teachers must also pass a Praxis II content test. However, as stated above, Virginia cannot guarantee content knowledge in each specific subject for those secondary teachers who add general social studies endorsements.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code, 8 VAC 20-22-40, -70

RECOMMENDATION

Require subject-matter testing for all secondary teacher candidates.

Virginia wisely requires subject-matter tests for most secondary teachers but should address any loopholes that undermine this policy (see Goal 1-H). This applies to the addition of endorsements as well.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Virginia was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Not only do Indiana and Tennessee require that secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subjects, but these states also do not permit any significant loopholes to this important policy by allowing secondary general science or social studies licenses (see Goals 1-G and 1-H).


Figure 23 Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area for licensure?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (For more on loopholes, see Goals 1-G and 1-H.)
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming

Figure 24 Do all secondary teachers have to pass a content test in every subject area to add an endorsement?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. (For more on loopholes, see Goals 1-G and 1-H.)
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wyoming

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal G – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require secondary science teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each science discipline they intend to teach.
- 2. The state should require middle school science teachers to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of science.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal G **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. Teachers must be certified in a specific discipline within the subject area of science.

Middle school science teachers in Virginia must earn a science concentration that includes courses in biology, chemistry, physics, and earth and space science, with a laboratory course in two of the four areas. Commendably, candidates must also pass the Praxis II "Middle School Science" test.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code 8-20-22-170 **Praxis Testing Requirements**

www.ets.org

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


Figure 26		CIENCE	ses /	SWITH Sied
Do states ensure that	PA.	Sej AR	ting / Silver	FNSES
secondary science teachers	J. S.	\$ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		With St.
have adequate subject-	FFERS	Fers 8	PEGEN SERVICE	ferso, sting
matter knowledge?	STATE OFFERS GENERAL	Sate of the School Control of the School Control of the School of	State of sta	State offer only single subject
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana	$\overline{}$	ī		Ī
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York	П			
North Carolina	П			
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
VIRGINIA				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming			_	Ш
	1	39	10	1



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

New Jersey does not offer certification in general science for secondary teachers. Although the state allows a combination physical science certificate, it ensure adequate content knowledge in both chemistry and physics by requiring teacher candidates to pass individual content tests in chemistry, physics and general science. Further, middle school science teachers must pass a science-specific content test.

Figure 27 Do states ensure that middle school teachers have adequate preparation to teach science?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia
- 2. Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Wyoming

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal H - Secondary Teacher Preparation in Social Studies

The state should ensure that social studies teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require secondary social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each social studies discipline they intend to teach.
- The state should require middle school social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of social studies.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal H **Virginia** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia offers secondary certification in general social studies. Called history and social sciences by the state, candidates must complete 51 semester hours in the following areas: history (a major or 18 semester hours, with coursework in American history, Virginia history and world history); political science (a major or 18 semester hours, with coursework in American government); geography (nine semester hours); and economics (six semester hours). They must also pass the Praxis II "Social Studies" general content exam. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the topical areas.

Middle school social studies teachers in Virginia must earn a history and social sciences concentration that includes courses in American history, world history, economics, American government and geography. Commendably, candidates must also pass the Praxis II "Middle School Social Studies" test.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code 8-20-22-170, -390 **Praxis Testing Requirements** www.ets.org

RECOMMENDATION

Require secondary social studies teachers to pass tests of content knowledge for each social studies discipline they intend to teach.

States that allow general social studies certifications—and only require a general knowledge social studies exam—are not ensuring that their secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. Virginia's required assessment combines all subject areas (e.g., history, geography, economics) and does not report separate scores for each subject area. Therefore, candidates could answer many—perhaps all—history questions, for example, incorrectly, yet still be licensed to teach history to high school students.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


Figure 29	₹	OFFER ONLY SWOLE LICENSES SOCIAL STUDIES	Offers Beneral Social Studies testing without adequate
Do states ensure that	OFFERS GENERAL SOCIAL ADEQUATE TESTING THE STING THE STATE THE	JOJE LOPE	ial st _a
secondary social studies	735 N	Y.S.W.	1, soc 1, soc
teachers have adequate	SE S	\	"hera thou
subject-matter	ERS VATI	SEST SEST	15. 88. 88. 88. 88. 88. 88. 88. 88. 88. 8
knowledge?	P. 20 7. 1	\$\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	9.6. 1.6.7.6. 1.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.7.6.
Alabama		7 /	7 29
Alaska			
Arizona		П	
Arkansas		П	
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland Massachusetts			1
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana	i i	- i	
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
VIRGINIA			
Washington			
West Virginia	П	П	
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
-	1	3	47
	•		.,



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Not only does Indiana ensure that its secondary social studies teachers possess adequate content knowledge of all subjects they intend to teach through both coursework and content testingbut the state's policy also does not make it overly burdensome for social studies teachers to teach multiple subjects. Other notable states include Georgia and South Dakota, which also do not offer secondary general social studies certifications.

Figure 30 Do states ensure that middle school teachers have adequate preparation to teach social studies?



on middle school level license but not on K-8 generalist license²

- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia
- 2. Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Washington
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming

1. Massachusetts does not offer a general social studies license, but offers combination licenses.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they will be required to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should not permit special education teachers to teach on a K-12 license that does not differentiate between the preparation of elementary teachers and that of secondary teachers.
- 2. All elementary special education candidates should have a broad liberal arts program of study that includes study in mathematics, science, English, social studies and fine arts and should be required to pass a subjectmatter test for licensure that is no less rigorous than what is required of general education candidates.
- 3. The state should require that teacher preparation programs graduate secondary special education teacher candidates who are highly qualified in at least two subjects. The state should also customize a "HOUSSE" route for new secondary special education teachers to help them achieve highly qualified status in all the subjects they teach.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal I **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Bar Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Regrettably, Virginia only offers a K-12 special education certification.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code 8 VAC 20-542-480

RECOMMENDATION

■ End licensure practices that fail to distinguish between the skills and knowledge needed to teach elementary grades and secondary grades.

It is virtually impossible and certainly impractical for Virginia to ensure that a K-12 special education teacher knows all the subject matter he or she is expected to be able to teach, especially considering state and federal expectations that special education students should meet the same high standards as other students. While the broad K-12 umbrella may be appropriate for teachers of low-incidence special education students, such as those with severe cognitive disabilities, it is deeply problematic for the overwhelming majority of high-incidence special education students, who are expected to learn grade-level content.

- Provide a broad liberal arts program of study to elementary special education candidates.
 - Virginia should ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess knowledge of the subject matter at hand. Not only should the state require core-subject coursework relevant to the elementary classroom, but it should also require that these candidates pass the same subject-matter test required of all elementary teachers. Failure to ensure that teachers possess requisite content knowledge deprives special education students of the opportunity to reach their academic potential.
- Ensure that secondary special education teacher candidates graduate with highly qualified status in at least two subjects, and customize a HOUSSE route so that they can achieve highly qualified status in all subjects they plan to teach.

To make secondary special education teacher candidates more flexible and better able to serve schools and students, Virginia should use a combination of coursework and testing to ensure that they graduate with highly qualified status in two core academic areas. A customized HOUSSE route can also help new secondary special education teacher candidates to become highly qualified in multiple subjects by offering efficient means by which they could gain broad overviews of specific areas of content knowledge, such as content-driven university courses. Such a route is specifically permitted in the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.






T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Unfortunately, NCTQ cannot highlight any state's policy in this area. Preparation of special education teachers remains a topic in critical need of states' attention. However, it is worth noting that three states-Louisiana, Pennsylvania and Texas—will no longer issue K-12 special education certifications. Only grade-level specific options will be available to new teachers.

Figure 33 Do states require subject-matter testing for elementary special education licenses?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana. Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon⁴, Pennsylvania⁵, Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia
- 4. Although Oregon requires testing, the state allows an "alternative assessment" option for candidates who fail the tests twice to still be considered for a license.
- 5. In Pennsylvania, a candidate who opts for dual certification in elementary special education and as a reading specialist does not have to take a content test.

Figure 32

1. Beginning January 1, 2013

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal J – Assessing Professional Knowledge

The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should assess new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning by means of a pedagogy test aligned to the state's professional standards.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal J **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not currently require new teachers to pass a test of pedagogy in order to attain licensure.

The Virginia Reading Assessment covers an essential component of pedagogy and is required for elementary education, most special education areas and the reading specialist endorsement. However, this assessment neither covers all instructional areas nor is required of all teachers.

Virginia is also part of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) Consortium and began a pilot program in Spring 2011.

Supporting Research

http://www.ets.org/praxis/va/requirements

RECOMMENDATION

Require that all new teachers pass a pedagogy test.

Virginia should verify that all new teachers meet professional standards through a test of professional standards.

■ Ensure that performance assessments provide a meaningful measure of new teachers' knowledge and skills.

While Virginia is commended for considering the use of a performance-based assessment, the state should proceed with caution until additional data are available on the Teacher Performance Assessment. Additional research is needed to determine how the TPA compares to other teacher tests as well as whether the test's scores are predictive of student achievement. The track record on similar assessments is mixed at best. The two states that currently require the Praxis III performance-based assessment report pass rates of about 99 percent. Given that it takes significant resources to administer a performance-based assessment, a test that nearly every teacher passes is of questionable value.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



Twenty-three states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it additionally commends the nine states (Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas) that utilize their own assessments to measure pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Figure 35

Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia
- 2. Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah⁴, Wyoming
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 4. Not required until teacher advances from a Level One to a Level Two license.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal K - Student Teaching

The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high-quality clinical experience.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require that student teachers only be placed with cooperating teachers for whom there is evidence of their effectiveness as measured by consistent gains in student learning.
- 2. The state should require that teacher candidates spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 1: Goal K **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia requires candidates to complete at least 300 clock hours of field experiences for initial programs, which must include a minimum of 150 clock hours of directed student teaching requirements. The state does not articulate any requirements for cooperating teachers.

Supporting Research

8 VAC 20-542-40 (3)

RECOMMENDATION

Require teacher candidates to spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

Virginia should require a more extensive summative clinical experience for all prospective teachers. Student teaching should be a full-time commitment, as requiring coursework and student teaching simultaneously does a disservice to both. Alignment with a school calendar for at least 10 weeks ensures both adequate classroom experience and exposure to a variety of ancillary professional

■ Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

In addition to the ability to mentor an adult, cooperating teachers should also be carefully screened for their capacity to further student achievement. Research indicates that the only aspect of a student teaching arrangement that has been shown to have an impact on student achievement is the positive effect of selection of the cooperating teacher by the preparation program, rather than the student teacher or school district staff.

 Explicitly require that student teaching be completed locally, thus prohibiting candidates from completing this requirement abroad.

Unless preparation programs can establish true satellite campuses to closely supervise student teaching arrangements, placement in foreign or otherwise novel locales should be supplementary to a standard student teaching arrangement. Outsourcing the arrangements for student teaching makes it impossible to ensure the selection of the best cooperating teacher and adequate supervision of the student teacher and may prevent training of the teacher on relevant state instructional frameworks.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

VIRGINIA

Figure 37	,	4 / 55
Do states require	چُ کُ	7 / 7
the elements of a	Ž.	00 / \$3
high-quality student	<u> </u>	
3 , 3	\$ Q	75.75 10.00
teaching experience?	SELECT	STUDENT TEACHING LAST
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey	Ē	
New Mexico		ī
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
VIRGINIA		
Washington		
		1
West Virginia		1 1
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	2	29




EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although no state has been singled out for "best practice" honors, Florida and Tennessee require teacher candidates to complete at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, and they have taken steps toward ensuring that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

^{1.} Candidates can student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Figure 38

Is the selection of the cooperating teacher based on some measure of effectiveness?




1. Strong Practice: Florida, Tennessee

- Alabama, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

Figure 39

Is the summative student teaching experience of sufficient length?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia⁵, Wisconsin
- $2.\ Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Virginia, Wyoming\\$
- 3. Illinois, Maine, New Mexico, Utah
- 4. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Maryland, Montana
- 5. Candidates can student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal L – Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should collect value-added data that connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. The state should collect other meaningful data that reflects program performance, including some or all of the following:
 - a. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including basic skills, subject matter and professional knowledge tests;
 - b. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests;
 - c. Satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison;
 - d. Evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching;
 - e. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.
- 3. The state should establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data. Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.
- 4. The state should produce and publish on its website an annual report card that shows all the data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.

Figure 40 How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation Program Accountability **Best Practice State** Florida State Meets Goal Louisiana States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Colorado 1, Georgia 1, Tennessee, Texas States Partly Meet Goal Kentucky, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina 16 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Illinois , Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, VIRGINIA, Washington, West Virginia 22 States Do Not Meet Goal Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas↓, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2009: **1**:4 💶 : 3

Area 1: Goal L **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal Raised for this Goal





Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia's approval process for its traditional and alternate route teacher preparation programs does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Virginia requires "evidence of contributions to preK-12 student achievement by candidates completing the program." However, the state then articulates that one required indicator of the achievement of this standard is evidence of the ability to affect student learning, "through the use of multiple sources of data such as a culminating experience, portfolios, interviews, videotaped and observed performance in schools, standardized tests, and course grades." Regrettably, this does not ensure that objective evidence of student achievement will be utilized to connect student achievement gains to preparation programs.

The state relies on some other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of traditional teacher preparation programs, but not its alternate route programs. It requires evidence of employer job satisfaction with program completers. "The indicator of the achievement of this standard shall include documentation that the education program has two years of evidence regarding candidate performance based on employer surveys." However, these data are not collected for alternate route programs.

In addition, Virginia collects programs' annual summary licensure test pass rates and requires that 80 percent of program completers and exiters pass their licensure exams. However, the 80 percent pass-rate standard sets the bar quite low and is not a meaningful measure of program performance.

Further, there is no evidence that the state's standards for program approval are resulting in greater accountability. In the past three years, no programs in Virginia have been identified in required federal reporting as low performing.

Finally, Virginia's website does not include a report card that allows the public to review and compare program performance.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code, 8 VAC 20-542-40 8 VAC 20-22-90 Title II State Reports https://title2.ed.gov

RECOMMENDATION

Collect data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

To ensure that programs are producing effective classroom teachers, Virginia should consider academic achievement gains of students taught by the programs' graduates, averaged over the first three years of teaching.

■ Gather other meaningful data that reflect program performance.

In addition to knowing whether programs are producing effective teachers, other objective, meaningful data can also indicate whether programs are appropriately screening applicants and if they are delivering essential academic and professional knowledge. Building on the data the state currently collects for its traditional teacher preparation programs, Virginia should gather data for all teacher preparation programs, such as the following: average raw scores of graduates on licensing tests, including basic skills, subject matter and professional knowledge tests; satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form

to permit program comparison; evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching; and five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

■ Establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.

Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval after appropriate due process.

■ Publish an annual report card on the state's website.

To inform the public with meaningful, readily understandable indicators of how well programs are doing, Virginia should present all the data it collects on individual teacher preparation programs.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia asserted that colleges and universities are required to collect data on student performance, such as candidate test scores and employer satisfaction surveys, which are reviewed during accreditation reviews.

The state also contended that although there is no state report card, Title II and biennial-measures reports are publicly reported on the website.

Supporting Research

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/regulations/regs_approval_education_programs_2011.pdf

Figure 41			ADITIONAL	/		NATIVE
Do states hold teach	ner	PRE	PARATION ON THE PROPERTY OF T	OBJECTIVE PROCESSITE	PREPA	RATION
preparation progra	ms OBJECTIVE PROGRAM		/ /	3 / 3	\$ E /	DATA PUBLICLY AVAILABLE ON W.
accountable?	Š	MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR	35/33		MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR	55/23
accountable.	7.7.8 7.7.8	MINIMUM STANDARDS F	4NG / 60/2	ZE PR	MINIMUM STANDARDS F	
	III C		Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z		N 40 8	Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z Z
	8,7	/ \$ \$ £	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	0 8	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \
Alabama						1
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut	_		$\overline{\Box}$			
Delaware						2
District of Columbia						
Florida						1
Georgia Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						1
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts	_					
Michigan						
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont						
VIRGINIA						
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						- H
		_				_
	25	5	14	17	2	10

Reported institutional data do not distinguish between candidates in the traditional and alternate route programs.


The posted data do not allow the public to review and compare program performance because data are not disaggregated by program provider.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs. The state also relies on other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs, and it applies transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval. Florida also posts an annual report on its website.

Figure 42 Do states use student achievement data to hold teacher preparation programs accountable?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 43

Which states collect meaningful data?

AVERAGE RAW SCORES ON LICENSING TESTS

Alabama, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Tennessee, West Virginia

SATISFACTION RATINGS FROM SCHOOLS

Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland¹, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, VIRGINIA, Washington¹, West Virginia

EVALUATION RESULTS FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES

Alabama, Arizona, Delaware¹, Florida, Illiniois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont

STUDENT LEARNING GAINS

Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas

TEACHER RETENTION RATES

Arizona, Colorado, Delaware¹, Missouri, New Jersey

1. For alternate route only

Figure 44	SATEHASTS OWN	/.	National accreditation	While not technically require	While not technically required
What is the relationship	Š	National acceptation			is is
between state program	30		edital	state hnical	for
approval and national	45/1			teo 7	## / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ### / ###
accreditation?	17. E	ation,	tiona, titute,	While not technically real	While not technically resis is there is some overlap.
	54	\ < \p_{\phi}	\	igis z	/ Z z
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona ¹					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii ¹					
Idaho					
Illinois ¹					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi	$\overline{}$	- i		Ē	
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio ¹					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas ¹	-				
Utah					
Vermont					
VIRGINIA					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
j				•	
	23	10	4	8	6

According to information posted on NCATE's website.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal A – Alternate Route Eligibility

The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. With some accommodation for work experience, alternate route programs should screen candidates for academic ability, such as requiring a minimum 2.75 overall college
- 2. All alternate route candidates, including elementary candidates and those having a major in their intended subject area, should be required to pass the state's subject-matter licensing test.
- 3. Alternate route candidates lacking a major in the intended subject area should be able to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge by passing a test of sufficient rigor.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 2: Goal A **Virginia** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

While the admission requirements for Virginia's alternate routes do not exceed those for traditional preparation programs, the state does require evidence of subject-matter knowledge and allows flexibility for nontraditional candidates.

Virginia classifies two routes, the Career Switchers Alternative Route to Licensure Program and the Alternative Route to Licensure, as alternate routes to certification. Virginia does not require candidates to either route to demonstrate prior academic performance, such as a minimum GPA.

Applicants to the Alternative Route to Licensure must meet coursework requirements in their intended teaching field. Candidates with five years of related work experience and a passing score on a content exam are exempt from this requirement. This exemption does not apply to elementary or special education. Candidates are also required to pass a basic skills and a subject-matter test.

Candidates in the Career Switcher Program must meet coursework requirements and are required to pass a subject-matter and basic skills test. The state also requires candidates in this alternate route to have at least five years of full-time work experience.

Supporting Research

8VAC20-22-90

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/educator_preparation/career_switcher/index

RECOMMENDATION

Screen all candidates for academic ability.

Virginia should require that candidates to its alternate routes provide some evidence of good academic performance. The standard should be higher than what is required of traditional teacher candidates, such as a GPA of 2.75 or higher. Alternatively, the state could require one of the standardized tests of academic proficiency commonly used in higher education for graduate admissions, such as the GRE.

Require all applicants to pass a subject-matter test for admission.

While the state is commended for requiring candidates to the Career Switcher Alternate Route to take a subject-matter exam, Virginia should require all candidates, including those with a major in the subject, to take such a test. The concept behind alternate routes is that the nontraditional candidate is able to concentrate on acquiring professional knowledge and skills because he or she has strong subject-area knowledge. Teachers without sufficient subject-matter knowledge place students at risk.

Eliminate basic skills test requirement.

While Virginia is commended for requiring Career Switcher applicants to demonstrate content knowledge on a subject-matter test, the state's requirement that these candidates also pass a basic skills test is impractical and ineffectual. Basic skills tests measure minimum competency—essentially those skills that a person should have acquired in middle school—and are inappropriate for candidates who have already earned a bachelor's degree. The state should eliminate the basic skills test requirement or, at a minimum, accept the equivalent in SAT, ACT or GRE scores.


VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia reiterated that candidates in the Career Switcher Program are required to take and pass a content area exam prior to admission. The state asserted that this requirement is sufficient demonstration of prior academic performance.



Figure 47


Do states require alternate routes to be selective?



- Strong Practice: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee
- Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, Wyoming
- Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 48

Do states ensure that alternate route teachers have subject-matter knowledge?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut⁴, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois⁴, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. State does not require test at all, exempts some candidates or does not require passage until program completion. Alaska, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyorning
- 3. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 4. Required prior to entering the classroom.

Figure 46


1. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.



The **District of Columbia** and **Michigan** require candidates to demonstrate above-average academic performance as conditions of admission to an alternate route program, with both requiring applicants to have a minimum 3.0 GPA. In addition, neither state requires a content-specific major; subject-area knowledge is demonstrated by passing a test, making their alternate routes flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Figure 49

Do states accommodate the nontraditional background of alternate route candidates?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut⁶, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Virginia, Washington
- 3. Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Wisconsin
- 5. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 6. Test out option available to candidates in shortage areas only.

62 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 VIRGINIA

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal B – Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide streamlined preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that the amount of coursework it either requires or allows is manageable for a novice teacher. Anything exceeding 12 credit hours of coursework in the first year may be counterproductive, placing too great a burden on the teacher. This calculation is premised on no more than six credit hours in the summer, three in the fall and three in the spring.
- 2. The state should ensure that alternate route programs offer accelerated study not to exceed six (three credit) courses for secondary teachers and eight (three credit) courses for elementary teachers (exclusive of any credit for practice teaching or mentoring) over the duration of the program. Programs should be limited to two years, at which time the new teacher should be eligible for a standard certificate.
- All coursework requirements should target the immediate needs of the new teacher (e.g., seminars with other grade-level teachers, training in a particular curriculum, reading instruction and classroom management techniques).
- 4. The state should ensure that candidates have an opportunity to practice teach in a summer training program. Alternatively, the state can require an intensive mentoring experience, beginning with a trained mentor assigned full time to the new teacher for the first critical weeks of school and then gradually reduced. The state should support only induction strategies that can be effective even in a poorly managed school: intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 2: Goal B **Virginia** Analysis



State Nearly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Although Virginia offers alternate routes with streamlined preparation, it could do more to meet the immediate needs of new teachers.

Candidates in the Career Switcher Program must complete 180 clock hours of instruction, including field experience, as part of their induction program. Coursework includes curriculum and instruction methods, standards of learning, differentiation of instruction, classroom/behavior management and human growth and development. During the first year, candidates attend a minimum of five seminars for an additional 20 cumulative instructional hours.

Virginia is commended for both the length of its Career Switcher alternate route program and its coursework requirements, which offer the flexibility and content that new teachers need to succeed in the classroom, without being overly burdensome.

The Alternate Route to Licensure program requires pre-K-3, elementary pre-K-6 and middle school candidates to complete 18 semester hours of coursework. Secondary candidates complete 15 semester hours of coursework. Topics include human growth and development, curriculum and instructional procedures, classroom and behavior management and foundations of education. Elementary candidates also complete six semester hours of language acquisition and reading, and middle school candidates must complete six semester hours of reading in the content area and language acquisition.

Career Switcher candidates have a practice-teaching opportunity and participate in a mentoring program. Mentors assist in implementing a professional development plan; observe, assist and coach new teachers; share resources and materials; and provide support regarding school procedures.

Alternate Route to Licensure candidates do not have a practice-teaching opportunity. The school district is required to provide a mentor to all new teachers.

Upon successful completion of all program requirements, candidates are eligible for a standard certificate.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code: 8 VAC 20-21

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/educator_preparation/career_switcher/index

RECOMMENDATION

Establish coursework guidelines for all alternate route preparation programs.

While Virginia is commended for the coursework requirements in the Career Switcher program, the state should consider similar guidelines for those in the Alternative Route to Licensure. Simply mandating coursework without specifying the purpose can inadvertently send the wrong message to program providers—that "anything goes" as long as credits are granted. However constructive, any course that is not fundamentally practical and immediately necessary should be eliminated as a requirement. Appropriate coursework should include grade-level or subject-level seminars, methodology in the content area, classroom management, assessment and scientifically based early reading instruction.

Consider providing opportunities to practice teach to all candidates.

While Virginia is commended for offering an opportunity to student teach in the Career Switcher program, the state may want to consider providing all of its candidates with a practice-teaching opportunity prior to entering the classroom.

■ Strengthen the induction experience for new teachers.

Virginia is commended for requiring all new teachers to work with a mentor; however, there are insufficient guidelines indicating that the induction program is structured for new teacher success. Effective strategies include intensive mentoring with full classroom support in the first few weeks or months of school, a reduced teaching load and release time to allow new teachers to observe experienced teachers during each school day.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.





TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE


Connecticut ensures that its alternate route provides streamlined preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers. The state requires a manageable number of credit hours, relevant coursework, a field placement and intensive mentoring. Other notable states include Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia and New Jersey. These states provide streamlined, relevant coursework with intensive mentoring.

^{1.} Florida requires practice teaching or intensive mentoring.

² North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 52


Do states curb excessive coursework requirements?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia
- 2. Indiana, Nevada, Wyoming
- 3. Alaska, Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 53

Do states require practice teaching or intensive mentoring?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia
- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey, New York, West Virginia
- 3. Strong Practice: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida⁶, Maryland, Massachusetts
- Alabama, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 5. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 6. Candidates are required to have one or the other, not both.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal C – Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from regulatory obstacles that limit its usage and providers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should not treat the alternate route as a program of last resort or restrict the availability of alternate routes to certain subjects, grades or geographic areas.
- The state should allow districts and nonprofit organizations other than institutions of higher education to operate alternate route programs.
- 3. The state should ensure that its alternate route has no requirements that would be difficult to meet for a provider that is not an institution of higher education (e.g., an approval process based on institutional accreditation).

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 2: Goal C **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not limit the usage or providers of its alternate routes.

Virginia is commended for having no restrictions on the usage of its alternate routes with regard to subject, grade or geographic areas.

Virginia allows institutions of higher education, local districts and private organizations to offer alternate route programs. The state is commended for structuring its programs to allow a diversity of providers. A good diversity of providers helps all programs, both university- and non-university-based, to improve.

Supporting Research

8 VAC 20-21-80

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/educator_preparation/career_switcher/index

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.





T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Twenty-six states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends all states that permit both broad usage and a diversity of providers for their alternate routes.

Figure 56 Can alternate route teachers teach any subject or grade anywhere in the state?





Figure 55 and 56

- 1. Alabama offers routes without restrictions for candidates with master's degrees. The route for candidates with bachelor's degrees is limited to
- 2. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

Figure 57

Do states permit providers other than colleges or universities?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Colorado, Georgia, North Carolina, Vermont⁵, West Virginia
- Alabama, Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho⁶, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi⁶, Missouri⁶, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey⁷, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina⁶, South Dakota, Utah⁶, Wyoming
- 4. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.
- 5. Districts can run Peer Review programs only.
- 6. ABCTE is also an approved provider.
- 7. Permits school districts to provide programs without university partnerships in some circumstances.

GENUINE OR NEARLY
GENUINE ALTERNATEROUTE ∫ Offered route is disingenuous Figure 58 Alternate oute that need significant improvements Do states provide real alternative pathways to certification? Alabama Alaska Arizona П Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida П П Georgia Hawaii П Idaho П Illinois П Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky П Louisiana Maine П Maryland П П Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico П П New York North Carolina North Dakota¹ П Ohio П П Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina П South Dakota Tennessee П П Texas Utah Vermont **VIRGINIA** П Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 7 25 18

Figure 58

1. North Dakota does not have an alternate route to certification.

gure 59 <i>/hat are the</i>	PREREQUISITE OF CT.	VERIFICATION OF SUIT	AVAILABILITY OF TEST	STREAMINED CO.] RELEVANT COURCE	X20/	PRACTICE TEACHING	BROAD USAGE	DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS
naracteristics of	ې			,		1	F / F		/ ^M o
ates' alternate	SITE				/ %	BLE /		<u> </u>	, / 2C
outes?	FOLI	25.8	1.48 J.	/ Will	/ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \		3/ 3/	115
outes:	P. G. G.	VERIFICATION OF SITE	4V4U48UTYO OUTOPTOWO	TREA.	ELEV.	REASONABLE PROGRAM :	PR4C VIEV	BROAD USAGE	/ VER
Alabama					/ & 			/ 8	7
Alaska									
Arizona									
Arkansas									
California									
Colorado									
Connecticut Delaware									
District of Columbia									
Florida									
Georgia									
Hawaii									
Idaho									
Illinois									
Indiana									
Iowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky								_	
Louisiana									
Maine Maryland									
Massachusetts							-		
Michigan									
Minnesota									
Mississippi									
Missouri									
Montana									
Nebraska									
Nevada									
New Hampshire									
New Jersey New Mexico									
New York									
North Carolina									
North Dakota									
Ohio									
Oklahoma									
Oregon									
Pennsylvania									
Rhode Island									
South Carolina									
South Dakota						_			
Tennessee									
Texas Utah									
Vermont Vermont									
VIRGINIA									
Washington									
West Virginia									
Wisconsin									
Wyoming									
	13	24	27	13	12	29	24	32	29

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal D – Part-Time Teaching Licenses

The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Either through a discrete license or by waiving most licensure requirements, the state should authorize individuals with content expertise to teach as part-time instructors.
- All candidates for a part-time teaching license should be required to pass a subjectmatter test.
- 3. Other requirements for this license should be limited to those addressing public safety (e.g., background screening) and those of immediate use to the novice instructor (e.g., classroom management training).

Background



Area 2: Goal D **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal Progress Since 2009



ANALYSIS

Virginia does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.

RECOMMENDATION

Offer a license that allows content experts to serve as part-time instructors.

Virginia should permit individuals with deep subject-area knowledge to teach a limited number of courses without fulfilling a complete set of certification requirements. The state should verify content knowledge through a rigorous test and conduct background checks as appropriate, while waiving all other licensure requirements. Such a license would increase districts' flexibility to staff certain subjects, including many STEM areas, that are frequently hard to staff or may not have high enough enrollment to necessitate a full-time position.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia noted that it offers the Local Eligibility license.

Supporting Research

http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+22.1-299.3

LAST WORD

The Local Eligibility license does not meet the intent of this goal, which is to allow content experts to teach part-time in the K-12 classroom. The Local Eligibility license cannot be used for instruction in core academic areas and requires that applicants complete training within the three-year scope of the license to become fully certified. There is also no indication that it is designed to be used on a part-time basis.

Figure 61 Do states offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part-time? YES No Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Mass a chusettsMichigan Minnesota П Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York 2 П North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont **VIRGINIA** 2 Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming 16 35



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Arkansas offers a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time. Individuals seeking this license must pass a subject-matter test and are also required to complete specially-designed pedagogy training that is not overly burdensome.

^{1.} License has restrictions.

^{2.} It appears that the state has a license that may be used for this purpose; guidelines are vague.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Goal E – Licensure Reciprocity

The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should offer a standard license to fully certified teachers moving from other states, without relying on transcript analysis or recency requirements as a means of judging eligibility. The state can and should require evidence of good standing in previous employment.
- 2. The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet the incoming state's testing requirements.
- The state should accord the same license to teachers from other states who completed an approved alternate route program that it accords teachers prepared in a traditional preparation program.

Background



Area 2: Goal E **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not support licensure reciprocity for certified teachers from other states.

Regrettably, Virginia grants a waiver for its licensing tests to teachers who have three years of out-of-state teaching at a public or accredited private school and who hold a full license with no deficiencies.

Teachers with valid out-of-state certificates are eligible for comparable licensure in Virginia. There is no state-mandated recency requirement for the standard certificate; however, transcripts are required for all out-of-state applicants. It is not clear whether the state analyzes transcripts to determine whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route or whether additional coursework will be required.

Virginia does require all incoming teachers to complete coursework in technology, for which there appears to be no test-out option. The state also requires training in child abuse recognition and intervention.

Virginia is also a participant in the NASDTEC Interstate Agreement; however, the latest iteration of this agreement no longer purports to be a reciprocity agreement among states and thus is no longer included in this analysis.

Supporting Research

Virginia Administrative Code 8 VAC 20-22-100 Code of Virginia, 22.1-298.1

RECOMMENDATION

To uphold standards, require that teachers coming from other states meet testing requirements.

Virginia takes considerable risk by waiving its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher who has three years of experience. The state should not waive any of its teacher tests unless an applicant can provide evidence of a passing score under its own standards. The negative impact on student learning stemming from a teacher's inadequate subject-matter knowledge is not mitigated by the teacher's having experience.

 Offer a standard license to certified out-of-state teachers, absent unnecessary requirements.

Virginia should consider a test-out option for its additional coursework requirement in technology.

Accord the same license to out-of-state alternate route teachers as would be accorded to traditionally prepared teachers.

Regardless of whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route, all certified out-of-state teachers should receive equal treatment. Virginia should consider discontinuing its requirement for the submission of transcripts. Transcript analysis is likely to result in additional coursework requirements, even for traditionally prepared teachers; alternate route teachers, on the other hand, may have to virtually begin anew, repeating some, most or all of a teacher preparation program in Virginia.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia asserted that its licensure regulations support reciprocity, and that transcripts are required to verify the degrees of the individual. There is no course-by-course transcript review for individuals accepted via reciprocity. The state added that in Virginia, technology requirements are incorporated within teacher preparation programs, and individuals from out of state complete the requirement in local school divisions.

Virginia also noted that individuals who hold a valid out-of-state license—a full credential without deficiencies—and who have completed a minimum of three years of full-time, successful teaching experience in a public or accredited nonpublic school (K-12) in a state other than Virginia are exempted from the professional teacher's assessment requirements.

LAST WORD


The submission of transcripts should be unnecessary for certified out-of-state teachers, unless the state has some reason to suspect that the certifying state routinely licenses teachers who do not have a degree.



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alabama and Texas appropriately support licensure reciprocity by only requiring certified teachers from other states to meet each state's own testing requirements and by not specifying any additional coursework or recency requirements to determine eligibility for either traditional or alternate route teachers.

Figure 63 Do states require all out-of-state teachers to pass their licensure tests?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York³, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania³, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington³, Wisconsin
- 2. Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana⁴, Nebraska⁴, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Exception for teachers with National Board Certification.
- 4. No subject-matter testing for any teacher certification.

Figure 64

- 1. For traditionally prepared teachers only.
- 2. Transcript review required for those with less than 3 years experience.



igure 65	_	State specifies different Coute teachers for alternat	/ "
o states treat out-of-s	tate her 1 te condition to	14 / 14 / 14 / 14 / 14 / 14 / 14 / 14 /	State has policies with the for alternate foure feath observed by
eachers the same whet	her 👸	differ, alte,	s wi
hey were prepared in a	475,	ifies to for	Olicia Coute
raditional or an alterna	te 😤 🗎	Spec men defie	has fiel to hate
oute program?	74 Z 74 Z 74 Z	tate quire te te	tate rent alter
1 3	50	2 m 5 /	29.5
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			_
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			_
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			_
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			-
New Mexico New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
VIRGINIA			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
J	_	_	
	6	6	39

Goal A – State Data Systems

The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should establish a longitudinal data system with at least the following key components:
 - a. A unique statewide student identifier number that connects student data across key databases across years;
 - b. A unique teacher identifier system that can match individual teacher records with individual student records; and
 - c. An assessment system that can match individual student test records from year to year in order to measure academic growth.
- 2. Value-added data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be considered among the criteria used to determine teachers' effectiveness.
- 3. To ensure that data provided through the state data system is actionable and reliable, the state should have a clear definition of "teacher of record" and require its consistent use statewide.

Background



Area 3: Goal A **Virginia** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not have a data system that can be used to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

However, Virginia does have two of three necessary elements that would allow for the development of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. The state has assigned unique student identifiers that connect student data across key databases across years, and it has the capacity to match student test records from year to year in order to measure student academic growth.

Although Virginia assigns teacher identification numbers, it cannot match individual teacher records with individual student records.

Supporting Research

Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org

RECOMMENDATION

Develop capacity of state data system.

Virginia should ensure that its state data system is able to match individual teacher records with individual student records.

■ Develop a clear definition of "teacher of record."

Virginia has not yet established a definition of teacher of record, which is essential in order to use the student-data link for teacher evaluation and related purposes. To ensure that data provided through the state data system are actionable and reliable, Virginia should articulate a definition of teacher of record and require its consistent use throughout the state.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 67	■ UNQUESTUBBITIES	ier Ch	/
Do state data systems			· / E
have the capacity to		£ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	SQ V
assess teacher	SDE)	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	SO _W
effectiveness?	EST	NE EN	P. P
<i>"</i>	0//0	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	TEST VER
Alabassa	3	, s, /	TEST RECORDS MATCH
Alabama Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi		_	
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey New Mexico			
New York			
New York North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma		-	
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
VIRGINIA			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	50	35	50
	30	33	33



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends the 35 states that have a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Key

indicates that the state assigns teacher identification numbers, but it cannot match individual teacher records with individual student records.

Goal B – Evaluation of Effectiveness

The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion or specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Evaluation instruments, whether state or locally developed, should be structured to preclude a teacher from receiving a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.
- 2. Evaluation instruments should require classroom observations that focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.
- Teacher evaluations should consider objective evidence of student learning, including not only standardized test scores but also classroom-based artifacts such as tests, quizzes and student work.
- 4. The state should require that evaluation instruments differentiate among various levels of teacher performance. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background



Area 3: Goal B **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Bar Raised for this Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not require that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.

The state requires local school districts to develop a teacher evaluation instrument that "addresses, among other things, student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel." It has promulgated guidelines for teacher evaluations (Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards) that instruct districts to evaluate teacher performance across a number of domains, including, among others, instructions, professionalism, and planning and assessment.

The guidelines focus primarily on teachers' knowledge and skills and less on teacher effectiveness as evidenced by student learning. Virginia recommends that evidence of student learning gains be included, suggesting multiple measures that can be used to capture and demonstrate these gains. While the state's intentions were almost certainly that these multiple measures include observations and an objective measure, the language here is too ambiguous to ensure that districts will follow suit.

Virginia has also recently approved a new model for evaluating teachers that recommends that students' academic progress account for 40 percent of a teacher's overall performance rating. However, these are merely guidelines, so districts can decide how much to actually weigh student achievement as well as how to evaluate it.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-295

Guideline for Uniform Performance Standards

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/regulations/uniform_performance_stds.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

Virginia should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion, or it should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Whether state or locally developed, a teacher should not be able to receive a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.

Ensure that classroom observations specifically focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.

Virginia should not only specifically require that its evaluations include classroom observations, but also the state should specifically articulate that these observations focus on effectiveness of instruction. The primary component of a classroom observation should be the quality of instruction, as measured by student time on task, student grasp or mastery of the lesson objective and efficient use of class time.

Utilize rating categories that meaningfully differentiate among various levels of teacher performance.

To ensure that the evaluation instrument accurately differentiates among levels of teacher performance, Virginia should require districts to utilize multiple rating categories, such as highly effective, effective, needs improvement and ineffective. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia cited the section of its Code pertaining to evaluations for administrators. "Each local school board shall adopt for use by the division superintendent clearly defined criteria for a performance evaluation process for principals, assistant principals, and supervisors that are consistent with the performance objectives set forth in the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents ... and that includes, among other things, an assessment of such administrators' skills and knowledge; student academic progress and school gains in student learning; and effectiveness in addressing school safety and enforcing student discipline."

The state also pointed out that in April 2011, it approved new performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers, and that student academic progress is a performance standard.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-294

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/performance_evaluation/index.shtml

Figure 69	MEQUIRES THAT STUDENT THE PREPARATION OF THE PREPARATION OF THE PREPARATION OF THE PROPARE	Section Calleton Section Calleton Student calletons are to be	Teacher evaluations must	_ /	
Do states consider	DENT.	######################################	owth owth	Student achievement data	
classroom effectiveness	7.57U 180W	WT C	int/gr	Jent, Jan	
as part of teacher	1 × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×	re RA	emer's		
evaluations?	PERS	er er er schie	er eve	t ach	
evaluations:	E PE	reach Snific dent	reach clude cent,	tuden t requ	
	- 4 E	7 18 13	/ "# # J	\ \Q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q_{\q	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona			Ш		
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia ¹					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
VIRGINIA					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	12	5	7	27	



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ has not singled out any one state for "best practice" honors. Many states have made significant strides in the area of teacher evaluation by requiring that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion. Because there are many different approaches that result in student learning being the preponderant criterion, all 10 states that meet this goal are commended for their efforts.

Figure 70

Using state data in teacher evaluations

States with Requirements for Student Achievement Data but Lacking Data System Capacity

Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, Nevada

States with Data System Capacity but No Student Achievement Requirements

Alabama, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Figure 69

^{1.} District of Columbia Public Schools requires that student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations.


Figure 71
Sources of objective evidence of student learning

Many educators struggle to identify possible sources of objective student data. Here are some examples:

- Standardized test scores
- Periodic diagnostic assessments
- Benchmark assessments that show student growth
- Artifacts of student work connected to specific student learning standards that are randomly selected for review by the principal or senior faculty, scored using rubrics and descriptors
- Examples of typical assignments, assessed for their quality and rigor
- Periodic checks on progress with the curriculum coupled with evidence of student mastery of the curriculum from quizzes, tests and exams

Figure 72

Do states require more than two categories for teacher evaluation ratings?



- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington
- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, U tah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

gure 73		State-designed teacher	t-in / r	District designed system	mit /	
o states direct how	Single statewide teacher	بق /	District designed gaten	. / 6	ate /	
eachers should be	tea			15 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 / 25 /	¹⁵ /	
valuated?	Wide Sten	bar ith	Sign /	iter, isne, itfr	· 6.	
valuateu:	tate in sy	esign M M.	t-de	1 des	/ ////////////////////////////////////	
	gle s 'atic	re-o vatic	istric Psiste Pewo	trict imal	No state policy	
	Sin	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	7 6 D		/ 🕺	
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California	_					
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida			1		_	
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho			1			
			■ ¹			
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky			1			
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland			1			
Massachusetts						
Michigan		2				
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska			1			
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico			\Box			
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio	- i			ī	П	
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island		2				
South Carolina		2				
South Dakota						
Tennessee		2				
Texas		2				
Utah						
Vermont			_			
VIRGINIA						
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
	9	10	24	5	3	

^{1.} State approval required.

^{2.} The state model is presumptive; districts need state approval to opt out.

Goal C – Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that all teachers receive a formal evaluation rating each year.
- While all teachers should have multiple observations that contribute to their formal evaluation rating, the state should ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

Background



Area 3: Goal C **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Regrettably, Virginia does not ensure that all teachers are evaluated annually.

Nonprobationary teachers must be evaluated at least once every three years. New teachers in Virginia must be formally evaluated once a year. The state's policy does not include any guidelines on when these evaluations should occur.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-303(A) and 22.1-295

RECOMMENDATION

Require annual formal evaluations for all teachers.

All teachers in Virginia should be evaluated annually. Rather than treated as mere formalities, these teacher evaluations should serve as important tools for rewarding good teachers, helping average teachers improve and holding weak teachers accountable for poor performance.

Base evaluations on multiple observations.

To guarantee that annual evaluations are based on an adequate collection of information, Virginia should require multiple observations for all teachers, even those who have nonprobationary status.

■ Ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

It is critical that schools and districts closely monitor the performance of new teachers. Virginia should ensure that its new teachers get the support they need and that supervisors know early on which new teachers may be struggling or at risk for unacceptable levels of performance.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


Figure 75		TERANTALION WALE EVALUATION ALL NEW TEACHERS
Do states require	Á	02
districts to evaluate	7)	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
all teachers each year?	\$	Z \ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
all teachers each year.	3/2	j
	<i>₹</i> ,₹	/ § ₹
	40	\ 40
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware ¹		
District of Columbia ²		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North Carolina	_	_
North Dakota		_
Ohio		_
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
VIRGINIA		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	22	43



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although not awarding "best practice" honors for frequency of evaluations, NCTQ commends all nine states that meet this goal not only by requiring annual evaluations for all teachers, but also for ensuring that new teachers are observed and receive feedback during the first half of the school year.

Figure 76 Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?




Figures 75 and 76

- 1. Although highly effective teachers are only required to receive a summative evaluation once every two years, the student improvement component is evaluated annually.
- 2. All District of Columbia Public Schools teachers are evaluated at least annually.

Figure 77


Do states require classroom observations?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska⁴, Arkansas, Colorado⁴, Delaware, Florida⁴, Georgia, Kentucky⁴, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri⁴, Nevada⁴, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon⁴, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia⁴
- Arizona, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin
- 3. District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. For new teachers.

Figure 78

Do states require that new teachers are observed early in the year?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal D - Tenure

The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- A teacher should be eligible for tenure after a certain number of years of service, but tenure should not be granted automatically at that juncture.
- 2. Evidence of effectiveness should be the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
- The state should articulate a process, such as a hearing, that local districts must administer in considering the evidence and deciding whether a teacher should receive tenure.
- 4. The minimum years of service needed to achieve tenure should allow sufficient data to be accumulated on which to base tenure decisions; five years is the ideal minimum.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background



Area 3: Goal D **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal Raised for this Goal





Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not connect tenure decisions to evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Teachers in Virginia are awarded tenure automatically after a three-year probationary period, absent an additional process that evaluates cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-303 and 22.1-305

RECOMMENDATION

End the automatic awarding of tenure.

The decision to grant tenure should be a deliberate one, based on consideration of a teacher's commitment and actual evidence of classroom effectiveness.

- Ensure evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
 - Virginia should make evidence of effectiveness, rather than the number of years in the classroom, the most significant factor when determining this leap in professional standing.
- Articulate a process that local districts must administer when deciding which teachers get

Virginia should require a clear process, such as a hearing, to ensure that the local district reviews a teacher's performance before making a determination regarding tenure.

Require a longer probationary period.

Virginia should extend its probationary period, ideally to five years. This would allow for an adequate collection of sufficient data that reflect teacher performance.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

		STATE ONLY					
	No policy	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 YEARS	5 YEARS	AWARDS ANNUAL CONTRACTS
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona							
Arkansas							
California							
Colorado							
Connecticut Delaware							
District of Columbia							
Florida							
Georgia							
Hawaii							
Idaho							
Illinois							
Indiana							
lowa							
Kansas							
Kentucky							
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland							
Massachusetts							
Michigan	- i		- i		- i		- i
Minnesota							
Mississippi				$\overline{\Box}$			
Missouri							
Montana							
Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire							
New Jersey							
New Mexico							
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota							
Ohio							
Oklahoma				1			
Oregon							
Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island							2
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee –							
Texas							
Utah							
Vermont							
VIRGINIA							
Washington							
West Virginia							
Wisconsin							
Wyoming							

Teachers may also earn career status with an average rating of at least effective for a four-year period and a rating of at least effective for the last two years.

^{2.} Teachers who receive two years of ineffective evaluations are dismissed.

Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico	LEARING CS THE CONTRIBON	
Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico	<u> </u>	
Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico	<u> </u>	
Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
lowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		_
Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico	_	
Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico		
New Jersey New Mexico		
New Mexico		
·		
New York		
North Carolina		
. to. ti. 2 allota		
Ohio		
Cittariorna	2	
Oregon		
Rhode Island		
554411 641 541114		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Utah Vermont		
•		
VIICOII VII		
Washington		
11050 16		
wyorning		



****** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Michigan has increased its probationary period to five years and requires that evidence of effectiveness be the primary criterion in awarding tenure.

Figure 82 How are tenure decisions made?




Figure 81

- 1. No state-level policy; however, the contract between DCPS and the teachers' union represents significant advancement in the area of
- 2. The state has created a loophole by essentially waiving student learning requirements and allowing the principal of a school to petition for career-teacher status.

Goal E – Licensure Advancement

The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should base advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license on evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- 2. The state should not require teachers to fulfill generic, unspecified coursework requirements to advance from a probationary to a nonprobationary license.
- 3. The state should not require teachers to have an advanced degree as a condition of professional licensure.
- 4. Evidence of effectiveness should be a factor in the renewal of a professional license.



The components for this goal have changed since 2009. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background



Area 3: Goal E **Virginia** Analysis







Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia's requirements for licensure advancement and renewal are not based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

In Virginia, new teachers apply for the initial Collegiate Professional license, which is valid for five years and can be renewed. The requirement for renewal is completion of 180 professional development points based on an individualized professional development plan. Points can be accrued from one or more of the following options: college credit, professional conference, curriculum development, publication of an article, publication of a book, mentorship/supervision, educational project and employing educational agency professional development activity. A minimum of 90 points (three semester hours in a content area) in the license holder's endorsement area or areas is required of license holders without a master's degree and may be satisfied at the undergraduate (two-year or four-year institution) or graduate level.

The state also offers the option of a Postgraduate Professional license for teachers holding a graduate (master's or doctorate) degree.

Virginia does not include evidence of effectiveness as a factor in the renewal of a professional license. Virginia teachers must renew their licenses every five years by obtaining 180 professional development points in the validity period. For applicants without a master's degree, 90 of these points must be graduate credits from an accredited master's program.

Supporting Research

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/licensure/index.shtml#renewal http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/licensure

RECOMMENDATION

■ Require evidence of effectiveness as a part of teacher licensing policy.

Virginia should require evidence of teacher effectiveness to be a factor in determining whether teachers can renew their licenses or advance to a higher level license.

Discontinue licensure requirements with no direct connection to classroom effectiveness.

While targeted requirements may potentially expand teacher knowledge and improve teacher practice, Virginia's menu of general, nonspecific professional development requirements for license renewal merely call for teachers to complete a certain amount of seat time. These requirements do not correlate with teacher effectiveness.

■ End requirement tying teacher advancement to master's degrees.

Virginia should remove its mandate that teachers obtain a master's or doctorate degree for any level of license advancement. Research is conclusive and emphatic that master's degrees do not have any significant correlation to classroom performance. Rather, advancement should be based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia asserted that it does not require teachers to fulfill generic, unspecified coursework requirements to advance from one license to another. The state also reiterated that it does not require teachers to have an advanced degree as a condition of professional licensure.

Figure 04			Consideration Biven to teacher	, /
Figure 84	OBJECTIVE ENDENCE.		scher	ine is ireness
Do states require teacher	ۍ ک	Some objective evidence of		Performance not considered
to show evidence of	DEN	SRE evide	siver, Per,	
effectiveness before	ÉEV.	SSisc	ation Ce by	
conferring professional		r Obje	rside, orma, ed to	m _{am}
licensure?	8.E.	Son /	Pet O	Perfo
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois ¹				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland ²				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio	Ш			
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont VIRGINIA				
Washington West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
vvyoninig				2.4
	3	3	11	34




T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Rhode Island is integrating certification, certification renewal and educator evaluation. Teachers who receive poor evaluations for five consecutive years are not eligible to renew their certification. In addition, teachers who consistently receive 'highly effective' ratings will be eligible for a special license designation.

Figure 85

Do states require teachers to earn advanced degrees before conferring professional licensure?




- 1. Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, New York and Oregon all require a master's degree or coursework equivalent to a master's degree
- 2. Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia
- 4. Strong Practice: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- 1. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.
- 2. Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation system for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.

Figure 86


Do states require teachers to take additional, nonspecific coursework before conferring or renewing professional licenses?



- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island

Figure 87

Do states award lifetime professional licenses?



- 1. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal F – Equitable Distribution

The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

The state should make the following data publicly available:

- 1. An "Academic Quality" index for each school that includes factors research has found to be associated with teacher effectiveness, such as:
 - a. percentage of new teachers;
 - b. percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once;
 - c. percentage of teachers on emergency credentials;
 - d. average selectivity of teachers' undergraduate institutions; and
 - e. teachers' average ACT or SAT scores;
- The percentage of highly qualified teachers disaggregated by both individual school and by teaching area;
- The annual teacher absenteeism rate reported for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school;
- 4. The average teacher turnover rate for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school, by district and by reasons that teachers leave.

Background



Area 3: Goal F **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Providing comprehensive reporting may be the state's most important role for ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers among schools. Virginia reports little school-level data that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

Virginia does not collect or publicly report most of the data recommended by NCTQ. The state does not provide a school-level teacher quality index that demonstrates the academic backgrounds of a school's teachers and the ratio of new to veteran teachers. Virginia also does not report on teacher absenteeism or turnover rates.

Virginia does report on the percentage of highly qualified teachers. Commendably, these data are reported for each school, rather than aggregated by district. The state is also commended for comparing the percentage of highly qualified teachers at high- and low-poverty schools. Virginia's Equity Plan, updated in February 2011, includes recent data about years of teaching experience.

Supporting Research

Virginia School Report Card 2010-2011 https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/reportcard/ An Update to Virginia's Equity Plan

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/federal_programs/esea/title2/part_a/reports/update_equity_plan.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Use a teacher quality index to report publicly about each school.

A teacher quality index, such as the one developed by the Illinois Education Research Council, with data including teachers' average SAT or ACT scores, the percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once, the selectivity of teachers' undergraduate colleges and the percentage of new teachers, can shine a light on how equitably teachers are distributed both across and within districts. Virginia should ensure that individual school report cards include such data in a manner that translates these factors into something easily understood by the public, such as a color-coded matrix indicating a school's high or low score.

Publish other data that facilitate comparisons across schools.

Virginia should collect and report other school-level data that reflect the stability of a school's faculty, including the rates of teacher absenteeism and turnover.

Provide comparative data based on school demographics.

As Virginia does with highly qualified teachers, the state should provide comparative data for schools with similar poverty and minority populations. This would yield a more comprehensive picture of gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

igure 89	AV NOEK FOR EACH SCHOOL	PERCENTAGE OF TACK	PERCENTAGE OF A.T.	´& /	/	/ .
Do states publicly	55	PRCENTAGE OF TEACH	S. S	4C/F	AWUAL TURNOUS.	TEACHER ABSENTEEISM RATE
report school-level	AVINDEX FOR EACH ASSOCIATED ES FACT TEACHER OLL WITH	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \		PERCENTAGE OF HIGH.	5 / 6	83 / 85;
data about teachers?	X S S					
Jala about teachers:	372		5 / Oy	\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\		/ ⁴⁸ 8
	V 4 0 3 3 4 5 0 3 4 5 0 5 4 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5	ENCE /	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	FEV.	/ * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	YER,
	4 £ 8 Z	LE LE	/ Jay	PERC	/ 🕺 /	, ZZO
Alabama			, ,		, , ,	
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida						
Georgia				-		
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont						
VIRGINIA						
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
, ,	0	18	10	41	6	5



No state has an outstanding record when it comes to public reporting of teacher data that can help to ameliorate inequities in teacher quality. However, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island and South Carolina report more school-level data than other states.

Ideally, percentage of new teachers and percentage of teachers on emergency credentials would be incorporated into a teacher quality index.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal A - Induction

The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-needs schools.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should ensure that new teachers receive mentoring of sufficient frequency and duration, especially in the first critical weeks of school.
- Mentors should be carefully selected based on evidence of their own classroom effectiveness and subject-matter expertise. Mentors should be trained, and their performance as mentors should be evaluated.
- Induction programs should include only strategies that can be successfully implemented, even in a poorly managed school. Such strategies include intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers.

Background



Area 4: Goal A **Virginia** Analysis



State Nearly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia requires that all new teachers receive mentoring. For the first year of employment, new teachers must be assigned a mentor by local district administration "to assist...in achieving excellence in instruction."

Mentors must successfully complete a training program, having achieved continuing status and work in the same building as the new teachers; the observation of the new teacher in the classroom is mandatory.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-305.1

Guidelines for Mentor Teacher Program

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/career_resources/mentor/program_creation_guidelines.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Expand guidelines to include other key areas.

While still leaving districts flexibility, Virginia should articulate minimum guidelines for a high-quality induction experience. The state should require a timeline in which mentors are assigned to all new teachers, ideally soon after the commencing of teaching, to offer support during those first critical weeks of school. It should also require mentors to be trained in a content area or grade level similar to new teachers and mandate a method for performance evaluation.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


106 : NCTQ STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK 2011 VIRGINIA

igure 91 Po states have policies hat articulate the	MENTORING FOR ALL NO.	MENTORING OF SUPERCY	MENTORNO PROJECTION RECTIONNING PROJECTION	CARFU SELETION.	MENTORS MUCE.	MENTORSPROGRAM.	MENTOR IS COM.	USE OF A MARETY OF EFFECTIVE
lements of effective	0,40	\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\					, / હૈ	SPE SPE
nduction?	rs W.				RSM	RS/P) 147E	, \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	\ \[\frac{4}{2} \ \ \frac{6}{2} \ \ \ \]
idaction:	MENT TEACHE	MENTC	MENTC	CAREFU	MENTO	MENTO BE EVALL	MENTO	USE OF
Alabama								
Alaska								
Arizona								
Arkansas								
California								
Colorado								
Connecticut								
Delaware								
District of Columbia								
Florida								
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho								
Illinois								
Indiana								
lowa								
Kansas								
Kentucky Louisiana								
Maine								
Maryland								
Massachusetts								
Michigan		-						
Minnesota								
Mississippi								
Missouri								
Montana	ī		П				П	
Nebraska								
Nevada	$\overline{\Box}$	$\overline{\Box}$				$\overline{\Box}$	$\overline{}$	
New Hampshire								
New Jersey								
New Mexico								
New York								
North Carolina								
North Dakota								
Ohio								
Oklahoma								
Oregon								
Pennsylvania								
Rhode Island								
South Carolina								
South Dakota								
Tennessee								
Texas								
Utah								
Vermont								
VIRGINIA								
Washington								
West Virginia								
Wisconsin								
Wyoming								
	30	18	9	17	28	12	21	17



South Carolina requires that all new teachers, prior to the start of the school year, be assigned mentors for at least one year. Districts carefully select mentors based on experience and similar certifications and grade levels, and mentors undergo additional training. Adequate release time is mandated by the state so that mentors and new teachers may observe each other in the classroom, collaborate on effective teaching techniques and develop professional growth plans. Mentor evaluations are mandatory and stipends are recommended.

Figure 92
Do states have policies that articulate the elements of effective induction?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia
- Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont, Wyoming

Goal B - Professional Development

The state should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.
- 2. The state should direct districts to align professional development activities with findings from teachers' evaluations.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal B **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not have state-level policy that connects professional development to teachers' evaluations.

RECOMMENDATION

Require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance. In order to increase their effectiveness in the classroom, teachers need to receive feedback on strengths and areas that need improvement identified in their evaluations. As such, Virginia should

require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their classroom performance.

■ Ensure that professional development is aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations. Professional development that is not informed by evaluation results may be of little value to teachers' professional growth and aim of increasing their effectiveness in the classroom. Virginia should ensure that districts utilize teacher evaluation results in determining professional development needs and activities.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Ten states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, Louisiana is commended for clearly articulating that the feedback provided to a teacher in a post-observation conference must include a discussion of a teacher's strengths and weaknesses.

Figure 94 Do teachers receive feedback on their evaluations?




- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma
- 3. Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Utah
- 4. Alabama, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin



Figure 96

Do states require that teacher evaluations inform professional development?



- Strong Practice: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Wyoming
- 2. Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Texas
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi⁴, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Viiginia, Washington, West Viiginia, Wisconsin
- 4. Mississippi requires professional development based on evaluation results only for teachers in need of improvement in school identified as at-risk.

Goal C – Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- While the state may find it appropriate to articulate teachers' starting salaries, it should not require districts to adhere to a state-dictated salary schedule that defines steps and lanes and sets minimum pay at each level.
- The state should discourage districts from tying additional compensation to advanced degrees. The state should eliminate salary schedules that establish higher minimum salaries or other requirements to pay more to teachers with advanced degrees.
- 3. The state should discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective. The state should eliminate salary schedules that require that the highest steps on the pay scale be determined solely be seniority.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal C **Virginia** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not address salary requirements, seemingly giving local districts the authority for pay scales and eliminating barriers such as state salary schedules and other regulations that control how districts pay teachers.

RECOMMENDATION

■ Discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees.

While still leaving districts the flexibility to establish their own pay scale, Virginia should articulate policies that definitively discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees, in light of the extensive research showing that such degrees do not have an impact on teacher effectiveness.

Discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective.

Similarly, Virginia should articulate policies that discourage districts from determining the highest steps on the pay scale solely by seniority.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

***** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida and Indiana allow local districts to develop their own salary schedules while preventing districts from focusing on elements not associated with teacher effectiveness. In Florida, local salary schedules must ensure that the most effective teachers receive salary increases greater than the highest annual salary adjustment available. Indiana requires local salary scales to be based on a combination of factors and limits the years of teacher experience and content-area degrees to account for no more than one-third of this calculation.

Figure 98 What role does the state		Sets minimum salary	□ SCHEDULE SET SALARY
play in deciding teacher	6.3) sal	7 2
pay rates?	imu, edu	\ \mu_	15.5%
Day rates:	min, Sch		\ \frac{1}{2}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}{2}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}{2}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}\text{Q} \\ \frac{1}\
	lary /	ts,	7.57. 7.4EL
Alabama	Sets minimum salary schedule	ഗ് / □	7 %
Alaska	ī		
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado ¹			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana Iowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine	_		
Maryland			
Massachusetts	П		Ī
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania	-		-
Rhode Island ²			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
VIRGINIA			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	16	8	27

^{1.} Colorado gives districts the option of a salary schedule, a performance pay policy or a combination of both.

^{2.} Rhode Island requires that local district salary schedules are based on years of service, experience and training.

Figure 99	₹	, \$ \	1 .6
Do states discourage	J. J	£ 54	⁷ Sati _i
districts from basing	ZEE ZOE		
teacher pay on advance	d \$\$		/ [/] / ₀
degrees?	REQUIRES PERFORMANCE	Leaves pay to	Requires compensation advanced degrees
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri	Н		
Montana	П		
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island		1	
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas		2	
Utah			
Vermont			
VIRGINIA			
Washington			
West Virginia Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
wyoning		_	
	3	32	16

^{1.} Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training".

^{2.} Texas has a minimum salary schedule based on years of experience. Compensation for advanced degrees is left to district discretion.

Goal D - Compensation for Prior Work Experience

The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should encourage districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience through mechanisms such as starting these teachers at an advanced step on the pay scale. Further, the state should not have regulatory language that blocks such strategies.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal D **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not encourage local districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience. However, the state does not seem to have regulatory language blocking such strategies.

RECOMMENDATION

■ Encourage local districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience.

While still leaving districts with the flexibility to determine their own pay scales, Virginia should encourage districts to incorporate mechanisms such as starting these teachers at a higher salary than other new teachers. Such policies would be attractive to career changers with related work

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

experience, such as in the STEM subjects.

Virginia disagreed with its score for this goal. Virginia asserted that the state does partially meet this goal because it does not have regulations that block school divisions from providing compensation for relevant prior experience.

LAST WORD


While it is important that the state does not have regulatory language blocking districts from compensating for prior work experience, NCTQ believes that this is an area where states need to be more proactive in encouraging this practice.



North Carolina compensates new teachers with relevant prior-work experience by awarding them one year of experience credit for every year of full-time work after earning a bachelor's degree that is related to their area of licensure and work assignment. One year of credit is awarded for every two years of work experience completed prior to earning a bachelor's degree.

Figure 101

Do states direct districts to compensate teachers for related prior work experience?



- 1. Strong Practice: California, Delaware, Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, Washington
- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal E – Differential Pay

The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 2. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in high-need schools.
- 3. The state should not have regulatory language that would block differential pay.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal E **Virginia** Analysis



State Nearly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia supports incentives earned by teaching certain subjects. As part of its Middle School Teachers Corps, the state provides incentives for experienced middle-school math teachers to teach in schools designated as "at-risk in mathematics." In addition, each year the state releases the top ten "critical shortage teaching areas." It uses this list to determine candidate eligibility for its scholarship loan program, which offers loan repayment for teachers in subject shortage areas.

Virginia supports differential pay for those teaching in high-needs schools. The state encourages local school boards to offer teachers in hard-to-staff, low-income schools incentives such as "increased compensation, improved retirement benefits,...increased deferred compensation,...relocation expenses, bonuses and other incentives as may be determined by the board."

Teachers who are National Board Certified are eligible to receive an initial award of \$5,000, with subsequent awards of \$2,500. However, this type of differential pay is not tied to high-needs schools or subject-area shortages.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-199.1; 22.1-290.01

Virginia Middle School Teachers Corps

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/career_resources/middle_teacher_corps/index.shtml

Virginia Critical Shortage Areas

http://teachvirginia.org/critical.html

Virginia Guidelines for Distributing National Board Certification Incentive Awards

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/licensure/guidelines_distributing_nbct_awards.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Expand differential pay for teachers in subject shortage areas.

Virginia should consider expanding its differential pay initiative to support other shortage areas beyond middle school mathematics. In addition, although the state's loan forgiveness program is a desirable recruitment and retention tool for teachers early in their careers, Virginia should expand its program to include those already part of the teaching pool. A salary differential is an attractive incentive for every teacher, not just those with education debt.

■ Consider tying National Board supplements to teaching in high-needs schools.

This differential pay could be an incentive to attract some of the state's most effective teachers to its low-performing schools.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia pointed out that the state is piloting performance pay in hard-to-staff schools and schools for improvement.

Supporting Research

Virginia Performance-Pay Incentives Initiative

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/career_resources/performance_pay/index.shtm

Figure 103		HIGH NEED SCHOOLS		SHORTAGE SUBJECT	= /
Do states provide				AREAS	
incentives to teach in		1 %		1 &	
high-need schools	74/	, (ene	74/	(ene	/ *
or shortage subject	RE√	o'gi,	REV	o'giji	pod
areas?	DIFFERENTIAL	/ uec	DIFFERENTIAL	/ uec	0,00
		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			No Support
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut ¹					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland ²					
Massachusetts					
Michigan	$\overline{}$	- i		- H	
Minnesota					
Mississippi			- H		Ī
Missouri	$\overline{\Box}$			$\overline{\Box}$	
Montana	ī		- i		Ī
Nebraska	$\overline{\Box}$				
Nevada		$\overline{}$			
New Hampshire					
New Jersey	$\overline{\Box}$				
New Mexico					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota ³					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
VIRGINIA			4		
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	21	7	17	11	17
	Z 1	1	17	11	17


- Connecticut offers mortgage assistance and incentives to retired teachers working in shortage subject areas.
- Maryland offers tuition reimbursement for teacher retraining in specified shortage subject areas and offers a stipend for alternate route candidates teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 3. South Dakota offers signing bonuses and scholarships to fill shortages in high-need schools.
- Shortage subject area differential pay is limited to the Middle School Teacher Corps program.



Georgia supports differential pay by which teachers can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects. The state is especially commended for its new compensation strategy for math and science teachers, which moves teachers along the salary schedule rather than just providing a bonus or stipend. The state also supports differential pay initiatives to link compensation more closely with district needs and to achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers. Georgia's efforts to provide incentives for National Board Certification teachers to work in high-need schools are also noteworthy.

Figure 104

Do states support differential pay for teaching in high need schools and shortage subjects?



- Strong Practice: Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia
- Colorado, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Idaho, Pennsylvania, Utah
- Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia

Goal F – Performance Pay

The state should support performance pay but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support performance pay efforts, rewarding teachers for their effectiveness in the classroom.
- 2. The state should allow districts flexibility to define the criteria for performance pay provided that such criteria connect to evidence of student achievement.
- 3. Any performance pay plan should allow for the participation of all teachers, not just those in tested subjects and grades.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal F **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

For the 2011-2012 school year, hard-to-staff schools in Virginia have been invited to participate in the state's Performance-Pay Incentives Initiative. Schools that receive grant funding for this program must implement a comprehensive teacher-evaluation system and at least 40 percent of teacher evaluations must be based on student-growth. The maximum stipend per teacher is \$5,000.

Supporting Research

Virginia Performance-Pay Incentives Initiative

http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/career_resources/performance_pay/index.shtml

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia was helpful in providing NCTQ with facts that enhanced this analysis.



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

An increasing number of states are supporting performance pay initiatives. Florida and **Indiana** are particularly noteworthy for their efforts to build performance into the salary schedule. Rather than award bonuses, teachers' salaries will be based in part on their performance in the classroom.

Figure 106	PERFORMANCE FACTORES	PERORMANCE BOW	Performance pay Permis	\ \ /	Does not support Performance Pay	
Do states support	Ş	/ ,	Performance pay perm.			
performance pay?	4	ج \ رُجُ		state of be	Jeg. / ₁ ~	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7		₹ / ð:	sore / g		
	\$ 25			y / gentle	Does not support	
	75 S.	, \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		init.	2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 /	
	# 1 P. F.	\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	7 2 2	
Alabama			,	, ,	_	
Alaska						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida						
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska ¹			Ш			
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma						
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont						
VIRGINIA						
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
	3	4	12	5	27	
		-		-		

^{1.} Nebraska's initiative does not go into effect until 2016.

Goal G – Pension Flexibility

The state should ensure that pension systems are portable, flexible and fair to all teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. Participants in the state's pension system should have the option of a fully portable pension system as their primary pension plan by means of a defined contribution plan or a defined benefit plan that is formatted similar to a cash balance plan.
- 2. Participants in the state's pension system should be vested no later than the third year of employment.
- 3. Defined benefit plans should offer teachers the option of a lump-sum rollover to a personal retirement account upon termination of employment that includes, at minimum, the teacher's contributions and accrued interest at a fair interest rate. In addition, withdrawal options from either defined benefit or defined contribution plans should include funds contributed by the employer.
- 4. Defined benefit plans should allow teachers to purchase time for unlimited previous teaching experience at the time of employment. Teachers should also be allowed to purchase time for all official leaves of absence, such as maternity or paternity leave.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal G **Virginia** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia only offers a defined benefit pension plan to its teachers as their mandatory pension plan. This plan is not fully portable, does not vest until year five and does not provide any employer contribution for teachers who choose to withdraw their account balances when leaving the system. It also limits flexibility by restricting the ability to purchase years of service. However, the state is commended for offering a fully portable supplemental savings plan.

Teachers in Virginia also participate in Social Security, so they must contribute to the state's defined benefit plan in addition to Social Security. Although retirement savings in addition to Social Security are good and necessary for most individuals, the state's policy results in mandated contributions to two inflexible plans, rather than permitting teachers options for their state-provided savings plans.

Vesting in a defined benefit plan guarantees a teacher's eligibility to receive lifetime monthly benefit payments at retirement age. Nonvested teachers do not have a right to later retirement benefits; they may only withdraw the portion of their funds allowed by the plan. Virginia's vesting at five years of service limits the options of teachers who leave the system prior to this point.

Teachers in Virginia with less than five years of service who choose to withdraw their employee accounts upon leaving only receive their own contributions plus interest, but not any employee contributions paid for by the employer. Certain school districts in Virginia pay all or a portion of teachers' mandatory contribution as an employment benefit; these are referred to as picked-up contributions. Teachers with at least five years of service receive their entire employee account, which consists of their own contributions and any contributions picked-up by employers plus interest. This means that those who withdraw their funds accrue no benefits beyond what they might have earned had they simply put their contributions in basic savings accounts.

Teachers with less than five years of experience who were employed by a district in which the employer picked-up the mandatory employee contribution may be leaving the system with no savings beyond Social Security. Further, teachers who remain in the field of education but enter another pension plan (such as in another state) will find it difficult to purchase the time equivalent to their prior employment in the new system because they are not entitled to any employer contribution.

Virginia limits teachers' flexibility to purchase years of service. The ability to purchase time is important because defined benefit plans' retirement eligibility and benefit payments are often tied to the number of years a teacher has worked. Virginia's plan allows teachers with at least five years of service to purchase time for previous teaching experience, up to four years. While better than not allowing any purchase at all, this provision is less than most states' and disadvantages teachers who move to Virginia with more teaching experience.

The state's plan also allows teachers to purchase up to one year of service per approved leave of absence, up to four years. This is a disadvantage to teachers who need to take more than four years of total leave over the course of their career, such as for paternity or maternity care or for other personal reasons.

The state is commended for offering fully portable supplemental savings plans with an employer match. Virginia offers 457 and 403(b) plans with a maximum match lowered to 10 dollars per pay period for fiscal year 2011. In fiscal year 2012, the match is set to return to its previous maximum of 20 dollars. Offering an employer match, of any amount, to supplemental savings plans is very rare.

Supporting Research

Virginia Retirement System, Plan 2, Handbook for Members Hired or Rehired on or after July 1, 2010 http://www.varetire.org/Pdf/Publications/handbook-plan-2.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Offer teachers a pension plan that is fully portable, flexible and fair.

Virginia should offer teachers for their mandatory pension plan the option of either a defined contribution plan or a fully portable defined benefit plan, such as a cash balance plan. A well-structured defined benefit plan could be a suitable option among multiple plans. However, as the sole option, defined benefit plans severely disadvantage mobile teachers and those who enter the profession later in life. Because teachers in Virginia participate in Social Security, they are required to contribute to two defined benefit-style plans.

Increase the portability of its defined benefit plan.

If Virginia maintains its defined benefit plan, it should allow all teachers that leave the system to withdraw interest and employer contributions. The state should also allow teachers to purchase their full amount of previous teaching experience, at least one year per approved leave of absence, and decrease the vesting requirement to year three. A lack of portability is a disincentive to an increasingly mobile teaching force.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The Virginia Retirement System did not respond to repeated requests to review NCTQ's analyses related to teacher pensions.

Accrued Liability: The value of a pension plan's promised benefits calculated by an actuary (actuarial valuation), taking into account a set of investment and benefit assumptions to a certain date.

Actuarial Valuation: In a pension plan, this is the total amount needed to meet promised benefits. A set of mathematical procedures is used to calculate the value of benefits to be paid, the funds available and the annual contribution required.

Amortization Period: The gradual elimination of a liability, such as a mortgage, in regular payments over a specified period of time.

Benefit Formula: Formula used to calculate the amount teachers will receive each month after retirement. The most common formula used is (years of service x final average salary x benefit multiplier). This amount is divided by 12 to calculate monthly benefits.

Benefit Multiplier: Multiplier used in the benefit formula. It, along with years of service, determines the total percentage of final average salary that a teacher will receive in retirement benefits. In some plans, the multiplier is not constant, but changes depending upon retirement age and/or years of service.

Defined Benefit Plan: Pension plan that promises to pay a specified amount to each person who retires after a set number of years of service. Employees contribute to them in some cases; in others, all contributions are made by the employer.

Defined Contribution Plan: Pension plan in which the level of contributions is fixed at a certain level, while benefits vary depending on the return from investments. Employees make contributions into a tax-deferred account, and employers may or may not make contributions. Defined contribution pension plans, unlike defined benefit pension plans, give the employee options of where to invest the account, usually among stock, bond and money market accounts.

Lump-sum Withdrawal: Large payment of money received at one time instead of in periodic payments. Teachers leaving a pension plan may receive a lump-sum distribution of the value of their pension.

Normal Cost: The amount necessary to fund retirement benefits for one plan year for an individual or a whole pension plan.

Pension Wealth: The net present value of a teacher's expected lifetime retirement benefits.

Purchasing Time: A teacher may make additional contributions to a pension system to increase service credit. Time may be purchased for a number of reasons, such as professional development leave, previous out-of-state teaching experience, medical leaves of absence or military service.

Service Credit/Years of Service: Accumulated period of time in years or partial years for which a teacher earned compensation subject to contributions.

Supplemental Retirement Plan: An optional plan to which teachers may voluntarily make tax-deferred contributions in addition to their mandatory pension plans. Employees are usually able to choose their rate of contribution up to a maximum set by the IRS; some employers also make contributions. These plans are generally in the form of 457 or 403(b) programs.

Vesting: Right an employee gradually acquires by length of service to receive employer-contributed benefits, such as payments from a pension fund.

Sources: Barron's Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms, Seventh Edition; California State Teachers' Retirement System http://www.calstrs.com/Members/Defined%20Benefit%20Program/glossary.aspx; Economic Research Institute, http://www.eridlc.com/resources/index.cfm?fuseaction=resource.glossary

Figure 109		Defined benefit plan with	fined	CHOICE OF DEFINED RES.	ő > / ×	
What type of pension] Defined benefit or	Zin 1	tal ple		DEFINED CONTRIBUTION	5
systems do states offer	5	igh y	la l	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	[5] Sign Sig	
teachers?	efit,			SEFIN		
teachers:	pen	tons	olan	/ 20		
	ρ _{θίί}	fine.	Hybrid plan	MED		
	Ped	7 2 8	/ ½	\ \tau_{\text{3.17}}	7 2 2	
Alabama			\Box			
Alaska		$\overline{}$	ī			
Arizona	$\overline{\Box}$		$\overline{\Box}$		$\overline{}$	
Arkansas		$\overline{}$			П	
California ²	$\overline{\Box}$		Ī			
Colorado						
Connecticut		$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$	$\overline{\Box}$	
Delaware						
District of Columbia						
Florida						
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana ³						
lowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota						
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio ⁴						
Oklahoma						
Oregon ⁵						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina ⁶						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah ⁷						
Vermont						
VIRGINIA						
Washington ⁸						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
	25	17	4	4	1	




T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alaska provides a fair and flexible defined contribution pension plan for all teachers. This plan is also highly portable, as teachers are entitled to 100 percent of employer contributions after five years of service. South Dakota's defined benefit plan has some creative provisions, which makes it more like a defined contribution plan. Most notably, teachers are able to withdraw 85 percent of their employer contributions after three years of service. In addition, Florida, Ohio, South Carolina and Utah are noteworthy for offering teachers a choice between a defined benefit or hybrid plan and a defined contribution plan.

- 1. A hybrid plan has components of both a defined benefit plan and a defined contribution plan.
- 2. California offers a small cash balance component but ended most of the funding to this portion as of January 1, 2011.
- 3. Indiana also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 4. Ohio also offers the option of a hybrid plan and offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 5. Oregon also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 6. South Carolina also offers a supplemental defined contribution plan.
- 7. Utah offers a choice between a defined contribution or a hybrid plan.
- 8. Washington offers a choice between a defined benefit or a hybrid plan.

Figure 110

Do states offer teachers an option other than a nonportable defined benefit plan?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska, Florida, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado³, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Although not fully portable, the state's defined benefit plan has some notable portability provisions.

Figure 111

- 1. For teachers who join the system on or after January 1, 2012.
- 2. Florida's defined benefit plan does not vest until year eight; teachers vest in the state's defined contribution plan after one year.
- 3. For teachers who join the system on or after July 1, 2012.
- 4. Ohio's defined benefit plan does not vest until year five; teachers vest in the state's defined contribution plan after one year.
- Oregon offers a hybrid plan in which teachers vest immediately in the defined contribution component and vest in the defined benefit component after five years.
- 6. South Carolina's defined benefit plan does not vest until year five; teachers vest immediately in the state's defined contribution plan.
- 7. Based on Washington's Plan 2. The state also offers a hybrid plan in which teachers vest immediately in the defined contribution component and vest in the defined benefit component after 10 years.


ow many years before	teachers ves	t?		
	3 YEARS OR LESS	4 to 5 years	6 to 9 years	10 years
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado Connecticut				
Delaware ¹				
District of Columbia				
Florida ²				
Georgia				
Hawaii ³				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa ³				
Kansas				
Kentucky Louisiana				
Maine		-		
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio⁴				
Oklahoma				
Oregon ⁵				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina ⁶				
South Dakota Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
VIRGINIA				
Washington ⁷				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	3	29	3	16

Figure 112		Only their Own	£ /	Their own contribution	THER OWN CONTRIBUTION	>
What funds do states p	ermit	/	Their own contribution plus interest	£ / £		_
teachers to withdraw f		<u> </u>	ontrij Suri			ī
their defined benefit p	lans d	' / <u>\$</u>) S	00 6		<u>}</u>
if they leave after	less than their	10; 	Their own con	own the		ERE
	ss th tribu	, , the	eiro inte	r deir	E SES	<u> </u>
five years? ¹	400	/ 8	\ \frac{\pi_{\mathred{F}_{\mathred{G}_{\math	7 8 8	/ * 83	
Alabama						
Alaska ²						
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California ³						
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware District of Columbia						
Florida						
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana						
lowa ⁴						
Kansas						
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan ⁵						
Minnesota						
Mississippi Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada ⁶						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio ⁷						
Oklahoma						
Oregon ⁸						
Pennsylvania Rhode Island						
South Carolina ⁹						
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah ¹⁰						
Vermont						
VIRGINIA						
Washington ¹¹						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
	4	5	34	6	1	

- States' withdrawal policies may vary depending on a teacher's years of service. Year five is used as a common point of comparision.
- As of July 1, 2006, Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan to new members, which allows teachers leaving the system after five years to withdraw 100 percent of the employer contribution.
- California has a defined benefit plan with a small cash balance component, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions and any employer contributions plus earnings from their cash balance component, regardless of their actions regarding their defined benefit account.
- 4. Once vested, lowa teachers may withdraw an employer match equal to one-thirtieth of their years of service. Effective July 1, 2012 teachers vest at seven years of service, so a teacher leaving at year five would not be entitled to any employer contribution.
- 5. Michigan only offers a hybrid plan. Exiting teachers may withdraw their own contributions and accrued earnings immediately and the employer contributions to the defined contribution component once vested at year four. Michigan teachers may withdraw their own contributions and accrued interest from the defined benefit component but may not withdraw the employer contribution.
- 6. Most teachers in Nevada fund the system by salary reductions or forgoing pay raises and thus do not have direct contributions to withdraw. The small mintority that are in a contributory system may withdraw their contributions plus interest.
- 7. Ohio has two other pension plans. Ohio's defined contribution plan allows teachers with at least one year of service who are leaving the system to withdraw 100 percent of the employer contribution. Exiting teachers with at least five years of experience in Ohio's combination plan may withdraw their employee-funded defined contribution component and the present value of the benefits offered in the defined benefit component.
- Oregon only has a hybrid retirement plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions plus earnings from their defined contribution component; they still receive the employer-funded defined benefit payments at retirement age.
- South Carolina also has a defined contribution plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw 100 percent of their contributions and employer contributions, plus earnings.
- 10. Utah offers a hybrid pension plan, which only has employee contributions when the costs exceed the guaranteed employer contribution. When costs are less than the employer contribution, the excess is contributed to the employee account and refundable after vesting.
- 11. Washington also has a hybrid plan, which allows exiting teachers to withdraw their contributions plus earnings from their defined contribution component; they still receive the employer-funded defined benefit payments at retirement age.

Figure 113

Do states permit teachers to purchase time for previous teaching experience?¹



- Purchasing time does not apply to defined contribution plans. In states that offer multiple plans or a hybrid plan, the graph refers to the state's defined benefit plan or the defined benefit component of its hybrid plan. Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan and is not included.
- Strong Practice: California, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah
- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- ${\it 4.\ Hawaii,\ Michigan,\ Minnesota,\ New\ York,\ Oregon}$

Figure 114

Do states permit teachers to purchase time for leaves of absence?¹



- Purchasing time does not apply to defined contribution plans. In states that offer multiple plans or a hybrid plan, the graph refers to the state's defined benefit plan or the defined benefit component of its hybrid plan. Alaska only offers a defined contribution plan and is not included.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota
- Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
- Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Goal H - Pension Sustainability

The state should ensure that excessive resources are not committed to funding teachers' pension systems.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that its pension system is financially sustainable, without excessive unfunded liabilities or an inappropriately long amortization period.
- 2. Mandatory employer and employee contribution rates should not be unreasonably high, as they reduce teachers' paychecks and commit district resources that could otherwise be spent on salaries or incentives.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal H **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

As of June 30, 2009, the most recent date for which an actuarial valuation is available, Virginia's pension system for teachers is 80.2 percent funded and has an amortization period of over 30 years. This means that if the plan earns its assumed rate of return and maintains current contribution rates, it would take the state more than 30 years to pay off its unfunded liabilities. Its funding ratio barely meets the recommended minimum standard, and the state's system is not financially sustainable according to actuarial benchmarks.

In addition, Virginia requires excessive resources to fund its teachers' retirement system. The current employer contribution rate of 8.81 percent is too high, in light of the fact that districts must also contribute 6.2 percent to Social Security. While this rate was established to allow the state to pay off liabilities within the required 30-year period, it does so at great cost, precluding Virginia from spending those funds on other, more immediate means to retain talented teachers. Virginia's amortization period is over 30 years because it suspended employer payments to the pension system for the fourth quarter of 2010. The mandatory employee contribution rate to the defined benefit plan of 5 percent is reasonable.

Supporting Research

Virginia Retirement System, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 http://www.varetire.org/Pdf/Publications/2010-annual-report.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

■ Ensure that the pension system is financially sustainable.

The state would be better off if its system was 95 percent funded and had an amortization period of 30 years or less to allow more protection during financial downturns. However, Virginia should consider ways to improve its funding level without raising the contributions of local districts and teachers. Committing excessive resources to pension benefits can negatively affect teacher recruitment and retention. In suspending districts' mandatory payments in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, the state eased financial pressure on the localities, but that further eroded the financial sustainability of the system. Improving funding levels necessitates, in part, systemic changes in the state's pension system. Goals 4-G and 4-I provide suggestions for pension system structures that are both sustainable and fair.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The Virginia Retirement System did not respond to repeated requests to review NCTQ's analyses related to teacher pensions.


Figure 116		, 9
Do state pension	<i>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</i>	FRA /
systems meet standard	FRG	\ 88 \ 7.4 \ 7.4
benchmarks for	00	\ \sum_{\subseteq} \sum
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	50	/ <u>\$</u> 2
financial health?	FUNDE /	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		1
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		1
Massachusetts		
Michigan ²		
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah³		
Vermont		
VIRGINIA		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
wyorning		
Wyoming	16	26



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

South Dakota, Tennessee and Wisconsin provide financially sustainable pension systems without committing excessive resources. The systems in these states are fully funded without requiring excessive contributions from teachers or school districts.

Figure 117 Are state pension systems financially sustainable?1



- 1. Cannot be determined for Michigan or Utah, which recently opened new systems.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alaska, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana⁴, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Based on Indiana's current plan only.

Figure 116

- 1. The amortization period is set to be under 30 years; however, the amortization period is not determined because the state is not meeting its annual required contribution.
- 2. Michigan opened a new system in July 2010.
- 3. Utah opened a new system in July 2011.

Figure 118

Real Rate of Return

The pension system funding levels reported here are based on each state's individual actuarial valuation, which use a series of varying assumptions. One of these assumptions concerns rate of return, which greatly affects a system's funding level. If investment returns fall short of assumptions, the fund will have a deficit; if returns are greater than expected, the fund will have a surplus. Higher assumed rates involve more risk, while rates closer to inflation (typically in the 3-5 percent range) are safer.

Most state pension funds assume a rate between 7.5 percent and 8.25 percent. A state using a 7.5 percent rate will report a lower funding level than if it had used 8.25 percent, even though its liabilities remain the same. Many states report that they do meet or exceed an eight percent rate of return over the life of the plan.

However, some economists argue that states' assumed rates of return are too high, and should instead be closer to four percent. They caution that the risk associated with states' higher rates is borne by taxpayers, with the result that tax rates rise to fund pension deficits. A rate closer to four percent would make the vast majority of the nation's pension systems less than 50 percent funded. In light of the current market situation, the debate over the rate of return is particularly timely. With no current consensus by experts or policymakers, NCTQ used states' self-reported numbers rather than recalculate all funding levels based on a standard rate of return. Considering how many states' systems NCTQ found in questionable financial health without using the lower rates some economists prefer, it is clear this is an issue that demands policymakers' attention.

Figure 119

Figure 119

How well funded are state pension systems?

	Funding Level
Alaska ¹	N/A
District of Columbia	118.3%
Washington	116%
New York	103.2%
Wisconsin	99.8%
South Dakota	96.3%
Delaware	96%
North Carolina	95.9%
Indiana ²	94.7%
Tennessee	90.6%
Wyoming	87.5%
Georgia	87.2%
Florida	86.6%
Utah	85.7%
Oregon	83.2%
Texas	82.9%
Nebraska	82.4%
Iowa	80.8%
VIRGINIA	80.2%
Arizona	79%
Idaho	78.9%
Michigan	78.9%
Minnesota	78.5%
California	78%
Missouri	77.7%
Pennsylvania	75.1%
Alabama	74.7%
Arkansas	73.8%
Nevada	71.2%
North Dakota	69.8%
South Carolina	67.8%
Vermont	66.5%
Maine	65.9%
New Mexico	65.7%
Maryland	65.4%
Montana	65.4%
	64.8%
Colorado	64.2%
Mississippi Massachusetts	
Massachusetts	63%
Connecticut	61.4%
Hawaii	61.4%
Kentucky	61%
Ohio	59.1%
New Hampshire	58.5%
New Jersey	57.6%
Oklahoma	56.7%
Kansas	56%
Louisiana	54.4%
Illinois	48.4%
Rhode Island	48.4%
West Virginia	46.5%

^{1.} Alaska has only a defined contribution pension system.

Indiana's current plan is 94.7 percent funded. However, when the current plan is combined with its closed plan, the funding level drops to 44.3 percent.

Figure 120
What is a reasonable rate for pension contributions?

- 4-7 percent each for teachers and districts in states participating in Social Security
- 10-13 percent each for teachers and districts in states not participating in Social Security

Analysts generally agree that workers in their 20's with no previous retirement savings should save, in addition to Social Security contributions, about 10-15 percent of their gross income in order to be able to live during retirement on 80 percent of the salary they were earning when they retired. While the recommended savings rate varies with age and existing retirement savings, NCTQ has used this 10-15 percent benchmark as a reasonable rate for its analyses. To achieve a total savings of 10-15 percent, teacher and employer contributions should each be in the range of 4-7 percent. In states where teachers do not participate in Social Security, the total recommended retirement savings (teacher plus employer contributions) is about 12 percent higher to compensate for the fact that these teachers will not have Social Security income when they retire. In order to achieve the appropriate level of total savings, teacher and employer contributions in these states should each be in the range of 10-13 percent.

Sources:

http://www.schwab.com/public/schwab/resource_center/expert_insight/retirement_strategies/planning/how_much_should_you_save_for_retirement_play_the_percentages.html
https://personal.vanguard.com/us/insights/retirement/saving/set-retirement-goals


Figure 121

- 1. The employer contribution rate includes the contributions of both school districts and state governments, where appropriate.
- The contribution rate is set to increase in future years. Some school districts in Georgia do not contribute to Social Security.
- 3. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years.
- Michigan opened a new system in July 2010 and employer contributions are not yet reported.
- 5. New Jersey reports its contributions as a flat dollar amount, and a percentage could not be calculated.
- The contribution rate is set to increase in future years. Most, but not all, school districts in Rhode Island contribute to Social Security.
- 7. The contribution rate is set to decrease in 2012.



Figure 122

Do states require excessive contributions to their pension systems?



- Strong Practice: Alaska, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey⁵, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 3. Michigan⁶
- Arizona, Hawaii, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island
- While not excessive, the employer and state contribution are quite low. The most recent total employer contribution was only 5.4 percent of the actuarially-determined annual required contribution.
- 6. Employer contribution rates to Michigan's new system have not yet been reported.

Figure 123

- 1. The contribution rate is set to increase in future years.
- Teachers contribute 9.4 percent to the defined benefit component and are automatically enrolled to contribute 2 percent to the defined contribution component; teachers may change the latter rate.
- 3. The contribution rate is set to increase in 2012 and decrease in 2014.
- 4. Teachers share in the employer contribution through salary reductions or foregoing equivalent pay raises.
- 5. For teachers hired after July 1, 2011, the contribution ranges from 7.5-12.3 based on a variety of factors.
- Teachers in the hybrid plan must make a mandatory contribution if the employer contribution does not cover system costs.
- 7. For the defined benefit plan; the rate varies for the defined contribution plan from a minimum of 5 percent.



Area 4: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Pension Neutrality

The state should ensure that pension systems are neutral, uniformly increasing pension wealth with each additional year of work.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The formula that determines pension benefits should be neutral to the number of years worked. It should not have a multiplier that increases with years of service or longevity bonuses.
- The formula for determining benefits should preserve incentives for teachers to continue working until conventional retirement ages. Eligibility for retirement benefits should be based on age and not years of service.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at www.nctq.org/stpy.



Area 4: Goal I **Virginia** Analysis



State Partly Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia's pension system is based on a benefit formula that is not neutral, meaning that each year of work does not accrue pension wealth in a uniform way until teachers reach conventional retirement age, such as that associated with Social Security.

Teachers' retirement wealth is determined by their monthly payments and the length of time they expect to receive those payments. Monthly payments are usually calculated as final average salary multiplied by years of service multiplied by a set multiplier (such as 1.5). Higher salary, more years of service or a greater multiplier increases monthly payments and results in greater pension wealth. Earlier retirement eligibility with unreduced benefits also increases pension wealth, because more payments will be received.

To qualify as neutral, a pension formula must utilize a constant benefit multiplier and an eligibility time-table based solely on age, rather than years of service. Basing eligibility for retirement on years of service creates unnecessary and often unfair peaks in pension wealth, while allowing unreduced retirement at a young age creates incentives to retire early. Plans that change their multipliers for various years of service do not value each year of teaching equally. Therefore, plans with a constant multiplier and that base retirement on an age in line with Social Security are likely to create the most uniform accrual of wealth.

Virginia's pension plan is commended for utilizing a constant benefit multiplier of 1.7 percent; however, teachers may retire before standard retirement age based on years of service without a reduction in benefits. Teachers may retire when they qualify for the "Rule of 90," meaning their age plus years of service equal 90, while other vested teachers may not retire until Social Security retirement age (age 67 for those born after 1960). Therefore, teachers who begin their careers at age 22 can reach the "Rule of 90" with 34 years of service by age 56, entitling them to 11 additional years of unreduced retirement benefits beyond what other teachers would receive who may not retire until age 67. Not only are teachers being paid benefits by the state well before Social Security's retirement age, but these provisions also may encourage effective teachers to retire early, and they fail to treat equally those teachers who enter the system at a later age and give the same amount of service.

Supporting Research

Virginia Retirement System, Plan 2, Handbook for Members Hired or Rehired on or after July 1, 2010 http://www.varetire.org/Pdf/Publications/handbook-plan-2.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

■ End retirement eligibility based on years of service.


Virginia should change its practice of allowing teachers whose age and years of service equal 90 to retire early with full benefits. If retirement at an earlier age is offered to some teachers, benefits should be reduced accordingly to compensate for the longer duration they will be awarded.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

The Virginia Retirement System did not respond to repeated requests to review NCTQ's analyses related to teacher pensions.

Figure 125

Do states base retirement eligibility on age, which is fair to all teachers?¹




- 1. This only refers to determining retirement eligibility, not retirement benefits.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alaska, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey
- 3. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Figure 126

- 1. All calculations are based on a teacher who starts teaching at age 22, earns a starting salary of \$35,000 that increases 3 percent per year, and retires at the age s/he is first eligible for unreduced benefits. The calculations use states' current benefit formulas and do not include cost of living increases. The final average salary was calculated as the average of the highest three years of salary, even though a few states may vary from that standard. Age 65 was used as a point of comparision because it is the miminum eligibility for unreduced Social Security benefits.
- 2. Does not apply to Alaska's defined contribution plan.
- 3. Minnesota provides unreduced retirement benefits at the age of full Social Security benefits or age 66, whichever comes first.
- California's formula has many options for retirement. A teacher with 40 years of experience at age 62 would reach California's maximum allowable multiplier of 2.4 percent.
- 5. Age 60 is the earlier teachers hired on or after July 1, 2012 may retire. Teachers hired prior to this point may retire at age 55.
- Massachusetts's formula has many options for retirement. A teacher with 35 years
 of experience at age 57 would reach Massachusetts's maximum allowable benefit
 of 80 percent.

igure 126 How much do states Day for each teacher	S Total anount in benefits paid retirement until age 65 ne of	fanlisst fetifement at teacher who stands ether teacher who stands ether fecified the stands ether the stands ether ethe
hat retires with	ount sr froi until	retire
unreduced benefits at	al am eache ment	fliest ache hing e un
an early age?1	Per th	fa, a te tead receiv
Alaska ²		
Illinois	Ų0	07
Maine Minnesota ³	\$0	65
New Hampshire	\$0 \$0	66 65
New Jersey	\$0 \$0	65
Washington	\$0 \$0	65
Tennessee	\$238,654	52
Michigan	\$289,187	60
California ⁴	\$310,028	62
Indiana	\$317,728	55
Hawaii ⁵	\$337,385	60
Kansas	\$337,385	60
Oregon	\$361,536	58
North Dakota	\$385,583	60
Oklahoma	\$385,583	60
Maryland	\$413,808	56
Wisconsin	\$416,007	57
Rhode Island	\$430,013	59
New York	\$440,819	57
Texas	\$443,421	60
South Dakota	\$447,707	55
VIRGINIA	\$468,982	56
Louisiana Florida	\$481,979	60
Vermont	\$485,257 \$486,832	55 56
Montana	\$518,228	47
Connecticut	\$520,009	57
Utah	\$520,009	57
lowa	\$551,428	55
Idaho	\$551,743	56
North Carolina	\$568,555	52
South Carolina	\$577,142	50
Nebraska	\$577,687	55
West Virginia	\$577,687	55
Delaware	\$577,927	52
District of Columbia	\$585,737	52
Massachusetts ⁶	\$594,296	57
Georgia	\$624,786	52
Mississippi	\$624,786	52
Alabama	\$625,747	47
Colorado	\$650,011	57
Pennsylvania	\$650,011	57
Wyoming	\$655,506	54
Arizona Arkansas	\$664,340	55
Ohio	\$681,789 \$687,265	50 52
New Mexico	\$734,124	52
Nevada	\$780,983	52
Missouri	\$789,343	51
Kentucky	\$791,679	49
-		

Figure 127
What kind of multiplier do states use to calculate retirement benefits?¹



- 1. Alaska has a defined contribution plan, which does not have a benefit multiplier.
- 2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware,
 District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana,
 Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana,
 Nebraska, Newada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina,
 North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina,
 South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington,
 West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wyoming



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alaska offers a defined contribution pension plan that is neutral, with pension wealth accumulating in an equal way for all teachers for each year of work. In addition, Illinois, Minnesota and New Jersey offer a defined benefit plan with a formula multiplier that does not change relative to years of service and does not allow unreduced benefits for retirees below age 65. Illinois and New Jersey are further commended for ending their previous practices of allowing teachers to retire well before Social Security age without a reduction in benefits.

Figure 128

Double-Dipping: Cure the Disease, Not the Symptom

Benefit recipients in teacher pension plans have recently been under scrutiny for "double-dipping," when individuals receive a pension and salary at the same time. This can occur when teachers reach retirement eligibility, yet wish to keep working without losing pension wealth. Teachers can retire, start receiving their monthly benefits and then return to teaching. The restrictions on a teacher's ability to return to work vary from state to state. Policies can include waiting periods, limitations on earnings or restrictions to working in difficult-to-fill positions.

Some descriptions portray teachers working while collecting their pensions as greedy or somehow taking advantage, when in fact they are just following the system that is in place. When a teacher reaches retirement eligibility in a defined benefit system, her pension wealth peaks and, after that, wealth accrual slows or even decreases because every year a teacher delays retirement, she loses a year of pension benefits. For example, if a teacher could retire with 60 percent of her salary at age 56, then every year she teaches past that point she is, in effect, working for only 40 percent of her pay because she is not receiving her pension. This puts relatively young teachers and the districts who wish to retain them in a difficult position. Districts want to keep effective teachers in schools, but the financial reality for teachers is hard to pass up.

Retirees returning to work are also an issue for defined benefit pension system funding because contributions are not being made to the system that would be made if those positions were held by non-retirees. This adds to the funding imbalances that many states' defined benefit systems face.

Some states have created Deferred Retirement Option Plans (DROP) in which retirees can have their benefits placed in a savings account while they return to work and, once they retire again, they can receive the lump sum in their DROP accounts and resume their monthly benefits.

Returning to work would not be a large policy issue if systems did not allow teachers to retire with unreduced benefits at such relatively young ages and if pension wealth accrual were more neutral. An effective teacher should be able to keep teaching and at the same time know that her pension wealth will not erode. More systemic fixes—like the ones outlined in the *Yearbook*—are needed. Calls to prohibit double-dipping are not addressing the real problem.

Goal A – Licensure Loopholes

The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Under no circumstances should a state award a standard license to a teacher who has not passed all required subject-matter licensing tests.
- If a state finds it necessary to confer conditional or provisional licenses under limited and exceptional circumstances to teachers who have not passed the required tests, the state should ensure that requirements are met within one year.

Background



Area 5: Goal A **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia allows teachers who have not met licensure requirements to teach under the three-year local eligibility license. The state explicitly prohibits these licenses from being provided to those teaching core academic areas as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act.

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-299.3

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS


Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, and New Jersey require all new teachers to pass all required subject-matter tests as a condition of initial licensure.

Figure 130 Do states still award emergency licenses?1



- 1. Not applicable to Montana and Nebraska, which do not require subject matter testing.
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁵, Ohio⁵, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin
- 4. Strong Practice: Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia
- 5. License is renewable, but only if licensure tests are passed.

Figure 131

- 1. Iowa only requires subject-matter testing for elementary teachers.
- 2. Montana does not require subject-matter testing.
- 3. Nebraska does not require subject-matter testing.
- 4. There is a potential loophole in Utah, as alternate route teachers appear able to delay passage of subject-matter tests.
- 5. Wyoming only requires subject-matter testing for elementary and social studies teachers.

How long can new tead				
practice without passin	ng	/	/	/ "
licensing tests?	Ž	/ .	/ 6	inor,
	EFER	/ yea	\\	spec,
	90	10 pt0	<i>₽</i>	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Alabama	I \square NO DEFERRAL] Up to 7 year	$\Box \phi_{b_{c},b_{c}}$	3 years or more (or unspecified)
Alaska	П			
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
Iowa ¹				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri Montana ²				
Montana ² Nebraska ³				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York	$\overline{\Box}$	Ī		
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas Utah⁴				
Vermont				
VIRGINIA			-	
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming ⁵				
	9	14	8	18

Goal B – Unsatisfactory Evaluations

The state should articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations, including specifying that teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations should be eligible for dismissal.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require that all teachers who receive a single unsatisfactory evaluation be placed on an improvement plan, whether or not they have tenure.
- The state should require that all teachers who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations or two unsatisfactory evaluations within five years be formally eligible for dismissal, whether or not they have tenure.

Background



Area 5: Goal B **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia requires that any probationary teacher who receives an unsatisfactory performance evaluation shall not be "reemployed" by the local district.

Virginia does not have a policy regarding non-probationary teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations, except that teachers receiving unsatisfactory evaluations must have an evaluation the following year.

Supporting Research

Code of Virginia: Section 22.1-295 and Section 22.1-303

RECOMMENDATION

Require that all teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations be placed on improvement

Virginia should adopt a policy requiring that all teachers who receive even one unsatisfactory evaluation be placed on structured improvement plans. These plans should focus on performance areas that directly connect to student learning and should list noted deficiencies, define specific action steps necessary to address these deficiencies and describe how and when progress will be measured.

Make eligibility for dismissal a consequence of unsatisfactory evaluations.

Teachers who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations or have two unsatisfactory evaluations within five years should be formally eligible for dismissal, regardless of whether they have tenure. Virginia should adopt a policy that ensures that all teachers who receive such unsatisfactory evaluations are eligible for dismissal.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 133	MAROVENENT PLAN AFER	ELICIBLE FOR DISMISSALATER RATINGS UNSATISFACE	; / & /	No articulated consequences
What are the	VAFT	0 / F	5 /) lar
consequences for	75.] Other consequences	/ bəsu
teachers who receive	YEN] NSAj	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	иәть	/ o _o ,
unsatisfactory	OVE)	PLE F	onse	_matr
evaluations?	A SING		, ther) artii
	, 4 \$	1,5\$	o o	/ >
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona		<u> </u>		
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho			1	
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland				
Massachusetts			2	
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				3
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada			4	
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina		5		
North Dakota			6	
Ohio Oklahoma			°	
Oregon Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
VIRGINIA				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	27	17	8	17


- Teachers could face nonrenewal based on evaluation results, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal after multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- While results of evaluations may be used in dismissal decisions, there are no specific criteria for a teacher's eligibility for dismissal.
- 3. Improvement plans are only used for teachers in identified "Schools At Risk." Those same teachers are also eligible for dismissal for multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- 4. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal.
- 5. Teachers in low performing schools can be dismissed after one negative rating.
- Local school boards must include procedures for using evaluation results for the removal of poorly performing teachers.

***** EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Illinois and Oklahoma both require that teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations be placed on improvement plans. Teachers in Illinois are then evaluated three times during a 90-day remediation period and are eligible for dismissal if performance remains unsatisfactory. In addition, new legislation in Illinois allows districts to dismiss a teacher without going through the remediation process if that teacher has already completed a remediation plan but then receives an unsatisfactory rating within the next three years. Oklahoma's improvement plan may not exceed two months, and if performance does not improve during that time, teachers are eligible for dismissal.

Figure 134

Do states specify that all teachers with multiple unsatisfactory evaluations are eligible for dismissal?



- Strong Practice: Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington
- 2. Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho³, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada⁴, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Teachers could face nonrenewal based on evaluation results, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal after multiple unsatisfactory evaluations.
- 4. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not clear that a teacher is eligible for dismissal.

Goal C – Dismissal for Poor Performance

The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should articulate that teachers may be dismissed for ineffective classroom performance.
- 2. A teacher who is terminated for poor performance should have an opportunity to appeal. In the interest of both the teacher and the school district, the state should ensure that this appeal occurs within a reasonable time frame.
- 3. There should be a clear distinction between the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed for classroom ineffectiveness and the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed or facing license revocation for felony or morality violations or dereliction of duties.

Background



Area 5: Goal C **Virginia** Analysis



State Meets a Small Part of Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

In Virginia, tenured teachers who are terminated have at least one opportunity to appeal. After receiving written notice of dismissal, the teacher may—within 15 days—request a hearing, which must take place within 30 days. The decision must then be rendered within 30 days. The teacher may file an additional appeal with the appellate court within 10 days.

Virginia does not explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal, nor does the state distinguish the due process rights of teachers dismissed for ineffective performance from those facing other charges commonly associated with license revocation, such as a felony and/or morality violations. The process is the same regardless of the grounds for cancellation, which include "incompetency, immorality, noncompliance with school laws and regulations, disability as shown by competent medical evidence when in compliance with federal law, conviction of a felony or a crime of moral turpitude or other good and just cause."

In addition, "incompetency may be construed to include, but shall not be limited to, consistent failure to meet the endorsement requirements for the position or performance that is documented through evaluation to be consistently less than satisfactory."

Supporting Research

Virginia Code 22.1-307; 309; 311; 313; 314

RECOMMENDATION

- Specify that classroom ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.
 - Rather than providing a possible definition for incompetence, Virginia should explicitly make teacher ineffectiveness grounds for dismissal so that districts do not feel they lack the legal basis for terminating consistently poor performers.
- Ensure that teachers terminated for poor performance have the opportunity to appeal within a reasonable time frame.
 - Nonprobationary teachers who are dismissed for any grounds, including ineffectiveness, are entitled to due process. However, cases that drag on for years drain resources from school districts and create a disincentive for districts to attempt to terminate poor performers. Therefore, Virginia must ensure that the opportunity to appeal occurs only once and only at the district level. It is in the best interest of both the teacher and the district that a conclusion be reached within a reasonable time frame.
- Distinguish the process and accompanying due process rights between dismissal for classroom ineffectiveness and dismissal for morality violations, felonies or dereliction of duty.
 - While nonprobationary teachers should have due process for any termination, it is important to differentiate between loss of employment and issues with far-reaching consequences that could permanently impact a teacher's right to practice. Virginia should ensure that appeals related to classroom effectiveness are only decided by those with educational expertise.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia referred NCTQ to its grievance procedure and asserted that its "Licensure Regulations for School Personnel" sets forth the requirements for the revocation of licenses. The state added that there is a separate process for actions against a teaching license.

VIRGINIA


Figure 136			
Do states articulate		/	/ ج
that ineffectiveness is	7-	7 / 5	777
**	\$		~ /
grounds for dismissal?	\$ \f	7 8 5	? /
	5, 7, 8, 17, 8, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18, 18,	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	
	250	7.7.7	/ %
Alabama		FES, THROUGH	
Alaska	$\overline{\Box}$		
Arizona	$\overline{\Box}$	- i	1
Arkansas	Ä		
California	$\overline{\Box}$		
Colorado	$\overline{\Box}$		
Connecticut	Ä	Ē	
Delaware			
District of Columbia		Ē	
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa	_		
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			-
Maryland			
Massachusetts	-		
Michigan			
Minnesota			_
Mississippi			
Missouri			-
Montana			
Nebraska			2
Nevada			-
New Hampshire			_
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York			
North Carolina			_
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
VIRGINIA			3
Washington			
West Virginia			3
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	9	13	38



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Oklahoma clearly articulates that teacher ineffectiveness in the classroom is grounds for dismissal and has taken steps to ensure that the dismissal process for teachers deemed to be ineffective is expedited. Teachers facing dismissal have only one opportunity to appeal.

Figure 137 Do states allow multiple appeals of teacher dismissals?



- 1. Strong Practice: Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Wisconsin
- 2. Teachers in these states revert to probationary status following ineffective evaluation ratings, meaning that they no longer have the due process right to multiple appeals: Colorado, Indiana, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois⁵, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. District of Columbia, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada⁶, Utah, Vermont
- 5. The teacher is responsible for the cost of the second appeal.
- 6. Though a teacher returns to probationary status after two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings, the state does not articulate clear policy about its appeals process.

- 1. It is left to districts to define "inadequacy of classroom performance."
- 2. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not articulated that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.
- 3. Dismissal policy includes dismissal for unsatisfactory evaluations, but the state's evaluation system does not measure teacher effectiveness (see Goal 3-B).

Goal D – Reductions in Force

The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should require that districts consider classroom performance and ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off.

Background



Area 5: Goal D **Virginia** Analysis



State Does Not Meet Goal



Progress Since 2009

ANALYSIS

Virginia does not have policy that addresses the factors used by districts to determine which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force.

RECOMMENDATION

Require that districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off during reductions in force.

Virginia can still leave districts flexibility in determining layoff policies, but it should do so within a framework that ensures that classroom performance is considered.

■ Ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off. Unlike some states, Virginia does not require that districts consider seniority; however, the state should do more to prevent districts from making decisions solely on this basis.

VIRGINIA RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Virginia recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.


Figure 139		/ _u .
Do states prevent	15/2	75
districts from basing	HO Z	
layoffs solely on "last	ANC FRE	\ \Z\\{\z\}
in, first out"?	Nac Nac	[5] A. J.
m, msc out .	FEFF	FWONTY CAMOT HE DECIDING FACTO
Alabama	_ '&' / 	
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota	_	_
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana	_	
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		_
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas	-	
Utah	•	-
Vermont	_	
VIRGINIA		
Washington Wash Virginia		
West Virginia Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	11	17



TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Colorado, Florida and Indiana all specify that in determining which teachers to lay off during a reduction in force, classroom performance is the top criterion. These states also articulate that seniority can only be considered after a teacher's performance is taken into account.


Figure 140 Do districts have to consider performance in determining which teachers are laid off?



- 1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio³, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Tenure is considered first.

Figure 141

Do states prevent districts from overemphasizing seniority in layoff decisions?



- 1. Strong Practice: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri⁶, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas
- 2. Strong Practice: Idaho, Utah
- 3. Hawaii, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin⁷
- 4. California, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon
- 5. Alabama, Alaska⁶, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia⁶, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts⁶, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska⁶, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming
- 6. Nontenured teachers are laid off first.
- $7. \ \ Only \ for \ counties \ with \ populations \ of \ 500,000 \ or \ more \ and \ for \ teachers \ hired \ before \ 1995.$

Board of Directors

Barbara O'Brien, Chair

Senior Fellow, The Piton Foundation

Stacey Boyd

Chief Executive Officer, The Savvy Source for Parents

Chester E. Finn, Jr.

President. The Thomas B. Fordham Institute

Ira Fishman

Managing Director, NFL Players Association

Marti Watson Garlett

Founding Dean of the Teachers College, Western Governors University Former Vice President, Academic Programs and Professional Licensure, Laureate Education, Inc.

Henry L. Johnson

Former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Consultant, Center for Results, Learning Forward Donald N. Langenberg

Chancellor Emeritus, University System of Maryland

Clara M. Lovett

President Emerita, Northern Arizona University

Carol G. Peck

Former President and Chief Executive Officer, Rodel Charitable Foundation of Arizona Former National Superintendent of the Year

John L. Winn

Florida Education Commissioner, Retired

Kate Walsh

President, National Council on Teacher Quality

Advisory Board

• Steven J. Adamowski, Connecticut State Board of Education • Sir Michael Barber, Pearson • Roy E. Barnes, former Governor, State of Georgia • McKinley A. Broome, Woodholme Elementary School • Cynthia G. Brown, Center for American Progress • David Chard, Southern Methodist University • Andrew Chen, EduTron • Jean Clements, Hillsborough Classroom Teachers Association • Celine Coggins, Teach Plus • Pattie Davis, Fairview Middle School • Jo Lynne DeMary, Virginia Commonwealth University • Michael Feinberg, The KIPP Foundation • Michael Goldstein, The Match School, Massachusetts • Eric A. Hanushek, The Hoover Institution • Joseph Hawkins, Westat • Frederick M. Hess, American Enterprise Institute • Paul T. Hill, Center on Reinventing Public Education • E.D. Hirsch, Core Knowledge Foundation • Michael Johnston, Colorado State Senate • Barry Kaufman, BK Education Consulting Services • Frank Keating, former Governor, State of Oklahoma • Joel I. Klein, News Corporation • Martin J. Koldyke, Academy for Urban School Leadership • Wendy Kopp, Teach For America • James Larson, Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School • Tom Lasley, Edvention • Amy Jo Leonard, Turtle Mountain Elementary School • Deborah M. McGriff, NewSchools Venture Fund • Ellen Moir, New Teacher Center • Robert N. Pasternack, Voyager Expanded Learning • Michael Podgursky, University of Missouri-Columbia • Michelle Rhee, StudentsFirst • Stefanie Sanford, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation • Audrey Soglin, Illinois Education Association • Daniel Willingham, University of Virginia • Suzanne Wilson, Michigan State University

National Council on Teacher Quality

1420 New York Avenue, NW • Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-393-0020 Fax: 202-393-0095 Web: www.nctq.org

Subscribe to NCTQ's blog PDQ
Follow NCTQ on Twitter and Facebook

NCTQ is available to work with individual states to improve teacher policies. For more information, please contact:

Sandi Jacobs Vice President sjacobs@nctq.org 202-393-0020