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During An Era of Education Change, It is Important to Clearly Understand, Interpret, and Apply Research Findings to Daily Practice and Policy

Characteristics of Teacher Preparation Programs are Evolving. We are moving to programs that include more classroom experience prior to teacher licensure and different models for teacher preparation programs. We need to ensure these models are closely monitored and include components linked to better teachers and increased student achievement.

Our Definition of Teacher Quality is Changing. In the past, we used indicators like qualifications such as licensure or continuing education. Now, we are moving towards a definition centering around demonstrated increases in student achievement.

It is Crucial to Raise Student Achievement in This Country. The US is falling behind other countries in our college-going rate, and we are in a race with others to build the strongest and best education system for future generations. We need to ensure our teacher preparation models are strong.

New Criteria Are Being Developed to Understand and Make Judgments About the Quality of Existing Teacher Preparation Programs. Are we sure that we are reviewing programs based on the criteria proven to prepare the best teachers?

Developing a clear understanding of existing research is central in crafting policies and teacher preparation programs that prepare strong educators and ultimately, positively impact student achievement.
This Report Includes an Executive Summary of Existing Research Relating to Teacher Preparation Programs, Components, and Degrees

**This report seeks to address the following key questions:**

- What does the evidence and research from the field tell us about the impact of teacher education programs, specifically those that are university-based, on graduates and P-12 student achievement?
- What does the evidence and research from the field tell us about the unique characteristics and components of effective educator preparation programs that contribute positively to student outcomes, in particular those that are university-based?
- What are the limitations of existing studies? In what areas is further research necessary?

**Data Sources:**

- Secondary data from relevant journals/scholarly publications, professional associations, education-related organizations, government sources such as NCES, and other key sources published within the past 5 years.

Ultimately, our goal is to provide key stakeholders with a clear understanding of existing research to inform sound decision-making across policymakers and organizations.
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Central Question:
Does path to certification make a difference?

Implications:
Funding for programs, state or district approval and support for programs, teacher licensure, types of programs offered by schools of education and/or other organizations, and ultimately, the question of how different pathways to certification might impact P-12 student achievement.

The following pages will explore research relevant to the central question.
The Highly Publicized 2009 Study By Mathematica and the Institute of Education Sciences Found Few Differences In Outcomes Between Teachers Trained Via Alternate and Traditional Routes to Certification

The Mathematica study seemed to indicate that teachers that entered the classroom through alternative routes to preparation before completing their training performed no differently than traditionally-prepared teachers. As a result, many people concluded that there was little value-add to university-based teacher education, and that more support should be given to programs that allow fast-entry into the teaching field with little preparation.

However, the Mathematica study was based on a biased sample and the findings have been largely misinterpreted by the public.

- Teachers in the schools selected for the study had less training than most teachers nationally, regardless of whether they completed their preparation via alternative or traditional routes. On average, these teachers had completed about half of the coursework required by the majority of U.S. states.
- Teachers that had completed training via “low coursework” alternative preparation programs actually lowered their students’ achievement.
- Teachers from “high coursework” programs raised student’s achievement, but not by much, with traditional route teachers doing slightly better.

The data from the Mathematica study actually indicates that teachers from “high coursework” traditional routes impacted student achievement most positively; however, even these teachers did only marginally well and their preparation programs still had a lower-than-average amount of required coursework in education. As a result, it is concerning that this study has largely influenced policy and public perception.

Several Empirically Strong Studies Indicate That Abbreviated Programs Without Adequate Coursework Produce Less Effective Teachers


These studies, which analyzed longitudinal data at the teacher/student level from Hourston, Texas, New York City, and North Carolina, found that:

- Teachers that entered classrooms before completing their preparation programs, whether through alternative route programs or on temporary licenses, were less effective in driving student achievement than fully prepared teachers working with similar groups of students.

- Teachers prepared via alternative routes that had completed the full education program for full certification had few differences in impacting student achievement, and in some cases, had larger gains in student achievement than other teachers.

Both traditional and alternate route programs vary greatly in terms of requirements and clinical components. Preparation programs that incorporate strong coursework that research links to student achievement will produce better teachers.

The Findings of Existing Research are Mixed but Suggest That It Is Extremely Difficult to Draw Clear Lines Between the Quality of “Alternate Route” Programs and “Traditional Route” Programs

There is broad diversity in the clinical and coursework requirements of both alternative route and traditional route preparation programs. Even in the Mathematica study, the requirements of alternative route teachers and traditionally prepared teachers were slightly overlapping. In some cases, alternative route teachers completed more coursework than some of the traditionally prepared teachers. In other cases, traditionally-prepared teachers completed no fieldwork. In following, unless specific programs are directly compared against one another, it is almost impossible to draw conclusions in general about the quality of “alternative” versus “traditional” route programs because the requirements vary greatly across programs.

Furthermore, there is a false dichotomy of “alternative” route programs and “traditional” route programs. A 2005 study by NCEI indicates that 62% of alternative route programs require the completion of one or more credit hours at a college or university.

Rather than continuing this general discourse, it seems to be more important to deeply understand the program components of educator preparation programs that research indicates positively impact student achievement, and to ensure that these programs components are incorporated into educator preparation programs, regardless of whether they are “alternative” or “traditional.”
Question:

Does path to certification make a difference?

Implications:

Funding for programs, state or district approval and support for programs, teacher licensure, types of programs offered by schools of education and/or other organizations, and ultimately, the question of how teacher preparation might impact P-12 student achievement.

What the Research Says:

In the absolute sense, no—but this cannot be misinterpreted to mean that fast-entry alternative programs without strong components are producing teachers that are equally as effective as other programs. The components of the program make the difference, and programs that incorporate strong components will produce strong teachers.
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Central Question:
What are the components of teacher education programs that positively impact teacher performance and P-12 student achievement?

Implications:
Ensuring that well-crafted preparation programs are funded and recognized, and assisting policymakers and stakeholders in identifying programs that are less likely to produce great educators.

The following pages will explore research relevant to the central question.
Eduventures’ 2009 Study Found Links Between Teachers’ Perception of Preparedness and Several Teacher Education Program Components

- Fieldwork occurred in a professional development school: 76% Yes, 85% No
- Mentoring/Induction program: 72% Yes, 84% No
- Subject-specific pedagogy: 71% Yes, 83% No
- Coursework on adapting instruction to a diverse set of learners: 69% Yes, 82% No
- Fieldwork was at a grade level that matched that of my first job: 73% Yes, 81% No
- Coursework in child development: 73% Yes, 81% No
- Subject/content-specific coursework: 70% Yes, 81% No
- Fieldwork was in a location similar to my first job: 71% Yes, 80% No
- None of the above: 62% Yes, 78% No

Source: Schools of Education Learning Collaborative, National survey of current teachers & administrators, N=1,504
Research Indicates That Certain Components Are Linked to Stronger Teacher Preparation, But Programs Are Not Always Incorporating These Most Valuable Components

Which of the following components were part of the program which fulfilled requirements for your initial certification or licensure?

- Subject/content-specific coursework: 74%
- Fieldwork was in a location similar to my first job: 74%
- Coursework on adapting instruction to a diverse set of learners: 66%
- Coursework in child development: 65%
- Subject-specific pedagogy: 61%
- Fieldwork was at a grade level that matched that of my first job: 59%
- Mentoring/Induction program: 51%
- Fieldwork occurred in a professional development school: 20%
- None of the above: 3%

Source: Schools of Education Learning Collaborative, National survey of current teachers & administrators, N=1,504

© 2011 Eduventures, Inc.
Evidence Indicates That Subject-Specific Content and Pedagogy, In Particular in Math and Science, Produces Stronger Teachers and Stronger P-12 Student Achievement

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality completed a Research Synthesis and Policy Brief in 2007-2008 That Indicated…..

• Teachers with *undergraduate or graduate majors in math* had stronger secondary student achievement in math than students whose teachers did not have that content expertise.

• Teachers that had completed *content-specific courses in science* had stronger secondary student achievement in science than students whose teachers did not have that content expertise.

• Teachers with *subject-specific pedagogical courses in math* produced secondary students with higher math achievement.

• Teachers with *subject-specific pedagogical knowledge* positively impacted elementary student achievement in reading, math, and language.

Content courses in math and science positively impact student achievement. Strong evidence linking content knowledge and improved student performance outside of math and science is murky at best. Across key subjects and levels, subject-specific pedagogical courses produce stronger student achievement.

Source: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality; Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: Making the Most of Recent Research; Goe & Stickler (March 2008)
Emerging Research Indicates That Coursework in Child and Development During Teachers’ Preparation Programs Positively Impacts Student Achievement

- In 2010, NCATE released a report advocating for education programs to more explicitly train teacher candidates in the rudiments of developmental science. The paper contends that a greater emphasis on developmental science in the course of teacher preparation is especially warranted given that research appears to point toward instruction rooted in child development as one way of boosting academic achievement.

- A research synthesis of studies on 213 school programs found that such programs led, on average, to an 11 percentile-point gain in student achievement. That study, by J.A. Durlak, a Loyola University Chicago clinical psychology professor, among others, is scheduled to appear in the January/February 2011 issue of Child Development.

Research indicates that teachers that can effectively apply child development principles to classroom practices positively impact student achievement. NCATE is currently advocating for teacher preparation programs to deepen child development applications across programs.

There is a Dearth of Empirical Research Linking Coursework on Differentiated Instruction Directly to Positive Impact on Student Achievement

The National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum defines differentiated instruction as “a process to approach teaching and learning for students of differing abilities in the same class. The intent is to maximize each student’s growth and individual success by meeting each student where he or she is….rather than expecting students to modify themselves for the curriculum.”


Researchers acknowledge that empirical research on differentiated instruction as a specific teaching practice is limited. However, research does appear to validate a number of teaching practices that are incorporated in the foundation of differentiated learning, such as promoting student engagement, effective classroom management, and assessing and responding to students’ learning styles. Some research also suggests that differentiated instruction benefits special education students.

While some research suggests that special education students benefit from differentiated instruction, many experts agree that this is an area that warrants further scholarly study.

Source: Huebner, T.A. (February 2010). Meeting students where they are. Differentiated Learning, 67(5).
Duration of Field Placement Plays a Significant Role in Producing Teachers That Feel Better Prepared – Longer Field Experiences Are Linked to Higher Levels of Perceived Initial Preparation

How well prepared did you feel to teach when you entered the classroom?

Amount of fieldwork required in preparation program

- None
- Less than 3 months
- 3-6 months
- 6-12+ months

While only 63.8% of teachers with no field experience report that they felt very prepared or prepared when they first started teaching, 80.8% of teachers with 6-12 months or more of field experience felt prepared. This suggests that field experience builds confidence and is linked to classroom performance. With evidence that field experience matters and a national push to incorporate more field-based experiences, preparation programs should be exploring ways to provide these longer experiences to students.

Source: Schools of Education Learning Collaborative, National survey of current teachers & administrators, N=1,504
Students Prepared Through Traditional, University-Based Programs Are More Likely to Report a Longer Field Experience

84.2% of students prepared through traditional teacher education programs report field experiences of longer than 6 months, whereas only 52.5% of teachers prepared through alternative programs report field experiences of that length.

Clearly, programs are implementing a broad range of clinical/fieldwork requirements and great diversity exists. University-based programs appear to more frequently require more fieldwork.
NCATE’s Blue Ribbon Panel Calls for Longer, More In-Depth Clinical Components Aligned With Teachers’ Eventual Jobs, and Research Exists That Suggests That The Clinical Component is a Key Aspect of Preparation Programs Impacting Student Achievement

- The National Research Council report *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy* cites fieldwork as one of three key aspects of teacher preparation programs most likely to impact student achievement positively.
- The Blue Ribbon panel advocates for increased fieldwork through closer ties between preparation programs and P-12 schools, including stronger partnerships such as professional development schools.
- The panel also recognizes that there is a diversity across programs, both university-based and those that aren’t university-based, in terms of clinical requirements and other program components, and advocates that all teacher preparation programs should be held to the same, high standards.

Research exists that links deeper clinical work, stronger ties between coursework and teaching practice, and stronger partnerships to better-prepared teachers.
Professional Development, Lab Schools, and University Managed Schools Gain High Marks From Teachers Supervising Candidates – Evidence Suggests That These Strong Partnerships Produce Better Candidates

- Teachers from professional development schools, lab schools, or university-managed schools are more likely to consider their partner university as preparing the best teacher candidates of any preparation program in the area (21%) and to rate candidates rated more positively at:
  - Creating original curriculum and instruction
  - Differentiating instruction
  - Integrating technology into the curriculum

- A higher percentage of cooperating teachers from affiliated universities also cite having more frequent face-to-face interactions with faculty. Fewer teachers report that they had never interacted with faculty, (66% vs. 77% in non-affiliated universities) or administrators (40% vs. 60%)

- They are also likely to have teachers who served longer as a mentor teacher (median of 5 years) compared to teachers from other schools (median of 3 years)

This research seems to suggest that partnerships that build strong ties between the preparation program and the P-12 school environment may be largely beneficial.
Studies Indicate That Participation In Mentoring/Induction Programs Is Positively Related To Teacher Performance and Student Achievement


Mentoring/induction programs that provide support to new teachers do appear to be linked to positive increases in student achievement. We know these programs are expensive, however, and require a considerable resource investment.
Professional Development for Teachers is Positively Linked to Student Achievement, Though It Must Be Sustained and Targeted


An analysis of existing research found that a set of programs which offered substantial contact hours of professional development (ranging from 30 to 100 hours in total) spread over six to 12 months showed a **positive and significant effect on student achievement gains**. These intensive professional development efforts offered an average of 49 hours in a year, and boosted student achievement by approximately 21 percentile points. Other efforts that involved a limited amount of professional development (ranging from 5 to 14 hours in total) showed no statistically significant effect on student learning.


*Source: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality; Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: Making the Most of Recent Research; Goe & Stickler (March 2008)*
There Does Not Appear To Be a Strong Relationship Between the Selectivity of An Institution And A Teacher’s Impact on Student Achievement


Analyzing data from North Carolina, this study suggests that teachers that graduate from highly ranked schools of education (schools the authors call “more prestigious”) do not impact student achievement any more positively than teachers who graduate from “less prestigious” institutions at the undergraduate level.

An analysis of data from the Miami-Dade public schools found that the selectivity of a teacher’s undergraduate institution (according to Peterson’s) is not a predictor of whether a teacher will positively impact student achievement.

The findings from these recent empirical studies is concerning, given the emphasis on selectivity in US News’ ranking system for schools of education and the emphasis on selectivity in NCTQ’s ranking system, which will be launched nationally in partnership with US News. These rankings are widely publicized; are these organizations focusing on the right criteria?
Unsurprisingly, Research Suggests that Teachers Prepared By Programs Incorporating Many or All of These Elements Impact Student Achievement More Positively Than Teachers Prepared By Programs That Incorporate Fewer Elements

This graph plots the average value-added to student achievement of institutions that produced at least 40 different NYC teachers between 2000-2006. The x-axis represents math achievement, and the y-axis represents ELA achievement. Each point represents a NYC institution’s impact on student achievement as measured by Boyd et. al (2008).

Institutions that positively impacted both math and ELA student achievement has the following components:

- Candidates’ clinical experiences matched their later teaching assignment in terms of grade level and subject area
- Ample opportunities for candidates to learn specific pedagogical practices in a clinical setting
- Strong coursework in content areas (math and reading)
- Among others.


Central Question:
What are the components of teacher education programs that positively impact teacher performance and P-12 student achievement?

Implications:
Ensuring that well-crafted preparation programs are funded and recognized, and assisting policymakers and stakeholders in identifying programs that are less likely to produce great educators.

What the Research Says:
Some preconceptions of preparation programs hold up, some do not, and still others provide an opportunity for further research.
In Summary, Some Preconceptions Hold Up, Others Do Not, and Still Others Need Additional Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Does Research Demonstrate that This Results in Better Teachers and Increased P-12 Student Achievement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical experiences match teaching assignment</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer, deeper clinical experiences</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong coursework in content areas</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong pedagogical coursework</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in child development</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> <em>for forthcoming in February 2011</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring/Induction Programs</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong>, but more work could be done to link these programs directly to increases in P-12 student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development schools and other strong partnership programs between providers and P-12 schools</td>
<td><strong>SOMETIME</strong>, but more work could be done to link PD schools directly to increases in P-12 student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in differentiating instruction</td>
<td><strong>SOMETIME</strong>, but more research is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige/selectivity of school</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong>, but more research is needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contents

Study Overview and Methodology 2

Findings 5

Does the Path to Teacher Certification Make a Difference in Student Achievement? 5

What are the Components of Teacher Preparation Programs that Positively Impact Teacher Performance and P-12 Student Achievement? 11

What is the Value-Add of Master’s Degrees for Teachers? 28

Analysis and Recommendations 35
Central Question:
What is the value-add of Master’s degrees in education for teachers?

Implications:
Policies allowing organizations other than universities to grant Master’s degrees (NY state), district and state policies relating to licensure retention and teacher salary, public perception and perceptions by key stakeholders in the education field.

The following pages will explore research relevant to the central question.
Evidence Regarding the Value-Add of Master’s Degrees for Teachers is Conflicting, and Limitations of Studies Should Be Recognized


- Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R.J. (2002). *What large-scale, survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the Prospects Study of Elementary Schools.* Teacher College Record, 104(8), 1525-1567.

Analyzing data from Texas, this study suggests that teachers with Master’s degrees do not positively impact student achievement; however, it does not differentiate between Master’s degrees in education and Master’s degrees in unrelated fields of study.

Analyzing data from North Carolina, this study suggests that a teacher’s Master’s degree negatively impacts student achievement (with all other variables held constant); however, it does not differentiate between Master’s degrees in education and Master’s degrees in unrelated fields of study.

Analyzing elementary school data from the early 1990s study *Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Opportunity*, this study found no impact of a teacher’s Master’s degree in English on student achievement, and negative impact from a teacher’s Master’s degree in mathematics on student achievement. However, the authors recognize that the sample of teachers with these particular degrees is small. In addition, the degrees examined were not pedagogically focused degrees in education; they were content-specific.
A 2009 Eduventures Study of NAEP Data Indicated That 4th and 8th Grade Students Whose Teachers Majored in Education (Including Early Childhood, Elementary, or Secondary) Scored Higher on Reading and Math Exams Than Students Whose Teachers Did Not Hold Such Majors by approximately points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th and 8th Grade Students whose Teachers Hold Graduate Majors in Education</th>
<th>4th and 8th Grade Students whose Teachers Do Not Hold Such Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scored</td>
<td>by approximately points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th Grade Students whose Teachers Hold Undergraduate Majors in Education</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th Grade Students whose Teachers Hold Graduate Majors in Education</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th Grade Students whose Teachers Hold Graduate Majors in Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th and 8th Grade Students whose Teachers Do Not Hold Such Majors</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eduventures 2010 Report: Exploring the Relationship Between Teacher Credentials and Student Achievement
NAEP Data Indicates That Students Whose Teachers Hold Master’s Degrees Scored Higher in Reading and Math Than The Students of Teachers Without Master’s Degrees

4th and 8th Grade Students Whose Teachers Hold a Master’s Degree of Any Type Scored Higher on the NAEP Reading and Math Exams Than Students Whose Teachers Hold Only a Bachelor’s Degree

Source: Eduventures 2010 Report: Exploring the Relationship Between Teacher Credentials and Student Achievement
Overall, Evidence Regarding the Value-Add of Master’s Degrees For Teachers is Murky at Best; Further Research Is Needed

For secondary teachers teaching math and science, research does indicate that advanced knowledge of subject-specific content assists teachers in improving student achievement.

- However, it seems logical to conclude that content-specific Master’s degrees for these teachers is directly linked to their role.

For other areas of teaching, there is a lack of research linking improved student achievement to Master’s degrees that are directly related to teacher’s specific jobs.

- Current research, including research that has been commonly cited by policymakers and other stakeholders, has been unable to isolate pedagogically-focused Master’s degrees in education from other types of Master’s degrees that teachers may have. As a result, the data may have a certain amount of “noise.” This could be why Master’s degrees appear to have little impact, or a negative impact, on student performance.

- The lack of research of this kind is a direct result of existing data systems; in many cases, the specific type of degree a teacher has is not tracked.

Existing research studies have limitations that should be recognized; these limitations seem to be a result of data systems that are not specific in nature, leading to a broad generalization of Master’s degrees for teachers. Research needs to be conducted that can more clearly link improved P-12 student performance to advanced degrees that relate specifically to a teacher’s role.
Central Question:
What is the value-add of Master’s degrees in education for teachers?

Implications:
Policies allowing organizations other than universities to grant Master’s degrees (NY state), district and state policies relating to licensure retention and teacher salary, public perception and perceptions by key stakeholders in the education field.

What the Research Says:
There is a dearth of empirically strong studies addressing this issue and further scholarly research that fills the gaps in existing studies is crucial. With current research, it is difficult to draw conclusions.
In Some Cases, Research Has Been Simplified and In Following, Misunderstood By The Public and Some Policymakers

• One key example of this is the misperception that research indicates that Master’s degrees are not linked to increased P-12 student achievement, when in fact, existing research studies have some serious inadequacies. Furthermore, many Master’s degrees that are directly related to teachers’ roles are linked to increased academic performance, as is the case with math and science degrees.

• A second concerning example is the Mathematica study—this study had some serious methodology flaws which made the findings difficult to interpret. The press largely simplified the findings, and as a result, the policy direction in the country seems to more strongly support fast-entry alternative route programs that may not incorporate key program components that are linked to increased student achievement.

Research studies that suggest that Master’s degrees for teachers are not linked to student improvement are based on data bases that can’t determine what types of Master’s degrees teachers have. Furthermore, people have largely misinterpreted and over generalized the Mathematica study. In fact, teachers prepared via fast-entry, low coursework alternative route programs are negatively impacting student achievement.
Policymakers Need to Shift Focus From Supporting “Alternative” Route Programs With Fast-Entry Into Classrooms to Supporting Programs That Incorporate Components That Evidence Links to Increased Student Achievement

- Research comparing “alternative programs” to “traditional programs” has yielded murky results, primarily because programs are so diverse and incorporate varying types and intensity of program components, so direct comparisons are incredibly difficult.
- Research indicates that “low coursework” programs—both “alternative” and “traditional”—with fast-entry into the classroom prepare teachers that may actually negatively impact P-12 student achievement.

Not all programs are created equal. Programs vary greatly in terms of the components they are including to prepare teachers. Programs that don’t include those important pieces—in-depth fieldwork in the classroom prior to licensure that matches teachers’ anticipated jobs, child development coursework, coursework in specific subjects areas—these programs are likely to produce less effective teachers that don’t increase student achievement. We must be vigilant that we are not approving or supporting programs without these components, or we could ultimately be harming our most at-risk students even further.
Evidence Suggests That University-Based Programs Overseen by Schools of Education More Commonly Incorporate Elements Linked to Increased Student Achievement.

- Students prepared through “traditional” routes to preparation more commonly report graduating from programs that include:
  - Longer field placements and student teaching experiences
  - Subject or content-specific coursework
  - Fieldwork in a location similar to their first job
  - Fieldwork in a grade level similar to their first job
  - Coursework in child development
- All of these components are linked to teachers that positively impact P-12 student achievement.

The lower frequency of these program components across “alternative route” programs may have been driven by increased support in recent years for alternate route programs that allow for fast-entry into classrooms without adequate coursework, pedagogical training, or clinical work. Many of these programs may not be university-based. If these programs are leaving out critical teacher preparation elements on a growing basis, what might this mean for students in schools that are already struggling? This message must be passed on to policymakers and the public.
This Literature Review And Other Existing Research Syntheses Make It Clear That Current and Anticipated Ranking Systems Are Not Necessarily Focusing On Criteria That Research Indicates Is Linked to Increased Student Achievement

• NCTQ, for example, reviews and ranks programs’:
  – Selectivity
  – Incorporation of 21st Century teaching
  – Student teaching
  – Outcomes evaluation
  – Faculty
  – Professional training

NCTQ’s ratings are not necessarily based on research. While some of them are—for example, reviewing whether programs include pedagogical coursework—others, like selectivity, don’t appear to be linked to increased student achievement. There are also other flaws in NCTQ’s methodology, which are outlined more deeply in other Eduventures reports.

This places schools of education in a “catch 22” situation. While the public may perceive it negatively if an SOE chooses not to participate in rankings such as those produced by NCTQ, these rankings clearly are not always focusing on the right elements. SOE-LC analysts have worked to produce briefs that illustrate flaws in these types of ranking systems, and perhaps there is more room for us to continue our work in this area leveraging research from this literature review and others.
About Eduventures Schools of Education Learning Collaborative

The Eduventures Schools of Education Learning Collaborative (SOE-LC) brings deans of schools of education together with their peers from other institutions to exchange best practices and to find solutions for shared challenges such as increasing operational efficiency, curriculum development, and outcomes assessment.

About Our Collaborative Research

Collaborative Research investigations address issues of field-wide importance and draw upon the collective Schools of Education Learning Collaborative members to play a lead role in defining each investigation’s goals. These projects present a collaborative effort by members to create a dataset that benefits each institution. 2010 members include:

- Azusa Pacific University
- Ball State University
- Boston University
- California State University, Chico
- Chicago School of Professional Psychology
- DePaul University
- Drexel University
- Eastern Kentucky University
- Fordham University
- George Mason University
- Grand Canyon University
- Indiana University
- Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
- Lesley University
- Long Island University
- Louisiana State University
- Loyola Marymount University
- Loyola University of Maryland
- National-Louis University
- North Carolina A&T State University
- North Georgia College and State University
- Northeastern University
- Northern Arizona University
- Ohio University
- Old Dominion University
- Portland State University
- Regis University
- Temple University
- University of California, Riverside
- University of Dayton
- University of Illinois-Chicago
- The University of Kansas
- University of North Texas
- University of Pittsburgh
- University of San Diego
- University of Southern California
- University of the Pacific
- University of Wyoming
- Western Michigan University
- William Paterson University

For more information about the Schools of Education Learning Collaborative, our research, or this report, please contact Mindy Anastasia at manastasia@eduventures.com