

TRANSFORMING TEACHING:

*CONNECTING PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
WITH STUDENT LEARNING*



A REPORT TO THE NEA

EMBARGOED until December 8,
2011. Please do not forward, copy
or otherwise share before this date.



In December 2010, NEA called on 21 accomplished teachers and educational leaders from around the country to form the Commission on Effective Teachers and Teaching (CETT). The Association gave the Commission significant resources and full autonomy along with four charges:

- ▶ *Analyze existing standards, definitions, policies, and practices related to teacher effectiveness and effective teaching; and develop a teacher’s definition of an effective teacher and effective teaching.*
- ▶ *Craft a new vision of a teaching profession that is led by teachers and ensures teacher and teaching effectiveness.*
- ▶ *Develop a comprehensive set of recommendations for the National Education Association about the union’s role in advancing and promoting teacher effectiveness and the teaching profession.*
- ▶ *Develop a comprehensive set of recommendations for education leaders and policymakers about the future of the teaching profession and the role of teachers in governing it.*

Our work took us across the country engaging with dozens of education experts and—even more importantly—talking with thousands of practicing teachers from every type of school and community. Both teachers and experts were eager to engage in meaningful conversation about our profession, define the meaning of effectiveness, and take responsibility for the work of teachers and the learning of students. Through this dialogue, common themes began to emerge as educators shared not only their dreams for what we could become but also their knowledge of how to translate those dreams into reality.

- ▶ *All students deserve an effective teacher. To make this a reality, the teaching profession does not need tinkering; it needs seismic changes in:*
 - *How, where, and when learning is expected to occur*
 - *How potential teachers are recruited and prepared*
 - *How professional development is aligned to student learning*
 - *How compensation is determined*
 - *How teachers are evaluated, retained, and dismissed.*

- ▶ *Our nation’s primary and secondary education is an interrelated system involving students, teachers, parents, administrators, policy-makers, and other key stakeholders. Opening our classroom doors goes beyond welcoming America’s children: making our teaching practice public allows others to learn from us and replicate what is working; extending our hands towards others to work with us improves the quality of our education system.*
- ▶ *Our recommendations must be applied systemically, not piecemeal. Teacher involvement in instructional decision-making must be significantly increased. Teachers must be physically present wherever and whenever decisions are being made. Teachers need to do more than simply implement others’ policies and visions.*
- ▶ *Teachers around the country have made it clear to us that they embrace accountability when it comes with the equivalent authority in decision-making.*

Those conversations, and additional research, have helped us build a vision that will strengthen the teaching profession and ensure that America’s students are prepared for tomorrow’s global challenges. We envision a profession that puts student learning at its core and guarantees that students acquire the critical thinking ability, ingenuity, and citizenship skills they will need to thrive as 21st century citizens.

A parent once shared with me: “I dropped my child off for the first day of school this year and, as I watched him walk towards the door, I wondered if his teachers understood that I was entrusting my most precious treasure to them. Do you understand the awesome responsibility you have and the incredible trust we place in you?” Those are humbling words.

We accept that responsibility as members of this Commission and as teachers who have committed our life’s work to America’s students.

Madaline Fennell



*Commission Chairperson
November 2011*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	iv
A New Vision For The Teaching Profession	1
A 21st Century Profession	5
A Professional Career Continuum.....	9
A Student-Centered Teacher Evaluation System	15
Professional And Progressive Compensation	19
Call To Action.....	21
Research Informing The Commission’s Recommendations	25
Meet The Commissioners	30
Advisory Committee Members	36
Panelists And Discussants.....	37
Staff Team	38

OVERVIEW

The time has come to respond boldly to a fundamental shift in the mission of American public schools. No longer do only the top 20 percent—or top 50 percent, or top 80 percent—of our students need an advanced education. We must prepare *all* students with the skills and knowledge to succeed in a competitive, fast-changing global economy.

As experienced educators, we are convinced that effective teaching requires preparation for an increasingly complex profession. Currently, our public education system leaves too many of America's 50 million elementary and secondary school students unprepared for civic engagement, higher education, careers, and family life.

We are frustrated that the onerous structures and mandates currently governing our practice discourage many promising graduates from pursuing our profession.

We believe that every teacher strives to be effective. But even the most accomplished among us cannot act in the best interest of students in a dysfunctional system over which we have little control or authority.

We applaud the nearly nationwide adoption of college and career readiness standards articulated by the Common Core, but schools need more than just national agreement about what students should know and be able to do. Without an effective teacher for every student in every classroom, the promise of these standards will go unmet.

The knowledge and skills that teachers must master to be effective for all students in our nation's schools are complex and ever-changing. We know that teaching *is* like rocket science: complicated, collaborative, and capable of taking our students to places yet to be explored.

We call for a systemic, collaborative approach to ensuring that our education system will provide effective teaching for all:

- ▶ **For students**, because to prepare all students for participation in a fast-changing global economy, we must mitigate regional and socioeconomic disparities through universal access to quality instruction.
- ▶ **For teachers**, because collaborative engagement is crucial to effective teaching.
- ▶ **For schools**, because supporting teacher collaboration promotes student learning.
- ▶ **For school districts**, because acknowledging effective teachers as instructional leaders helps to attract and retain strong, well-prepared professionals.
- ▶ **For families**, because collaboration between home and school strengthens student engagement and informs instructional planning.
- ▶ **For communities**, because collaborating with effective teachers connects the community and its resources to advance student learning.
- ▶ **For teacher preparation programs**, because collaboration with effective teachers is essential for making teacher education relevant and developing teacher leaders.
- ▶ **For teacher associations**, because recruiting effective teachers as Association leaders establishes accountability for teaching and learning as a core goal.
- ▶ **For our nation**, because ensuring that every student has an effective teacher supports democracy, equity, and economic well-being.

A NEW VISION FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION

We envision a teaching profession that embraces *collective accountability* for student learning balanced with *collaborative autonomy* that allows educators to do what is best for students.

Today's schools and districts have a hierarchical structure controlled by individual gatekeepers: Superintendents are gatekeepers of district knowledge and decision-making, and principals are gatekeepers of school knowledge and decision-making. Often, this structure is mirrored in the classroom, where individual teachers make decisions behind closed doors.

Educators can become far more effective by working together and sharing responsibilities. We call for systemic changes in the educational structures by engaging teachers in the decision-making processes that impact student learning. Moving from a top-down hierarchical model to a circular structure of shared responsibility will also help to engage students as active participants in their own learning.

What Is Effective Teaching?

Effective teaching is a student-centered practice that is at the heart of our vision for the teaching profession. Effective teaching leads to improved student outcomes in clear and demonstrable ways. Clearly, not all teachers are equally effective. In fact, effectiveness varies widely among teachers, and a particular teacher may be more effective with some groups of students than with others. Effectiveness is often shaped by personal and academic background, pedagogical preparation, teaching assignment, school and district support, and peer influences.



Effective teachers have a positive impact on student learning. They know their content and how to teach it to a broad range of students. They have the dispositions and aptitudes to work effectively with colleagues and students. They have mastered a repertoire of instructional strategies and know when to use each appropriately. They plan instruction purposefully, analyze student learning outcomes, reflect on their own practice, and adjust future planning as needed. Effective teachers consider collaboration an essential element of their practice. They take responsibility for both classroom and school-wide learning; many also engage their students in virtual learning.

Teacher effectiveness must be determined through evidence-based processes that are fair, accurate, and transparent. Determinations of effectiveness should inform decisions about teaching assignments, continued employment, advancement to teacher-leader and administrative positions, and compensation.

OUR VISION FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION RESTS ON THREE GUIDING PRINCIPLES:

1. Student learning is at the center of everything a teacher does.

Our nation's students live in a complex world where out-of-school influences compete for their time and attention. Effective teachers acknowledge students' individual assets and honor the racial, ethnic, linguistic, gender, religious, cultural, socioeconomic, and other unique characteristics that students bring to the classroom. Effective teachers incorporate formal and informal opportunities to learn that include students' out-of-school experiences.

To strengthen our focus on student learning, we must transform schooling from a time-oriented system based on grade level and credits earned to a performance-based system aligned to national learning standards.

Individual students vary in the amount of time they need to reach their academic potential. Many students may benefit from year-round schooling, while others may need extra time for learning pursuits beyond the classroom. Some students require more time to learn than others do. Some students need time for academic assistance, and some need opportunities for enrichment.

Student learning and well-being need to be at the center of decisions involving instructional models, scheduling, school structure, and flexibility to support learning both inside and outside of the classroom.

2. Teachers take primary responsibility for student learning.

We envision a profession built on the concept of collaborative autonomy. To set student learning goals and assess outcomes, effective teachers work in collaborative teams and use professional judgment based on teaching standards and practice.

We envision a profession in which teachers hold themselves accountable and take responsibility for student learning and well-being. Along with accountability and responsibility comes

the need for authority to make instructional and educational management choices and decisions. We envision a profession in which teachers are the leading voice in determining professional standards, developing assessments, structuring learning experiences, designing and delivering professional development. In this profession, accomplished teachers become instructional leaders whose voice is central in developing school policies.

We envision a profession in which teachers share responsibility for the development and implementation of a rigorous curriculum and multiple assessments of student learning. In too many schools, teachers work in isolation behind closed classroom doors. We must open our doors, step into the corridors, and share responsibility for all our students, including the most challenging. Collaboration and collegiality must become central to our daily practice.

Collaboration and responsibility must extend beyond individual schools and districts. We envision a professional culture in which effective teachers are attracted to the most challenging schools, where students' needs are highest. In this culture, great teachers will demand and expect great challenges.

A cultural shift within the profession will begin when we abandon attitudes and behaviors that isolate us within our classrooms. Collaborative autonomy requires that we assist colleagues who are struggling to be more effective and end practices that can harm our students.

3. Effective teachers share in the responsibility for teacher selection, evaluation, and dismissal.

Teacher-led quality control is central to a collaborative, supportive environment guided by the highest standards of our profession. To prepare all students to succeed in the 21st century, our profession requires transformational changes in recruitment, selection, preparation, professional learning, evaluation, compensation, and career advancement. To ensure that every classroom has an effective teacher, we envision teachers working as colleagues who apply their knowledge, authority, and skills to advance student learning. In this professional culture, teacher participation becomes the norm in decisions about teacher selection and assignment, peer review, dismissal, and career advancement.

In the system we envision, teachers collaborate with administrators to create a peer review program—a high-quality evaluation system in which teachers are deeply engaged in assessing and evaluating practice, developing professional learning plans, and contributing to personnel decisions. The need for tenure is replaced by a peer review program that provides opportunities for improvement or, when improvement is lacking, ensures due process throughout dismissal procedures. By guaranteeing teachers' due process rights through a fair and transparent peer review system, continued employment is based on performance.

Effective teaching:

- ▶ Engages all students in the learning process.
- ▶ Focuses on interactions and activities between teachers and students.
- ▶ Involves collaboration among teachers.
- ▶ Leads to growth in student knowledge, skills, and well-being.
- ▶ Centers on a continuous professional learning cycle: planning, practice, implementation, reflection, analysis, and modification of practice.

The ultimate measure of effectiveness is evidence of a teacher's contributions to student learning and well-being, to the educational community, and to the profession.

A Teacher-Led, Team-Led School

The Math and Science Leadership Academy (MSLA) in Denver, Colo., is a teacher-led public school serving 265 students in grades K-4. Nearly all MSLA students qualify for free or reduced-priced lunch, and 70 percent are English Language Learners. A group of teachers founded the school in 2009.

“MSLA is less about empowering teachers to make what typically are administrative decisions and more about drawing upon teacher leadership to define and cultivate a professional culture that best serves students and their families. This distinction is important,” explains Lori Nazareno, lead teacher at MSLA, who designed the school with input from the Denver Classroom Teachers Association, the Colorado Education Association, and several teachers. She describes how they developed the school:

District leadership was willing to consider a model in which teachers teach and also lead. Moreover, the district and union were able to agree on the importance of taking a risk on a teacher-led school and also to continue jointly supporting the idea.

We thought, if we empower teachers to decide how we spend our money, how we structure the schedule, and what programs and activities we bring in, then we would end up with decisions based on what’s best for the kids—not based on what the district wants or what adults want or what anybody else is saying. And we knew that would attract highly accomplished teachers to the school.

As a four-person development team, we put together a staffing plan that included teacher-led recruitment and evaluation processes. We decided that all teachers would need to be willing to engage in peer review and professional development programs to support excellence throughout the school. They would also need to have the skill and will to collaborate with each other and with the students and families they served. We organized instruction so that teachers at each grade level would have an average of four hours per week to plan together and analyze students’ progress.

The interview and observation process considered individual teachers’ knowledge, dispositions, and assets, but it was also designed to analyze how each teacher’s strengths would complement those of other staff members. By collaborating with peers, teachers would be able to respond to new ideas, spread their own knowledge, and share the workload among colleagues. Each teacher we hired also became part of the collective process of interviewing and evaluating prospective colleagues to join our team.

As lead teacher, Nazareno monitors all decisions pertaining to curriculum, discipline, and other student issues at MSLA. Co-lead teacher Lynne Lopez-Crowley focuses on budget, scheduling, and other operational matters. Sharing leadership responsibilities allows both lead teachers to spend at least one day per week in the classroom.

“They understand what we’re going through,” says fourth-grade teacher Paty Gonzalez Holt. “They really know the kids and their academic level and which kids we’re concerned about and which have potential for being leaders.”

MSLA teachers also share in school leadership. Each serves on one of four decision-making teams: Professional Development; Climate and Culture; Curriculum; and Instruction and Peer Review. The School Leadership Team (SLT), consisting of the two lead teachers, a local teacher association representative, and three elected members, acts as a board of directors for each decision-making team: for example, the SLT may approve the professional development team’s plan or send it back for further refinement.

A 21ST CENTURY PROFESSION



We believe a 21st century education system must support every student, teacher, school, and district. In our vision, effective teachers have the skills and authority to work together to design instruction and measure student learning based on meaningful goals and clear learning standards. The schools we envision develop students' academic knowledge, critical thinking, and innovation skills, while also attending to their overall well-being. Effective teachers are facilitators of learning who develop and assess students' proficiency through formal and informal learning experiences.

The system we envision includes four key qualities:

1. A commitment to authentic and diverse student growth

In the system we envision: Learning in formal and informal settings is valued and measured. Learning experiences engage all students with meaningful and rigorous content; incorporate student interests, strengths, and life experiences; and address the need to master core knowledge and skills. Learning connects with real-world experiences and is technologically relevant. Student progress is based on demonstrated mastery rather than time spent in class. Schools remain open year-round to meet the needs of students and their families. Through field experiences and online resources, learning and schooling become a continuous endeavor, with flexible scheduling and adaptable staffing patterns.

2. An aligned system of standards, supports, and measures

In the system we envision: Student learning begins with clear, concise, challenging standards that describe what students should know and be able to do in academic domains

and beyond. These standards shape rich, meaningful curricula, identify appropriate learning resources, and are adapted to meet the diverse needs of students. A balanced, authentic system aligns student assessments with the day-to-day work of teaching and learning. It also measures student learning in authentic ways. In this system, practices and standards for preparing and supporting teachers are directly linked to systems and standards for student learning.

3. New leadership roles in schools

In the system we envision: School leadership is a joint endeavor with highly effective classroom teachers. In a collaborative school culture where all teachers share responsibility for student learning and well-being, shared decision-making models utilize classroom expertise in advancing the effectiveness of schools and the mission of public education. Administrators and teachers have a collaborative relationship characterized by joint decision-making and accountability. Teachers assume hybrid roles that involve both teaching and leading; effective principals spend some time teaching and welcome opportunities to work with teacher leaders.

“Early in my teaching career, I had a class in which most of the kids were from very low-income families. During class one day, a student called out, ‘Why are you trying so hard to teach us? Everyone knows that kids from the ghetto can’t learn.’

“I asked him, ‘Who told you that you can’t learn?’ and he responded, ‘Everyone tells us that.’

“I told him, ‘I believe you can learn.’

“That student eventually became a college graduate.”

—Mary Futrell,
Commission Member

4. Effective use of technology for all students

In the system we envision: Teachers and students have access to cutting-edge educational technology and to the support needed to use it productively. All students have Internet access at school, at home, and in the community.

Teachers utilize a wide array of digital teaching and learning materials and tools. As more and more textbooks are replaced by digital media, all teachers have the professional development and resources to make effective use of current materials.

NATIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

We believe the overwhelming majority of the nation’s 3.5 million teachers are effective practitioners or can become effective with appropriate support and assistance. However, there are some individuals in charge of classrooms today who are not qualified to teach and should not be working with children. If teachers are to be held accountable and responsible for student learning, the profession must take responsibility for the performance of its members.

In order to ensure that every child—regardless of family income, location, or other factors—is taught by effective teachers, it is crucial to set national standards for the preparation, licensing, and certification of educators. Today, individual states establish their own standards for teachers, and some states have established standards for teacher educators. These standards range widely, from highly demanding in some states to insignificant in others. Furthermore, effective teachers and talented teacher candidates often find it unnecessarily difficult to relocate from one state to another because of inconsistent or conflicting licensure policies.

Therefore, we call for a new organization led by effective teachers. The National Council for the Teaching Profession (NCTP) will be responsible for defining and setting the standards for a national system of preparation, licensure, and certification of all teachers and teacher educators.

The Council will honor and build on the research and standards developed by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support and Consortium, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. NCTP will work to ensure that each state’s teaching standards are no less rigorous than the national standards. Alignment among state standards will facilitate teacher quality and mobility from state to state.

Bringing this work under one national umbrella group will lead to preparation, licensure and certification processes that are consistent, efficient, and cost effective. This coordinated effort will support increased student learning by providing access and equitable opportunities for all children.

The NCTP will benefit from the leadership of highly effective teachers and their practice-based knowledge, skill, and wisdom. With them, the NCTP will work to identify and establish national standards for:

- ▶ Teacher preparation programs,
- ▶ Teacher educators,
- ▶ Teacher evaluation, and
- ▶ Advancement within the profession.

Relying on anyone other than effective teachers to lead this work short-changes teachers and students.

“Having been a classroom teacher in Boulder, Colo., for 20 years, I have wanted to go to a high-needs school, perhaps an inner city school. However, because the system does not allow for mobility, it is financially unfeasible to change districts. To go where the students’ needs are greatest, I would lose substantial income and would be considered a first-year teacher.”

—Adele Bravo,
Commission Member

All states will be invited to work together as part of this national body. Initial licensure will continue to be awarded through state education agencies, but state licenses will be based on a single rigorous, consistent set of national standards. The goals are to ensure teacher credentials are rigorous and portable; to streamline the credentialing process for teachers who move from one state to another; and to help remedy



the current inequitable distribution of teachers. Schools and districts will respect NCTP-endorsed credentials because they certify accomplished preparation and practice.

NCTP will set the standards and work toward awarding Professional Teacher Certificates and Master Teacher Certificates, much like the American Medical Association awards board certifications to physicians.

Professional certification will become the basic eligibility criteria for educational administrative positions in schools or districts and for teacher educator positions in accredited preparation programs. Earning a Professional or Master Teacher Certificate may make the holder eligible for additional compensation, career advancement, and licensure reciprocity across states.

National Council for the Teaching Profession will have:

- ▶ A governing body consisting primarily of highly effective teachers in addition to representatives from participating organizations.
- ▶ A charge to ensure that all licensed and certified teachers have met national standards.
- ▶ Self-sustaining operations.

The NCTP will confer with student and parent organizations, seeking their input into defining, preparing, developing, and recognizing effective teaching.

Individuals will be eligible to join NCTP by virtue of their active membership in any of the subscribing organizations.

In addition to identifying and approving standards for the teaching profession, NCTP may share models of teaching and learning, disseminate peer reviewed or research-based best practices, promote professional learning, and act as a clearinghouse for professional information and resources for teachers and teacher educators.

A PROFESSIONAL CAREER CONTINUUM

An effective teacher is the single most important school factor in a high-quality education. We believe that effective teachers must define the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and aptitudes required for entry and advancement within our profession. Currently, teacher quality policies and state requirements do not benefit from teacher input; state requirements often create barriers to ensuring that all classrooms are led by effective teachers with both content and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The result is a lack of attention to whether all prospective teachers meet rigorous selection standards and an incredible disparity across the country in the preparation of teachers. For example, for full licensure in Massachusetts, teachers must have an undergraduate degree in the arts and sciences, pass a literacy and mathematics test and a test of content knowledge, teach successfully for at least three years, and complete post-baccalaureate work in content and pedagogy. For licensure in Mississippi, however, teachers may have a bachelor's degree in any subject, and they need only pass a content area test and complete as few as three weeks of training.



There is also a huge mismatch between teacher preparation and the employment marketplace. Despite a large oversupply of teachers in some areas, many districts face a shortage of qualified teachers, and some subject areas are in especially high demand. Furthermore, the teaching profession needs to attract a talented pool of candidates who represent the rich diversity of American society.

We envision a system designed to ensure that all teachers are prepared to lead classrooms with diverse student populations. In this new system, teachers will understand not only their subject matter, but also the theory and practice behind a range of teaching strategies. Teachers

will know how to incorporate appropriate reading and writing skill development into their instruction and how to differentiate teaching and learning to accommodate students' special needs. They will be culturally proficient and understand how cultural differences affect student learning. They will be equipped with strategies to assist second language learners in acquiring English language skills.

SELECTING APPROPRIATE TEACHER CANDIDATES

We believe it is the responsibility of effective teachers to encourage and recruit high-achieving students to pursue a career in teaching. We envision the selection of teacher candidates for preparation programs as purposeful and guided by four core elements:

- ▶ **Strong academic preparation:** Prospective teachers demonstrate their interest in and commitment to lifelong learning. They present evidence of solid academic performance and application of knowledge and skills to situations similar to those confronted by teachers.
- ▶ **Dispositions:** Prospective teachers have the predisposition to apply thoughtfulness, self-reflection, respect for differences, compassion, honesty, fairness, and other key qualities in their professional conduct.
- ▶ **Aptitudes:** Prospective teachers show qualities such as a love of learning, curiosity, sense of humor, and the capacity to work with children or youth and to advocate for their students.
- ▶ **Demographic needs:** Recruitment and selection criteria consider the need for teachers who represent the diversity of the U.S. population and the need for appropriately qualified teachers in underserved communities and in hard-to-staff areas of the curriculum.

ENSURING QUALITY PREPARATION

We believe that teacher preparation programs must be judged by the professional qualifications and teaching effectiveness of their graduates and the quality and substance of the preparation program itself. The first step is to insist that all teacher preparation programs are properly accredited, to ensure that they adhere to national standards. A second step is to insist that programs be judged by placement rates of their graduates and by their graduates' impact on student learning and well-being. Programs that fail to meet these standards may be given a reasonable amount of time to improve; those that do not improve must be closed.

Teaching is complex work. The teaching profession needs to embrace a clear, rigorous, universally accepted body of knowledge and skills identifying what a prospective teacher should know and be able to do before entering the classroom. We envision a system in which candidates acquire this knowledge and learn these skills through significant school-based experiences. In our vision, anyone who receives a teaching license has demonstrated specific skills and knowledge and has significant school-based experience.

Knowledge. We believe that for future success, all pre-service teachers need to learn at least the following:

- ▶ Content matter appropriate for teaching the subject area(s)
- ▶ Child, adolescent, and abnormal psychology
- ▶ English language development and second language acquisition strategies
- ▶ Instructional methods, strategies, and practices
- ▶ Curriculum models and practices
- ▶ Instructional technology practices and information technology use
- ▶ Standards-based curriculum design
- ▶ Content-based reading and writing strategies
- ▶ Instructional adaptations to address students' individual learning styles, readiness to learn, and level of independence
- ▶ Instructional accommodations for students' special learning needs
- ▶ Impact of socioeconomic background, ethnicity, race, gender, language skills, disability, and other factors on teaching and learning
- ▶ Classroom management strategies

Skills: We believe all pre-service teachers must learn to do the following:

- ▶ Plan instruction
- ▶ Guide students through a variety of learning experiences
- ▶ Assess student progress
- ▶ Analyze student learning outcomes
- ▶ Diagnose special needs, prescribe learning strategies, develop remedial plans, and adjust instruction to suit special needs
- ▶ Reflect on practice
- ▶ Collaborate with colleagues
- ▶ Incorporate 21st century skills, such as critical thinking and problem solving, into teacher practice

School-based experiences: We believe that to be successful in today's complex learning environment, all pre-service teachers need to spend significant time in schools working

alongside effective teachers. A series of classroom experiences such as the following will allow candidates to apply the content and pedagogical knowledge and skills they acquire:

- ▶ Observing a variety of effective teachers
- ▶ Assisting with small and large group instruction
- ▶ Planning and conducting small group and whole class instruction
- ▶ Teaching a diverse range of students for an extended period of time
- ▶ Conferencing with individual students
- ▶ Conferring with parents and other responsible adults
- ▶ Collaborating with teams of teachers

We believe that state licensing boards must require compelling evidence that a candidate for licensure is well-prepared. To earn a license, a candidate must successfully complete assessments of the following:

- ▶ Content area knowledge as applied to elementary and secondary schooling
- ▶ Ability to plan, instruct, and reflect on a lesson
- ▶ Demonstrated impact on student learning outcomes
- ▶ Evidence demonstrating teaching dispositions and aptitudes

LEADING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

“In the United States, teachers are generally objects of research rather than participants in the research process itself. The topics of professional development are often chosen by administrators in the central office rather than by teachers seeking to improve their own practice on terms of their choosing.”

—Mark S. Tucker in the report,
“Standing on the Shoulders of Giants:
An American Agenda
for Education Reform”

We believe that over the course of their career, effective teachers must reassess their practice and learn new approaches. We also believe that school districts must ensure that the learning needs of educators are addressed through professional development that is a significant part of a teacher’s work. Too often, professional development is disconnected from the realities of classroom practice. We know that teachers want high-quality professional learning that is meaningfully connected to their daily work and to the students they serve. We propose that resources be redirected to high-quality student-centered professional development informed by teacher self-assessments and evaluations.

Effective teachers work collaboratively with their colleagues and are continually learning and growing in ways that improve their teaching practice and enhance student learning. We envision a system in which school districts invest resources in creating teacher-led learning communities that design and implement professional development and assess its

impact on teacher practice. By defining the content and design of a professional development program, teachers can ensure that their professional learning and classroom practice are connected, which in turn strengthens student learning.

In our vision, professional development and its funding focus on:

- ▶ **Improved student learning and well-being:** In our vision, all professional development conforms to national professional learning standards. Teachers engage only in professional development activities that enhance their knowledge, skills, dispositions, and aptitudes to improve student learning and well-being. Teacher leaders assess all professional development using research-based protocols to determine its impact on teacher practice and student learning.
- ▶ **Peer review programs:** In our vision, all teachers participate in peer review programs that (1) furnish the support needed for early career teachers to become effective; (2) implement improvement strategies for struggling teachers to become more effective; (3) identify professional learning opportunities for effective teachers to become highly effective; and (4) include a process for teachers who are deemed ineffective to be recommended for dismissal.
- ▶ **Job-embedded programs:** We believe job-embedded professional development clearly offers a direct connection between a teacher's daily instruction and professional learning. This connection enhances content-specific instructional practices to improve student learning. A direct connection between learning and its application is critical for continuous professional growth.
- ▶ **Differentiation by career stage, expertise, and other criteria:** Teachers' professional development needs vary according to level of experience, evaluation ratings, and school context. A teacher may lead some professional learning activities and be a learner in others, in accordance with that teacher's expertise in particular areas. Professional learning activities should include a wide array of formats to foster accessibility within the school day. Formats may include action research, case discussions, coaching and mentoring, critical friends groups, data teams, examining student work, lesson study, portfolios, and study groups.

Redefining the Masters in Education

Education matters. Teachers with advanced degrees who expand their knowledge and skills in the science of teaching and learning have a significant impact on student learning. However, inadequate compensation and limited career opportunities often lead teachers to pursue advanced degrees that contribute little to improving their practice. We envision a redefinition of the Masters of Education that allows the teacher to acquire:

- ▶ Advanced teaching and learning skills
- ▶ Instructional leadership or education management knowledge and skills
- ▶ Peer review and evaluation skills

Earning a high-quality master's degree focused on expanding professional knowledge and skills in teaching or leading is an essential component of teacher growth.

This new vision of teacher learning would require dramatic change in the curricular offerings of universities and in agreements between teachers and schools regarding what specific educational credentials should be valued and rewarded in teacher advancement and compensation systems.

ENCOURAGING LEADERSHIP ROLES

Historically, most teachers have spent their careers isolated in classrooms, doing essentially the same job year after year. As school cultures become increasingly complex and collaborative, the need to differentiate teachers' roles and responsibilities becomes increasingly apparent.

A teacher-designed career path is vital to recruiting and retaining effective practitioners. In our vision, effective teachers may take on additional roles and responsibilities while staying within the teaching ranks, and some may gradually move into administrative positions. We propose a teacher career path that: (1) acknowledges the diverse expertise teachers acquire during their careers; (2) identifies specific roles and responsibilities; and (3) defines the professional knowledge and skills teachers must acquire to fulfill each role.

A teacher might travel along any of three separate leadership paths: instructional leadership, education management, and/or school and district leadership.

► **Instructional leadership:** We envision instructional leaders as classroom-oriented teachers who assume additional roles requiring an understanding of adult learning theory; models of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and facilitation skills. The roles might include: academic dean, content-area leader, instructional coach, curriculum developer, data analyst, family and community engager, induction leader, mentor, new teacher developer, peer reviewer, action researcher, university liaison, or staff developer.

► **Educational management:** We envision educational managers as systems-oriented teachers who take on additional roles requiring an understanding of school operations, human resources, and systems management. The roles might include: athletic director, budget developer, dean of students, program evaluator, public relations director, scheduler, and special education case manager.

► **School and district leadership:** We envision opportunities for effective teachers to become school principals and district superintendents responsible for managing large, complex organizations. Teachers can bring a classroom perspective to roles that (1) encompass instructional leadership and education management functions and (2) add knowledge and skills related to education policy, labor relations, and collaborative partnerships.



A STUDENT-CENTERED TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM



Educators want meaningful feedback about their practice from both peers and supervisors. Far too often, teachers are evaluated infrequently, superficially, and by supervisors who have little or no teaching experience. Frequently, teachers do not receive feedback that is helpful and have little opportunity to address shortcomings in their practice that are identified in an evaluation. Most school administrators are responsible for evaluating too many teachers and are given little opportunity to learn how to evaluate effectively.

Districts report difficulty in dismissing unsatisfactory teachers, but the problem is circular: Teachers often challenge termination decisions because they were not properly evaluated or were not given an opportunity to improve. Both sides end up being dissatisfied. Ultimately, it is the students who lose under a weak or broken evaluation and support system.

A SYSTEM BASED ON PEER EVALUATION

Most teachers agree that our current evaluation systems do a poor job of identifying teachers' strengths and weaknesses and providing ways for a teacher to improve. To break this cycle, we propose an evidence-based peer-review teacher evaluation system that identifies highly effective practitioners who may assume leadership functions and guarantees due process rights for teachers while expediting the dismissal of unsatisfactory practitioners.

In this system, peer reviewers evaluate teachers based on evidence from the teacher's classroom and school practice, and on student learning outcomes. Ineffective teachers who have been given adequate time and resources to improve face dismissal if they fail to make significant progress toward effectiveness. Teacher evaluations are a key consideration in school and grade

assignments. Seniority is used for decision-making only when all other factors are equal.

We believe peer review evaluations will result in meaningful assessments of practice, improved professional development, evidence-based personnel decisions, and high-quality instruction—all leading to improved student learning.

The peer review program we propose requires that teacher practice be judged by specially trained, highly effective teachers. An effective evidence-based peer review program requires three key elements for evaluating teacher performance: evidence from observations of practice, examination of teacher work products and student work, and student learning outcomes.

In the system we envision, the individual teacher's practice is judged by a peer review team. Evaluations that may result in dismissal are presented to a peer review board. The peer review team and peer review board must give priority to the needs of students and schools when making evaluation decisions.

Evidence of Teaching and Learning: We envision a system based on multiple measures of evidence from the teacher's practice and student work. The teacher self-assesses and reflects on his or her own practice with respect to performance standards, addressing content knowledge, pedagogy, learning environment, collaboration, and family engagement.

The teacher then provides evidence to support self-ratings, such as:

- ▶ Observation data from peer reviewers and administrators
- ▶ Teacher work products, such as lesson and unit plans, teacher-developed curriculum materials, and teacher-developed tests or performance tasks
- ▶ Student learning outcomes measured by classroom, school, district, or state assessments
- ▶ Contributions to the profession through active participation in school or district committees and professional associations
- ▶ Work products, participation in study groups, lesson study, or action research
- ▶ Survey results from parents, students, or colleagues

Peer review team. In our vision, a peer review team conducts classroom observations, which include examining teacher work products and student work. This team generally consists of one or more administrators and one or more accomplished teachers who demonstrate competency with the teaching standards. Team members participate in professional development about observing and judging practice, coaching and facilitation, and having difficult conversations. Team members use a valid, reliable, unbiased evaluation instrument agreed upon by the professional teaching association and the school administration. The peer review team rates the educator's practice based on standards; suggests specific areas for professional growth and development; and recommends such personnel decisions as continued employment, placement on an improvement plan, or dismissal.

Peer review board. To ensure a fair, transparent, unbiased process, we envision a peer review board created by the school or district. Board members are primarily master teachers selected by their professional association and master administrators. In the event of a dispute related to evaluation, the board reviews the evaluation, and its decision serves as the determining factor for recommending continued employment, remediation, or dismissal.



In addition, the board is responsible for an audit process, in which evaluation reports are randomly reviewed to ensure that the process holds integrity and remains thorough, reflective, and rigorous.

Timelines: In the education system we envision, teachers set student-centered annual goals for enhancing professional practice and improving student learning. Teachers are observed by their peers, and, in turn, they observe their peers. Teachers participate in ongoing, job-embedded, professional development directly related to attaining their goals.

In this system, the frequency of submission of evidence for formal evaluation purposes depends on the teacher's effectiveness rating and career stage.

- ▶ Novice teachers are observed frequently by peers and supervisors. Formal evaluations take place annually.
- ▶ Professional teachers are observed frequently by peers and occasionally by supervisors. They are formally evaluated on a two- to three-year cycle.
- ▶ Master teachers are observed frequently by novices and peers and occasionally by supervisors. They are formally evaluated on a three- to five-year cycle.
- ▶ Teachers with ineffective practice are observed frequently by peer review teams. Evaluations are not time-bound, but determined by the degree and nature of the teacher's need to become effective. If the peer review team finds evidence of concern, it may recommend more intensive remediation and evaluation. In the event that an educator does not improve instruction, the peer review team recommends dismissal to the peer review board.

PROFESSIONAL AND PROGRESSIVE COMPENSATION

The compensation system we envision requires acknowledged societal regard for the teaching profession, demonstrated by an entry-level salary that realistically reflects the educational attainment, expertise, and value of the teaching professional.

Teacher compensation in this system is competitive with professions that are comparable in terms of educational preparation, knowledge, and skills. Compensation is high enough to attract and retain a highly skilled teacher workforce.

Stability in the educator workforce supports our basic premise that all students are entitled to an effective teacher in every classroom. In our vision, teaching faculties in all schools include novice teachers, highly effective veteran teachers, and teacher leaders.

Our vision of a progressive teacher compensation system is based on the premise that each teacher's compensation is determined by a combination of factors such as:

- ▶ **Quality of Practice:** Teachers who demonstrate effectiveness through an evidence-based peer evaluation system earn a higher salary.
- ▶ **Additional Roles and Responsibilities:** Teachers who become peer reviewers, teacher educators, or model classroom teachers, and teachers who assume instructional leadership or educational management roles, earn a higher salary.
- ▶ **Challenging Teaching Assignments:** Teachers who work in hard-to-staff schools or in hard-to-staff positions earn a higher salary.
- ▶ **Expanded Learning Programs:** Teachers who work an extended schedule—in a school with an extended school day or year—earn a higher salary.



Tiered Compensation

We envision a tiered compensation system, bargained at the local level. The salary for each of the tiers represents a significant percentage increase over the previous tier. Except for cost-of-living adjustments, pay increases are not automatic. Advancement in this compensation system is determined neither by time in service nor by graduate degrees. Advancement to the next tier requires evidence of effectiveness using multiple data sources such as:

Honoring the Single Salary Schedule

The single salary schedule—the primary system by which most teachers in America are paid—is grounded in a tradition of equity and efficiency. It was created to address massive inequities and to dramatically increase lifetime earnings in a profession that—at one point in time—provided little salary, security, or fairness. We deeply honor our fellow teaching professionals who fought valiantly to provide such security and to level the playing field for women and minorities in the profession.

Our call for progressive compensation is grounded in the same core values and recognizes that tomorrow's equity challenges call for new models that will ensure fair and adequate compensation for educators, as well as equity and effective learning for the students they teach.

- ▶ Advanced credentials based on NCTP standards
- ▶ Attainment of National Board Certification
- ▶ Additional teaching licenses that broaden the teacher's knowledge and skills
- ▶ Level of effectiveness as determined by peer-reviewed evaluations
- ▶ Implementation of effective practices based on professional learning
- ▶ Completion of action research projects

Within a given tier, a teacher may receive additional compensation for professional practices such as:

- ▶ Operating a model classroom for the benefit of fellow teachers
- ▶ Serving in a hard-to-staff school or a hard-to-staff teaching position
- ▶ Assuming additional roles and responsibilities such as peer reviewer, teacher educator, instructional leader, educational manager, or roles with specific incentives
- ▶ Participating in an expanded learning day or year

A teacher's specific salary depends on a combination of these and other locally determined factors.

Arbitrary limitations on the number of teachers receiving additional compensation cannot exist. If the goal is a highly effective teaching force, an arbitrary cap discourages collaboration and continued learning, which have been clearly tied to improved student learning.

When a new professional and progressive compensation system is in place, teachers will be fully responsible not only for their own continued professional growth, but also for advancing the profession as a whole. Individual teachers will seek opportunities to take risks and grow professionally while assembling evidence of student learning and professional growth and reflecting on this evidence.

CALL TO ACTION



Transformational change requires collaboration among a wide variety of stakeholders. While teacher quality is often viewed as a local issue, it is also a national responsibility. Implementing our vision will require policy changes at the local, state, and national levels. It will require teachers, teacher preparation programs, school districts, local and state teachers' associations, state education agencies, state legislatures, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, other national teacher organizations, and the U.S. Department of Education to work together toward changing longstanding policies and practices.

We call upon the National Education Association to:

1. Adopt the goal of improving student learning as a core organizational goal.
2. Allocate resources to implement the Commission's recommendations.
3. Work with state affiliate leaders to create guidelines resulting in comprehensive evidence-based peer review evaluation systems.
4. Engage the 100,000 National Board Certified teachers, state and national teachers of the year, and other accomplished teachers to take on the roles of peer reviewer or teacher leader.
5. Partner with key stakeholders to develop a peer review preparation program that will select, train, and support peer reviewers with the goal of preparing at least one accomplished teacher as a qualified reviewer for every ten teachers in U.S. schools.
6. Actively promote the involvement of accomplished teachers in Association leadership at the

national level through leadership training and sustained targeted outreach.

7. Launch an ambitious program to learn about the professional needs of new teachers, and address those needs.
8. Collaborate with the American Federation of Teachers and other education stakeholders in pursuing a shared vision of transformation for the teaching profession through the establishment of the National Council for the Teaching Profession.
9. Address internal barriers to organizational engagement about teaching quality and student learning:
 - a. Embed greater flexibility within NEA governance structures for rapid response to changing political and educational environments.
 - b. Modify NEA resolutions and other policies to allow for nimble responses to emerging educational issues.
 - c. Transform the UniServ Program, making UniServ directors advocates for educational issues to advance NEA's professional agenda.
 - d. Conduct research to inform education policy on the effects of school leadership, teacher collaboration, and quality curriculum on student learning outcomes.

We call upon state and local teacher associations to:

1. Collaborate with district leaders to create peer review programs; establish competitive salary plans based on career stage, teaching assignment, credentials, roles and responsibilities, and expanded learning time; and develop teacher decision-making structures addressing the career continuum, student learning, and professional development.
2. Collaborate with state departments of education, higher education leaders, and other education stakeholders to define rigorous selection criteria for attracting diverse candidates with strong academic skills and appropriate dispositions and aptitudes to work effectively with children and youth.
3. Recruit effective teachers to serve in local and state association leadership roles.

We call upon our fellow teachers to:

1. Take responsibility for the learning and well-being of every student by establishing collaborative autonomy as a defining characteristic of effective teaching.
2. Advocate for and participate in evidence-based peer review programs as the primary teacher evaluation protocol.
3. Advocate for the National Council for the Teaching Profession through all of our professional organizations.

4. Engage as active participants in collegial professional growth by giving and receiving feedback about teaching practice and student learning, by sharing instructional practices, and by regularly visiting other classrooms.
5. Develop instructional leadership or educational management capabilities to assume new teacher leadership roles and responsibilities.

We call upon teacher preparation programs to:

1. Work collaboratively with practicing teachers in every aspect of teacher preparation, including the need to determine and continually update the body of knowledge, pedagogical skills, and learning experiences that pre-service candidates must acquire.
2. Align all elements of preparation programs with the NCTP standards.
3. Staff all preparation programs only with instructors who have experience as effective elementary and secondary school teachers.
4. Partner with urban, suburban, and rural school districts to transform teacher preparation by focusing on clinical practice via school-based learning experiences such as teacher residencies for all pre-service candidates.
5. Prepare pre-service candidates to successfully complete comprehensive teacher performance assessments prior to earning a license.

We call upon school districts to:

1. Collaborate with teacher associations to create peer review programs; establish competitive salary plans based on career stage, teaching assignment, credentials, roles and responsibilities, and expanded learning time; and develop teacher decision-making structures addressing the career continuum, student learning, and professional development.
2. Identify and provide specific resources to support collaborative meeting time for teachers and adequate time for high-quality, job-embedded professional development.
3. Implement instructional leadership and education management roles as career path options for teachers.

We call upon state education agencies to:

1. Revise policies and regulations to ensure teacher preparation programs and licensure requirements align with National Council for the Teaching Profession standards.
2. Revise policies and regulations to ensure that a majority of state standards and practice board members are effective teachers.
3. Collaborate with teacher associations and teacher preparation programs to redesign teacher preparation programs that will provide an effective teacher for every classroom.

4. Create formal processes for continual engagement with teacher association leaders to understand the teaching, learning, and leadership issues emerging at the district level.
5. Develop formal processes for continual engagement with teacher preparation programs and their partner districts to understand and address workforce development and education career issues.
6. Conduct research on the workforce needs at the school and district levels to guide the recruitment strategies of teacher preparation programs and career decisions faced by pre-service teachers.
7. Develop statewide plans to ensure Internet access in all schools and to all students at home.

We call upon state legislatures to:

1. Enact legislation mandating evidence-based peer review evaluation frameworks and independent teacher-led state standards and practice boards.
2. Enact legislation making Internet access available to all students both in school and at home.
3. Identify specific funding streams to support the establishment of peer review programs, standards and practice boards, research identifying best practices, and programs designed to elevate and support the teaching profession.

We call upon the U.S. Department of Education to:

1. Collaborate with teachers and their associations to create conditions to provide for an effective teacher in every classroom.
2. Allocate resources for the establishment of a National Council for the Teaching Profession.
3. Encourage states to establish evidence-based peer review evaluation and independent teacher-led state standards and practice boards.
4. Require teacher preparation programs to follow state-approved National Council for the Teaching Profession standards for teacher candidates and teacher educators.
5. Engage Internet service providers in efforts to develop and implement state-level plans to ensure Internet access in all schools and to all students at home.

Moving Forward

Enormous transformation is never easy. There will always be economic barriers and people who are opposed to change. But we firmly believe that the time for action is now. We believe our vision is both practical and necessary.

We call upon the country's 3.5 million teachers and their professional organizations to take up the mantle of transformational change—for our students, for our schools, and for our nation.

Research Informing The Commission's Recommendations

Compensation

Carlson, J. (2009). *A-Path: Accomplished teaching pathways*. Plymouth, WI: Educator Compensation Institute. Retrieved on October 13, 2011, from [www.edcomp.org/uploadedFiles/Content/4-3-09%20A%20PATH%20Description\(1\).pdf](http://www.edcomp.org/uploadedFiles/Content/4-3-09%20A%20PATH%20Description(1).pdf)

Chait, R., and Miller, R. (2009). *Paying teachers for results: A summary of research to inform the design of pay-for-performance programs for high-poverty schools*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Florida Solutions Team (2011). *Effective teachers and performance pay: Research-driven and classroom-based solutions from a cadre of Florida's most accomplished teachers*. Carrboro, NC: Center for Teaching Quality. Retrieved on August 31, 2011, from www.teachingquality.org/sites/default/files/Effective_Teachers_and_Performance_Pay_Feb11.pdf

Gratz, D.B., (2010). *The perils for performance pay: Making education compensation work*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Heneman, H., Milanowski, A., Kimball, S., and Odden, A. (2006). Standards-based teacher evaluation as a foundation for knowledge and skill-based pay. *CPRE Policy Briefs*, RB-45, May 2006. University of Pennsylvania: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Imazeki, J., and Goe, L. (2009). The distribution of high qualified, experienced teachers: Challenges and opportunities. *TQ Research & Policy Brief*, August 2009. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Mass2020. (2010). Listening to experts: *What Massachusetts teachers are saying about time and learning and the expanded learning time initiative*. Boston, MA: Author. Retrieved on October 12, 2011, from www.mass2020.org/files/file/Listening_to_Experts_final.pdf

Pennington, H. (2007). *The Massachusetts expanding learning time to support student success initiative*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved on October 12, 2011, from www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/01/pdf/MALearningTime.pdf

Prince, C., Schuerman, P. Guthrie, J., Witham, P., Milanowski, A., and Thorn, C. (2009). *The other 69 percent: Fairly rewarding the performance of teachers of nontested subjects and grades - Guide to implementation: resources for applied practice*. Washington: U.S. Department of Education Center for Educator Compensation Reform.

Rowland, C., and Potemski, A. (2009). Alternative compensation terminology: Considerations for education stakeholders, policymakers, and the media. *Emerging Issues*, 2, August 2009. Washington, DC: Center for Educator Compensation Reform.

Springer, M.G., Ballou, D., Hamilton, L., Le, V., Lockwood, J.R., McCaffrey, D., Pepper, M., and Stecher, B. (2010). *Teacher pay for performance: Experimental evidence from the project on incentives in teaching*. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University.

Diversity

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., and York, R.L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Government Printing Office.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Phillips, M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G.J., Klebanov, P., and Crane, J. (1998). Family background, parenting practices, and the black-white test score gap. In Jencks, C. and Phillips, M. (eds). *The black-white test score gap*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Tyler, L. (2011). *Toward increasing teacher diversity: Targeting support and intervention for teacher licensure candidates*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Available online at www.nea.org/assets/docs/ETS_NEAteacherdiversity11.pdf

Valdés, G. and Castillon, M. (2010). English Language Learners in American Schools: A Look at the Broader Context. In Lucas, T. (ed) *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators*. Philadelphia, PA: Erlbaum/Taylor and Francis.

Villegas, A. and Irvine, J. (2010). Diversifying the Teaching Force: An Examination of Major Arguments. *The Urban Review*. 42(3): 175-192.

Evaluation

Baker, E.L., Barton, P.E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H.F., Linn, R., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Shavelson, R.J., and Shepard, L.A. (2011). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers*. Briefing paper 278, August 29, 2010. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved on October 9, 2011, from http://epi.3cdn.net/724cd9a1eb91c40ff0_hwm6ij90.pdf

Chait, R. (2010). *Removing chronically ineffective teachers*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: How Teacher Performance Assessments Can Measure and Improve Teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Goe, L. (2010). *Evaluating teachers with multiple measures*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Hinchey, P.H. (2010). *Getting teacher assessment right: What policymakers can learn from research*. University of Colorado at Boulder: National Education Policy Center.

National Education Association (2011). *Teacher Evaluation: A Resource Guide for National Education Association Leaders and Staff*. Washington, DC: Author.

Newton, X., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., and Thomas, E. *Value-Added Modeling of Teacher Effectiveness: An exploration of stability across models and contexts*. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 18 (23). 1-23. Retrieved on October 18, 2011, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/810>

Project on the Next Generation of Teachers (2010). *Users guide to peer assistance and review*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School. Retrieved on August 31, 2011, from www.gse.harvard.edu/~ngt/par/resources/users_guide_to_par.pdf

Skinner, K. J. (2011). *Reinventing educator evaluation: Connecting professional practice with student learning*. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Teachers Association. Retrieved on October 9, 2011, from www.massteacher.org/advocating/-/media/Files/PDFs/CEPP/evalreport.pdf

Toch, T., and Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Education Sector Reports, January 2008. Washington, DC: Education Sector.

National Organization

Flexner, A. (1910). *Medical education in the United States and Canada: A report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, Bulletin No. 4. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2011). *Building a high-quality teaching profession: Lessons from around the world*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Professional Development

Archibald, S., Coggshall, J., Croft, A., and Goe, L. (2011). *High-quality professional development for all teachers: Effectively allocating resources*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Champion, R. (2003). The real measure of a professional development program's effectiveness lies in what participants learn. *Journal of Staff Development*, 24(1), 75-76.

Croft, A., Coggshall, J.G., Dolan, M., Powers, E., and Killion, J. (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it down well*. NCCTQ Issue Brief, April 2010. Available online at www.tqsource.org/publications/JEPD%20Issue%20Brief.pdf

Professional Vision

Dale, J. (2011). *Dangerous mind games: Are we ready to overhaul the teaching profession?* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Policy Research.

Drury, D. and Baer, J. (2011). *The American Public School Teacher: Past, Present, and Future*. MA: Harvard Education Press

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2011). *Building a high-quality teaching profession: Lessons from around the world*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Phi Delta Kappa (2011). *What Americans said about the public schools*. Bloomington, IN: Author. Retrieved on September 29, 2011, from www.pdkintl.org/poll/index.htm

Tucker, M. (2011). *Teachers, their unions and the American education reform agenda*. Washington: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Recruitment and Preparation

Alliance for Excellent Education (2008). *What keeps good teachers in the classroom? Understanding and reducing teacher turnover*. Issue Brief, February 2008. Washington, DC:

Auguste, B., Kihn, P., and Miller, M. (2010). *Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top-third graduates to careers in teaching, an international and market research-based perspective*. New York, NY: McKinsey & Company.

Berry, B. (2009). *Children of poverty deserve great teachers: One union's commitment to changing the status quo*. Hillsborough, NC: Center for Teaching Quality.

Beteille, T. and Loeb, S. (2009). Teacher quality and teacher labor markets. In Sykes, G., Schnieder, B., and Plank, D. (eds), *Handbook of Education Policy Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Crowe, E. (2010). *Measuring what matters: A stronger accountability model for teacher education*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: How Teacher Performance Assessments Can Measure and Improve Teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R.C., and Johnson, C.M. (2009). Teacher preparation and teacher learning. In Sykes, G., Schnieder, B., and Plank, D. (eds), *Handbook of Education Policy Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Diez, M. E. (2007). Looking back and moving forward: Three tensions in the teacher dispositions discourse. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58 (5), 388- 396.

Skinner, K.J. (2008). *Tomorrow's teachers: Preparing the education workforce for 21st century schools*. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Teachers Association. Retrieved on October 13, 2011 from www.massteacher.org/teaching/cepp/-/media/Files/PDFs/CEPP/tomorrow.ashx

Stansbury, K. and Zimmerman, J. (2002). Smart induction programs become lifelines for the beginning teacher. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22(1), 10-17.

Standards of Practice

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (2011). *Model Core Teaching Standards*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved on October 9, 2011, from www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf

Learning Forward. (2011). *Standards for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: Author.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1989) *Core propositions*. Arlington, VA: Author. Available online at www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_propositio

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC: NCATE. Retrieved on October 8, 2011, from www.ncate.org/Portals/0/documents/Standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf

Rothstein, R. (2010). *How to fix our schools: It's more complicated, and more work, than the Klein-Rhee 'manifesto' wants you to believe*. EPI Issue Brief 286 (October 14, 2010). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium. (2010) *Teacher Leader Model Standards*. Washington: Author. Retrieved on October 9, 2011, from www.teacherleaderstandards.org/downloads/TLS_Brochure_sm.pdf

Teacher Effectiveness

Bohn, C.M., Roehrig, A.D., and Pressley, M. (2004). The first days of school in classrooms of two more effective and four less effective primary-grades teachers. *Elementary School Journal*, 104(4), 269-287.

Chait, R. and Miller, R. (2010). *Treating different teachers differently: How state policy should act on differences in teacher performance to improve teacher effectiveness and equity*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H.F., & Vigdor, J.L. (2007). *How and why do teacher credentials matter for student achievement?* NBER Working Paper No. 12828.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Ducommun, C. (2010). *Recognizing and developing effective teaching: What policymakers should know and do*. Policy Brief, May 2010. Washington, DC: Partnership for Teacher Quality.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Recognizing and enhancing teacher effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, (3), 1-24.

Freiberg, H.J., Huzinec, C.A., and Templeton, S.M. (2009). Classroom management – a pathway to student achievement: A study of fourteen inner-city elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 110(1), 63-80.

Hill, H.C., Rowan, B., and Ball, D.L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42, 371-406.

Matsumura, L.C., Slater, S.C., and Crosson, A. (2008). Classroom climate, rigorous instruction and curriculum, and students' interactions in urban middle schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 108(4), 293-312.

Tucker, M. (2011). *Standing on the shoulders of giants: An American education agenda for education reform*. Washington, DC: National Center on Education in the Economy.

Technology/21st Century

Cowan, K. (2009). Learning across distance: Virtual-instruction programs are growing rapidly, but the impact on “brick-and-mortar” classrooms is still up in the air. *Harvard Education Letter*, 25(1), January/February 2009. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2008). *School reform in the new millennium: Preparing all children for 21st century success. Recommendations from the MA Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's Task Force on 21st Century Skills*. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Partnerships for 21st Century Skills: (2009). *21st century learning environments*. Washington, DC: Author.

Schulte, B. (2011). Hybrid schools for the iGeneration: New schools combine “bricks” and “clicks.” *Harvard Education Letter*, 27(2), March/April 2011. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Silva, E. (2008). Measuring skills for the 21st century. *Education Sector Reports*, November 2008. Washington, DC: Education Sector.

Symonds, W.C., Schwartz, R.B., and Ferguson, R. (2011). *Pathways to prosperity: Meeting the challenge of preparing young Americans for the 21st century*. A report issued by the Pathways to Prosperity Project. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Walser, N. (2008). Teaching 21st century skills: What does it look like in practice? *Harvard Education Letter*, 24(5), September/October 2008. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Zhao, Y., Pugh, K., Sheldon, S., and Byers, J.L. (2002). Conditions for technology innovations. *Teachers College Record*, 104(3), 482-515.

Meet the Commissioners

Ronarae Adams is director of the Professional Teaching and Leadership Development Center for the National University School of Education and serves as the lead program faculty for the National Board Certified (NBC) Teacher Leadership Specialization Master's Degree Program. She took on various roles during her 24 years in the Poway Unified School District (PUSD) in California: elementary teacher, mentor, clinical teaching supervisor, coordinator of the district's alternative education program for grades 6-12, director of K-12 Curriculum and Instruction, online project manager for the county, and director of the San Diego County NBCT Network of Accomplished Teaching. She earned a master's degree in educational leadership, and a California Administrative Services Certificate from Azusa Pacific University in 1992. She successfully renewed her National Board Certification in 2006 and is now pursuing a doctorate in education.

Adele Bravo is a reading and math interventionist with Boulder Valley School District in Colorado. She has 18 years of teaching experience in Colorado and three in California. She has taught kindergarten, first and second grades, and has been a district literacy coach. Bravo also currently teaches in the early childhood education department at Colorado Community College. In 2006, she was named Colorado's Teacher of the Year. In 2007, she was nominated for the NEA Foundation Award for Teaching Excellence. She has served on the state advisory committee for the Colorado Council of the Arts, on the Colorado Education Association's Teaching and Learning Committee, and on the governor's P-20 Educational Council. She has a master's degree from Regis University. In 2009, Bravo earned National Board Certification in Literacy.

James Brooks, who has taught high school English and photojournalism in Millers Creek, NC, for more than 25 years, successfully renewed his National Board Certification (AYA English/ Language Arts) in 2009. He has received numerous honors for his professional expertise including: Wilkes County Teacher of the Year (1995); USA Today – All Teacher Team (2008); NCTE English Media Literacy Award (2008); the Outstanding North Carolina English Teacher Award (2009); High School Teacher of Excellence; NEA Award for Teaching Excellence (2007); and National Council of Teachers of English (2010). Additionally, he is a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership (with an emphasis in media and technology) at Appalachian State University.

Andy Coons, a National Board Certified teacher, is president of the Tacoma Education Association. He has spent most of his career teaching middle-school students the relevance of mathematics in their lives. He is passionate about issues of social justice and equitable access in public education. Coons has served as a math instructional coach, technology facilitator, and National Board facilitator for hundreds of candidates. He is a member of the Washington State Mathematics Council; serves on the Board of Examiners of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; and is a member of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards Board of Directors. He is working on his Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Washington.

Madaline (Maddie) Fennell is a classroom leader who has taught first, fourth and sixth graders in the Omaha Public Schools over the past 22 years. She is currently chairs the Commission on Effective Teachers and Teaching. Fennell has an undergraduate degree from Creighton University, a Master of Science in Elementary Education and Certificate in Urban Education from the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and an endorsement in assessment from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. She is known for her work in writing curriculum, conducting trainings, providing professional development, and making keynote addresses across the country. She has served on Association boards of directors on the local, state, and national levels and she is a former president of the Omaha Education Association. Her honors include being named the 2007 Nebraska Teacher of the Year and receiving the Ike Friedman Education Leadership Award from the Knights of Aksarben.

Sharon Gallagher-Fishbaugh, the 2009 Utah Teacher of the Year, is known to her second-grade students at Salt Lake City's Dilworth Elementary as "Mrs. G." Gallagher-Fishbaugh, a National Board Certified Teacher, has more than 30 years experience in Utah Public Schools. She served as the co-chair of Utah's National Board Certified Teacher Coalition, and in 2009 was named the Salt Lake District Teacher of the Year. In April 2010, the NEA Foundation awarded her the NEA Member Benefits Award for Teaching Excellence. Gallagher-Fishbaugh left the classroom in 2010 to serve a three-year term as president of the 18,000-member Utah Education Association. She is a member of the state Office of Education Teaching Standards workgroup and serves on several education committees. She earned a B.A. from Loretto Heights College in Denver and a M.A. from National University in La Jolla, Calif., She is a member of the National School Reform Faculty.

Michael Geisen, the 2008 National Teacher of the Year and a science teacher at Sisters Middle School in central Oregon, has been helping students experience science for the past decade. Legend has it that in his former career as a forester, he successfully scared away a charging black bear. Geisen uses humor, movement, music, technology, project-based learning, cooperative groups, art, theater, and personal connections with his students to make science fun and relevant to their lives. As an educational consultant, Geisen shares his expertise on high-quality teaching and learning around the world. He has served on numerous state and national panels to help redefine the teaching profession and the public education landscape. Geisen earned his bachelor's degree in forest resource management from the University of Washington and later earned a master's degree in education at Southern Oregon University. He tells students he earned his street credibility by repeating seventh grade over and over again.

Robert Goodman, the 2006 New Jersey Teacher of the Year, is director of the New Jersey Center for Teaching and Learning. As the science chair and a teacher of physics, chemistry, and environmental science at the Bergen County Technical High School in Teterboro (1999 to 2009), he founded and led the development of the Progressive Science Initiative (PSI) and, later, the Progressive Mathematics Initiative (PMI). Goodman is a content expert reviewer for Achieve, a field reader for the U.S. Department of Education, and a member of the Education Advisory Committee for the Liberty Science Center. He received a B.S. in Physics from the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a M.A. in Teaching Physics from SUNY Stony Brook, and a doctorate in Science Education from Rutgers University. Before becoming a teacher, Goodman spent 20 years in the electronics industry, which included serving as the president and CEO for Haman Kardon, JBL Consumer Products, and Onkyo International Operations.

Mary Hatwood Futrell is the former dean of The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development. A professor of education and co-director of GW's Center for Curriculum, Standards, and Technology, she specializes in education reform policy, professional development, and diversity issues. Futrell is the former president of both Education International and the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession and has served as a senior consultant for Quality Education for Minorities Network. Some of her honors include the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education David G. Imig Award for Distinguished Achievement in Teacher Education (2002), the NEA Foundation Award for Outstanding Service to Public Education (2003), and UNESCO's Jan Amos Comenius Medal (2004). Futrell is also a past president of the NEA and the Virginia Education Association.

Anne Keith, the 2010 Montana Teacher of the Year, teaches eighth-grade math, algebra, and communication arts at Sacajawea Middle School in Bozeman. In her earlier career, she pursued work for GE Capital as a financial analyst. In 1988, she earned a B.A. from Rutgers University, with a major in economics and a minor in mathematics. She earned her teaching certificate while working full time and attending night school. Keith began teaching seventh grade communication arts and social studies in 1992. She received a Masters of Education from Montana State University, Bozeman, She is National Board Certified in Early Adolescent Mathematics.

Renee Moore, the 2001 Mississippi Teacher of the Year, taught for 17 years, with eight of those as lead teacher at Broad Street High School in Shelby, Miss. She began teaching part-time at the college level in 1994 and recently accepted a full-time position at Mississippi Delta Community College. Moore, who is a National Board Certified Teacher (Adolescent/Young Adult English Language Arts), received the Milken National Educator Award in 2001. She has served as a Carnegie Fellow and was the first practicing classroom teacher to be appointed to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. She is also a member of the Mississippi Commission on Teacher and Administrator Licensure. She has published a number of articles about culturally engaged instruction and is co-author of *Teaching 2030*, published by Teachers College Press (2010).

Shelly Moore, a National Board Certified Teacher, is a high school English and drama teacher at Ellsworth Community High School in Wisconsin who has 13 years of teaching experience. She describes her calling as teaching self-confidence and creative expression to students by directing school musicals and plays and coaching forensics and other academic competition teams. She is past president of the Alliance for Wisconsin Theatre Education. Moore holds a bachelor's degree in English, Political Science, and Theatre Arts from the University

of Wisconsin-Stevens Point and a Master of Science in English Education from University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

Lori Nazareno, who holds two certifications from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, has 23 years of experience working in high-needs schools in Denver and Miami. She currently serves as co-lead teacher in Denver's Mathematics and Science Leadership Academy. This innovative school is a teacher-led school that utilizes a peer-review and evaluation system. Nazareno is a recognized teacher leader at the local, state, and national level and has served on the Board of Directors for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, as well as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Advisory Board for Innovative Professional Development.

Haydee Rodriguez teaches U.S. Government and Theatre at Southwest High School in El Centro, CA. In 2005, Rodriguez achieved National Board Certification (Social Studies), was named the Imperial County Teacher of the Year, and was selected by Rotary International to represent Southern California in a Group Study Exchange to West Africa. She served on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Social Studies-History Committee in 2009, and was recently appointed to a three-year term on the NBPTS Board of Directors. Rodriguez earned a bachelor's degree in Social Sciences (History) in 1998 from San Diego State University. In 2002, she earned a Master's in Education from Stanford University. While at Stanford she worked tirelessly with the other founders of East Palo Alto High School to create a teacher-led/student-centered school.

Kathleen Skinner is director of the Center for Education Policy and Practice at the Massachusetts Teachers Association. As an urban educator, she taught for 15 years in the Somerville Public Schools as a high school English and social studies teacher, an elementary reading specialist, and a dropout prevention specialist. She was the assistant principal at Gloucester High School for five years where she focused on school change, professional development, and accountability, and then she was director of Professional Development, Program Review and Evaluation with the Lawrence Public Schools. Skinner is a National Board Certified Teacher (Adolescent/Young Adult English Language Arts) and the founding president of the New England Chapter of Learning Forward (formerly NSDC). She is the author of various education policy papers on teacher preparation, teacher career paths, and teacher evaluation. She completed her dissertation on *The Roles and Responsibilities of Teacher Union Presidents* (1993) at the University of Massachusetts–Lowell.

Peggy Stewart, the 2005 New Jersey State Teacher of the Year, has taught social studies at Vernon Township High School for the past 18 years. She is currently director of Professional Learning and Communications with the New Jersey Center for Teaching and Learning and chairs the New Jersey Professional Teaching Standards Board. As a member of the New Jersey International Education Task Force, Stewart created professional development programs that she presented for educators throughout New Jersey. In 2005, Stewart was awarded the U.S.-Eurasia Awards for Excellence in Teaching and in 2007, Princeton University's Prize

for Distinguished Secondary School Teaching. She earned a master's degree from Ramapo College in 1996 and became a National Board Certified Teacher in 2005.

Mary K. Tedrow, the 2001 Frederick County (Virginia) Teacher of the Year, is a high school English teacher in Winchester, VA. She also co-directs the Northern Virginia Writing Project and is adjunct professor at George Mason University and Lord Fairfax Community College. She successfully renewed her National Board Certification (AYA English Language Arts) in 2010. Tedrow has a B.A. with a major in English and a minor in journalism, and in 1999, she earned a Master of Science in Education, with an emphasis in teaching, from Shenandoah University.

Andy Tompkins became president and CEO of the Kansas Board of Regents on June 1, 2010. Prior to that, he served as the Kansas State Department of Education's Commissioner of Education (1996-2005). Throughout his career, Tompkins has served in various roles in K-12 and higher education. He has been a high school teacher, principal, superintendent, university associate professor, department chair, and college dean. He was inducted into the Kansas Teacher's Hall of Fame in 2001. He was recognized as a Master Teacher in 1999 and was awarded the Leadership Kansas Alumnus of the Year Award in 2002.

William Thomas, the 2009 Maryland Teacher of the Year, is a social studies teacher specializing in local, state, and national governments, who teaches Advanced Placement government at Dr. Henry A. Wise Jr. High School in Prince George's County. During his career, Thomas has been recognized several times for exceptional teaching. In 2005, he received both the Prince George's County Outstanding Teacher Award and the Myrtle Fentress Outstanding Educator Award. He was awarded the Sallie Mae First Year Teacher Award in 1999. Thomas holds a bachelor's degree in social studies from the State University of New York at Albany and earned a Master of Education (with a concentration in reading) from Bowie State University. He earned National Board Certification (AYA Social Studies-History) in 2008.

Lynette Wayne is a first-grade teacher at Christa McAuliffe Elementary School in Hastings, MN. In 2000, she earned National Board Certification (EC/Generalist) and was named the Hastings Chamber of Commerce Teacher of the Year. Her numerous honors include being a 2005 Minnesota Teacher of the Year Finalist, participating in the 2006 Japan Fulbright Memorial Fund Program, and receiving the 2008 NEA Member Benefits Award for Teaching Excellence. Wayne founded the Hastings Teacher Support Network and currently serves as president of Education Minnesota – Hastings. As a member of a merged state affiliate, she has held numerous leadership positions in both NEA and AFT. She successfully renewed her National Board Certification in 2009 and was recently appointed to a three-year term on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Kathleen Wiebke is executive director of the Arizona K-12 Center in Phoenix, AZ., which provides professional development to preK-12 educators. She is a National Board Certified Teacher (middle childhood, generalist), who has served as deputy associate superintendent at the Arizona Department of Education. She has also worked as a principal and teacher in the Paradise Valley Unified School District. Wiebke was recently appointed to a three-year term on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Board of Directors.

Advisory Committee Members

The Commission would like to publicly thank members of the Advisory Committee for:

- ▶ *Encouraging the Commission to think differently, consider diverse viewpoints, and stray from perceived “comfort zones” around issues related to teacher quality;*
- ▶ *Participating in Advisory Committee meetings;*
- ▶ *Contributing their best thinking to Commission discussions;*
- ▶ *Reviewing Commission proposals and providing feedback; and*
- ▶ *Challenging Commission recommendations and ideas.*

Barnett Berry, Center for Teaching Quality

Tim Daly, The New Teacher Project

Charlotte Danielson, The Danielson Group

Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University

Terri Dozier, Virginia Commonwealth University

Laura Goe, American Institute for Research and Educational Testing Service

Frederick (Rick) Hess, American Enterprise Institute

Gloria Ladson-Billings, University of Wisconsin - Madison

Susan Moore-Johnson, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Joyce Powell, NEA Executive Committee

Sharon Robinson, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Lee Shulman, Stanford University

Mark Simon, Economic Policy Institute and Mooney Institute for Teacher and Union Leadership

Gary Sykes, Understanding Teacher Quality Research Center, ETS

Guadalupe Valdes, Stanford University

Yong Zhao, University of Oregon Center for Advanced Technology in Education

Panelists and Discussants

The Commission extends a special thank you to the presenters, discussants, and pre-service student leaders who met with the Commissioners to share their thoughts on the current state of the teaching profession and how the policies and processes governing the profession might be re-imagined to ensure a highly effective and respected profession.

Jo Anderson, U.S. Department of Education
John Bangs, National Union of Teachers
Charles Barone, Democrats for Education Reform
Barnett Berry, Center for Teaching Quality
Josh Biber, Teach for America
Cindy Brown, Center for American Progress
Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University
Arne Duncan, U.S. Department of Education
Shari Francis, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
Richard Lemons, Education Trust
Peter McWalters, Council of Chief State School Officers
Lynn Olson, Gates Foundation
Becky Pringle, National Education Association
Sharon Robinson, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Marc Simon, Economic Policy Institute and Mooney Institute for Teacher and Union Leadership
Dennis Van Roekel, National Education Association

NEA Advisory Committee of Student Members

Tommie Leaders, Chair
Margaret-Suzanne Bell, Pacific Region
Renatae Cuffee, Mid-Atlantic Region
Amanda Frost, Midwest Region
Megan Funaro, Northeast Region
Amber Mills, Western Region
Samantha Roberts, Southeast Region
Molly Rogers, Mid-Atlantic Region
Michael Ruggless, Midwest Region

NEA Staff Team

The Commission appreciates the commitment, support, and dedication of this NEA team.

Margaret Anderson, NEA Teacher Quality
Monique Bailey, NEA Teacher Quality
Jillian Darwish, Commission Facilitator
Segun Eubanks, NEA Teacher Quality
Donna Harris-Aikens, NEA Education Policy and Practice
Nancy Henderson, Commission Historian
Alexis Holmes, NEA Education Policy and Practice
Michelle Hudgins, NEA Public Relations
Karen Johnson, NEA Education Policy and Practice
Doug Lea, NEA Teacher Quality
Judith McQuaide, NEA Research
Richelle Patterson, NEA Teacher Quality
Andrea Prejean, NEA Education Policy and Practice

