Section 11

Keeping Current
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms
Assessment

AHSA – Alternative High School Assessment (formerly known as the Special Review Assessment or SRA) is an alternative assessment that provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate their mastery of the Core Curriculum Content Standards (CCCS) for the purposes of satisfying the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) graduation requirement. Students who fail to demonstrate proficiency in one or both HSPA content areas must participate in the AHSA process. The AHSA process begins with remedial instruction and is followed by the administration to the student of performance assessment tasks in the respective content area. Students must pass a certain number of these tasks, which are aligned to the CCCS, to satisfy the HSPA requirement. They may also satisfy that requirement through re-test administrations of the HSPA.

APA - Alternate Proficiency Assessment – The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates the participation of all students with disabilities in statewide assessments. States must develop and conduct alternate assessments for students who cannot participate in the general statewide testing program. The New Jersey APA is a portfolio assessment by which evidence of student progress is collected during several months. The portfolios are scored by the state and results contribute to district/school adequate yearly progress calculations under No Child Left Behind.

CRT – Criterion-Referenced Tests are intended to measure how well a person has learned a specific body of knowledge and skills – the Core Curriculum Content Standards (CCCS). The statewide assessments are CRTs.

HSPA – High School Proficiency Assessment was implemented in 2002 as a high school graduation requirement, replacing an earlier high school test that pre-dated the development of the CCCS. The HSPA measures student achievement of the knowledge and skills in the language arts literacy and math CCCS. Passing both sections of the test is a requirement for receiving a high school diploma.

LAL – Language Arts Literacy integrates verbal skills needed for critical thinking and communication.

NAEP – National Assessment of Educational Progress is sometimes referred to as “the nation’s report card.” It biennially measures student achievement levels in reading and math at grades 4 and 8, and in other selected subjects in alternate years. While NAEP does not provide student- or school-performance data, its national, state-level and sub-population data inform educational policy-making and assist states in measuring the rigor of statewide assessment programs.

NCES – National Center for Education Statistics is the branch of the U.S. Department of Education that collects and reports statistics about schools in all 50 states. http://nces.ed.gov/
NJ ASK — New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge is the state’s elementary and middle school assessment program covering grades 3 through 8. NJ ASK is intended to provide information about student progress toward mastery of the skills specified by the CCCS in language arts literacy and math at each grade level, and science at grades 4 and 8.

NRT — Norm-Referenced Tests compare test takers to each other on a given set of criteria not aligned with state standards. NRTs often provide percentile rankings rather than proficiency designations.

SCASS -- State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards was created by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to help states design assessments in a variety of subject areas.

TIMSS -- Third International Mathematics and Science Survey is an international comparative study designed to provide information about educational achievement and learning contexts for the participating countries in mathematics and science in grades 7 and 8.

Bilingual Education/ESL

ACCESS for ELLs English language proficiency test is a large-scale test administered annually to English language learners (ELLs). It measures students’ growth in English language skills in relation to the academic English language proficiency (ELP) standards.

AMAOs -- Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives are performance targets that include:

• Making progress toward English language proficiency as measured by the state’s ELP assessment;

• Attaining English language proficiency as measured by the ELP assessment;

• Meeting annual yearly progress (AYP) targets as measured by the state content assessment.

ELL -- English Language Learners are pupils whose native language is other than English and who have difficulty speaking, reading, writing or understanding the English language as measured by an English language proficiency test. Thus, they require bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English.

ELS -- English Language Services are designed to improve the English language skills of students with limited English proficiency. These services are provided in school districts with less than 10 students of limited English proficiency and are in addition to the regular school program.

ESL -- English as a Second Language programs in K-12 education require a daily developmental second language program of up to two periods of instruction based on student need. Programs offer listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing in English using second-language teaching techniques. Teachers also incorporate the cultural aspects of the students’ experiences into ESL instruction.
LEP -- Limited English Proficient is defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:15-1.2 as pupils whose native language is other than English and who have difficulty speaking, reading, writing 4 or understanding the English language as measured by an English language proficiency test. Thus, they require bilingual or ESL programs in order to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English.

NJTESOL/NJBE -- New Jersey Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages/New Jersey Bilingual Education is a chapter of the two national associations. This professional organization has been established for educators concerned with the teaching of English as a second language and bilingual education.

Sheltered English Instruction is an approach used to make academic instruction in English understandable to LEP students. Sheltered English classes are taught by regular classroom teachers who have received training on strategies to make subject area content comprehensible for LEP students.

WIDA -- World-class Instructional Design and Assessment is a consortium of 19 partner states that has developed English language proficiency standards and an English language proficiency test (ACCESS for ELLs®) aligned with the standards to comply with Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act.

WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards for English Language Learners in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 were developed by WIDA. They are the standards and language competencies that LEP students in pre-K programs and elementary and secondary schools need to become fully proficient in English and to have unrestricted access to grade-appropriate instruction in challenging academic subjects.

Early Childhood Education

CCP -- Certified Childcare Professional is a credential earned by teachers for their knowledge of early childhood development and their skills in working with young children. The credential means that the candidate has, at a minimum, 180 hours of continuing education credit, 720 hours of classroom experience and has passed the exam.

CDA -- Child Development Associate is the national credential for early care and education teachers who have met the CDA competency standards or 120 hours of formal education through an agency or organization with expertise in child development or early childhood teacher preparation. Only the Council for Professional Recognition can award a CDA credential. 11

Creative Curriculum is an early childhood education curriculum developed by Teaching Strategies that applies child development and learning theories to an education environment that focuses planning around indoor and outdoor interest areas.

Curiosity Corner is an early childhood education curriculum developed by the Success for All Foundation that fosters cognitive, linguistic, social, physical and emotional development of three- and four-year-olds in a theme-based environment.
Developmental Screening is an assessment that screens preschool children by quickly sampling their skills across areas of language, reasoning, gross motor, fine motor and social development. It is required that all three- and four-year-old children in former Abbott districts be administered an initial screening device, such as the Early Screening Inventory-Revised (Meisels et al., 1997), regardless of whether they are enrolled in a district preschool program. This information is never used to determine or deny placement. Screening is always the first step in the assessment process as it does not provide enough information to identify children as needing special education services.

DCF -- Department of Children and Families partners with DOE in implementing early childhood education programs.

DHS -- Department of Human Services is responsible for licensing childcare providers and funding wrap-around services for the providers.

DYFS -- Division of Youth and Family Services is a division within DCF with responsibility for childcare licensing, child protection and child welfare, among other programs.

ECERS-R -- Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised is designed to assess group programs for children of preschool through kindergarten age. It is used to evaluate each component of a preschool classroom from the quality of interactions, materials and activities to the way in which the classroom is arranged.

Family Worker is a position required in every early childhood education program in a private-provider setting serving former Abbott school districts. There must be one family worker for every 45 children and their families being served by the agency. In conjunction with the school district, agency and parents, the family worker ensures that parents and children obtain necessary health and social services.

Full-Day Preschool is a preschool program consisting of a six-hour comprehensive educational program and day in accordance with the school district’s grade one through 12 daily school calendar and not exceeding the 10-month academic period.

High/Scope Preschool Curriculum is an early childhood education curriculum developed by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation that encourages children to make choices about materials and activities throughout the day to foster developmentally important skills and abilities.

Master Teacher is a position required in every former Abbott early childhood education program. There must be at least one master teacher for every 20 early childhood education classrooms to coordinate early childhood education programs and assist in the provision of professional development in early childhood education. Master teachers who specialize in supports for English Language Learners and inclusion of children with special needs are also provided.

NAEYC -- National Association for the Education of Young Children is a Washington, D.C.-based organization of early childhood educators and advocates dedicated to improving the quality of programs for children from birth through third grade.
NJAELYC -- New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children is an affiliate group of the NAEYC.

Preschool Education Aid (See State Aid/School Data)

P-3 -- Preschool through Grade 3 Endorsement is a credential that is required as of Sept. 1, 2001, for any new preschool teacher in a former Abbott district in either a district program or private-provider setting.

Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards is a document containing guidelines for creating developmentally appropriate preschool learning environments that promote early literacy and other important goals. The guidelines support and prepare young children to meet New Jersey's Core Curriculum Content Standards when they enter kindergarten.

Private Providers are early childhood agencies in the community that contract with school districts to provide the mandated early childhood programs for three- and four-year-olds.

Targeted Preschool are preschool programs for all at-risk preschool children in school districts other than those school districts required to provide universal preschool.

Tools of the Mind is a comprehensive preschool curriculum based on the work of Lev Vygotsky. Teachers scaffold children's learning in all domains during play and classroom activities. All components include a focus on self-regulation.

Universal Preschool includes preschool programs for all age-eligible resident three- and four-year-old children in District Factor Group (DFG) A and B school districts and DFG CD school districts with a concentration of at-risk children equal to or greater than 40 percent.

High-Need School Districts

At-Risk School District is a district as defined in P.L. 2007. c.260.

Abbott School District refers to the following 28 urban school districts that were litigants in Raymond Abbott v. Fred G. Burke decided by the New Jersey Supreme Court on June 5, 1990, as follows: Asbury Park City; Bridgeton City; Burlington City; Camden City; East Orange City; Elizabeth City; Garfield City; Gloucester City; Harrison Town; Hoboken City; Irvington Township; Jersey City; Keansburg Borough; Long Branch City; Millville City; New Brunswick City; Newark City; City of Orange Township; Passaic City; Paterson City; Pemberton Township; Perth Amboy City; Phillipsburg Town; Pleasantville City; Trenton City; Union City; Vineland City; and West New York Town. The following school districts were added to the original 28 Abbott school districts pursuant to statute: Neptune Township, Plainfield and Salem City. The Abbott designation was eliminated when the School Funding Act, P.L. 2007 c. 260 was enacted.

CCCS -- Core Curriculum Content Standards (see Standards)
CSA -- Chief School Administrator is a term that refers to a district superintendent, including former Abbott school districts or the state school district superintendent in the case of a state-operated school district.

ELC -- Education Law Center is the legal entity that represents the school districts previously designated as Abbott districts in all court proceedings and oversees the actions taken to carry out the court’s decisions.

High-Need School District is a school district in which 40 percent or more of the students are “at-risk” as defined in P.L. 2007, c.260 and is at one or more of the following proficiency levels on state assessments:

1. Less than 85 percent of total students have achieved proficiency in language arts literacy on the N. J. Assessment of Skill and Knowledge (NJ ASK) 3;

2. Less than 80 percent of total students have achieved proficiency in language arts literacy on the NJ ASK 8;

3. Less than 80 percent of total students have achieved proficiency in language arts literacy on the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA);

4. Less than 85 percent of total students have achieved proficiency in mathematics on the NJ ASK 4;

5. Less than 80 percent of total students have achieved proficiency in mathematics on the NJ ASK 8; and/or

6. Less than 80 percent of total students have achieved proficiency in mathematics on the HSPA.

Secondary Education School District is a school district that includes students in at least two of the grades from six through 12 pursuant to N.J.A.C 6A:13

Standards-Based Reform is the process by which schools and school districts work to align school district and/or school curriculum to the CCCS and assure that instructional practice and professional development are effective and driven by the curriculum.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

Achievement Gap Title I requires schools to close achievement gaps across several subgroups of students, assuring that each group meets the same benchmarks as they move toward meeting the federal Title I goal of 100 percent proficiency in language arts literacy, mathematics and science by 2014.

Accountability requires schools to be responsible for progress and achievement for all students and subgroups.
**AYP -- Adequate Yearly Progress** Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, schools not making AYP for any of the state assessments for two consecutive years are designated as in need of improvement. New Jersey has taken a proactive measure to inform schools not making AYP after one year by designating them as Early Warning to assist them in identifying areas in need of attention and to make any necessary adjustments to prevent not meeting AYP for another year.

**CAPA Team** -- Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement Team consists of educational practitioners, parents and other individuals assembled, trained and assigned by the Commissioner and the chief school administrator to implement the CAPA process in low-performing schools to bring about school improvement.

**Consolidated State Accountability Workbook** each state is required to submit a workbook to the United States Department of Education (USED) detailing the implementation of its single accountability system as regulated by NCLB.

**Corrective Action** is action taken that is consistent with state law and substantially and directly responds to the consistent academic failure of a school. It is designed to increase the likelihood that students enrolled in schools identified for corrective action will meet or exceed the state’s proficient levels of achievement on the state’s assessments.

**DINI** -- District In Need of Improvement means that the entire district did not meet the requirements for making AYP for two consecutive years.

**Early Warning for Unsafe Schools** The Unsafe School Choice Option policy sets forth a provision for schools to be designated as persistently dangerous when they meet the objective criteria for three consecutive years. New Jersey has taken a proactive measure to inform schools meeting the criteria for this designation after two consecutive years to assist them with reducing the number of violent incidents and subsequently avoiding the designation of persistently dangerous.

**Eligible Attendance Area** is the area where the percentage of children from low-income families who live in the school attendance area is equal to the district percentage, is at least 35 percent or is located in a single attendance area.

**ESEA -- Elementary and Secondary Education Act** is the principal federal law enacted in 1965 affecting education from kindergarten through high school. This law provides guidance and funds to schools throughout the United States. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 reauthorized ESEA. Prior to NCLB, the education reauthorization was called Improving America’s Schools Act.

**ESL** -- English as a Second Language (See Bilingual Education/ESL)

**Flexibility** is when communities have more options to determine how to best serve students.

**HQT -- Highly Qualified Teacher** under NCLB means any teacher hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year to teach in a Title I, Part A program must be “highly qualified.” In addition, the law requires all local educational agencies (LEAs) to have a plan to ensure that all teachers in the LEA
teaching subjects in the Core Curriculum Content Standards be “highly qualified” by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. The requirements can be found at

**HOUSE** -- High Objective Uniform State Evaluation (HOUSE) Standard establishes the federally sanctioned alternate criteria by which veteran teachers can demonstrate that they satisfy the highly qualified requirement in New Jersey.

**IASA** -- Improving America’s Schools Act was the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act. The act was amended in 1994 and was reauthorized in 2002 as No Child Left Behind.

**Intradistrict School Choice Children** are eligible for school choice when the Title I school they attend has not made AYP in improving student achievement, as defined by the state, for two consecutive years or longer and has been identified as in need of improvement.

**LEA** -- Local Education Agency (See State Aid and School Data)

**LEP** -- Limited English Proficient (See Bilingual Education/ESL)

**NCLB** -- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was signed into law on January 8, 2002. It reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the main federal law regarding K-12 education. The four main pillars of NCLB are: accountability; flexibility and local control; enhanced parental choice; and a focus on what works in the classroom. NCLB requires state governments and educational systems to help low-achieving students in high-poverty schools meet the same academic performance standards that apply to all students.

**Paraprofessional** is an employee who provides instructional support with Title I, Part A funds.

**Parent Involvement** is the participation of parents in regular, two-way, meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other social activities that play an integral role in assisting their child’s learning.

**Parent’s Right to Know** is a provision in NCLB that requires schools receiving Title I, Part A funds to notify at the beginning of the school year parents of each student that they can request and receive information on the professional qualifications of the student’s classroom teacher. Additionally, the law requires that if a student is being taught by a teacher who is not highly qualified, parents are to be notified after four consecutive weeks.

**PDS** -- Persistently Dangerous School is a public elementary or secondary school building (except for regional day schools, educational services commissions and special services school districts) that meets the objective criteria of persistently dangerous established by DOE for three consecutive years and is part of an LEA that receives funds under NCLB. The most current available data from the Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System (EVVRS) is used to identify persistently dangerous schools on or before July 31 of each year, in compliance with federal regulations (68-FR 16789). [http://www.nj.gov/njded/profdev/nclb/](http://www.nj.gov/njded/profdev/nclb/).
Safe Harbor is the method for making AYP if student subgroups do not meet performance targets. The percentage of students scoring non-proficient must be reduced by at least 10 percent for each student subgroup that did not meet performance targets.

School Attendance Area is the geographic area in which the children served by a particular school reside.

School Report Card contains statistical profiles of all public schools in the state and is an important element in New Jersey’s continuing commitment to set high standards, measure school progress and report results to the public each year.

Schoolwide Program is a program using Title I funds to address the entire school curriculum and the varied educational needs of children living in impoverished communities with comprehensive strategies for improving the entire school’s academic performance. At least 40 percent of the children enrolled in the school or residing in the school attendance area must be from low-income families to qualify.

Scientifically Based Research involves the application of rigorous, systematic and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs.

Single Accountability System The state has a single accountability system for all public schools, districts and charter schools. The state’s accountability system requires AYP decisions for all public schools.

Single Attendance Area is a school district with either one school, less than 1,000 students or has only one grade span.

SINII -- Schools in Need of Improvement is a designation based on making AYP, which is calculated using 40 primary indicators (test participation and scores) and one secondary indicator (attendance or high school graduation). Schools that do not meet the benchmark on one or more of the indicators for two consecutive years are designated as “in need of improvement.” The 40 primary indicators are based on meeting a 95 percent participation rate in language arts literacy and math tests, as well as meeting AYP benchmark targets for the math and language arts literacy (LAL) tests. Data are then examined by looking at 10 subgroups for both tests.

SES -- Supplemental Educational Services refers to extra academic instruction provided to income-eligible students who attend a Title I SINI. Extra help in LAL and math must be provided outside of the regular school day. SES is mandated by NCLB for students attending Title I schools in their second year and beyond of being designated as in need of improvement. DOE maintains a list of approved schools and educational agencies that offer SES.

SESA -- Supplemental Educational Services Agreement is used for parents of eligible children attending Title I schools to enter into a service agreement with a supplemental education service provider. SES provides extra academic assistance for eligible children. Students from low-income families who are attending Title I schools that are in their second year of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress for three or more years), in corrective action or in restructuring status are eligible to receive these services.
Student Subgroup: All students, as well as nine identified subgroups, must meet the proficient target in order for a school to make AYP. The nine student subgroups are: special education; LEP; economically disadvantaged; white; African American; American Indian; Asian/Pacific Islander; Hispanic; and other.

Targeted Assistance Program: is a Title I program that directs funds and provides services only to identified children who are in most need of academic support/enrichment.

Federal Title programs:

TITLE I, PART A supports programs and resources aimed at improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged.

TITLE I, PART D serves neglected and delinquent youth in institutions, community day programs and correctional facilities to assure they attain high academic levels of performance.

TITLE II, PART A provides resources for improving teacher and principal quality and increasing the number of highly qualified teachers and principals in classrooms and schools.

TITLE II, PART D facilitates comprehensive and integrated educational technology strategies that target specific needs of individual schools.

TITLE III, PART A focuses on teaching of English to limited English proficient (LEP) children, including immigrant children and youth.

TITLE IV, PART A provides resources for fostering a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.

TITLE V, PART A provides a flexible source of funding to assist LEAs in the development and implementation of various innovative reforms.

TITLE VI, PART B addresses unique needs of rural school districts.

TITLE IX covers general provisions applicable to some/all of the programs, including equitable participation of nonpublic school students and teachers in NCLB programs.

TTT -- Troops to Teachers is a federal program that seeks to place experienced former military personnel as teachers in school districts serving high concentrations of low-income families. TTT helps relieve teacher shortages, especially in math, science, special education and other high-needs subject areas, and assists military personnel in making successful transitions to careers in teaching.

USCO -- Unsafe School Choice Option policy (Title IX, Part E, Subpart 2, SEC. 9532) establishes the criteria and actions necessary for school districts and DOE to ensure a safe learning environment for students. Students attending a persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary school, or who become a victim of a violent criminal offense, as determined by state law, while in or on the grounds of the public school the student attends are provided with an option to transfer to a safe public elementary school or secondary school within the LEA.
Professional Standards and Development

HQT -- Highly Qualified Teacher (See NCLB)

NBPTS -- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards establishes rigorous standards for what effective teachers should know and be able to do; develops and operates a national voluntary system to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards; and advances related education reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in public schools. The national board sets advanced standards in more than 30 certificated fields.

NJHIRE is DOE’s Internet-based hiring system that helps match teachers seeking jobs with districts in search of applicants.

NJPEP -- N. J. Professional Education Port-Virtual Academy (www.nj.gov/education/njpep/) provides support to the educational community in the understanding and implementation of the Core Curriculum Content Standards, statewide and local assessments, and the integration of 21st century knowledge and skills and global perspectives through professional learning that inspires, leads to reflection and fosters collaboration with peers and students.

NJPTSB -- N. J. Professional Teaching Standards Board is an advisory board appointed by the Commissioner of Education to oversee the implementation of the continuing education regulations for teachers. Nineteen members comprise the board and include the following: 10 classroom teachers; two college representatives, with at least one representing a teacher education program; three district administrators; two members of local boards of education; and two members of the general public. The primary role of the board is to advise the Commissioner with regard to implementation of the professional development requirements for teachers.

PAEMST -- Presidential Awards for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching is a program administered by the National Science Foundation (NSF) that identifies outstanding math and science teachers in each of four categories -- elementary mathematics and science and secondary mathematics and science. Each Presidential honoree’s school receives a $7,500 grant to be spent under the honoree’s direction during a five-year period to improve math or science programs.

PDS -- Professional Development Schools are collaborative school/university/community partnerships focused on improving the education of practicing and prospective teachers; strengthening knowledge and practice in teaching; and enhancing the profession by serving as models of school/university collaboration. The partnerships address student learning problems, shared teaching, collaborative research on the problems of educational practice and cooperative supervision.

Professional Standards for School Leaders define the knowledge, dispositions and performances expected of New Jersey principals and school administrators. The standards serve as the basis of the state’s program approval process for school leader preparation and as a guide for the professional development of school leaders.
Professional Standards for Teachers define the knowledge, dispositions and performances expected of New Jersey teachers, and serve as the basis of the state's program approval process for teacher preparation and as a guide for the professional development of teachers.

SAELP -- State Action for Education Leadership Project is a national project to strengthen school leaders through the development of state-level policy and regulations that promote the recruitment, preparation, assessment/certification, development and retention of a diverse pool of school leaders whose primary mission is to enhance teaching, learning and student achievement. New Jersey was selected as one of 15 states funded by the DeWitt-Wallace Funds to develop and pilot policies that would attract, develop and retain high-quality principals and superintendents, particularly for high-need schools.

Title II, Part A -- Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program is federally funded under Title II, Part A of NCLB. Its purpose is to increase student academic achievement through strategies, such as improving teacher and principal quality through high-quality professional development, as well as increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

Special Education

APR -- Annual Performance Report is a federally mandated report of each state's performance in implementing the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

CST -- Child Study Team consists of a school psychologist, a learning disabilities teacher/consultant and school social worker who are employees of the school district responsible for conducting evaluations to determine eligibility for special education and related services for students with disabilities.

ESY -- Extended School Year means special education and related services provided to a student with a disability beyond the normal school year in accordance with the student's IEP and at no cost to the parent.

FAPE -- Free, Appropriate Public Education consists of special education and related services that are provided at public expense under public supervision and direction and without charge to parents; meet state and federal requirements; include preschool, elementary or secondary school education; and are provided according to an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

IDEA -- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is the federal statute that mandates a FAPE for students with disabilities. In New Jersey, students ages 3 through 21 are included.

IEP -- Individualized Education Program is a written plan developed at a meeting that includes appropriate school staff and parents. It determines the special education program for a student with disabilities through individually designed instructional activities constructed to meet goals and objectives established for the student. It establishes the rationale for a student's placement and documents the provision of FAPE.
**IEP Team** -- Individualized Education Program Team is the group of individuals who are responsible for the development, review and revision of the student's individualized education program. The team comprises the parent, the student (if appropriate), required school personnel and other knowledgeable individuals at the discretion of the school district or parent.

**LRC** -- Learning Resource Center is one of several centers that form a statewide network designed to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities ages 3 to 21. The centers provide professional development activities, technical assistance and statewide dissemination of educational materials, practices and techniques for educators, parents, paraprofessionals, child study teams and administrators. The program is intended to influence the design and implementation of special education programs. The LRC network includes two centers in the northern region, one center in the central region and one center in the southern region of the state. Each LRC project consists of two program components -- activities for educators and parents of students with disabilities ages 5 to 21 and activities for educators and preschoolers with disabilities ages 3 to 5.

**LRE** -- Least Restrictive Environment sets the standard that students with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled to the maximum extent appropriate. It means that special classes, separate schooling or other removal of students with disabilities from the general educational environment should occur only when the severity of the disability is such that education in general education classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

**MKSD** -- Marie H. Katzenbach School for the Deaf under DOE provides educational and vocational services to deaf and multiply disabled deaf and hard-of-hearing children from birth through 12th grade. Residential services are provided to approximately half of the school’s students on a five-day-a-week basis.

**RDS** -- Regional Day Schools are schools for the handicapped as authorized by the State Facilities for the Handicapped Bond Fund (chapter 149, laws of 1973). The 11 schools are managed by the local school districts under contract DOE.

**SPP** -- State Performance Plan is a federally required plan of how each state will implement the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

---

**Standards (Academic)**

**CCCS** -- Core Curriculum Content Standards were first adopted in 1996 by the State Board of Education and revised and readopted by the board in 2004 and 2009. The standards are reviewed and revised every five years. CCCS include common expectations for student achievement grades pre-K to 12 in the following nine areas:

Standard 1: Visual and Performing Arts

Standard 2: Comprehensive Health and Physical Education
Standard 3: Language Arts Literacy

Standard 4: Mathematics

Standard 5: Science

Standard 6: Social Studies

Standard 7: World Languages

Standard 8: Technology

Standard 9: 21st Century Life and Careers

**CPIs** -- Cumulative Progress Indicators specify content or skills to be taught at specific grade levels and are cumulative -- that is, the progress indicators begin at a foundational or basic level and increase in complexity as students mature.

**Grade Level Clusters** establish the exit benchmark level for the CPIs. They may be grade-specific (e.g., by the end of grade 1, end of grade 2, etc.) or across several grades (e.g., K-4 or by the end of grade 4; 5-8 or by the end of grade 8, etc.).

**Strands** are organizational tools that help teachers locate related content and skills.

State and national organizations associated with the nine Core Curriculum Content Standards can be found under each of the areas at [http://www.nj.gov/njded/aps/cccs/](http://www.nj.gov/njded/aps/cccs/).
Professional Development Schools
Professional Development Schools

What are they?

“Professional Development Schools (PDS) are innovative institutions formed through partnerships between University professional education programs and P-12 schools. Their mission is professional preparation of candidates, faculty development, inquiry directed at improvement of practice and enhanced student learning.” National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, PDS Standards.

What are the benefits?

- **Stronger sense of professional community** - When teachers have a strong sense of professional community their morale is better and teacher commitment is higher. Teachers collaborate more with each other and administrators.

- **School based professional development** – PDS relationships help support innovative teaching practices and help teacher development as school leaders.

- **More adults in the classroom** – With many pre-service students (practicum and student teaching) in PDS on a regular basis P-12 students benefit from more adults to assist in the teaching learning process.

- **Reflective Practice** – PDS often encourage thoughtful inquiry into teaching and learning and which fosters a reflective teaching process.

- **New Leadership Opportunities** – Opportunities for teachers and administrators to serve as adjunct faculty and take on new leadership roles.

Professional Development Schools are by design an environment that combines the best theory, research and practice by fostering a collaborative community of learners!
What It Means to Be a Professional Development School

A Statement by the Executive Council and Board of Directors of the National Association for Professional Development Schools

www.napds.org
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What It Means to Be a Professional Development School

A Statement by the Executive Council and Board of Directors of the National Association for Professional Development Schools

Colleges and universities and P–12 schools and districts in the United States have often worked together to advance agendas of mutual interest. Such collaboration has been particularly noteworthy in the field of education where the goal of preparing and sustaining professional educators has enhanced the need for school–university collaborations. In the mid-1980s, thanks to the work of organizations such as the Holmes Group (now the Holmes Partnership) and the National Network for Educational Renewal, the term “Professional Development School” (PDS) emerged as a part of the nation’s educational discourse. Unique and particularly intense school–university collaborations, PDSs were designed to accomplish a four-fold agenda: preparing future educators, providing current educators with ongoing professional development, encouraging joint school–university faculty investigation of education-related issues, and promoting the learning of P–12 students. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) gave credence to the significance of Professional Development Schools by conducting a study that resulted in the publishing of the NCATE PDS Standards. That document identified five standards, twenty-one elements, and dozens of descriptors that could be used not only to evaluate the efficacy of a particular Professional Development School but also to determine the developmental state of that PDS.

Despite the valuable work of these PDS pioneers, in the two decades since “PDS” first hit the American educational landscape and in the six years since the publication of the NCATE PDS Standards, the term Professional Development School has come to be used to describe all manner of school–university relationships. In particular, educators seem to be routinely using PDS to describe any school–university relationship that engages in the preparation of new teachers. As such, the term has lost its authenticity as schools and universities have climbed on the PDS bandwagon without giving sufficient attention to the question, “What precisely does it mean to be a Professional Development School?”

It has become imperative that recognizing a PDS by some means be communicated throughout the educational world, particularly as PDSs have been praised in recent years as being among the most effective models for furthering educational goals. Arthur Levine,
in his 2006 report *Educating School Teachers*, cited PDSs as “a superb laboratory for education schools to experiment with the initiatives designed to improve student achievement” (p. 105). He further indicated that a PDS can “offer perhaps the strongest bridge between teacher education and classroom outcomes, academics and clinical education, theory and practice, and schools and colleges” (p. 105). Responding to Levine, Sharon Robinson, president and CEO of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), posited that PDSs “are emerging as particularly effective, evidence-based school–university partnership models in many sites across the nation, providing academic content and pedagogical instruction that is well integrated with extensive, closely supervised, hands-on in-school clinical experience” (2007, p. 2). We also know that PDSs have begun to be legislatively mandated. Thus, the proliferation of PDSs and their support by national education leaders provided a tacit mandate to the National Association for Professional Development Schools to articulate a deliberate set of essentials that would allow educators to “know” whether the relationships in which they work are indeed PDSs.

In an attempt to come to a common understanding of what it means to be a PDS, the NAPDS Executive Council and Board of Directors gathered twenty-two educators in August 2007 for a two-day Summit on Professional Development Schools entitled “En Route to a Common Understanding.” The participants in the summit, which was held in New Orleans, were all experienced with PDSs and represented not only the P–20 continuum but also a number of professional education associations that have played active roles in the PDS national initiative. The conversation produced agreement on nine essentials that the NAPDS maintains need to be present for a school–university relationship to be called a Professional Development School. Without having all nine, the relationship that exists between a school/district and college/university, albeit however strong, would not be a PDS. How individual PDSs meet these essentials will vary from location to location, but they all need to be in place to justify the use of the term “PDS.”

The nine required essentials of a PDS are:

1. **A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;**

2. **A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;**
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
8. Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.

The NAPDS posits the following narratives for each of the nine required essentials of a PDS to assist with the differentiation between PDSs and other forms of strong school–university partnership. Essentials 1 through 5 establish the philosophical underpinnings for PDSs, while essentials 6 through 9 describe the logistical requirements of a PDS relationship.

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community

Schools/districts, colleges/universities, and their respective teacher education units all have mission statements that may differ from those of their PDS partners. However, the mission statement of the PDS needs to reflect the essentials of the respective participants that pertain to the PDS work, as well as wider-ranging aspects that are involved in a relationship between/among entities. Thus, the scope of the PDS mission statement should provide an all-inclusive sense of the partnership that distinguishes the PDS from the participants, yet is reflective of their contributions, input, and involvement.

In addition to identifying the distinctive nature of the PDS relationship, the mission statement should also focus on two overarching goals: the advancement of the education profession and the improvement of P–12 learning. In furthering the education profession, the PDS
relationship should be all-inclusive in its promotion of professional growth across the continuum of pre-service teacher candidates, in-service educators, and college/university faculty and administrators.

The tenet that all students can learn becomes the sine qua non of the PDS work that must be conducted in ways that are unbiased, fair, and just for everyone in the school community. PDSs must provide safe environments where all students can learn, all students are comfortable, and all students are secure and physically, emotionally, and intellectually out of harm's way. The implication of a comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach scope than the mission of any partner is tied implicitly to this phrase.

PDSs may also extend themselves to the community outside the school/district and college/university gates. Ultimately, local businesses, agencies, and policymakers can become participants in the work of a PDS, and how their involvement is delineated becomes an expression of the PDS. P–12 parents and families may also be involved in the work of the PDS. While involvement of stakeholders beyond the school/district and college/university gates is not a required delineator, their participation can strengthen the PDS.

2. **A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community**

As noted in the prefatory comments above, the professional preparation of teacher candidates lies at the heart of the four-fold agenda of Professional Development Schools. PDSs, however, are more than simply places where teacher candidates complete their clinical experiences. Instead, they are schools whose faculty and staff as a collective whole are committed to working with college/university faculty to offer a meaningful introduction to the teaching profession. As such, PDSs create a school-wide culture that incorporates teacher candidates as full participants of the school community.

3. **Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need**

While PDSs focus, in part, on the preparation of new teachers, they also provide a venue for professional development of educators already in the field. Thus, continuous learning focused on an engaged community of learners is a critical feature of a PDS. The knowledge and skills of those involved in the PDS requires enhancement and refinement, including an infusion of data-based (qualitative and quantitative) state-of-the-art content. The
continued learning of those involved in the PDS requires that the activities that promote this learning be provided on a regular basis. The notion of selecting topics or themes and providing guided learning activities suggests that practice, reflection, and feedback, at the very least, need to be embedded in a series of working sessions with PDS participants.

Schools/districts provide professional development for teachers that is typically school-wide and/or district-wide. The intent of the professional development in a PDS is that it is specific to the PDS. Additionally, at any given time and for any given topic or theme, either or both P–12 faculty and college/university faculty could be involved in providing the professional development. Both faculties, as well, could be the recipients of the same professional development.

The community of learners, through action, results, and personal/professional expectation, determines the focus of the professional development of those involved in the PDS. What is fundamental to this aspect of professional development is the individual and collective self-reflection that establishes the direction of professional development.

4. **A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants**

The field of education tends to use the term “best practice” without always providing parameters for its application. As we look at the use of this term related to PDSs, implicit in best practice is the focus on providing improved and enhanced educational opportunities for all P–12 students. These opportunities, however, must be explicit and based on practice that is mutually determined by the PDS participants. We recognize that this determination implies that “theory” and “practice” be co-mingled in a way that will provide what is best for the learning of the P–12 students in the PDS. Incorporating a “theory to practice” model will necessitate discussion and shared decision-making among the participants. The intent of this statement is to honor: (a) the skill and expertise of P–12 faculty and the context in which they work on a daily basis and (b) the knowledge and expertise of college/university faculty. Therefore, the PDS should foster and encourage practice that is extraordinary or novel but also thoughtful. Concomitantly, the PDS also serves as a learning laboratory for the development of teacher candidates. Thus, on a continuum, teacher candidates, new teachers, veteran teachers, and college/university faculty are professionally developed via their work in the PDS.
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants

PDS participants both engage in and routinely reflect upon best practice. The structures and processes for advancing the planned study of the work of the PDS and its effects on P–12 student and teacher candidate learning are defined differently by each PDS, but those structures and processes must be deliberately planned and routinely conducted so that reflection and feedback are used to strengthen the work of the PDS.

In addition to routinely examining best practice, PDS participants also share their work with others, both within and outside of their PDS, as a way of contributing to the educational dialogue. This sharing can take many forms, including, but not limited to, conference presentations, inter-school and/or intra-school discussions, PDS-sponsored forums, and oral or written reports to school boards, parent organizations, and other community agencies.

6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved

A PDS involves, at a minimum, a relationship between one school/district and one college/university. Whether the PDS involves one or multiple relationships; various forms of conversations will naturally occur as the relationship takes shape. These conversations necessarily lead to a formalized, written document signed by the individuals responsible for negotiating on behalf of the respective participants. The document, which goes beyond agreements involving teacher candidate placements, should specifically identify the obligations of each entity, as well as the roles to be played by various individuals in maintaining and furthering the relationship. Conversations leading to the signing of the articulation agreement must not be restricted to single representatives from each entity but must include representatives of as many PDS participants as possible (e.g., P–12 teachers and administrators, college/university faculty and administrators, teacher candidates).

7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration

An organizational structure/arrangement must be in place that not only guides the work of the PDS but also allows for and encourages collaboration, reflection, and regular communication among participants. Meetings and discussions, both formal and informal,
should be held on a regular basis, with the regularity of formal meetings/discussions being at the discretion of participants. To help guide the work of the PDS, the structure that is developed will provide for decision-making over such issues as how the PDS functions, how evaluations of the PDS will be used, and how resources will be best invested for the benefit of the relationship. Participation in the structure may not necessarily be equal but should represent some equivalency of contribution based on the ongoing collaboration.

8. **Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings**

A successful PDS relationship requires the engaged involvement of both college/university and school/district personnel. Participants from both entities participate on a regular basis in fulfilling the mission of the PDS through both formal and informal roles.

Formal roles are those necessary functions that are defined by the PDS, have specific titles, and have detailed expectations and responsibilities for those assuming the roles. Examples of these roles might be: site coordinator, site liaison, site supervisor. Titles tend to be specific to each PDS and will vary, as will the expectations, responsibilities, and the individuals filling these roles. However, for each PDS, the roles need to be operationally defined, as would any job description. These roles are considered necessary but may not be sufficient for the operation of a PDS. In many PDSs, there are informal roles that are assumed short-term by any number of individuals. These informal roles tend to be more fluid, situation-specific, and, while perhaps helpful to the functioning of the PDS, are not precisely or explicitly stated in an articulated agreement.

In the same sense that colleges/universities and schools/districts have varying mission statements, so, too, do they have differing institutional cultures. While differences exist among P–12 schools/districts and colleges/universities, the roles and their associated expectations and responsibilities need to be respectful of and incorporate the differences among the various institutional cultures represented in the PDS. This type of boundary spanning is germane to the work that takes place in a PDS, is sensitive to the work that takes place in each culture, and accepts unconditionally the necessity for collaborative effort.
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.
Successful PDS work requires the dedication of significant resources beyond the normal operating scope of schools/districts and colleges/universities. Resources can take any of a variety of forms including, but not limited to: leadership, time, space, people, money, materials, expertise, and workload. The more traditional sense that resources are financial and or equal must be examined and not limited in light of the needs of the PDS. In the true sense of collaborative effort, resources for PDSs are not necessarily equal or on a one-to-one correspondence. However, at the core of sharing resources is that each participant agrees to dedicate and provide willingly that which it has available to strengthen the work of the PDS.

How educators, especially those in P–12 settings, are acknowledged for the work they do, the investment they make, and the involvement they have in PDS work must be determined in prescribed ways. While rewards and recognitions are not the incentives for which educators necessarily work, they are critical as an acknowledgement from the PDS about how participants are engaged. For example, a school-based liaison and a university faculty member who is school-based may have differentiated teaching schedules from others on their faculties; teachers who may take on the mentoring of new teachers in the building may receive additional funds for supplies or travel to a conference or tuition for a specialized workshop.

Conclusion
The NAPDS Executive Council and Board of Directors assert that these nine essentials are integral to the philosophies, policies, and processes of Professional Development School partnerships. The NAPDS has a responsibility as a steward for the PDS movement to encourage all PDS stakeholders to articulate their own unique relationships within a framework that allows P–20 educators the opportunity for a common understanding of what it means to work in a PDS partnership. As conveyed, these nine essentials allow for multiple variations in PDS work while maintaining some consistent expectations irrespective of the idiosyncratic nature of individual PDS partnerships. Armed with this common understanding, PDSs have the opportunity to forge their own individual policies and processes based on their own contextual needs, safe in the knowledge that they can describe the ways they have adhered to the nine overarching essentials. These essentials afford and encourage flexibility while maintaining some common assumptions.
We thank our gracious colleagues from valued P–20 associations for their wisdom in the creation of these nine essentials as the central tenet of Professional Development School work. We trust that PDSs will use the nine essentials to shape their own commitments, visions, and strategic planning efforts. Moreover, we believe that these essentials will provide insight for all school–university partnerships seeking to extend further the scope and magnitude of their existing relationships so that they can build toward a PDS culture. By expressing common expectations for PDS collaboration, the NAPDS believes the PDS movement will continue to establish itself as the preeminent model for partnerships between P–12 schools/districts and colleges/universities.
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Teacher Preparation Model
10 Design Principles for Clinically Based Preparation

1. Student learning is the focus: P-12 student learning must serve as the focal point for the design and implementation of clinically based teacher preparation, and for the assessment of newly minted teachers and the programs that have prepared them. Candidates need to develop practice that advances student knowledge as defined by, for example, the Common Core State Standards, for those subjects for which they have been developed.

2. Clinical preparation is integrated throughout every facet of teacher education in a dynamic way: The core experience in teacher preparation is clinical practice. Content and pedagogy are woven around clinical experiences throughout preparation, in course work, in laboratory-based experiences, and in school-embedded practice.

3. A candidate’s progress and the elements of a preparation program are continuously judged on the basis of data: Candidates’ practice must be directly linked to the InTASC core teaching standards for teachers and Common Core Standards, and evaluation of candidates must be based on students’ outcome data, including student artifacts, summative and formative assessments; data from structured observations of candidates’ classroom skills by supervising teachers and faculty; and data about the preparation program and consequences of revising it.

4. Programs prepare teachers who are expert in content and how to teach it and are also innovators, collaborators and problem solvers: Candidates must develop a base of knowledge, a broad range of effective teaching practices, and the ability to integrate the two to support professional decision-making. To be successful teachers in challenging and changing environments, candidates must learn to use multiple assessment processes to advance learning and inform their practice with data to differentiate their teaching to match their students’ progress. Further, effective teachers are innovators and problem solvers, working with colleagues constantly seeking new and different ways of teaching students who are struggling.

5. Candidates learn in an interactive professional community: Candidates need lots of opportunities for feedback. They must practice in a collaborative culture, expecting rigorous peer review of their practice and their impact on student learning.
6. Clinical educators and coaches are rigorously selected and prepared and
drawn from both higher education and the P-12 sector: Those who lead the next
generation of teachers throughout their preparation and induction must themselves be
effective practitioners, skilled in differentiating instruction, proficient in using assessment
to monitor learning and provide feedback, persistent searchers for data to guide and
adjust practice, and exhibitors of the skills of clinical educators. They should be specially
certified, accountable for their candidates’ performance and student outcomes, and
commensurately rewarded to serve in this crucial role.

7. Specific sites are designated and funded to support embedded clinical
preparation: All candidates should have intensive embedded clinical school experiences
that are structured, staffed, and financed to support candidate learning and student
achievement.

8. Technology applications foster high-impact preparation: State-of-the-art
technologies should be employed by preparation programs to promote enhanced
productivity, greater efficiencies, and collaboration through learning communities.
Technology should also be an important tool to share best practices across partnerships,
and to facilitate on-going professional learning.

9. A powerful R&D agenda and systematic gathering and use of data supports
continuous improvement in teacher preparation: Effective teacher education
requires more robust evidence on teaching effectiveness, best practices, and preparation
program performance. A powerful research and development infrastructure – jointly
defined by preparation programs, school districts, and practitioners – supports knowledge
development, innovation, and continuous improvement. While not every clinically based
preparation program will contribute new research knowledge or expand development,
each must systematically gather and use data, and become part of a national data network
on teacher preparation that can increase understanding of what is occurring and evidence
of progress in the field.

10. Strategic partnerships are imperative for powerful clinical preparation:
School districts, preparation programs, teacher unions, and state policymakers must
form strategic partnerships based on the recognition that none can fully do the job alone.
Each partner’s needs can be met better by defining clinically based teacher preparation as
common work for which they share responsibility, authority, and accountability covering
all aspects of program development and implementation.
A New, Clinically Based Model for Teacher Preparation

The Panel calls for clinically based preparation, which fully integrates content, pedagogy, and professional coursework around a core of clinical experiences. Ensuring that all teacher preparation programs follow these principles will require far more than tinkering with current models to increase opportunities for clinical practice or longer internships. However, significant innovations over the last two decades are helping point the way forward.

Major efforts led by reform-minded groups of education deans, institutions of higher education and teachers' unions have supported the creation of partnerships focused on building strong connections between the preparation of teachers and schools. They have created hybrid institutions called professional development and professional practice schools staffed and structured to simultaneously support student achievement and clinical preparation and, sometimes, the full continuum of teacher learning. They are intended to play a similar role to teaching hospitals in medical education. Many preparation programs have moved in this direction, guided, for example, by the principles of the Holmes Group and the Standards for Professional Development Schools created by NCATE with the field.

Other innovative programs have been initiated by districts, foundations, and community organizations in partnership with universities that have developed similar clinically based preparation models. Many of these programs, including urban teacher residencies, have been successful in terms of preparing more effective teachers, reducing teacher turnover, and improving student outcomes in the process.

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) recently profiled extensive clinical work underway in 67 colleges of education. The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation has developed a state-wide model that has leveraged state and philanthropic support to bolster clinical preparation in Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and a growing number of states. The Foundation provides $30,000/year stipends to prospective math and science teachers who agree to spend a year in clinically robust master's degree programs and teach for three years in low-income rural and urban secondary schools. Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows are placed in cohorts in well-run, high-needs schools where they are mentored by clinical faculty and expert teachers.

But these programs are not the norm, and few have fully integrated clinical preparation throughout the process of teacher education. They are often handicapped in their efforts by the lack of commitment among all partners to taking on new roles and responsibilities and by the lack of a supportive infrastructure, including institutional, district, and state policy and funding strategies. Clinically based approaches must have the commitment and support of the full complement of stakeholders who need to be involved.

Clinically based approaches, the Panel believes, have numerous advantages over traditional practica and student teaching arrangements, and partnerships that exist in name only, in no small part because they address the context for teacher education preparation programs and require school districts to take on shared responsibility for teacher education. In clinically based programs, preparation programs learn more directly what they need to know about what schools really need and they enable districts to hire new teachers who are prepared to be effective in their schools. In these programs, teacher
preparation can more fully incorporate practitioner knowledge through the development of clinical faculty. Candidates can achieve the full value of embedded clinical experience because school districts will have committed to reallocating, restructuring and restaffing schools for clinical preparation. Students, the primary focus, can then benefit from functioning learning communities formed to support teacher learning and from the additional human resources that can be focused on their needs. Together, these partners can shift a program’s emphasis from learning about teaching to using knowledge to develop practice that effectively addresses students’ needs. It also calls for stringent new accountability mechanisms and the creation of reward structures that ensure that this takes place. This shift, the panel says, also better reflects the complex nature of professional practice.

New teachers need more than technical skills; they need a repertoire of general and subject-specific practices and the understandings and judgment to engage all students in worthwhile learning. They need to have opportunities to reflect upon and think about what they do, how they make decisions, how they “theorize” their work, and how they integrate their content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge into what they do. This can be accomplished through a combination of both school embedded practice and laboratory-type experiences. In a clinically based preparation program, laboratory experiences, school embedded learning and course work are integrated through a structure designed to help the candidate develop both the knowledge base and skills of professional practice. The lab experiences, experts say, are designed to support the investigation of practice, and embedded school experiences offer guided practice in real-life situations.

Engaging Academic Faculty in Clinical Preparation

Teacher education programs have developed strategies to help better acculturate college faculty to the needs of schools. For example, at National Louis University (NLU), faculty from arts and sciences and from education interested in working with the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) Urban Teacher Residency sign up for “Boot Camp.” This commits them to make four intensive visits to schools involved in the program. They must get to know the students, the communities, the district, and the challenges their students will encounter. This is required before they are accepted as faculty in the urban teacher residency program. NLU faculty must address how their teaching of candidates relates to addressing the needs of the students their candidates will teach. Another approach to engaging academic faculty in clinical preparation are the “PedLabs” at Boston College. Similar to a lab component of an undergraduate-level science course, a pedagogical lab is a one-credit add-on to a traditional three-credit arts and sciences course. Prospective teachers can elect to take that additional course. Each content area has a committee that includes education faculty; they design a course that focuses on ways to teach the content in a school setting. The arts and sciences faculty can observe their students teaching the content in their clinical experience and then provide feedback on their instructional strategies and on the representation of the content. At Montclair State University, arts and sciences faculty co-teach content methods courses and advise pre-service teachers. Montclair is one of the more than 25 partnerships that are members of the National Network for Educational Renewal that are working to revamp teacher preparation and P-12 schools through a collaboration of school and higher education institutions, including colleges of education and arts and sciences departments within the academy.
School embedded practice focuses on developing complex analytic and practical skills. It provides real-world context for developing a whole constellation of complex skills that are orchestrated differently in different contexts, including the full range of students’ cognitive and social-emotional developmental needs — and what the circumstances are in the classroom at the time. School-embedded experiences help teachers develop content-specific and general teaching skills and provide opportunities for candidates to become active members of learning communities, develop skills and dispositions associated with teaming, and work with parents within the community. A defined clinical curriculum will provide the prospective teacher with real responsibilities, the opportunity to make decisions and to develop skills to analyze student needs and adjust practices using student performance data while receiving continuous monitoring and feedback from mentors.

Equally important are much needed laboratory experiences embedded throughout the preparation program. Laboratory experiences provide prospective teachers opportunities to learn through on-line and video demonstrations, analyzing case studies representing both exemplary practice and common dilemmas, and participating in peer and micro-teaching. Such experiences offer the opportunity to analyze a virtual student's pattern of behavior, or engage candidates in the life of a virtual school, calling upon the candidates to investigate and make decisions, and to see the consequences of those decisions.

Clinically based education programs can take some lessons in integrating laboratory experiences, embedded clinical learning and course work from medical preparation. In some programs, medical students follow a cohort of patients from the day they enter medical education to the day they complete their training, even as they take coursework and work with simulated patients in the course of their preparation. In the problem-based method developed at Harvard Medical School, for example, case studies and simulations of problems in diagnosing patient conditions, or working with families are used to construct an integrated spiral curriculum. These same cases are revisited several times during a semester. This allows medical students, working in small groups guided by clinical and academic faculty, to approach real life issues of individual patients, in increasingly more knowledgeable and sophisticated ways as their course work adds to their knowledge base. A similar approach can be used for teacher candidates, addressing the learning needs of individual students, classes, and whole school issues.
Peer Coaching
Peer Coaching: Changing Classroom Practice and Enhancing Student Achievement

Les Foltos, Puget Sound Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology

Why Peer Coaching?

Over the last fifteen years, a growing number of educators have come to the conclusion that the workshop and conference format that make up most staff development is ineffective. Teachers say that traditional professional development doesn’t offer the sustained opportunities for collaboration, feedback, and reflection they need to change their classroom practice. At the same time, a different methodology for professional learning has emerged. Richard (2003) notes that more and more schools across the country are replacing traditional staff development with school-based staff developers. Boston and San Diego School Districts are pioneers of this method of preparing teachers, but they are just two examples of the dozens of school districts that have adopted peer coaching as a model for school-based staff development. The reasons for this shift are clear; research on effective staff development shows that a peer coaching methodology meets teachers’ needs and is effective at shaping classroom practice.

Researchers have noted that workshops that comprise most traditional staff development methodologies don’t provide sufficient time, activities, or content necessary to promote meaningful change (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Borman, & Yoon, 2001). Study results by Joyce and Showers (1996, 2002) show that fewer than 15% of teachers implement new ideas learned in traditional staff development settings such as workshops. The problem with these traditional approaches is that teachers often don’t have the skills or knowledge needed to apply what they learn in these workshops and have no way to receive support or feedback when they do attempt to apply what they have learned. Teachers need time to see new strategies modeled during the school day and opportunities to use new skills in developing and implementing learning activities (Garet, et al., 2001; Joyce and Showers 1996, 2002; Rodriguez and Knuth, 2000).

As they have studied the impact of traditional professional development, many researchers have identified the characteristics of effective staff development, and their findings are remarkably consistent. Alexander Russo (2004) summarized these research findings in a recent article. Effective staff development must be “ongoing, deeply embedded in teachers’ classroom work with children, specific to grade levels or academic content, and focused on research-based approaches. It also must help to open classroom doors and create more collaboration and sense of community among teachers in a school” (para. 8).

Russo noted that school-based coaching not only met these criteria “remarkably well,” it is consistent with the standards for effective staff development outlined by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC). For more than a decade the National Staff Development Council has studied the research on professional development with the goal
of improving the quality of teachers’ professional development. The NSDC has outlined standards for effective professional development based on its analysis of the research. In reviewing the NSDC’s standards, Russo noted coaching aligned with many of them. In particular, he noted coaching “...is focused on authentic student work, is closely tied to specific school or district’s curriculum and to teachers’ practice, takes place on a continuous basis, and relies heavily on research” (para. 9).

Does peer coaching affect academic achievement?

While peer coaching may be an effective model of staff development, many educators are asking hard questions about peer coaching and academic achievement. Does peer coaching actually affect student learning? Does it produce increases in academic achievement? There are increasing indications that coaching can affect academic achievement.

- Richard (2003) notes that coaching, which was part of a broader package of reforms, was producing test score improvements in the San Diego School District.
- Guiney (2001) looked at the impact of literacy coaching in Boston Public Schools and concluded that, “Several schools have had dramatic increases on parts of the state’s difficult test, the MCAS [Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System]—increases that can be directly connected to teachers’ work that was undertaken with their coaches” (para. 12).
- Branigan (2002) concluded that Missouri’s eMINTS program, which combines computer technology, an inquiry-based approach to teaching, and extensive professional development, including coaching, produced impressive results in students who took the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) test. “Results show that a higher percentage of students in eMINTS classrooms scored in the ‘Proficient’ or ‘Advanced’ categories...when compared with other students who took the MAP tests...” (para. 18).

Despite these promising findings, a recent study of peer coaching by Neufeld and Roper (2003) found that there is no conclusive evidence that coaching alone produces increases in academic achievement. Despite the lack of clear proof that coaching leads to increased academic achievement, Neufeld and Roper were quick to point out that “…coaching does increase the instructional capacity of school and teachers, a known prerequisite for increasing learning” (p. v). Their conclusion is shared by many leading researchers in the field.

Does peer coaching affect teacher practice?

Research findings indicate that school-based peer coaching plays an important role in improving teachers’ abilities to adopt and implement new teaching and learning practices. When comparing teachers who had worked with coaches with those who had not, Showers and Joyce (2002) found that teachers who worked with coaches:
• Practiced new strategies more often and with greater skill than teachers who were not coached.
• Retained and increased their new skills over time; teachers who were not coached did not.
• Demonstrated a clearer understanding of the purposes and uses of the new strategies than teachers who were not coached.

These same researchers also found that when teachers combined participation in traditional workshops with peer coaching or methodologies that promoted collaboration and reflection, more than 80% of teachers were using newly learned strategies in their classrooms (Joyce and Showers, 1996; Joyce, Murphy, & Showers, 1996; Richardson, 1999).

Over time, research had made it increasingly clear that one key to changing classroom practices is to provide teachers with opportunities for ongoing discussion and reflection. Methodologies that provide teachers with these chances for collaboration change teaching practice (Darling-Hammond, 1995, 1996; Garet et al., 2001; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992; Little, 1993; Loucks-Horsley, Stiles, & Hewson, 1996; Richardson, 1994; Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Richard, 2003; Showers and Joyce, 2002; Veenman and Denessen, 2001). Coaching is one methodology that encourages this type of professional collaboration. Teachers value coaching because it promotes their learning by offering them opportunities to become involved in meaningful discussions and planning, observing others, being observed, and receiving feedback (Carey and Frechtling, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998). Garet and several co-authors (2001) found that teachers from the same school who work together with coaches have more opportunities to “discuss concepts, skills, and problems that arise during their professional development experiences” and are “likely to share common curricular materials, course offerings, and assessment requirements” (p. 922).

Does peer coaching help teachers effectively integrate technology into classroom practice?

The peer coaching methodology has an impact on teaching practices in a variety of content areas, and also plays a powerful role in helping teachers integrate technology into their classroom learning activities. Teachers needed ongoing support as their proficiency in integrating technology into instruction grew. While teachers initially rely heavily on technical support, they need instructional support as they begin to use technology to support project based learning or interdisciplinary learning (White, Ringstaff, & Kelley, 2002). Peer coaching can provide the type of support teachers need as they begin to integrate technology with classroom activities that actively engage students in learning (Ike, 1997; Miller, 1998; Norton and Gonzales, 1998; Saye, 1998; Tenbusch, 1998; Yocam, 1996). One reason peer coaching is so useful for technology integration is that it provides both ongoing support and just-in-time support that teachers value (Brush et al., 2003).
Conclusion

While peer coaching is slowly finding its way into American schools, we have enough experience with this methodology to know that it is a proven technique which can change teacher practice. Experience with this form of professional development shows us the building blocks that need to be in place to make it successful. Like any other professional development methodology, coaching won’t be successful unless it is closely aligned with the school’s educational goals, budget, and other resources. If it is “integral to a larger instructional improvement plan that targets and aligns professional development resources toward the district’s goals,” Neufeld and Roper (2003) concluded that, “coaching can become a powerful vehicle for improving instruction, and, thereby, student achievement” (p. 26). Peer coaching is a cost-effective way for schools and school districts to meet their needs.
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Why Peer Coaching?

Over the last fifteen years, a growing number of educators have come to the conclusion that the workshop and conference format that make up most staff development is ineffective. Teachers say that traditional professional development doesn’t offer the sustained opportunities for collaboration, feedback, and reflection they need to change their classroom practice. At the same time, a different methodology for professional learning has emerged. Richard (2003) notes that more and more schools across the country are replacing traditional staff development with school-based staff developers. Boston and San Diego School Districts are pioneers of this method of preparing teachers, but they are just two examples of the dozens of school districts that have adopted peer coaching as a model for school-based staff development. The reasons for this shift are clear; research on effective staff development shows that a peer coaching methodology meets teachers’ needs and is effective at shaping classroom practice.

Researchers have noted that workshops that comprise most traditional staff development methodologies don’t provide sufficient time, activities, or content necessary to promote meaningful change (Garet, Porter. Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Study results by Joyce and Showers (1996, 2002) show that fewer than 15% of teachers implement new ideas learned in traditional staff development settings such as workshops. The problem with these traditional approaches is that teachers often don’t have the skills or knowledge needed to apply what they learn in these workshops and have no way to receive support or feedback when they do attempt to apply what they have learned. Teachers need time to see new strategies modeled during the school day and opportunities to use new skills in developing and implementing learning activities (Garet, et al., 2001; Joyce and Showers 1996, 2002; Rodriguez and Knuth, 2000).

As they have studied the impact of traditional professional development, many researchers have identified the characteristics of effective staff development, and their findings are remarkably consistent. Alexander Russo (2004) summarized these research findings in a recent article. Effective staff development must be “ongoing, deeply embedded in teachers’ classroom work with children, specific to grade levels or academic content, and focused on research-based approaches. It also must help to open classroom doors and create more collaboration and sense of community among teachers in a school” (para. 8).

Russo noted that school-based coaching not only met these criteria “remarkably well,” it is consistent with the standards for effective staff development outlined by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC). For more than a decade the National Staff Development Council has studied the research on professional development with the goal
• Practiced new strategies more often and with greater skill than teachers who were not coached.
• Retained and increased their new skills over time; teachers who were not coached did not.
• Demonstrated a clearer understanding of the purposes and uses of the new strategies than teachers who were not coached.

These same researchers also found that when teachers combined participation in traditional workshops with peer coaching or methodologies that promoted collaboration and reflection, more than 80% of teachers were using newly learned strategies in their classrooms (Joyce and Showers, 1996; Joyce, Murphy, & Showers, 1996; Richardson, 1999).

Over time, research had made it increasingly clear that one key to changing classroom practices is to provide teachers with opportunities for ongoing discussion and reflection. Methodologies that provide teachers with these chances for collaboration change teaching practice (Darling-Hammond, 1995, 1996; Garet et al., 2001; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992; Little, 1993; Loucks-Horsley, Stiles, & Hewson, 1996; Richardson, 1994; Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Richard, 2003; Showers and Joyce, 2002; Veenman and Denessen, 2001). Coaching is one methodology that encourages this type of professional collaboration. Teachers value coaching because it promotes their learning by offering them opportunities to become involved in meaningful discussions and planning, observing others, being observed, and receiving feedback (Carey and Frechtling, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Loucks-Horsley et al., 1998). Garet and several co-authors (2001) found that teachers from the same school who work together with coaches have more opportunities to “discuss concepts, skills, and problems that arise during their professional development experiences” and are “likely to share common curricular materials, course offerings, and assessment requirements” (p. 922).

Does peer coaching help teachers effectively integrate technology into classroom practice?

The peer coaching methodology has an impact on teaching practices in a variety of content areas, and also plays a powerful role in helping teachers integrate technology into their classroom learning activities. Teachers needed ongoing support as their proficiency in integrating technology into instruction grew. While teachers initially rely heavily on technical support, they need instructional support as they begin to use technology to support project based learning or interdisciplinary learning (White, Ringstaff, & Kelley, 2002). Peer coaching can provide the type of support teachers need as they begin to integrate technology with classroom activities that actively engage students in learning (Ike, 1997; Miller, 1998; Norton and Gonzales, 1998; Saye, 1998; Tenbusch, 1998; Yocam, 1996). One reason peer coaching is so useful for technology integration is that it provides both ongoing support and just-in-time support that teachers value (Brush et al., 2003).


