



## Overview of the Teacher Preparation Program Regulations Proposed by the U.S. Department of Education

December, 2014

On December 3, 2014 the U.S. Department of Education [proposed new teacher preparation regulations](#)\* which would require states receiving funds under the Higher Education Act to create a rating system for **all teacher preparation programs** in the state. Only programs with high ratings would be eligible to participate in the federal student financial aid program called TEACH grants. While both traditional and alternate route pathways to teaching would be covered by the ratings, states may apply different thresholds of employment outcomes for the two groups.

While there is no federal funding to implement these new requirements, the economic impact is estimated to meet or exceed \$100 million. Given this threshold, the Office of Management and Budget must also share comments and analysis and is seeking feedback by January 2, 2015 (p. 71870-71884).

### **Rating System Required**

The mandated rating system **MUST** include at least these 4 levels (p. 71830):

- Low Performing
- At-Risk
- Effective
- Exceptional

At least these four indicators would create the rating:

#### 1. **Student Learning Outcomes:**

Student learning outcomes would be determined from student growth data (change in student achievement in tested grades and subjects and the change in student achievement in non-tested grades and subjects between 2 points in time...VAM) or teacher evaluations which must include in significant part data on growth for all students, or both. NOTE: Student growth must include both tested grades and subjects under ESEA and non-tested grades and subjects, as required by ESEA waivers (p. 71833-71834).

- No teacher preparation program could be rated “effective” or “exceptional” unless the student learning outcomes have been deemed “satisfactory” by the state (p. 71830-71831).

#### 2. **Employment Outcomes:** *including retention and placement rates* (p. 71834-71835).

Employment outcomes, which are disaggregated for high need schools would be required to count as a significant part of the employment measure.

*States could exclude the following from placement rate and retention rate calculations: new teachers or graduates who are teaching in other states or in private schools, or those new teachers or recent graduates who enroll in graduate school or join the military.*

States would be allowed to calculate employment placement and retention rates differently for traditional programs and alternate route programs.

- Teacher placement rate, *disaggregated for high need schools*, calculated as follows:  
The annual combined, non-duplicated percentage of new teachers and recent graduates who have been hired in a full time teaching position for the grade level, span, and subject area in which the teachers are prepared.
- Teacher retention rate, *disaggregated for high need schools*, calculated as follows:
  - Percentage of new teachers who have been hired to teach full-time and have served at least 3 consecutive years in the 5 years following certification or licensure to be the teacher or record
  - Percentage of new teachers who have been hired into full-time teaching and reached a level of tenure within 5 years following certification or licensure to be the teacher or record
  - One hundred percent minus the number of new teachers who were fired.

### **3. Survey Outcomes, including qualitative and quantitative data (p. 71835).**

- Teacher Survey – designed for new teachers serving in full time teaching positions for the grade level, span, and subject area in which teachers were prepared to capture their perceptions on whether the preparation they received was effective.
- Employer Survey – (employers or supervisors) designed to capture the perceptions of whether new teachers who attended teacher preparation programs within the state were effectively prepared.

### **4. Professional Accreditation or State Program Approval (p. 71835)**

- The teacher preparation program would be required to be accredited by a specialized accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary of Education for the accreditation of professional teacher education programs **OR**
- The teacher preparation program produces teacher candidates with content & pedagogical knowledge as determined through the rating system, who have met rigorous entry and exit qualifications; who have quality clinical preparation.

## **Connecting the Rating of a Teacher Preparation Program to Federal Student Financial Aid: TEACH Grants**

The TEACH Grants, federal student financial aid of \$4000/year in return for service in a high-need school and a high need field would be connected to the rating system as follows:

In order to be a TEACH grant-eligible institution, an Institution of Higher Education (IHE) would be required to provide at least one teacher preparation program at the baccalaureate or master's degree

level that is a high quality teacher preparation program as determined through the new mandated rating system and metrics (p. 71843; 71890).

In order for a program to participate in the TEACH grant program, the program would be required to be rated at “effective” or “exceptional” for 2 out of the last 3 reporting years (p. 71843; 71866).

Programs with a STEM Major:

The proposed regulations allow STEM programs at TEACH Grant-eligible institutions to participate in the TEACH Grant program provided that, over the most recent three years for which data are available, the Secretary has not identified that fewer than 60 percent of the STEM program’s TEACH Grant recipients complete at least one year of teaching that fulfills the service obligation within three years of completing their STEM program (p. 71843; 71866).

### **Reporting Requirements**

States would be required to report on all teacher preparation programs in the state which produce 25 or more new teachers per year. States may lower the threshold of 25 but not increase it (p. 71831-71832; 71876).

Should a program NOT produce 25 new teachers per year, the threshold could be met by the following (p. 71877):

- Aggregating similar programs operated by the same entity;
- Aggregating data for a program over multiple years, limited to up to 4 years;
- A combination of the two above

### **Institutional Report Cards**

In addition to what is currently required to be reported by the Higher Education Act, these proposed regulations would require that institutions include the quality of their teacher preparation programs as determined through the new metrics & rating system AND make the information available on its website (p. 71825; 71872-71874).

### **State Report Cards**

In addition to what is currently required to be reported by the Higher Education Act, these proposed regulations would require that states report the quality of all teacher preparation programs in the state, including distance education programs, as determined through the mandated metrics and rating system. This information would be required to be posted on the state’s website (p. 71825-71826; 71874-71882).

### **Consequences**

Being Designated as a Low-Performing Programs (p. 71842; 71889)

- States would be required to provide technical assistance to “low-performing” programs
- Programs could lose state approval and/or state financial support
  - If the above happens, the teacher preparation program would be required to provide transitional & remedial support for a period of time not longer than 150 % of the published length of the program.
  - IHE must inform the Secretary within 30 days of the loss of funding or approval

- IHE must notify students about loss of Title IV funding due to loss of funding or approval
- Support can be regained by the program upon evidentiary improvement.
- Programs identified as “at risk” and “low performing” for 2 out of any 3 year will be unable to accept students using TEACH grant funding.
- States must provide technical assistance to “low performing” programs

**Note:** The proposal includes over 20 specific new definitions of terms (p. 71854-71857; 71885-71887; 71890).

**Proposed Implementation Timeline**

2015-2016	States design, establish, and troubleshoot data systems necessary for the mandated performance rating systems.
October 2017	Pilot additional reporting requirements for the Institutional Report Cards covering academic year 2016- 2017. Last reporting for the State Report Cards under the current system.
April 2018	Pilot reporting for State Report Cards still identifying low performing or at risk programs based on current system requirements but can include the performance ratings based on the new mandated reporting requirement
April 2019	State Report Cards must include the new mandated rating system for performance assessment.
July 2020	Programs could be ineligible to participate in the TEACH Grant program

**DEADLINES**

Comments on the proposed information collection requirements are due to the Office of Management and Budget by **January 2, 2015**. Email [OIRA\\_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov).

Comments on this proposal are due to the US Department of Education by **February 2, 2015** via the Federal Register (<http://1.usa.gov/16okLNx>).

AACTE Member Resources (<http://aacte.org/resources/regulations>)

Questions? Email [regs@aacte.org](mailto:regs@aacte.org)

*\* Page numbers refer to the December 3, 2014 [Federal Register announcement](#) where the proposed teacher preparation regulations were published.*