Why do states provide feedback to teacher preparation programs?

State leaders are increasingly focused on improving college and university programs that prepare teachers as a route to a high-quality teacher workforce. States are uniquely positioned to provide feedback to teacher preparation programs on the effectiveness of the teachers they train. This work requires significant data capacity to reliably and securely link teachers with their students’ achievement and growth data with the state’s teacher preparation programs. This feedback on teachers’ classroom performance can be a powerful tool in fostering continuous program improvement, informing school and district staffing assignments, targeting professional development opportunities, and helping teachers improve their practice.

Most states have the capacity to link teacher performance data with teacher preparation programs through the state’s teacher-student data link (TSDL), which links teachers to students by course.

Twenty-two states share information about how teachers perform in the classroom with their teacher preparation programs, up from six states in 2011.

* California, New Jersey, Oregon, and South Dakota did not participate in the Data for Action 2014 survey.
In states where teacher performance data are shared with teacher preparation programs, states and preparation programs are making improvements to teacher training programs and policies to best meet the needs of students.

**State Spotlight: Kentucky**
Data on student literacy growth across grade levels were used to pursue a change to state regulations regarding literacy preparation for secondary teacher candidates. The Education Professional Standards Board has adopted the International Reading Association’s Standards for Reading Professionals 2010 as applied to Middle and High School Content Classroom Teachers. Moving from adoption of the standards to full regulatory implementation has already begun. In August 2014, the board discussed applying those standards to every candidate in a program that will result in certification to teach students in one or more middle or high school grades. Even considering such a dramatic shift from previous policy reflects the value the board places on quality data, quality analysis, and data-informed decisionmaking to improve state policy. A summary of the report is available at [www.epsb.ky.gov/boardinfo/meetingagendas.asp](http://www.epsb.ky.gov/boardinfo/meetingagendas.asp) under Presentations to the Board, August 6, 2012.

**State Spotlight: Ohio**
The Judith Herb College of Education at The University of Toledo is using student growth data linked to teachers who have completed its preparation program to track its graduates’ employment and performance. Data are grouped by the completers’ program area. The college will be using graduates’ performance information to inform continuous quality improvement of program design and delivery.

**State Spotlight: Tennessee**
The teacher preparation program at Lipscomb University uses Tennessee’s annual [Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs](#) to inform improvements to its program. The 2012 report card showed that the training for social studies teachers was not as strong as it needed to be. This external source of data reinforced what the university was learning from internal sources such as survey data and anecdotal information—that the pedagogy training for social studies teachers needed improvement. Data helped start a conversation with the provost leading to changes such as filling a position to strengthen the pedagogy training, shoring up the social studies methods courses, and changing the selection process for the program.

These modifications are positively affecting students in Tennessee as the 2014 report card revealed that recent graduates of Lipscomb tend to be more effective than other beginning social studies teachers. Now the university is using new, more detailed information from the state to analyze the effectiveness of different types of teacher preparation programs. For example, the teaching candidates from the graduate-level math preparation program did not perform as well as the teaching candidates from the undergraduate program. Looking into the differences between the programs, university leaders realized that the undergraduate program included more monitoring of the student teaching component of the training. The university made changes to the graduate program to ensure that the programs are of equal rigor. According to Dr. Candice McQueen, senior vice president and dean of the College of Education at Lipscomb, “Using data is the key to improvement.”

To learn more, read *Using Data to Improve Teacher Effectiveness and the Roadmap for a Teacher-Student Data Link.*

---

The Data Quality Campaign’s *Data for Action* is a series of analyses that highlight state progress and key priorities to promote the effective use of data to improve student achievement. For more information, please visit [www.dataqualitycampaign.org](http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org).