
Context and Purpose

The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) have made educator effectiveness a priority in order to educate all students for college and career readiness and close achievement gaps. The mission of the educator preparation team is to guarantee that educator preparation results in effective educators ready to support the success of all students. To achieve this goal, ESE entrusts Sponsoring Organizations to provide this effective preparation.

In recent years there has also been a growing national spotlight on the need to improve efforts to prepare effective educators for our schools and districts. In December 2012, The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released a [set of recommendations](#) aimed at transforming educator preparation and standards for entry into the profession. Likewise, the then newly formed national accreditation agency the [Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation](#) (CAEP) issued [updated standards](#) for an accreditation process that demands excellence in producing educators who raise student achievement. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education has released [regulations](#)¹ in a similar attempt to elevate accountability and measure performance of preparation providers in producing candidates that are effective.

In support of this increased emphasis on the preparation of effective educators at both the state and national level, the BESE adopted revised [Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program Approval](#) in June 2012 as components of a comprehensive system to support educator development across the career continuum. In addition, the consensus of a broad group of stakeholders led to new educator evaluation frameworks in 2012 as well as new performance assessments for candidates in 2014.

The June 2012 revisions were the result of years of collaborative work with educator preparation programs and other stakeholders to create, pilot, and implement a continuous-improvement, evidence-based program-approval process. In addition, ESE solicited and received feedback from national organizations: the Center for American Progress, the Data Quality Campaign (DQC), Education Sector, the Education Trust, and the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ); researched practices in other states; surveyed and met with school and district administrators; and conducted forums and surveys of Sponsoring Organizations.

With the adoption of these regulations, ESE has changed the types of data collected from educator preparation programs and has shifted the program approval process to include outcome measures in addition to the review of program inputs. By analyzing data about

-
- ¹ The US Department of Education published a final rule for the [Teacher Preparation Regulations](#) that establishes new teacher preparation accountability regulations under Title II of the Higher Education Act.

programs, including data such as school employment and educator evaluation ratings, and evaluating outcomes based on this data, ESE will be able to:

- identify high-performing programs and be able to share evidence from which others can learn;
- identify low-performing programs, be able to provide targeted technical assistance and, where necessary, close programs who fail to improve; and
- share findings and information with the public.

In addition, the 2012 Program Approval standards:

- require educator preparation programs to work in partnership with districts and schools to support the needs of the PK-12 sector and inform educator preparation program effectiveness;
- increase expectations for Sponsoring Organizations in monitoring individual program efficacy;
- ensure that educator preparation programs focus recruitment, retention, and preparation efforts on preparing educators for high-need placements in Massachusetts;
- emphasize the need for a stronger field-based experience component in preparing educators, such as:
 - ensuring preparation candidates work with effective educators by requiring that Supervising Practitioners have a summative evaluation rating of proficient or higher in order to be eligible to serve in that capacity (refer to the two-page overview of [the MA Educator Evaluation Framework](#)); and
 - increasing the minimum-hour requirements for the practicum, and requiring that field-based experiences span the full school year and that they occur in diverse settings.
- align with the national direction for educator preparation by: (1) including updated accountability measures with increased annual reporting requirements; and (2) shifting from a five-year to a seven-year approval cycle with increased interim review options.