

Contract No: ED-IES-12-C-0007



Supporting Justification for OMB Clearance of a Study of Clinical Practice in Traditional Teacher Preparation Programs in Missouri

Section A

December 5, 2013

Submitted to:

Institute of Education Sciences
Laboratory
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20208
(202) 219-1385

Project Officer:
Sandra Garcia

Submitted by:

REL Central at Marzano Research

9000 E. Nichols Ave., Ste. 112
Centennial, CO 80112
(303) 766-9199

Project Director:
Stephen Meyer

Table of Contents

Section A. Justification.....	3
A1. Circumstances Necessitating Collection of Information.....	3
Statement of Need.....	3
Overview of the Study Design.....	5
Overview of the Specific Data Collection Plan.....	6
A2. How, by Whom, and for What Purpose Information is to Be Used.....	7
A3. Use of Automated, Electronic, Mechanical or Other Technological Collection Techniques.....	8
A4. Efforts to Identify Duplication.....	8
A5. Sensitivity to Burden on Small Entities.....	8
A6. Consequence to Federal Program or Policy Activities if the Collection is Not Conducted or is Conducted Less Frequently.....	8
A7. Special Circumstances.....	8
A8. Federal Register Announcement and Consultation.....	8
Federal Register Announcement.....	8
Consultations Outside the Agency.....	9
A9. Payment or Gift to Respondents.....	9
A10. Confidentiality of the Data.....	9
A11. Additional Justification for Sensitive Questions.....	10
A12. Estimates of Hour Burden.....	11
A13. Estimate for the Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents or Record Keepers.....	11
A14. Estimates of Annualized Costs to the Federal Government.....	11
A15. Reasons for Program Changes or Adjustments.....	11
A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication.....	12
Tabulation Plans.....	12
Publication Plans.....	12
Timeline.....	13
A17. Approval to Not Display the Expiration Date for OMB Approval.....	13
A18. Exception to the Certification Statement.....	13
References.....	14

Attachment A: Public Law 107-279-Nov. 5, 2002 Education Sciences Reform

Attachment B: Printed Copy of Online Survey

Attachment C: Affidavit of Nondisclosure

Attachment D: Text for Invitations and Reminders

Section A. Justification

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) requests OMB clearance for data collection conducted by REL Central at Marzano Research Laboratory. ED, in consultation with REL Central under contract ED-IES-12-C-0007, has planned a study of clinical practice in traditional teacher preparation programs in Missouri. OMB approval is being requested for administration of a survey to practicing first-year teachers.

A1. Circumstances Necessitating Collection of Information

This data collection is authorized by the Educational Sciences Reform Act (ESRA) of 2002 (see Attachment A). Part D, Section 174(f)(2) of ESRA states that as part of their central mission and primary function, each regional educational laboratory “shall support applied research by . . . developing and widely disseminating, including through Internet-based means, scientifically valid research, information, reports, and publications that are usable for improving academic achievement, closing achievement gaps, and encouraging and sustaining school improvement, to schools, districts, institutions of higher education, educators (including early childhood educators and librarians), parents, policymakers, and other constituencies, as appropriate, within the region in which the regional educational laboratory is located.”

Statement of Need

Educator preparation¹ has been the focus of an increasing number of policymaker and practitioner conversations at the national and state levels in recent years. Recent emphasis on teacher effectiveness and accountability has led the education policy, research, and practitioner communities to take a closer look at teacher preparation and has raised concerns about program quality from researchers, policy analysts, teacher accreditation organizations, and teachers themselves (Alderman, Carey, Dillon, Miller, & Silva, 2011; Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Crowe, 2010; Ingersoll, Merrill, & May, 2012; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010). In 2011, the U.S. Department of Education released a *Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement* (U.S. Department of Education, 2011) that emphasizes better reporting of program outcomes for accountability purposes; specifically, information about student achievement growth, teacher job placement and retention rates, and surveys of program graduates and their principals.

In addition to the focus on increased accountability, policymakers and researchers have expressed increased interest in research about teacher preparation program² (TPP) design and implementation. In response to a congressional mandate, the National Research Council (NRC) conducted a study for the

¹ For the purposes of this proposal, “educator preparation” refers to formal pre-service training for classroom teachers and school administrators. This study focuses on the preparation of classroom teachers.

² For the purposes of this study, “teacher preparation program” reflects the U.S. Department of Education (2011) definition to include any state-approved course of study, the completion of which signifies that an enrollee has met all the states’ educational and/or training requirements for initial certification or licensure to teach in elementary, middle or secondary schools. Unless otherwise noted, the term “programs” is used in this proposal to refer to the institutions or entities that offer such a course of study (such as universities or other organizations). “Program types” refer to broad categories of approaches used within programs (such as “alternative” or “traditional”) and “certification tracks” refer to one of various types of sub-programs designed to prepare teachers for different types of teaching positions (such as “elementary education”).

Institute of Education Sciences (IES) to synthesize evidence on several key questions related to teacher preparation. Among its findings, the report (NRC, 2010) identified the need for research that improves understanding of the relationships between characteristics of teacher preparation and student learning. That type of research, however, depends on good information about the implementation of TPPs, which is scarce. With respect to the implementation of TPPs, the NRC (2010) report concluded: “There is very little systematic research regarding the specific ways teachers of reading, mathematics, and science are currently being prepared . . .” and “the limited information we found does not support conclusions about the current nature and content of teacher preparation programs” (p.4). Indeed, researchers have found substantial limitations related to the availability and quality of data related to questions about teacher preparation, including information about characteristics of students entering programs, their experiences in TPPs, teacher and student outcomes, and teaching context (Crowe, 2007; Voorhees, Barnes, & Rothman, 2003).

Regional Priorities and Need. The seven states in the Central Region employ nearly 200,000 teachers and nearly 14,000 teacher candidates³ complete an approved TPP at roughly 200 institutions of higher education each year. Constituents in all seven states have identified assessment of teacher preparation as a priority and are working to redefine systems for program assessment. Regional needs related to TPP evaluation and research were initially identified through a review of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grant program applications and conversations with state grant administrators in 2011, and were affirmed through conversations in 2012 with constituents throughout the Central Region who are participating in REL Central's Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance (Teacher Preparation Workgroup). Participants in the alliance represent all states in the region and represent a range of constituents, including state education agency (SEA) administrators (for example, SLDS grant managers and those who oversee educator preparation and educator quality), institution of higher education (IHE) administrators (for example, education school deans), and IHE faculty (for example, researchers who study this and related topics).

In particular, SEA staff and TPP administrators have interest in collecting and analyzing data that provide information about the relationship between TPP implementation and outcomes for teachers and their students. Colorado, for example, is seeking to identify the forms of teacher preparation and certification that correlate most closely with students' academic growth in the classroom, to evaluate the effectiveness of TPPs, and to identify promising models and practices in educator preparation (Colorado Department of Education, 2009). As part of the development of a system to assess the effectiveness of TPPs, Missouri is focusing on analysis that relates value-added estimates of student achievement to teacher participation in preparation programs (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008) and is developing standards (and associated indicators and measures) for educator preparation programs that align with the Missouri Standards for Preparation of Educators (MoSPE). Also, in Missouri, TPP administrators expressed interest in conducting research that examines the impact of their program redesign efforts (C. Basile, personal communication, May 25, 2012). In Wyoming, the

³ For the purposes of this study, a “candidate” is a participant enrolled in a teacher preparation program (who is a candidate to become a professional teacher upon completion). Count is based on 2011 Title II reports of the number of “prepared” teachers in the Central Region; available here: <https://title2.ed.gov/Title2STRC/ChooseState.aspx?Type=Map&Year=2011>.

legislature recently commissioned a study that will use the state's SLDS to examine the teacher labor market, including the relationship between aspects of teacher preparation and teacher effectiveness (L. Ballard, personal communication, June 25, 2011). South Dakota and Kansas are also working to align new educator effectiveness standards with expectations for newly trained teachers (R. Melmer, personal communication, May 9, 2012; P. Coleman, personal communication, July 16, 2012).

In conversations with REL Central staff, alliance members expressed an interest in conducting research about TPPs that relates elements of program design and implementation to outcomes. Because the ability to relate elements of TPP design and implementation to outcomes requires good data about design and implementation, alliance members also expressed the need for help in better understanding the variation in TPP implementation in the Central states, including how to measure alternative approaches and how to use these data to examine the relative effectiveness of different program elements. Among various elements of TPP design and implementation, clinical practice⁴ emerged as a priority area for research among alliance members because:

1. Clinical practice is identified as a central and critical aspect of teacher preparation in professional standards (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2010; Association of Teacher Educators, 2008; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2008) and in research (Greenberg, Pomerance, & Walsh, 2011).
2. The design and implementation of the clinical practice component varies widely across TPPs (NCATE, 2010);
3. Little information about the design and implementation of clinical practice in TPPs is currently available;
4. Clinical practice is an area in which Central states are planning to develop or are currently developing standards for TPPs;
5. Collecting good information about implementation of the clinical practice component of TPPs is perceived by alliance members as being difficult; and
6. Two states in the region, Colorado and Missouri, are members of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Alliance for Clinical Teacher Preparation, which is focused on piloting diverse new approaches to clinical preparation (NCATE, 2010).

Overview of the Study Design

This study is designed to support needs in the region by providing descriptive information about clinical practice in TPPs. The study purpose is to document current practice and provide a data collection tool

⁴ For the purposes of this proposal, "clinical practice" is defined to correspond with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2008) definition, including the following two primary elements: (1) student teaching (or internships) that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity, immerse candidates in the learning community, and provide opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing; and (2) field experiences that include various early and ongoing field-based opportunities in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research.

and an approach for collecting data from TPP graduates that can be adopted and adapted as part of future research to be conducted by the alliance.

The study is designed to address the following research questions:

1. *What are the characteristics of clinical practice in traditional teacher preparation programs completed by first-year public school teachers in Missouri?*
2. *How does clinical practice in traditional teacher preparation programs vary among certification tracks completed by first-year public school teachers in Missouri?*

Survey data will be collected from a respondent pool of approximately 3,500 first-year public school teachers in Missouri. Based on an expected minimum response rate of 80%, REL Central at Marzano Research Laboratory expects to analyze data from a minimum of 2,800 completed surveys.

The survey is designed to collect information about the following eight primary components of clinical practice experiences in teacher preparation programs: (1) clinical placement characteristics; (2) clinical placement curriculum; (3) clinical placement timing; (4) cooperating teacher characteristics; (5) supervisor characteristics; (6) IHE and P-12 school collaboration; (7) candidate evaluation and feedback; and (8) teacher preparation program evaluation. Descriptive analyses will be used to characterize survey responses for: states, certification tracks (distinguished by grade and subject area), and individual teacher preparation programs (results reported confidentially to program administrators).

Overview of the Specific Data Collection Plan

To answer the research questions, REL Central at Marzano Research Laboratory will collect survey data from first-year teachers in public schools in Missouri. Self-reported survey data was chosen as the data source to address the research questions, because it is the most cost-effective way to collect individual-level information about experiences in TPPs. REL Central at Marzano Research Laboratory will work with the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MO DESE) to collect contact information for teachers who graduated from traditional teacher preparation programs and who are teaching for the first time during the 2014–15 school year. Only teachers who graduated from a traditional teacher preparation program during the twelve months prior to their first teaching assignment will be included. Staff in the Educator Preparation Section at MO DESE have agreed to share contact information for first-year teachers, including the following data elements: teacher identifier⁵, teacher name, teacher email address, name of school in which they are teaching and physical address, current teaching assignment, certification route, name of preparation program, teaching certification(s), gender, and race/ethnicity⁶.

⁵ To comply with MO DESE data sharing requirements unique teacher identifiers will be generated for REL Central, which are linked to state teacher identifiers in a data file maintained by MO DESE.

⁶ These latter five variables will be used to assess survey nonresponse bias (that is, to see the extent to which survey respondents represent the sampled population in terms of preparation program, teaching certifications, gender, and race/ethnicity).

Using the data provided by MO DESE, an invitation to complete an online survey will be sent via email⁷ (see Attachment B) to each first-year teacher who was prepared in a traditional program. The invitation will be sent by REL Central at Marzano Research Laboratory, describing the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, intended use of the data collected, methods for maintaining confidentiality, and the estimated amount of time needed to complete the survey (estimated to be 20–30 minutes). Customized invitations will be used with respondent identifiers embedded in the emailed survey links to track survey response. Paper surveys mailed to respondents via USPS will contain unique identifiers for the same purpose. Up to seven reminders with increasingly persuasive language will be sent to respondents to increase response rates.

A2. How, by Whom, and for What Purpose Information is to Be Used

Data from the study may be used to understand the extent to which clinical practice components vary within and across programs. This will inform conversations about emerging state standards for TPPs, such as what constitutes minimum implementation of priority components. These data will also inform conversations about TPP reform or redesign by identifying areas in which programs have less or greater emphasis.

By collecting data about the clinical practice component of TPPs from recent program graduates, descriptive analyses will highlight variation both within and across programs. Information about variation across certification tracks may reveal differences in the nature and extent of clinical experiences for students of different types (for example, elementary or high school level teacher candidates) that could inform changes in TPP design, policy, or requirements. For example, if survey data suggest weak implementation of particular clinical practice components, TPP administrators may choose to implement policies or practices designed to improve experiences or make them more consistent.

Descriptive data about clinical practice in TPPs in Missouri can be used as a baseline to monitor change over time at the state and program levels and as a basis for examining the impact of changes in policy or TPP reform activities. These data may also be used in future correlational research that relates TPP implementation to teacher and student outcomes (for example, teacher retention and value-added student achievement). The study will also provide a data collection tool that can be adopted and adapted as part of future research on TPP design, implementation, and impact to be conducted by SEAs, TPPs, or the alliance.

A3. Use of Automated, Electronic, Mechanical or Other Technological Collection Techniques

The survey will be administered online using survey software such as SurveyMonkey in order to reduce cost. Respondents will be sent a unique link via email that will lead them to the online survey.

⁷ If email addresses are not available, the study team will communicate with respondents via U.S. Postal Service mail sent to their school address. MO DESE indicated that email address information is typically missing for up to 5% of first-year teachers and that physical address information is available for all teachers in the sample. Follow-up data collection will be conducted via USPS for individuals who do not respond to two email requests.

SurveyMonkey allows the creation of a unique link for each email address in the invite list that prevents duplicate responses, because the link cannot be used after the survey is completed. Reminders will also be sent via email using the survey software. Participants' contact information (for sending the online survey) and their background information will be collected electronically from MO DESE using a secure file-sharing mechanism.

A4. Efforts to Identify Duplication.

The survey data collects unique data that addresses the need for understanding the implementation of clinical practice components of teacher preparation programs. REL Central reviewed the literature and determined that there is no alternative source for the information to be collected through the survey.

A5. Sensitivity to Burden on Small Entities

The data collection does not involve small entities.

A6. Consequence to Federal Program or Policy Activities if the Collection is Not Conducted or is Conducted Less Frequently

If the proposed data were not collected, the alliance would not have timely and relevant research on clinical practice in traditional TPPs to understand the extent to which clinical practice components vary within and across programs and to inform conversations about emerging state standards for TPPs. Constituents in the region would not have descriptive data for comparison of the clinical practice components of particular traditional TPPs to state averages. The alliance would not have a descriptive dataset on which potential future studies might be based. The data will be collected only one time; thus, there is no "frequency" component to the data collection.

A7. Special Circumstances

There are no special circumstances.

A8. Federal Register Announcement and Consultation

Federal Register Announcement

ED will publish Federal Register Notices to allow both a 60-day and 30-day public comment period. The REL will assist ED in addressing any public comments received.

Consultations Outside the Agency

REL Central has consulted with research alliance members on the administration of the survey, the clarity of the instructions, and the survey instrument. Feedback on the survey was solicited via email and during a web conference hosted by REL Central in early 2013. We have also consulted with content and methods experts to develop the study. Table 1 lists the individuals who were consulted on the statistical, data collection, and analytic aspects of this study. These individuals include members of REL Central's Educator Effectiveness Research Alliance and Technical Working Group (TWG). TWG members are experts in content and methodology and they provide consultation on the design, implementation, and

analysis of the study. The research alliance members are educators and stakeholders in the Central Region who share a specific education concern.

Table 1. Individuals Consulted as Part of Study Design and Development

Name	Role	Title	Organization	Contact Information
Gale Hairston	Alliance Member	Director, Educator Preparation	Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MO DESE)	Gale.Hairston@dese.mo.gov
Heather MacCleoud	Alliance Member	Assistant Director, Educator Preparation	MO DESE	Heather.MacCleoud@dese.mo.gov
Michael Allen	TWG Member	Senior Research Consultant	Teacher Preparation Analytics	michael.allen@teacherpreanalytics.com
Bruce Randel	TWG Member	President	Century Analytics	bruce.randel@centuryanalytics.com
Carmelita Lamb	Alliance Member	Teacher Education Department Chair	Turtle Mountain Community College	lamb@tm.edu
Carole Basile	Alliance Member	Dean	College of Education, University of Missouri - St. Louis	basilec@umsl.edu
Mark Ehlert	Alliance Member	Assistant Research Professor	U. of Missouri - Columbia, Department of Economics	ehlertm@missouri.edu
Leigh Anne Taylor-Knight	Alliance Member	Executive Director	Kansas City Area Education Research Consortium	lknight@kcaerc.org

As appropriate, we will consult with representatives of those organizations from whom information is to be obtained, such as research alliance members and TWG members to address any public comments received on burden.

A9. Payment or Gift to Respondents

No incentive will be provided to survey respondents. REL Central leadership, in consultation with REL Central’s Contracting Officer Representative (COR), advised against the use of incentives to reduce project cost.

A10. Confidentiality of the Data

REL Central will be following the new policies and procedures required by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183: "All collection, maintenance, use, and wide dissemination of data by the Institute" are required to "conform with the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the confidentiality standards of subsection (c) of this section, and sections 444 and 445 of the General Education Provision Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, 1232h)." These citations refer to the Privacy Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment. Subsection (c) of section 183 referenced above requires the Director of IES to "develop and

enforce standards designed to protect the confidentiality of persons in the collection, reporting, and publication of data." Subsection (d) of section 183 prohibits the disclosure of individually identifiable information, and makes any publishing or communicating of individually identifiable information by employees or staff a felony.

REL Central will protect the confidentiality of all information collected for the study and will use it for research purposes only. No information that identifies any study participant will be released. Information from respondents will be presented at aggregate levels in reports. Unique identification numbers will be assigned to each participating teacher and used to identify all survey responses. The ID number/name association files will be kept secure in a confidential file separate from the data analysis file. No information that could be used to identify respondents or the TPPs from which they graduated will be included in the public use data files or reports⁸. Data from the online survey software system will be downloaded and deleted from the online system within one week after the survey window closes. REL Central implements semi-weekly downloads of all data stored online to protect against data loss. These data files will then be stripped of any identifying information. Information will be reported in aggregate so that individual responses are not identifiable. All identification lists will be destroyed at the end of the project. The research team is trained to follow strict guidelines for soliciting consent, administering data collection instruments, and preserving respondent confidentiality. All members of the research team have successfully completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) course in the Protection of Human Research Subjects through Liberty IRB. A copy of the affidavit of non-disclosure is provided in Attachment C for each researcher who will have access to the data. Names of all REL staff with access to data will be submitted to the NCEE security officer, accounting for staff who leave REL Central and any newly hired staff who are granted data access.

All study materials will include the following language:

Per the policies and procedures required by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183, responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific district or individual. We will not provide information that identifies you or your district to anyone outside the study team, except as required by law. Any willful disclosure of such information for nonstatistical purposes, without the informed consent of the respondent, is a class E felony.

A11. Additional Justification for Sensitive Questions

No questions of a highly sensitive nature are included in the teacher survey.

⁸ REL Central will include descriptive information about study participants (such as gender and certification type) in the public use data file to the extent possible, ensuring compliance with state of Missouri requirements and disclosure avoidance techniques recommended by the U.S. Department of Education's Privacy Technical Assistance Center.

A12. Estimates of Hour Burden

The total reporting burden associated with the data collection for the study is 1,176 hours (Table 2). An estimated respondent pool of 3,500 first-year teachers will be asked to participate via email in the online survey. Based on an expected 80% response rate, approximately 2,800 teachers will complete the survey, with an estimated burden (based on results of the survey pretest) of 25 minutes (0.42 hours) per teacher. The estimated total cost to respondents is \$32,928, based on an average teacher hourly wage of \$28 (Table 3).

Table 2. Estimated annualized burden hours

Instrument	Person Incurring Burden	Number of Respondents	Responses per Respondent	Total Responses	Hours per Response	Total Burden Hours
Survey	Teacher	2,800	1	2,800	.42	1,176

Table 3. Estimated annualized cost to respondents

Instrument	Person Incurring Burden	Total Burden Hours	Hourly Wage Rate	Total Respondent Costs
Survey	Teacher	1,176	\$28	\$\$32,928

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics, estimates Annual Teacher Salary to be \$57,810. To calculate an hourly wage, a 40-hour work week was assumed, resulting in an average hourly wage of \$27.79.

A13. Estimate for the Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents or Record Keepers

There are no start-up costs for this collection.

A14. Estimates of Annualized Costs to the Federal Government.

The total estimated cost for this study is \$288,250 over three years. The average yearly cost is \$96,083. This cost represents the value of all services to perform activities associated with the proposed data collection including: data collection instrument development and testing; establishing and meeting with expert consultants; establishing and maintaining data security; collecting data; cleaning, coding, processing, and analyzing data; preparing project reports and data files; and disseminating reports and data. The estimated cost also reflects personnel costs of federal employees involved in the oversight and review of project plans and progress (estimated at a cost of \$5,000 per year).

A15. Reasons for Program Changes or Adjustments

This is a new study.

A16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication.

Tabulation Plans

For research question 1 (*What are the characteristics of clinical practice in traditional teacher preparation programs completed by first-year public school teachers in Missouri?*), REL Central will present descriptive statistics for all respondents in the sample. To provide context for interpreting findings, respondent counts, survey response rates, and descriptive information about survey respondents will be presented (that is, name of teacher preparation program, certification(s), current teaching assignment, gender, and race/ethnicity). These variables will also be used to assess nonresponse bias. For continuous variables (such as number of hours or weeks), means and standard deviations will be presented. For categorical variables, the proportion of respondents selecting each response category will be presented. For “check all that apply” responses (such as subject areas taught), means and standard deviations based on the total number of responses selected will be reported, as will the proportion of respondents selecting each response category. Frequencies (expressed as percentages) of response categories will be included all tables with categorical response options.

To examine research question 2 (*How does clinical practice in traditional teacher preparation programs vary among certification tracks completed by first-year public school teachers in Missouri?*), descriptive statistics will be presented by grade level and subject. Specifically, results will be presented separately for early childhood, elementary school (Grades 1–6), middle-level (Grades 5–9), and high school (Grades 9–12) certifications. Results will also be presented by subject (English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social science) separately for middle-level and high school certifications. For categorical variables, frequencies (expressed as percentages) of response categories will also be presented for each grade level and subject area. Response categories may be collapsed for ease of interpretation after reviewing how the data are distributed and inferential analyses to explore group differences will be considered.

Program-Level Analysis. Program-level analyses will be conducted that mirror the analyses described in plans to address research question 1, above. Program-level descriptive statistics for each survey item, along with the mean and standard deviation for the sample as a whole will be presented. Reports will be generated for each teacher preparation program. Consistent with MO DESE policy, reports will only be generated for programs for which data for a minimum of 15 respondents are available. Further, no data will be presented in any cell based on three or fewer respondents. Program-level reports will be treated confidentially and will be shared only with the dean, or their designee, of each teacher preparation program.

Publication Plans

Results for REL Central’s rigorous studies will be made available to the public through peer-reviewed evaluation reports that are published by IES on its website. The datasets from these rigorous studies will be turned over to the REL’s IES project officer. These data will become IES restricted use datasets requiring a user’s license that is applied for through the same process as NCES restricted use datasets. Even the REL contractor would be required to obtain a restricted use license to conduct any work with the data beyond the original study.

Timeline

The timeline for data collection, analysis and reporting is shown below (Table 4). If OMB approval is received in early spring 2014, REL Central will administer the survey in spring 2014. Otherwise, survey administration will take place at the beginning of the 2014-15 academic year.

Table 4: Schedule of activities

Activity	Schedule
Administer survey instrument	April 2014-June 2014 (or September 2014-November 2014)
Analyze and report	July 2014-December 2014 (or January 2015-June 2015)

A17. Approval to Not Display the Expiration Date for OMB Approval

No request is being made for exemption from displaying the expiration date.

A18. Exception to the Certification Statement

No exceptions to the certification statement are requested or required.

References

- Alderman, C., Carey, K., Dillon, E., Miller, B., & Silva, E. (2011). *A measured approach to improving teacher preparation*. Washington, DC: Education Sector.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers—A policy brief*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Association of Teacher Educators. (2008). *Standards for teacher educators*. Fairfax, VA: Author.
- Ballard, L. (2011, June 25). E-mail correspondence. Chief Information and Data Officer & Director, Information Management Division, Wyoming Department of Education.
- Basile, C. (2012, May 25). Telephone correspondence. Dean, College of Education, University of Missouri, St. Louis.
- Chesley, G., & Jordan, J. (2012). What's missing from teacher prep? *Educational Leadership*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Coleman, P. (2012, July 16). E-mail correspondence. Director of Teacher Education and Licensure, Kansas State Department of Education.
- Colorado Department of Education (2009). *Application for grants under the Statewide Longitudinal Data System Recovery Act Grants*. Denver, CO: Author
- Crowe, E. (2007). *An effective system of data collection on teacher preparation*. Paper prepared for the Committee on Teacher Preparation Programs, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, Washington, DC.
- Crowe, E. (2010). *Measuring what matters: A stronger accountability model for teacher education*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Greenberg, J., Pomerance, L., & Walsh, K. (2011). *Student teaching in the United States*. Washington, D.C., National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2012). Retaining teachers: How preparation matters. *Educational Leadership*, 30–34.
- Melmer, R. (2012, May 9). Telephone correspondence. Dean, School of Education, University of South Dakota.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2008). *Application for grants under the Statewide Longitudinal Data System Recovery Act Grants*. Jefferson City, MO: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010, November). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Our future, our teachers: The Obama administration's plan for teacher education reform and improvement*. Washington, D.C: Author.

Voorhees, R. A., Barnes, G. T., & Rothman, R. (2003, July). *Data systems to enhance teacher quality*. Boulder, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers.