

CHCI White Paper

DEVELOPING THE NEXT GENERATION OF LATINO LEADERS®

April 2012

Professional Development: The Importance of Preparing Teachers to Educate Vulnerable Populations

Blanchi Roblero, 2011–12 CHCI Secondary Education Graduate Fellow

Abstract

In the midst of current education budget discussions, the teaching profession has been targeted for criticism and job losses for two reasons: not closing the educational achievement gap and not preparing America's students and future workforce to be successful in a global economy. Although teacher requirements and preparation vary from state to state, these states seem to have one thing in common; most of them have failed to adequately prepare teachers to educate Americans, in particular vulnerable populations like English Language Learners (ELL). As reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) moves forward, we need to ensure that the needs of ELLs and their teachers are prioritized. To address these needs, the reauthorization of ESEA should add provisions requiring general education teachers earn specific credentials and professional development to develop both language and academic proficiency for ELLs. As the academic success of ELLs students in public schools will contribute to the success of the United States' economy by creating a well-educated growing workforce, their need of adequately prepared teachers have to be recognized and addressed.

Introduction

The Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty provided the political context for passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. This was a period when educational inequity became a national concern. The primary purpose of the ESEA was to help schools better serve the "special educational needs of educationally deprived children." Over time and with the reauthorization of this legislation in 2002, the law's focus expanded to include numerous other objectives, such as ensuring that educators are "highly qualified." Under the Bush Administration (2001), this Act was renewed and renamed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). This new version of the legislation expanded the federal role in education and took particular aim at improving the educational realities of disadvantaged students. At the core of the No Child Left Behind Act were a number of measures and mandates designed to drive broad gains in student achievement and to hold states and their schools accountable for student progress (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Since last reauthorized, The No Child Left Behind Act has brought to light significant educational disparities among students of color, low-income students, migrant students, students with disabilities and English Language Learners (ELL). However, the mandates and laws of this act have not improved the conditions of

these students attending public schools. In many components of NCLB, there are unrealistic expectations. For example, ELL students are expected to achieve content knowledge before they master the English language, creating a problem not only for the student but also for the teacher whose goal is to adequately educate a well rounded individual.

Providing high quality education hence prepared teachers, is a right that should not be denied to ELL students. In October 2011, the Los Angeles Unified School District agreed to improvements in the way it teaches English language learner students after a 19-month investigation by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights found thirty percent of students were being denied equal educational opportunities. Many English learners were being kept away from core academic classes they needed to graduate and enroll in college or job training programs due to many factors, one of them being unprepared teachers (Department of Education, 2011). One of the resolutions of the LAUSD case was to provide professional development to improve the quality of teachers of English Language Learners. However, as a country we should not wait until school districts break the rights of these students in order to provide them with well-qualified instructors and education (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). As the re-authorization of ESEA moves forward, we need to ensure that the needs

In the past the responsibility of ELLs' learning fell on the shoulders of bilingual teachers. However, as ELLs today spend the largest percentage of their schooling in regular classrooms, increasingly the duty of general education teachers is to be prepared and ready to educate ELLs.

of ELLs and their teachers are prioritized and addressed. The academic success of this segment of the public school population will contribute to the success of the United States economy by providing a fast growing well-educated labor force.

Title II and III of the ESEA specifically authorize programs that provide funding and management support for the professional development of general education teachers and those who teach ELLs. This brief will address the complexities of funding and developmental programs for teachers of ELLs as well as alternatives to improve the training of teachers in this field while simultaneously improving ELLs' academic achievements.

English Language Learners

According to Title IX of ESEA, ELLs are defined as students between the ages of 3 and 21 years who have difficulty listening, writing, reading or speaking English to the extent that it may be detrimental to their success in society (U.S Department of Education, 2010). Despite common assumptions, most ELLs are not immigrants. Actually, 84 percent of this population was born within the United States; 76 percent of elementary school ELLs and 54 percent of secondary school English Language Learners are native born (Capps, R. M. Fix, J. Murray, 2005). This group of students not only is the fastest growing in the US but also the one with the highest high school dropout rates and lower academic achievement in comparison to their peers (NEA, 2008). This jeopardizes having a well-educated workforce that can continue to compete globally.

English language learners are currently the fastest growing population of the public education sector in the United States. In the past 15 years, ELL students have doubled to 5 million and it is predicted that by 2015 this population will in-

crease to 10 million. More importantly, by 2015, it is projected that one out of every four students in public schools will be an English Language Learner (NCELA, 2007). Currently, about 12 percent of students in public schools across the nations are ELLs, meaning that there should be great attention paid to this population when making education policies since they are a population that is increasing expeditiously but constantly left behind.

The Education of English Language Learners

ESEA prohibits ELLs from being pulled out of the core academic classroom; therefore, general education teachers are responsible for both content and language learning. Although this prohibition has been in place since 2001, and designates more responsibilities to general education teachers, development and training for these educators has continued to lag behind creating a serious problem for both the educator and the student (Leos, K & Saavedra, L., 2010).

As the number of ELLs increases, more educators will continue to encounter the challenge of providing effective second language instruction and academic content. In the past the responsibility of ELLs' learning fell on the shoulders of bilingual teachers. However, as ELLs today spend the largest percentage of their schooling in regular classrooms, increasingly the duty of general education teachers is to be prepared and ready to educate ELLs (National Education Association, 2008).

Federal Funding

Title II

Title II of the ESEA, provides approximately \$3 billion yearly to support local and state level activities to improve teacher

quality and consequently improve student achievement. For the most part, these funds are spent at the district level on professional development and class-size reduction. Since 2002, funding towards professional development has increased; however, research on professional development program and its effectiveness has not been measured.

A recent review of nine rigorous studies found that adequate teacher professional development could boost student achievement by 21 percentile points (Chait & Miller, 2009). This review also concluded that training lasting 14 hours or less would not yield positive effects on either the teacher's development or the achievement of the students. This finding may suggest a different approach in the allocation of Title II funds for professional development programs and tracking of development courses for content areas as well as English as a Second Language.

Title III

The creation of Title III in the ESEA reauthorization of 2001 marked a new federal approach to provide high quality instruction that meets the needs of English Language Learners. Federal funds are distributed to states based on a formula that takes into account the number of immigrant and ELL students in each state. School- and division-level programs supported with Title III funds must provide research-based instruction designed to help ELL students develop fluency in English and achieve state standards in core academic content areas. Title III also supports high quality professional development for classroom teachers, principals, administrators, and other school or community-based organizational personnel to improve the instruction and assessment of ELLs (U.S Department of Education, 2010).

English Language Learners require teachers that are skilled in a variety of instructional, pedagogical and cultural strategies. Recent research in teacher preparation suggest that general education teachers who do not hold a license or certification on bilingual education or English as a Second Language (ESL), are not prepared to meet the needs of these students.

Preparedness of general education teachers to educate English Language Learners

In the midst of education conversations and government budget discussions, the teaching profession has been the one targeted with large cuts in jobs for not closing the achievement gap and not preparing America's students and workforce to be successful in a global economy. Although teacher requirements and preparation may vary from state to state, these states seem to have one thing in common; most of them have failed to adequately prepare teachers to educate Americans, in particular vulnerable populations like English Language Learners.

Rosalinda B. Barrera, Assistant Deputy and Director of the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) in the Department of Education, has emphasized the fact that there is a lack of prepared teachers who can efficiently deal with the needs of ELL students in the classroom (Barrera, HSS conference, 2011). Moreover, the data in Appendix A. (*Quality Counts 2009*), shows many states have not focused on teachers of ELLs and their participation in professional development; it also supports Ms. Barrera statement presenting that only 33 states have English Language standards and out of these states only three (Arizona, Florida, and New York) require all teachers to show competence in English Language instruction. Professional development for teachers working with ELLs is imperative to closing the academic achievement gaps of ELLs and hence, improves the overall educational achievement of our country.

ELLs are a salient population to the US economy who encounters multiple challenges. For example, these students' academic performance is far below that of their peers and they also have extremely high dropout rates. English Language Learners come to the classroom from very different backgrounds. Looking at the aca-

ademic span of this population, teachers prove to be an important factor in improving their academic career. An increasingly large body of research has established the importance of professional development for student learning as it allows teachers to share their concerns and support one another in finding ways to work effectively with ELLs (NEA, 2010).

Therefore, teachers of ELLs are in need of practical, research-based information, teaching strategies and development that is needed to evaluate, and educate ELLs. For example, in a 2005 survey of California teachers, many of them showed frustration with the fact that they received too little professional development and/or in-service on how to teach ELLs (Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, P., Driscoll, A., 2005).

English Language Learners require teachers that are skilled in a variety of instructional, pedagogical and cultural strategies. Recent research in teacher preparation suggest that general education teachers who do not hold a license or certification on bilingual education or English as a Second Language (ESL), are not prepared to meet the needs of these students. This is problematic given that most general education teachers have at least one ELL in their classroom, but only 29.5 percent of those teachers have been exposed to any kind of development in the field. In addition, as the ELL student population continues to grow across the nation, only about 20 states require upcoming teachers to receive training for working with ELLs (Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., Levy, J., 2008). It is imperative to address the needs of teacher development on ELLs, as many more educators will encounter the challenge of effective second language instruction in their classroom.

According to the Office English Language Acquisition (OELA), teachers and principals are not being trained; more and more teachers without any ESL back-

ground are being responsible for teaching ELLs. One out of every five professional development programs offers a full course on English Language Learners; in fact we know that fewer than thirty percent of teachers that have one ELL in their classroom have had any relevant professional development and thirty-five percent of elementary school ELL teachers participated in even one hour of training in this past year, so there is a great need for development (Barrera, HSS conference, 2011).

The importance of additional training for teachers of ELLs and general education teachers

Despite ongoing debates about whether and how many teachers make a difference in student learning, many studies show that the most important factor-affecting student learning is the teacher. The journal *The Future of Children*, published in spring 2011, explains, "The quality of instruction is what matters most in educating English-learners." The immediate inference of this finding is that more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. Effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels. If the teacher is ineffective, student under that teacher's guidance will achieve inadequate progress academically (Calderon, M., Slavin, R., and Sanchez, M., 2011).

In addition, the America Education Research Association (Holland, H. 2005) published a research point which showed that the most important factor of student success is what teachers learn. Professional development should aim to improve teachers' knowledge and it should enhance their understanding of student thinking in the subject matter as well as English acquisition. Aligning substantive training with the curriculum and teachers'

Schools that seek to provide a high quality development for general teachers in the field of English Language learners need to be aware of what works and what does not.

actual work experiences is vital to the success of teachers and their students.

Teachers themselves have expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of resources and feeling of unpreparedness to teach ELLs. These teachers often find themselves struggling with lack of skills to teach ELLs, a wide range of English and academic skills among ELLs, and lack of professional development to gain linguistic, cultural and instructional knowledge of this group (Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, P., Driscoll, A., 2005). Professional development is essential for the success of teachers dealing with vulnerable populations as well as the students learning. General education teachers must become aware of the areas in which ELLs may encounter challenges, and also be exposed to development programs that will give them guidance and support in working with these students by allowing teachers to share their experiences and support one another in finding ways to work with these students.

Effective techniques of Professional Development

Some experts in the field of English Language Learners have been able to discover through research and their career experience different techniques and approaches that may improve the perspective and instruction of a teacher when educating ELLs. One aspect of having a successful program is having a cultural component that will maximize the opportunities of ELLs by understanding different cultural backgrounds. Geneva Gay (2005), emphasizes teaching all students to learn about their own culture and appreciate the cultures of others. A good relationship with the classroom teacher and classmates will provide a great deal of support ELLs need to cope with the challenges they face.

There are effective techniques generally recommended for educating these

students. For example, teachers should strive to help their ELLs be comfortable in their classroom to help them learn. The more anxiety students' experience, the less language they will comprehend (Gay, 2000). Gay also suggests differentiating instruction for English language learners in the classroom. Teachers should make sure the lessons provide comprehensible input for students and link new learning to ELLs' prior knowledge. Literature in the classroom should reflect multiple ethnic, language and cultural perspectives. Classrooms should display and use pictures, books, labels and other information from different cultures (Gay, 2000).

New research continues to identify additional effective techniques for effective professional development. For example, Professor Hakuta, a long time expert on ELLs, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation are collaborating to create a team that will work with national ELL experts and educators to identify the academic language required in different content areas and develop an open-source platform of resources to help teachers of English-language learners implement the new standards. By the spring of 2012, the project will develop and begin testing samples of curriculum with frameworks, lesson plans, and teacher professional development and other resources based on federal standards, and then will work with the Council of Great City Schools to test them out in classrooms (Zehr, M.A., 2011). Initiatives like this should be supported and studied to see what is effective in the classroom and incorporate it into the professional development of teachers.

Some comprehensive models overhaul how schools address the needs of ELLs have shown to be effective. One model that motivates this change is the Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL), which emphasizes professional development for secondary school general teachers, as well

as ELL specialists, to learn how to engage English Language Learners. An evaluation of the first two years of the program in a high school in the Austin (Texas) Independent School District concluded it was "moderately effective." Since then, districts in San Diego and New York City have also implemented it (Zehr, M.A., 2011).

In addition, the Office of English Language Acquisition at the U.S. Department of Education has also provided many grants for development programs such as the Delta program in Florida. This training program studies the relationship between teacher preparation and the achievement of ELLs K-12, for its recent teacher graduates' to determine the effectiveness the professional development program and makes improvements in the curriculum and instruction. Interestingly, one observation was that teachers that are bilingual felt more prepared to teach them and the clinical experience or direct experience with ELLs was looked as the most helpful and beneficial aspect in being prepared to educate ELLs.

The time teachers spend in professional development makes a difference as well, but only when the activities focus on high-quality instruction. Fourteen hours or less will not have any effect on student achievement; therefore, we need to ensure that teachers are exposed to significant training varying from 30 to 50 hours. Extended opportunities to better understand student learning, curriculum and instruction, and subject matter content can boost the performance of both teachers and students (Holland, 2005).

Program Recommendations for Implementers

Schools that seek to provide a high quality development for general teachers in the field of English Language learners need to be aware of what works and what does not. These professional development pro-

The federal government has very limited power in setting education policies across the nation. But under ESEA and its guidelines this power has increased and is currently influencing policy at the state and local levels.

grams should include, but not be limited to the following characteristics:

- Establish high standards for ELL's language acquisition and academic content within lesson planning, instruction and testing.
- Use of effective pedagogy skills and knowledge on ELLs.
- Demonstrate how to implement strategies that simultaneously integrate language and content learning as well as exposure to successful instructional approaches that increases ELL academic achievement.
- Align teachers' learning opportunities with their real work experiences, using actual curriculum materials and assessments.
- Provide adequate time for professional development and ensure that the extended opportunities to learn emphasize observing and analyzing students' understanding of the instruction.

There also has to be a strict evaluation of professional development system in place. Most states and school districts do not know how much money they are spending on professional development for teachers or what benefit they are actually getting from their outlays because they do not systematically evaluate how well the additional training works. An effective evaluation includes an examination of actual classroom practices, the training's impact on teacher behavior, and its effect on student learning. "Evaluation should be an ongoing process that starts in the earliest stages of program planning and continues beyond the end of the program." (Holland, H. 2005)

Policy Recommendations for Policy Makers

The federal government has very limited power in setting education policies across the nation. But under ESEA and its guide-

lines this power has increased and is currently influencing policy at the state and local levels. Amid all the issues targeting the education of our country, the teaching profession should not be overlooked. Policy makers need to ensure that a reauthorized ESEA does the following:

- 1) *Introduces requirements for teachers that address the unequal distribution of highly-qualified teachers across districts.* These provisions are necessary so students can be guaranteed an effective education. But these provisions could be further strengthened for English Language Learners by requiring general education teachers to be appropriately trained as demonstrated by specific credentials and professional development to develop both language and academic proficiency in ELLs (ELL group, 2011).
- 2) *Promotes support through funding (competitive grants) for teacher preparation* We need to fund programs that build the capacity of general education and ESL teachers to differentiate instruction and assessment of ELL's as well as teach ELLs the academic language required to successfully access academic content. ELL experts need to be involved at every level of design and implementation if we really are attempting to close the achievement gap that this specific group currently faces. Their expertise and knowledge about the ELL community and their teachers could serve as a guide and outline of what legislation should focus on in order to have educators teaching vulnerable students like ELLs in an effective and substantive manner.
- 3) *Allocates funds of Title II to specific activities at the district-level that will improve the quality of professional development for general education teachers educating ELLs.* Since 2002, their funding towards professional development has increased;

however, tracking of the professional development and effectiveness has not been measured (Chait & Miller, 20). The reauthorization of ESEA needs to design a tracking system of development programs; increasing funding does not get much accomplished when we do not know where the money is going.

- 4) *Ensures that school districts have reliable systems for evaluating the impact of professional development on teachers' practices and student learning.* More attention needs to be paid to the kind of development program that is implemented and its success should be shown by data driven measures. Database decision-making should promote systematic collection of data to build evidence of effectiveness of the programs. Districts also have to do a better job advancing the requirement of showing competency to ELLs after completing any professional development training.
- 5) *Guarantees resources will be selected to states to work towards the development of a broad national framework that captures the many dimensions of the academic English, hence, training for teachers.* As a consequence, ESEA should also strive to incentivize professional development for teachers with the goal of having at least 70 percent of teachers' proficient to teach ELL's by the year 2020. There has to be an ongoing federal support toward programs like the National Professional Development (NPD) program, which is the only federal program that targets training for personnel that serves el. With a funding of 40 million since 2002 the NPD has been able to allocate grants for 8,000 teachers and train 1700 teachers through in-service and were able to complete the certification on ESL; however, this number still does not match the need of trained teachers that is on demand (Barrera, HSS conference, 2011)

- 6) *Raises the current cap under title III.* ELL enrollments are expanding throughout the country, especially in several states where school personnel have limited experience and expertise in serving these students. Therefore, under Title III, Congress should lift the cap on appropriations for pre and in-service preparation of bilingual and ESL teachers and also set aside fifteen percent of Title III funds for the National Professional Development program mentioned before.

Summary

The federal government has to be committed to improving the education of ELL students by providing assistance in the development of training programs for general education teachers. Funding and spending have been taken into account with these recommendations, which is why policy makers need to be aware that professional development needs to be looked as a long term process instead of just focusing on short term needs of certain education agendas. In addition, there should be less expansion of resources without research-based evidence of quality of training programs.

Investment in professional development is essential for closing the achievement gap among students. Policymakers cannot only focus on the pipeline for new teachers but also promote development among existing teachers that have been in the field for years. There has to be more emphasis for teachers to attend workshops that will sharpen their skills to better educate ELLs. Funds that are currently allocated in Title II of ESEA could be redistributed in a way that will lead to improvements in English Learners by ensuring that funds are used in effective ways. Funding for teacher development should align with strategic goals and perhaps channel these funds towards competitive grants that present greater results.

ESEA must support the crafting of effective teachers in schools and classrooms. This must include expanding the capacity to culturally and academically prepare teachers. Through Title II, the federal government should provide support to states and dis-

tricts that have a curriculum of professional development (including characteristics previously mentioned) for teachers in order to prepare them to work with ELLs. Educators must be empowered and stimulated to establish creative responses in the classroom. Lastly, investing in an educational model that will address the needs of ELL students and create professional development programs for teachers requires collaboration, discipline, and coordination throughout the educational and policy making system.

Bibliography:

1. Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., Levy, J. Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity. National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2008.
2. Calderon, M., Slavin, R., and Sanchez, M. "Effective Instruction for English Learners," *The Future of Children*, Spring 2011.
3. Chait, R. Miller, R. Ineffective Uses of ESEA Title II Funds: Funding doesn't Improve Student Achievement". Center for American Progress, 2009.
4. Capps, R., Fixx, M., Ost, J., Reardon-Anderson, J., & Passel, J. "The Health and Well-Being of Young Children of Immigrants". Urban Institute: New York, NY, 2004.
5. Gándara, P., J. Maxwell-Jolly, & A. Driscoll, "Listening to Teachers of English Language Learners. A Survey of California Teachers' Challenges, Experiences, and Professional Development Needs." *The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning*, and UC Linguistic Minority Research Center; Santa Cruz, Calif., 2005.
6. Geneva, G. "Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, Research and practice." *Multicultural Education Series: Teachers College Columbia University*, 2000.
7. Holland, H. "Teaching Teachers: Professional Development to Improve Student Achievement". Volume 3, Issue 1. *American Education Research Association*, 2005
8. Leos, K. and Saavedra, L. "A New Vision to Increase the Academic Achievement For English Language Learners and Immigrant Students". *The Global Institute for Language and Literacy Development*, 2010.
9. Parsad, B., Lewis, L. & Farris, E. "Teacher Preparation and Professional Development: 2000". U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2001. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001088.pd>
10. Martinez, L. "Professional Development for General Education Teachers of English Language Learners." *National Education Association*, 2010.
11. Payán, R. M., & Nettles, M. T. "Current state of English-language learners in the U.S. K–12 student population." (English-Language Learners Symposium Fact Sheet). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, January 2008.
12. The Working Group On ELL Policy. "Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Letter to Chairman Harkin". October 26, 2011. Web. Retrieved on December 2nd, 2011.
13. U.S. Department of Education. "Biennial Report to Congress on the Implementation of Title III State Formula Grant Program, School Years 2004-06." Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students, 2008.
14. U.S. Department of Education. "Education Department Announces Resolution of Civil Rights Investigation of Los Angeles Unified School District." Office of Civil Rights on October 11, 2011. Web. Retrieved on November 20th, 2011
15. Walqui, A. "Developing Accompanied Instructional Support Specialists: Applying Shulman's Model to ELL Education." Prepared for American Educational Research Association meeting, 2006.
16. Zher, M.A. "English-language Learners". *Education Week Magazine*, June 16th 2011. Web. November 22nd, 2011
17. Zher, M.A. "Gates Join Stanford ELL Project as Details Emerge". *Education Week Magazine*, August 15, 2011. Web. November 28th, 2011
18. "English Language Learners Face Unique Challenges". *National Education Association*, 2008.

Appendix A

Table 1. State policies regarding teaching of English Language Learner (ELL) students, by state: 2008–09

State	State has teacher standards for ELL instruction	State requires all prospective teachers to demonstrate competence in ELL instruction	State offers incentives to earn English as a Second Language license and/or endorsement	State bans or restricts native-language instruction
United States ¹	33	3	11	7
Alabama	No	No	No	No
Alaska	No	No	No	No
Arizona	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
California	Yes	No	No	Yes
Colorado	Yes	No	No	No
Connecticut	No	No	No	Yes
Delaware	No	No	Yes	No
District of Columbia	No	No	No	No
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes	No	No	No
Hawaii	No	No	No	No
Idaho	Yes	No	Yes	No
Illinois	Yes	No	No	No
Indiana	Yes	No	No	No
Iowa	Yes	No	Yes	No
Kansas	Yes	No	Yes	No
Kentucky	No	No	No	No
Louisiana	No	No	No	No
Maine	No	No	No	No
Maryland	Yes	No	Yes	No
Massachusetts	Yes	No	No	Yes
Michigan	Yes	No	No	No
Minnesota	Yes	No	No	No
Mississippi	No	No	No	No
Missouri	No	No	No	No

Table 1. State policies regarding teaching of English Language Learner (ELL) students, by state: 2008–09

State	State has teacher standards for ELL instruction	State requires all prospective teachers to demonstrate competence in ELL instruction	State offers incentives to earn English as a Second Language license and/or endorsement	State bans or restricts native-language instruction
Montana	Yes	No	No	No
Nebraska	Yes	No	No	No
Nevada	No	No	No	No
New Hampshire	Yes	No	No	Yes ²
New Jersey	Yes	No	No	No
New Mexico	Yes	No	No	No
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
North Carolina	Yes	No	No	No
North Dakota	Yes	No	No	No
Ohio	No	No	No	No
Oklahoma	No	No	No	No
Oregon	Yes	No	No	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	No
Rhode Island	Yes	No	No	No
South Carolina	No	No	No	No
South Dakota	No	No	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	No	No	No
Texas	Yes	No	No	No
Utah	No	No	No	No
Vermont	Yes	No	No	No
Virginia	Yes	No	No	No
Washington	No	No	Yes	No
West Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	No	No	No

1 National total reflects the number of “Yes” responses for each column.

2 New Hampshire state law indicates that instruction should be exclusively in English, but bilingual education programs are permitted with the approval of the state board of education and the local school district.

SOURCE: *Quality Counts 2009: Portrait of a Population*, Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, Education Week, 2009. Data Source

Appendix B

Table 2. State encouragement and support for teacher professional development and incentives for earning National Board Certification, by state: 2009–10				
State	State has formal professional-development standards	State finances professional development for all districts	State requires districts/schools to set aside time for professional development	State requires districts to align professional development with local priorities and goals
United States ¹	40	24	16	31
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Alaska	No	No	No	No
Arizona	Yes	No	No	No
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	No	No	No	No
Colorado	Yes	No	No	No
Connecticut	Yes	No	Yes	No
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
District of Columbia	No	No	No	No
Florida	Yes	No	No	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Idaho	No	No	No	No
Illinois	No	No	No	No
Indiana	Yes	No	No	Yes
Iowa	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Kansas	Yes	No	No	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maine	Yes	No	No	No
Maryland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes	No	No	Yes
Michigan	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mississippi	Yes	No	No	No
Missouri	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Montana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2. State encouragement and support for teacher professional development and incentives for earning National Board Certification, by state: 2009–10

State	State has formal professional-development standards	State finances professional development for all districts	State requires districts/schools to set aside time for professional development	State requires districts to align professional development with local priorities and goals
Nebraska	No	Yes	Yes	No
Nevada	No	Yes	No	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes	No	No	No
New Jersey	Yes	No	No	Yes
New Mexico	Yes	No	No	Yes
New York	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ohio	Yes	Yes	No	No
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Oregon	Yes	No	No	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Rhode Island	Yes	No	No	Yes
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	No	No	No	No
Tennessee	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Texas	No	No	No	No
Utah	Yes	No	No	Yes
Vermont	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Virginia	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Washington	Yes	Yes	No	No
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	No	Yes	No	Yes
Wyoming	No	No	No	Yes
West Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	No	No	No

1 National total reflects the number of “Yes” responses for each column.

SOURCE: *Quality Counts 2010: Fresh Course, Swift Current*, Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, Education Week, 2010. Data Source