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Purpose of the BRC

To increase both the quality and quantity of teachers for Mississippi’s schools through a collaboratively-developed redesign initiative targeted for all teacher preparation programs.
Process

- Over an 18-month span, the BRC:
  - Received guidance from national experts,
  - Reviewed research from regional, national, and international studies, and
  - Made campus visits to explore exemplary teacher preparation programs.

- Input was also gleaned from a variety of Mississippi stakeholders who held varying viewpoints about teacher preparation.
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Process

• As the process unfolded, it became apparent that success is dependent upon the willingness of key stakeholders to:
  1) embrace the concept of shared responsibility
  2) build strong collaboration among all stakeholders
  3) secure financial resources

• All information gathered was considered in developing the final recommendations and implementation plan.
BRC Timeline

BRC Kick-off Meeting
BRC Focused Work Meetings
Town Hall Meetings/Critical Entity Review/Website Feedback
Presentation of Thematic Areas & Critical Components to BRC
Development of Initial Action Plans
Presentation of Action Plans to BRC
Steering Committee Development of Work Plan
BRC Review of Implementation Plan
Development of Recommendations and Outcomes
Endorsed by MACTE
Presentation to IHL/MDE Boards for Approval

November 2006
January – April 2007
June – October 2007
October 30, 2007
Nov. 07 – Jan. 08
January 24, 2008
March-May, 2008
June 30, 2008
July-August, 2008
September 5, 2008
September 18, 2008
Implementation Phases

Implementation of the recommendations will occur in two phases. Each phase features components linked to one or more responsible entity.

**Phase I - 2008-09**
Primary responsibility of most recommendations tied to preparation programs

**Phase II – Multi-Year Launch Beginning 2008**
Includes components that require additional resources-time, talent, funding-with primary responsibility for most recommendations tied to the state
Recommendations

Seven key issues are addressed in recommendations:

1. Meaningful Field Experiences
2. Subject Content Preparation
3. Differentiating Instruction
4. Classroom Management
5. Recruitment and Retention
6. Strong Partnerships
7. Accountability
1. Meaningful Field Experiences

To establish consistency during comprehensive field experiences and to ensure that P-12 schools and preparation programs serve as partners in this process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Identify and implement comprehensive and consistent performance expectations for all teacher candidates.

2. Provide adequate and appropriate supervision of teacher candidates during all field placements.

3. Ensure a range of diverse settings that reflects the reality of the P-12 classroom and areas of licensure.
2. Subject Content Preparation

The depth of content knowledge necessary for appropriate student learning must be acquired by all teacher candidates.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Ensure *adequate preparation* to master subject area content *knowledge* in all areas of licensure.

2. Require that candidates *demonstrate mastery in delivery of content* as it relates to P-12 *student developmental* levels.
3. Differentiating Instruction

Varied learning styles, disabilities, and cultural differences create the need for teachers who can provide multiple classroom opportunities while meeting the needs of all students.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Require mastery of knowledge and skills for effectively differentiating instruction to meet all learner needs.

2. Reinforce/revise program content through collaboration with P-12 partners.
4. Classroom Management

Skillful management of the classroom to ensure a safe, orderly, successful learning environment requires appropriate opportunities for practice and feedback.

RECOMMENDATIONS:


2. Provide extensive opportunities to demonstrate appropriate expertise in an array of strategies.

3. Strengthen the collaborative involvement of P-12 educators in identifying preparation problem areas.
5. Recruitment and Retention

*Induction and mentoring programs are often minimal in nature, not well designed, and of limited quality and impact.*

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. **Enhance** pre-service incentives for hard-to-fill content areas and high need schools.

2. Implement **induction and mentoring programs** using current research and exemplary practice.

3. Utilize the first year of teaching as a **year-long residency** with a standard license conferred upon successful fulfillment of the residency requirements.
6. Strong Partnerships

To effectively prepare teachers for Mississippi schools, all stakeholders must be more meaningfully engaged in the preparation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Appoint a broad-based STATE P-16 Council to focus on statewide leadership, policy making, accountability, problem solving, and linking with the legislature.

2. Establish PROGRAM P-16 Councils representative of all stakeholders to impact curricular design/review, field experiences, collaboration, assessment, and program evaluation.

3. Plan opportunities for meaningful collaboration among P-12 educators, teacher preparation educators, and the broader community.
7. Accountability

An accountability model linked to effective teaching will increase both transparency and stakeholder confidence.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. Develop a sophisticated state-wide system that appropriately links preparation program graduates to P-12 student learning.
2. Establish and execute an implementation plan for the accountability model.
3. Establish an annual meeting with stakeholders for review of program progress regarding achievement and productivity.
Next Steps

Orientation Session for Redesign Teams         September 23, 2008
Recommendations sent to Collaborative Partners  September 2008
Redesign Work within Preparation Programs      October 2008-February 2009
Redesign Proposals Due                        March 30, 2009
Review of Redesign by External Consultants     April-May 2009
Implementation of Initial Phase of Redesign    June 2009
QUESTIONS ?