Teacher Effectiveness

Transforming the Roles and Responsibilities of
University-Based Teacher Education Programs

Robin White, Ivan Charner, Joseph Dominic, and Caitlin Rose Dailey
FHI 360

May 2019

About the Authors
This report was written by FHI 360 staff who provided customized coaching to institutions of higher education (IHEs) participating in the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative (TEI) and broader technical support to foundation staff, advisers, and cross-site work groups. Bush Foundation staff and representatives of the TEI sites were given opportunities to provide input prior to publication, but the content presented draws from the experiences and observations of FHI 360 staff during nine years of work with the TEI.

For further information about this report, contact Robin White (arwhite@fhi360.org)

For further information about the TEI, contact Justin Christy (jchristy@bushfound.org)

About FHI 360
FHI 360 is a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving lives by developing, implementing, and evaluating locally driven integrated solutions to education, health, workforce development, economic development, and civil society challenges. Its domestic education work focuses on improving educational opportunities for youth through services that include program design (e.g., the creation of models, protocols, tools, and materials), project management, professional development, coaching, creation of local and national networks, and collective impact and program evaluation. FHI 360 has worked at the nexus of IHEs, schools, and communities for more than 50 years, solving critical issues in education, health, and youth development through projects in 48 states and work with more than 60 IHEs and more than 400 school districts. Learn more at www.fhi360.org.

About the Bush Foundation
Learn more at www.bushfoundation.org.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Launched in 2009 as one of the Bush Foundation's three priority funding areas for the next decade, the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative (TEI) was a bold and ambitious effort to reduce student achievement gaps and increase the percentage of students in the foundation's service region (Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and the 23 Native nations that share the same geography) who are on track to earn a degree after high school. The focus of this initiative was a select group of institutions of higher education (IHEs) and consortia, along with their district partners. A specific goal of the TEI was to produce 25,000 effective new teachers by 2020.

Shortly after announcing this initiative, the Bush Foundation engaged FHI360 to provide customized coaching to the partner IHEs and consortia and broader technical support to foundation staff, advisers, and cross-site work groups. This report, written by the FHI 360 coaches with support from the Bush Foundation and input from representatives of the participating IHEs, is designed to share knowledge gained from the TEI with grantmakers, teacher educators, and other external audiences that could apply learning from the TEI to future investments and initiatives.

The Bush Foundation identified four pillars for its TEI—recruit, prepare, place, and support. The pillars guided transformation efforts that began with an emphasis on intentional recruitment into teacher education, redesign of both classroom and field experiences as well as stronger linkages between the two, an IHE focus on helping teacher education graduates obtain their first teaching positions, and continued support for alumni in their early years of teaching. The pillars were not prescriptive; they were broad categories to guide transformation efforts based on sites' individual contexts, needs, and priorities. Early on, the foundation changed the label of the *place* pillar to *employ* to clarify expectations that participating IHEs should play active roles in helping their teacher education graduates obtain initial teaching positions. A fifth pillar—measure—was added to the framework during TEI implementation in recognition of the important steps the IHEs were taking to assess the impact of their work.

Rather than issuing a competitive request for proposals (RFP) to all IHEs with teacher education programs in its region, the Bush Foundation originally selected 15 potential IHE partners and invited them to participate in the TEI. Beginning in 2009, FHI 360 helped the Bush Foundation hone its proposal expectations, assisted with cross-site convenings designed to introduce the partner IHEs to the foundation's proposal expectations and time line, provided background information on previous foundation-funded efforts to transform university-based teacher education, and worked with individual sites and consortia to develop proposals that described their plans to incorporate the four pillars into comprehensive plans to transform their teacher education programs.

After thorough reviews by senior foundation officials, the FHI 360 coaches, and members of an Advisory and Review Committee convened by the foundation to provide guidance to the TEI, the Bush Foundation ultimately awarded grants to five individual IHEs and two consortia: Minnesota State University, Mankato; St. Cloud State University; University of Minnesota, University of South Dakota; Winona State University; the Twin Cities Teacher Collaborative (composed of Augsburg College, Bethel University, Concordia University St. Paul, Hamline University, University of St. Catherine, and University of St. Thomas); and the Valley Partnership (composed of North Dakota State University, Valley City State University, and Minnesota State University, Moorhead).

Spanning 10 years and representing one of the Bush Foundation's largest investments in its history, the TEI leaves a legacy of successes and accomplishments at both the site and cross-site levels. The TEI legacy includes:

- New courses, sequences, and programs that align teacher education at TEI sites with the needs and expectations of P-12 districts and the pupils they serve.
- Stronger, more-focused P-12 partnerships.
- Earlier, longer, and more frequent clinical experiences for teacher candidates.
- More intensive efforts to recruit and retain candidates of color.
- Greater emphases on racial equity and social justice.
- A set of four aligned valid and reliable common metrics surveys that are now being used by other IHEs in Minnesota and North Dakota and continuing to attract national attention.
- Enhanced capacities to collect and analyze data and use data from multiple sources for program improvement.
- IHEs' recognition of their responsibilities for employment and continuing support for graduates.

The successes of TEI required the Bush Foundation, the IHEs, and other partners to navigate major contextual changes and overcome a range of challenges. The most significant of these challenges were:

- Significant variations in site capacities and leadership commitments.
- Major shifts in local, state, and national economic conditions.
- Transitions in the foundation's senior leaders and education team.
- Pace of change in higher education.
- Organizational, cultural, and political differences between higher education and P-12.

Ultimately, implementation of the TEI was a complex process with multiple moving parts. Despite this complexity, many of the partner IHEs achieved significant —and lasting—accomplishments in their efforts to transform their teacher education programs. The impact of these accomplishments may continue to grow as a result of the groundwork established during the TEI. Although the initiative fell short of the aspirational goal of 25,000 effective new teachers in the region by 2020, there is substantial evidence that many of the partner IHEs are producing graduates who are well-prepared to assume their responsibilities as novice teachers and that P-12 districts are eager to hire their graduates. In addition, the TEI provided important learning for the participating IHEs, the Bush Foundation, FHI 360, and the broader field of teacher education.

This report concludes with lessons for grantmakers and teacher education programs and considerations for P-12 educators who are interested in forging stronger partnerships with IHEs (and more specifically teacher education programs). The recommendations for grantmakers focus on lessons that could be used to guide future philanthropic efforts to improve teacher quality and effectiveness. The lessons for teacher educators are inter-related and should be used to guide future efforts to transform teacher education—with the caveat that application of one lesson in isolation is unlikely to yield substantive and sustainable change. The considerations for P-12 educators stop short of full-scale recommendations because the FHI 360 coaches had less frequent and less in-depth interactions with them during the TEI. Nonetheless, these considerations point to a number of actions that P-12 educators can take based on lessons learned from the TEI.

Introduction

Launched in 2009 as one of the Bush Foundation's three priority funding areas for the next decade, the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative (TEI) was a bold and ambitious effort to reduce student achievement gaps and increase the percentage of students in the foundation's service region (Minnesota [MN], North Dakota [ND], South Dakota [SD], and the 23 Native nations that share the same geography) who are on track to earn a degree after high school. The focus of this initiative was a select group of institutions of higher education (IHEs) and consortia, along with their district partners. A specific goal of the TEI was to produce 25,000 effective new teachers by 2020.

Shortly after announcing this initiative, the Bush Foundation engaged FHI 360, a nonprofit human development organization that has worked at the nexus of IHEs, schools, and communities for more than 50 years, to provide customized coaching to the partner IHEs and consortia and broader technical support to foundation staff, advisers, and cross-site work groups. This report, written by the FHI 360 coaches with support from the Bush Foundation, is designed to share knowledge gained from the TEI with grantmakers, teacher educators, and other external audiences that could apply learning from the TEI to future investments and initiatives. Drafts of the accomplishments, challenges, and lessons sections were sent to at least one representative of each of the partner IHEs for input that subsequently informed the final version of this report.

This report begins with an overview that: 1) describes the pillars that served as the organizing framework for the TEI; 2) identifies the organizations and entities that played major roles in the TEI; and 3) summarizes the processes used to select the sites that received TEI funding. The next two sections summarize major TEI accomplishments and the challenges encountered during TEI implementation. These summaries are followed by a brief analysis of how the TEI unfolded across three chronological phases in its 10-year duration. The report concludes with key lessons from the TEI for grantmakers, university-based teacher education programs, and P-12 partners.

Overview of the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative

Before reaching out to IHEs or engaging FHI 360 to provide coaching support, the Bush Foundation identified four pillars for its TEI—recruit, prepare, place, and support. The pillars provided the core structure or framework around which the TEI was built. The pillars guided transformation efforts that began with an emphasis on intentional recruitment into teacher education, redesign of both classroom and field experiences as well as stronger linkages between the two, an IHE focus on helping teacher education graduates obtain their first teaching positions, and continued support for alumni in their early years of teaching. The pillars were not prescriptive; they were broad categories to guide transformation efforts based on sites' individual contexts, needs, and priorities. Early on, the foundation changed the label of the *place* pillar to *employ* to clarify expectations that participating IHEs should play active roles in helping their teacher education graduates obtain initial teaching positions. A fifth pillar—measure—was added to the framework during TEI implementation in recognition of the important steps the IHEs were taking to assess the impact of their work.

Roles and Responsibilities in TEI Planning and Implementation
In the early years of the TEI, the Bush Foundation played highly visible leadership roles and recruited other organizations and individuals to provide additional guidance and assistance to the participating IHEs. The foundation, with initial support from McKinsey & Company, developed the vision and guiding principles for the TEI and framed the parameters under which the initiative would operate. The foundation hired the Value-Added Research Center (VARC) to develop a new value-added assessment system that was expected to play a crucial role in the TEI by linking the performance of new teachers with the IHEs that prepared them. This value-added system was expected to serve as the primary measure of both the effectiveness of new teachers produced and the overall success of the TEI. Shortly after the announcement of its ambitious goal for producing effective new teachers, the Bush Foundation launched a national search for a vice president of education to assume day-to-day leadership of the TEI. The foundation ultimately selected a local candidate with extensive experience in state government, including her position as director of the MN Office of Higher Education. A second senior staff member was added to the Bush Foundation's education unit in less than a year.

The Bush Foundation's new education vice president engaged FHI 360 to provide coaching and related technical support to the TEI. The FHI 360 roles and responsibilities evolved during the 10-year life span of the TEI, but the primary focus was always on the delivery of customized coaching to help the sites transform the quality of their teacher education programs. The coaches often served as facilitators, catalysts, brokers, and critical friends. At some IHEs, they also served as mentors and sounding boards for TEI leaders and provided a safe space for those involved in the TEI to share concerns and frustrations. They focused on helping sites make data-informed decisions about how and why to implement TEI activities, but they did not tell the sites what they should do. At various points in the TEI, the coaches also advised foundation staff on development of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) that was executed with each site, assisted with the design and delivery of cross-site meetings, and met regularly with foundation staff to review sites' progress and emerging trends in teacher education. FHI 360 also facilitated and provided technical support to the cross-site work group established to identify the common measures of progress the TEI sites would use.

In addition, FHI 360 collaborated with senior Bush Foundation administrators on the identification and recruitment of an Advisory and Review Committee (ARC) that included national experts on transformation of university-based teacher education as well as a local superintendent and a union representative. The cross-site convenings and summits hosted by the Bush Foundation typically included opportunities for the ARC members to provide input and guidance to faculty and administrators. In addition, the foundation convened the ARC regularly to review the IHE partners' milestone reports and discuss broader trends in teacher education, and FHI 360 staff contributed to the ARC discussions.

Selection of TEI Sites
Rather than issuing a competitive request for proposals (RFP) to all IHEs with teacher education programs in its region, the Bush Foundation originally selected 15 potential IHE partners and invited them to participate in the TEI. Nine of the IHEs were asked to become members of two consortia. One of these consortia consisted of six private, religious IHEs in the Twin Cities; the other spanned the Fargo-Moorhead border by bringing two IHEs in eastern ND together with one IHE in western MN. The invitations to partner included specific references to the four pillars—recruit, prepare, place, and

support—that were identified as the framework for the TEI. These pillars were later included as required components of the proposals that the partner IHEs were asked to submit.

Beginning in 2009, FHI 360 helped the Bush Foundation hone its proposal expectations, assisted with cross-site convenings designed to introduce the partner IHEs to the foundation's proposal expectations and time line, provided background information on previous foundation-funded efforts to transform university-based teacher education, and worked with individual sites and consortia to develop proposals that described their plans to incorporate the four pillars into comprehensive plans to transform their teacher education programs. After thorough reviews by the FHI 360 coaches, ARC members, and senior Bush Foundation administrators, the Bush Foundation decided not to fund one potential partner and awarded funds to five universities and two consortia:

- Minnesota State University, Mankato
- St. Cloud State University
- Winona State University
- University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
- University of South Dakota
- Twin Cities Teacher Collaborative (later referred to as TC2), composed of Augsburg College, Bethel University, Concordia University St. Paul, Hamline University, University of St. Catherine, and University of St. Thomas
- Fargo-Moorhead consortium (later renamed Valley Partnership), composed of North Dakota State University, Valley City State University, and Minnesota State University, Moorhead

After the identification of sites and the amount of funding that each would receive based on an estimate of the number of teachers each would produce and the scope of work it proposed, the Bush Foundation asked eight IHEs and one consortium to sign a customized MOU. (Individual MOUs were executed with the three members of the Valley Partnership while one was executed with the IHE that served as the fiscal agent for TC2.) Each MOU included the total number of teachers the site would be expected to produce by 2020, the roles and responsibilities of the foundation and the site, an explicit commitment that the site would participate in the identification/development of common metrics and subsequent data collection and reporting, and a payment schedule that included opportunities to earn two rounds of bonus payments for each effective teacher (as measured by the anticipated value-added system) produced and retained.

What Were the Major Successes and Accomplishments of the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative?

Spanning 10 years and representing one of the Bush Foundation's largest investments in its history, the TEI leaves a legacy of successes and accomplishments at both the site and cross-site levels. The TEI legacy includes:

New courses, sequences, and programs that align teacher education at TEI sites with the needs and expectations of P-12 districts and the pupils they serve: Sites identified different priorities and relied on different sources of data initially to design and implement the strategies used to transform their teacher education programs. As a result, there was significant variation in the new programs. Strategies

employed at different campuses included new modules that replaced traditional course sequences, new partnerships with community colleges to create pathways to baccalaureate teacher education programs, mapping of current courses to determine where to add new content on classroom management, pupil assessment, educational technology and other topics, and a degree program that integrated special education content with elementary education certification. Some sites also launched new programs to recruit and prepare paraprofessionals for teaching positions and received additional funding for them through the Bush Foundation's supplemental TEI grants to support diversity in teaching.

Stronger, more-focused P-12 partnerships: The TEI explicitly encouraged IHEs to acknowledge the expertise that P-12 districts bring to teacher education, expand existing partnerships and/or create new ones, and engage P-12 educators in the redesign and transformation of teacher education in substantive ways. Many of the sites worked intentionally to put this emphasis into practice and deepened their collaboration with partner districts. They worked with P-12 representatives at many levels of leadership, from classroom teachers to superintendents. They engaged P-12 representatives on program, course, and curriculum re-design committees. They co-designed new clinical placement activities that asked more of the IHEs and the P-12 schools. Some sites hired staff members with specific responsibilities for building and nurturing strong P-12 partnerships.

Earlier, longer, and more frequent clinical experiences for teacher candidates: The early years of the TEI coincided with increasing attention to clinical experiences in the teacher education field. Sites capitalized on this momentum from the field, the resources of TEI, and deepening relationships with P-12 partners to innovate in their clinical experiences for teacher candidates. Clinical placements for teacher candidates at most TEI sites now start earlier, last longer, and occur more frequently, and they are linked directly to classroom instruction to help candidates translate theory into practice. Teacher candidates gain practical knowledge that prepares them for the professional world of teaching. Beyond increasing the quantity and duration of clinical experiences, TEI sites also invested in improving their quality by training mentor teachers and IHE-based clinical supervisors, redefining expectations and selection processes for clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers, and, at many sites, by instituting co-teaching models. (A majority of the TEI sites moved away from traditional student teaching placements to implement a co-teaching model in which candidates were paired with trained cooperating teachers to share responsibilities for all aspects of instruction, including planning, organization, delivery, and assessment.)

More intensive efforts to recruit and retain candidates of color: In its vision for the TEI, the Bush Foundation encouraged sites to examine or re-examine their efforts to recruit, prepare, place, and support teacher candidates of color. Many sites redoubled their outreach to potential candidates of color on their campuses and in local communities. Some sites established new programs designed to help paraeducators, other education support professionals, and community members of color prepare for and transition into teaching positions. IHEs also provided additional supports for candidates of color once enrolled, including scholarship opportunities, tutoring, and one-on-one mentoring. While these efforts met with mixed success, at least one IHE increased its proportion of candidates of color by slightly more than 10 percent.

Greater emphases on racial equity and social justice: Deeper partnerships with P-12 educators combined with recruitment of candidates of color led some IHEs to focus more on racial equity and social justice. They focused on the needs of both P-12 partners that expected novice teachers to be able to work effectively in diverse classrooms and candidates of color who brought new perspectives to courses, programs, and the teacher education environment. Even IHEs that were not successful in increasing enrollment of candidates of color responded to P-12 expectations with revised courses that included new emphases on racial equity and social justice.

A set of four aligned valid and reliable common metrics surveys that are now being used by other IHEs in MN and ND and continuing to attract national attention: The Bush Foundation originally envisioned the common metrics as a supplement to value-added assessment. However, the sites bonded through their collaborative efforts to develop a framework for cross-site data collection and a series of four aligned instruments—surveys completed by candidates upon entry into teacher education and at exit, a transition to teaching survey administered one year after graduation, and a survey completed by the supervisors of first-year teachers. The common metrics work group decided to operate by consensus, and all decisions on the initial surveys and subsequent revisions were approved by all IHE partners. The consensus model provided a foundation for the development of data governance recommendations that all 14 IHEs adopted as well as data-sharing across IHEs. The TEI common metrics were ahead of the curve because they predated accreditation standards that required university-based teacher education programs to collect valid and reliable survey data from graduates and their supervisors. By 2015, the common metrics surveys were the only instruments that had been developed by a cross-state work group of teacher educators and used successfully in multiple states.

Enhanced capacities to collect and analyze data and use data from multiple sources for program improvement: The TEI built in a requirement that IHEs develop and deploy common metrics surveys, a process that helped embed data into programmatic decision-making at many sites. The Bush Foundation backed up the emphasis on collecting and using data by providing supplemental data capacity grants to 13 of the 14 IHE partners as well as a grant to the four participating MN State IHEs to access and work with data at the state university system level. The combination of these investments and FHI 360 coaching on the importance of data for program and course improvements helped many IHEs build a culture of evidence that encompassed a wide range of data sources, including edTPA and institutional data. Almost all of the IHEs enhanced their human and technical resources to collect, analyze, and use data in teacher education.

IHEs' recognition of their responsibilities for employment and continuing support for graduates. The TEI pillars underscored the concept that teacher educators' responsibilities do not end when teacher candidates graduate. Many sites took on additional efforts to help their graduates secure employment—for example, by collaborating with campus career centers on counseling and career fairs—and provided additional support in the first years of teaching. These efforts dovetailed with and benefitted from other advances prompted by the TEI. Closer partnerships with P-12 districts allowed for more intensive induction programs, and enhanced data capacities enabled the sites to locate their graduates newly employed in schools and offer them ongoing support.

What Were Major Challenges to the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative?

The successes of TEI required the Bush Foundation, the IHEs, and other partners to navigate major contextual changes and overcome a range of challenges. The most significant of these challenges were:

Significant variations in site capacities and leadership commitments: From the outset, the TEI was confounded by the complexity of trying to move individual IHEs and consortia toward a common goal established by the foundation. With broad-based teams at the site level and a range of external partners (VARC, ARC, formative evaluators, and FHI 360 coaches), the TEI exhibited multiple moving parts at both the site and cross-site levels (and a third level for the consortia). The FHI 360 coaches were able to work with Bush Foundation staff to develop customized technical assistance and support designed to meet the specific context, strengths, and improvement priorities of each grantee, and the ARC provided assistance on this front. Nonetheless, variations in site capacities contributed to differences in outcomes across the IHEs. The common metrics helped all of the IHEs develop the capacity to collect consistent data from candidates and later their supervisors, but the data collection activities and response rates continued to show the range of capacities (and priorities) across sites. The Bush Foundation honored its commitment not to release any data that compared and ranked the TEI sites--and in doing so, ensured that other sites and broader public audiences did not receive tangible evidence of variations in site performance.

Major shifts in local, state, and national economic conditions: In the early years of the TEI, major swings in local, state, and national economic conditions had a negative effect on the sites' abilities to place their graduates in teaching positions. The lingering effects of the 2008 recession led to fewer retirements than the Bush Foundation projected and fewer job openings for novice teachers. The shortage of teaching positions was probably less acute in ND and SD, but many of the open positions were not attractive to recent graduates because they were in the states' most rural areas. The lower employment numbers and continued projections of limited job openings led to recruitment challenges, and many TEI sites struggled to come close to enrolling the number of candidates required to attain the number of graduates identified in their respective MOUs. The recession and other external economic factors also contributed to state budget cuts that hit higher education disproportionately hard. The foundation relieved pressure on the TEI sites by electing not to penalize them for falling short of the numbers of teacher education graduates specified in their MOUs.

Transitions in the foundation's senior leaders and education team: Although foundations often announce long-term initiatives with ambitious goals, changes in their leadership, priorities, and program staff can affect outcomes. The Bush Foundation experienced turnovers in both its senior leadership and education teams at about the midpoint of the TEI. The coaches struggled to help key IHE personnel understand the changes that routinely occur with foundation staffing transitions. As the new foundation staff launched additional education initiatives, they were able to establish credibility with TEI sites by offering supplemental funding opportunities (to P-12 partners for support of university-based teacher education and to TEI IHEs to promote diversity in teacher education) as well as sustainability grants for IHEs to lead continued collaboration on common metrics and teacher effectiveness.

Pace of change in higher education: Even if the TEI had been implemented with no unexpected external challenges or personnel changes at the IHEs, the time line for the initiative was unrealistic considering

the pace of change in higher education. The TEI sought to transform teacher education programs in roughly a five-year window (or less) in order to have candidates completing "new" teacher education programs by 2014 or earlier and assessed for their effectiveness using a new value-added system by 2017. The structures and processes of higher education (e.g., approval of new courses, sequences, and programs and hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions) were problematic for achieving such rapid change. Even if the faculty, staff, and deans who were most actively involved in the redesign of preparation experiences (both classroom and clinical) had been able complete their work in the first year of the TEI, the approval processes could have easily spanned one year or more. University committees and state higher education systems are often slow and deliberative—and in no rush to approve new courses, programs, or sequences based on an externally imposed time line.

Organizational, cultural, and political differences between higher education and P-12: All too often, higher education and P-12 districts speak different languages and bring different perspectives on what can and should be done to improve the quality of P-12 teaching and learning. Efforts to bring IHE and P-12 representatives together to work on issues important to both are often stymied by scheduling and logistics. For example, P-12 teachers are typically unavailable during the school day, and many IHE faculty teach in the late afternoon and early evening. Some of the TEI sites were able to make more progress than others to move beyond their silos by offering joint professional development opportunities and enhancing the roles of teachers on special assignment (TOSAs), who can serve as translators across the cultural divide between IHEs and P-12 districts. By continuing to push the TEI sites to engage P-12 partners in multiple aspects of their work, the Bush Foundation and the FHI 360 coaches helped some TEI sites and their P-12 partners develop sustainable strategies for reducing their cultural differences and barriers.

Implementation of the Teacher Effectiveness Initiative and Steps Toward Sustaining Transformation

The TEI required a highly challenging mix of programmatic changes at IHEs, decisions and approvals at multiple levels, and supports and accountability applied to IHEs by external entities. This section of the report provides a snapshot of how the TEI moved from planning to implementation and the changes that occurred as a result of progress and setbacks, shifting priorities, leadership transitions, the lingering impact of the 2008 recession, and the difficulties associated with building a new value-added model that could be used to link the performance of new teachers with the IHES that prepared them.

Early Energy and Enthusiasm
The Bush Foundation launched the TEI with the visible and enthusiastic support of its president and a long-term funding commitment from its board. Foundation staff maintained regular communications with the TEI sites and looked for opportunities to use their relationships with IHE leaders to leverage change. The Bush Foundation hosted cross-site convenings and summits, many of which provided opportunities for the FHI 360 coaches, ARC members, and guest speakers to offer input and guidance to faculty and administrators. With support from FHI 360, the foundation led development of a template for milestone reports that sites used to provide updates on their progress, and senior Bush Foundation leaders participated in annual milestone visits to all sites.

Concurrently, FHI 360 conducted regular coaching visits to each TEI site and supplemented in-person interactions with telephone calls and emails. Their initial focus was on helping the sites translate their ambitious proposals into work plans with specific action steps, time lines, and indicators of progress. Many of the sites expanded the visibility of the TEI by engaging p-12 partners in new and more substantive ways as they developed plans for TEI implementation. IHE representatives collected information about the perceived strengths and weaknesses of their teacher education programs and sought P-12 suggestions for how TEI funds could be used to strengthen them. As the TEI unfolded, some IHEs created or expanded programs for TOSAs, developed new partnership structures, and engaged P-12 educators in both co-teaching and a continuum of clinical experiences.

In addition to customized coaching, FHI 360 provided a broad range of related support to the Bush Foundation and the TEI as a whole. The coaches helped Bush staff convene the ARC, which reviewed sites' milestone reports, assisted with the design and delivery of cross-site meetings, and met regularly with the Bush education team and the FHI 360 coaches to review the progress of each site and discuss broader trends in education. In addition, FHI 360 helped to expand awareness of the TEI by submitting proposals for conference presentations and organizing panels that shared their accomplishments and learning at annual meetings of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Of particular note, FHI 360 planned and facilitated the first common metrics work group meeting in early 2010 and continued to provide technical support to the group for more than five years. During that period, FHI 360 assisted with development of four surveys administered at all TEI sites—surveys of candidates at program entry and exit as well as a follow-up survey conducted with alumni one year after program completion and a corresponding survey completed by supervisors. Subsequently, FHI 360 supported multiple survey revisions based on psychometric analyses to ensure validity and reliability. In addition, FHI 360 staff created and updated an electronic common metrics handbook, wrote the RFP for a vendor to administer the graduate follow-up and supervisor surveys, and later worked with sites to move to self-administration of all four surveys. FHI 360 also prepared site-specific reports to highlight findings from each of the four common metrics surveys and facilitated a subgroup that developed data governance recommendations to guide publication and sharing of common metrics data.

Changes and Challenges
As TEI sites moved into full implementation, many were forced to adjust their plans based on changes in project or IHE leadership, campus funding, other contextual factors (e.g., delays in hiring for key positions or approval for new programs), and reviews of data from common metrics and other sources. These data often suggested the need to focus more attention on specific aspects of teacher education (e.g., classroom management, student assessment, integration of technology in the classroom, and working with students with special needs). As the needs for midcourse corrections were identified or specific challenges required more attention, the FHI 360 coaches were able to provide more time to sites that were struggling or wanted additional assistance in pushing themselves toward further innovation. At various points in time, the coaches served as critical friends, confidantes, neutral facilitators, resources for information and referrals, catalysts, and provocateurs.

By the time that TEI sites developed revised programs and began looking for opportunities to place their completers in teaching positions, there was mounting evidence that teacher retirements were occurring at a much slower pace than the Bush Foundation had projected. Conversations with superintendents and others suggested that many teachers had opted to stay in their jobs longer to build up the savings they lost in the 2008 recession. When the foundation and the coaches prompted sites to dig deeper into labor market information, most IHEs discovered that the number of teaching positions expected to open within their partner districts within the next few years was far lower than the number of candidates they were currently preparing. In turn, concerns about being able to find teaching positions in desirable locations made it difficult for the IHEs to recruit the numbers of candidates needed to meet the target numbers of effective teachers specified in their MOUs. The Bush Foundation never sought to renegotiate the target numbers included in the MOUs, and the demand for new teachers increased significantly in the later years of the TEI as retirements accelerated and many districts found themselves facing teacher shortages again.

The announcement of the resignation of the Bush Foundation's president in early 2012 signaled a period of change and adjustments for the TEI. While the level of foundation interaction with the sites, the coaches, and the ARC continued at high levels during the tenure of an interim president and support for VARC remained central to the TEI initiative, things began to change when a new president was named, the senior education staff moved on to new positions, and a new education team was established. The new education team took a less hands-on approach to the TEI sites, moving away from the role of an operating foundation to focus more on stewardship and the development of new directions for the foundation's education portfolio.

The new education team also took a hard look at the difficulties that VARC was continuing to experience in its efforts to access the data needed to build a new value-added assessment system. Even though VARC had built a reputation for its work in creating value-added systems in major school districts across the country, the organization struggled mightily to gain access to personnel data for novice teachers in the region and link those data to the IHEs that prepared the teachers. The Bush Foundation ultimately severed its relationship with VARC, but this decision meant that the foundation needed to find a new measure of effective teachers to use in calculating the bonus payments to which it had committed in its MOUs with the TEI sites. The foundation staff engaged external consultants and TEI site representatives in the exploration of alternative measures but ultimately chose to use the common metrics supervisor survey for this purpose—primarily because it was already in use by all of the sites, and other measures would require new investments of time and money. This exploration process ultimately led the sites to request that the foundation reallocate the funds reserved for a second round of bonus payments to creation of new measures of teacher effectiveness.

Steps toward Sustainability
The Bush Foundation's original vision for the TEI anticipated that the participating IHEs would transform their teacher education programs based on the pillars. In doing so, they would become so successful at producing effective teachers that they would distinguish themselves from their competitors, attract increasing numbers of teacher education candidates, and become the go-to sources for districts looking to hire new teachers. Sustainability was not mentioned specifically in the MOUs that the foundation executed with its IHE partners. The foundation leaders who launched the TEI expected the transformed

teacher education programs to be so successful that IHEs would discontinue their previous programs and support the new ones through existing budgets. That scenario was ambitious, but several sites reached a level of transformation that they defined as their new normal—and found it difficult to remember how they had operated differently in the past.

By the 2014-15 school year, FHI 360 coaches began encouraging the sites to focus on plans for sustaining specific activities and positions that were launched with TEI funds. Some of the sites had already begun to move key positions (e.g., assessment coordinators, recruitment coordinators, partnership directors, or data stewards) onto other sources of funding, and many of those that had not worked with the coaches to develop plans for doing so. The new Bush Foundation education team also provided additional encouragement for sites to take more active leadership roles in defining and implementing strategies for sustaining their work. The education team asked FHI 360 to step away from involvement in cross-site activities (e.g., facilitation and technical support for the common metrics work group and assistance with planning and delivery of summits) and determined that participation in coaching should be optional for IHEs. The foundation also encouraged FHI 360 to offer coaching to individual members of the two consortia, which made sense because the consortia were already phasing out their staffing and many of their cross-site activities. FHI 360 was asked to focus its coaching in 2016 and 2017 on planning for sustainable leadership and/or operations.

To encourage greater independence and active leadership among the IHE partners, the Bush Foundation used RFPs to identify individual IHEs that would assume lead responsibility for continuing the common metrics work and launching a portfolio of work focused on development of new measures of teacher effectiveness. The sites chose to collaborate on their responses to the RFPs instead of competing against each other and created a governance council to oversee both the common metrics and teacher effectiveness work.

Ultimately, implementation of the TEI was a complex process with multiple moving parts. Despite this complexity, many of the partner IHEs achieved significant —and lasting—accomplishments in their efforts to transform their teacher education programs. The impact of these accomplishments may continue to grow as a result of the groundwork established during the TEI. Although the initiative fell short of the aspirational goal of 25,000 effective new teachers in the region by 2020, there is substantial evidence that many of the partner IHEs are producing graduates who are well-prepared to assume their responsibilities as novice teachers and that P-12 districts are eager to hire their graduates. In addition, the TEI provided important learning for the participating IHEs, the Bush Foundation, FHI 360, and the broader field of teacher education.

Key Lessons for the Bush Foundation and Other Grantmakers

Over the course of the TEI, the coaches identified a number of key lessons that could inform subsequent grantmaking to improve teacher quality and effectiveness. As summarized below, many of these lessons transcend the specific content and design of the TEI.

Grantees should be allowed to define their partnerships and relationships. In the initial design of the TEI, the composition of the two funded consortia was determined by the funder rather than the

participating IHEs. While the two consortia operated very differently, neither seemed to engender lasting relationships among their members or make sustainable change at the consortium level. Consortium members were expected to attain the same goals as IHEs that received individual funding awards, but they were forced to operate with considerably less funding at the campus level and the added complexity of building new governance structures and cross-IHE work plans. Partnerships and relationships are crucial to effective teacher education, but grantees should have the discretion to engage partners that share their vision and want to collaborate to achieve common goals.

If a funder expects grantees to provide common data, the grantees should be engaged in building and implementing a suite of common metrics. In a large-scale transformation initiative, common data across grantees are important for tracking overall progress and exploring whether and how change is occurring at specific sites. To ensure buy-in and, equally important, that the initiative collects *meaningful* data that is *useful* for practitioners, grantees should play a role in making decisions about the data to be collected and developing instruments to collect the data they need. The collaborative efforts of the TEI common metrics work group provided opportunities for site representatives to share expertise, learn from each other, and identify strategies for enhancing data-driven decision-making at their respective campuses.

If funders build an initiative around a specific source of data, they should have evidence that the data will be available before moving forward. The Bush Foundation's original intention was to use a new value-added assessment system as the primary indicator of teacher effectiveness and the success of the TEI. When VARC was unable to collect the data needed assess the effectiveness of novice teachers in the region and connect data on these teachers back to the IHEs that prepared them, the common metrics assumed primacy as the only source of common performance data across the 14 participating IHEs. This unexpected adjustment reinforced the critical importance of including multiple measures into the MOUs between the Bush Foundation and the TEI sites.

Funders can enhance grantees' data capacities by requiring them to collect and use specific data. Data are only as good as the abilities of grantees to analyze and use them. Experience in the TEI showed that requiring the sites to collect and use data—including the common metrics surveys and other institutional data—built capacity among teacher educators to consider specific data in making decisions about programmatic changes. Consultation and collaboration around data emerged from the common metrics work group and the development of data governance recommendations, and the coaches provided technical support at the IHE level. Recognizing that many sites needed to improve their capacities to collect and report high-quality data, the Bush Foundation also offered modest grants that IHEs could use to upgrade their systems and/or hire additional staff to work on data collection, analyses, and reporting.

Teacher educators should be able to assist their candidates in obtaining teaching positions and track their alumni into employment. The TEI's requirements that IHEs guarantee the effectiveness of their graduates, help graduates secure employment, and offer continuing support to novice teachers were novel ideas for many sites. These requirements forced teacher educators to become more systematic about collecting contact information from candidates prior to graduation and to forge new partnerships on campus and with P-12 partners. On campus, teacher education programs teamed with career centers

to help candidates identify available teaching positions and pursue them successfully. P-12 partners helped identify job openings and design and deliver support services for both candidates and novice teachers.

Funders and grantees should develop and implement strategies to share lessons, challenges, and resources with others in their states and fields. Although the Bush Foundation funded FHI 360 to develop presentation proposals that enabled TEI sites to share accomplishments and lessons learned at major national conferences, there was no concerted effort to share similar information with other IHEs in the foundation's service region. An explicit process for sharing descriptive information about changes to teacher education programs at TEI sites as well as TEI lessons and tools might have promoted greater collaboration across all university-based teacher education programs in the region. Funded IHEs in both ND and MN ultimately engaged other IHEs in use of the TEI common metrics, but other opportunities for knowledge sharing were limited.

P-12 partnerships must be a two-way street with mutual inputs and benefits for both an IHE and the districts with which it works. IHEs need P-12 schools to host student teachers and other clinical placements, but this most basic version of collaboration with P-12 districts does not begin to tap the full potential of district/IHE partnerships. Asking P-12 partners to help shape teacher education curricula and clinical placements addresses P-12 needs by ensuring that new teachers are being trained *for the classrooms in which they will teach*. Moreover, input from P-12 can freshen teacher educators' knowledge of current practices in the field and guarantee that school sites will be accepting of clinical placements for teacher candidates. However, P-12 districts need financial support to become equal partners to IHEs in teacher education.

Funders, grantees, and other partners need to be operating with the same definition of success, even if that definition changes over time to adjust to changes in context and circumstances. The TEI launched with the assumptions that MN, ND, and SD would shortly face significant teacher shortages and that value-added scores would provide evidence of new teachers' effectiveness. When these assumptions were not borne out in the early years of the initiative, the TEI failed to establish and build consensus on a new definition of success. Consequently, teacher educators at most sites struggled to gauge whether they succeeded in meeting the aims of the TEI.

Funders should provide external coaching to support the design and implementation of new initiatives. Coaches who are knowledgeable enough to assess the differences in grantee context and capacity and flexible enough to meet the needs of individual grantees can play a critically important role as intermediaries between a funder and its grantees. Coaches can offer new and different perspectives and provide a safe space for grantees to discuss challenges and concerns that they might be hesitant to share with the funder. In addition, coaches can offer neutral facilitation and push/pull functions to help grantees explore options and determine the best ways to move forward on project implementation.

Grantmakers can use funding as a lever for improvement of site performance. Bush Foundation staff worked closely with FHI 360 coaches to implement a strategy that linked continued funding to program improvement at one struggling site. This focused effort prompted a renewed commitment by key site leaders and produced substantial changes in how the IHE approached TEI implementation. This strategy

could have been used as a catalyst for other struggling sites, but the intensity of effort required to intervene effectively limited the extent to which this lever was used.

Both funders and grantees need to be aware of the myriad ways in which progress can be affected by external stakeholders and the decisions they make. External stakeholders that influenced the nature and, often, the outcomes of the TEI include legislators, state department of education officials, state higher education officials, state teacher education officials, and teacher education accreditation officials. As the TEI sites sought to transform their teacher education programs, they confronted changes in accreditation requirements at the state and national levels and new legislative mandates. At times, the actions taken by external stakeholders impeded IHEs' abilities to implement specific transformation activities or created new and unrealistic expectations. In ND, participating IHEs were severely limited in their capacity to offer new teacher education programs to respond to candidate or district needs because the state university system was hesitant to approve new programs if there were vacant seats in similar programs at other IHEs. In SD, the board of regents recommended that all state-funded IHEs with teacher education programs move from a single-semester student teaching model to a year-long residency without evidence that the residencies would lead to better outcomes or funding to bring them to scale. In MN, the Board of Teaching changed reporting, licensing, and accreditation requirements several times; these changes meant that IHEs had to adjust their data collection and reporting systems, and candidates were expected to complete a changing battery of assessments.

Key Lessons for Teacher Education Programs

University-based teacher education programs typically lack opportunities for transformative change. Limited resources create challenges with respect to new personnel or changes to faculty roles, curricula, clinical experiences, and P-12 partnerships. The TEI created opportunities for partner IHEs to rethink these challenges and test ways to address them. The IHEs' experiences during their efforts to plan, implement, and assess progress toward change produced important lessons that should be used to sustain their current efforts and guide future efforts to transform teacher education. The lessons listed below are inter-related; applying one in isolation is unlikely to generate substantive and sustainable change.

IHE administrators and faculty often struggle to move beyond the systems, structures, and processes that constitute business as usual to transform teacher education. Creating and implementing a shared vision for transformation of teacher education requires active support at all levels within the university, from president and provost to faculty and staff. A shared vision can be a powerful motivator, but specific goals and a detailed work plan are needed to guide implementation activities. Unless top-level leaders remain actively engaged during implementation, faculty and staff may perceive that transformation of teacher education is not a high priority.

Funding can be a powerful catalyst, but it is insufficient to drive transformative change in teacher education programs. Major grants can enable an IHE to launch activities and hire staff, but administrators, faculty, and staff need a common vision and data-driven work plan to ensure that they are not just adding new things to the status quo. If funds are dedicated to new positions, the IHE should

have a plan in place for moving those staff to operating funds or they run the risk of losing the positions (and the programs or services they support) when the grant is expended.

Building a culture of evidence is an essential step toward transformative change in teacher education programs. By increasing its capacities to collect, analyze, present, and use valid and reliable data, an IHE can ensure that it identifies appropriate goals, strategies, and interventions for transformation efforts and measures the progress being made. Although most partner IHEs had no difficulty generating ambitious lists of possible ways to expend their TEI funds, some struggled to produce data to back up their initial expenditures or track the progress of their work. The Bush Foundation's data capacity grants helped the IHEs connect the dots to make decisions based on data and understand the impact of their TEI-funded activities.

Cross-IHE collaborations can be powerful sources of strength. The TEI's common metrics work group is a powerful example of what IHE representatives can accomplish by working together. Some IHE representatives came to the work group with skepticism and less capacity to make substantive contributions to the tasks of establishing a common metrics framework and developing and revising four aligned surveys, but the stronger members of the work group were able to increase the engagement of their colleagues over time. The facilitation support provided by a coach created a safe space to build trust as the work group made decisions by consensus and developed a series of governance recommendations to guide use of data emerging from the common metrics surveys.

IHEs need to increase and expand the engagement of P-12 partners in teacher education. Both IHEs and P-12 partners need to understand the political, practical, and programmatic context in which the other operates. IHEs must recognize and respect the expertise that P-12 districts bring to the teacher education enterprise and engage P-12 educators in substantive ways. Meaningful partnerships must be developed and nurtured over time to allow all parties to establish trust and open lines of communication. Partners and partnerships may need to evolve over time as IHEs or P-12 districts experience changes in leadership or organizational priorities.

Support for teacher education candidates and graduates needs to be a continuum that begins with acceptance into teacher education, continues through course sequences and clinical placements, and extends through early years of teaching. Early clinical placements offer candidates opportunities to draw support from university faculty and staff as well as P-12 teachers. Building this continuum of support requires coordinated and consistent professional development for university supervisors, clinical faculty, cooperating P-12 teachers, and mentors of novice teachers.

Strong transformation teams demonstrate the power of persistence. They are strong enough to withstand transitions in leadership at the president, provost, dean, or project lead level. They have the depth that enables one member to assume a more substantial role without a significant learning curve. Moreover, they recognize that working in silos is unlikely to yield significant and lasting change.

Teacher educators need to understand the realities and dynamics of the labor markets their graduates will be entering. Without an understanding of these markets, IHEs cannot predict the employment challenges their graduates will face or help their candidates identify the licensure areas that are most

likely to lead to employment. IHEs need better data to anticipate P-12 needs and help their graduates secure employment. The labor markets for new teachers are often opaque to IHEs, but the efforts to secure contact information from graduates for the transition to teaching survey gave many IHEs new insights into the hiring patterns of P-12 districts.

Recruitment of candidates of color requires commitment to both retention and examination of systems and processes to yield more teachers of color. IHEs that were successful in increasing the enrollment of candidates of color in their conventional or non-conventional teacher education programs learned that getting them in the door was only the start. Those that were ultimately most successful in increasing the number of novice teachers of color worked with these candidates to identify barriers to success and provide appropriate supports to overcome these barriers.

Teacher education programs need to focus on building the capacity of all candidates to teach for racial equity and social justice. Although P-12 districts are actively seeking more teachers of color, they are also increasing their expectations that *all* teachers possess the skills, dispositions, and beliefs needed to work effectively in diverse classrooms. IHEs need to expand their efforts to infuse racial equity and social justice into curricula across teacher education programs, offer more clinical experiences in diverse classrooms, and provide professional development for faculty and staff who are teaching or supervising field placements.

Key Considerations for P-12 Educators Who Want to Strengthen Partnerships with Teacher Education Programs

One of the key lessons from the TEI is the powerful case made for strengthening and sustaining the roles of P-12 educators in IHE/district partnerships. The TEI experience confirms how active and practical engagement by P-12 educators adds authentic, real-world lenses to efforts to transform teacher education. Drawing from their day-to-day work, superintendents, principals, teachers, and other school and district staff bring unique perspectives to partnership activities and unique understandings of how schools, districts, and IHEs can work together to strengthen teacher education and improve student learning. The paragraphs below provide some suggestions for strengthening P-12 involvement in university-based teacher education.

Partnership roles for P-12 educators: IHEs' traditional reliance on P-12 schools to hire graduates and host student teachers and other clinical placements is an outdated and largely ineffective model of IHE/P-12 partnerships that does little to balance the division of power between IHEs and the P-12 districts and schools with which they work. The TEI explicitly encouraged IHEs to acknowledge and take advantage of the expertise of P-12 educators. IHEs were asked to expand existing partnerships and/or create new ones and fully engage P-12 educators in the redesign and transformation of teacher education. P-12 educators need to be more assertive and ask for substantive roles in which they can help shape teacher education curricula, course sequences, programs, and clinical placements. Engagement in these activities will address P-12 needs by ensuring that new teachers are being trained for the classrooms in which they will teach. In addition, P-12 educators can provide important information (through advisory groups, partnership councils, focus groups, and supervisor surveys) for IHE use in continuous improvement of teacher education programs.

IHEs and P-12 educators should not overlook the important roles TOSAs and other teacher leaders can play in their partnerships. The commitment of superintendents or other top-level administrators is essential, but so is active participation of experienced teacher leaders. At some TEI sites, TOSAs and other current and former teachers led mentoring for novice teachers, coordinated clinical placements, provided P-12 voices on IHE committees, conducted co-teaching training, and taught teacher education courses in the IHEs. Because the most successful teachers are often the ones who are most reluctant to leave their classrooms in the hands of substitutes, primary responsibilities for partnership work may need to be assumed by TOSAs and others who are at least temporarily removed from teaching duties.

Continuum of support for candidates and novice teachers: A continuum of support for teacher candidates and novice teachers needs to be a focal point for IHE/P-12 partnerships. Although many districts already provide some type of mentoring or induction program, some IHEs are recognizing a need to offer continuing support to their teacher education alumni throughout their first two years of teaching. Some TEI sites forged stronger partnerships by collaborating with P-12 educators to identify priority investments for supporting candidates and novice teachers and became more intentional about the shared resources that spanned in-service and pre-service professional growth and development. P-12 educators need to work closely with their IHE partners to ensure that the supports offered to novice teachers are coordinated and collaborative. Ideally, P-12 educators will be engaged with candidates from the time that they are accepted into teacher education programs and will work with their IHE colleagues to ensure candidates are ready to benefit fully from the mentoring and induction activities in which they are expected to participate as novice teachers.

Labor market data on teaching positions: To strengthen their partnerships with university-based teacher educators and improve their odds of getting the graduates they need, P-12 systems should provide timely information about current and projected hiring needs and preferences. Few universities have the resources or capacity to conduct detailed labor market analyses of the current and projected hiring needs and preferences of their partner districts or other districts in which their candidates might want to teach. As a result, they lack the concrete data they need to recruit students into teacher education and advise candidates on the pathways that are most likely to lead to employment. P-12 educators can help to ensure that IHEs are preparing new teachers in the subjects and certification areas they will need in the future by sharing projected hiring needs with their IHE partners.

Funding for IHE/P-12 partnerships: Traditional P-12 and IHE funding streams are typically inadequate to develop and implement robust partnership models. External funding can be a catalyst or stimulus for new or strengthened partnerships, but both IHEs and P-12 educators need to plan to sustain them. One approach, difficult though it may be, is for IHE and district partners to continue to secure funding from external sources. Another approach is to pool resources to sustain their partnerships. In some TEI sites, the mechanisms for funding TOSAs required financial or in-kind contributions from both IHEs and P-12 districts. P-12 administrators need to step up their efforts to provide partnership funding and/or or in-kind contributions, because they cannot have equal voice and decision-making authority if IHEs provide all of the resources.

Higher-quality clinical experiences: As P-12 educators seek more substantive engagement in university-based teacher education, they need to assume greater responsibilities for the quality of clinical experiences offered in their schools. P-12 educators need to improve their capacity to identify and provide the best possible learning experiences for candidates. Districts should develop rigorous and transparent policies for selecting cooperating teachers for each type of clinical experience and identify specific expectations for each experience (e.g., the teaching strategies or practices to be highlighted in initial observations). Clinical placements for teacher candidates should start earlier, last longer, and occur more frequently; they should also be linked directly to specific course content to help candidates translate theory into practice.

Life cycle of IHE/P-12 partnerships: Both P-12 educators and the IHEs with which they collaborate need to recognize that partnerships will evolve and change over time. A change in goals, priorities, or leaders in either an IHE or a P-12 district can prompt a reassessment of the partnership and the extent to which it is meeting IHE and P-12 needs. Neither P-12 educators nor IHEs should feel compelled to remain in partnerships from which they are not deriving the anticipated benefits. All partners should feel comfortable suggesting changes in priorities, strategies, and working relationships.

Steps toward stronger partnerships: Superintendents, principals, teachers, and other P-12 educators should begin by informally assessing the extent to which their current IHE partnerships are meeting school and district needs and researching other IHEs with which they might be able to form new partnerships. The suggestions provided above are only a list of options. P-12 educators may wish to focus on some of these options and add other roles or strategies that better reflect their needs and priorities. The most critical point is that P-12 educators need to recognize the assets they can offer IHEs and leverage these assets as they identify their roles and responsibilities in IHE/P-12 partnerships.

Conclusion

The TEI established ambitious goals at the outset that set the stage for bold new approaches to the enterprise of university-based teacher education. The changes that ensued over the course of the next 10 years were perhaps less sweeping than originally envisioned, but the TEI prompted varying degrees of change at participating IHEs across the Bush Foundation's service region. Some IHEs learned more about the candidates they recruited into their teacher education programs (e.g., extent to which grade-point averages exceeded minimum admissions criteria) or expanded their efforts to recruit more candidates of color. Some made substantial changes in the ways they prepare teachers, introducing new courses, curricula, and clinical experiences, often with a focus on racial equity and social justice. In a major shift, the TEI sites acknowledged their responsibilities for helping new teachers find employment and worked with campus and P-12 partners to make it happen. They also built deeper relationships with P-12 partners, so they could offer better support to novice teachers. Along the way, they developed new measures and amassed new data to understand how well their programs were preparing prospective teachers.

The TEI also required teacher educators to build supportive working relationships with partners at multiple levels: with faculty members and leaders from other departments and colleges/schools across their own campuses; with P-12 educators; with other TEI sites; and with the Bush Foundation and the

various external support organizations and entities engaged through the TEI. These new collaborations produced some of the most significant accomplishments of the TEI, including the widespread use of co-teaching in clinical placements and development of common metrics surveys that are now in use in teacher education programs beyond the TEI sites and the Bush Foundation's service region.

These innovations point the way to a vision of teacher education that is cohesive, collaborative, and more attuned to the assets and needs of P-12 schools and their students. This vision of teacher education unfolds within a culture of evidence in which teacher educators are constantly re-assessing the effectiveness of their programs and adjusting accordingly. The philanthropic community, teacher educators, and current/prospective P-12 partners in teacher education should look to the TEI as a source of achievements and lessons that can serve as a foundation for future efforts to re-envision and transform university-based teacher education.