



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Teacher Residency Workgroup Findings

2022

Cindy Rockholt

**Assistant Superintendent of Educator Growth and
Development**

Prepared by:

- **Nicholas Gillon**, Assistant Director, Development and Learning Systems, IDEALS Institute, Johns Hopkins University School of Education
ngillon1@jhu.edu
- **Emma Barnes**, Master of Science in Education Policy Graduate Student, Development and Learning Systems, IDEALS Institute, Johns Hopkins University School of Education
Eebarnes101@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Recommendations Overview	5
Recommendation 1: Establish Infrastructure for Sustainability of Paid Statewide Teacher Residency Programming.....	6
Findings Related to Recommendation 1.....	6
Resourcing Recommendation 1	8
Increase Funding for OSPI Data System and Analytic Support	8
Fund OSPI Programming Costs	8
Recommendation 2: Emphasize and Resource Partnerships in Designing, Developing, and Delivering a Statewide Model	10
Findings Related to Recommendation 2.....	10
Resourcing Recommendation 2	12
Fund Liaisons to Foster Local Partnership	12
Fund Communities of Practice for EPP-District Partnership Teams.....	12
Fund Stipends for Principals Hosting Schoolwide Residencies	12
Recommendation 3: Determine and Codify Features and Requirements for Paid Teacher Residency Programming.....	14
Findings Related to Recommendation 3.....	14
Resourcing Recommendation 3	16
Provide Funds for Preparation Programs to Shift Practices.....	16
Fund Professional Learning Among District and EPP Partners in a Collaborative and Guided Context.....	17
Fund PESB to Develop and Administer a Process to Review and Approve Residency Model Programs.....	17
Recommendation 4: Expand and Enhance Mentoring Capacity Across the Educator Preparation and Induction System.....	18
Findings Related to Recommendation 4.....	18
Resourcing Recommendation 4	19
Provide Stipends for Experts to Provide Course Work and Instruction.....	19
Provide Stipends and Professional Learning to Mentors/Cooperating Teachers.....	20
Recommendation 5: Ensure Sustainable Funding for Statewide Paid Teacher Residency Programming.....	21
Findings Related to Recommendation 5.....	21
Resourcing Recommendation 5	21
Fund OSPI Programming Costs	21

Allocate Additional Funding for High Poverty Schools	22
Appendix A	23
Workgroup Members	23
Speakers and Expert Guests	24
Legal Notice	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In April 2021, the Washington State Legislature appropriated \$60,000 of the federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) III funds of the American Rescue Plan Act to support a technical advisory workgroup to explore recommended residency options for pre-service educators. This had a focus on educators of color and bilingual/multilingual speakers. The project leads submitted preliminary recommendations to Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in November 2021 and then convened the Teacher Residency Workgroup. The Workgroup began meeting in January 2022 and met monthly through June 2022. The project leads analyzed data from the workgroup sessions and had follow up conversations with key workgroup members to create these recommendations.

The Workgroup focused its efforts on identifying, describing, and strategizing to develop a residency model that could overcome key challenges that are involved in establishing a statewide paid teacher residency. The members of the Workgroup heard presentations from expert guest speakers and shared their varied experiences with teacher residencies. Project leads systematically analyzed presentations and discussions from these workgroup sessions, academic and professional literature, and Washington State contextual factors to develop these recommendations.

The project leads' synthesized recommendations are:

1. Establish infrastructure for sustainability of statewide paid teacher residency programming.
2. Emphasize partnerships in designing, developing, and delivering statewide model.
3. Determine and codify features and requirements for paid teacher residency programming.
4. Expand and enhance mentoring capacity across the educator preparation and induction systems.
5. Ensure sustainable funding for statewide paid teacher residency programming.

This report provides details on each of these recommendations, workgroup materials, agendas, and meeting outlines, as well as summaries and synthesized recommendations of each meeting. These initial recommendations include information about these programs and some challenges associated with scaling a residency model to the entire state.

RECOMMENDATIONS OVERVIEW

"Most industries spend time with their developing professionals under a master practitioner, they give them the skills on the job, and they pay them. Our educators are asked to pay tuition, often pay for a second place to live while they are given their placement assignment, and they accrue more debt in order for the privilege to teach. We have to stop this."

– State Superintendent Chris Reykdal

The workgroup developed recommendations from a review of literature on teacher residencies, from policy and professional documents about established residency models, and from robust analysis of the input provided by workgroup members. These recommendations are the synthesis of these data sources, not the consensus opinion of the authors of the research and professional literature or of each workgroup member. The recommendations include important ideas associated with funding a statewide paid teacher residency model and focus on infrastructure, partnerships, residency program features, mentoring, and financing.

RECOMMENDATION 1: ESTABLISH INFRASTRUCTURE FOR SUSTAINABILITY OF PAID STATEWIDE TEACHER RESIDENCY PROGRAMMING

It will require great coordination among those currently involved in the preparation, placement, and induction of teachers to establish a paid statewide teacher residency. Timely and consistent effort must be collaborative and sustained to ensure the cohesive, functional, and effective infrastructure that is needed for implementation.

Findings Related to Recommendation 1

- 1.1 Collaborate to build out from the current educator preparation and induction systems, policies, and infrastructure rather than starting from a blank slate on a stand-alone initiative. However, these systems need critical assessment and transformation to succeed in supporting a sustainable statewide teacher residency model funded through the district apportionment system.
- 1.2 Ensure the program has the infrastructure, resources, and policy clarity needed to succeed.
 - 1.2.1 Situate a statewide paid teacher residency option within existing systems of preparation program approval, candidate recruitment, educator preparation, clinical practice, and pre-service mentoring in a way that centers the needs of students, teachers, and teacher candidates who are among the furthest from educational justice.
 - 1.2.2 Ensure that participation in a statewide paid residency model is a voluntary opportunity that is accessible to educator preparation program (EPP) providers across a variety of program types and locations, with emphasis on districts where the needs of P-12 schools and candidates are the greatest.
 - 1.2.3 Align the pre-service mentoring work done through a statewide paid teacher residency model with OSPI Standards for Beginning Educator Induction and Beginning Educator Supports Team (BEST) practices to ensure that mentoring in pre-service residencies is seamlessly integrated with in-service mentoring and other induction supports.
 - 1.2.4 Engage district leaders, EPP providers, and educator union representatives, as well as current teachers, teacher candidates, and mentors, as part of the team designing implementation details alongside OSPI and the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB).
 - 1.2.5 Focus on candidates who have systematically been blocked or have otherwise not had equitable access to teacher preparation programs.
- 1.3 Design the statewide paid teacher residency model's infrastructure and supports to prioritize areas of greatest workforce need. Encourage candidates of color, candidates from Sovereign

Tribal Nations, and multilingual candidates. Focus on the needs of districts that have significant difficulty attracting and retaining teachers, and on teaching endorsements in chronic shortage areas such as special education (SPED), Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), and instruction for multilingual students (ELL).

- 1.3.1 The infrastructure must be designed to center the voices of marginalized and underrepresented communities in program and policy design as well as implementation by including educators of color in all parts of the process.
 - 1.3.2 The model's design and supports, as well as curriculum and instruction practices, need to encourage, enable, and ensure culturally sustaining practices.
 - 1.3.3 Explicit elements of equity-focused design, such as candidate recruitment, support, and mentoring, need cohesive and operationalized definitions within current OSPI and PESB Diversity Equity and Inclusion standards and practices.
 - 1.3.4 Infrastructure and supports should be designed to focus on retention of residents as certificated teachers in the districts where they serve their residencies.
- 1.4 Analyze multiple sources of available data to understand and prioritize school districts' most critical workforce needs and strengths.
- 1.4.1 Identify the districts that demonstrated ability to attract and retain teachers of color, multilingual speakers, and individuals from Sovereign Tribal Nations.
 - 1.4.2 Prepare early to track the progress and impact of the model with intentional data strategies that utilize and advance current data sources, analyses, and processes.
 - 1.4.3 Use current data collection and program monitoring systems from PESB and ERDC to identify how current programs align with residency model definitions and district service/shortage areas.
 - 1.4.4 Use current data collected from eCert and S275 data systems to establish baseline teacher workforce data and to set implementation targets.
 - 1.4.5 Identify what new data elements need to be collected to adequately assess, improve, and sustain a statewide paid residency model.
- 1.5 Clearly define and operationalize the term "teacher residency" in alignment with research literature and most-current practice within existing regulatory structures in Washington Administrative Code (WAC).
- 1.5.1 Consistently use terminology and definitions that are aligned with current research and practice. This must include collaboration with PESB to amend or enhance formal definitions from WAC 181-80-010.
 - 1.5.2 Draw heavily from recent research literature, existing policy models, and evidence-based publications from national associations focused teacher residency, including but not limited to Pathways Alliance's *Towards a National Definition of Teacher Residencies*.
 - 1.5.3 Develop residency policy that specifies the most critical program elements with particular and limited flexibility.

- 1.6 Develop a statewide implementation team with clear goals to establish policy and program details to launch a statewide paid teacher residency for candidates no sooner than September 2024.
 - 1.6.1 Once funded, prior to implementation, a statewide residency program model must be operationalized collaboratively by a committed working group of stakeholders.
 - 1.6.2 The group should include OSPI, PESB, EPPs, district leaders, representatives of educator unions and professional associations, teachers, teacher candidates, and building leaders.
 - 1.6.3 Maintain the implementation team through the first three cohorts to assess and address emergent challenges, review initial results, and discuss outcomes.
 - 1.6.4 Contract a rigorous evaluation of the process and outcomes after three years.

"What about small rural districts? There are really small districts that don't have resources to be able to have a mentor on special assignment [;] they don't have the money to be able to hire people. How are we creating a systemic sort of model from the state level that's going to allow all districts, to have access to something like this?"
- Teacher Educator

Resourcing Recommendation 1

Increase Funding for OSPI Data System and Analytic Support

In order to focus on residency opportunities in rural communities, communities of color, communities most affected by teacher shortage, students from multi-lingual and multicultural families, and content areas with the most chronic shortage, it is necessary to be able to easily access accurate data on educator vacancy sorted by endorsement and geographic area. These data resources should be developed to maximize action-focused collaboration and minimize duplication of effort in collection and analysis.

Fund OSPI Programming Costs

Funding statewide paid teacher residencies utilizing the prototypical school funding model will require changes to existing school apportionment and financial management systems. These upfront costs will be necessary expenditures that should reduce maintenance costs overtime.

Table 1: Implementation Milestones Related to Recommendation 1

Implementation Milestone	Timeline
A. Assemble an Implementation Team charged to develop detailed goals, scopes of work for residency partners, application processes, and technical assistance materials.	Spring 2023
B. Make required changes to existing school apportionment and financial management systems.	Spring 2023

Implementation Milestone	Timeline
C. Collaborate alongside PESB to understand how a statewide paid teacher residency could be situated within currently approved program standards and known best practices.	Spring 2023
D. Access relevant educator workforce data from available sources; conduct a gaps analysis to identify what data elements will be needed; and make plans to collect them.	Spring 2023
E. Prepare a focused landscape analysis using available district and educator preparation program data on the teacher workforce to identify focal districts.	Spring 2023
E. Develop equity-focused goals for the first statewide cohorts of residents working in focal districts.	Spring 2023
F. Determine and detail processes for EPPs serving focal districts interested in accessing funding, guidance, and resources to retool their programs in order to participate in a statewide paid teacher residency model.	Spring 2023

RECOMMENDATION 2: EMPHASIZE AND RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS IN DESIGNING, DEVELOPING, AND DELIVERING A STATEWIDE MODEL

"Our focus is on shifting the mindset and saying, instead of teacher prep does this and districts do this, and yet they each have different concerns. We're looking down that road together and trying to find opportunities to build mutual trust, consistent communication, and a willingness to approach the inevitable ripples and challenges that emerge as you're trying to do this work in new ways."

—Teacher Residency Faculty

The single most important factor to establishing and sustaining a statewide paid teacher residency model is a network of coordinated, collaborative, and mutually sustaining partnerships among EPPs and Districts. The essential role of partnerships cannot be underestimated, and their work must come before implementation through careful coordination and planning with state agency partners and other stakeholders.

Findings Related to Recommendation 2

- 2.1 Develop formal agreement language and collaborative work practices between districts and the EPPs under the guidance of broader state policy.
 - 2.1.1 Districts interested in participating in a statewide paid teacher residency model should proceed through an application and approval process administered by OSPI. That district should then establish formal partnership with one or more EPP that has proceeded through an application process developed and administered by PESB.
 - 2.1.2 Design an application process for districts and EPPs to participate in application and review processes.
 - 2.1.3 Application processes must not be considered formalities; they ensure that the district and the EPPs are informed, supported, and prepared to implement the state model with commitment to sustainability.
 - 2.1.4 Although a district should be able to partner with more than one EPP and EPPs should be able to partner with more than one district, steps should be taken to establish cohort models in which 15-30 candidates proceed together through the steps in one EPP to ensure viability of the model for EPPs. That is, an EPP should have at least 15-30 residency model candidates in cohorts rather than 4 or 5 residency model candidates mixed into programming that is not approved as a residency.
 - 2.1.5 Partnerships should focus on particular content areas that align with the districts' most consistent and pressing needs. This may also help EPPs specialize their offerings (for

example SPED, STEM, or ELL) to best support the districts they serve and share the placements available in districts served jointly by two or more EPPs. This is preferable to having all EPPs transition their elementary programs to residencies.

- 2.1.6 Districts should share responsibility for the success of the program and participate in ongoing program review processes alongside their EPP partners.

"My program has 5 faculty for 300 candidates, and we partner with about 130 districts. How do we have the physical time as programs to have that level of collaboration with that many school districts?"

-Teacher Educator

- 2.2 Guide this collaboration with stated goals and outcomes that are explicit parts of partnership agreements and application processes that are articulated within, but go beyond, current guidelines detailed in WAC 181-80-10.

- 2.2.1 Local residency partnerships require effective communication and consistent collaboration across key stakeholders so that each member can fulfill their role and implementation can meet the stated partnership goals.
- 2.2.2 Residency partnerships must create clear agreements that detail roles and responsibilities for all those involved in supporting the residency in that district.
- 2.2.3 These agreements need to include scopes of work for common roles and information sharing practices that can lead to assessment of candidates, support for mentors, and evaluation of the statewide model.
- 2.2.4 Partnership collaboration must center on co-ownership of the preparation program between the district and EPP(s), starting with shared vision of quality teaching and effective preparation programming.
- 2.2.5 These local partnerships need support from statewide systems, structures, and resources such as district personnel serving as liaisons who have experience in the district they are serving and expertise preparing or inducting teachers.

- 2.3 Partners must collaborate to operationalize residency program elements such as alignment between curriculum and clinical experiences; candidate recruitment and mentor matching processes; candidate assessment; and training, support, and evaluation for mentors.

- 2.3.1 These program elements must align with state standards for preparation programming detailed in Chapter 181-78A WAC and emphasize both candidate and P-12 student learning.
- 2.3.2 Local partnership teams must include leaders from districts and the EPP(s).
- 2.3.3 Additional members would be beneficial, especially EPP faculty, district induction mentors, cooperating/mentor teachers, building leaders, union representatives, state education agency or Education Service District (ESD) personnel, parent support/advocacy organizations or other community-based organizations, and P-12 school leaders.

- 2.4 Partnerships between EPPs and districts must revolve around collaboration in P12 schools.

- 2.4.1 Residents need to be integrated in the schools' professional and community life including activities, professional duties, and extracurricular events.

- 2.4.2 Formal partnerships should emphasize schoolwide efforts to support residents in cohort-based learning; promote residents' sense of belong, which can lead to improved retention; and source additional funding to focus on residency as a schoolwide instructional improvement strategy.

"Start thinking about the residency as an instructional investment, instead of an HR pathway investment."

- Karen DeMoss, Prepared to Teach, National Residency Consultant

Resourcing Recommendation 2

Fund Liaisons to Foster Local Partnership

The partnership needed to create effective and sustainable teacher residencies will require focused and intentional effort from individuals in EPPs and districts. Providing resources for liaisons who have expertise in teacher education and district experience will enable partnerships to succeed. Liaisons who are deeply connected to the community and deeply embedded in shared learning through the residency will be necessary.

Fund Communities of Practice for EPP-District Partnership Teams

Professional learning will be needed to shift practices toward teacher residencies in a statewide model. The time and cost of this learning cannot be overlooked if the goal is to develop successful and sustainable programs. Communities of practice could serve as learning venues focused on impactful classroom practice; implementing Cultural Competency, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CCDEI) Standards in residency programs; and supportive mentorship. Funding these venues would help the system shift.

Fund Stipends for Principals Hosting Schoolwide Residencies

In order to enact impactful residency experiences, school building leaders will need to provide active support. Principals would have critical responsibilities to establish and encourage a culture of belonging to promote learning and influence retention and support of diverse educators. A stipend for principals could support this work. Decision options would need to be considered when defining how these stipends could be distributed and what, if any restrictions, would be placed on their use.

"You've got to respect a local context, and that's a great opportunity in the work ahead of us is to figure out how we match state resources and initiatives with the power of the beauty of communities and their needs and their populations to leverage this work."

– Teacher Union Representative

Table 2: Implementation Milestones Related to Recommendation 2

Implementation Milestone	Timeline
A. Codify partnership guidelines and requirements	Spring 2023
B. Determine and detail stipend and tuition benefit provisions, procedures, and application processes.	Summer 2023
C. Use landscape and needs analyses to identify potential districts with greatest need, readiness to benefit, and ability to implement (with support necessary supports).	Spring 2023
D. Establish professional learning communities and liaisons to support partnership and collaboration structures.	Summer 2023–2024

RECOMMENDATION 3: DETERMINE AND CODIFY FEATURES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PAID TEACHER RESIDENCY PROGRAMMING

In order to implement a statewide paid teacher residency, there must be a definition that outlines the key features and requirements of residency programs. Although teacher residency currently carries a definition in WAC 181-80-005(6), the term must be made more explicit, robust, and detailed than the descriptions in WAC 181-80-010.

"We need to be sure that we clearly define what is a residency when we move forward. People might just tack [it] on because it's the thing right now, or it's a movement. Are we defining what expectations we have in the residency and what it looks like?"
—Workgroup Member, Teacher Educator

Findings Related to Recommendation 3

- 3.1 A statewide paid teacher residency model must be built upon evidence-based foundations and be placed within the state's current systems of educator preparation and induction.
 - 3.1.1 Programming requirements must align with PESB preparation program standards and inform any changes in those standards.
 - 3.1.2 As residencies involve not only pre-service but also in-service support for candidates, programming definitions and requirements must align with BEST teacher induction supports.
 - 3.1.3 Changes to the state's apportionment system will be required in order to fund residents, mentors, the retooling of EPPs, and district leaders' effort to implement a statewide paid teacher residency model.
- 3.2 Residency partners at EPPs and districts, together with their stakeholders, should co-design residency implementation around shared visions and goals for candidates' experiences and learning outcomes, along with the sequence of coursework and clinical experiences within the program and learning standards framework.
 - 3.2.1 EPP-district partnerships need to develop curriculum and expectations for candidates' learning in a statewide paid teacher residency model in alignment with PESB approved learning standards for teachers and the approved competencies for the particular endorsement that candidates are earning.
 - 3.2.2 Curriculum and clinical practice experiences should be intentionally and integrally connected by design and in practice.
 - 3.2.3 Designing curriculum in collaboration between EPPs and districts should maximize how much districts' workforce needs influence the scope and sequence of residency programming, and to a lesser degree, the offerings of EPPs.
 - 3.2.4 Curriculum and clinical experiences should provide residents opportunities to learn in the ways they will be expected to teach when they complete the program; this will require instructors, field supervisors, and classroom mentors to ensure that the

- residents' learning experiences, assessment, and feedback opportunities are connected to their contexts.
- 3.2.5 To ensure this alignment, mentor teachers need support to understand and enact the teacher residency curriculum in ways that allow them to integrate coursework and clinical practice experiences throughout the residency period. Following residency, induction mentoring would continue this learning.
- 3.3 Clinical experiences in teacher residencies are connected with course curriculum by design and characterized by explicit modeling, co-planning, co-teaching, co-assessment, and shared reflection on teaching practice. Residents must not be teachers of record. Mentors should not mentor multiple candidates in multiple classrooms.
- 3.3.1 Clinical placements in residency programs are co-teaching models designed to maximize learning for candidates and P-12 students along with support from trained mentor teachers, who are in turn supported by schools.
 - 3.3.2 Clinical placements should be one full academic year, ideally aligned with mentor teachers' work weeks and school calendars with at least 50% of residents' clinical experience in their host classroom co-teaching alongside their mentor.
 - 3.3.3 As residents are not teachers of record, mentor teachers remain responsible for P-12 student learning, although residents' responsibilities should increase over the course of the residency experience.
 - 3.3.4 Residency experiences in which candidates are co-teaching in the endorsement area that they are seeking are highly preferred but may not be feasible in all cases.

"Oftentimes in teacher preparation, we focus on generic methods. And that doesn't work as well [as] when districts are using actual curriculum or bringing the residents, together with cooperating teachers to do shared professional development in curriculum that the district is actually using."

- Workgroup Member, Teacher Educator

- 3.4 A sustainable statewide paid teacher residency model must provide residents a living wage with benefits and support their tuition expenses.
- 3.4.1 Funding from the state should ideally be combined with district funding and federal funding when possible and be considered an investment in individuals who can be long term employees in a sustainable workforce. This would allow programs to become a stable part of the district's overall teacher development strategy.
 - 3.4.2 Connected with their clinical practice and depending on the needs and affordances of the district, residents may serve in occasional or part-time paid roles that support the school and do not detract from their residency placement, provided the residents are co-teaching with their mentor teacher for at least 50% of their time.
 - 3.4.3 Salaries, or stipends, for residents should be set in a way that is responsive to local costs of living and district pay scales. Ideally, residents earn more than paraeducators and less than first year teachers.
 - 3.4.4 Residents receive benefits in alignment with district policy.

- 3.4.5 In addition to a salary and benefits, residents should be provided funds defray or cover their program costs. Since program costs vary widely, these funds should be provided as a flat amount, not a percentage of the program cost.
 - 3.4.6 Covering program costs could be done through loan repayment for those who successfully complete a program; as an upfront disbursement, with no repayment, regardless of candidates' completion; as an upfront disbursement with repayment forgiven contingent upon a successful program completion; or as an upfront disbursement, with repayment forgiven contingent upon successful program completion as well as a specified number of years of service as a teacher in the specific district.
- 3.5 A statewide paid teacher residency model should emphasize cohort-based designs to support candidates, schools, and EPPs.
- 3.5.1 Cohort groups can promote candidates' program success and completion as well as enable professional collaboration among residents in their coursework and clinical placements (RE7).
 - 3.5.2 Cohort groups support learning by enabling collective partnerships between candidates, EPPs, schools, and districts.
 - 3.5.3 Cohort grouping could support EPPs in making the decision to retool their programs. It may not be viable for them to serve very small numbers of candidates in boutique programs.

Resourcing Recommendation 3

Provide Funds for Preparation Programs to Shift Practices

Currently there are robust standards for Washington's teacher preparation programs. There are also a wide variety of program types. The standards for all programs already include many aspects that are included here as elements of residency. This includes partnership with districts, clinical practice aligned with curriculum, training for mentors, and culturally responsive practices.

However, a statewide teacher residency model would require more formal partnerships with districts, longer clinical practice, closer and co-developed curriculum alignment, and more robust training for mentors. If this model is to be available across the variety of EPP types in Washington State, then EPP providers need time, voice, guidance, and resources to assess and adjust their programs. These program adjustments may also take longer for one program than another based on the structure of the program and the institution in which these programs operate.

Although this expenditure is common nationwide in statewide residency model policies, structures and supports are not always in place to guide the use of these funds. For example, funding one person as a fulltime 'residency program aligner' may not be a wise use of funds because the needed retooling is more than a one-person job. Funding EPP providers based on key deliverables, design documents, or demonstrable milestones could foster better results on a rapid timeline. These decisions should be pursued by the implementation team in collaboration with EPP and district stakeholders.

Fund Professional Learning Among District and EPP Partners in a Collaborative and Guided Context

As mentioned above, communities of practice could serve as learning venues focused on impactful classroom practice; the implementation of Cultural Competency, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CCDEI) Standards in residency programs; and supportive mentorship. Residency model definitions and standards will be clear and specific but also allow for local adaptation. This local adaptation will take time, learning and collaboration. Professional learning through communities of practice or similar venues will be essential to support this model's launch.

Fund PESB to Develop and Administer a Process to Review and Approve Residency Model Programs

In order to implement a statewide paid teacher residency, participating EPPs would need to be reviewed to ensure they have all the design, instruction, and partnership components in place. PESB currently has a program approval processes and infrastructure that could serve as a template. However, it would require additional resources to adapt the process, support the staff, and develop the communication resources necessary to implement.

Table 3: Implementation Milestones Related to Recommendation 3

Implementation Milestone	Timeline
A. Building from collaboration with PESB, codify in WAC the revised definition of teacher residency programs	Spring–Fall 2023
B. Collaborate with PESB to develop and implement a process for approving EPPs for statewide paid teacher residencies	Spring–Fall 2023
C. Establish formal EPP-District partnerships	Winter 2024
D. Convene partners and Communities of Practice to establish program implementation specifics in each partnership	Winter 2024 and on

"We can address the COVID teacher shortage by creating teacher residency for everyone, but when we're focusing on people of color and migrating bilingual students it's going to take a different approach. The data tells us that the systems in place are not working for this group of people so with the data telling us that story there are opportunities for growth."

Shandy Abrahamson, OSPI, Office of Native Education

RECOMMENDATION 4: EXPAND AND ENHANCE MENTORING CAPACITY ACROSS THE EDUCATOR PREPARATION AND INDUCTION SYSTEM

"We believe very strongly that support for new teachers requires a collective sense of responsibility. Ideally, what you have is not just a mentor and a principal for in-service mentoring but, in fact, a whole building and even a whole district that's organized around providing support for that new teacher. We find that, to the extent that a school and a system believe that new teachers are all of our responsibility, those new teachers are supported and they stay because they're getting those things that we identified are missing for new teachers in many circumstances."

—Sue Anderson, OSPI BEST

Findings Related to Recommendation 4

- 4.1 Coordinate the systems of preservice and in-service mentoring in order to implement a statewide paid teacher residency model.
 - 4.1.1 Recognize mentorship is a critical factor in determining candidates' success in becoming educators and districts' success in retaining them.
 - 4.1.2 Recruit and select mentors with demonstrated ability to enact culturally sustaining practices and student-centered instruction.
 - 4.1.3 Residency mentors should facilitate pre-service connections between clinical experience and candidates' coursework and performance assessments.
 - 4.1.4 In addition to supporting residents, these individuals must be connected with preparation program supervisors and instructors through explicit and ongoing strategies.
 - 4.1.5 Residency mentors need to receive support in common with one another and remain connected with in-service induction mentoring and related supports.
- 4.2 Mentor teachers should engage in professional learning opportunities with other mentor teachers to promote learning in the role, to gain self-efficacy, and improve their ability to provide instructional coaching and pedagogic support to candidates aligned with the district-EPP partnerships' visions of effective instruction.
 - 4.2.1 Structures and supports should sustain this learning through a network of mentors and learning opportunities.
 - 4.2.2 Mentoring networks and supports should focus on mentor learning and growth, and mentors' improvement and retention overtime to support a stable and resilient residency program in the school and district.

- 4.2.3 Mentors' expertise may be verified or recognized through organized training, competency-based credentialing, or other strategies.
- 4.3 Residency experiences must include opportunities for mentor teachers and instructors to assess candidate's learning, which must involve cooperation among EPPs, districts and schools.
 - 4.3.1 Strong residencies are co-teaching models in which candidates and mentors co-teach to support P-12 students learning while district instructional leaders and EPP instructors co-teach with mentors to support candidates' learning.
 - 4.3.2 Mentor teachers share responsibility for assessing residents' progress, communicating regularly with EPP instructors and field supervisors to support candidates' learning.
 - 4.3.3 The need for collaborative assessment shows the essential nature of partnership and shared design of candidates' learning experiences in programs and in schools.
- 4.4 The matching process of candidates and mentors is critical.
 - 4.4.1 Mentors need clear information about the role, goals, and benefits of mentoring. Mentors cannot make an informed choice if the entirety of the role is not clear to them.
 - 4.4.2 Develop strategies and shared practices among EPPs and districts to match candidates in districts to the EPPs that offer approved residency programming.
 - 4.4.3 Prioritize the matching process of a candidate to a mentor to maximize benefits in learning and minimize costs in time and frustration.
 - 4.4.4 Create intentional strategies to ensure equity in opportunity for EPP partners serving the same district to place residents in schools while considering that that even with statewide implementation of a paid teacher residency model, existing traditional programs will still have enrolled candidates in need of placements.
 - 4.4.5 Establish and encourage a culture of belonging through mentorship for both pre-service residents and novice teachers.
 - 4.4.6 Recognize that personal connection through positive mentoring focused on shared work can cultivate lasting, positive, and productive professional relationships in a multi-cultural, multi-lingual environment.
- 4.5 Compensate mentor teachers for their dual responsibilities as classroom teachers and school-based clinical educators in the residency program.
 - 4.5.1 Mentors' roles should be specified within the policy frameworks of PESB preparation program standards and BEST induction mentoring supports, with specified and limited flexibility to adapt to the local context.
 - 4.5.2 Mentors' specific roles and scopes of work should be designed by the district-EPP partnership implementing each residency program with input from school-based partners.
 - 4.5.3 Ideally, mentor teachers' roles and compensation are integrated into districts' teacher professional development and teacher leadership frameworks.

Resourcing Recommendation 4

Provide Stipends for Experts to Provide Course Work and Instruction

Given the residency model relies on residents and mentors co-teaching, and a high level of district-EPP coordination, EPP instructors and district experts should co-teach residency curriculum when

possible. The work of developing aligned curriculum and clinical practices materials and process will extend beyond the time and capacity constraints of mentor teachers and EPP instructors. Additional support to design and co-teach residency courses would be of great value. Stipends for these instructional designers/instructors/resource developers could leverage the expertise of EPP instructors and practicing educators in the district in ways that increase program quality and decrease time-to-implementation.

Provide Stipends and Professional Learning to Mentors/Cooperating Teachers

Serving as a mentor/cooperating teacher and hosting a resident is significant work and requires significant expertise and commitment. To build a sustainable mentor workforce which can support sustainable teacher workforce will require investments not only infrastructure and professional learning for mentors, but also for a stipend to compensate them for their work, their expertise, and a year-long commitment.

"What does a culturally responsive mentoring program look like? Not just teaching as a subject matter, but that be[ing] the entire, holistic point of the mentoring program. What does that look like within the multicultural and multilingual populations we are trying to serve?"

- Shandy Abrahamson, OSPI, Office of Native Education

Table 4: Implementation Milestones Related to Recommendation 4

Implementation Milestone	Timeline
A. Detail the alignment between in-service and pre-service mentoring through collaborative analysis of BEST standards, PESB standards, and established residency definition.	Spring–Summer 2023
B. Detail scopes of work, learning opportunities, and compensation processes for mentors.	Spring–Summer 2023
C. Identify and onboard mentors in focal districts with approved EPP partners.	Winter 2024–Fall 2024
D. Establish policy for approved partnerships to recruit and hire residents, pending enrollment.	Summer–Fall 2023
E. Residents approved by districts enroll in PESB-approved programs partnered with those districts.	Winter–Spring 2024
F. Match residents with mentors.	Spring–Summer 2024
G. Establish local mentor learning supports that enhance statewide, district, and EPP mentor training.	Winter 2024 and on

RECOMMENDATION 5: ENSURE SUSTAINABLE FUNDING FOR STATEWIDE PAID TEACHER RESIDENCY PROGRAMMING

"The need for dollars can decrease over time because residency candidates stay longer; there will be less of a need to fund residents over time. And then, over time, that investment can go down at the State level because districts will start saving money and their investment can go up."

- Karen DeMoss, Prepared to Teach, National Residency Consultant

Findings Related to Recommendation 5

- 5.1 The appropriate sustainable funding for residents, mentors, principals, partnerships, and system supports will make sure a statewide paid teacher residency model would be feasible and would achieve success as a workforce generator in the State of Washington
 - 5.1.1 A statewide paid teacher residency model should be built based on long-term financial modeling, not short-term grants.
 - 5.1.2 Funding should pull together resources from multiple national, state, and local sources to maximize opportunity for candidates, programs, and schools.
- 5.2 Guidance should be provided to districts about how to creatively leverage funds that go from the state to districts and how to leverage residency work to access federal funds for school improvement, student outcomes, special education inclusion, or other funding sources.
 - 5.2.1 Take into consideration the cost of living where the residency programs are offered and how to create a consistent yet flexible model when funding residents and mentors.
 - 5.2.2 Provide additional funding for districts with limited funding so that they can be equally successful to those districts that have more robust funding.
 - 5.2.3 Provide additional funding to high-poverty schools to support their access to the benefits of a residency program.

Resourcing Recommendation 5

Fund OSPI Programming Costs

The work involved in developing infrastructure, providing support, and convening partners will require investment in human resources. OSPI should provide technical assistance, including guidance on how to creatively leverage funding sources and how to take into consideration the cost of living where the residency programs are and create a consistent yet flexible model to address differences. OSPI staff will also engage in ongoing research in partnership with other education stakeholders and PESB.

Allocate Additional Funding for High Poverty Schools

It will be necessary to develop and enact a strategy to fund residents where they are needed most. Equity-based funding should ensure that districts with limited resources are successful in fully supporting teacher residency programs.

Table 5: Implementation Milestones Related to Recommendation 5

Implementation Milestone	Timeline
A. Develop, improve, and share long-term cost projections to begin a phased approach to establishing a paid statewide teacher residency model.	Spring 2023
B. Clarify processes through which districts in greatest need receive the greatest support.	Spring 2023
C. Develop and share guidance for districts as to how they can leverage residencies to secure cost savings and acquire resources to support residency programming.	Summer 2023
D. Develop cost vs. impact evaluation analysis methodologies to evaluate the statewide paid teacher residency model.	Summer 2023

"Our [District] partner in a paid residency program did the math and they're looking at all those teachers exiting the career and how expensive that is. They know many elementary teachers leave every year, and so, with that savings of new teachers, versus leaving teachers they're able to invest in stipend for the residents and cooperating teachers."

- Residency Program Teacher Educator

APPENDIX A

Workgroup Members

- John Pizarro, Highline College
- Marisa Bier, University of Washington
- Lindsey Lightner, WSU-TriCities
- Ron Jacobson, Whitworth University / PESB
- Bryan Carter, City University
- Lori Jass, ESD 112
- Kathy Whitlock, ESD 112
- Aaron Perzigian, Western Washington University
- Mathew Miller, ESD 112
- Kathy Whitlock, ESD 112
- Keith Reyes, Yakima Valley College
- Melissa Matczak, ESD 105
- Mike Esping, ESD 123
- Kari Terjeson, ESD
- Shandy Abrahamson, OSPI, Office of Native Education
- Rebecca Purser, Native Educator Cultivation Program
- Kristin Percy-Calaff, OSPI, Migrant & Bilingual Education
- Sue Anderson, OSPI, Beginning Educator Supports Team
- Veronica Gallardo, OSPI, System and School Improvement
- Cindy Rockholt, OSPI, Educator Growth and Development
- Lindsey Stevens, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession
- Jim Meadows, Washington Education Association
- Sarah Butcher, Roots of Inclusion
- Maddy Thompson, Office of the Governor

Speakers and Expert Guests

- Patrick Sexton, University of Pennsylvania
- Coleen McDonald, Classroom Academy Residency Program
- Erich Schultz, Louisiana Department of Education
- Nicole Bono, Louisiana Department of Education
- Jill Harvieux Pitner, National Center for Teacher Residencies
- Marjori Krebbs, University of New Mexico
- Karen DeMoss, Prepare to Teach, Bank Street
- Tessa Neigum, University of Wisconsin
- Robert Grey, Delaware Department of Education
- Richard Dunn, Woodring College of Education
- Christie McLean Kesler, Woodring College of Education
- Chris Nesmith, Elma School District, Washington State Apprenticeships in Public Education
- David Nowotny, Public School Employees of Washington
- Mona Halcomb, OSPI, Office of Native Education
- Muzdah Malik, PESB
- Dan Goldhaber, American Institute for Research
- Teresa Grayson, Education Research and Data Center
- John Fairbairn, Ferndale School District
- Emma McCallie, Tennessee Department of Education
- Emma Barnes, University of Washington, Johns Hopkins University, Project Staff

LEGAL NOTICE



Except where otherwise noted, this work by the [Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License](#). All logos and trademarks are property of their respective owners. Sections used under fair use doctrine (17 U.S.C. § 107) are marked.

Please make sure permission has been received to use all elements of this publication (images, charts, text, etc.) that are not created by OSPI staff, grantees, or contractors. This permission should be displayed as an attribution statement in the manner specified by the copyright holder. It should be made clear that the element is one of the "except where otherwise noted" exceptions to the OSPI open license. For additional information, please visit the [OSPI Interactive Copyright and Licensing Guide](#).

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at [OSPI Reports to the Legislature webpage](#). This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: 22-0040.



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Chris Reykdal | State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building | P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200