

# South Carolina Teacher Residency Programs: Characteristics, Outcomes & Recommendations

**WORKING PAPER SERIES I:  
Setting the Baseline for South Carolina**

## **RESEARCH TEAM**

Michalann G. Evatt  
A. Scott Henderson

Furman University

**MAY 2019**



## + ABSTRACT

The National Commission on Excellence in Education’s landmark report *A Nation at Risk* (1983) identified significant problems facing America’s schools. Nevertheless, more than three decades later, teacher recruitment and retention are among the challenges that still confront the nation’s public schools. While initiatives such as vouchers, charter/magnet schools, and high-stakes testing have focused on students, they have had little impact on teacher recruitment and/or retention. However, during the past several years, school districts, non-profit organizations, and colleges/universities have collaborated in establishing teacher residency programs (TRPs). These programs are notable for providing teacher candidates with an extended clinical experience (one year) in the classroom of a master teacher.

Another innovative aspect of TRPs is their focus on recruiting teacher candidates for critical-needs subject areas and/or for high-needs schools/school districts. Preliminary data suggest that TRPs are successfully meeting some of the challenges associated with teacher recruitment and retention. In South Carolina, there are several established and emerging programs that incorporate various components of TRPs, making them a promising development in the ongoing attempt to improve the state’s public schools.

## + INTRODUCTION

Since the publication of the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report *A Nation at Risk* 36 years ago (1983), policymakers, elected officials, and scholars have crafted and implemented proposals for improving the quality of the nation’s public schools. Notable efforts have included Goals 2000, No Child Left Behind, and an array of school-choice options—for example, charter schools, magnet schools, and vouchers (Goldstein, 2014; Green, 2014; Ravitch, 2000). More recently, teacher residency programs (TRPs) have emerged as a strategy to address the quality of the nation’s public schools and student performance by focusing on the need to recruit a well-prepared, stable workforce of teachers (Guha, Hyler, & Darling-Hammond, 2016).

“A teacher residency is a mutually beneficial partnership between preparation providers and districts, one in which the integration of clinical experiences and coursework throughout the preparation program is co-designed to strengthen teacher preparation and improve schools and learning in the partner districts.”  
— National Education Association (NEA)

## + DEFINITIONS

As defined by federal law, TRPs are teacher preparation programs that are school-based, which require that teacher candidates (students seeking certification through a teacher preparation program) teach for a minimum of one academic year with a mentor teacher who is the teacher of record. Concurrently, the teacher candidate must receive instruction (in their certification area) from a partner institution (defined as an institution of higher education [IHE] with a teacher education program), though the actual courses can be taught by personnel in a local education agency and/or by TRP faculty. TRPs must also provide teacher candidates with effective teaching skills and ensure that they will be prepared to attain full state certification/licensure in their given subject areas. Finally, TRPs must offer teacher candidates the opportunity to earn master’s degrees no later than 18 months after they start the program (United States Code, 2018).

The National Education Association (NEA) has provided a similar definition of TRPs, though with a slightly different emphasis: “A teacher residency is a mutually beneficial partnership between preparation providers and districts, one in which the integration of clinical experiences and coursework throughout the preparation program is co-designed to strengthen teacher preparation and improve schools and learning in the partner districts” (Coffman & Patterson, 2014, p. 1). Collaboration among stakeholders, integration of coursework with clinical experiences, and mutuality of benefits are key concepts that emerge from the NEA’s conceptualization of TRPs. Indeed, it is this broader notion of TRPs that has inspired efforts (including some in South Carolina) to adopt, modify, and implement aspects of TRPs.

## + HISTORICAL CONTEXT

TRPs are an outgrowth of related efforts during the post-World War II era to meet the demand for qualified elementary and secondary teachers, namely Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) degrees and alternative certification programs. M.A.T. options emerged in the 1950s at a number of colleges and universities, including Brown, Colgate, Duke, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Mount Holyoke, Tulane, Vanderbilt, the University of Massachusetts, Wesleyan University, and Yale. and M.A.T. degrees were not only aimed at prospective teachers (completion of an M.A.T. typically met state certification requirements) but also classroom teachers who wanted to pursue a graduate degree that offered a combination of subject matter and pedagogical content (an M.A.T. covers less subject matter than a traditional M.A. degree, but more pedagogical information, which M.A. degrees usually omit altogether). M.A.T. programs increased in popularity during the K-12 teacher shortages in the late-1960s and early-1970s, with some teacher candidates receiving assistance from the federal government to participate in such programs (Guha, Hyler, & Darling-Hammond, 2016; Perkins & Snell, 1962).

In the early-1980s, anticipating another wave of K-12 teacher shortages, states began to introduce options for prospective teachers that would complement traditional teacher preparation programs, the vast majority of which were completed as part of an undergraduate degree. In 1983, eight states offered alternative certification programs (ACPs), which is what these non-traditional certification options are most frequently called (National Center for Alternative Certification, 2006). Currently, all 50 states plus the District of Columbia have one or more ACPs. According to the United States Department of Education (2013), one out of five new teachers attained certification through an ACP by 2013. Although the rigor of ACPs varies significantly, they possess common features. Teacher candidates enrolled in ACPs must have an undergraduate degree (usually, though not always, in the subject for which they are seeking certification); fulfill the requirements of an accelerated/abbreviated teacher education program usually affiliated with an IHE; complete some sort of clinical practice (either with a teacher of record in his/her classroom or as the actual teacher of record); and pass all national and state exams necessary for certification (National Center for Alternative Certification, 2006).

TRPs, which began to appear in the early-2000s, sought to incorporate the advantages of M.A.T. programs and ACPs, while at the same time avoiding their disadvantages. Thus, TRPs differ from these latter programs in key respects (Berry et al., 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2003). First, TRPs result from collaborative efforts between partner school districts and IHEs for the purpose of targeting the school district’s hiring needs (for example, to recruit more special education or STEM teachers). Sometimes, multiple IHEs and/or school districts are involved; a local non-profit organization/board can also serve as an additional partner (Coffman & Patterson, 2014). Another key difference is the length of clinical practice. Modeled on the extended apprenticeship that plays an important role in medical education, TRPs seek to address the weaknesses found in the clinical practice portion of some traditional teacher education programs (Gatlin, 2009; Klein, Taylor, Onore, Strom, & Abrams, 2013). In many teacher preparation and M.A.T. programs, clinical practice is a relatively brief period of time spent by the teacher candidate in the classroom of a mentor teacher, with limited opportunities to incorporate prior coursework or theoretical knowledge. On the other hand, ACPs are often based on a sink-or-swim model, whereby teacher candidates get virtually no clinical experience before being hired as teachers of record in classrooms; it is learning by trial and many errors, which often comes at the expense of K-12 students (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2012), often with the most vulnerable populations of students. By contrast, teacher

candidates in TRPs participate in clinical experiences that are a full academic year. Finally, TRPs attempt to integrate ongoing pedagogical instruction that informs the prospective teacher’s decisions regarding the delivery of content, assessments, student accommodations, and the implementation of technology. Rather than learning and then doing (with few connections), teacher candidates in TRPs are given multiple opportunities to reflect on and during practice, much like medical residents do in hospital settings (Perlstein, Jerald, & Duffrin, 2014; Zeichner, 2010).

## + CURRENT CHALLENGES IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

The increasing number of TRPs during the past five to seven years has resulted in large measure because of concerns over teacher recruitment and retention (Carroll, 2007; Gray, Taie, & O’Rear, 2015; Podolsky, Kini, Bishop, & Darling-Hammond, 2016; Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). Since the Great Recession of 2007-2009, the annual demand for teachers has risen sharply, having reached the current plateau of approximately 300,000 new hires needed each year. Furthermore, an additional 145,000 teachers would be required to reduce teacher-student ratios to pre-recession levels, which many districts are attempting to accomplish. Teacher demand will also be fueled by an estimated increase of 3,000,000 K-12 students by the mid- to late-2020s (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). Conversely, the supply of qualified teachers has been decreasing. Enrollments in teacher education programs fell from 691,000 in 2009 to 451,000 in 2014, a 35% reduction. In fact, the number of available teachers in 2016 was at the lowest level in a decade. Reduction in the supply of teachers has also resulted from retirements, which have accounted (and will account) for 28 to 31% of the 8% (annual) nationwide teacher attrition rate. Exacerbating matters, teacher shortages have been (and will continue to be) acute in STEM subjects, special education, and bilingual education (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016).

One of the biggest factors contributing to teacher vacancies is the pre-retirement attrition rate, which has been/will be responsible for approximately 59 to 67% of the total national attrition rate between 2011-2012 and 2019-2020 (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). These pre-retirement attrition rates point to the other major challenge that TRPs attempt to address: teacher retention. Teachers leave the classroom for a variety of reasons: poor working conditions, lack of parental and/or administrative support, insufficient resources, paperwork, teach-to-the-test imperatives, failure to receive the respect and autonomy accorded to other professionals, and/or low salaries (Darling-Hammond, 2003). Thus, up to 30% of new teachers leave within their first five years, with that figure approaching 50% in critical-needs schools and subject areas. Compounding the frustration and stress that new teachers face is the absence of effective and consistent mentoring during their first year or two in the classroom. High turnover rates—and the educational and financial costs associated with them—present challenges that are absent from virtually every other profession in America (Carroll, 2007; Gray, Taie, & O’Rear, 2015; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).

The current situation in South Carolina mirrors (and in some cases exceeds) national trends in teacher recruitment and retention. The following are key points excerpted from the *Annual Educator Supply and Demand Report: 2018-2019 School Year* issued by the South Carolina Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA, 2019):

“Teacher Residency Programs, which began to appear in the early-2000s, sought to incorporate the advantages of M.A.T. programs and Alternative Certification Programs, while at the same time avoiding their disadvantages.”

## Recruitment

- Districts reported 621 vacant teaching positions in 2018-2019. This is a 13% increase compared to vacancies reported at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year and a 29% increase compared to 2016-2017. These vacancies are in addition to the 7,600 vacancies caused primarily by teacher departures that had been filled by districts prior to the start of the 2018-2019 school year.
- Districts are hiring more teachers from other countries. For the 2018-2019 school year, South Carolina school districts hired nearly 400 international teachers; in 2013, approximately 100 were hired.
- The number of South Carolina students who completed a teacher education program has declined by 32% since 2012-2013. The number of hires who graduated from an in-state teacher preparation program increased for the first time since 2013-2014, accounting for 24% of all new hires.

See Table 1 below for a summary of key recruitment data.

**Table 1:** *Key Recruitment Data for South Carolina*

DATA	EXPLANATION
13% / 26%	Percentage increase in the number of vacant teaching positions in 2018-2019 compared to 2017-2018 and 2016-2017, respectively.
300%	Percentage increase in the number of international teachers hired in 2018-2019 compared to 2012-13.
32%	Percentage decrease in the number of students completing a teacher education program since 2012-13.

## Retention

- Approximately 7,300 South Carolina teachers left their positions during or at the end of the 2017-2018 school year; this is an increase of nearly 10% compared to the number of teachers who left during or at the end of the 2016-2017 school year. Of these teachers 27% reportedly went to teach in another South Carolina public school district, leaving more than 5,300 teachers who are no longer teaching in any South Carolina public school.
- Out of all teachers (excluding retirees), 48% who left had five or fewer years of experience in a South Carolina public school classroom, and 17% had been teaching in South Carolina no more than one year.
- Of first-year teachers hired for the 2017-2018 school year, 25% left their positions during or at the end of that school year and are no longer teaching in any South Carolina public school. This was up from 22% during the 2016-2017 year.

See Table 2 below for a summary of key retention data.

**Table 2:** *Key Retention Data for South Carolina*

DATA	EXPLANATION
10%	Percentage increase in the number of teachers who left their positions at the end of 2017-2018 compared to 2016-2017.
48%	Percentage of teachers (not including retirees) who left their positions with five or fewer years in a public South Carolina classroom.
25%	Percentage of first-year teachers hired in 2017-2018 who left their positions.

Given existing trends, South Carolina will be short 6,000 teachers by the 2027-2028 school year, of which approximately 2,500 will be vacancies in STEM, social studies, and special education positions (Self, 2018).

## + METHODOLOGY

To determine the characteristics, outcomes, and recommendations related to current TRPs, the authors reviewed a wide range of primary and secondary sources, including academic and professional journals (e.g., *Review of Educational Research*, *Teaching Education*, *Learning Policy Institute Reports*). They also consulted online resources using the following keywords when conducting searches: *alternative certification*, *mentor teacher*, *South Carolina*, *teacher recruitment*, *teacher residency*, *teacher residency programs*, *teacher retention*, and *teaching internship*. Electronic databases (e.g., Academic Search Premier, Education Full Text, ERIC, and JSTOR) were also consulted, as were pertinent websites (e.g., Learning Policy Institute, National Center for Education Statistics, National Center for Teacher Residencies, and the South Carolina Department of Education). The authors communicated or searched electronically and/or directly with college/university-based or affiliated TRPs, including the following: Boston TRP, Clemson University, Coastal Carolina University, Columbia College, CREATE TRP, Dallas Teacher Residency, Furman University, Memphis TRP, North Carolina A&T University, New York University, and University of San Francisco. Findings are noted in the next sections.

## + FINDINGS

The *goals* identified by each of the TRPs that were reviewed share a common vision of effective teacher preparation, enhanced teacher recruitment/retention, and student achievement. A year-long clinical experience (residency) and purposeful mentorship/partnerships that go beyond what is typical of traditional teacher preparation programs are the two *characteristics* at the core of TRPs. TRP characteristics also include financial incentives, residency assignments in high-needs schools, in-service (post-program) mentorship, and completion commitments. All TRPs stress the importance of highly trained and effective mentors.

All but a few of the TRPs the authors reviewed are connected to master's degrees, a Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.), Master of Arts, or Master of Education. In keeping with the legal definition of TRPs, the authors focused on programs associated with master's degrees.

Each of the TRP characteristics identified by the authors creates a more holistic approach to teacher preparation for the purpose of increasing teacher recruitment and retention rates. These *characteristics* are explained further below. (Appendix Table 1 provides details of the representative sample of TRPs studied.)

### Teaching Residency/Partnership

- Partnerships include school districts, private companies, and for profit and nonprofit organizations, some of which fund financial incentives and other operating costs.
- Teacher candidates in all TRPs reviewed complete a year-long residency with a cooperating teacher/mentor and a university mentor.
- High-needs school placements: the majority of partnerships are in large urban areas, with a few others in rural settings that have critical needs subject areas and/or are located in critical-needs geographic areas.
- TRPs are in areas of high teacher turnover.
- Formal community engagement: Most TRPs require teacher candidates to engage (during the academic year and summers) with the school's/area's families and community.
- Participation in school activities: TRPs require participation in school meetings, board meetings, and other school sponsored events.
- Extended mentorship: Mentor support is year-long, and mentors are often required to attend training institutes to advance their knowledge and skills for effective mentoring.

- Preparation aligns with district goals/initiatives: Districts identify hiring needs, work with residency programs to design and evaluate candidate preparation, and develop deeper partnerships with teacher preparation programs.

### **Financial Incentives**

- Residency programs often receive financial support from private and public sources.
- Full tuition or tuition benefits provide financial support to teacher candidates to participate in a TRP.
- Graduate assistantships provide opportunities for participants in some TRPs to work with university faculty researching best teaching practices and/or work with school-age children/young adults in tutoring and other education settings.
- Living stipends and/or housing benefits provide additional financial support for some TRP participants—and, in some TRPs, these benefits are connected to cohort living communities.
- Paid internships provide participants in some TRPs with salaries/stipends during their year-long residency and/or salaries/stipends during other field experiences that are part of the curriculum such as tutoring, after-school program work, and substitute teaching.

### **Post-Program Commitment**

- Teacher candidates who complete many TRP programs must agree to teach in Title I/critical-needs partner schools for a specified period of time (for example, three years).
- Teacher candidates who complete some TRPs must agree to provide teacher evaluation and student growth/achievement data to the TRP as a way for programs to evaluate their effectiveness and gauge their impact on teacher recruitment and retention.

### **Post-Program Benefits**

- TRP participants are provided with access to early job contacts/preferential interviews with principals, which—in addition to benefiting the TRP participants—allows school and district personnel to fill anticipated teacher vacancies and maximize retention efforts.
- TRP mentoring during the induction year and beyond: TRPs make a commitment to provide mentoring support to program completers during their first year, with most TRPs doing so for two years, while a few others do so for up to four years.
- Continued professional development and resources: TRPs make a commitment to provide professional development and other resources to program completers.
- Access to alumni and education leader networks: TRPs make a commitment to provide program completers with access to developing networks of alumni and educators as a way to strengthen ties to the teaching profession.

## + SOUTH CAROLINA

In South Carolina, at least six colleges or universities with teacher education programs have incorporated variations of year-long residencies in some or all of their teacher preparation tracks. On the undergraduate level, Winthrop University was the first traditional teacher education program in the state to implement a year-long student teaching (clinical practice) requirement—a core characteristic of TRPs—coupled with a strong history of partnerships with Professional Development Schools (PDS). Lander University shifted to a year-long student teaching residency last year and is focusing on partner placements with rural schools. Columbia College has an innovative Alternative Pathways Educator Certification (APEC) Program that models a TRP. The program, targeting partner school district employees (excluding currently certified teachers) and career changers, leads to certification within two years and a bachelor’s degree for those who do not hold a bachelor’s degree.

South Carolina’s three TRPs *with master’s degree components* have a majority of the characteristics described in previous sections of this paper, although the implementation of these characteristics varies. Two of these programs lead to M.A.T. degrees: one through a B.A. to fifth year M.A.T (Clemson University) and one that requires a bachelor’s degree in education or another degree as an admission requirement (Coastal Carolina University). Both of these programs are in their first or second year of operation. The third program, in its 19th year, is a B.A. to fifth year (or more depending on additional licensure area sought) leading to an M.A. in Education (Furman University). The programs at Coastal Carolina and Furman are described below. (Clemson University stated its intention to share TRP information in its own future publication.)

## + COASTAL CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

Coastal Carolina’s new residency program has several characteristics that are consistent with national TRPs. The Coastal Carolina Educator-in-Residence program places teacher candidates in Georgetown County schools where two-thirds of the schools are designated as Title I and are located in critical-needs geographic areas, with poverty indexes ranging from 70 to 93% and teacher turnover rates as high as 30%. Program completers earn certification for grades 9-12 (teacher shortages are especially acute on the secondary level). Graduate assistantships provide TRP participants meaningful experiences prior to their formal classroom teaching responsibilities. For example, teacher candidates are required to do after-school tutoring in the schools or in a classroom within the Georgetown teacher residency housing. Program cohorts live together in Georgetown in apartment-style housing, which allows them to participate in after-school curricular and extracurricular activities, including clubs, athletic events, theater, attendance at board meetings, department meetings, and school meetings. Teacher residency housing is fully fitted with computer capabilities, Internet access, and synchronous learning capabilities for class and study space. The year-long residency requires 35 days of full-time teaching during the clinical practice, much more than the minimum required by the state for certification. Coastal Carolina requires the program completers to commit to providing their teacher observation and student growth data to the TRP.



## + FURMAN UNIVERSITY

Furman University's Teacher to Teacher Residency Program in elementary, secondary, and foreign languages has a year-long experience during the senior year of the undergraduate program in which teacher candidates are assigned to a cooperating teacher's classroom in one of the local partner school districts with the support of an assigned university supervisor for the entire year. The Senior Block during the spring term (not to be confused with the student teaching internship that occurs later in the program in the fifth year) requires three weeks of full-time teaching. Though placement in a Title I/high-needs school is not a requirement, the partner districts are very diverse in terms of socioeconomic background and race/ethnicity, which results in many TRP participants being placed in Title I schools. Furman's TRP is designed so that teacher candidates fulfill the internship requirement (clinical practice) in the fall of his/her fifth year, while continuing M.A. coursework that began in the summer. Qualified TRP participants have the option of fulfilling their internship requirement *concurrent with their duties as induction year teachers in partner schools*, although candidates may elect or be advised to complete traditional internships with cooperating teachers, also during the fall of their fifth year. In addition to a university supervisor, the Furman TRP requires a second mentor for teacher candidates who are hired as induction teachers during the fifth year. TRP participants continue M.A. coursework that leads (in almost all cases) to an additional area of certification by the end of summer following the fifth year. Financial incentives include reduced tuition during the fifth year and salaries/benefits for induction teachers.

## + OUTCOMES

The National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR), a nonprofit organization dedicated to developing high quality teacher residency programs, partners with 23 teacher residency programs in large metropolitan areas across the United States. This Next Generation Network notes in its recent *Network Partner Report* and *Stakeholder Perceptions Report* that 86% of TRP graduates are still teaching in residency program partner districts after three years. The University of San Francisco states that 89% of its residency program graduates are still teaching in the San Francisco school district since the TRP was created eight years ago. The Boston Teacher Residency reports 71% of graduates are teaching in Boston public schools through year six compared to 51% of peers. In Tennessee, the Memphis Teacher Residency Program has the highest percentage of graduates meeting and exceeding classroom student growth averages among 39 teacher preparation programs. Denver Teacher Residency graduates teaching in Denver Public Schools outperformed all other new teachers in every aspect of the district's evaluation system. The Dallas Teacher Residency reports that each cohort has outperformed their teacher counterparts in the Dallas Independent School District (e.g., outperformed other first year teachers by 18% in their first year of teaching). NCTR found that more than half of residency graduates are people of color, whereas nationally fewer than 20% of teachers are people of color. Career changers account for 41% of TRP participants. A very high number of residency program graduates (92%) are teaching in Title I schools, 31% are teaching STEM subjects, 28% are teaching English Language Learners, and 15% are teaching students with special needs. In their recent *Stakeholder Report*, NCTR states that principals (97%) said they would be more likely to hire a residency graduate than other teacher education program graduates. Key findings from hiring principals reveal that residency graduates are exceptionally well prepared for today's classrooms and outperform new teachers on evaluations (National Center for Teacher Residencies, 2018).

School and district leaders echo the NCTR findings about program advantages. Superintendents and principals of established TRPs that have been in existence for a while boast that TRP participants are more advanced than beginning teachers, enter the interview process with a high degree of professionalism, and are familiar with the schools, their students, and the nuances of community dynamics. Residency graduates thus have access to early job contacts and preferential interviews.

One long-established teacher residency program in South Carolina (Furman) studies the impact of its program by collecting data on hiring, retention, and completer impact on student growth. In the last five years, the hiring rate averaged 97% for program completers. (In two of the last five years, the rate dropped below 100% because two completers chose to pursue full-time graduate study and one decided to pursue a non-education career.) Out of those who completed the program five years ago, 91% are still teaching, with 60% of that number in South Carolina classrooms, while the rest are teaching in other states. The overall retention rate for the last five years of completers is 94%. During this same time period, 97% of Furman’s residency program graduates (who are teaching in South Carolina) are employed in residency partner schools and 25% are teaching in Title I schools. Principals in partner districts report that 93% of residency graduates who have been teaching three to five years scored at the proficient to exemplary level on rubric-based evaluations of their teaching. For classroom student growth, principals reported 86% of residency graduates moved their students to the expected year’s growth (57%) or beyond a year’s growth (29%) as evidenced in standardized testing. Finally, principals reported 85% of these residency graduates met or exceeded their annual Student Learning Outcome (SLO) targets.

Coastal Carolina’s Educator-in-Residence TRP is only in the initial stages of collecting program impact data. Personnel in their partner district, Georgetown, have already been impressed with the program and agreed to enter into a formal PDS collaboration with Coastal. Further, the Georgetown School District has expressed interest in including Educator-in-Residence participants in their induction and mentoring programs. Early reports indicate that 100% of TRP participants will be hired this year. A specific area of improvement the impact study identified by Coastal’s Spadoni College of Education focuses on the need to develop more specific learning experiences that involve preservice teachers in applying theoretical knowledge to varied educational contexts. This would help bridge the gap between theory and practice in a relevant and meaningful manner, while simultaneously addressing the causes of teacher attrition.

Other South Carolina college and university efforts to focus on teacher retention incorporate a core TRP characteristic—strong school partnerships—as found in the teacher preparation programs at Winthrop University and the University of South Carolina-Columbia, for example. The Carolina Teacher Induction Program (Carolina TIP) at the University of South Carolina provides support and mentorship for teachers entering their first year after completing their teacher preparation program at the University of South Carolina. This program (in its early stages) has produced positive outcomes: 100% of the induction teachers returned after their first year of teaching, which exceeds recent state and national averages.

## + RECOMMENDATIONS

A thoughtful, statewide, comprehensive vision and system for preparing, developing, and retaining South Carolina teachers, one that goes beyond reactions as quick fixes or recent pedagogical trends, could address our state’s needs. This system could encompass the time a candidate enters a teacher preparation program through his/her first years of teaching and beyond. All stakeholders—teacher education programs, state education think-tanks and organizations (e.g. CERRA, Commission on Higher Education), the State Department of Education, school districts, and state policymakers—need to work cooperatively to develop this system.

Findings in this paper support TRPs (and TRP characteristics implemented in teacher education programs) as a promising practice to recruit and retain high quality educators. Further research related to TRPs needs to be conducted to determine the most effective program characteristics and those that most positively impact recruitment and retention. TRPs and TRP-like preparation programs, coupled with more effective administrative support and school leadership—as well as enhanced school environments, professional development, mentorship, and incentives for teachers to be motivated, effective, and committed professionals—are needed so that educators view teaching as a long-term career.

Specific recommendations, within the context of the need for a comprehensive state vision and system based on the authors' analysis of TRPs, are provided below.

1. Year-long student teaching/residency has been described by school leaders as a way to get to identify prospective teachers who will likely stay in the classroom longer. Indeed, TRPs, through year-long residencies, give candidates multiple opportunities to reflect on and during practice at a more in-depth level due to an increased number of days in full-time teaching prior to program completion, which ultimately leads to increased retention. EPPs can capture this beneficial outcome if, at the very least, they lengthen student teaching.
2. TRPs' student teaching/residencies are with school district partners that identify short- and long-term hiring needs and use residency candidates to fill those needs. This type of partnership has proven to be effective in teacher retention because—as data provided in this paper have shown—teachers hired by partner schools tend to stay longer than if they had been hired by a non-partner school. EPPs can capture this beneficial outcome if partnerships have this goal in mind.
3. Because NCTR found that more than half of TRP graduates are people of color, TRPs and TRP-like programs in South Carolina should consider stronger recruitment efforts for diverse teacher candidates. Some of the TRP characteristics described in this paper may serve as incentives.
4. Because knowledge of community settings can help educators better teach and communicate with their students, EPPs (with or without a TRP) should consider offering, if feasible, cohort housing arrangements and co-curricular requirements for community engagement that can provide candidates with more opportunities to get to know and understand the people and communities in their placement setting and the setting of their potential teaching positions. This may also encourage community engagement as a lifelong teacher practice.
5. Since TRP model programs have mentors who are highly trained and become more effective teachers themselves, South Carolina EPPs could collaborate with the state's Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA) on best practices for mentoring pre-service teachers (based on CERRA's work with induction teachers). This could augment CERRA's report on mentoring protocols, *A Redesign of the South Carolina Mentor Training* (2016). These best practices could provide a framework for TRPs and similar programs for mentor hiring and training, EPP program design, and partnership school procedures.
6. Studies show that both mentors and pre-service/novice teachers benefit from effective mentoring. Thus, stakeholders should encourage and/or strengthen collaborative efforts among EPPs (with or without TRPs), school districts, and the state to support the mentoring of pre-service, induction, and novice teachers. Stakeholders should also enhance the preparation/support of school leaders who mentor new teachers in their schools.
7. South Carolina lawmakers are well positioned to address teacher recruitment and retention challenges by supporting and making funds available for teacher residency collaborations between EPPs and partner school districts. EPPs are also encouraged to seek funding through private and public sources as several TRPs studied have done. Since financial incentives for candidates—in addition to strong partnership relationships and mentoring—are among the TRP characteristics that address teacher recruitment and retention issues, such funding could include (but not be limited to) assistance for offsetting costs and/or creating financial and other incentives associated with TRP participants' enrollment, as well as subsidies for mentors who are assisting TRP participants and/or induction teachers.
8. The South Carolina Department of Education is poised to contribute to much-needed statewide research by making data related to teacher recruitment, preparation, and retention available to EPPs. Such data include annual hiring, movement, and retention of EPP completers, as well as student growth measures, surveys of principals/students, and evaluations of completers' teaching. These data will allow EPPs to determine the effectiveness of characteristics such as yearlong student teaching/residency, school partnerships, financial incentives, and other program characteristics, all of which (according to research cited above) will strengthen the preparation of South Carolina's prospective teachers.

## + CONCLUSION

Mounting evidence suggests that TRPs produce teachers who can meet school district hiring priorities, are prepared to fill vacancies in high-needs schools, and are more likely to have higher retention rates than non-TRP graduates. This, in turn, will lead to cost savings for school districts, a strengthening of the teacher workforce, and enhanced school environments. Furthermore, it appears that TRP-designed programs increase the pool of teachers of color; the burden of college debt may be significantly lower due to financial incentives provided to teacher candidates by TRPs; and those who serve as TRP mentors frequently become better teachers themselves because of their work with TRPs. Ultimately, evidence suggests that TRP graduates have consistently strong teaching evaluations and a positive impact on student learning. For these reasons, South Carolina should consider investigating a wide variety of strategies for supporting the creation of TRPs, while EPPs should consider incorporating TRP characteristics in South Carolina's existing teacher preparation programs. All stakeholders, working together to complement efforts, can make an impact on the teacher recruitment and retention issues that are critical to South Carolina and our nation.

## + REFERENCES

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2012). *Where we stand: Clinical preparation of teachers*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., Curtis, C., Hernandez N., Wurtzel J., and Snyder, J. (2008). *Creating and sustaining urban teacher residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare, develop, and retain effective teachers in high-needs districts*. Retrieved from [https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/files/content/docs/pubs/FINAL.CREATINGANDSUSTAININGUTR.PDF?\\_ga=2.162138812.1227854196.1550447633-963469471.1550447633](https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/files/content/docs/pubs/FINAL.CREATINGANDSUSTAININGUTR.PDF?_ga=2.162138812.1227854196.1550447633-963469471.1550447633)
- Carroll, T. (2007). *Policy brief: The high cost of teacher turnover*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Coffman, A. N., and Patterson, R. (2014). *Teacher residencies: Redefining preparation through partnerships*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 6–13.
- Gatlin, D. (2009). A pluralistic approach to the revitalization of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 469–477.
- Goldstein, D. (2014). *The teacher wars: A history of America's most embattled profession*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Gray, L., Taie, S., and O'Rear, I. (2015). *Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-2008 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.
- Green, E. (2014). *How to build a better teacher: How teaching works*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Guha, R., Hyler, M. E., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The teacher residency: An innovative model for preparing teachers*. Retrieved from [https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher\\_Residency\\_Innovative\\_Model\\_Preparing\\_Teachers\\_REPORT.pdf](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher_Residency_Innovative_Model_Preparing_Teachers_REPORT.pdf)
- Ingersoll, R. M., and Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201–233.
- Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., and Abrams, L. (2013). Finding a third space in teacher education: Creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education*, 24(1), 27–57.
- National Center for Alternative Certification. (2006). *Alternative teacher certification: A state by state analysis*. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20061003233216/http://www.teach-now.org/intro.cfm>
- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2018). *Our impact*. Retrieved from <https://nctresidencies.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/NCTR-Our-Impact.pdf>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Perkins, D., and Snell, J. (1962). *The education of historians in the United States*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Perlstein, L., Jerald, C., and Duffrin, E. (2014). *Building effective teacher residencies*. Chicago, IL: Urban Teacher Residency United.
- Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Bishop, J., and Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *Recruiting and retaining excellent educators: Research and policies to strengthen the teaching workforce*. Palo Alto, CA: The Learning Policy Institute.

- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left behind: A century of battles over school reforms*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., and Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 4–36.
- Self, J. (2018). Classrooms in crisis: Why South Carolina teachers are leaving in record numbers. Retrieved from <https://www.thestate.com/news/local/education/article205569864.html>
- South Carolina Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement. (2019). *Annual educator supply and demand report: 2018-2019 school year*. Retrieved from [https://www.cerra.org/uploads/1/7/6/8/17684955/2018-19\\_supply\\_demand\\_report\\_update\\_jan\\_16.pdf](https://www.cerra.org/uploads/1/7/6/8/17684955/2018-19_supply_demand_report_update_jan_16.pdf)
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., and Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming-crisis-teaching>
- United States Code. (2018). Teacher residency program. Title 20, Chap. 28, Sub. Chap. 2, Sec. 1021, Sub. Sec. 20.
- United States Department of Education. (2013). *Preparing and credentialing the nation's teachers: The Secretary's Ninth Report on Teacher Quality*. Retrieved from <https://title2.ed.gov/TitleIIReport13.pdf>
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89–99.

## + APPENDIX

**Table 1. TRPS and Characteristics\***

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	FINANCIAL INCENTIVES	GRADUATE DEGREE	ADMISSION REQ'S	POST-PROGRAM REQ'S	POST-PROGRAM BENEFITS	OUTCOMES
Boston Teacher Residency (2002)	Yearlong student teaching/ internship	\$13,732 living stipend; \$5,920 AmeriCorps Award upon completion; Waive 1/3 of \$10,000 program cost for each year committed to Boston Public Schools	M.Ed. Education University of Massachusetts Boston		3-year commitment to Boston Public Schools	PD and formal support, Early Career Teaching Network	71% teaching through year 6, compared with 51% of peers
CREATE Atlanta Neighborhood Charter School 7 Atlanta Public Schools – Georgia State University (2015)	Yearlong student teaching/ internship	\$5,000 stipend in pre-service year 1; paid summer learning	Master's degree in K-8 Education Georgia State University			2 years of in-service professional growth programs & 3 years induction support beyond residency; stipends; year 1 paid team teacher with another year 1 teacher resident; year 2 paid lead teacher	
Dallas Teacher Residency-Texas A&M Commerce (2013)	Yearlong student teaching/ internship	\$20,000 living stipend	Master's degree		Encouraged but not required to teach in partner district	Continuing mentor support through individual coaching and professional learning communities; access to network of alumni and educational leaders; pathways to become future mentor teachers	100% since start of program receive teaching offers in partner schools; 100% of mentors agreed being a mentor makes them a more effective teacher
Memphis Teacher Residency (2008)	Yearlong student teaching/ internship + summer academic enrichment camp/ community engagement	Tuition and shared housing stipend + \$12,000 living stipend	Master of Urban Education Union University	3.0 GPA minimum	3-year commitment to teach in Memphis high-needs partner schools	4+ years ongoing professional development; access to classroom resources; participation in community events; instructional coaching; year 5+ opportunities to mentor residents	92% of class of 2010-2015 completed 3-year teaching commitment
North Carolina A&T	Yearlong student teaching/ internship	Stipend during teaching residency; paid for participation in conferences, professional development	M.A.T.	3.0 GPA minimum	3-year commitment to teaching in a rural partner school		
NYU Steinhardt (2016)	Yearlong student teaching/ internship	Scholarships + paid teaching residency stipend or salary	M.A.T.	Interview/ acceptance by a partner school	2-year commitment in partner school of residency (in most cases)		
San Francisco Teacher Residency University of San Francisco (2010)	Yearlong student teaching/ internship	Discounted tuition + \$15,000 living stipend; TEACH grant application offer (\$4,000 per year)	Master's degrees; option for added bilingual authorization certification		Commitment to teaching in high-needs schools in San Francisco; TEACH recipients must teach 4 years in high-needs school	2 years coaching support	89% teaching in San Francisco School District in 8 years of program

\*The TRPs identified outside of South Carolina in the table are a representative sample of TRPs and may not be inclusive of all TRPs across the nation.

## South Carolina TRPS

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	FINANCIAL INCENTIVES	GRADUATE DEGREE	ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS	POST-PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	POST-PROGRAM BENEFITS	OUTCOMES
Clemson University	Yearlong student teaching		Bachelor's degree & M.A.T in 5th year	3.4 GPA			
Georgetown Educator in Residence Coastal Carolina University (2017)	Yearlong teaching residency + community engagement	Affordable Georgetown apartments residence benefit + graduate assistantship	M.A.T.		Teachers provide graduate impact data	Affordable Georgetown apartments residence in first year teaching	Finishing first year but appears 100% hiring
Teacher to Teacher Residency Program Furman University (1999)	Senior year yearlong experience & 5th year induction year internship	Reduced tuition for Internship; reduced graduate school tuition rate; partial induction year teacher salary	Bachelor's degree & M.A. with additional certification in 5th year			Additional mentor in induction year	94% teaching after 5 years; 100% hiring rate



### ABOUT SC TEACHER

SC TEACHER provides comprehensive research, visualized data profiles, and compelling stories to communicate impact of educator pipeline policies and promote transformative practices that inform policymakers, educators, and communities who care about education scaling economic opportunity.

SC-TEACHER.ORG