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Introduction

In this paper I argue that a voluntary certification system for highly accomplished teachers must be part of a coherent system of professional accountability which is developed, implemented and managed by the profession. This would be a system that engages professional judgement of evidence provided by teachers in relation to their professional knowledge and practice, and professional standards for teaching would provide the organising framework for that judgment. It would be a system incorporating and aligning all forms of professional licensure, including entry into the profession and subsequent professional milestones. It would be a system that all partners in the profession across Australia—employers, professional associations, and registration authorities—endorse, participate in and align with.

The profession can take the lead in developing and implementing such a coherent and coordinated national approach by carefully developing a system to recognise and reward highly accomplished teaching. Such a system should aim to recognise and build teacher quality by defining what it is highly accomplished teachers know and are able to do. Moreover, such a system must find ways of making teaching public and acknowledging teaching as intellectual work which involves professional judgment that draws on a recognised professional knowledge base and contextualised knowledge about students and their learning.

The paper is presented in two main sections. First, a proposed conceptual framework for the professional recognition and certification of highly accomplished teachers is outlined. Then, the argument for this proposed conceptual framework is presented drawing on learnings from relevant research and professional activity in both Australia and the USA.
A conceptual framework for the professional recognition and certification of highly accomplished teachers

Purpose

The purpose of any system for professional recognition and certification of highly accomplished teachers is to identify and acknowledge quality teaching. The overall goal is to value, support and enhance quality teaching.

Potentially, a system of professional recognition and certification of highly accomplished teachers can:

- develop teacher expertise and enhance student learning outcomes
- build teacher morale through opportunities for recognition
- be a catalyst for systematic and goal-focused teacher reflection
- provide goals and a frame for ongoing professional learning
- provide teachers with opportunities to review their progress and clarify their future career plans
- enhance the status of the profession.

To achieve this, any approach for professional recognition and certification of highly accomplished teachers needs to include processes and structures that:

- recognise teachers' work in the 21st century as intellectual work that is complex and highly contextualised
- support teacher learning and reflect what is known about how teachers learn
- impact positively on teachers, their classrooms and their students
- recognise and accommodate differentiated pathways in teachers' growing expertise
- align with systemic learning and development policies and strategies
- align with systemic career and advancement policies and strategies
- align with bureaucratic licensure policies and practices.
Underpinning principles

Any approach to teacher professional recognition and certification needs to be underpinned and informed by a set of agreed principles about teachers’ work in Australian schools. These principles should capture teacher professionalism for the 21st century.

1. Teaching is intellectual work requiring considered and well-informed professional judgment; therefore, any recognition system needs to be able to recognise this cognitive dimension of teachers’ work—not only their behaviours or practices.

2. Teachers are researchers and inquirers, both individually and collectively; they are also users of research.

3. Teachers’ work is informed by a well researched knowledge base for teaching, including:
   - content knowledge
   - general pedagogical knowledge
   - curriculum knowledge
   - pedagogical content knowledge
   - knowledge of learners
   - knowledge of educational contexts
   - knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds.

4. Teachers’ work is described in rigorous and well-researched professional standards for teaching. These provide descriptions of teachers’ work throughout their careers.

5. Learning to teach is ongoing. Teacher professional learning occurs in a continuum from pre-service teacher education throughout a teacher’s career. Professional standards for teaching provide key organisers for teachers to plan their continuing learning and identify their professional growth and achievements. Effective professional learning is embedded within an accreditation and recognition framework that acknowledges both formal professional learning programs and non-formal professional learning, and has clear relationships with professional standards and career advancement.
Organising principles

An effective recognition system for Australian teachers would be organised in such a way as to:

1. encourage and frame professional learning
2. build quality teaching and focus on enhancing student learning outcomes
3. involve judgments which are differentiated according to the phase of professional growth and the purposes for which the judgment is being made
4. engage legitimate professional standards and include guidance about exemplary professional practice in relation to them (not checklists but perhaps vignettes)
5. incorporate clear guidance about what constitutes evidence so that evaluators can make informed judgments about the teacher’s professional practice as well as their professional learning. Evidence requirements would increase as reward ‘stakes’ increase
6. engage trained evaluators who can make judgments that are valid, reliable and based on evidence. Evaluators must be able to recognise examples of criteria/the standards in action in a range of contexts and situations
7. include clear, well-justified and readily accessible descriptions of the relevant criteria/standards, structures and procedures (i.e. the content and the processes)
8. be accessible by all teachers.

Elements

a) A continuum of recognition

A teaching career is marked by specific phases, including graduation from pre-service teacher education programs, employment as a beginning teacher and then various stages of professional and career progression. The content and processes for determining transitions between these phases must be aligned and articulated. This does not mean that they would be identical but that there must be some consistency in approach and the outcomes must be able to be used for a range of purposes. A system for recognition could include:

1. Career continuum. This would involve judgment and recognition associated with transitions within a teaching career e.g.

   employment as a beginning teacher → end of probationary period → continued employment accountability → promotion

   This would be the responsibility of the employer:
2. **Certification/registration continuum.** This would involve judgment and recognition associated with transitions in relation to professional certification/registration e.g.

![Certification/registration continuum diagram](image)

3. **Professional continuum.** This would involve judgment and recognition associated with teachers’ ongoing professional learning and individual decisions to apply for various types of recognition e.g. self development and personal performance management; recognition for the purposes of awards, certificates, diplomas, scholarships, sabbatical, credit in higher degree study; and advanced levels of credentialing (e.g. as highly accomplished teachers). This could be the responsibility of employers, professional associations and other representatives of the profession, and higher education institutions depending upon the purpose.

**b) Content and processes**

For each continuum, decisions must be made about the specific content (what it is that is being recognised and judged—that is, quality teaching) and the process to be used in making judgments (how it will be assessed). While there might be some commonality, it is likely that the content and processes used in each continuum would be slightly different. However there must be alignment. Teachers should be able to see how the processes align and articulate, and how the content (what is being judged) describes teachers’ work in a consistent and holistic way. Moreover, teachers must be confident that the processes by which judgments about quality teaching are being made recognise quality teaching in a range of contexts.

**Content: Determining quality teaching and providing evidence**

The following steps are suggested for the development of a system of voluntary certification for highly accomplished teachers:

1. Determine quality teaching. This must reflect the full range of knowledge, skills and abilities that teaching professionals possess and use—professional standards for teaching. These statements must capture teaching in a range of contexts and focus on teaching in a specific area.

2. Translate these standards into authentic tasks that enable teachers to provide evidence of highly accomplished knowledge and practice in relation to the standards—a teacher performance assessment task. These tasks would assess teachers’ application of specific pedagogical knowledge that research has shown to be associated with successful teaching in their specialised area. Moreover these tasks should be designed to illuminate an integrated, unified and sustained teaching and learning period, not a collection of isolated and unrelated teaching acts.

3. Consider ways in which the evidence can be compiled and submitted for assessment—a portfolio. The evidence should incorporate multiple sources of data.
Process: Making judgments about quality teaching

1. Develop procedures for scoring the tasks and setting the passing score. These would be rubrics related to the components of professional practice the teacher performance task is designed to assess and the levels of professional practice identified in the professional standards.

2. Select and train scorers.

3. Develop a moderation process.

Developing the system: pilot and evaluation

The utility of any results from a system of voluntary certification for highly accomplished teachers depends on the degree to which the 'instrument'—for example, a teacher performance task—is valid and reliable. Thus, a pilot study would need to be conducted to evaluate the validity of the teacher performance task in accurately and appropriately measuring the professional practice of the teachers.

During a pilot study, the following issues would need to be addressed in an evaluation:

- Predictive validity—does the evidence address what it claims to?
- Authenticity—is the evidence able to be verified as genuine?
- Currency—is the evidence relatively recent?
- Sufficiency—is there sufficient evidence in relation to the standards?
- Reliability—is the scoring/judging/assessing process reliable?
- Fairness—does the process fairly appraise the skills of all teachers?

A final but not small consideration in developing a system of voluntary certification for highly accomplished teachers is the determination of how such a system would be funded. A system such as the one argued for in this paper has significant funding implications. However, the alternative is to judge teacher competence solely on the basis of proxies for professional practice, often tests of content and/or pedagogical knowledge or one-shot observations of isolated teaching acts. These proxies serve to simplify the complexity of teaching and de-professionalise teachers’ work. This should be avoided at all costs.
The case for a voluntary certification system for highly accomplished teachers

In framing the argument to support the conceptual framework for the professional recognition and certification of highly accomplished teachers, I draw on Linda Darling-Hammond’s framework for conceptualising models of accountability to highlight the importance of the profession taking control of the accountability agenda. Even though her work is focused on the US context, there are clear parallels in Australia.

Accountability models and the profession—the case for professional accountability

Darling-Hammond (1989, 2004) outlined the following accountability models designed to safeguard the public interest:

- **Political accountability.** Elected officials must stand for re-election at regular intervals so that citizens can judge the representativeness of their views and the responsiveness of their decisions.

- **Legal accountability.** Courts must entertain complaints about violations of laws, as enacted by representatives of the public, and of citizens’ constitutionally granted rights, which may be threatened either by private or legislative action.

- **Bureaucratic accountability.** Agencies of government promulgate rules and regulations intended to assure citizens that public functions will be carried out in pursuit of the public goals voiced through democratic or legal processes.

- **Professional accountability.** Governments create professional bodies and structures to ensure competence and appropriate practice in occupations that serve the public and also delegate certain decisions about occupational membership, standards, and practices to these bodies.

- **Market accountability.** Governments allow clients or consumers to choose what services best meet their needs; to preserve the utility of this form of accountability, monopolies are prevented, freedom of choice is protected, and truthful information is required of service providers. (1989: 61)

In the US, for the better part of almost two decades, public education has been dominated by legal and bureaucratic forms of education accountability combined with some emerging market accountability with the growth of charter and magnet schools. Current education accountability often means monitoring test scores averaged for classrooms, schools, and districts and monitoring compliance with a prescribed curriculum designed to help students learn what is on the tests. Teaching is regulated by the state, and rewards and sanctions are linked to compliance and non-compliance. Such a system does not promote a view of teaching as intellectual work involving professional judgment—the essence of teacher professionalism (Tripp 1993). Nor does it endorse and recognise an approach to teaching that values and encourages responsiveness to individual students and their contexts. Professional accountability can do these things.
Professional accountability

According to Darling-Hammond, professional accountability involves three principles:

- Knowledge is the basis for permission to practice and for decisions that are made with respect to the unique needs of clients.
- The practitioner pledges their first concern to the welfare of the client.
- The profession assumes collective responsibility for the definition, transmittal, and enforcement of professional standards of practice and ethics. (1989: 67)

Thus, a self-regulated teaching profession would take collective responsibility for ensuring that all those permitted to teach are well prepared, that they have and use all available knowledge to inform professional practice, and that they maintain a primary commitment to clients (that is, their students and the public). A professional accountability model comprising these dimensions represents a ‘policy bargain’ that the profession makes with society, whereby greater (self-) regulation of teachers is guaranteed in exchange for deregulation of teaching:

For occupations that require discretion, knowledge, and judgment in meeting the unique needs of clients, the profession guarantees the competence of members in exchange for the privilege of professional control over work structure and standards of practice. (Darling-Hammond 1989: 67)

Central to any professional accountability model for the teaching profession are clear statements of what it is that teachers know and are able to do. As Robert Yinger and his colleagues state:

The key to successful professionalisation of any practice is to convince clients and the public that a professional, as a result of education and practical experience, possesses unique knowledge and skills that can be employed to solve the particular problems of practice and thus serve client needs. Research and knowledge-based standards can convey the professional qualifications of teachers by creating a shared and public language of practice that not only describes how knowledge is used but also becomes a vehicle for testing and elaborating the components of professional activity. Standards, when used in this manner by a developing profession, thus become a means to development and empowerment, not merely a means of external control. (Yinger and Hendricks-Lee 2000: 94)

It is true that in various ways in many countries, the profession has sought to regulate the preparation of teachers, support their entry into the profession, and also recognise highly accomplished teachers. For example, in the US, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) represent the profession’s best attempts nationally to self-regulate entry into the profession. However, in the main, state-based bureaucratic accountability mechanisms still dominate profession entry processes. After that, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) represents the profession’s attempt to focus teaching on student learning and to acknowledge highly accomplished teachers.

In Australia, national professional associations have developed standards for accomplished teaching in English language and literacy, mathematics, science, modern languages, special education and library and information services. The purpose underpinning the development of these standards has been to describe the work of highly accomplished teachers in these curriculum fields and to consider potential uses of these standards in relation to credentialing, portfolio development and professional learning.
Professional standards for teaching

Integral to any form of professional accountability in teaching are professional standards designed to describe effective professional practice at various junctures in a teaching career in different school systems and contexts. Professional standards create a shared and public ‘language of practice’ that describes how specialised knowledge is used in practice and also becomes the vehicle for assessing and judging professional activity (Yinger and Hendricks-Lee 2000). It is important that a system for describing and talking about effective professional practice, and then judging it, allows teachers in all settings to demonstrate effective professional practice.

There has been considerable growth in the development and implementation of professional standards for teaching, with these standards often unrelated and used in quite different ways. For example, in the US, national professional standards and assessments are structured for reciprocity in the certification of new teachers across states (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium [INTASC]), or for the recognition of accomplished teachers (NBPTS) or for reviewing and accrediting teacher education programs (e.g. NCATE, TEAC). At the same time, the states have consistently sought to control licensure of teachers against their own state-developed standards.

In Australia, a professional standards maze is also developing. State education systems and teacher registration bodies have created teaching standards for the purposes of employment and career stage decisions, generally consistent with the national framework developed by Commonwealth and state Ministers jointly in 2003. Teaching Australia has worked with the profession to develop standards for advanced teaching and school leadership (Teaching Australia 2008), building on this framework and the work of professional teaching associations.

As well as ownership and purpose being different, there are differences in the processes by which these standards for teaching have been constructed. Sometimes they are constructed by reviewing the research on effective teaching and effective teachers (what it is they know and/or do), sometimes they are constructed by teachers themselves reflecting on and recording what it is they know and do in their job, and often it is some combination of these.

I suggest that professional standards for teaching need to be articulated at three levels:

i) entry to the profession as a beginning teacher

ii) as a fully qualified teacher after some period of supported and managed induction

iii) as a highly accomplished teacher—and that these standards need to be informed by a clearly articulated knowledge base for teaching informed by practitioner knowledge as well as researcher knowledge (Hiebert, Gallimore et al. 2002).

A similar argument can be made for standards for principals’ work. These standards can be informed by a clearly articulated knowledge base for school leadership informed by practitioner knowledge as well as researcher knowledge.

Developing standards is not an easy task. The challenge is to map what the profession as a whole values and expects of its members (Yinger and Hendricks-Lee 2000). Teaching is complex and therefore recognising and naming quality teaching is complex. Challenging curriculum expectations and more diverse learners means that teachers have to be more sophisticated in their understanding of the
effects of context and learner variability on teaching and learning. Teachers’ skills are related to their ability to evaluate teaching situations and develop responses that can be effective under different circumstances. Given this complexity, there are many risks associated with trying to name and judge good teaching. It is important that we are not seduced into naming and assessing what is easiest to name, observe and assess—usually the technical aspects of teaching. Moreover, quality teaching is intellectual work that involves professional judgment and therefore consideration needs to be given to a developmental dimension. The emphasis should be on standards that help teachers understand their practice and improve it, rather than regulatory standards which reduce teacher autonomy and professionalism (Sachs 2003). Professional standards for teaching have at their core teacher learning and improving practice. Any system of professional accountability needs to be able to capture this.

The importance of certification—a continuum of certification

In many countries, professional standards for teaching are used to judge knowledge and abilities as a beginning teacher in order to make certification decisions in relation to entry to the profession, and often to decide full and/or ongoing membership of the profession.

In the US recently, there has been a wave of questioning the value of traditional teacher preparation and the need for certified teachers. Doubts about the value of teacher preparation were fuelled by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation which foregrounded subject matter knowledge and verbal ability as the main determinants of high quality teaching. The US federal government generously funded the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE), an option for prospective teachers to bypass traditional teacher education en route to certification. Those with an undergraduate degree can pay to take an online examination to be ‘certified’ as a teacher. Likewise, programs such as Teach for America in the US and Teach First in the UK enable high achieving undergraduates with no teacher preparation to enter the profession after a short and intensive summer school ‘preparation’.

In response, educational researchers have highlighted research showing that certified teachers are more effective than uncertified teachers in terms of student achievement (for example Darling-Hammond 2000; Wilson, Floden et al. 2001; Darling-Hammond and Bransford 2005).

In the main, current systems of certification aim to ensure that teachers have a minimal level of competence as they begin their careers. The profession and/or governments ensure that those allowed into the profession are competent to practice. And there is some evidence that certified teachers do a better job. But what about after that? Employers take over and employ various strategies involving standards and promotion processes linked to a range of job roles and responsibilities to make decisions about teachers’ ongoing learning, development and recognition.
In the US, NBPTS was created in 1987 in response to recommendations made by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Its task was to establish standards for exemplary teaching practice and to develop a way to award advanced-level certification to teachers who meet these standards. The NBPTS has been offering advanced-level certification for teachers since 1994. A recent US Congress requested evaluation of the impacts of the NBPTS concluded that board-certified teachers are more effective at improving their students’ achievement than other teachers, but school systems vary greatly in the extent to which they recognise and make use of board-certified teachers (Hakel, Koenig et al. 2008). The evidence also shows that teachers’ engagement in the certification processes contributes greatly to their professional growth.

In Australia, there seems to be growing consensus about using a standards-based certification system to recognise and reward accomplished teaching. The Business Council of Australia (BCA) is calling for ‘a new national certification system that recognises excellent teachers and provides the basis for a new career path for the profession’. This is to be accompanied by ‘a new remuneration structure that rewards excellent teachers’ and underpinned by ‘a comprehensive strategy that supports teachers to continue to learn’ (The Business Council of Australia 2008: 2). The question is how should it be framed, who should manage it, and what processes should be used to manage it?

**Issues associated with voluntary certification: teacher participation, equity and wider recognition**

While there is growing evidence of the value of recognising highly accomplished teaching both for the profession and for the individual teacher; such support is often for a ‘voluntary’ system. But what does ‘voluntary’ really mean?

In the US, teachers volunteer to apply for NBPTS certification. It was originally envisaged that NBPTS certification would become a credential widely recognised by states and employers. However, the recent evaluation concluded:

> From 1993, when the program began operation, through 2007, roughly 99,300 teachers applied for board certification, and 63,800 teachers earned the credential. While these numbers represent less than three percent of the country’s current force of 3.7 million teachers, it is noteworthy that participation has increased over the life of the program, from about 540 applicants in the first year to about 12,200 in the 2006-2007 school year. Overall, the number of board-certified teachers translates to about three for every five schools. Participation rates are not even across the country, however: There are higher concentrations in some states and districts, and in a few districts participation rates are approaching levels likely to be sufficient for the program to have the intended effects. Not surprisingly, the popularity of board certification appears to be related to the degree to which states and districts encourage it. Some states offer financial incentives to teachers—covering the $2,500 test fee and offering sizeable salary increases to those who are successful—and have higher participation rates than states that offer minimal or no incentives. (Hakel, Koenig et al. 2008)
The challenge is to set up a system of voluntary certification that would then be used by employers and others in various ways. Otherwise, there is no real reason for it except for the perceived prestige associated with the ‘credential’.

One dimension of teacher participation in voluntary certification is cost. The costs associated with applying for National Board certification are high, with the effect that participation rates of teachers in disadvantaged or high needs schools were much lower than those in advantaged schools. A particular concern raised in the evaluation is the low number of racial/ethnic minority teacher participants (Hakel, Koenig et al. 2008). Access and equity issues need to be addressed in a truly ‘voluntary’ system.

Judging accomplished professional practice

The question is whether widespread and coordinated teacher performance assessment can strengthen professional accountability and be a mechanism by which the profession can strike a more rigorous and accepted ‘policy bargain’ with the state. Such a teacher performance assessment must be more than mere documenting of practice, particularly in the form of observable behaviours like the competency movement of the 1980s. We need authentic assessments of teaching, approaches like cases, exhibitions, portfolios, and problem-based inquiries (or action research). What we have learnt in pre-service teacher education is that these strategies appear to provide support for teacher learning as well as avenues for more valid assessment of teaching (Darling-Hammond and Snyder 2000). In any professional accountability framework, teacher professional knowledge and judgment must be at the centre. The challenge is to decide upon ways of assessing teaching that provide evidence of teachers’ professional practice as well as their professional thinking and judgment.

In 2006, the state of California mandated a teacher performance assessment for an initial teaching credential. A consortium of teacher preparation programs at a number of California universities—PACT (Performance Assessment for California Teachers)—developed a teacher performance assessment which was approved as a requirement for a teaching credential in California by the bureaucratic state-legislated agency that accredits teacher education programs and credentials teachers in that state, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

The PACT assessments or teaching events (TEs) use multiple sources of data (teacher plans, teacher artifacts, student work samples, video clips of teaching, and personal reflections and commentaries) that are organised on four categories of teaching: planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection (PIAR). The PACT assessments build on efforts by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, which developed performance assessments for use with expert and beginning teachers. Like these earlier assessments, the focus of the PACT assessments is on candidates’ application of subject-specific pedagogical knowledge that research finds to be associated with successful teaching (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1998; Fennema et al., 1996; Grossman, 1990; Porter, 1988; Shulman, 1987). What distinguishes the PACT assessments from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards assessments is that the TE tasks are more integrated (capturing a unified learning segment), are designed to measure teacher performance at the preservice level, and have no assessment centre components. Moreover, the PACT assessment system also uses a multiple measures approach to assessing teacher competence through the use of course-embedded signature assessments. (Pecheone and Chung 2006: 23)
Thus, PACT aims to be an integrated, authentic, and subject specific assessment of teacher knowledge and skill. The research on the first two pilot years of implementing PACT in California suggests that it is a valid measure of individual teacher competence for the purpose of teacher licensure and is a powerful tool for teacher learning and program improvement (Pecheone and Chung 2006).

The NBPTS process employs a performance assessment task for making determinations about advanced level certification. Several studies support the contention that these assessments predict teacher effectiveness as judged by their student learning gains (e.g. Bond, Smith et al. 2000; Goldhaber and Brewer 2000; Goldhaber and Anthony 2004; Vandevenoort, Amrein-Beardsley et al. 2004).
Summary and conclusion

In summary, a national voluntary system of certification for highly accomplished teachers should be underpinned by an aim to recognise, promote and reward quality teaching. It should be owned by the teaching profession and managed by a body that comprises representation from constituencies of the profession. This system has to be voluntary and align with forms of licensure or registration, particularly at entry to the profession and full registration after an induction period. It also has to align with career paths and related remuneration offered by employers. Such a system should be based on the concept of ongoing learning and professional growth. It would be of personal and professional interest to teachers, and there would be tangible gains professionally and career-wise from engaging in such voluntary certification.

As part of such a system, it is suggested that there be at least three levels of licensure or certification:

- entry to the profession (compulsory)
- full registration after an induction period (compulsory)
- highly accomplished (voluntary but recognised by employers and the profession).

The system must differentiate what it is teachers should know and be able to do at each of these levels. Professional standards will be different for each level but they will align with each other. A developmental trajectory will be evident in the language of the standards.

As much as possible, the processes for licensure at entry to the profession, for full registration and as a highly accomplished teacher should differentiate between what teachers know and are able to do within specific areas of teaching (e.g. early childhood, primary, secondary mathematics etc). The processes for judging highly accomplished teaching should especially focus on teaching in a particular specialised area.

The processes for judging highly accomplished teaching should involve teachers submitting evidence which clearly demonstrates highly accomplished professional practice and the professional judgment which has informed that practice. This has to be clearly linked to established professional standards for highly accomplished teaching and must avoid de-professionalising proxies such as teacher tests, written essays, and so on. As such, some sort of teacher performance assessment holds promise for being the most authentic way to judge professional practice, judgment and knowledge base.

Finally, any system for the voluntary certification of highly accomplished teachers will require ongoing evaluation in order to monitor its effectiveness and inform ongoing adjustments to the system. This would ideally comprise the development of a database of certified teachers and a systematic longitudinal study to investigate, for example, what these teachers do after completing the certification process, how many are employed, where they work, what jobs they do, and how effective they are in terms of student learning outcomes.
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