

## **Revised SEA Highly Qualified Teacher Plan**

The Revised Highly Qualified Teacher Plan has been developed in response to guidance received from The United States Department of Education (USDE), dated May 15, 2006. The guidance requested that the State Education Agency (SEA) respond to findings cited in a report titled “Assessing State Progress in Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) Goals” and provided guidelines in the “Reviewing Revised State Plans” rubric. In collaboration with the SEA Office of Academic Credentialing and Standards (OACS), the Office of Accounting and Assessments (OAA) and the Office of Information Technology (OIT), the SEA Office of Federal Grant Programs (OFGP) has developed this comprehensive plan to ensure compliance with the HQT regulations in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). It describes policies and procedures currently in place and provides timelines for future implementation of newly developed strategies for attaining full compliance.

Prior data collection deficits have hindered SEA efforts to establish pertinent programs to meet HQT timelines. At this time, several initiatives are underway that allow improved data collection for the SY2005-2006 Consolidated State Performance Report submission. The SEA is also moving towards full implementation of an automated data collection process for SY 2006-2007. These improvements, along with relevant programmatic initiatives and a revised SEA compliance and monitoring process, will result in the implementation of clear and focused corrective action plans and targeted technical assistance.

### **Requirement 1: HQT Data Analysis**

**The revised plan must provide a detailed analysis of the core academic subject classes in the State that are currently *not* being taught by highly qualified teachers. The analysis must, in particular, address schools that are not making adequate yearly progress and whether or not these schools have more acute needs than do other schools in attracting highly qualified teachers. The analysis must also identify the districts and schools around the State where significant numbers of teachers do not meet HQT standards, and examine whether or not there are particular hard-to-staff courses frequently taught by non-highly qualified teachers.**

#### ***SEA Response***

The SEA’s most comprehensive data collection to date occurred during the SY 2004-2005 “Employed Educator Reporting Process” as described below.

The District of Columbia is comprised of 54 LEAs, of which the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) is the largest. The District of Columbia also has 41 public charter school LEAs that report annual HQT data to the SEA-Office of Academic Credentials and Standards. In order to facilitate the reporting process for LEAs, the SEA employs what it terms as the Employed Educator Reporting System. The Employed Educator Reporting System consists of four major phases of data reporting and analysis whereby:

- 1) Initial data is submitted by the LEAs via the Employed Educator Reporting Form (EERF)
- 2) Initial data analysis is conducted by SEA-OACS
- 3) LEAs undergo a validation process to identify and correct factual errors in the initial reporting, and
- 4) A LEA Teacher Quality Report for each reporting LEA is generated based on the data provided.

It should be noted that there are several specific limitations to the reported data and the capacity to manipulate said data, which prevent the figures in this report from providing a completely reliable representation of the District of Columbia's educator personnel. The purpose of this section is to provide context with regard to challenges which emerged during the data analysis, and to alleviate any confusion on the part of those who read said data.

#### Margin of Error for Electronic Data Match

In an effort to move the SEA to possess the capacity to perform the large-scale data analysis functions required of state education agencies by NCLB, the SEA created and implemented a comprehensive, state-wide, Educator Licensing Information System (ELIS). Since the summer of 2003, the SEA has migrated data from more than 20,000 paper certification files into ELIS. As is the case with any project requiring a large amount of data entry, human error has played a role in preventing the data in the ELIS system from being 100% reliable. At the time that LEA data from the 2004-2005 Employed Educator Reports were matched against ELIS for licensing records, the SEA estimates that the data pertaining to teachers employed by the District of Columbia LEAs was approximately 93-95% accurate. At present, the SEA is continuing to work toward achieving 100% ELIS reliability.

Due to the aforementioned, the SEA fully acknowledges and expects that, upon further analysis at the LEA level, most significantly within the DCPS LEA, discrepancies in the data will be discovered whereby ELIS has indicated that a teacher(s) does not hold the appropriate credentials for his/her assignment when in actuality he/she may. For this reason we understand that the number and percentages of DCPS teachers holding the appropriate license and meeting the highly qualified criteria for their assignment(s) will be slightly skewed in the negative direction.

#### Incomplete Data Fields

Another point of limitation stems from the actual data submitted to the State by the District of Columbia's LEAs. The District of Columbia's LEAs submitted to the State, a total of 14,345 data entries. Of the 14345 entries, 771 did not contain sufficient information for a match to be made against SEA-OACS' licensure database. Entries were identified as having insufficient information if they lacked or contained inaccurate data from one or more of the following categories: first/last name, Social Security Number, Assignment and/or Subject Code.

---

Per ED's request for state-wide HQT data analyses, please refer to the tables below.

**Table I: Core Academic Subjects and Percentages Taught/Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\***

Core Assignment Area	Number of Assignments	Number Taught by HQT	Percent Taught by HQT	Percent Not Taught by HQT
<b>Elementary Education</b>	<b>1610</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>56.2%</b>	<b>43.80%</b>
<b>English</b>	<b>1692</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>49.10%</b>
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>62.50%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>51.3%</b>	<b>48.70%</b>
<b>Overall Science</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>47.1%</b>	<b>52.90%</b>
General Science	354	175	49.4%	50.60%
Biology	466	203	43.6%	56.40%
Chemistry	112	59	52.7%	47.30%
Physics	43	22	51.2%	48.80%
<b>Economics</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>History</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>66.2%</b>	<b>33.80%</b>
<b>Geography</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>67.1%</b>	<b>32.90%</b>
<b>Civics and Government</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>50.1%</b>	<b>49.90%</b>
<b>Foreign Languages</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<b>50.60%</b>
<b>Arts</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>51.3%</b>	<b>48.70%</b>

*\*Represents teachers for which there was sufficient data to be identified in state licensure records.*

A statewide analysis of teacher quality data disaggregated by the NCLB core academic subject areas reveals a need to significantly increase HQTs across all core subject areas. Based on the number of assignments and the percentage of non-highly qualified teachers, the top five core subject areas with the greatest need of improvement are:

- 1) English
- 2) Elementary Education (encompasses all core subject areas)
- 3) Mathematics
- 4) Arts
- 5) Science

On the following pages, Table II gives the HQT percentages for each school in the District of Columbia; AYP designations; and high/low poverty status. Table III shows a comparison of HQT percentages at schools that met and did not meet annual yearly progress (AYP) goals. Analyses of the required ED elements follow the tables.

**Table II: District of Columbia Schools and Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher**

Name of School	% CL HQ	Met AYP	High or Low Poverty
Adams ES	53.8%	√	
Aiton ES	58.8%		
Amidon ES	46.7%		
Anacostia SHS	57.8%		
Arts and Tech PCS	91.3%		<b>H</b>
Backus MS	15.9%	√	
Ballou Senior High School	66.5%		
Ballou Stay Senior High	67.0%		
Bancroft ES	37.5%		
Banneker SHS	63.6%	√	<b>L</b>
Barbara Jordan PCS	60.0%		<b>H</b>
Barnard ES	66.7%	√	
Beers ES	82.4%		<b>L</b>
Bell SHS	44.5%		
Benning ES	60.0%		
Birney ES	14.3%	√	
Booker T. Washington PCS	100.0%		<b>H</b>
Bowen ES	61.5%		<b>H</b>
Brent ES	50.0%	√	<b>L</b>
Brightwood ES	54.5%	√	
Brookland ES	47.1%	√	<b>L</b>
Browne JHS	25.4%		
Bruce-Manroe ES	53.3%	√	
Bunker Hill ES	46.2%	√	<b>L</b>
Burroughs ES	46.2%	√	
Burrville ES	66.7%	√	
Capitol City PCS	100.0%		<b>H</b>
Cardozo SHS	43.5%		<b>L</b>
Cesar Chavez PCS - Florida	95.7%		<b>H</b>
Cesar Chavez PCS - Mass	100.0%		<b>H</b>
Children's Studio Sch. PCS	0		<b>H</b>
Clark ES	60.0%	√	
Cleveland ES	60.0%	√	<b>H</b>
Community Academy PCS	59.6%		<b>H</b>
Cook JF ES	11.1%		<b>H</b>
Cooke HD ES	50.0%		
Coolidge SHS	75.8%		<b>L</b>

Name of School	% Cl. HQ	Met AYP	High or Low Poverty
Davis ES	16.7%		<b>H</b>
DC Bilingual PCS	50.0%	N/A	
DC Prep Academy PCS	73.3%	√	
Deal JHS	56.8%	√	<b>L</b>
Draper ES	66.7%		
Drew ES	80.0%	√	
Dunbar Pre Engineering	77.4%		
Dunbar Senior HS	49.2%		<b>L</b>
E. L. Haynes PCS	57.7%		
Eagle Academy PCS	0	N/A	
Eastern SHS	66.1%	N/A	<b>L</b>
Eaton ES	56.3%	√	<b>L</b>
Eliot JHS	31.9%		<b>H</b>
Ellington SHS	20.9%	√	<b>L</b>
Elsie Whitlow PCS	97.9%	√	<b>H</b>
Emery ES	58.3%		
Emilia ES	0.0%		<b>L</b>
Ferebee HO ES	80.0%		<b>H</b>
Fillmore Arts Center	0.0%	N/A	
Fletcher-Johnson MS	35.0%		
Friend Edison - Blow Pierce	29.6%	√	<b>H</b>
Friend Edison - Chamb.	5.6%	√	<b>H</b>
Friend Edison - Woodridge	36.0%	√	<b>H</b>
Friend Edison - Woodson	0.0%		<b>H</b>
Gage-Eckin ES	36.4%	√	<b>H</b>
Garrison ES	53.8%		<b>H</b>
Gibbs ES	68.8%	√	
Green ES	75.0%		<b>H</b>
Hamilton Center	0.0%		<b>H</b>
Hardy MS	43.0%	√	<b>L</b>
Harris C ES	40.0%	√	
Harris PR EC	39.4%		
Hart Middle School	22.4%		
Hearst ES	62.5%		<b>L</b>
Hendley ES	62.5%		<b>H</b>
Hine JHS	43.0%	√	<b>L</b>
Houston ES	66.7%		
Howard Road Academy	51.1%		<b>H</b>
Hyde ES	80.0%	√	<b>L</b>
Hyde Leadership PCS	65.1%		<b>H</b>
IDEA PCS	92.9%		<b>H</b>
Ideal PCS	32.4%		<b>H</b>

Name of School	% Cl. HQ	Met AYP	High or Low Poverty
Jackie Robinson EC	0.0%		
Janney ES	81.3%	√	<b>L</b>
Jefferson JHS	46.6%	√	<b>L</b>
Johnson JHS	30.2%		
Jos Arz Academy PCS	71.0%		
Kenilworth ES	21.4%		<b>H</b>
Ketcham ES	57.1%		
Key ES	54.5%	√	<b>L</b>
KIMA PCS	88.6%		
Kimball ES	76.9%		
KIPP DC-Key PCS	90.9%	√	
Kramer MS	24.3%		
Lafayette ES	83.3%	√	<b>L</b>
Langdon ES	53.8%	√	
Lasalle ES	85.7%		
Latin Am. Bilingual PCS	0		
Leckie ES	50.0%	√	
Lincoln Middle School	32.4%		<b>L</b>
Ludlow Taylor ES	50.0%	√	<b>H</b>
Luke C. Moore Academy	54.5%		<b>L</b>
M.M. Washington SHS	38.9%		<b>L</b>
MacFarland MS	30.3%		
Malcolm X ES	30.0%	√	
Mamie D. Lee	0.0%		
Mann ES	87.5%	√	<b>L</b>
Marriott Hospitality PCS	97.0%		
Martin Luther King ES	53.8%		
Mary McLeod Bethune PCS	100.0%		
Maury ES	88.9%	√	
Maya Angelou PCS - Evans	100.0%		
Maya Angelou PCS - Shaw	97.4%		
McGogney ES	75.0%		<b>H</b>
McKinley SHS	51.2%	√	
Meridian PCS	85.0%		
Merritt ES	8.6%		
Meyer ES	47.4%		<b>H</b>
Miner ES	75.0%		<b>H</b>
Montgomery ES	45.5%	√	
Moten Center	0.0%		
Moten ES	22.2%		<b>H</b>

Name of School	% Cl. HQ	Met AYP	High or Low Poverty
Murch ES	82.4%	√	<b>L</b>
Nalle ES	41.7%		
New School for Ent. PCS	77.8%		
Noyes	25.0%		
Oak Hill Youth Center	46.7%		
Options PCS	61.1%		
Orr ES	64.3%	√	
Oyster ES	21.4%	√	<b>L</b>
Park View ES	5.9%	√	
Patterson ES	75.0%	√	
Paul Jr. High PCS	85.3%	√	
Paul Robeson	0.0%		
Payne ES	69.2%	√	
Peabody ES	0.0%	N/A	<b>L</b>
Plummer ES	27.3%		<b>H</b>
Powell ES	57.1%		<b>H</b>
Prospect	0.0%		
Randle-HG ES	50.0%	√	
Raymond ES	72.7%		
Reed LC ES	54.5%	√	
River Terrace ES	66.7%	√	
Ronald H. Brown MS	35.0%		
Roosevelt SHS	50.9%		<b>L</b>
Roosevelt Stay	41.0%	N/A	
Roots PCS	25.0%		
Ross ES	80.0%		
Rudolph ES	28.6%	√	
S.A.I.L PCS	54.5%		
Sasha Bruce PCS	100.0%		
Savoy ES	38.5%	√	
Seaton ES	75.0%	√	<b>H</b>
SEED PCS	94.9%	√	
Shadd ES	66.7%		
Shaed ES	70.0%		
Shaw JHS	38.9%		
Shepherd ES	66.7%	√	<b>L</b>
Simon ES	61.5%		<b>H</b>
Slowe ES	46.7%		
Smothers ES	77.8%		
Sousa MS	6.8%		
Southeast Academy PCS	50.0%	√	
Spingarn SHS	47.5%		<b>L</b>
Spingarn Stay SHS	66.7%		
Stanton ES	59.1%		

<b>Name of School</b>	<b>% Cl. HQ</b>	<b>Met AYP</b>	<b>High or Low Poverty</b>
Stevens ES	80.0%	√	<b>L</b>
Stoddert ES	83.3%		<b>L</b>
Stuart Hobson MS	11.4%	√	
Taft Center	0.0%		
Takoma ES	53.1%	√	
Terrell JHS	8.1%		
Terrell MC ES	42.9%	√	<b>H</b>
The Next Step PCS	84.2%		
Thomas ES	25.0%		
Thomson ES	25.0%	√	
Thurgood Marshall ES	22.6%		<b>L</b>
Thurgood Marshall PCS	61.3%		
Tree of Life PCS	21.4%		
Tri-Community PCS	93.8%		
Truesdale ES	27.3%		
Tubman ES	57.1%		
Turner ES	27.8%	√	<b>H</b>
Two Rivers PCS	72.7%		
Tyler ES	45.5%		<b>H</b>
Van Ness ES	40.0%		
Walker Jones ES	33.3%		
Washington Center	27.6%		<b>L</b>
Washington Math and Sci.	90.2%		
Watkins ES	66.7%	√	<b>L</b>
Webb ES	56.3%		
West ES	60.0%	√	
Wheatley ES	80.0%	√	<b>H</b>
Whittier ES	64.3%	√	<b>L</b>
Wilkinson ES	56.3%		
William E. Doar PCS	100.0%		
Wilson JO ES	76.9%		<b>H</b>
Wilson SHS	49.9%		<b>L</b>
Winston EC	65.4%		<b>H</b>
Young America Works PCS	100.0%	N/A	
Young ES	43.8%		<b>H</b>

<b>Woodson Business and F</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	L
<b>Woodson SHS</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	
<b>Garfield ES</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	
<b>Head Start</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	
<b>Choice Alternative</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	
<b>Eliot Center</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	
<b>MS</b>	<b>Evans</b> No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	H
<b>Francis JHS</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	
<b>Garnet Patterson</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	H
<b>Schools WW SHS</b>	No Employed Educator Data was provided for the 2004-2005 reporting year	L

**Table III: Percentage of HQT and School Annual Yearly Progress**

% HQT	0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%	Total
School Met AYP	2	3	7	4	13	13	10	7	6	3	68
School did not meet AYP	14	2	15	11	13	19	15	14	7	13	123

Due to the fact that almost twice as many schools in the District of Columbia did not make AYP as those that did, the data in Table III shows in some cases that a greater number of schools with fewer HQTs did not make AYP, as well as reveals that there are more schools with higher numbers of HQTs that also did not make AYP. The data analysis bottom line is there is a significant need to increase the number of HQT across schools that meet and do not meet AYP. The state recognizes that with a state-wide average of 64.8 percent of classes taught by HQTs, there is need for improvement across all core academic subject areas; across schools that have met/not met AYP goals; and across schools in both high and low-poverty areas. The state will need to provide targeted technical assistance and programmatic initiatives for its largest LEA, the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) as their workforce represents 75 percent of teachers in the state, and less than half of DCPS-LEA teachers are currently highly qualified. While the SEA will also include public charter LEAs in all efforts to improve teacher quality, state-wide data indicates a need to focus on DCPS.

**Figure 1: Statewide Analysis of Teacher Quality by Reported Assignment**

District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)

<b>Reported core subject classes taught by identifiable educator</b>	<b>7475</b>	
<b>Assignments taught by educator meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>3349</b>	<b>44.8%</b>
<b>Assignments taught by educator not meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>4126</b>	<b>55.2%</b>

### Schools Chartered by the DC Public Charter School Board (DCBOE)

<b>Reported core subject classes taught by identifiable educator</b>	<b>829</b>	
<b>Assignments taught by educator meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>75.8%</b>
<b>Assignments taught by educator not meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>24.2%</b>

### Schools Chartered by the DC Public Charter School Board (DCPCSB)

<b>Reported core subject classes taught by identifiable educator</b>	<b>1389</b>	
<b>Assignments taught by educator meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>1028</b>	<b>74.0%</b>
<b>Assignments taught by educator not meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>26.0%</b>

### District of Columbia Low Poverty

<b>Reported core subject classes taught by identifiable educator</b>	<b>3834</b>	
<b>Assignments taught by educator meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>1893</b>	<b>49.4%</b>
<b>Assignments taught by educator not meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>1941</b>	<b>50.6%</b>

### District of Columbia High Poverty

<b>Reported core subject classes taught by identifiable educator</b>	<b>1516</b>	
<b>Assignments taught by educator meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>64.8%</b>
<b>Assignments taught by educator not meeting highly qualified criteria</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>35.2%</b>

## Improved Data Management Systems for Future Data Collection Efforts

The absence of connectivity between individualized data collection systems that house teacher qualification, teacher assignment and course schedule data, impeded the State's ability to comprehensively identify and target appropriate resources toward the achievement of 100% HQTs and to effectively monitor progress towards that goal. To remedy this challenge, the SEA is currently developing a single database to electronically collect HQT data, and will implement the system for the 2006-07 data collection.

As a part of the consolidated application process for NCLB funds, all local education agencies are required to submit a corrective action plan for HQT compliance. Currently the State is reviewing the submission by the DCPS LEA which includes the utilization of the School Net™ and PD Planner© software packages to collect HQT data and provide information on needs-based professional development activities. The State will also work with the public charter school LEAs as they establish individualized strategies to tie professional development activities to their HQT objectives. In addition, the state will launch several initiatives to assist all LEAs in meeting the HQT goals. These initiatives are primarily noted in Section III of this document.

All information, when analyzed, will be the basis for forming an incentive plan which is intended to provide rewards to improve retention of teachers working in low performing schools.

**Table IV: State-wide HQT Data Collection Process**

<b>SY 2006-07 Highly Qualified Teacher Data Collection Timeline</b>		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible Office</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
2006-2007 Employed Educator Reporting Handbook and Reporting Forms sent to DC LEAs	Office of Academic Credentials & Standards (OACS)	Late-August 2006
Initial Employed Educator Reports due to the State	OACS	October 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
HQ determinations made by the State based on initial data provided by LEAs. LEAs asked to validate initial LEA profiles (reports) for factual errors, status and assignment changes	OACS	December 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
Preliminary 2006-2007 data sent to the USDE	OACS; SEA-Office of Federal Grants Programs (OFGP)	December 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
Validated (final) Employed Educator Reports due to the state	OACS	January 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
Final HQ determinations made, final reports sent from State to all LEAs.	OACS	March 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2007
SEA Employed Educator Report generated and published. Report is based on data provided by DC LEAs.	OACS	May 2007

**Requirement 2: SEA Oversight of LEA HQT Plans**

**The revised plan must provide information on HQT status in each LEA and the steps the SEA will take to ensure that each LEA has plans in place to assist teachers who are not highly qualified to attain HQT status as quickly as possible.**

*SEA Response*

The DCPS-SEA has, and is continuing, steps to ensure that LEAs employ and develop teachers who are highly qualified. State intervention will provide necessary additional professional development opportunities based on specifically identified needs. The SEA will gather need-based data using trends in HQT data collections from previous years; information collected at the mid-year point; and information gathered as part of the LEA application for NCLB Consolidated funding.

**Table V: SY2004-05 District of Columbia LEAs and HQT Status**

LEA	% Cl. HQ	Met HQT Annual Measurable Objectives	High or Low Poverty
Booker T. Washington PCS	100%	√	H
Capitol City PCS	100%	√	H
Mary McLeod Bethune PCS	100%	√	
Sasha Bruce PCS	100%	√	
William E. Doar PCS	100%	√	
Young America Works PCS	100%	N/A	
Maya Angelou PCS - Evans	99%	√	
Cesar Chavez PCS	98%	√	H
Elsie Whitlow PCS	98%	√	H
Marriott Hospitality PCS	97%	√	
SEED PCS	95%	√	
Tri-Community PCS	94%	√	
IDEA PCS	93%	√	H
Arts and Tech PCS	91%	√	H
KIPP DC-Key PCS	91%	√	
Washington Math and Sci.	90%	√	
KIMA PCS	89%	√	
Paul Jr. High PCS	85%	√	
Meridian PCS	85%	√	
The Next Step PCS	84%	√	
New School for Ent. PCS	78%		
DC Prep Academy PCS	73%		
Two Rivers PCS	73%		
Jos Arz Academy PCS	71%		
Hyde Leadership PCS	65%		H
Thurgood Marshall PCS	61%		
Options PCS	61%		
Barbara Jordan PCS	60%		H
Community Academy PCS	60%		H
E. L. Haynes PCS	58%		
S.A.I.L PCS	55%		
Howard Road Academy	51%		H
DC Bilingual PCS	50%	N/A	
Southeast Academy PCS	50%		
District of Columbia Public Schools	45%		
Ideal PCS	32%		H
Roots PCS	25%		
Tree of Life PCS	21%		
Friendship Edison PCS	18%		H
Children's Studio Sch. PCS	0%		H
Eagle Academy PCS	0%	N/A	
Latin Am. Bilingual PCS	0%		

Based on the data in Table V above, the District of Columbia has 19 LEAs that are meeting HQT annual measurable objectives (AMOs), and 20 that are not meeting their AMOs. To target technical assistance, the SEA will implement a Highly Qualified Compliance Action Plan (HQCAP) as the primary tool to ensure LEA HQT planning is in place and on track to reaching full compliance by the end of school year 2006-07. The HQCAP (see Appendix I) is a newly revised plan that will be part of the NCLB Consolidated Funds application process beginning with SY 2006-07. Additionally, the SEA will increase LEA HQT benchmarking meetings from once to four times per year during SY 2006-07 to ensure that LEA HQT numbers increase, and programs effectively respond to stated needs.

Per Title I requirements, those LEAs and schools in improvement status will be required to set aside an additional five percent of their Title I funds for professional development purposes. This five percent is in addition to the required five percent that all LEAs lacking 100% HQTs must set aside for the purpose of reaching full compliance. Through consistent SEA monitoring and targeted technical assistance, the SEA will ensure that Title I, II, and other appropriate federal funds are spent on meeting 100% compliance. A new requirement for all LEAs needing to meet 100 percent will be the implementation of individualized HQT Action Plans for core subject teachers with outstanding HQT requirements. The SEA will work with LEAs on the expedient provision of appropriate assistance to these teachers, including the requirement that LEAs first use available funds to pay for:

- 1) Content-based coursework at accredited colleges/universities
- 2) Development and implementation of content-based professional development opportunities to meet HOUSSE requirements
- 3) ETS/Praxis tests to attain HQT status by passing rigorous subject-matter assessments

The table below provides more specific information on the LEA HQCAP Review Process.

**Table VI: SEA Implementation and Monitoring of LEA HQCAPs**

<b>LEA Application Requirements and Timeline</b>	
<b>Action</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Finalize the Highly Qualified Compliance Action Plan (HQCAP).  The plan is divided into three major sections: Section I - Aggregate Data Needs Assessment; Section II – Highly Qualified Compliance Strategies; and Section III - Highly Qualified Compliance Timeline. The data requested in Section I will help to validate the development of measurable goals and consistent strategy implementation. The strategies in Section II will allow LEAs the opportunity to document the successes and/or concerns faced in implementing past HQ plans. Section III will serve as a record for documenting present and future objectives; implementation activities; schedule for meeting objectives; responsible parties; and funding sources.	July 2006
SEA training for LEAs on the revised NCLB Consolidated funds application process, including the HQCAP. LEAs will be instructed to provide quarterly benchmarks within their HQT compliance timeline to ensure progression towards 100% compliance.	August 2006
HQCAPs from all LEAs not yet at 100% compliance will be reviewed as part of the NCLB Consolidated funds LEA application process	October 2006

The State will ensure compliance with quarterly benchmarks by regularly reviewing the progress of all LEAs through desk and on-site monitoring visits.	October 2006 – May 2007
Title II funds will not be released to the LEAs unless their HQCAP plans are completed and evaluated by the SEA as being realistic and attainable by the June 2007 deadline.	October 2006

### **Requirement 3: State System of Support**

**The revised plan must include information on the technical assistance, programs, and services that the SEA will offer to assist LEAs in successfully completing their HQT plans, particularly where large groups of teachers are not highly qualified, and the resources the LEAs will use to meet their HQT goals.**

#### *SEA Response*

Since the SEA has identified the five core academic subject areas below as those with the lowest number of HQTs state-wide, the SEA will target Title I, II and other appropriate federal funds to activities that will significantly increase the number of HQTs in:

- 1) English
- 2) Elementary Education (encompasses all core subject areas)
- 3) Mathematics
- 4) Arts
- 5) Science

In addition to focusing on the core areas above, the SEA will ensure that schools not meeting AYP goals are targeted for additional resources and focused professional development.

While some of the SEA State System of Support activities for SY 2006-07 are still under development, the SEA will strive to implement programs and professional development offerings that supplement LEA initiatives and provide broader opportunities for teachers to meet HQT requirements. Along with researching successful HQT strategies used in other states, the DC-SEA will implement some of the initiatives below:

- Researching national and on-line professional development opportunities to provide to LEAs for publication in their materials and on their websites.
- Providing additional funding for the state-wide teacher mentor program, which will facilitate the provision of mentors for teachers enrolled in highly qualified, state-approved alternate route programs.
- Using SAHE funds, partner with the Colleges of Arts and Sciences at institutions of higher education (IHEs) to encourage increased content-based offerings for teachers (in the top five content areas with the lowest number of HQTs), and the provision of locally-based professional development at LEA sites.

- Partnering with IHEs to offer Praxis content area test preparation assistance. *Using federal funds, the DCPS LEA currently offers Praxis I assistance to teachers free-of-charge through a partnership with George Mason University.*
- Provision of retention incentives for highly qualified teachers to transfer to and/or remain in low-performing schools (those not making AYP), or schools in need of transfers for equity purposes.
- Implementing stream-lined HQT data collection policies and practices to ensure timely awareness of HQT needs and appropriate provision of services.
- Implementing the HOUSSE process for veteran teachers to meet HQT requirements.
- Use of distance-learning via District Schools Television (DSTV), and other quality video and on-line offerings to provide relevant professional development.
- Provide financial incentives (bonuses) to encourage teachers who are HQ in multiple disciplines to move to core subject areas of greater need (i.e. reading) or to move to hard-to-staff schools.
- Develop the Committee of Practitioners to provide oversight on SEA HQT policies and procedures. The Committee of Practitioners (COP) comprised of a wide membership of school and non-school constituents will meet quarterly to review policies to enhance the educational process.

**Table VII: Timeline for State Support Activities**

<b>State System of Support</b>	
<b>Action</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Provide technical assistance to all LEAs at the required pre-application/ pre-award LEA training.	August 2006
Provide feedback/approve of LEA Highly Qualified Compliance Action Plans (HQCAP)	October 2006
Implement HOUSSE process for veteran teachers and multi-subject Special Education teachers who are highly qualified in at least one of the following: Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, or Science	Winter 2006
Where necessary, revise subgroups of teachers who need the most assistance becoming highly qualified based on the analyses of LEA HQCAP plans.	September 2006
A calendar and description of programs and services that the SEA will offer will be provided to LEAs to assist in their HQT efforts. This action plan will be finalized August 30 <sup>th</sup> after consultation with the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center, and other experts in professional development from the DC Consortium of Universities.	January 2006
With limited state funds available, priority assistance will be directed toward the staffing and professional development needs of schools that are most at risk (not meeting AYP).	December 2006

#### **Requirement 4: SEA Plan for LEA Technical Assistance/Corrective Action**

**The revised plan must describe how the SEA will work with LEAs that fail to reach the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year.**

##### ***SEA Response***

While it is the expectation that all LEAs will meet 100% HQT compliance by the end of SY 2006-07, the SEA must also make contingency and corrective action plans for LEAs that fail to meet the stated goal. Due to the fact that there are 20 LEAs that did not meet their annual measurable HQT objectives, including the state's largest LEA representing 75% of the teacher workforce, timely consistent monitoring of LEA progress will be a state priority. Please see Table VI for the steps in the LEA plan approval and monitoring process.

The SEA will therefore increase its monitoring of LEA HQT progress from once per year to establishing a quarterly review process. During the quarterly reviews, the state will perform desk/on-site monitoring, follow-up conference calls and document next steps to ensure that LEAs are on track to meeting HQT goals. The HQCAP action plan template will be used to guide the state on the level of necessary technical assistance and/or corrective action. By intensifying the scrutiny, technical assistance, and provision of focused, needs-based professional development activities, it is the hope of the state that corrective action will not be necessary.

In addition to effective implementation and monitoring of LEA HQCAPs, the state also has plans in place to provide extensive programmatic support to increase the number of HQTs state-wide, with funds targeted to teachers at schools not making AYP. Please see Requirement 3 for more information on the state system of support.

To avoid the corrective action/sanctions outlined in Table VIII:

- 1) LEAs with 60 percent or less classes taught by HQTs must increase their percentage to at least 80 percent.
- 2) LEAs with 61% or higher must increase their percentage at least 20% or meet 100% HQT compliance.

By setting the above minimum requirements, the state plan recognizes those LEAs who make significant progress in meeting HQT requirements. The increases noted above would validate a LEA's plans and procedures in place that should not be impacted negatively by the imposition of harsh sanctions for failure to meet the 100% goal. In addition, with the winter 2006 implementation of the HOUSSE process for veteran teachers, the State believes the above minimum requirements to be attainable due to the increased flexibility to meet HQT requirements the HOUSSE process provides.

Therefore, the SEA has established a two-tiered plan for LEAs that fail to meet the 100% HQT goal as outlined in the following table.

**Table VIII: SEA Corrective Action Plan for LEA HQT Compliance**

	Corrective Action and/or Sanction
LEAs that MEET minimum increase requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Review HQCAPs to determine most effective programs/services to increasing HQT compliance across all LEAs, and LEA-specific strategies.</li> <li>2) Ensure the LEA increases funding to the most effective programs.</li> <li>3) Require the elimination of programs that do not result in a significant increase of HQTs.</li> <li>4) Withhold 0.5% of Title II-A funds for SY 2007-2008 for each quarterly HQT benchmark that is not met during the 2006-07 school year. The withheld funds will be used for LEA implementation of state-directed interventions/programs.</li> </ol>
LEAs that DO NOT MEET minimum increase requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Review HQCAPs to determine most effective programs/services to increasing HQT compliance across all LEAs, and LEA-specific strategies.</li> <li>2) Ensure the LEA increases funding to the most effective programs.</li> <li>3) Require the elimination of programs that do not result in a significant increase of HQTs.</li> <li>4) Withhold 1.5% of Title II-A funds for SY 2007-2008 for each quarterly HQT benchmark that is not met during the 2006-07 school year. The withheld funds will be used for LEA implementation of state-directed interventions/programs.</li> </ol>

Continuous failure to demonstrate good faith efforts in achieving the State minimum requirements could result in assignment to a High Risk Status.

### **Special Grant Conditions for High-Risk LEAs**

If an LEA is designated as high risk, the State Education Agency, reserves the right to impose one or more of the following special conditions on the LEA:

- Require participation in on-site or workshop activities to review HQT requirements on the district and school levels.
- Require that the LEA be paid on a reimbursement basis;
- Withhold future payments of entitlement funds until documented deficiencies are corrected and evidence of acceptable performance is established;
- Require that the LEA provide additional or more detailed information on recruitment practices and hiring practices, working environment information, and retention efforts;
- Require that the LEA obtain HQT technical or management assistance; or
- Suspend or terminate the award in whole or in part.

Except under special circumstances, LEAs with a high-risk designation may not apply for other federal discretionary grants until a corrective action plan is developed addressing all issues that placed the LEA in high-risk category.

For those LEAs deemed high-risk for meeting the 100% HQT goal, the state will also implement the accountability provisions in Section 2141 of NCLB. Many of the requirements from this section are already included in the state’s corrective action planning process.

### **Removal of High-Risk Status**

Once an LEA is defined as high-risk, this status will remain in effect until the LEA has met its HQT quarterly benchmarks for two consecutive quarters. The demonstration of fiscal and programmatic responsibility to the satisfaction of the State will also be required.

### **Requirement 5: SEA Plan for HOUSSE Implementation**

**The revised plan must explain how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for teachers not new to the profession who were hired prior to the end of the 2005-06 school year, and how the SEA will limit the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005-06 school year to multi-subject secondary teachers in rural schools eligible for additional flexibility, and multi-subject special education who are highly qualified in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire.**

#### *SEA Response*

The SEA High Objective Uniform State Standard Evaluation (HOUSSE) instrument was reviewed through a validation process on June 15, 2006. The HOUSSE instrument (**please see Appendix II**) will be implemented for elementary and secondary teachers immediately after final approval by the Chief State School Officer. In the DCPS LEA alone, over 1000 veteran elementary and special education teachers and those teaching out-of-field (a sample of MS-HS data showed an average of 14.6percent out-of-field teaching) will be able to use the HOUSSE to meet highly qualified requirements.

Through the quarterly LEA monitoring reviews, the SEA will ensure that the HOUSSE analysis process is completed only for teachers who are not new to the profession. The SEA’s HQT data collection system currently collects hire date data and will monitor HOUSSE usage with the current system. Per the September 5, 2006 letter from Secretary Spellings, the SEA will continue to permit HOUSSE usage for veteran teachers unless and until the U.S. Department of Education makes HOUSSE changes during the ESEA reauthorization process.

**Table IX: HOUSSE Implementation**

<b>HOUSSE to Help Achieve Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	
<b>Action</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
SEA has established a HOUSSE instrument that will be in SY 2006-07	Winter 2006

## **Requirement 6: SEA HQT Equity Plan**

The revised plan must include a copy of the State’s written “equity plan” for ensuring that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.

### *SEA Response*

#### **Current Equity Data**

The SEA has made tremendous progress in improving the teacher data collection and management procedures, with more improvements scheduled to be implemented this year. These procedures require LEAs to submit updated HQT data annually via a report known as the “Employed Educator Reporting Process” to the SEA-Office of Academic Credentials and Standards. That office analyzes, reports, and validates the information. The result is a “LEA Teacher Quality Report” that is generated based on the data provided.

The DC SEA’s data collection and management system was recently revised to permit the state to also collect and report data relevant to the number and distribution of inexperienced and unqualified teachers and the extent to which they are teaching poor and minority children. Consequently, the SEA has developed a data collection and analysis plan that will address the required indicators of teacher effectiveness (subject matter competency and experience). Please see Appendix III for comprehensive school and LEA data that informed the responses to this requirement.

To make a determination if poor and minority District of Columbia students were being taught at higher rates by inexperienced and/or unqualified teachers (non-HQT / out-of-field), the following was found:

**Table X: D.C. Equity Data by Poverty**

<b>1) Do schools with higher than the state poverty average of 66% have higher rates of:</b>			
	<b>State Average</b>	<b>Schools Higher Than State Poverty Average</b>	<b>Schools Lower Than State Poverty Average</b>
<b>Non HQT’s</b>	36.66%	37.54%	35.55%
<b>Inexperienced Teachers</b>	26.16%	23.83%	29.06%
<b>Not Making AYP</b>	70.27%	77.17%	61.05%
<b>2) Do schools that have been designated as high/low poverty have higher rates of:</b>			
	<b>State Average</b>	<b>High Poverty Schools</b>	<b>Low Poverty Schools</b>
<b>Non HQT’s</b>	36.66%	29.89%	32.16%
<b>Inexperienced Teachers</b>	26.16%	21.15%	28%
<b>Not Making AYP</b>	70.27%	71.05%	44.26%

<b>3) Do LEAs with higher than the state poverty average of 66% have higher rates of:</b>			
	<b>State Average</b>	<b>LEAs Higher Than State Poverty Average</b>	<b>LEAs Lower Than State Poverty Average</b>
<b>Non HQT's</b>	36.66%	24.36%	21.86%
<b>Inexperienced Teachers</b>	26.16%	40.25%	44.22%

Please note that since the minority student state-wide average is 91.59%, the SEA’s equity plan is focused on ensuring impoverished children are not taught at higher rates by unqualified, inexperienced teachers. D.C.’s “minorities” are in fact the majority in district schools, therefore they will always be in the situation of being impacted the greatest by quality teacher distribution and other policies.

In looking at both schools and LEAs that had higher and lower poverty statistics than the state-wide poverty average, the data in Table X reveals that there is little difference between the state-wide average and high/low poverty schools/LEAs in the following areas:

- the percentage of HQ classes taught
- the percentage of inexperienced teachers

This resultant HQT data reaffirms the state’s earlier acknowledgement that there is a significant need to improve overall HQT numbers state-wide to meet the 100% goal, as evidenced further by the following:

**Table I: Core Academic Subjects and Percentages Taught/Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers\*** (excerpted from section 1: Requirement 1: HQT Data Analysis)

<b>Core Assignment Area</b>	<b>Number of Assignments</b>	<b>Number Taught by HQT</b>	<b>Not Taught By HQT</b>	<b>Percent Taught by HQT</b>	<b>Percent Not Taught by HQT</b>
English	1692	861	831	50.90%	49.10%
Mathematics	1500	770	730	51.30%	48.70%
Elementary Education	1610	905	705	56.20%	43.80%
Arts	1243	638	605	51.30%	48.70%
Overall Science	975	459	516	47.10%	52.90%
Reading/Language Arts	630	236	394	37.50%	62.50%
Foreign Languages	532	263	269	49.40%	50.60%
Biology	466	203	263	43.60%	56.40%
Civics & Government	515	258	257	50.10%	49.90%
History	554	367	187	66.20%	33.80%
General Science	354	175	179	49.40%	50.60%
Geography	207	139	68	67.10%	32.90%
Chemistry	112	59	53	52.70%	47.30%
Physics	43	22	21	51.20%	48.80%
Economics	1	0	1	0%	100.00%

The previous table shows that greatest need for improvement exists in the following areas:

- 1) English
- 2) Elementary Education (encompasses all core subject areas)
- 3) Mathematics
- 4) Arts
- 5) Science

Surprisingly, the teacher distribution data reveals that impoverished children are more likely to be taught by an experienced teacher (one with more than 5 years of experience) than more affluent students. Therefore, no state-wide inequities exist among the schools when it comes to the distribution of experienced teachers in low-income communities.

It is apparent from the data analysis that schools and LEAs with poverty statistics lower than the state average are more likely to make AYP than those schools with higher poverty statistics. However, this is a stand-alone fact that does not appear to be influenced by teacher quality nor experience data per Table X.

### **Addressing Equitable Distribution Gaps**

In an effort to have the greatest impact in increasing teacher quality for all students in the District of Columbia, the SEA will focus on the following two primary strategies:

**Strategy 1: Increase the number of highly qualified teachers to 100% with a focus on the subject areas with the fewest number of HQTs, and those in schools not making AYP.**

**Strategy 2: Continue to improve upon the analysis and dissemination of teacher quality data to ensure stakeholder knowledge of and commitment to assuring equitable qualified teacher distribution.**

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) is the LEA's largest district, encompassing 77% of the teacher workforce. As the largest LEA, DCPS is in most need of SEA intervention for improving its percentage of highly classes taught by HQTs with a current average of 58.63% HQTs, while public charter schools have an average of 76.53% HQTs. While the SEA will focus efforts on improving teacher quality in DCPS, the programs and tasks that lead to the fulfillment of the outlined strategies will support teacher quality improvement across all schools in the District of Columbia.

State-wide data document that poor children are not taught by unqualified teachers at significantly higher rates than more affluent children (max. +1.99% more). In fact, high poverty schools have higher rates of HQTs and experienced teachers. Equity initiatives will therefore address the inequities found between schools and programming and incentives offered for those in low-performing schools with the highest numbers of non-HQTs. The equity plan is developed both to address inequity between schools and as a preemptive means of addressing inequity between high and low poverty schools. In fact, the state plans to take the proactive step of working with LEAs to provide incentives to inspire highly qualified teachers to work at those

schools that do not have an equitable percentage of HQTs, especially those that are low-performing. In summary:

- Per Table X, students at high-poverty schools are not taught at higher rates by non-HQT teachers, less experienced teachers.
- There is inequity in the distribution of HQTs between schools without regard to economic status.
- There is a great need to develop more HQTs in English, Mathematics, Elementary Education and Science (see Table 1 on the next page). This subject area conclusion is based on the number of assignments and the percentage of non-highly qualified teachers within the subject area.

It is important to note that upon implementation of the High Objective Uniform State Standard Evaluation (HOUSSE), some teachers will be able to use the HOUSSE to meet highly qualified requirements. SEA data will be analyzed again to identify possible inequities following the implementation of HOUSSE. The state intends to monitor the implementation of HQ Compliance Action Plans on a quarterly basis. This will ensure that technical assistance is aligned with need as revealed through both centralized data sources and the LEA HQ Compliance Action Plans submitted as part of the consolidated application for entitlement funding.

**Strategy 1: Increase the number of highly qualified teachers to 100% with a focus on the subject areas with the fewest number of HQTs, and those in high poverty schools that are not making AYP.**

<b>Strategy 1 Tasks/Programs</b>	<b>Needs-based reason for task/program</b>	<b>Responsible Office</b>	<b>Progress Measure/ Measure of Success</b>	<b>Deadline for Task/Program Implementation</b>
Require New Teacher Induction Program (0-3 years) description as part of Title II-A funding application.	Reduce teacher turnover rates through effective induction programs.	Office of Federal Grants Programs (OFGP)	Baseline data to be collected on the current number of LEA induction programs and available retention data. Progress to be assessed by the number of new induction programs and increases in teacher retention.	FY2008 LEA Funding Application
Develop and fund new teacher mentor program to provide mentors to those in subject areas with the lowest percentage of HQTs (see Appendix IV for sample mentor program guidelines).	As teachers enrolled in state-approved teacher education programs pass content area licensure assessments, they must be mentored to meet HQT requirements	OFGP; Office of Academic Services (OAS); and Office of Academic Credentials and Standards (OACS)	Increased number of highly qualified teachers in alternate route programs	Fall 2007
Direct the usage of Title II-A SAHE Funding towards the development of content-based professional development in high-need HQT subject areas.	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21)	OFGP; SAHE Agency	Increased number of HQTs in five high-need areas.	Spring 2007 SAHE Application process
Collaborate with local teacher education programs on state-wide areas of need and specific measures to increase the number of traditional program completers who teach in the District of Columbia.	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21); In the near future, we will be able to analyze the extent to which local program completers stay in DC	OACS	Increased number of local traditional program completers who teach in the District of Columbia	Spring 2007

Create <i>DC Hires</i> website to advertise available positions; licensure requirements; state-wide high-need areas; and available state, local, and federal incentives to teach in high-need subject and poverty areas (see p.25 for available programs)*.	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21)	OFGP	Increased number of qualified candidates referred to LEA HR offices/websites	The SEA website will be launched by Feb 17, with an expected completion deadline of July 30, 2007
Provide renewable stipends to National Board Certified Teachers who opt to teach in the highest poverty schools that are not making AYP (see Table XI).	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21); low number of high poverty schools that make AYP	OFGP	Increased number of NBCTs in high-poverty, low-HQT schools	Fall 2007
Consistently apply for federal, private, and non-profit funding that would assist in decreasing the number on non-HQTs.	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21)	OFGP	Increased funding to assist LEAs with meeting HQ requirements	Underway

**Table XI: Schools with Highest Poverty\*\*/Lowest Percentage of HQTs**

Name of School	Sch Type	# Core Classes	#Classes HQ	% Classes HQ	# Inexp	%Inexp	% Minority	% SES	high/low poverty	made AYP
Taft Center	DCPS	4	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	100.00%	93.81%	H	N
MacFarland MS	DCPS	76	23	30.26%	22	28.95%	100.00%	81.63%	H	N
Garnet_Patterson	DCPS	57	22	38.60%	16	28.07%	99.63%	85.71%	H	N
Powell ES	DCPS	22	11	50.00%	9	40.91%	100.00%	95.06%	H	N
Ballou Senior High School	DCPS	217	116	53.46%	42	19.35%	100.00%	85.85%	H	N
Tree of Life PCS	PCS	11	6	54.55%	4	36.36%	100.00%	100.00%	H	N
Stanton ES	DCPS	22	13	59.09%	3	13.64%	100.00%	91.30%	H	N
Moten ES	DCPS	10	6	60.00%	3	30.00%	100.00%	84.52%	H	N
Young ES	DCPS	18	11	61.11%	2	11.11%	100.00%	86.05%	H	N
Bowen ES	DCPS	13	8	61.54%	1	7.69%	100.00%	90.00%	H	N
Draper ES	DCPS	11	7	63.64%	0	0.00%	100.00%	93.71%	H	N
Plummer ES	DCPS	13	9	69.23%	2	15.38%	100.00%	86.23%	H	N

\*\*higher than state poverty average

## **\*Incentive Programs available to D.C. Teachers**

- **Federal Perkins Loan Teacher Cancellation**

Cancels 100% of federal Perkins loans for teachers who work for a full academic year in a low-income school. (Teachers of hard-to-fill subjects such as special education, math, science, bilingual education, and foreign languages are also eligible for loan cancellation.)

- **Teacher Next Door Program**

Helps high-need districts attract and retain teachers by helping teachers buy homes in low-income neighborhoods.

- **Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program – FFEL and Direct Loan Programs**

Provides up to \$17,500 in federal loan forgiveness for certain math, science, and special education teachers employed for five consecutive years in a low-income school.

- **National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)**, in partnership with the SEA –OACS, invites experienced teachers to choose to seek advanced certification and validation of their skills. Candidates must comply with stated requirements and must submit entries for all portfolio and assessment center exercises applicable to the certification sought. DCPS – SEA – OACS will utilize NBPTS subsidy funds to support first time candidates by paying \$1,000 of the certification fee. Teachers in the District of Columbia are eligible to receive Six in-service/recertification credits, upon completion of the National Board Certification, regardless of the outcome.

- **Scholarships/grants to completers of state-approved alternate-route teacher preparation programs in the District of Columbia.** Currently, American University, George Washington University, Trinity (Washington) University, and the University of the District of Columbia all provide teachers to District of Columbia LEAs through federal T3 (Title III or Transition To Teaching?) Grant programs, which partially cover the tuition and expenses. The state may offer to reimburse a portion of associated tuition and testing fees for individuals who have completed programs during the 2006-2007 and chose to work in targeted schools to eliminate inequity.

- **Transition to Teaching Grant – (TOPS Program)** – partnering with American University, SEA-OACS in its collaboration efforts, have designed a program to increase the number, longevity, and diversity of highly qualified teachers in high-needs elementary schools in the District of Columbia. Selected are 240 of the most promising provisionally certified teachers to participate. In addition, master teachers will be trained to serve as mentors. Individuals receive on-site supervision from clinical faculty to assist in the development of teaching competencies. Financial support is also provided

- **DHCD Teacher Housing Assistance Program (THAP)**

The Teacher Housing Assistance Program (THAP) provides an incentive for teachers to become first-time homeowners in Washington, DC. Through THAP, the District & Department of Housing and Community Development (DCHC) provides eligible candidates with a deferred loan of up to \$10,000.

**Strategy 2: Continue to improve upon the analysis and dissemination of teacher quality data to ensure stakeholder knowledge of and commitment to assuring equitable qualified teacher distribution.**

As noted earlier, the SEA will continue to improve data collection and reporting via the *Employed Educator Reporting* (EER) which consists of four major phases of data reporting and analysis whereby:

- Initial data is submitted by the LEAs via the Employed Educator Reporting Form (EERF)
- Initial data analysis is conducted by SEA-OACS
- LEAs undergo a validation process to identify and correct factual errors in the initial reporting, and
- A LEA Teacher Quality Report for each reporting LEA is generated based on the data provided.

By collecting, tracking, and publicizing data on this issue, the SEA will draw public attention to the issue and ensure that District stakeholders are aware and involved in ensuring that benchmarks are met. A state web portal is currently under development that will assist in the SEA’s efforts to collect and merge data documenting teacher effectiveness, with the ultimate goal of being able to link student achievement and teacher quality data.

Strategy 2 Tasks/Programs	Needs-based reason for task/program	Responsible Office	Progress Measure/ Measure of Success	Deadline for Task/Program Implementation
Increase accuracy and completeness of teacher quality data collection.	To improve the SEA’s ability to provide meaningful programs that address documented inequities	OACS; OIT; OFGP	Accurate data on a percentage/number of schools and teachers and on measures of teacher effectiveness	Underway
Collect and publicly report data on distribution of teacher talent.	To consistently inform stakeholders of state-wide teacher quality status	OACS; OIT; OFGP; Office of Accountability (State, District & School Report Cards)	Increased awareness (number of times data is accessed on web); compliance rates as documented in LEA monitoring reports.	Underway
Expand data collection system to include college degree information to also be publicized in the mediums above.	To consistently inform stakeholders of state-wide teacher quality status	OACS; OIT; OFGP; Office of Accountability (State, District & School Report Cards)	Increased awareness (number of times data is accessed on web)	No later than the publication deadline for SY 2007-08 Report Cards

Use data analyses to lobby the Board of Education, City Council, and Congress of the need for committed funds for teachers in high-need/low-HQT areas	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21); To consistently inform stakeholders of state-wide teacher quality status	Chief State School Officer	Attainment of committed local, state or federal funds in high-needs subject areas	Spring 2007 SAHE Application process
Publish annual Teacher Quality Report inclusive of comprehensive LEA/school data and program completer information from D.C. state-approved teacher education programs.	To consistently inform stakeholders of state-wide teacher quality status	OACS	Increased awareness; establish basis of annual state teacher quality evaluation and needs assessment	November 2007
Create <i>DC Hires</i> website to advertise available positions; licensure requirements; state-wide high-need areas; and available state, local, and federal incentives to teach in high-need subject and poverty areas (see below for available programs).	Low number of HQTs in five core areas (see p. 21)	OFGP	Increased number of qualified candidates referred to LEA HR offices/websites	The SEA website will be launched by Feb 17, with an expected completion deadline of July 30, 2007
Monitor the specific staffing needs of DC LEAs using generated reports that identify subject area shortages.	Increase the SEA's ability to develop equity incentive programs that target identified shortages	OACS; OIT; OFGP	Receipt of quarterly LEA teacher vacancy reports	March 2007
Create web search engine to provide current licensure information on District of Columbia teachers.	To consistently inform stakeholders of state-wide teacher quality status; assist LEAs with meeting NCLB Parent's Right to Know Requirements	OACS	Increased awareness (number of times data is accessed on web); LEA feedback on ease of system-use	Underway
Continue to ensure that Parent's Right to Know, and 4-week non-HQT letters are consistently sent by LEAs per NCLB	To ensure that parents are informed of the qualifications of their child's teacher(s)	OFGP Monitoring Team	Full compliance during on-site and desk monitoring	Underway

In sum, the SEA has chosen to focus on the two strategies and their programs/tasks to significantly increase the percentage of HQTs statewide which will result in more poor and minority student being taught by qualified teachers, though they are not currently taught at higher rates by unqualified, inexperienced teachers.

## Monitoring LEA Equitable Teacher Distribution

While current state-wide equity data does not show that impoverished students are taught at higher rates than other students, there are opportunities for LEAs, especially DCPS and other multi-site LEAs to examine teacher distribution patterns to ensure that inequities do not arise and/or are reduced among schools. To that end, the SEA will monitor LEA equitable teacher assignment by:

**Table XII: LEA Teacher Distribution Monitoring**

Action Item	Action Steps	Timeline
Increase accuracy and completeness of teacher quality data collection.	Revise Employed Educator Reporting (EER) processes where necessary to fully capture LEA teacher quality data	No later than the publication deadline of SY 2007-08 EER Reporting Handbook (with major data submission revisions to be communicated to LEAs in a timely manner)
*Require LEAs that show inequities in teacher assignment (by poverty and/or between schools) to analyze their assignment data to determine causes and remedies to address gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify LEAs/schools with most significant quality gaps</li> <li>- Provide training to LEAs on analyzing their data and developing specific steps to address gaps</li> <li>- LEAs analyze data and develop their teacher equity plan</li> <li>- LEAs submit their equity plan to the State for review and approval</li> <li>- LEAs reanalyze their data and revise their equity plans annually</li> </ul>	<p>LEA Training to take place after the hiring of the state Title II-A Program Coordinator, a process that is currently underway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LEAs to submit equity plans by June 2007</li> </ul>
*Target specific intervention strategies for schools identified as “high priority”, i.e. not making AYP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify LEAs with most significant gaps and high priority schools</li> <li>- Require the LEAs to develop an analysis of the teaching staff of high priority schools compared with their other schools in the district</li> <li>- Require the LEAs to develop specific strategies to attract and retain their most highly effective teachers to these schools</li> <li>- Require the LEAs to submit these specialized plans for high</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• December annually</li> <li>• December 2006 and annually</li> <li>• January 2007 – April 2007 and annually</li> <li>• January 2007 – April 2007 and annually</li> <li>• June 2007 and annually</li> <li>• June 2007 and annually</li> </ul>

	<p>priority schools with their equity plans to the State annually</p> <p>- Require the LEAs to gain state approval of their plans, including the use of available resources to implement the plans, to receive approval for the use of their NCLB Consolidated Application</p>	
<p>Redirect the federal education resources in LEAs that have not reduced the gaps in teacher distribution and have high priority schools to target improvements</p>	<p>- Identify LEAs that are not reducing the gap in teacher distribution and who also have high priority schools</p> <p>- Redirect their NCLB Consolidated Application funds, school improvement funds, and IDEA funds to target improvement in teacher quality in their high poverty schools and/or high priority schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• December 2007 and annually</li> <li>December – May 2007 and annually</li> </ul>

*\*Adopted from the Tennessee Teacher Equity Plan*