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Introduction

The following plan was developed in response to the United States Department of Education’s (USDE) request that each state submit a revised plan for meeting the highly qualified teacher (HQT) goal of 100%. This document outlines the plan that the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) will implement in current and subsequent school years in order to ensure that all courses throughout the state are taught by highly qualified and effective educators.

NOTE: Throughout this plan, the Department references “districts”. By “districts,” ESE is referring to traditional school districts, charter schools, and vocational technical schools.
Background

Teacher Quality Initiatives in Massachusetts
Massachusetts has a rich history of implementing strategies and initiatives focused on increasing the number of highly qualified teachers throughout the state. In 1993, the Massachusetts Education Reform Act was signed into law, creating a framework for unprecedented improvements in developing rigorous academic content and performance standards, strong assessments, an accountability system, and a revamped school finance system that increased levels of funding while addressing fiscal inequities. In the area of educator quality, the Education Reform Act guided Massachusetts’ efforts to elevate the standards by which individuals become teachers in Massachusetts as well as improve the conditions that impact the profession, such as those related to professional development, beginning teacher support and induction, educator recruitment, and career advancement.

By the 2006-2007 school year, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) had created a set of licensure regulations requiring a full year of mentoring and induction in every teacher’s first year of employment along with a strong focus on content knowledge aligned with the State’s Curriculum Frameworks (student learning standards). The strong focus on content was applied to preparation programs – at both the district and higher education levels – and an ESE program approval process was initiated to ensure that the content focus of each preparation program was sufficient and that each program was meeting the detailed requirements outlined in regulations. Additionally, the Department maintained the Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL) as the State’s teacher testing program and implemented a relicensure process for all veteran educators, requiring these educators to participate in professional development activities in the content of their license.

In 2008, Governor Patrick announced his Education Action Agenda. This robust plan was the final product of the Commonwealth Readiness Project, a nine-month effort by a diverse group of education, business, and civic leaders who developed goals that aim to individualize learning, develop and retain effective teachers, heighten focus on college and career readiness, and unleash innovation and systemic change. These goals and the specific recommendations became the foundation for Massachusetts’ Race to the Top (RTTT) proposal, of which developing and retaining an effective, academically capable, diverse, and culturally competent educator workforce is a primary objective. As one of the 12 recipients of the RTTT grant, Massachusetts demonstrated a true commitment to expanding the number of highly qualified and effective educators throughout the state, thus ensuring that all Commonwealth students have access to a high-quality education that will prepare them to excel in the 21st century.

ESE’s Response to No Child Left Behind
With the passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2002, ESE worked diligently to understand the requirements of the Act, develop policies that reflected the requirements in the law (including the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) provisions), and implement the law across the Commonwealth. To this end, the Department developed the Statewide NCLB Implementation Plan.
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Committee (SNIC), which was comprised of district representatives, members of the professional educator associations in the state, and ESE staff. This group assisted the Department with the first two years of the implementation of the law, providing a sounding board related to policy development and anticipated implementation. Eventually, the Educational Personnel Advisory Council (EPAC) replaced the SNIC group, and EPAC continues to advise the Department on policies that relate to educator personnel, including HQT. *(For more information on EPAC, refer to Collaboration with the Educational Personnel Advisory Council.)*

In 2009, an Associate Commissioner was hired to lead a newly reorganized Center for Educator Policy, Preparation, Licensure, and Leadership (EPPL). The goal of this center is to support faster and more coherent progress in building and strengthening the educator pipeline in Massachusetts. The center works continuously to develop innovative models of educator preparation and has engaged in stakeholder-based efforts to develop new performance standards for educational leaders, define the knowledge and skills of professional teaching practice, craft a new teacher and leader evaluation framework leading to proposed regulatory changes, and produce a biennial report about the status of the state’s educator workforce. As such, this unit is poised to make substantial and significant progress in improving the quality and effectiveness of educators throughout the Commonwealth.

Through the formation of EPAC and EPPL, the Department created and has maintained policy statements, documents, and guidance used to clarify the requirements of the law. ESE has a website ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/nclb/hq/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/nclb/hq/)) dedicated to the HQT requirements, including materials that will help districts and schools implement the requirements. The website is updated regularly to reflect clarifications and/or changes offered by USDE.

**Massachusetts’ Plan for Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal**

In the 2009-10 school year, Massachusetts had 392 operating school districts (school districts including charter schools, regional school districts and vocational/technical schools) throughout the state. There were over 1,800 public schools within the Commonwealth educating over 955,000 students. These students were all supported by a teacher workforce just under 70,000. Since the passage of NCLB, ESE has worked hard to ensure that these districts, schools and educators understand the requirements of the law and that they implement those requirements appropriately and effectively.

This plan outlines the current status of teacher quality in the Commonwealth, the progress that the state has made in meeting the federal highly qualified teacher requirements as outlined in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and further steps that will be taken next year and in subsequent years to ensure that a good-faith effort is made by the state, districts and schools to meet the goal of having 100% of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers.
Meeting USDE Revised Plan Requirements

**Requirement 1: Highly Qualified Teacher Data**

**State-Wide Teacher Data**

ESE began collecting HQT data during the 2003-2004 school year. At the time, the Department did not have an individual educator database that would compile information at the class level; as such, the Department used FTEs as an equivalent to classes in order to measure Massachusetts’ progress in meeting federal HQ teacher requirements. During these first four years of data collection, the percentage of HQ teachers did not fluctuate much until the 2006-2007 school year. (See Table I.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SY</th>
<th>HQT Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I. State HQT Percentages from 2003-04 through 2006-07**

In October 2007, ESE rolled out the Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS). This new data collection system enabled ESE to collect demographic data and work assignment information on individual public school educators in all Commonwealth districts and schools. In connecting educators to specific courses, EPIMS allowed the Department to shift the analysis of HQ teacher data from FTEs to core academic classes, providing a much more accurate representation of the percentage of courses throughout the state taught by highly qualified educators. Over the last three school years, the Department has seen the percentage of highly qualified teachers increase by nearly one percentile point each year. (See Table II.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SY</th>
<th>HQT Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table II. State HQT Percentages from 2007-08 through 2009-10**

Based on the EPIMS data collected in October 2009, 97.3% of Massachusetts’ core academic classes are taught by highly qualified teachers. During the last three years, the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers increased by an average of 2.2%, with the greatest increases in foreign languages, science, reading, and math. Furthermore, the number of special education and ESL classes taught by HQ teachers increased by 5.3% and 1.7% respectively. (See Appendix I.) These gains can be chiefly attributed to district HQT reports and

---

1 This revised State Plan will only analyze data collected via EPIMS (beginning in the 2007-08SY) as the disaggregated data collected prior to the 2007-08SY is not comparable to subsequent years.
plans for reaching the 100%. Through these plans, HQT specialists are able to better understand the current HQT status of districts as well as their needs and provide more efficient, targeted assistance to districts throughout the Commonwealth.

**District-Level Teacher Data**

The data analyzed at the district level in 2006 indicated that the majority of districts had HQT percentages above 95%. At that time, 21% of districts met the 100% goal, while 42% of districts had HQT percentages between 95 and 99.9 percent. Only twenty percent of districts had less than 90% of their FTEs meeting the HQT requirements.

Since then, the Department has shifted its analysis of district-level teacher data to focus on the percentage of districts that fall within three different groups: districts reporting 100% HQTs, districts reporting between 97-99.9% HQTs, and districts reporting less than 97% HQTs. In developing these groups, HQT specialists were able to provide specialized technical assistance strategies for districts with different HQT needs as well as guidance for districts in different groups on how to most effectively utilize their Title IIA funds to improve and/or maintain their HQ status. Consequently, the percentage of districts in the state with HQT percentages above 97% grew 12.5 percentile points from 2007-08 to 2009-10. (See Table III.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total # of Districts</th>
<th># of Districts with 100% HQT</th>
<th># of Districts with 97-99% HQT</th>
<th># of Districts with &lt;97% HQT</th>
<th>% of districts over 97%</th>
<th>% of districts at 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table III. Change in District-Level HQT Data between 2007-08 to 2009-10**

Further breakdown of district-level teacher data reveals that:

- The percentage of districts reporting 100% HQT in arts increased by 8 percentile points between the 2007-08 and 2009-10 school years.
- 95% of districts in the Commonwealth report that 100% of their teachers assigned to teach Civics & Government or Economics courses were HQ for that assignment.
- Teachers in the core content areas identified as needing targeted assistance in the 2006 State HQT Plan (under Requirement 3) made significant gains. For each of the following content areas, the percentage of districts reporting 100% of their classes in the specified core content area as being taught by highly qualified teachers increased:
  - In foreign languages, the number of districts increased by 6%
  - In math, the number of districts also increased by 6%
  - In science, the number of districts increased by 5%
  - In reading, the number of districts increased by 4%
- The number of HQ teachers in high-poverty districts increased 3.6% from the 2007-08 school year to the 2009-10 school year. During that same time, the number of HQ teachers in low-poverty districts increased by 0.6%.


- The percentage of ESL and special education classes taught by HQ teachers increased in districts throughout the Commonwealth by 1.3% and .6% respectively from the 2007-08 school year to the 2009-10 school year.

See Appendix II, and Appendix III, for additional district-level data.

In addition, the average HQT percentage for districts not making AYP in 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 is similar to the average HQT percentages for those districts meeting AYP. In fact, during the past three years, the average HQT percentages for districts not making AYP increased more for those making AYP – 1.8% and 1.6% respectively. (See Table IV below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of districts receiving AYP determination</th>
<th># of High-poverty districts making AYP</th>
<th># of Low-poverty districts not making AYP</th>
<th># of High-poverty districts not making AYP</th>
<th>Average HQT % for districts making AYP</th>
<th>Average HQT % for districts not making AYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV. Change in District-level HQT Data for Districts Making and Not Making AYP

However, the number of high-poverty districts not making AYP has remained relatively stagnant and the number making AYP throughout the past three years has actually declined. Although the average HQT percentage for high-poverty districts has increased, it is clear that the Department must continue to focus resources on developing strategies that help districts translate their successes in improving teacher quality into continuous improvement in student achievement.

School-Level Teacher Data

The HQT data reported at the school level has improved steadily over the last three school years. Since the 2007-08 school year, the percentage of schools reporting 100% HQTs has increased over 8 percentile points, while the number of schools reporting over 97% of their classes as being taught by HQTs grew by nearly 9 percentile points. (See Table V below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total # of Schools</th>
<th># of schools with 100% HQT</th>
<th># of schools with 97-99% HQT</th>
<th># of schools with &lt;97% HQT</th>
<th>% of schools over 97%</th>
<th>% of schools at 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V. Change in School-level HQT data between 2007-08 and 2009-10
When the data sets are broken down by school type (elementary, middle, or secondary school), they illustrate that although greater gains were made by middle and secondary schools from the 2007-08 school year to the 2009-10 school year, elementary schools still maintain a higher percentage of HQTs. (See Figure I below.) Currently, nearly 98% of core academic classes at the elementary level are taught by HQ teachers; in contrast, fewer than 97% of classes at the middle school level and only slightly more than 95% of courses at the secondary level are taught by HQ teachers.

![Change in HQT Percentage - School type](image)

Figure I. Change in HQT Percentage by School Type

Additional breakdown of the school level data illustrates how the HQT percentages reported by schools designated as high-poverty and low-poverty have changed over the last three years. As shown in the chart below, high poverty schools have increased their HQT percentages much more rapidly than low-poverty schools. At the end of the 2009-10 school year, a gap of less than 1 percentile point existed between high-poverty and low-poverty schools, a 50% decrease from the gap that existed in 2007-08.
The HQT percentages reported by middle and secondary schools demonstrate even greater and more consistent gains throughout the past three years. As illustrated in the charts below, low-poverty schools at both the middle and secondary level increased their HQT percentages by about 1% between 2007-08 and 2009-10, while high-poverty schools increased their HQT percentages by 8% at the middle school level and 5% at the secondary school level.
Figure IV. Change in HQT Percentages for Secondary Schools

These increases represent significant improvements in the distribution of highly qualified teachers throughout the Commonwealth, especially for those middle and secondary schools designated as high-poverty. Although the gap in HQTs between the different types of schools has declined, it still persists, and it represents an area of continued focus for technical assistance provided by the Department.

See Appendix IV, for the school-level HQT data plotted in the figures above.

In addition, the difference between the average HQT percentage for schools not making AYP in 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 and schools making AYP has decreased by .5%; while schools making AYP have increased their HQT percentages by 1.2%, schools not making AYP have increased by 1.7%. (See Table VI below.) These improvements represent significant progress in the equitable distribution of high quality teachers to schools throughout the Commonwealth.

Table VI. Change in School-level HQT Data for Districts Making and Not Making AYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of schools receiving AYP determination</th>
<th># of High-poverty schools making AYP</th>
<th># of Low-poverty schools making AYP</th>
<th># of High-poverty schools not making AYP</th>
<th># of Low-Poverty schools not making AYP</th>
<th>Average HQT % for schools making AYP</th>
<th>Average HQT % for schools not making AYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite this progress, high-poverty schools have remained relatively stagnant in the number not making AYP and the number of low-poverty schools making AYP has actually decreased. Consequently, the Department’s strategies for helping districts translate their successes in improving teacher quality into continuous improvement in student achievement (as found in reviewing the district-level data) must include specific assistance on distributing their most highly qualified and effective educators to schools with the highest need.

See Appendix V, for additional AYP data.

Factors Affecting HQ Status
The Department believes that schools and districts throughout the state have made great strides in understanding the Highly Qualified requirements and regulations, and in using the various technical assistance tools available as a resource for enhancing their understanding. With the launch of the Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS) in 2007, districts were required not only to understand the HQ requirements but also to understand how to accurately report the status of their teachers to ESE. To help prevent inaccuracies in district data reporting, ESE’s Data Collection team implemented several support strategies, including trainings, online tutorials, handbooks, and data collection support specialists. ESE’s Data Collection and Teacher Quality teams continue to support districts throughout the data reporting process, and they are exploring ways to integrate the educator data into the Education Data Warehouse (EDW) so that districts can more immediately review their reporting. (For more information on EDW, see the “Data and Reporting Systems” section of Requirement 6.)

Despite this work and the resulting gains in HQT status, there are still several factors that impact the ability of all schools and districts throughout the Commonwealth to reach the 100% HQT goal. By far the most significant difficulty districts face has been the fiscal declines of the last several years. As a result of persistent funding constraints, districts not only have eliminated student programs but also have reduced the numbers in their educator workforce. Schools and districts must often staff courses with non-HQ teachers, frequently out-of-field teachers, in order to accommodate their funding shortages.

In addition, these fiscal constraints have forced many schools and districts to reduce their leadership teams. In many instances, principals are left without the support of assistant principals and several assistant superintendents have had to take on additional roles as human resource directors and budget officers. These administrative cuts place a great deal of strain on a district; as administrators struggle to provide adequate support to educators throughout the districts, they must also work to accurately and efficiently complete the myriad of tasks now required of them. Frequently included in these new responsibilities is the task of reporting and monitoring HQT status as well as providing assistance and support to teachers in need of meeting the HQ requirements.

Additionally, there are realities at the local level including retirements, attrition, and lack of qualified teachers in shortage areas (such as Special Education, English as a Second Language,
Math, and Science) that sometimes hinder providing all teachers with the most appropriate classroom assignments. Although the state has worked with schools and districts on several initiatives focused on combating these issues (as outlined in the “Targeted Assistance for Subgroups of Teachers” section), many areas remain “hard-to-staff.” The Department has worked toward the 100% HQT goal and will continue this effort while balancing these realities that force districts and schools to make difficult decisions on staffing and teacher assignments.
Requirement 2: ESE Action Steps to Ensure that Each District Has an HQT Plan in Place

Identification of Districts That Have Not Met 100% HQT

Each year ESE receives HQT data from every district and school in the state through the Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS) reporting. (See Table II, for a summary of the state HQT percentages reported for the past three years.) The data shows that:

- 123 districts met the 100% HQT goal during the 2009-10 school year.
- 160 districts had an HQT percentage between 97-99.9% during the 2009-10 school year.
- 109 districts had an HQT percentage less than 97% during the 2009-10 school year.

Currently, 269 districts throughout the state have not met the 100% HQT goal; this is approximately 68% of the districts in the Commonwealth. Although Massachusetts’ districts have made great strides in improving their HQT percentages throughout the past three years (as outlined in Table III.), clearly many districts are still striving for the 100% HQT goal. In order to assist districts in this process, the Department must ensure that each district has a relevant and viable HQT plan in place.

NOTE: Throughout this plan, the Department references “districts”. By “districts,” ESE is referring to traditional school districts, charter schools, and vocational technical schools.

District Action Steps

Beginning in 2006-07 school year, the Department implemented a formal process for assisting districts in developing an effective HQT plan and for reviewing district progress in meeting annual measurable objectives. During the first year of implementation, the Department created cohorts of school districts that were at different stages of meeting the HQT requirements. Each cohort was obligated to meet the following plan requirements in the 2006-07 school year:

- COHORT A – Districts that had 100% HQT were required to submit a plan that outlined the recruitment, hiring and retention strategies that would help them maintain their 100% HQT status. These plans were reviewed by HQT specialists in order to ensure that all districts employed strategies for maintaining their HQT percentage and to also assess best practices from the field that could be shared with other districts.
- COHORT B – Districts that had not yet met 100% HQT, but met their annual measurable objectives for either the 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 school year. These districts were required to submit a plan outlining how their Title IIA and Title IA funding was targeted to help teachers meet the HQT requirements and to develop activities that would help eliminate the achievement gap separating low-income and minority students from other students.
• COHORT C – Districts that failed to meet their annual measurable objectives for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years were required to develop a comprehensive Teacher Quality Improvement Plan (TQIP). These plans outlined how the district planned to address the issues and/or circumstances that were impacting their ability to meet the HQT goals. Each TQIP included the following: an analysis of their HQT data; an outline of specific strategies the district would employ with individual teachers in order to support them in becoming HQ as well as strategies that the district would use to address core academic areas with higher rates of non-HQ teachers; an overview of how the district would fund their initiatives; and an overview of how the district would recruit, support, and retain HQTs.

By June 30, 2007, 91 of the then 390 districts in the Commonwealth met the 100% HQT goal.

Since June 2007, the annual measurable objectives for HQT were phased out and all districts were required to submit the same type of plan reporting on strategies they are employing to reach or maintain 100% HQT status. They have done so through the TQIP. As mentioned above, this plan originally was intended to target districts struggling to meet their annual measurable objective. Considering the number of districts that failed to meet the federal objective of 100% HQT by the end of the 2006-07 school year, the Department expanded the TQIP to all districts, regardless of their HQ percentage.

The TQIP still is released to districts annually in June, although it is has evolved into the Teacher Effectiveness and Quality Improvement Plan (TEQIP). The focus of the TEQIP continues to be on measuring district and school progress toward the 100% HQT goal, but with the addition of “effectiveness” to the report, it now also includes a component that asks districts to address how they measure teacher effectiveness. In the Department’s last administration of the TEQIP, districts were required to complete the following:

• An analysis of their current data for all non HQTs, if applicable. The TEQIP was designed to populate automatically with the information reported by the district through the annual EPIMS data collection. Through this analysis, districts are required to identify any trends they see in their non HQT data (i.e. subjects, schools, grade levels, etc. with the greatest numbers of non HQ teachers), whether or not teachers attained HQ status since the EPIMS reporting (submitted in October), and how the district would target Title IIA funds, and Title I funds if applicable, to support the non HQ teachers, particularly those in schools and/or content areas for which the district is not meeting AYP, in becoming HQ. (See Figure V. below.)
2009-2010 Teacher Effectiveness & Quality Improvement Plan

SECTION I - TEACHERS NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED (HQ)

Using the following chart pre-populated with certified BPMS data, indicate the additional required information – in columns 8 or 9 and 8 or 9 – specifying likewise, FY 2011 Title IIA funding assistance, and, if applicable, Title I funding assistance information for each teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) First-Name</th>
<th>(2) MI</th>
<th>(3) Last-Name</th>
<th>(4) Is teacher’s salary funded in part or in full by Title I?*</th>
<th>(5) Core Subject</th>
<th>(6) If teaching core subject &lt;25% of teaching schedule, does teacher hold any valid and active teaching license?</th>
<th>(7) If teaching core subject &lt;25% of teaching schedule, does teacher hold the valid and active license for the assignment?</th>
<th>(8) How will the district target FY 2010 Title IIA and Title I, if applicable, funds to assist the teacher in becoming HQT?*</th>
<th>(9) If the teacher has attained HQT status since the BPMS collection***, indicate how by selecting from the drop-down menu(s) one or a combination of – the option(s) completed by the teacher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Life and Physical Science-Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Select One</td>
<td>Teacher will not return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Life and Physical Science-Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Select One</td>
<td>Licensure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As noted in §1119(a)(1) of the ESEA, all Title I Teachers hired after the first day of the 2002-2003 school year must be highly qualified at the time of hire.

** Title IIA funds must target non-HQTs before the district can spend funds on other eligible activities, such as class size reduction.

*** The district’s 2009-2010 BPMS data has been certified, and cannot be altered to reflect changes in teacher’s HQ status that have occurred since October 1, 2009.

Figure V. TEQIP Teacher Data Chart

- **An outline of the district’s Equitable Distribution Plan (EDP).** Through the TEQIP, districts must describe the strategies that they will use to ensure the equitable distribution of HQ teachers, by providing the following information:
  - The impact that their previous year’s EDP had on specific schools within the district;
  - The obstacles they faced in implementing the previous year’s EDP;
  - The inequalities in the distribution of HQTs that currently exist in the district;
  - How the district planned to change its strategy to address the obstacles and inequalities;
  - How the district would continue to implement successful strategies to ensure the equitable distribution of HQTs; AND
  - How the district would continuously measure the progress of the strategies in their EDP.

- **A description of how districts measure teacher effectiveness.** As the focus on highly qualified teachers begins to expand to include teacher “effectiveness,” the Department wants to ensure that districts are introduced early to this new component. In an effort to increase district awareness and gauge their current understanding of teacher effectiveness, a new section of the TEQIP asks districts...
to provide information on the different methods they use to measure teacher effectiveness.

**ESE Action Plan to Ensure that All Districts Have TEQIPs in Place**

In order to ensure that all Massachusetts districts have plans in place to assist non HQTs become HQ as quickly as possible, ESE will continue to require that all districts with an HQT percentage less than 100% develop a TEQIP as part of their Title IIA planning process. Districts will continue to submit these plans through the TEQIP application.

In order to support districts in developing, implementing, and measuring the effectiveness of their HQT plans, the Department will:

- Provide technical assistance to districts with general questions related to HQT and the development of their TEQIP through telephone inquiries and the HQTHelp email (HQTHelp@doe.mass.edu).
- Provide planning documentation and model documents on the ESE website, including tools and materials that districts can use to develop their TEQIP.
- Continue to provide a networking group for urban superintendents across the state. The Urban Superintendents Network provides district leaders with an opportunity to share ideas, concerns and solutions. It also allows the Department to provide targeted assistance to urban superintendents who face a variety of challenges, including those related to recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers. ESE will continue working with these urban superintendents to address problems that arise in relation to broad educational issues as well as the implementation of specific sets of requirements, such as the HQT provisions.
- Continue to provide customized assistance to the 10 urban districts that comprise the Commissioner’s Districts. These districts were identified because they share the following characteristics: (1) they each have 10,000 or more students (with one exception); (2) they have the highest poverty and subgroup enrollment in the state; (3) they each have three or more schools in Corrective Action or Restructuring in the aggregate, for ELA, for math, or both; AND (4) they are all in Corrective Action either in the aggregate or for subgroups as a district. Since 2007-2008, the Office of Urban and Commissioner’s District (UDA) has been charged with providing customized support to the Commissioner’s Districts to enhance their capacity to support high need schools, in addition to all other schools in the district. To this end, UDA assistance, activities, tools, and resources are purposefully designed to complement and strengthen district capacity to guide and monitor school improvement.
- Provide districts with strategies, programs, and initiatives to assist them as they further develop and implement their plan. Some of these strategies are outlined in the “ESE Technical Assistance for District Implementation of HQT Plans” section.
- Produce a quarterly newsletter for districts with reminders, guidance, and updates on their responsibilities under Title IIA. The newsletter includes updates on the Highly Qualified (HQ) teacher and paraprofessional requirements, reminders regarding the state requirements for licensure, information on upcoming reporting deadlines (for the
TEQIP and/or Title IIA budget submission) and important links and references for additional guidance. Districts are urged to read the update carefully, make revisions to their implementation of the requirements as necessary, and contact ESE staff as needed to answer any questions on the provisions. Districts are also able to sign up for an RSS feed on the Title IIA website so that they can receive email notifications when the page is updated.

- Reorganize Teacher Quality (TQ) Team so that each HQT Specialist can focus her/his expertise on a specific area of Title IIA and or Highly Qualified requirements (such as HQT regulations, TEQIP reporting, or Title IIA regulations). The Department will provide districts with a list of HQT specialists and their expertise area so that districts can receive specialized and expedited assistance regarding their questions. Specialists will also be available to help districts in the further development and implementation of their TEQIP and Title IIA initiatives.

- Hold an annual Title IIA meeting at the Department for all districts. During this meeting, ESE staff will provide seminars regarding HQT regulations, Title IIA and reporting requirements, and monitoring activities. The Department will strongly encourage districts to attend, and all information provided throughout the meeting will be made available online for districts unable to attend or to access after the conference.

- Provide targeted assistance to districts through the Massachusetts School and District Accountability and Assistance System (SDA). The SDA is designed to gauge the progress of schools and districts toward helping all students in the Commonwealth achieve grade level proficiency in English language arts and mathematics by 2014. The system enables the Department to assess the effectiveness and monitor the improvement of all public schools and districts, hold school leaders accountable for that performance and improvement, and identify where State intervention is needed. State assistance is delivered through a cohort approach based on the size and type of school districts. The assistance is tailored to meet district needs and is designed to use research based approaches to enhance districts' capacity to improve school performance.
Requirement 3: ESE Technical Assistance, Programs and Services Offered to Districts and the Resources Districts Use to Meet the 100% HQT Goal

Since 2007, the Department has implemented several specific strategies, programs and services for assisting districts and schools in meeting the 100% HQT goal. These initiatives involve working directly with districts to address their individual needs, but also focused on addressing trends across the Commonwealth that surfaced as more accurate and comprehensive data became available. Many of these initiatives are targeted toward schools that are underperforming, and ESE continues to use available federal and state funds to carry out these programs.

NOTE: The previous section provides details about the technical assistance that the Department will be providing in addition to the information provided below.

ESE Technical Assistance for District Implementation of HQT Plans

The Department successfully implemented the following technical assistance programs and will continue to do so in order to support districts as they develop, implement, and complete their HQT plans:

- Technical Support Lines – ESE successfully established a technical support system through which districts contact members of the MA Teacher Quality Team via phone or email to discuss general questions related to understanding and interpreting HQT regulations and the development of their HQT plan. At any time, districts/schools can also request “live” technical assistance with the Department via teleconferencing or in-person meetings.

- Online Resources – Districts also are able to reference the ESE website for important information regarding HQT regulations and requirements. Included in the available online resources is a Frequently Asked Questions page, the Title IIA Newsletter, and links to several model documents that can aid districts in their record keeping practices. The FAQs page is regularly updated to include the timeliest and most important questions districts and schools may have regarding HQTs. Plus, any additional resources provided to districts through webinars and/or conferences are also available on the Title IIA guidance portion of the ESE website. Districts are able to sign up to receive email notifications of any updates or changes to these online resources through the RSS feed option.

- Teleconferencing with §2141(c) districts – During the annual review process of district HQT status and Title IIA budget proposals, members of ESE’s HQT Team schedule teleconferences with districts identified under the accountability requirements of §2141(c) of ESEA. These meetings are designed to review the current obstacles districts are facing in meeting AYP and the 100% HQT goal, and support them in identifying
effective strategies for overcoming those obstacles. All districts identified under §2141(c) must participate in these conferences and sign a funding agreement as to how their Title IIA funds will be used.

- **Expedited Licensure Reviews** - A superintendent can request an expedited review of an individual’s license application, whether new or for renewal. This support provides districts with expedited assistance and guidance for resolving issues regarding outstanding licenses and has greatly reduced the impact of licensure issues on meeting HQT goals.

- **Alternative and Practice-based Preparation Programs** - Districts experiencing large numbers of non-HQTs in specific content areas are offered technical assistance related to the development of alternative and practice-based preparation programs. These programs allow districts to “grow their own” teachers in core academic areas that have proven difficult to fill with appropriately licensed staff.

*The Department uses federal Title IIA State Activities funds for these initiatives.*

- **Title IIA Improving Teacher Quality Grants** - The Department of Higher Education currently funds 15 partnerships through the [Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program](#). Each funded partnership includes institutions of higher education and high-need school districts. Funds are used to conduct professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals have subject matter knowledge and computer-related technology experience to enhance student learning. Awards are made for up to three years, assuming yearly progress and federal appropriation, and districts are encouraged to participate.

*Federal Title IIA SAHE funds are used for these initiatives.*

In addition, ESE is planning to enhance further the technical assistance programs outlined above by implementing the following district support activities in the 2011-12 school year:

- **Pre-planning forms** – For FY12, ESE will provide planning documents to districts to assist them in developing effective HQT Plans and matching those plans with initiatives funded through their Title IIA and Title IA grants, and/or other federal, state, and local funds. Included in these forms will be models of district HQT plans, Equitable Distribution Plans, and required Title IIA documents as well as a flowchart outlining the connection between district EPIMS reporting, HQT plans, Title IIA grants, and Title IA grants. In addition, ESE HQT Specialists will work with the ESE Data Collection team to develop district HQT reports through the new Data Warehouse program, allowing districts to use more up-to-date data to inform their HQT Plans.

- **Title IIA Meeting** – [As discussed earlier](#), beginning in the 2011-12 school year the Department will hold an annual Title IIA meeting for all districts. During this meeting,
ESE staff will provide seminars regarding HQT regulations, Title IIA and reporting requirements, and monitoring activities. The Department will strongly encourage districts to attend, and all information provided throughout the conference will be made available online.

**ESE Technical Assistance for Teachers in Obtaining HQ Status**

ESE works closely with teachers to assist them in meeting the highly qualified requirements. In addition to making the technical support lines and online resources described previously available to teachers as well as districts, the Department has successfully also implemented the following technical assistance programs for teachers:

- **Assistance with Licensure** – Teachers who have questions about the licensure requirements are able to contact ESE staff members trained to understand the intricacies of the MA licensure process via the Licensure Call Center or by visiting the Walk-In Customer Service Counter. These services are available to all educators no matter what stage they are at in their career.

The Department will use both state and Title IIA State Activities funds for these initiatives.

- **MTEL Test Preparation** – The Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEls) are the most popular modes through which teachers demonstrate subject matter competency in their core content area, as they the required tests through which educators demonstrate communication skills and subject matter knowledge in the area of the license sought. Most of the tests have full-length practice tests, and Test Information Booklets and test objectives lists are available for all tests on the MTEL website (http://www.mtel.nesinc.com/index.asp) under the “Preparation Information” heading. Also, there are multiple-choice question analyses for the General Curriculum test and the Foundations of Reading test.

Several institutions across the state offer MTEL test preparation courses, all of which are listed on the ESE website. In addition, ESE initiated a pilot program for use of the Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) software as a tutoring tool for individuals interested in furthering their math skills. Although the program is not specifically designed for or aligned with the MTEL, it does address some of the content as that addressed in the Math MTEL. At the conclusion of the pilot, participant data will be analyzed to examine the potential benefits to educators and educator-candidates of using web-based tutorials.

The Communication and Literacy Skills MTEL and the Foundations of Reading MTEL are now offered as computer based tests (CBT), in addition to paper based tests, and are available during several testing windows at test centers throughout the state. Over the next few years, the Department anticipates that all of the MTEL tests will migrate gradually from paper to computer, which will provide educator candidates with increased testing access and flexibility.
The Department uses both federal Title IIA State Activities funds and funds generated from testing fees for these initiatives.

- **Collaboration with Teachers Associations across the State** – The Department maintains a collaborative working relationship with the Massachusetts teachers unions regarding the highly qualified teacher requirements. ESE and the teachers associations have and will continue to work together to provide teachers with accurate information and options for meeting the federal HQT requirements.

- **Collaboration with the Educational Personnel Advisory Council (EPAC).** EPAC advises the Commissioner and the Board of Education on issues pertaining to all educational personnel. The Department will continue to meet regularly with the Council to garner feedback from the field regarding policy development and implementation of strategies and programs related to teacher preparation, licensure and educator quality.

**Targeted Assistance for Subgroups of Teachers**

In implementing an educator-level data collection system, EPIMS, ESE has moved from an aggregate level data collection and analysis to a more detailed collection and analysis. EPIMS has better enabled the Department to identify the subgroups of teachers (and classes) that are in most need of assistance in understanding and obtaining HQ status. In addition, the improved data collection practices has enabled the Department to provide more targeted services and programs that address the specific HQT needs of subgroups of teachers across the state. Below are the targeted services and programs that the Department will provide to specific subgroups of teachers, particularly those in hard-to-staff areas.

**Teachers of English Language Learners (ELL)**

In 2004, the Department successfully modified the ELL licensure requirements in order to clarify the purpose of the ELL license and improve the ability of individuals to become licensed to teach ELL populations in Massachusetts. As a result, the number of HQ teachers in ESL has increased over the past three school years by .6%. *(See Appendix I.)*

The modifications made to the ELL licensure requirements were successful in clarifying what an individual would need in order to obtain an ELL license and the responsibilities that s/he would take on in doing so. However, despite the Department’s hopes that this clarity would entice more individuals into pursuing an ELL license, the number of licensed ELL educators throughout the state has remained relatively stagnant over the past three years, at approximately 1650 FTEs or 2.4% of all teachers in the state. Meanwhile, the population of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students has steadily risen from 5.8% of the student population during the 2007-08 school year to 7.2% in the 2010-11 school year. Clearly, the Department must continue and enhance its targeted assistance efforts for this subgroup.

In response to this need, the Department continues to provide targeted professional development to ELL teachers in providing Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) programs to LEP
students. Furthermore, to increase the availability of these professional development programs, ESE has developed a summer “Train the Trainer” program in which educators can apply to received professional development in providing one or more of the different category trainings of the SEI program within their own district. This work supports the capacity of districts to provide ongoing, in-house trainings in the four Categories of SEI PD, greatly increasing the ability of ELL teachers to meet the needs of all of their students.

For information on specific initiatives targeted toward ESL teachers, please refer to the “Support Teachers in Earning ESL or Special Education Licensure” and “Target Initiatives for ESL and Special Education Teachers” strategies under Requirement 6.

The Department uses state and federal Title I and III funds for these initiatives.

Special Education Teachers
The Department continues to offer several special education initiatives to assist with the recruitment, preparation, professional development and retention of highly qualified and effective special education teachers, particularly in high poverty districts and schools that are not meeting AYP in the special education subgroup. These initiatives include distance learning opportunities that are offered at no cost to Massachusetts school districts and educational organizations. The subjects included in these courses range from, “Seclusion and Restraint: The Impact of Federal and State Policy on the Classroom,” to “Connecting Educational Standards to Student Learning Plans,” to “Policy to the Classroom.”

For information on additional initiatives targeted toward Special Education teachers, please refer to the “Support Teachers in Earning ESL or Special Education Licensure,” the “Special Education Improvement Grant,” and the “Target Initiatives for ESL and Special Education Teachers” strategies under Requirement 6.

The Department uses National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) funds and federal Special Education funds for these initiatives.

Math and Science Teachers
The Department recognizes that, particularly within high poverty and non-AYP districts, math and the sciences are content areas of high need. ESE must implement strategies to attract and prepare highly qualified and effective teachers in these areas across the Commonwealth. The Department has addressed this need by splitting the state General Curriculum MTEL into two subtests – one focused on math alone and another focused on multiple subjects. All prospective elementary and special education teachers are required to take and pass the general curriculum MTEL in order to be licensed. The test is also the primary mode through which elementary educators demonstrate subject matter competency. In developing the two general curriculum subtests, the Department is taking another step toward ensuring that all teachers are well prepared to teach students in these content areas.
The Department uses both federal Title IIA State Activities funds and funds generated from testing fees for this initiative.

In addition, ESE continues to fund Mathematics and Science Partnerships between districts not meeting AYP and classified as high poverty, and a science, technology, engineering, and/or mathematics (STEM) department from an institution of higher education. These partnerships are intended to increase the content knowledge and teaching skills of classroom teachers in the STEM areas, and, consequently, increase the academic growth and achievement of students in those areas. In addition, these programs provide greater opportunities for STEM teachers to attain highly qualified status by providing high-quality, rigorous, content-specific professional development in the core content areas.

The Department uses federal Title IIB funds for this initiative.

For more information on additional initiatives targeted toward STEM teachers, please refer to the “Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Fund,” the “STEM Advisory Council,” and the “UTeach” strategies under Requirement 6.

Reading Teachers
Massachusetts currently supports several grant opportunities available to districts and charter schools throughout the state to improve their literacy instruction. Included in these grants is the Massachusetts Early Literacy Intervention Program. This is a state-funded grant program that provides funds to support professional development for Reading Recovery, an early intervention individual tutorial literacy program. In addition, through this grant districts are encouraged to develop collaboratives that support a Reading Recovery regional training site for long-term university-based training of future teacher trainers in Reading Recovery.

The Department also supports K-12 Literacy Professional Development Partnership grants, similar to the Mathematics and Science Partnerships discussed above.

The Department uses state funds for these initiatives.

Foreign Language Teachers
Since 1997, Massachusetts has offered Professional Development Institutes (PDIs) to educators during the summer months. PDIs provide interested educators with free, graduate-level professional development that is designed to increase the content knowledge of participants. PDI providers are selected based on rigor, and priority is given to science classes and then to foreign languages, mathematics, English language arts, and the arts. Participant priority is given to teachers who are in need of becoming highly qualified in specific content areas, with a focus on those teaching in high poverty schools and/or schools that are not making AYP.

The Department uses federal Title IIA funds for these initiatives.

Use of Available ESE Funding to Assist Teachers Who are Not Highly Qualified
As outlined above, the Department uses a variety of funding sources to address the needs of teachers who are not yet highly qualified and to support the development and implementation of the programs, services and technical assistance described above. These funding sources include state funds, federal Title I, IIA, IIB, III funds, federal special education funding, State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, Teacher Incentive Funds, and Race to the Top funds.

Title IIA State Activities Funds are used to provide assistance to school districts and teachers in relation to meeting the licensure and subject matter competency requirements of HQT. This includes using the funding to provide technical and targeted assistance to school districts. Title I funds will assist schools and districts that are not making AYP by providing them with targeted and individualized technical assistance, services and programs for improving student achievement, teacher quality (including professional development for meeting the HQT provision), and school/district-wide improvement efforts.
**Requirement 4: Meeting the HQT Goal by the End of the 2010-2011 School Year and Corrective Action Measures for Those Districts that Fail to Meet This Goal**

By the end of the 2009-2010 school year, 97.3% of core academic classes throughout Massachusetts were taught by highly qualified teachers. Since the 2006-07, this number has increased more than 2 percentile points (see the State-wide Teacher Data included under Requirement 1). Clearly, the programs and assistance outlined the Department’s 2006 State HQT Plan had a positive impact on districts, schools, and educators. Yet, the state is still nearly 3 percentile points from the goal of 100% HQT. As such, ESE has developed the following monitoring plan and corrective action strategies to ensure that districts throughout the states are using their IIA funding appropriately, are reporting their data accurately, and are effectively implementing Department initiatives and strategies to not only support district progress toward the HQT goal but to also increase the number of highly effective educators employed throughout the state.

**ESE Monitoring Plan**

The Department annually monitors district progress toward reaching the goal of 100% HQT through the Teacher Effectiveness and Quality Improvement Plan (TEQIP). In this plan, all districts are required to submit an electronic report to the Department that examines the district’s current HQT status, which is automatically populated with the district’s most recent Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS) data. Districts must then outline their plan for supporting non-HQ teachers in becoming HQ, including how Title IIA and Title IA funds will be used to support this plan, as well as their plan for ensuring the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers to all students, particularly to high poverty and minority students throughout the district. The TEQIP is released to districts in June and typically has a completion deadline in mid-August; the approval of a district’s TEQIP is a required prerequisite for districts to receive their Title IIA funds. *(For more information on the TEQIP report, please see the Teacher Effectiveness and Quality Improvement Plan section of the Massachusetts State HQT Plan.)*

In previous years, the TEQIP was automatically populated with HQT data from a district’s October EPIMS reporting. Since the report was collected at the end of the school year and based only on a snapshot of the district personnel data, many districts used the report to explain how they had successfully improved the HQT status of their teachers during the school year. With the addition of a second EPIMS collection in the 2010-11 school year (one in October and another in June), the HQT specialists reviewing TEQIPs will have a much more comprehensive view of district data. As such, reviewers will be able to assess quickly whether or not districts were able to successfully utilize Title IIA funds for professional development, recruitment, retention, or other initiatives in order meet the 100% HQT goal. Those districts for which their HQT percentage remained the same or decreased between the October and June EPIMS reporting will receive additional assistance and monitoring.
ESE also will initiate a more comprehensive monitoring process in order to ensure that districts are in compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The Title IIA program review, in conjunction with other state and federal program reviews, aims to ensure that all educators throughout the Commonwealth are provided with the support and resources needed to become highly qualified and effective. These reviews will be conducted by HQT Specialists and will be both desk-based audits and on-site reviews. The purpose of NCLB Monitoring is to verify that all grantees are meeting federal requirements, including HQT requirements, and to provide districts with additional assistance in their greatest areas of need. The collaboration between the state and each district allows for the identification of effective delivery models, best practices, and technical assistance needs.

Corrective Actions for Districts that Fail to Meet HQT and AYP Goals

ESE will continue to employ the following accountability measures to ensure that all schools and districts are meeting their AYP goals and the HQT goals of 100%:

- All districts with an HQT percentage less than 100% must submit an updated Teacher Effectiveness and Quality Improvement Plan (TEQIP). This TEQIP must be approved by an ESE HQT specialist before a district can receive Title IIA funds.

- Districts with an HQT percentage of less than 100% will be required to target a reasonable portion of their Title IIA funds toward achieving 100% HQT. (Such districts will need to allocate funding to meet the HQT goal before they can resume applying Title IIA money to other eligible activities, such as “class size reduction.”) Through the review process, the Department’s HQT Specialists will work closely with these districts to provide targeted technical assistance regarding the issues that the district and schools are having in making progress toward the HQT goal and what might be the most appropriate and effective use of Title IIA funds for developing strategies to address these issues.

- Districts that fail to reach 100% HQT and fail to meet AYP for three consecutive years must enter into a funding agreement with the Department under the accountability requirements of §2141(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The 2141(c) Funding Agreements were first enforced during Fiscal Year 11 (FY11) as it was the first year the Department had collected three consecutive years of HQT data from schools and districts. ESE’s HQT Specialists collaborated with 168 districts to develop funding agreements that meet the following assurances:

- The Professional Development Needs Assessment was developed with the involvement of teachers and principals and meets the requirements of §2141(c).

- The Fiscal Year 11 (FY 11) Title II, Part A funding is targeted to assist the district in meeting AYP and the 100% Highly Qualified Teacher requirements. The funding is used to enable teachers to:
Revised State Plan for Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal

- Obtain HQT status in all core academic classes taught;

- Improve student achievement in the classroom, particularly in areas in which the district is not meeting AYP; and

- Teach and address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with disabilities, students with special learning needs (including students who are gifted and talented), and students with limited English proficiency.

- The district’s FY11 Title I, Part A funding will not be used to pay for any new paraprofessionals (unless the district could claim an exemption to this requirement).

In addition, in collaborating to develop the agreements, HQT Specialists worked with districts and schools to develop professional development, recruitment, and retention strategies that would help them meet and maintain their HQT and equitable distribution goals.
Requirement 5: Massachusetts Limitation of HOUSSE Procedures

Through June 2007, the Department allowed the use of the HOUSSE option for teachers in specific shortage areas, Special Education and English as a Second Language (ESL), and teachers licensed before 1999. After June 2007, the HOUSSE option was eliminated for all teachers except Special Education teachers and “veteran” ESL teachers (ESL teachers with at least one year of experience teaching ESL). So long as they are Highly Qualified in language arts, mathematics or science at the time of hire, Special Education and veteran ESL teachers are still able to use the HOUSSE option as a way to demonstrate subject matter competency in the subjects that they teach. The HOUSSE plan provides these teachers with an option for demonstrating subject matter competency in multiple core content areas through one avenue instead of taking multiple MTEL exams or obtaining multiple graduate degrees. The HOUSSE option is no longer available or viable for new teachers as they are required to take the appropriate MTEL exam to obtain a MA teaching license.
Requirement 6: Massachusetts Equity Plan

Ensuring that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children.

Preface
The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) has developed this Equity Plan, as required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act, to ensure that poor and minority children throughout the Commonwealth are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.

NOTE: Throughout this plan, the Department references “districts”. By “districts,” ESE is referring to traditional school districts, charter schools, and vocational technical schools.

Plan Components
This Plan presents ESE’s current and future initiatives for meeting our equity goals. These initiatives all fall within the following eight areas, important components of a State Equity Plan as determined by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). These areas include:

- Data and Reporting Systems – Teacher data and reporting systems ESE has developed or will develop to identify and correct inequities in the distribution of quality teachers in high-poverty/high-minority schools vs. low-poverty/low-minority schools.
- Teacher Preparation – Initiatives ESE has developed or will develop in order to build a pipeline of prospective teachers for high-poverty, low-performing schools.
- Out-of-Field Teaching – Current strategies and ESE plans for reducing the incidence of out-of-field teaching (particularly in mathematics, science, special education, and bilingual education/English as a Second Language) in high-poverty, low-performing schools.
- Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers – Initiatives ESE has developed or will develop in order to build a critical mass of qualified, experienced teachers who are willing to work in hard-to-staff schools.
- Professional Development – ESE plans for strengthening the skills, knowledge, and qualifications of teachers already working in high-poverty, low-performing schools.
- Special Knowledge and Skills – ESE strategies for ensuring that teachers have the specialized knowledge and skills they need to be effective with the populations of students typically served in high-poverty, low-performing schools (including Native American students, English language learners, and other students at risk).
- Working Conditions – ESE initiatives for improving the conditions in hard-to-staff schools that contribute to excessively high rates of teacher turnover.
• Policy Coherence – ESE plans for improving internal processes or revising state policies that may inadvertently contribute to local staffing inequities.

In addition to implementing and maintaining strategies in each of the areas listed above, the Department will support this equity plan by:

• Working with district leaders to highlight the equitable distribution of teachers as one of the Department’s priority goals. ESE will work with the Urban Superintendents Network, the Educational Personnel Advisory Council (EPAC), the Massachusetts Association of School Personnel Administrators (MASPA), the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS) and the two Principals’ Associations to clearly communicate the Department’s priority goal of equitable distribution of teachers. Some districts continue to use their collective bargaining agreement negotiations to resolve attracting highly qualified candidates for shortage area positions and in hard to staff schools. The Department will continue promoting such promising practices statewide.

• Providing Targeted Assistance to High Need Districts and Schools. Through the Department’s District and School Accountability System, ESE has developed a “Framework for District Accountability and Assistance” in order to define the process through which the Department will work directly with districts and schools to identify and address inequitable distribution of teachers as part of the improvement process. Under this framework, ESE will continue to provide targeted assistance to districts at Levels 3, 4, and 5\(^2\) in order to produce sustainable improvement.

• Creating a new, statewide Educator Evaluation Framework. On May 25, 2010, the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education directed the Commissioner to establish a Task Force on the Evaluation of Teachers and Administrators. The purpose of the task force was to review the Board’s Regulations on Evaluation of Teachers and Administrators (603 CMR 35.00), including the Principles of Effective Teaching and Principles of Effective Administrative Leadership, and recommend a revised set of regulations and principles (“evaluation framework”) by March, 2011.

The task force convened in August, 2010 and consisted of practicing classroom teachers and administrators, representatives of subject matter associations, special educators and special education administrators, higher education representatives,

---

\(^2\) The five levels of schools, Levels 1 through 5, were defined in the Department’s Framework for District Accountability and Assistance. Under that plan, Level 3 districts are those with one or more schools among the lowest-performing 20%, Level 4 districts are identified through a district review and have one or more schools among the lowest-performing and least improving 2%, and Level 5 districts are districts or schools declared by the Board as requiring “Joint District-ESE Governance.”
vocational educators, a student representative, business representatives, and several at-large members with expertise in areas relevant to performance management, psychometrics, economics and statistics. On March 22, 2011 the final task force report was presented to the Board.

The outcome of the Task Force on Evaluation of Teachers and Administrators was a new evaluation framework that includes multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement as a significant factor in an educator’s evaluation and provides adequate feedback to educators in order to promote continuous improvement. The Department is currently developing a plan for implementing the new evaluation framework during the 2011-2012 school year with Level 4 districts, including a model evaluation system; the system will then be rolled out to all Race to the Top districts during the 2012-2013 school year and all Commonwealth districts in 2013-2014. The implementation of the new evaluation system will help to ensure that all schools and districts throughout the Commonwealth are employing more consistent and effective evaluation practices. In addition, the new evaluation tools will provide ESE with important feedback regarding the distribution of highly qualified and effective educators to schools and districts with the highest number of low income and minority students.

Current Inequities in Teacher Assignment
The Department has successfully implemented the Educator Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS), a formal data collection process for acquiring educator-level data, including demographics, teaching assignment and HQT designation. EPIMS was first implemented in October 2007 and has allowed for annual data collection from districts and schools during that past three school years. The 2010-2011 school year, marks the first year of biannual data collection through EPIMS, requiring that districts submit data in October and again in June. Through EPIMS, the Department has been able to track accurately the distribution of highly qualified teachers throughout the Commonwealth and use that data to identify high need areas, evaluate educational practices and programs, and assist districts in their recruiting efforts.

The Department has used the EPIMS data collected in the 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 school years to understand the current distribution of teachers who have not met the HQ requirements throughout the state. In addition, the Department has compared the EPIMS data to district and school level AYP data and high poverty designations in order to assess any trends in the schools and/or districts having difficulty achieving 100% HQT. (For an analysis of collected data, please refer to Requirement 1 of the State’s Revised HQT Plan.)

Based on this data, the Department has determined that although high poverty districts and schools have made great gains in their HQ status over the past three years, they continue to have a more difficulties recruiting HQ teachers, helping existing teachers become HQ, and retaining teachers that are already HQ. In addition, high poverty elementary schools maintain a
higher HQT percentage than secondary schools, although their gains over the past three years have not been as significant as those in secondary schools. Although the gap in HQT percentage between high poverty and low poverty schools decreased for elementary, middle and secondary schools, the gap at the elementary levels remains significantly lower (at about 1%) than at the middle (about 3%) or secondary (about 4%) levels.

The average percentage of HQT in 2009-10 for schools not making AYP was 97.2%, an increase of 1.7% since the 2007-08 school year. There are currently 1140 schools identified as not making AYP. Currently, 87% of schools designated as high-poverty are also schools that are not making AYP, and 47% of this sub-group have HQT percentages at 100%. In contrast, 59% of schools receiving an AYP determination currently have HQT percentages of 100%. Although gains have been made toward ensuring that all schools, regardless of AYP status, are meeting the 100% HQT goal (see the School-Level Teacher Data analysis under Requirement 1), clearly the Department needs to continue developing and supporting strategies that support the equitable distribution of HQ teachers. This plan outlines those strategies.

Implementation and Monitoring of Equity Plan and District Efforts

As the Department develops more sophisticated and value-added data systems, it will amend this equity plan accordingly to reflect updates to policies, programs and initiatives. The biannual EPIMS data collection will provide the Department with more timely data for determining those schools and districts that may need additional support and/or monitoring with relation to their equitable distribution of teachers. Since EPIMS has provided annual information on individual teachers and the assignment of those teachers across the state, it has enabled the Department to monitor how schools and districts are (or are not) equitably distributing teachers as well as trends that may be occurring across schools, districts and the state as a whole. With the implementation of a biannual data collection through EPIMS, ESE will more readily obtain the information it needs to understand where issues of distribution are occurring.

Coupled with EPIMS, the Department will continue to monitor the issue of equitable distribution of teachers at the local level through the collection of an Equitable Distribution Plan (EDP). Through this plan, districts are required to analyze the current distribution of non-HQ teachers, plan strategies for ensuring the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers within their schools and throughout the district, and describe how they will measure the effectiveness of these strategies. Previously, the EDP was a requirement of the Teacher Effectiveness and Quality Improvement Plan (TEQIP). Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, the EDP will become part of each district’s Title IIA Needs Assessment process, and the plan will require that districts speak to how each activity or strategy funded through Title IIA will help maintain or improve the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers throughout the district. The EDP will continue to be reviewed in conjunction with district HQT reporting to assess district progress toward the HQT goal and determine any additional technical assistance that may be necessary.
Finally, the Department will coordinate the review of those schools and districts that are flagged as having problems or concerning trends related to the distribution of teachers through their EPIMS and TEQIP reporting. These reviews will use some of the existing monitoring and outreach mechanisms that the Department has in place, including the monitoring plan outlined in this Revised State HQT Plan and the District and School Accountability process.
Strategies
Outlined below are current and developing strategies the Department is using to address the equitable distribution of teachers across the Commonwealth. The programs, policies and overall strategies included in the plan have been selected from those practices for which there is evidence (or reasonable certainty) that they have or will impact positively the eight components of the State Equity Plan and, as a result, the equitable distribution of teachers.

1. Data and Reporting Systems
The Department currently utilizes the Educator Personnel Information Management Systems (EPIMS) as a means to collect educator data at the district and school levels. EPIMS replaced the previous system used by ESE, the District and School Staffing Report (DSSR), which collected staff information on the aggregate. In addition to providing more accurate and specific data than previously provided through DSSR, the data collected through EPIMS is also linked to ESE’s licensure data, currently maintained through the Educator Licensure and Recruitment (ELAR) database.

Using EPIMS, the Department is able to collect individual data and aggregate the data in a variety of ways that are consistent across all districts. It provides the educator-level data needed for the micro-analysis of individual teachers, including demographics, licensure, employment status, education, work assignment, and HQT status (including how the individual has demonstrated subject matter competency). The collection of teacher data through EPIMS also is coordinated with the collection of student data through the Student Information Management System (SIMS), allowing ESE to link the student data to the teacher data.

For additional information about EPIMS please refer to the most current EPIMS-Frequently Asked Questions document as well as the data handbook on ESE’s website.

Although EPIMS reporting has greatly enhanced the process for collecting HQT data, the Department continues to work on further developing the teacher data and reporting systems needed to efficiently identify inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers so that we can work more effectively to correct those inequalities. In an effort to enhance these data and reporting systems, the Department has implemented the following programs:

- Biannual EPIMS reporting. During the 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 school years, EPIMS data was collected annually in October, providing a snapshot of district HQT status and needs. Although the annual EPIMS reporting provided an important year-to-year status update on districts and their personnel, the data did not capture any changes in the HQ status of teachers during the school year.
Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, EPIMS data will be collected biannually, first in October and again in June. The June collection will represent a district’s year’s worth of cumulative data, and will present a more current and accurate representation of a district’s HQT status.

- **District Analysis and Review Tool (DART).** The goal of the District Analysis and Review Tool (DART) is to turn the Department's vast amount of data into valuable, easily consumable information. The DART offers a snapshot of district and school performance, allowing users to track easily select data elements over time and make sound, meaningful comparisons to the state or to "comparable" organizations. The data elements are linked to a broader strategic framework defining the characteristics of effective educational organizations and cover a broad range of district and school interests including demographic, assessment, student support, educator, financial, and achievement gap data. ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/dart/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/dart/))

- **Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF).** The Department received a 6 million dollar State Longitudinal Data Systems grant from the US Department of Education. Part of this grant will be used to introduce new technology to improve the data collection process at the district level. ESE is currently integrating the School Interoperability Framework into already existing data collection systems and provide a competitive grant opportunity for local school districts to implement SIF technology within their own data systems.

In addition, the Department is offering a grant opportunity to districts participating in Race to the Top (RTTT) to implement a vertical Schools Interoperability Framework structure. The grant program provides supplemental funding for RTTT districts to aid in the building of the SIF structure, which supports the reporting of both student and staffing data to the Department's data collection systems in near-real time. ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sif/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/sif/))

- **Education Data Warehouse.** In 2006, Massachusetts allocated $5.2 million for the purchase of an enterprise education data warehouse with unlimited licenses for educators, policy leaders, parents and students to access and analyze a wide range of data. The purpose of the warehouse is to allow educators at every level to understand the relationships between educator recruitment, preparation, licensure, hiring, class assignments, HQT status and student performance, and to use this information to identify best practices, the impact of investments, and where improvements are most needed.

The Education Data Warehouse (EDW) launched and has become a collaborative effort between ESE and local school districts to centralize K-12 educational performance data into one state coordinated data repository. The EDW is free and available on the ESE website to authorized users.
The warehouse is already populated with SIMS and MCAS data for every district in the state and will soon contain the EPIMS data for all districts as well. The SIMS and MCAS data included in the report moves with students from district to district, and there are over 30 reports available for comparing data between schools and districts to state totals. The EDW allows districts to load their own local data and write their own reports.

EPIMS and the EDW provide the state, districts, and schools with the tools needed to employ more data-driven decision making, including the use of “growth models” in the development of educator quality policy and programming.

- **Transform State Data Systems.** As part of the Race to the Top grant, the Department initiated several projects focused on transforming state data systems to deliver comprehensive, accessible, actionable, and timely data to all educators and key stakeholders. Through these projects, districts, schools, and educators will be able to use data in new and innovative ways without wasting scarce monetary and human resources. Included in these projects are the following initiatives:
  ~ Expanding the capacity of current data systems to serve 80,000 users (10 times the current number of Educator Data Warehouse (EDW) users)
  ~ Integrating discipline, financial, and comparison data into the EDW
  ~ Automating updates made in the Educator Licensure and Recruitment (ELAR) system with the Department data systems
  ~ Expanding educator training on data use to 25,000 new users
2. **Teacher Preparation**

Given critical shortages in high need areas, Massachusetts seeks to expand the supply of effective educators through intensive teacher and administrator recruitment and preparation initiatives aimed at increasing the number, cultural competence, and diversity of academically talented candidates entering teaching, particularly those specializing in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), special education, English language learners, and educational leadership. ESE will continue to expand the pool of these candidates and to build and strengthen the educator pipeline of prospective teachers for all teaching assignments and leadership positions across the state, but particularly for our students in most need – those in high-poverty/low-performing schools – through investment in a limited number of highly leveraged, research-based initiatives.

Since the inception of the state’s 2006 Equity Plan, the Department has been committed to the following policies, programs, and initiatives:

- **Provide Alternate Routes to State Licensure.** Massachusetts licensure regulations allow for multiple alternative routes to initial licensure. The alternative routes are offered by district-based models, the SEA, higher education institutions, professional associations, and other non-profit organizations, and are approved against the same program approval standards cited above. Unlike many states, candidates in alternative route programs receive the same initial license as those completing traditional preparation programs. Several alternative routes provide both a residency-style experience for candidates and a streamlined path to licensure. Multiple alternative routes to administrative licensure, such as the Panel Review—a state-run portfolio-based process for career changers—and a 300-hour district-based Administrative Apprenticeship Internship route—completed under the supervision of a mentor—also exist. In addition, programs that provide district-based licensure for aspiring principals, novice principals, and other school-based administrators, allow for expedited training and placement of administrators in high-need schools. These routes ensure high and consistent standards statewide, while allowing for local flexibility in the recruitment and preparation of teachers and administrators.

- **Promote Alternative Preparation Programs.** Twenty nine of the Commonwealth’s school districts, charter schools, educational collaboratives, private training providers, and professional associations have developed and maintain alternative preparation programs (with additional approvals pending). The Department encourages districts and other providers who collaborate with districts that have hard-to-staff schools and subject areas to create “grow your own” programs. These programs give districts the opportunity to invest in teachers from the beginning of their careers, and it provides teachers with an opportunity to participate in on-the-job-learning. These programs are often popular with career changers, given that candidates can meet the majority of their
requirements while working as a full time teacher. The number of teachers and leaders prepared through alternative programs has grown steadily in recent years.

- **Continue to use the Success Factors Study.** The “Success Factors Study” is a state sponsored research project that evaluates the alternative preparation programs across the state. The Department will continue to use the information gathered through this study to identify successful models, challenges encountered by these programs, and strengths and weaknesses of the programs as a means of informing related policies. The Department also will use the lessons learned by those existing programs to target future technical assistance and marketing for prospective programs in high poverty, low performing districts and schools.

- **Continue the Incentive Program for Aspiring Teachers Tuition Waiver.** The Incentive Program for Aspiring Teachers, administered by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, provides tuition support to qualified students who, after enrolling in college and earning a minimum 3.0 grade point average, decide to enter a certification program in a field with demonstrated teacher shortages. Students who participate in the program must commit to teaching for two years in a public school in the Commonwealth, upon successful completion of a bachelor’s degree.

- **Continue the Paraprofessional Teacher Preparation Grant Program.** The purpose of the Paraprofessional Teacher Preparation Grant Program is to provide financial assistance to Massachusetts residents who are currently employed as paraprofessionals in Massachusetts public schools, but wish to become licensed as full-time teachers. This grant is designed to help reduce financial barriers that often become obstacles for many paraprofessionals in attaining higher education. The program also is an attempt to help address the Commonwealth's current teacher shortage. This program is administered by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education. ESE continues to inform high need schools and districts of this opportunity so that they may share this information with eligible paraprofessionals.

- **Expand the Number of High-Quality Pathways for Potential Educators.** At present, Massachusetts has several strong initiatives in place and a competitive RFP process to source regional and statewide initiatives aligned with these strategies. Through the state’s regional **readiness centers**, ESE will connect with P-16 education leadership and local communities, analyze educator workforce data, and identify the highest priority gaps in each region of the state. Additionally, Massachusetts will use RTTT funds to expand the number of high-quality pathways for potential teachers and administrators via targeted initiatives, including the following: a) pre-collegiate recruitment initiatives; b) pathways for students in community colleges, including articulation agreements between two- and four-year colleges; c) initiatives for school paraprofessionals and teacher aides in SPED and ELL settings; d) outreach to college students not currently on the path to teaching; e) programs to attract midcareer candidates into teaching; and f)
support for a limited number of pilot programs designed to build the pipeline for educators in critical shortage areas and create model practice-based programs. ESE will give preference to initiatives that recruit, prepare, and place academically talented and diverse candidates in cohorts via practice-based and residency models; provide extended induction support, including increased collaboration between districts and preparation programs during the first two years of a teacher’s placement; emphasize content and pedagogical knowledge; and utilize community-based financial and nonmonetary incentives to attract and retain candidates.

- **Continue the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math Fund (STEM Pipeline Fund).** The purposes of the STEM Pipeline Fund are to: 1) increase the number of Massachusetts students who participate in programs that support careers in fields related to mathematics, science, technology, and engineering; (2) increase the number of qualified mathematics, technology, engineering and science teachers in the Commonwealth; and 3) improve the mathematics, technology, engineering and science educational offerings available in public and private schools. Through this fund, the Department of Higher Education developed a series of regional STEM networks designed to connect districts, higher education, and industry in order to increase student interest in STEM careers, add to the pool of qualified STEM teachers, and improve the quality of STEM offerings. The fund is managed by the Robert H. Goddard Council, a group comprised of high-level representatives from industry, state government, and K–12 and higher education.

- **Continue the STEM Advisory Council.** In October 2009, Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick established a STEM Advisory Council to serve as a central advisory body, including public and private sector stakeholders, to increase student interest in and preparation for careers in STEM fields. This Council is leveraging the seven regional PreK–16 STEM networks (funded through the [STEM Pipeline Fund](#)) and the STEM-focused Greater Boston Readiness Center to coordinate and enhance the availability of STEM professional development and instructional services to educators.

- **Implement a UTeach program.** UTeach began at the University of Texas at Austin in 1997 as a way to increase the number of STEM teachers through collaboration between the School of Education and School of Arts and Sciences. ESE wrote UTeach into its Round 2 RTTT application as a way to increase the number of STEM (which are critical shortage areas) teachers entering and staying in the field. The State produces a low number of STEM teachers annually through its existing programs, and the UTeach model has proven to be a successful way to increase the quantity and quality of STEM teaching candidates. Under this project, ESE will fund one UTeach site in order to increase the number of highly qualified and effective STEM educators in the field.
3. Out-of-Field Teaching

To aid in the equitable distribution of Highly Qualified (HQ) and effective teachers across the state, ESE launched initiatives and supports to ensure that districts assign teachers to teach subjects that match their training and education. This is especially relevant to specific shortage areas that are most likely to be taught by unlicensed and untrained teachers, such as teachers of special education, mathematics and English language learners. (For additional information on staffing at the district level, see the 2010 District and School NCLB Report Cards on ESE’s public School and District Profiles website.)

The Department has and will continue to implement policies that will help reduce the incidence of out-of-field teaching (particularly in mathematics, special education, and bilingual education/English as a Second Language) in high-poverty, low-performing schools.

Below are some of those policies:

- **Support Teachers in Earning ESL or Special Education Licensure.** The Massachusetts Licensure Academy project is designed to increase the numbers of licensed educators teaching students who are English language learners (ELLs) or students with moderate disabilities (SwDs) by providing multiple routes to licensure at the Prek-8 and 5-12 grade levels. Using the online distance learning model provided through the Department’s Massachusetts Online Network for Educators (MassONE), the project will offer free, online, graduate level courses designed to assist educators who are teaching ELLs or SwDs and working on waivers to earn a Preliminary, Initial, or Professional English as a Second Language (ESL) license or a Moderate Disabilities license.

- **Target Technical Assistance.** Each year, Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) monitoring for all Massachusetts public school districts is conducted through the Teacher Effectiveness & Quality Improvement Plans (TEQIPs). *(For more information on the TEQIP, please refer to the “District Action Steps” section of Requirement 2.*) Through the review of these plans, ESE’s Teacher Quality Team provides in-depth technical assistance to districts regarding teacher assignment, licensure and HQT requirements. This assistance often focuses on recommendations, sharing best practices, and brainstorming how to decrease the incidence of out-of-field teaching.

- **Continue the Massachusetts Math and Science Partnership (MMSP) Program.** The purpose of the MMSP program is to improve student achievement in mathematics, science, technology and engineering through intensive, high-quality professional development activities that focus on deepening teachers’ content knowledge. MMSP partnerships must include a high need school district and a mathematics, science, or engineering department from an institution of higher education. One of the goals of this program is to increase the number of STEM teachers in the partner school districts who are licensed in the subject area(s) and grade level(s) they teach – thus giving them...
an opportunity to become licensed in the math or science area(s) they are currently teaching out-of-field.

- **Target Audits of Teacher Licensure Waivers.** Currently, ESE’s Office of Licensure conducts random, monthly audits of waivers requested and granted to a district. In conducting the audits, the Licensure staff prints out a report of the first year waivers granted during the current month and selects approximately 5% of the districts included in the report at random for an audit. The Office is now looking to transform the waiver auditing process from a random district audit to a target audit of specific schools. The benefits to this new process are twofold: by focusing audits on individual schools rather than the district as a whole, ESE will focus on schools within districts that are in need of more assistance in increasing their licensed and highly qualified staff, and promote the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers throughout the district.

- **Develop a Status of the Educator Workforce report.** In order to monitor key supply, demand, and distribution trends by district, school, student characteristics, and other priority indicators, Massachusetts has developed a report on key issues in educator supply and demand and the distribution of qualified and effective educators by district, school and preparation pathway. The current report uses proxies for teacher and leader effectiveness (for example, percentage highly qualified teachers, percentage of teachers on waivers, and percentage of teachers with less than three years of experience), and provide the state with an initial picture of trends in the educator workforce. The first report will be published in the summer of 2011 and the report will be updated biennially.
4. Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers

In recent years, Massachusetts has invested resources to gather data along the career continuum in order to identify, monitor, and evaluate areas of educator shortage. ESE regularly collects data on the educator pipeline from the state’s Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS), Educator Licensure and Recruitment system (ELAR), Title I and state annual reporting data, ESE’s annual survey of projected program completers, Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) reporting, and waiver data. Using this information, the Department will design and implement a model to attract highly effective educators, provide them with the tools and training they need to succeed, and retain them in schools in which they are most needed.

In total, ESE expects to increase the statewide supply of effective teachers and administrators in high priority areas by at least 650 by 2013-2014.

Below are some of the programs, initiatives, and policies that will enable the Department to achieve this goal:

- **Conduct a Diversity Summit.** In order to identify issues and action steps needed to increase the effectiveness, diversity, and cultural competence of the current and future workforce and to link these issues explicitly to closing statewide achievement gaps, ESE plans to hold its first statewide diversity summit in 2011. The summit will be held annually and will focus on the recruitment and retention of a diverse and culturally proficient educator workforce. The expected result of the summit is the production of specific actionable recommendations to guide state, district and higher education efforts, to inform the state’s equity plan and to strengthen the diversity and cultural proficiency of Massachusetts educators.

- **Implement new Mentor Training Program.** ESE is developing a hybrid, online mentor training program to provide teachers with adequate support throughout their first years of teaching. The online mentoring program is an opportunity to increase significantly the pool of effectively trained mentors and, consequently, develop highly effective teaching practices in a greater number of new teachers than ever before. The program will help to lower the current attrition rates of new teachers, particularly in schools and districts serving low performing and/or high needs student populations.

- **Pilot new Human Resources Systems and Tools.** The HR pilot project is designed to identify and promote the most efficient, effective, and supportive school and district HR systems throughout the Commonwealth. The project was developed through a partnership between the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) and the Working Group for Educator Excellence (WGEE), and through this project, participating districts will engage in comprehensive reform of personnel policies for teachers and school leaders, from training, to induction, to retention. This work draws on research and national best practices for developing the most effective HR re-design
strategies for improving educator performance and for recognizing model HR systems that can be replicated elsewhere.

- **Develop a Specialized Corps of Turnaround Teacher and Leader Teams.** In November 2009, ESE engaged an initial group of providers, experts, funders, and Level 4\(^3\) district leaders to outline the major components of the new model to develop teachers and leaders who will serve to turn around the persistently lowest achieving schools in the state. In recruiting a cadre of turnaround teachers, the Department will draw from both experienced teachers with proven success in the classroom as well as new teachers, with experienced teachers providing additional instructional leadership. Experienced teachers will receive, at a minimum, incentives (e.g., loan forgiveness, career ladder opportunities, compensation) to work in persistently low-achieving schools, up to six months of intense training and support, ongoing mentoring and interaction with a cohort, and opportunities for close collaboration with turnaround leaders.

- **Collaborate with Recruiting and Retaining Educators Subcommittee.** As part of Governor Patrick’s Commonwealth Readiness Project, the Recruiting and Retaining Educators Subcommittee used retirement projections, teacher waiver data, and data from the state’s EPIMS reporting to formulate a set of recommendations, including expanded recruitment efforts and incentives to teach in hard-to-staff schools and in high need subjects. These recommendations also led to the reorganization of educator policy, preparation, licensure, and leadership into a cohesive center at the Department in 2008, and helped shape the recommendations for expanding the pool and pipeline of effective teachers.

- **Continue Incentive Pay.** Massachusetts has shown a willingness to experiment with incentives, including differential pay and signing bonuses for STEM teachers, as a direct outgrowth of supply and demand data analysis. The 2008 National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) State Policy Yearbook noted that Massachusetts is one of only 17 states meeting all goal components regarding differential pay for teachers in shortage subjects and high need schools (NCTQ 2008).

The Department will continue this work through the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) initiative. TIF is designed to enable districts to attract, support, evaluate, reward and retain effective educators. The initiative focuses on the state’s two largest urban districts—Boston and Springfield—within which are 63% of the lowest-performing Level 4 schools in the state. Attracting and retaining highly effective educators to work in these 21 high needs schools is a key component in a comprehensive approach to turning around the performance of their 13,000 students. Up to 1029 teachers would be eligible

---

\(^3\) A Level 4 school is an “underperforming” school and is both low performing on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) over a four year period (in both English language arts (ELA) and mathematics) and not showing signs of substantial improvement over that time. “Level 4” refers to the placement of those schools in the state’s Framework for District Accountability and Assistance.
for incentives or rewards. If scaled in all the schools in these two districts alone, the project will impact approximately 80,000 students.

- **Expand Leadership Opportunities for Experienced, High-Performing Teachers.** The state will work with ten selected districts to explore four alternative compensation pilots to include performance, knowledge, professional skills, and/or willingness to take on tough assignments in addition to longevity and education attained as the bases for compensation. The state will capture learning and best practices from these four pilots and continuously share them with the regional networks of participating districts. In support of this work, ESE will provide these districts with supplemental RTTT funds to implement individual, team, and school-level incentives tied to multiple measures of effectiveness and to create new teacher leader positions and career pathways tied to the district’s new evaluation system. These new teacher leader positions will be incorporated into the state’s revised performance-based licensure system and career ladder, with the creation of the teacher leader license(s).

- **Continue the STEM Pipeline Fund.** As previously mentioned, the Department of Higher Education administers the STEM Pipeline Fund to: increase the number of Massachusetts students who participate in programs that support careers in fields related to STEM; increase the number of qualified STEM teachers; and improve the STEM educational offerings available in public and private schools.

- **Continue the aMAzing Teachers Campaign.** In 2010, the Department launched the aMAzing Teachers campaign ([www.amazingteachers.org](http://www.amazingteachers.org)) to recruit outstanding educators into 35 of the lowest performing schools (identified as part of Level 4 districts). Together, these nine urban districts educate 18% of the Commonwealth’s students, but a disproportionate share of the most undeserved students, including: 43% of students of color; 41% of student living in poverty; 60% of English language learners; and 21% of students with disabilities. This initiative directly addresses the need to increase educator effectiveness in order to close persistent achievement gaps in student performance by enabling these high-need districts to attract effective educators.

- **Expand Statewide Recruitment.** Massachusetts is currently facing shortages in many critical areas of education, including school administrators and teachers of STEM, special education, English Language Learners (ELL), and foreign language. In 2002, ESE launched the Gateway for Educators in Massachusetts (GEM), an interactive tool available to prospective and current educators interested in exploring the requirements, opportunities, and incentives available with different educational careers. The GEM tool was linked to the Massachusetts Educators Career Center (MECC), a Massachusetts based job search engine available to schools, districts, and candidates throughout the state. Both of these online tools were designed to enhance recruitment efforts throughout the state; however, neither was designed to focus specifically on recruiting educators into hard-to-staff positions. Despite this work, great inequities in the ability to
Recruit highly qualified and effective teachers still exist throughout the state as wealthier districts have the resources that poorer districts often lack.

The focus of this project is to streamline three recruitment programs (GEM, MECC, and aMAzing Teachers) into one coherent and easy-to-use recruitment tool that has the flexibility to meet the staffing needs of all schools and districts throughout the state. In addition, this project will initiate a comprehensive and sustainable marketing campaign for promoting the tool to all potential users in the field.

- **Promote National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification.** ESE encourages individuals to participate in the professional growth experience offered by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process. This process affords participants an opportunity to reflect upon their practice. The Department includes this certification as a means for meeting one of the requirements for the Professional teaching license in Massachusetts and administers application subsidy funds. For more information, please visit: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/recognition/nbpts.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/recognition/nbpts.html).

- **Continue Teacher Recognition Programs.** While all classroom teachers should be recognized on a daily basis, the ESE annually honors exemplary educators through various recognition programs. These programs include the Massachusetts Teacher of the Year and the Christa McAuliffe Fellowship, and they serve as strong incentives for retaining the most highly qualified and effective educators. For more information, please visit [http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/recognition/default.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/recognition/default.html).
5. **Professional Development**

ESE has a historical commitment to encouraging and supporting the professional development (PD) and growth of educators in the field by providing high quality professional development opportunities for Massachusetts educators, and supporting implementation of professional learning. The Department will continue to support programs and initiatives that strengthen the skills, knowledge, and qualifications of teachers already working in high-poverty, low-performing schools.

Moreover, foundational to our RTTT proposal are ambitious plans to overhaul the state’s PD system which will include new statewide initiatives, in addition to projects the state has already been supporting. These projects and initiatives include the following:

- **Enhance the Statewide PD System.** Massachusetts aims to ensure that every educator has access to effective professional support and development opportunities aligned with the state’s reform agenda. The system will provide supports to drive statewide implementation of the PreK–12 teaching and learning system, including the model curriculum and unified assessment system; close the achievement gap in all seven content areas through focused investment in educator content knowledge (particularly adolescent literacy and STEM subjects) and five instructional strategies (using student data to make decisions, “backwards design” of curriculum, universal design, English as a second language, and cultural competence); and reinforce improvements to district evaluation models and the state’s licensure system. Implementation support will occur through the following six channels: (1) free online modules and videos available through the Digital Library; (2) statewide and regional meetings to launch new products and services; (3) regional networks to build leadership capacity at the LEA and school levels; (4) intensive professional development institutes; (5) regional training to support use of ESE-developed tools and resources; and (6) job-embedded professional development through Professional Learning Communities.

In recent years, Massachusetts has built the foundation for this investment. This foundation includes state regulation requiring induction programs for new teachers and completion of Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs) as part of license renewal. The state also has developed high quality courses and institutes in several high need areas critical to closing the achievement gap (including adolescent literacy and STEM, ELL, and cultural competence). To distribute this content, ESE has built out several delivery channels, including District School and Accountability Centers (DSACs), statewide regional readiness centers, relationships with strong public and private vendors, online and hybrid (face-to-face and online) versions of several institutes and courses, and ESE-convened networks of urban leaders focused on literacy and STEM.

- **Create a Professional Development Delivery System.** This project will address the need for a coordinated delivery system for state-sponsored professional development across the range of units, projects, and purposes in a way that ensures attention to high priority initiatives, including increasing the number of high quality educators, school and
district turnaround, providing high quality curriculum, instruction and assessment, and using data effectively. From the perspective of the field, this project is meant to provide a systematic process by which educators and district personnel can easily find, access, and engage in state-sponsored professional development that relates.

- **Develop a Professional Development Quality Assurance System.** This project will address the need for quality professional development offerings across the state, both those offered by organizations, districts and the state, by providing a process to approve, review and improve the quality of professional development providers to assure high-quality, high-impact learning experiences for educators. Specifically, this initiative will: (1) develop performance criteria for professional development providers, aligned to standards for professional development, by 2012; (2) establish and put into operation a system to approve and periodically review professional development providers by specific areas of expertise by 2014; (3) publish a preferred professional development provider list, by specific areas of expertise, that identifies high-quality providers by 2014; and (4) ensure that 100% of professional development providers engaged through DSACs, Readiness Centers, Professional Development Institutes, and ESE grant-funded professional development will be aligned to standards for professional development and criteria for providers by 2014.

- **Continue to use the District and School Accountability Centers (DSACs).** ESE has established six regional DSACs to help districts and their schools strategically access and use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. In collaboration with partner organizations, DSACs use a regional approach that leverages the knowledge, skills and expertise of local educators to address shared needs through an emphasis on expanding district and school capacity for sustained improvement. For more information about DSACs, please visit: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/regional](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/regional).

- **Continue the Regional Readiness Centers.** These multipurpose and collaborative centers are another mode of delivery that the state has invested in, and they are focused on improving the quality of teaching both across the education continuum and across Massachusetts. These Readiness Centers serve as hubs for collaboration among local, regional, and state education stakeholders and deliver coherent professional development and instructional services to early education and out-of-school time programs, schools, districts, and communities. The MA Executive Office of Education established six Readiness Centers in October 2009, managed and operated by a regional consortia of partners that include public and private institutions of higher education, school districts, early education and out-of-school-time providers, educational collaboratives, non-profit organizations, and business and community partners. More information is available on [Readiness Centers](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/regional) site.)

- **Expand Professional Learning Communities.** In collaboration with educators in several large urban districts, ESE also has developed a new suite of tools and resources focused
on data-driven instruction and decision making (“Professional Learning Communities” or “PLCs”) in high need schools. PLCs are a necessary vehicle for effective, sustained implementation of PD and numerous other programs and initiatives targeted at the improvement of teaching and learning. They help ensure that the intended curriculum is the taught curriculum, and that all students have access to a challenging curriculum through a well defined process for systemically building content knowledge and instructional practice. Educators will increase their professional capacity through the use of a PLC toolkit. Project activities under this initiative will include: creation of a toolkit for educators to develop PLCs that embed professional development in regular professional practice (components of the toolkit will include rationale for PLC implementation, development of a theory of action specific to a given PLC, guidance for facilitators, a variety of protocols, and support for participants to reflect upon and evaluate PLC effectiveness); a training process for use of the PLC toolkit that addresses the need to create a shift of emphasis from teachers to learners that will be developed, piloted, revised and made accessible to districts; and the development of guidance for cross-district learning that is designed to develop district capacity in specific domains.

- **Continue the Summer Professional Development Institutes.** In the summer of 2010, ESE hosted its 15th annual statewide Professional Development Institute (PDI) program. The graduate level institutes focus on strengthening teachers’ content knowledge, refining their skills in a wide range of subjects with a particular emphasis on expanding content knowledge in shortage area subjects, teaching strategies for professionals working in programs that serve young students with disabilities, and meeting other dedicated teachers. Educators can find institutes offered in regions located throughout the state, including some offered online. All institutes offer professional development points and optional graduate credit for an additional fee.

- **Continue Title IIA SAHE Grants.** The Massachusetts Board of Higher Education has awarded competitive grants to a number of partnerships using federal Title IIA funding. Each funded partnership includes institutions of higher education and high-need school districts. Funds are used to conduct professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals have subject matter knowledge and computer-related technology experience to enhance student learning. The program is designed to raise student achievement in the core academic subjects through activities that improve teaching and learning, and increase the number of administrators and highly qualified teachers.

- **Strengthen and Expand Educator Training and Supports for Data Use.** Over the last five years, Massachusetts has increased dramatically the data available to educational leaders for policy development and operational decisions and has developed and delivered a variety of professional development opportunities for teachers and principals on effective data use. For most educators, significant investment in training and job-embedded activities is required before data use becomes a regular component of practice. ESE seeks to build upon the existing six-course sequence of Educator Data
Warehouse (EDW) training to include additional topics, and will invest in online delivery to make the courses more broadly accessible and easier to integrate into daily job activities. Topics will include the new statewide student growth model, effective use of the PreK–12 teaching and learning system, and use of the EDW to inform professional development planning and educator evaluations, among others. In addition to upgrading the online course delivery infrastructure, ESE will expand capacity in regional DSACs to launch, train, and directly support district and school data teams.

- **Encourage use of the MA Teachers’ Domain.** The Massachusetts Teachers’ Domain is a free service for educator use, offered by public broadcasting and its partners. The domain provides digital media for the classroom and professional development and offers thousands of media resources, support materials, and tools for classroom lessons, individualized learning programs, and teacher professional learning communities. ESE will encourage districts to take advantage of this service through its targeted technical assistance efforts. For more information, please visit: [http://www.teachersdomain.org](http://www.teachersdomain.org).

- **Administer the Massachusetts Teaching, Learning and Leading Survey (Mass TeLLS).** Over 40,000 Massachusetts educators - teachers and administrators - responded to the Massachusetts Teaching, Learning and Leading Survey in March 2008. Among other areas mentioned under the Working Conditions section, the survey allowed educators to provide candid – and confidential – views about professional development in their schools. Mass TeLLS will be administered again in the fall of 2011 and the fall of 2013. Many RTTT professional development initiatives will be well underway by the administration of the second survey in 2013, so that survey will serve as a gauge measuring whether or not teacher perception of PD offered in schools changed between 2011 and 2013.

- **Continue to offer the Special Education Improvement Grant 274.** Under the federal fund code 274 grant, the Special Educations Planning and Policy Development (SEPP) office offers a program to school districts and approved special education schools and collaboratives to fund professional development activities that will help to improve the capacity of educators to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities. The priorities of this grant program are designed to advance the skills of educators working with students with disabilities through high-quality, intensive, and sustained professional development activities.

*Outlined in the following section, Specialized Knowledge and Skills, are additional PD opportunities that ESE offers to strengthen the skills, knowledge, and qualifications of teachers working in high-poverty, low-performing schools or in high need areas.*
6. Specialized Knowledge and Skills

Great teachers and leaders are critical to improving rapidly low achieving schools. The state will work with its school districts to accelerate the flow of highly effective educators into these schools, drawing from a variety of teacher and administrator networks, recruiting and mentoring groups, understanding best practices of particular school districts, and implementing strong professional development for instructional leaders. Using these strategies, the state will provide highly effective educators with the specialized tools and training they need.

Below are specific programs and services that ESE has and will offer to ensure that teachers have the particular knowledge and skills they need to be effective with the populations of students typically served in high-poverty, low-performing schools (including students with disabilities, English language learners, and other student groups at risk):

- **Continue the High Expertise Teaching Project (HET).** In the summer of 2009, a joint partnership between ESE and the Working Group for Educational Excellence (WGEE) initiated HET, aimed at defining the knowledge and skills that are essential at key developmental stages across an educator’s career (i.e. novice, experienced, and mastery teachers). HET is working to delineate a “quality career continuum” that can help policymakers and practitioners in their efforts to increase educator effectiveness and improve student learning.

  Currently, four different subcommittees (Generic Pedagogy, Teaching All Children, Professional Culture, and Family and Community Engagement) of HET are completing draft documentation outlining the core knowledge, skills, and dispositions for their domains and the key indicators of novice and experienced teachers within their focus area. Future iterations of this document will incorporate more practitioner based information in the form of exemplary practices, or “drill-downs,” which will eventually evolve into a reference tool for teachers and administrators. For more information, please visit: [http://teachers21.org/public-policy-and-discourse/working-group-for-educator-excellence/current-initiatives/](http://teachers21.org/public-policy-and-discourse/working-group-for-educator-excellence/current-initiatives/).

- **Target Initiatives for ESL and Special Education Teachers.** Previously mentioned were programs aimed at supporting the specific population of teachers working with English Language Learners (ELLs) or Students with Disabilities (SwDs). These initiatives include the following: the Massachusetts Licensure Academy project aimed at increasing the number of licensed ESL and special education teachers; the Early Childhood Special Education PD program for public preschool, kindergarten and early childhood professionals working in SwD programs; the Special Education PD Institutes offering free, statewide PD for special education professionals; and [grant 274 funding PD activities](#) designed to advance the skills of educators working with students with disabilities.
• **Continue the SEI Professional Development Initiative.** Beginning in the 2003-2004 school year, districts in Massachusetts are required to implement a state law governing the education of limited English proficient (LEP) students. These students are required to receive sheltered English immersion (SEI) instruction until they are proficient in English. In response to this, ESE has developed and will continue to provide free, targeted professional development to help districts, charter schools, and educational collaboratives build capacity by training teams of qualified individuals to conduct Sheltered English Immersion PD in their communities.

• **Continue the Executive Leadership Program for Educators (ExEL) at Harvard University.** In the summer of 2007, ESE and four Massachusetts urban districts (Boston, Springfield, Worcester, Chelsea) joined the Oregon Department of Education and four Oregon districts in the Harvard Executive Leadership Program for Educators (ExEL). This program, funded by the Wallace Foundation, builds on and integrates several programs and approaches currently in use at Harvard's graduate schools to help improve leadership in urban and high needs districts and state departments of education. ExEL is a multi-year collaborative effort of the Harvard Business School, the Harvard Graduate School of Education and the John F. Kennedy School of Government designed to help school districts, ESE and leadership teams bring high quality teaching and learning to scale. The Massachusetts state and district team has identified instructional improvement goals and outcomes deemed central to its work and has chosen English Language Learners as the focus of their learning. For more information, please visit: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/Exel/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/Exel/).

• **Continue the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Training Project.** The CSPD Training Project was developed as a response to the requirements outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education (IDEA) Act of 1997 requiring that states develop a multifaceted approach to personnel development under regulations for CSPD. To fulfill this obligation, the Special Educations Planning and Policy Development (SEPP) office instituted a series of training activities to supplement ongoing personnel preparation activities that provided within school districts and other agencies. The CSPD Training Project presently consists of three components: (1) training modules, offering training units to assist school districts and their agencies in providing high quality PD on special education related topics; (2) CSPD trainers, who receive ongoing training on the CSPD training modules; and (3) CSPD districts, comprised of the 40 largest districts in Massachusetts who may send their district's PD provider to training sessions on the modules.

• **Continue the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series.** NASDSE, with support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PATTAN), offers the NASDSE Professional Development Series. These conferences bring nationally recognized experts to the state through technology,
providing an affordable means of quality personnel development for a variety of stakeholders. Experts provide important information on high-interest topics to audiences that include state directors of special education, state agency staff, local administrators, teachers, related service providers, higher education faculty, families, and other stakeholders.

- **Continue the Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA).** MFA is a federally funded competitive five-year grant that builds upon the previous successes of Project FOCUS and Project FOCUS Academy. The grant program provides online professional development opportunities and leadership institutes to educators, families, and other stakeholders on a variety of topics related to instructing students with disabilities, particularly in secondary schools. The MFA courses are research-based, have the rigor and expectations of three or four credit graduate level courses, and target areas that increase teacher effectiveness and affect student outcomes.

- **Maintain the Office of Special Education Planning and Policy (SEPP) Website.** The Special Education section of ESE’s website provides a variety of tools, news items, and resources to districts, parents, and other stakeholders: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/). Some of the most visited sections of the website are: (1) Headlines ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/)); Contact Us – Opportunity for external customers to request information/ask questions: [specialeducation@doe.mass.edu](mailto:specialeducation@doe.mass.edu); Grants ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/grants.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/grants.html)); Training ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/training.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/training.html)); Forms and Notices ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/)); Special Education Program Plan ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/programplan/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/programplan/)); and Special Education Data ([http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx)).

- **Continue the Curriculum and Instruction Math Office.** With input and guidance from the Massachusetts Urban Superintendents Network and the Massachusetts Urban Math Liaisons Network (mathematics directors providing guidance and support in mathematics in Massachusetts public schools), supporting students with disabilities in mathematics was identified as a critical priority in the urban districts. In response to this need, the Math Specialist Support group dedicated its meetings to developing a district level collaboration between special educators and math specialists.

- **Maintain the Sign Language Video Resource Library.** Under this project, ESE provides a cost-free institute for educational interpreters to improve participants’ sign vocabulary in mathematics, science, and technology content areas for grades 7-12. The purpose of this library project is to develop mathematics, science, and technology vocabulary reference tools that educational interpreters and teachers of students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing may incorporate into instruction. Available technical assistance includes
written guides and DVDs, and the design of the tool is user-friendly, promoting ready access for end users.

- **Continue the K-12 Literacy Professional Development Partnership Program.** This state-funded program supports professional development projects in 110 districts with identified literacy proficiency gaps in critical K-12 literacy issues. The grants fund partnerships between eligible districts or groups of districts and institutions of higher education or other providers with demonstrated expertise in literacy. Funds support the implementation of effective, research-based instructional practices designed to increase the percentage of students who achieve proficiency in literacy. The Office of Literacy's regional staff supports the districts receiving funds through this grant program by providing ongoing professional development linking research, curriculum content and instructional practices, and encourages participants to work together to implement research-based practices. The Office's regional staff also works directly with the highest need districts in Massachusetts to support implementation. For more information, please visit: [http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants10/rfp/738.html](http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants10/rfp/738.html).

- **Revise the General Curriculum Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL).** As per the regulations (603 CMR 7.06 (b) 2. a.) that established the framework for strengthening the mathematical preparation of elementary teachers, the General Curriculum Test has been modified to include a separately scored mathematics subtest. The March 2009 test administration of the MTEL marked the beginning of the updated General Curriculum test reflecting the larger effort that is underway across the state and across the nation to improve teaching and learning in the subject matter of mathematics at the elementary level.

- **Develop corp of Turnaround Teachers.** In the winter of 2010, Massachusetts announced the 36 persistently lowest-achieving schools that became the focus of the state’s initial turnaround work. Through this work, the state aims to accelerate the flow of highly effective teachers and leaders into turnaround schools by recruiting, training, supporting, and retaining a corps of educators committed to turning around our persistently lowest-achieving schools. Turnaround teachers and leaders will be provided with intensive professional development for tiered instruction and behavioral supports to meet likely challenges, including remediating students performing significantly below grade-level, working with English language learners and students with special behavioral or emotional needs. Experienced teachers will receive, among other supports, up to six months of intense training and support, ongoing mentoring and interaction with a cohort, and opportunities for close collaboration with turnaround leaders.
7. Working Conditions

ESE recognizes the impact working conditions have on excessively high rates of turnover, particularly in hard-to-staff schools. It also understands the role that school and district leadership plays in developing and sustaining a working environment that leads to high expectations and performance for students and educators. For principals and administrators, ESE will use RTTT funds to deliberately focus on strengthening instructional leadership and improving working conditions to better support staff.

Below are specific initiatives that ESE will focus on to improve the conditions in hard-to-staff schools:

- **Implement Mass TeLLS.** Previously mentioned in the Professional Development section was Mass TeLLS, first administered in 2008 and again to be administered in 2011 and 2013. This survey’s main purpose is to measure teacher and administrator perception of school climate, conditions and culture – including leadership, empowerment, facilities and resources, PD, and time – in schools across the Commonwealth. The project will collect data from all licensed in-school educators within the 394 school districts across the state. Using the survey results, district administrators and union leaders will identify at least one issue to address related to school climate and negotiate an agreement about the process to be used in developing a plan for addressing it. Districts will report to ESE in 2012 and again in 2014 on the progress made in addressing the identified issue(s).

- **Implement Labor Management Support Teams.** Collaboration among superintendents, school committees, and teacher unions is essential to the success and sustainability of district plans to improve school climate. In supporting districts’ efforts to develop and implement potent district-improvement strategies using the Mass TeLLS survey results, districts will have the option of utilizing a two-person labor-management support team in negotiating the resolution of an identified issue. The goal of these teams is to provide districts with support in building and/or strengthening the collaborative capability of labor management and district administration to engage in effective negotiation and planning. ESE will contract with an outside provider to recruit, train and select the labor management support teams, as well as provide ongoing support and track individual team member and district participation. RTTT monies will be available to support this collaborative engagement.

- **Continue the Massachusetts Cohesive Leadership System (MCLS).** With support from the Wallace Foundation and the Massachusetts State Legislature, ESE has been working closely since 2007 with strategic partners – such as the Educational Leadership Alliance and both Boston and Springfield Public Schools – to build the MCLS. At the same time, the state has been planning for changes in policy, programs and practice that will be needed to tackle the state’s growing need for an increasing numbers of leaders.
prepared to meet the demands of the 21st century. These demands require leaders who can lead for change and support all students to the highest level of achievement. This includes, but is not limited to, developing teachable, actionable, and measurable state performance standards to guide leadership evaluation processes that foster growth along a continuum of practice throughout the career trajectory, and improving conditions for current leaders. For more information, please visit: http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/mcls/.

- **Implement the New Superintendent Induction Program.** This induction program is designed to guide and support new superintendents as they attend to four of the most critical accomplishments of successful superintendents in their first year on the job: developing and implementing an entry plan aimed at building relationships and assessing current conditions; creating a strategy to raise student achievement; developing a high-functioning senior leadership team that works productively to drive the system’s work; and establishing a strong relationship with school board members and a clear, shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the board. The program consists of a series of professional development days focused on learning best practices for achieving the goals outlined above as well as pairing each superintendent with an induction coach – a former superintendent trained in coaching and helping the new superintendent enter into the role successfully, develop a strategy for systemic improvement and ensure the district’s leadership team and school committee are well positioned to support implementation of the strategy. The first cohort included superintendents from Level 3 and Level 4 districts and began meeting in August 2010; the second cohort will be opened to all superintendents throughout the state and will begin in 2011 with a third beginning in 2012. Each cohort will meet for three years.

- **Continue the National Institute for School Leaders (NISL) Initiative.** The NISL program has been addressing the shortage of effective instructional leaders in high-need districts as a statewide initiative since 2005. NISL is an intensive two-year training program, offering comprehensive professional development for Massachusetts principals, assistant principals, school-based leaders, district administrators, and superintendents aimed at strengthening districts’ organizational and instructional leadership skills, including addressing issues related to working conditions. To date, the program has served over 1200 educational leaders from 77 districts in 40 cohorts across Massachusetts. Most recently, the NISL training took further hold in the state through its inclusion in the professional development menu of options in the DSAC system of support.

Up until fiscal year 2010, costs for NISL participation were almost exclusively paid for by the state. Through RTTT grants, districts will take on the fiscal responsibility for participation in the training. For more information, please visit: http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/nisl/.
• **Develop the Urban and Commissioner’s Districts Initiative.** The Center for Targeted Assistance at ESE operates on a theory of action concluding that, if districts assume as a key function the responsibility for establishment of the conditions for school effectiveness at each school, then student and school performance will improve. Since 2007-2008, the Office of Urban and Commissioner’s District (UDA) has been charged with providing customized support to the Commissioner’s Districts to enhance their capacity to support high need schools, in addition to all other schools in the district. To this end, UDA assistance, activities, tools, and resources are purposefully designed to complement and strengthen district capacity to guide and monitor school improvement. For more information, please visit: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ucd](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ucd).

• **Continue the Urban Superintendents Network.** The Urban Superintendents Network is a group of urban district superintendents (mostly from districts that have schools that aren’t meeting AYP) that meets monthly to share ideas, concerns and solutions to a variety of issues that arise. The meetings are held by the Department and provide ESE with an opportunity to provide targeted assistance to urban superintendents who have a variety of challenges, including those related to recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers. ESE will continue working with these urban superintendents to address specific issues that arise in relation to improving student achievement, including improving working conditions in hard-to-staff schools.

• **Continue the Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools.**

  **Section 19 of Chapter 321 of the Acts of 2008** required the creation of the Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools. Since January 2009, the Task Force worked to create a framework for supportive school environments, and developed a self-assessment tool to improve educational outcomes for students with behavioral health needs, and to assist school environments in fostering effective collaboration with community based behavioral health providers. The framework addresses areas such as school leadership, professional development, access to behavioral health services, effective academic and non-academic supports, family engagement, and referral polices and protocols. The self-assessment tool measures schools’ capacity to address students’ behavioral health needs and to identify issues and areas that need further state and/or local support and focus.
8. Policy Coherence

During the past three years, ESE has successfully adopted and implemented a new strategic plan focused on the following goals and priorities: educator effectiveness, curriculum and instruction, accountability redesign, supports for students and families, and state leadership and operations. The plan provides a structure and focus for ensuring that policies are having their intended effect and internal processes are streamlined so as not to adversely impact the field. The implementation of this plan allowed the Department to enhance the internal processes and state policies that impact the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective educators throughout the state, including:

- Establishing a new Center for Educator Policy, Preparation, Licensure and Leadership Development (EPPL) to place the Department's work in supporting the educator continuum under one division.

- Implementing a new mathematics MTEL for elementary and special education teachers to ensure that all educators have a solid understanding of skills.

- Proposing policy standards for administrators that were approved by the Board in June 2009; continuing development of performance indicators for principals; initiating development of performance indicators for superintendents.

- Gathering all educator collective bargaining contracts statewide to develop a free, searchable, online database that will make them publicly available.

- Developing new protocols for joint approval/accreditation reviews with the Teacher Education Accreditation Council and piloting an outcomes-based teacher preparation program approval process with five organizations in the spring.

- Absorbing the work of the former Office of Educational Quality & Accountability (EQA) into the Department. Coordinating accountability and compliance reviews to meet our statutory obligation to conduct no more than one major review in any nine-month period.

The Department will continue to work on aligning specific initiatives for ensuring the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective educators with the goals and priorities outlined in the strategic plan. In order to streamline this work, ESE will implement the following policy initiatives and strategies:

- **Biannual EPIMS Data Collection.** The statewide implementation of EPIMS has enabled the Department to analyze equity issues on a granular level and provided the Department with a systematic and quantitative means of monitoring the implementation of policies that affect educator recruitment, preparation, HQ status,
licensure, assignment, and retention. *(For additional information on EPIMS, please refer to the Data and Reporting Systems section.)*

- **Improve the effectiveness of Teacher and Administrator Preparation Programs.** High quality preparation pathways in Massachusetts are critical for preparing the next generation of great teachers and leaders. ESE has approved 89 organizations throughout the state, both traditional and alternative providers.

New preparation approval standards will require stronger partnerships between institutes of higher education (IHEs) and districts, practice-based models of preparation, and a tighter integration between preparation and induction during the first two years of a teacher’s placement. Pilots for these models will be developed through a Request For Proposal (RFP) program. The result will be programs better aligned with the state’s educator workforce needs, including greater selectivity in admissions, as well as stronger preparation in content knowledge, pedagogy, and cultural competency.

Massachusetts began working to increase the accountability of preparation programs through a partnership with 12 representative preparation programs piloting a new program approval process that is based on outcome indicators, and will be aligned with measures of effectiveness as they are developed. A second cohort of 14 organizations is currently working with the Department to continue these efforts.

Draft Effectiveness Indicators and a Preparation Program Report Card have been outlined, and will incorporate evidence of student growth and district collaboration programs. Through the statewide pilots, ESE will develop a transparent statewide accountability system, anchored in measures of student achievement and growth of program graduates, that includes web-based public reporting for all preparation entities and new program approval regulations.

- **Develop stronger Massachusetts Regulations for Licensure and Preparation Program Approval.** The State’s Regulations for Licensure and Preparation Program Approval ensure that all teachers have the requisite skills and content knowledge to positively impact student achievement. The current regulations require each of the teacher preparation programs in Massachusetts to go through ESE’s program approval process to ensure that they address the content and licensure requirements outlined in the Regulations.

Additionally, forthcoming is the development of stronger licensure and program approval regulations linked to outcome measures, such as the effectiveness of program graduates in promoting student achievement. These regulations will be linked to a multi-tiered licensure system, that is performance and portfolio-based, and a statewide career ladder.
• **Continue to use Professional Standards for Teachers and Pre-service Performance Assessment.** Included in the Massachusetts Regulations for Licensure are the Professional Standards for Teachers. These Standards define the pedagogical and other professional knowledge and skills required of all teachers across the state. These Standards are used by teacher preparation providers in preparing their candidates, by ESE in reviewing programs seeking state approval, and by ESE as the basis of performance assessments of candidates. Candidates demonstrate that they meet the Professional Standards by passing a Performance Assessment for Initial License. The Professional Standards include: Plans Curriculum and Instruction, Delivers Effective Instruction, Manages Classroom Climate and Operation, Promotes Equity, and Meets Professional Responsibilities ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=08](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=08)). ESE has provided specific guidelines for these Pre-Service Performance Assessments, and for each of the Standards: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/PPA_guidelines.doc](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/PPA_guidelines.doc).

• **Develop New Performance Standards for Principals, Superintendents, and other Leadership Roles.** In June 2009, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education voted unanimously to approve new policy standards for education leaders that apply to all leadership roles at all stages. Based on a growing body of research on effective leadership, the standards are focused in core areas that have the highest positive impact on student achievement: Learning and Instruction, Management and Operations, Family and Community Partnerships, and Ethical and Reflective Leadership. For more information, please visit: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/policy/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/policy/).

• **Develop Educator Evaluation Standards.** The development of statewide educator evaluation standards will create powerful new tools for educators to be effective with high need student populations. As part of the state’s Race to the Top initiatives, Massachusetts will develop statewide guidelines for assessing the effectiveness of teachers and administrators through an iterative process that builds on and includes national research and development efforts, district pilots, and statewide networks. Valid assessments will be developed for teacher effectiveness, including a teacher’s impact on student growth, and new approaches to measuring administrator effectiveness, including an administrator’s impact on student growth and on teacher effectiveness within a school. This work will be a catalyst to promote effectiveness across the entire educator career continuum.

• **Revise Induction and Mentoring Guidelines.** Through the Department’s current licensure regulations, all districts are required to provide an induction and mentoring program to new teachers during their first year of practice. The Department is reviewing and will be revising its mentoring and induction guidelines in aiming to include stronger mentoring/induction requirements – along with clear examples of each – by encouraging closer collaboration between school districts and institutes of higher education. The expected result is the tying of teacher preparation with mentoring and
induction to eliminate the steep learning curve that many new teachers experience during their first years in the classroom. By addressing this, the Department hopes to reduce new teacher attrition and require all districts and schools – including hard-to-staff schools – to provide new teachers with the support needed to be successful in the classroom and remain in the teaching field.

- **Revise the State Standards for Professional Development.** The planned revision of the state’s PD standards will underpin many other RTTT and ESE professional development projects, including all those related to educator quality and licensure. This project will address the need for quality professional development offerings across the state, both those offered by districts and those offered by the state, by articulating standards for professional development that lead to high-quality, high-impact learning experiences for educators.

- **Continue the District Professional Development Plan Requirement.** Through the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993, all school districts are expected to annually develop a professional development plan for all principals, teachers, other professional staff employed by the district, and school council members. Districts are strongly encouraged to connect professional development with continuous district- and school-improvement planning and to connect their district professional development plan to the School Improvement Plans that are also required through the Education Reform Act. This connection is strengthened by relicensure, which requires educators to have professional development plans that are in line with school and/or district improvement plans. While the relicensure regulations outline minimum requirements for professional development, ESE encourages educators to participate in professional experiences that support and expand their content and professional skills beyond the minimum requirements. Accordingly, districts may choose to offer additional incentives, through collective bargaining, for educators to go beyond the minimum requirements for relicensure and to continue to participate in professionally-relevant and academically-meaningful professional development.

- **Continue Massachusetts Relicensure Requirements.** The Commonwealth's relicensure regulations require individuals with a Massachusetts Professional license to engage in sustained professional development that strengthens professional knowledge and skills relevant to their licenses. ESE has designed a relicensure process that requires all educators to prepare an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) for each five-year renewal cycle. Educators must obtain 150 professional development points in each five-year cycle; 120 of those points must focus on the content and/or pedagogy of the license, with minimum of 90 in the specific content for the license. The plan must be consistent with the educational needs of the school and/or district, and enhance the ability of the educator to improve student learning.
• **Create a performance based licensure system.** The Department will develop a new career ladder to recognize and compensate a variety of new teacher leader roles. ESE will develop endorsements to licensure for at least five of these roles, e.g. mentor, instructional coach, parent outreach coordinator, instructional team leader, and data team leader. These will be developed and available to teachers beginning in 2012. In addition, the state will encourage high need districts to provide additional compensation to recruit and retain highly qualified and effective teachers in leadership roles.

In concert with the development of new teacher leader endorsements and changes in educator preparation approval requirements, ESE will also comprehensively review and enhance its policies on teacher induction so that they may provide more effective guidelines for supporting and retaining highly qualified and effective educators.

• **Continue Requirements for adding a license in MA Licensure Regulations.** The *Massachusetts Regulations for Educator Licensure and Program Approval* allow many existing teachers who hold an Initial or Professional license to add an additional license by taking the appropriate Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL), rather than completing an additional educator preparation program. This simplifies the licensure requirements for out-of-field teachers to become licensed in their out-of-field area.

• **Continue Collaboration with the Educational Personnel Advisory Council (EPAC).** EPAC advises the Commissioner and the Board of Education on issues pertaining to all educational personnel. The Department will continue to meet regularly with the Council to garner feedback from the field regarding policy development and implementation of strategies and programs related to teacher preparation, licensure and educator quality. This council is comprised of representatives from each of the professional teacher and administrator associations in the Commonwealth, school districts, institutions of higher education, higher education organizations, and the Massachusetts Association of School Personnel Administrators. The current focus of EPAC is on accountability and support for educator quality and effectiveness at every level, specifically in the areas of recruitment and retention, induction and mentoring, preparation program approval, and resources for educators. This council is a forum to discuss implementation issues related to ESE policy.

• **Further develop targeted assistance for underperforming schools.** On January 18, 2010, *An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap*, was signed into law and took effect immediately. Its purpose is to foster educational innovation and turn around underperforming schools. In anticipation of the new law, the Department initiated work with a wide range of stakeholders, including the School and District Accountability and Assistance Advisory Council, to develop a framework for district and school accountability and assistance, including identifying and intervening in the lowest performing schools in order to bring about rapid improvements. As a result, the
Department proposed amendments to the Regulations on Under-Performing Schools and Districts, 603 CMR 2.00, to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). The proposed amendments simplified and shortened the process for identifying and providing state assistance to under-performing schools, clarified expectations regarding the kinds of improvement actions that schools and districts must take, and established different levels and types of intervention appropriate to each situation.

- **Further develop the Office of Planning and Research to Close Proficiency Gaps (OPR).** OPR provides relevant analysis, research, and planning support so that the Department can make evidence-based decisions to improve educational outcomes. The OPR site serves as a clearinghouse for all research, evaluation, and data products released by ESE. [http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/about.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/about.html)

- **Continue the Critical Shortage Program.** The Critical Shortage Program waives the time and earnings limitations on the re-employment of retirees, who have met the state licensure and federal HQ requirements, when appropriate, in Massachusetts public schools. The Department determines a "critical shortage" for a position. ESE has adopted regulation 603 CMR 7.14(13)(b), allowing the Commissioner of Education to deem, upon the request of a superintendent, that a district has a "critical shortage", and that the district has made a good-faith effort to hire non-retirees but without success. This program allows districts to retain quality, veteran teachers in hard-to-staff subject and administrative areas, without it adversely affecting the educator’s retirement benefits. Districts are informed of this program through ESE’s website. See [http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/cs_waiver.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/cs_waiver.html).

- **Maintain a searchable database of public school teacher collective bargaining contracts.** The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has compiled a database of public school teacher collective bargaining agreements under the authority of Mass. General Laws c. 15, §55A, as amended in 2008: Each school district, including regional school districts and charter schools, shall annually file with the office [of school and district accountability within the department], on or before October 1, a copy of its current personnel contracts and collective bargaining agreements in a form and manner prescribed by the commissioner.

The public is welcomed to use this database as a resource. Among other things, the database can be used to find particular district agreements or to search among the agreements for keywords. [http://educatorcontracts.doemass.org/](http://educatorcontracts.doemass.org/)
Conclusion

The Department pledges its commitment to the strategies, programs, policies and ideas outlined in this plan. The Commonwealth has built a successful tradition of excellence in relation to educator quality throughout the state. There is, however, a great deal more that can and should be done in the area of educator quality as it relates to the equitable distribution of highly qualified educators to low income and minority students throughout the State. This plan will enable the Department to address and recognize success for all students.
Appendices

Appendix I. State-wide percentage of ESL and Special Education classes taught by HQTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix II. Percentage of core content area classes taught by HQTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Area</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“All Subjects”</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics/Government</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies/Social Sciences</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Change = +2.2%
Appendix III. Change in the percentage HQTs at the district level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Area - &quot;All Subjects&quot;</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics &amp; Government</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences/Social Studies</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-poverty schools</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-poverty schools</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education classes§</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL classes**</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ The HQT percentages of ELL and Special Education teachers are based on classes in which an ELL or Special Education teacher is the sole content provider. Districts may report 100% HQT of ELL or Special Education classes for any one of the following reasons: (1) all of the ELL or Special Education teachers at the district are HQ for the courses they teach; (2) all ELL and/or Special Education teachers at the district serve in a consultative capacity; OR (3) the district does not serve any ELL and/or Special Education students.
### Appendix IV. Change in HQT percentage at the school level (by school type and poverty level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All schools</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-poverty schools</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-poverty schools</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Revised State Plan for Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal

## Appendix V. AYP data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th># districts received AYP determination</th>
<th># of districts made AYP</th>
<th># schools received AYP determination</th>
<th># of low poverty schools receiving AYP determination</th>
<th># of high poverty schools receiving AYP determination</th>
<th># of schools made AYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>