

2008-2009 NEVADA PLAN FOR EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Requirements

States must have a plan in place to ensure that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children [ESEA 1111(b)(8)(C)]

In addition, the United States Department of Education requires states to demonstrate that they are making good-faith efforts to correct staffing inequities and are on track to meet the HQT goal.

NCLB requires State plans to describe:

- *the **specific steps** the SEA will take... to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, and*
- *the **measures** the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such steps. (States will be required to demonstrate progress towards the equitable distribution of teachers.)*

CCSSO shared the following information (CCSSO powerpoint – “Presenting Evidence for the Probable Success of Your Strategies”, May 8-9, 2006):

The SEA’s role in solving the teacher quality gap is to:

1. Regulate – e.g., set licensing, monitor for compliance
2. Build systems – e.g., state job banks
3. Build capacity – e.g., teacher/leadership training; technical assistance
4. Allocate resources – e.g., state compensation – loan forgiveness etc.
5. Inform LEAs and schools about what works and what is needed

2 Goals:

1. Increase the relative attractiveness of hard-to-staff schools so they can compete for their fair share of good teachers.
2. Make these schools personally and professionally rewarding places to work.

Ways to ensure an equitable distribution of teachers:

Increase supply -

1. Create a new pool of teachers
2. Redistribute existing teachers

Reduce demand -

3. Strengthen the skills of teachers already working in high-need schools (PD; mentoring)
4. Keep qualified, experienced teachers from leaving (PD; improve leadership; incentives; alternative ways to compensate)

Strategies that are most likely to work are those that:

1. Reward teachers for taking on more challenging assignments
2. Provide the specialized preparation and training teachers need to be successful in challenging classrooms
3. Improve working conditions that contribute to high teacher turnover
4. Revise state policies or improve internal processes that may inadvertently contribute to local staffing inequities

Different ways to target schools in need:

- Make it exclusive
Ex. Teach in VA – recruit for top high need subject areas & 100 high need schools; merit pay for teachers who raise student performance
- Give priority to certain schools or teachers
Ex. State sponsored PD; FL- 1st priority discretionary funds for schools with D & F
- Make it increasingly lucrative
Ex. CA – loan assumption program for hard to fill subjects/hard to staff schools (could be more \$ or faster assumption)

Strategies that are NOT likely to close the teacher quality gap:

1. Involuntary transfers
2. Simply producing more teachers
3. Raising all teachers' pay (with conditions not changed)
4. Purely compensatory measure to make up for bad working conditions, lack of resources, and poor leadership

Characteristics of a well-designed state teacher equity plan:

1. Comprehensive – address all the elements
Take inventory of current policies and programs (multiple examples were provided);
Identify new strategies Nevada will adopt – What is missing?
2. Targeted – focused on schools that have the greatest needs
3. Aligned – to what already doing
4. Strategic – way build support
5. Specific – set measurable outcomes & timelines; list steps to implementation
6. Balanced – short and long term strategies – what SEAs are doing as well as what LEAs are doing.

Nevada Policy Agenda for Teacher Quality

A broad range of national research demonstrates the importance of prepared, experienced and well-supported teachers and administrators to promote long-term school improvement and to close the achievement gap, both goals of NCLB and Nevada Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session of the 2003 Nevada Legislature. Nevada Revised Statute 391.100 mirrors the requirements of NCLB regarding all core teachers meeting the “highly qualified” teacher (HQT) requirements by June 30, 2006. Nevada made a significant increase in regard to teachers meeting the NCLB “highly qualified” teachers requirement - from 68.1% as of the October 1, 2005 district “Contracted Educators Report” to 80.38% as of May 1, 2006, 86.62% as of May 24, 2007, 89.2% as of May 2008 and 91.71% as of May 2009. All districts have had a plan to get their teachers to meet the HQT requirements since 2003 which has been updated annually as needed as part of the Title II-A consolidated application supplement for federal funds.

In 1999 the Nevada State Legislature created a statewide network of Regional Professional Development Programs. The RPDP created Nevada Professional Development Standards. Several task forces have been created to work on the issue of teacher quality including the Nevada National Governors Association Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of Teachers and the Teacher Quality Task Force to align teacher preparation, licensing and relicensing.

The overarching goal of the Nevada education system, as written in the 2008 Nevada State Improvement Plan is to ***effectively deliver a rigorous and relevant standards-based education that increases achievement, reduces the achievement gap, and prepares each student for post secondary college and career readiness***. To achieve the central goal of NCLB – closing the achievement gap by 2014 – we will need to focus on ensuring that highly qualified and effective teachers are equitably distributed among the neediest of our students and schools.

Research consistently shows that teacher quality, as measured by content knowledge, experience, training and credentials, or general intellectual skills, is strongly related to student achievement. Skilled teachers produce better student results. The fact that poor and minority students are least likely to have qualified, highly effective, teachers is a major contributor to the achievement gap. It follows then that recruiting highly qualified and effective teachers to low-performing schools and students, and providing high-quality professional learning opportunities to support teachers in being effective in their positions will pay off in terms of better student achievement and narrowing of the achievement gap.

Equitable Teacher Distribution: Nevada's Good Faith Effort

Nevada completed Phase I of the Equity Plan as outlined on p. 29 and is in Phase II as outlined on pp. 30-32. The purpose of Phase II is to ensure the Nevada Equity Plan is successful in correcting staffing inequities by working with the Southwest Comprehensive Center as a Nevada Committee on Equitable Distribution of Teachers, to include State Department of Education staff and representatives from Clark County School District and Washoe County School District, as outlined in the goal and objectives listed.

Nevada's Growth Rate and HQT Verification Challenges

Student Growth

Nevada is the second fastest growing state in the nation. From 03-04 to 06-07 there was an increase in student count each year of more than 12,000 students. However, student growth was cut in half in 07-08 as compared to 06-07, and growth in 08-09 was only 3,548 students. The slowed growth in Clark County School District has made it possible to have a larger pool of "highly qualified" and "experienced" teacher candidates to hire into high need schools than in previous years.

Teacher Recruitment

Despite significant slowed student growth in 07-08 and 08-09, a primary barrier to meeting the 100% performance target of teachers who meet the NCLB "highly qualified" teacher requirement continues to be the teacher pool shortage in Nevada. Following are the approximate percentages of teachers over the past 3 years who are newly licensed in Nevada that come from Nevada: 22% in 06-07, 26% in 07-08 and 37% in 08-09. Nevada is unique with 69% of the teachers positioned in Clark County School District (Las Vegas) – 15,856 teachers out of the 08-09 school year State total of 22,885. Clark County as the fifth largest school district in the United States has significant teacher recruitment and retention challenges. For the 08-09 school year CCSD hired 633+ new teachers outside of Nevada out of the 1784 new teachers hired (as of March 2, 2009), down significantly from 772 new teachers outside of Nevada out of

2,700 new teachers in 07-08. In 07-08 there were only 406 teacher preparation program completers coming out of University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Teacher Retention

Based on CCSD trend data, an average of approximately 33% of new teachers hired by the Clark County School District from 2004-2005 through 2006-2007 separated employment during their first three years. Of the 2,492 new teachers hired in 2004-2005, 62.24% remain in the Clark County School District, and 37.76% separated over a five-year period.

Nevada's Analysis of Data

Nevada "High-Need Schools"

February 2009 there were 126 "high need schools" identified and 24 of those made AYP (in 2008). There were 107 high-need schools identified in Clark County School district (21 of these made AYP in 2008); 14 high-need schools in Washoe County School District (2 of these schools made AYP in 2008); and 1 high-need school each in Elko, Nye and Pershing County School Districts.

March 2008 there were 102 "high need schools" identified and 36 of those made AYP (in 2007). There were 90 high-need schools identified in Clark County School District (32 of these made AYP); 9 high-need schools in Washoe County School District (2 of these schools made AYP); 1 high-need school each in Carson City School District and Humboldt County School District that made AYP, and 1 high-need school in Nye County School District.

March 2007 there were 100 "high-need schools" identified and 36 of these schools made AYP (in 2006), 9 high-need schools identified in Washoe County School District (2 schools made AYP), 1 school each in Carson City School District and Nye County School District that made AYP, and 1 school in Humboldt County School District. There were 85 "high-need schools" identified in 2005-2006 (all schools that didn't make Adequate Yearly Progress were included but this was before final designations came out in August; 37 schools that were listed as high need for 05-06 were not listed for 06-07).

The following 2 tables demonstrate improvement in equitable distribution of teachers.

Table 1. Percent of Core Subject Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in Low and High Poverty Schools – State of Nevada Report Card (www.nevadareportcard.com)

The gap between high/low poverty schools in terms of classes not taught by “highly qualified” teachers has reduced markedly, with the gap almost being eliminated by May 2009 (1.11% point difference) when comparing schools in the top quartile of poverty to the bottom quartile of poverty.

State/Districts	May 2009	May 2008	October 1, 2006	Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Gap Between High/Low Poverty - % Point Difference
State Note: in 03-04 *	X			9.01% * 28.6%	10.12% *73%	1.11% *44.4%
		X		7.6%	15.1%	7.5%
			X	15.4%	27.9%	12.5%
Clark	X			11.1%	12.1%	.98%
		X		10.0%	19.2%	9.2%
			X	19.7%	34.8%	15.1%
Washoe	X			3.4%	1.9%	No inequity
		X		2.2%	2.9%	.7%
			X	5.5%	4.4%	No inequity
All Other Districts	X			5.5%	7.6%	2.1%
		X		8.3%	7.1%	No inequity
			X	7.6%	11.9%	4.3%

Table 2. Percent of Core Subject Classes Taught by Teachers With Less Than 3 Years of Experience

While the gap between high and low poverty schools in terms of teachers with less than 3 years of experience has been reduced by 4% statewide 2008 to 2009, the gap is still a 14% point difference as of May 2009.

State/Districts	May 2009	May 2008	Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Gap Between High/Low Poverty - % Point Difference
State	X		23.4%	37.5%	14.1%
		X	24.1%	42.2%	18.1%
Clark	X		25.4%	40.3%	15%
		X	27.7%	47.2%	19.5%
Washoe	X		18.1%	29.6%	11.5%
		X	19.7%	29%	10.4%

Inequities in teacher assignment (percent point difference between high/low poverty and high/low minority for HQT and experience data) are summarized in the following tables for 2008-2009 as compared to 2007-2008, and 2007-2008 as compared to 2006-2007.

2008-2009					2007-2008					Percent Point Difference 08/09 from 07/08
Percentage of Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers					Percentage of Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers					
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between High and Low Poverty Schools		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between High and Low Poverty Schools		
State	133 Low and 131 High	9.01%	10.12%	1.11%	State	132 Low and 122 High	7.59%	15.14%	7.55%	-6.44%
Churchill		n/a	n/a		Churchill	1 Low and 1 High	2.72%	17.84%	15.12%	
Clark	81 Low and 88 High	11.12%	12.10%	0.98%	Clark	70 Low and 79 High	9.96%	19.16%	9.20%	-8.22%
Douglas	5 Low and No High Poverty schools	8.41%	n/a		Douglas	4 Low and No High Poverty schools	2.31%	n/a		
Elko	6 Low and 6 High	5.42%	11.11%	5.69%	Elko	8 Low and 5 High	8.14%	23.41%	15.27%	-9.58%
Esmeralda	1 Low and 2 High	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Esmeralda		n/a	n/a		
Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	0.00%	n/a		Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	16.98%	n/a		
Humboldt	1 Low and 1 high	8.33%	33.33%	25.00%	Humboldt	1 Low and 1 High	6.04%	11.54%	5.50%	19.50%
Lander	1 Low and 0 High	14.29%	n/a		Lander	1 Low and 0 High	7.10%	n/a		
Lincoln		n/a	n/a		Lincoln	1 Low and 0 High	0%	n/a		
Lyon	1 Low and 0 High	0.00%	n/a		Lyon	2 Low and 1 High	9.02%	0%	-9.02%	
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	40%		Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	25%		
Nye	2 Low and 2 High	9.09%	0.00%	-9.09%	Nye	2 Low and 5 High	13.30%	6.35%	-6.95%	-2.14%
Carson	1 Low and 1 High	8.82%	0.00%	-8.82%	Carson	1 Low and 3 High	8.93%	1.14%	-7.79%	-1.03%
Pershing	0 Low and 4 High	n/a	7.02%		Pershing	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	66.67%		
Storey		n/a	n/a		Storey		n/a	n/a		
Washoe	32 Low and 27 High	3.44%	1.92%	-1.52%	Washoe	33 Low and 26 High	2.22%	2.92%	0.70%	-2.22%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	44.40%	n/a		White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	46.05%	n/a		

2008-2009				
Percent less than 3 years of experience				
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Poverty Schools
State	133 Low and 131 High	23.41%	37.49%	14.08%
Churchill		n/a	n/a	
Clark	81 Low and 88 High	25.36%	40.32%	14.96%
Douglas	5 Low and No High Poverty school	22.42%	n/a	
Elko	6 Low and 6 High	16.25%	26.19%	9.94%
Esmeralda	1 Low and 2 High	100%	0.00%	-100.00%
Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	15.38%	n/a	
Humboldt	1 Low and 1 high	6.25%	33.33%	27.08%
Lander	1 Low and 0 High	14.29%	n/a	
Lincoln		n/a	n/a	
Lyon	1 Low and 0 High	26.53%	n/a	
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	60%	
Nye	2 Low and 2 High	33.00%	16.67%	-16.33%
Carson	1 Low and 1 High	21.57%	16.22%	-5.35%
Pershing	0 Low and 4 High	n/a	14.04%	
Storey		n/a	n/a	
Washoe	32 Low and 27 High	18.13%	29.61%	11.48%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	70.37%	n/a	

2007-2008				
Percent less than 3 years of experience				
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Poverty Schools
State	123 Low and 124 High	24.10%	42.19%	18.09%
Churchill	1 Low and 1 High	22.73%	19.35%	-3.38%
Clark	69 Low and 81 High	27.72%	47.20%	19.48%
Douglas	No High Poverty schools	1.20%	n/a	
Elko	8 Low and 5 High	17.04%	79.32%	62.28%
Esmeralda		n/a	n/a	
Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	0.70%	n/a	
Humboldt	1 Low and 1 High	9.09%	18.18%	9.09%
Lander	4 Low and 0 High	20.90%	n/a	
Lincoln	1 Low and 0 High	25%	n/a	
Lyon	2 Low and 1 High	20.00%	37%	16.84%
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	25%	
Nye	2 Low and 5 High	22.02%	29.60%	7.58%
Carson	1 Low and 2 High	12.39%	8.28%	-4.11%
Pershing	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	50.00%	
Storey		n/a	n/a	
Washoe	32 Low and 26 High	19.68%	29.06%	9.38%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	48.00%	n/a	

Percent Point Difference 08/09 from 07/08
-4.01%
-4.52%
-52.34%
17.99%
-23.91%
-1.24%
2.10%

2008-2009				
Percent of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher				
		Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Minority Schools
State	302 Low and 292 High	8.34%	13.46%	5.12%
Churchill	7 Low and 0 High	14.04%	n/a	
Clark	115 Low and 229 High	11.39%	14.99%	3.60%
Douglas	15 Low and 0 High	8.02%	n/a	
Elko	18 Low and 9 High	6.56%	10.27%	3.71%
Esmeralda	3 Low and 1 High	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Eureka	3 Low and 0 High	2.71%	n/a	
Humboldt	8 Low and 4 High	2.67%	27.27%	24.60%
Lander	6 Low and 0 High	4.92%	n/a	
Lincoln	8 Low and 1 High	10.34%	14.29%	3.95%
Lyon	18 Low and 0 High	0.60%	n/a	
Mineral	3 Low and 1 High	2.90%	40.00%	37.10%
Nye	15 Low and 4 High	8.90%	4.54%	-4.36%
Carson	8 Low and 3 High	4.27%	1.26%	-3.01%
Pershing	5 Low and 0 High	7.02%	n/a	
Storey	4 Low and 0 High	4.76%	n/a	
Washoe	62 Low and 40 High	4.27%	3.00%	-1.27%
White Pine	8 Low and 0 High	30.93%	n/a	

2007-2008				
Percent of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher				
		Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Minority Schools
State	311 Low and 280 High	8.10%	15.70%	7.60%
Churchill	8 Low and 0 High	8.76%	n/a	
Clark	116 Low and 218 High	11.05%	17.64%	6.59%
Douglas	15 Low and 0 High	2.90%	n/a	
Elko	17 Low and 9 High	6.21%	11.54%	5.33%
Esmeralda	2 Low and 1 High	6.45%	6.25%	-0.20%
Eureka	3 Low and 0 High	8.18%	n/a	
Humboldt	8 Low and 4 High	4.07%	21.42%	17.35%
Lander	6 Low and 0 High	6.77%	n/a	
Lincoln	8 Low and 1 High	17.08%	12.76%	-4.32%
Lyon	18 Low and 0 High	4.86%	n/a	
Mineral	3 Low and 1 High	19.89%	25.00%	5.11%
Nye	15 Low and 3 High	9.07%	0.00%	-9.07%
Carson	10 Low and 2 High	6.25%	1.14%	-5.11%
Pershing	5 Low and 0 High	4.93%	n/a	
Storey	4 Low and 0 High	5.00%	n/a	
Washoe	61 Low and 41 High	3.46%	2.68%	-0.78%
White Pine	8 Low and 0 High	19.35%	n/a	

Percent Point Difference 08/09 from 07/08
-2.48%
-2.99%
-1.62%
0.20%
7.25%
8.27%
31.99%
4.71%
2.10%
-0.49%

2008-2009				
Percent less than 3 years of experience				
		Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Minority Schools
State	302 Low and 292 High	23.52%	35.50%	11.98%
Churchill	7 Low and 0 High	21.05%	n/a	
Clark	115 Low and 229 High	23.67%	36.97%	13.30%
Douglas	15 Low and 0 High	22.07%	n/a	
Elko	18 Low and 9 High	19.67%	23.78%	4.11%
Esmeralda	3 Low and 1 High	20.00%	0.00%	-20.00%
Eureka	3 Low and 0 High	10.81%	n/a	
Humboldt	8 Low and 4 High	13.90%	22.72%	8.82%
Lander	6 Low and 0 High	19.67%	n/a	
Lincoln	8 Low and 1 High	22.41%	14.29%	-8.12%
Lyon	18 Low and 0 High	31.55%	n/a	
Mineral	3 Low and 1 High	17.64%	60.00%	42.36%
Nye	15 Low and 4 High	23.30%	20.45%	-2.85%
Carson	8 Low and 3 High	23.07%	16.46%	-6.61%
Pershing	5 Low and 0 High	14.04%	n/a	
Storey	4 Low and 0 High	14.29%	n/a	
Washoe	62 Low and 40 High	23.24%	27.86%	4.62%
White Pine	8 Low and 0 High	46.39%	n/a	

2007-2008				
Percent less than 3 years of experience				
		Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Minority Schools
State	311 Low and 280 High	25.18%	39.55%	14.37%
Churchill	8 Low and 0 High	18.65%	n/a	
Clark	116 Low and 218 High	27.21%	41.31%	14.10%
Douglas	15 Low and 0 High	13.87%	n/a	
Elko	17 Low and 9 High	17.91%	30.68%	12.77%
Esmeralda	2 Low and 1 High	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Eureka	3 Low and 0 High	2.91%	n/a	
Humboldt	8 Low and 4 High	14.71%	38.06%	23.35%
Lander	6 Low and 0 High	21.80%	n/a	
Lincoln	8 Low and 1 High	28.61%	25.00%	
Lyon	18 Low and 0 High	34.27%	n/a	
Mineral	3 Low and 1 High	25.07%	25.00%	-0.07%
Nye	15 Low and 3 High	27.90%	12.67%	-15.23%
Carson	10 Low and 2 High	26.28%	20.27%	-6.01%
Pershing	5 Low and 0 High	9.21%	n/a	
Storey	4 Low and 0 High	11.79%	n/a	
Washoe	61 Low and 41 High	23.44%	29.09%	5.65%
White Pine	8 Low and 0 High	32.59%	n/a	

Percent Point Difference 08/09 from 07/08
-2.39%
-0.80%
-8.66%
-70.00%
-14.53%
42.43%
12.38%
-0.60%
-1.03%

2007-2008				
Percentage of Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers				
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Poverty Schools
State	132 Low and 122 High	7.59%	15.14%	7.55%
Churchill	1 Low and 1 High	2.72%	17.84%	15.12%
Clark	70 Low and 79 High	9.96%	19.16%	9.20%
Douglas	4 Low and No High Poverty schools	2.31%	n/a	
Elko	8 Low and 5 High	8.14%	23.41%	15.27%
Esmeralda		n/a	n/a	
Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	16.98%	n/a	
Humboldt	1 Low and 1 High	6.04%	11.54%	5.50%
Lander	1 Low and 0 High	7.10%	n/a	
Lincoln	1 Low and 0 High	0%	n/a	
Lyon	2 Low and 1 High	9.02%	0%	-9.02%
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	25%	
Nye	2 Low and 5 High	13.30%	6.35%	-6.95%
Carson	1 Low and 3 High	8.93%	1.14%	-7.79%
Pershing	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	66.67%	
Storey		n/a	n/a	
Washoe	33 Low and 26 High	2.22%	2.92%	0.70%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	46.05%	n/a	

2006-2007				
Percentage of Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers				
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Poverty Schools
State	123 Low and 128 High	15.40%	27.92%	12.52%
Churchill		n/a	n/a	
Clark	76 Low and 80 High	19.70%	34.40%	14.70%
Douglas	5 Low and No High Poverty schools	3.18%	n/a	
Elko	5 Low and 5 High	8.49%	22.60%	14.11%
Esmeralda		n/a	n/a	
Eureka		n/a	n/a	
Humboldt	1 Low and 4 High	13.11%	14.90%	1.79%
Lander	3 Low and 0 High	2.08%	n/a	
Lincoln	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	0%	
Lyon	1 Low and 2 High	12.46%	19%	6.32%
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	14%	
Nye	2 Low and 3 High	16.03%	12.19%	-3.84%
Carson	1 Low and 1 High	2.77%	2.57%	-0.20%
Pershing	0 Low and 3 High	n/a	0.00%	
Storey		n/a	n/a	
Washoe	29 Low and 25 high	5.50%	4.40%	-1.10%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	21.72%	n/a	

Percent Point Difference 07/08 from 06/07
-4.97%
-5.50%
1.16%
3.71%
-15.34%
-3.11%
-7.59%
1.80%

2007-2008				
Percent less than 3 years of experience				
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Poverty Schools
State	123 Low and 124 High	24.10%	42.19%	18.09%
Churchill	1 Low and 1 High	22.73%	19.35%	-3.38%
Clark	69 Low and 81 High	27.72%	47.20%	19.48%
Douglas	No High Poverty schools	1.20%	n/a	
Elko	8 Low and 5 High	17.04%	79.32%	62.28%
Esmeralda		n/a	n/a	
Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	0.70%	n/a	
Humboldt	1 Low and 1 High	9.09%	18.18%	9.09%
Lander	4 Low and 0 High	20.90%	n/a	
Lincoln	1 Low and 0 High	25%	n/a	
Lyon	2 Low and 1 High	20.00%	37%	16.84%
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	25%	
Nye	2 Low and 5 High	22.02%	29.60%	7.58%
Carson	1 Low and 2 High	12.39%	8.28%	-4.11%
Pershing	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	50.00%	
Storey		n/a	n/a	
Washoe	32 Low and 26 High	19.68%	29.06%	9.38%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	48.00%	n/a	

2006-2007				
Percent less than 3 years of experience				
		Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Poverty Schools
State	123 Low and 127 High	26.67%	41.76%	15.09%
Churchill		n/a	n/a	
Clark	74 Low and 81 High	28.93%	44.26%	15.33%
Douglas	5 Low and No High Poverty schools	16.46%	n/a	
Elko	5 Low and 5 High	20.92%	27.98%	7.06%
Esmeralda	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	33.00%	
Eureka	1 Low and 0 High	0.00%	n/a	
Humboldt	2 Low and 4 High	43.75%	14.81%	-28.94%
Lander	2 Low and 0 High	22.22%	n/a	
Lincoln	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	25%	
Lyon	1 Low and 2 High	26.00%	49.89%	23.89%
Mineral	0 Low and 1 High	n/a	14.30%	
Nye	2 Low and 4 High	35.29%	29.90%	-5.39%
Carson	1 Low and 1 High	33.00%	33.00%	0.00%
Pershing	0 Low and 3 High	n/a	5.36%	
Storey		n/a	n/a	
Washoe	26 Low and 24 High	22.56%	29.93%	7.37%
White Pine	1 Low and 0 High	22.00%	n/a	

Percent Point Difference 07/08 from 06/07
3.00%
4.15%
55.22%
38.03%
-7.05%
12.97%
-4.11%
2.01%

2007-2008				
Percent of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher				
		Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Minority Schools
State	311 Low and 280 High	8.10%	15.70%	7.60%
Churchill	8 Low and 0 High	8.76%	n/a	
Clark	116 Low and 218 High	11.05%	17.64%	6.59%
Douglas	15 Low and 0 High	2.90%	n/a	
Elko	17 Low and 9 High	6.21%	11.54%	5.33%
Esmeralda	2 Low and 1 High	6.45%	6.25%	-0.20%
Eureka	3 Low and 0 High	8.18%	n/a	
Humboldt	8 Low and 4 High	4.07%	21.42%	17.35%
Lander	6 Low and 0 High	6.77%	n/a	
Lincoln	8 Low and 1 High	17.08%	12.76%	-4.32%
Lyon	18 Low and 0 High	4.86%	n/a	
Mineral	3 Low and 1 High	19.89%	25.00%	5.11%
Nye	15 Low and 3 High	9.07%	0.00%	-9.07%
Carson	10 Low and 2 High	6.25%	1.14%	-5.11%
Pershing	5 Low and 0 High	4.93	n/a	
Storey	4 Low and 0 High	5.00%	n/a	
Washoe	61 Low and 41 High	3.46%	2.68%	-0.78%
White Pine	8 Low and 0 High	19.35%	n/a	

2006-2007				
Percent of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher				
		Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Percent Point Difference between H and L Minority Schools
State	310 Low and 264 High	15.40%	27.92%	12.52%
Churchill	8 Low and 0 High	16.80%	n/a	
Clark	119 Low and 204 High	13.59%	20.94%	7.35%
Douglas	15 Low and 0 High	2.22%	n/a	
Elko	16 Low and 10 High	8.99%	16.69%	7.70%
Esmeralda	3 Low and 1 High	0%	0%	0.00%
Eureka	3 Low and 0 High	9.62%	n/a	
Humboldt	8 Low and 4 High	7.48%	30.77%	23.29%
Lander	6 Low and 0 High	5.90%	n/a	
Lincoln	9 Low and 1 High	0%	n/a	
Lyon	17 Low and 0 High	14.71%	n/a	
Mineral	3 Low and 1 High	14.12%	14.30%	0.18%
Nye	15 Low and 3 High	13.32%	6.00%	-7.32%
Carson	10 Low and 2 High	4.21%	0.00%	-4.21%
Pershing	5 Low and 0 High	0%	n/a	
Storey	4 Low and 0 High	n/a	5.55%	
Washoe	62 Low and 39 High	7.58%	4.97%	-2.61%
White Pine	7 Low and 0 High	18.46%	n/a	

Percent Point Difference 07/08 from 06/07
-4.92%
-0.76%
-2.37%
-0.20%
-5.94%
4.93%
-1.75%
-0.90%
1.83%

2008-2009 Data

Clark County School District: The greatest inequity in teacher distribution is in Clark County School District, the largest school district in Nevada, i.e. high-poverty/high-minority schools continue to have teachers that have not met the NCLB “highly qualified” requirements and have less than 3 years of teaching experience. However, the slowed student enrollment growth in Clark County School District has made it possible to have a larger pool of “highly qualified” and “experienced” teacher candidates to hire into high need schools than in previous years.

The district is making every effort to hire teachers who have met the “highly qualified” teacher requirements into high need schools and to develop a teacher compliance plan for every non-HQ teacher to meet the HQ requirements as soon as possible, as well as monitor those plans. In 07-08 the district prioritized “high need schools” (as defined by the criteria for equitable distribution of teachers) for CCSD teams of retired administrators to work with first, to assist school administrators and teachers in developing and monitoring individual teacher plans to meet the HQT requirements as soon as possible. For 08-09 the district Human Resources staff worked directly with school administrators and teachers in development of these plans.

It is difficult to track overall CCSD district level “progress” in equitable distribution of teachers from one year to the next because school designations for “high/low poverty” and “high/low minority” change and the numbers of schools designated as “in need of improvement” change, making year to year overall comparisons difficult. **However, the need to focus on collecting, analyzing and tracking teacher and administrator cause data to reflect the needs of individual schools that remain on the list of “high need schools” from year to year is evident. More specific strategies for addressing inequities at these schools need to be planned with measurable evidence for the success of the strategies.**

HQT – High/Low Poverty Schools:

While the gap between high/low poverty schools in terms of classes not taught by “highly qualified” teachers reduced to 0.98% point difference by May 2009 when comparing schools in the top quartile of poverty to the bottom quartile of poverty, high poverty schools still had 12.10% of classes being taught by teachers who had not met the HQT requirements. The percent point difference 08-09 from 07-08 is - 8.22% which is a marked improvement.

HQT – High/Low Minority Schools:

The percent point difference 08-09 from 07-08 is -2.99%, with high minority schools at 14.99% and low minority schools at 11.39% (a 3.6 % point difference).

CCSD continues to hire a much larger percentage of teachers with less than 3 years of experience at high poverty than at low poverty schools because many teachers leave high need schools at the end of the school year and the new pool of available teachers reportedly consists mainly of teachers who are new to the profession. This issue continues to be discussed in planning meetings to address the EDT needs in the district plan for equitable distribution of teachers.

Less than 3 Years Experience - High/Low Poverty Schools:

The percent point difference 08-09 from 07-08 is – 4.52%, with high poverty schools at 40.32% and low poverty schools at 25.36% (a 14.96% point difference).

Less than 3 Years Experience - High/Low Minority Schools:

The percent point difference 08-09 from 07-08 is -0.80%, with high minority schools at 36.97% and low minority schools at 23.67% (a 13.30% point difference).

Washoe County School District: Washoe County School District which is the second largest school district in Nevada continues to have inequity in regard to teachers with less than 3 years of experience

Less than 3 Years Experience - High/Low Poverty Schools:

The percent point difference 08-09 from 07-08 is 2.10%, with high poverty schools at 29.61% and low poverty schools at 18.13% (a 11.48% point difference).

Less than 3 Years Experience - High/Low Minority Schools:

The percent point difference 08-09 from 07-08 is -1.03%, with high minority schools at 27.86% and low minority schools at 23.24% (a 4.62% point difference).

There is no inequity in terms of teachers who have met the “highly qualified” teacher requirements.

2007-2008

Clark County School District: The greatest inequity in teacher distribution is in Clark County School District, the largest school district in Nevada. This district has a large number of high-poverty/high-minority schools that have teachers that have not met the NCLB highly qualified requirements and have less than 3 years of teaching experience. In looking at the 07-08 data on core classes not being taught by teachers who have met the “highly qualified” teacher requirements, the gap between schools that are high poverty (19.16%) versus low poverty (9.96%) is 9.20%. For 07-08 the gap was 14.70% as compared to 9.20% for 06-07. This school year the district prioritized “high need schools” (as defined by the criteria for equitable distribution of teachers) for CCSD teams to work with first, to assist school administrators and teachers in developing and monitoring individual teacher plans to meet the HQT requirements as soon as possible. For 07-08 when looking at high/low minority schools (which for purposes of looking at EDT are determined by being 50% or greater for high minority and less than 50% for low minority) – the HQT discrepancy is 6.59% and the experience discrepancy is 14%.

CCSD continues to hire a much larger percentage of teachers with less than 3 years of experience at high poverty than at low poverty schools (19.48% discrepancy for 07-08) because many teachers leave high need schools at the end of the school year and the new pool of available teachers reportedly consists mainly of teachers who are new to the profession.

Washoe County School District: Washoe County School District which is the second largest school district in Nevada continues to have some inequity in regard to teachers with at least 3 years of experience, but not with teachers who have met the “highly qualified” teacher requirements.

Nevada's Key Goals

1. Continuously monitor teacher distribution through data collection and analyses of identified patterns, so that Nevada poor and minority students have equitable access to experienced and qualified teachers who are effective in teaching students to needed levels of achievement.
 - *Measure:* Percentage of teachers who have met NCLB “highly qualified” requirements and/or experienced teachers in high need schools (high poverty/high minority schools in need of improvement) versus schools with low poverty/low minority and not in need of improvement.
 - *Publicly Report Progress:* Nevada Equity Plan – Executive Summary

http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability_NCLB.htm
2. Increase the percentage of Nevada’s teachers meeting the NCLB “highly qualified” requirements to 100%.
 - *Measure:* Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Nevada’s districts/schools.
 - *Publicly Report Progress:* State Accountability Report

Nevada’s Strategies and Sub-Strategies Listed by Supportive Elements

1. Provide technical assistance to districts in analyzing, choosing and implementing plans of action for specific district policies and practices based on theories of change to address inequities in teacher assignment, and in response to targeting systemic issues involving high need schools. The SEA and LEAs will coordinate efforts to:
 2. Increase the relative attractiveness of hard-to-staff schools so they can compete for their fair share of good teachers.
 3. Make these schools personally and professionally rewarding places to work to retain high quality teachers.

Because Clark County School District (CCSD) is 69% of Nevada, some of their EDT strategies are listed herein.

Element 1: Data and Reporting Systems

- 1.1 Collect and publicly report data on the distribution of teacher quality. (pp. 7-20, 40-56)
- 1.2 Program data for data reports on equitable distribution of teachers. (p. 39)

Element 2: Teacher Preparation

- 2.1 The SEA contacted the Teach For America program providing teachers to Clark County School District requesting the program ensure their teachers placed in Title I schools meet the NCLB “highly qualified” teacher requirements before placement by taking the subject matter competency tests (p. 57)

Element 3: Out-of-Field Teaching

- 3.1 No longer approve out-of-field teacher assignments in core subjects. (p. 60)
- 3.2 The CCSD Human Resources Division monitors transfer requests and denies the transfer of out-of-field teachers to high-poverty, low-performing schools. (p. 60)
- 3.3 The CCSD Human Resources Division denies contracts to any new teacher applicant seeking an out-of-field teaching position. (p. 60)

Element 4: Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers

- 4.1 AB1: The 2007 legislature created a grant fund for incentives for:
 - teachers and administrators who have been employed in that category of position for at least 5 years and who are employed in schools which are at-risk
 - and teachers who hold an endorsement in the field of mathematics, science, special education, English as a second language or other area of need within the district, as determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction [this incentive targets high need areas, but not at-risk schools.]The financial incentive available for individual employees who participate in the program is limited to no more than \$3,500 per year. The district had to notify before August 1, 2007 each employee who is currently receiving the 1/5th retirement service credit that he may elect to participate in the program of incentive pay for licensed educational personnel in lieu of the purchase of retirement service if they continue to be eligible for the program (so the 1/5th retirement service credit is being phased out). (p. 63)

- 4.2 Allow retired staff in hard to fill positions to be rehired (p. 64)
[In CCSD “at high-need schools” - p. 65).
- 4.3 List state and federal incentives on the SEA website to ensure better communication of this information to teachers and encourage districts to do the same on their website. (p. 64)
- 4.4 In CCSD the Title I office allows Title I schools great flexibility in their hiring practices, because the amount of difference between the lowest and highest paid teachers are picked up in the district Title I budget, rather than each school being forced to hire teachers with less experience who would be lower on the salary schedule. (p. 65)
- 4.5 CCSD - Allow high need schools first pick of teachers. (p. 66)

Element 5: Professional Development

RPDP Professional Development (pp. 70-78)

- 5.1 Continue professional development provided by the Regional Professional Development Programs to improve the quality of teaching at schools designated as “in need of improvement”.
- 5.2 Strengthen school leadership by continuing to provide professional development through the Regional Professional Development Program as outlined in the Administrative Strand.
- 5.3 Continue state initiatives – Strengthen school leadership through the Nevada Association of School Administrators; partner with the International Center for Leadership in Education to study what model schools do to get student achievement results, promote professional learning communities; promote assessment for learning; support response to intervention; require curriculum self-analysis for districts and schools identified for corrective action. (pp. 79-84)

Element 6: Specialized Knowledge and Skills (p. 86)

6.1 Urban Academy at 22 Low-Performing Schools (CCSD)

CCSD provides summer classes (16 credits), for teachers new to the district assigned to high-need schools, in areas such as classroom management, lesson planning, meeting the needs of diverse learners, and State standards and benchmarks.

6.2 Professional Development on Working with Diverse Learners (CCSD)

All teachers receive professional development on working with diverse learners. Techniques and strategies for teaching diverse learners is embedded into all professional development activities offered to elementary, middle school, and high school teachers. All teachers new to the district are required to complete new teacher induction modules throughout their first year in the district. These modules include instruction on teaching strategies to use with diverse learners. Differentiated instruction is the focus of the training modules in order to assist teachers new to the district with appropriate strategies to address the needs of diverse learners.

Element 7: Working Conditions

- 7.1 Continue the Working Conditions Survey in Clark County and Washoe County School Districts and increase teacher retention by improving working conditions. (p. 89)
- 7.2 Continue State class size reduction funding. (p. 90)

Element 8: Policy Coherence

- 8.1 AB 1: The 2007 legislature created a grant fund for incentives for teachers who hold an endorsement in the field of mathematics, science, special education, English as a second language or other area of need within the district. This incentive targets high need areas, but not at-risk schools. This may be a policy coherence problem. Since critical shortage area teachers can receive a financial incentive working at any school regardless of designation, this could deter them from wanting to go to and stay at an at risk school. On the other hand, if an at-risk school (defined as “at risk” by at least 65% free and reduced lunch) needed a math teacher, for example, and the teacher didn’t have 5 years of experience, as is a requirement for receiving a financial incentive at an at risk school otherwise, the teacher could be provided the incentive immediately even with 1 year of experience which would help the school fill their teacher needs. (p. 93)
- 8.2 The SEA has upgraded the licensure system in the Southern Office to reduce the amount of time for licensure issuance from 12 to 14+ weeks to 2-5 weeks depending on the number of applications submitted. (p. 93)
- 8.3 CCSD has doubled support staff and added an administrator to speed up the processing time of applications. CCSD has monitored application status weekly to shorten the application process as reported May 2009. (p. 93)
- 8.4 AB 425 of the 2009 Legislature revises provisions governing the licensure of certain educational personnel which helps teachers meet licensure requirements more expediently, and thus “highly qualified” teacher requirements. (p. 94)
- The Bill eliminates the requirement that new applicants for a Nevada teaching license (from out-of-state) have previous teaching experience in order to be exempt from the examinations required for the initial licensure of teachers and other educational personnel if the Commission on Professional Standards in Education determines that the examinations required for initial licensure in the other state are comparable to the examinations required for initial licensure in Nevada.
 - The Bill requires the Commission to conduct a review of the regulations of the Commission governing the licensure and endorsement of special education teachers to improve and enhance reciprocal licensure in Nevada of special education teachers from other states.

