

New York State's Revised Plan to Enhance Teacher Quality



**THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The New York State Education Department
Albany 12234
September 2006 Update**

For further information, contact nclbnys@mail.nysed.gov.

CONTENTS	PAGE	ATTACHMENTS	PAGE
Executive Summary.....	i	A Data Sources	65
Table of Acronyms.....	vi	B Evidence for Probable Success of Strategies and Action Steps.....	69
Part 1. Federal Teacher Quality Requirements.....	1	C Federally-funded Partnerships to Support an Equitable Distribution of Teachers for High Need Schools.....	74
Part 2. New York State's Teacher Quality Agenda.....	7	D Links to Information about New York State Programs for Teachers.....	76
Part 3. Gap Analysis.....	8	E May 2006 Regents Item on Teacher Supply and Demand (<i>separate document</i>)	
Part 4. Overarching Strategies to Close the Gaps.....	22	F May 2006 Regents Presentation on the Need for Certified Teachers (<i>separate document</i>)	
Part 5. Action Steps.....	24	G May 2006 Presentation to Regional Network Partners group on NYS Teacher Equity Gap (<i>separate document</i>)	
Area 1. Data and reporting systems.....	27	H Lists of LEAs and Schools with Their AMO and AYP Status (<i>separate documents Attachments H-1 through H-8</i>)	
Area 2 . Pre-service teacher preparation and specialized knowledge and skills for high poverty LEAs.....	29		
Area 3. Certification and out-of-field teaching.....	31		
Area 4. Recruitment and retention of certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers....	32		
Area 5. Professional development.....	38		
Area 6. Working conditions in schools and LEAs.....	46		
Area 7. Monitoring and Technical Assistance.....	47		
Area 8. Policy coherence.....	51		
Area 9. Limiting the use of the HOUSSE.....	52		
Part 6. Example of Local Progress.....	58		

Executive Summary

- The New York State Board of Regents has clear goals for teacher quality in New York State and comprehensive policies for achieving them. Since 1998, when the Regents Teaching Policy launched systemic reforms, the New York State Education Department has been upholding new, higher standards for the preparation, certification, induction, ongoing professional development, recruitment and retention of teachers as well as school and district leaders and has been measuring results by supporting independent, scholarly research. All of the Regents reforms are focused on enhancing the quality of teachers and school environments in order to raise student achievement and close achievement gaps.
- The Regents goals and policies are closely aligned with teacher quality goals in the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). As a result, in May 2006, the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) determined that New York State was making a good faith effort to comply with the NCLB's teacher quality goals and was demonstrating progress.
- To meet both State and federal teacher quality goals, New York State must ensure that: (1) all classes in core academic subjects are taught by highly qualified teachers; and (2) low income and minority children have the same access as all other children to appropriately certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers.
- The New York State Education Department will use four strategies to close remaining gaps in teacher quality. First, it will continue to target State and regional resources to high need, low performing districts and schools and hold them accountable for results. Second, it will continue to measure and publicly report on progress in districts and schools. Third, it will continue to strengthen teacher preparation, certification, induction, ongoing professional development and retention strategies. Fourth, it will expand effective partnerships between the State, public schools and districts, higher education, cultural institutions and the business community to support teacher quality in all LEAs and schools.
- In a coordinated effort across virtually all of its program offices and their partners, the State Education Department will take actions to implement these four strategies in nine areas: (1) data and reporting systems; (2) pre-service teacher preparation and specialized knowledge and skills for high poverty LEAs; (3) certification and out-of-field teaching; (4) recruitment and retention of certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers; (5) professional development; (6) working conditions in schools and LEAs; (7) monitoring and technical assistance; (8) policy coherence; and (9) limiting the use of the HOURSSE.
- As required by the U.S. Department of Education, this plan provides data on the number and distribution of teachers who were not highly qualified in 2004-2005 and the inequitable distribution of teachers across districts. The plan explains how New York State addresses gaps in teacher quality, lists specific strategies and future action steps and provides an example of local progress in New York City. The plan also includes a description of New York State's data sources on

teacher quality, links to evidence for the probable success of planned action steps and links to information about statewide teacher quality programs. Finally, this plan also explains how New York State will significantly reduce the use of the HOUSSSE.

- By December 2006, the State Education Department will review this plan with the partners whose support is essential to its successful implementation. Amendments may be made to the plan in response to this review.
- Listed below is a summary of some of the action steps the State Education Department will be taking. These steps are embedded throughout the plan and are included in Attachment E.

Next Steps / Current Actions. The Department will continue to work with State leaders, the entire education community and others to address teacher quality. The following are highlights of the current plan.

Supporting Teachers in Low Performing District and Schools

The Department will strengthen its regional network strategy for supporting teachers in high need, low performing districts and schools. This strategy relies on Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs) that provide direct technical assistance to identified low performing districts and schools and that coordinate the efforts of other regional networks specializing in special education, bilingual education, professional development and other areas to support the same identified low performing districts and schools.

Strengthening Teacher Preparation, Induction and Professional Development

High standards for teacher preparation. The Department will ensure that the more than 100 teacher preparation institutions in New York State continue to meet the Board of Regents high standards. State regulations adopted by the Board of Regents require all teacher education programs to have curricula with a general core, a content core and a pedagogical core; program accreditation; a pass rate of 80 percent or higher on all certification exams; required content in literacy; and field experiences in high need schools and with “socioeconomically disadvantaged students, students who are English language learners and students with disabilities.” All teacher preparation programs must demonstrate that they measure the impact of their graduates on student learning in schools and use their findings for program improvement. In addition, the Department will continue to measure the effectiveness of different teacher preparation pathways on student learning.

Strengthen and support new teacher mentoring and induction. The Department will continue to strengthen mentoring for new teachers. Every school district in New York State is required to provide mentoring to first-year teachers. Every teacher with an Initial Certificate (valid for the first five years of teaching) must receive mentoring from an employer in order to qualify for a Professional Certificate (valid after the first five years of teaching). A district’s mentoring program

must be part of its Professional Development Plan. A competitive State grant program provides funds that help a number of districts implement their mentoring programs. A district's mentoring program must be consistent with its required Professional Development Plan. Increased technical assistance will be given to those districts and schools that have been determined, through monitoring, to have less effective teacher mentoring programs. The Regents and Education Department are requesting an additional \$26,000,000 from the Governor and Legislature to further support mentoring for new teachers.

Teacher professional development. The Department will continue to work with school districts and regional networks that support them to enhance professional development for teachers. New York State requires all districts to have Professional Development Plans that respond to the specific learning needs of their students and to provide mentoring to first-year teachers. In addition, all teachers with Professional Certificates must complete at least 175 contact hours of professional development, consistent with their districts' Professional Development Plan, every five years in order to maintain their certificate in good standing. The Department will work with high need districts and schools to monitor the content and effectiveness of all professional development offerings. In school year 2006-2007, the New York State Education Department will be identifying best practices in professional development for benchmarking purposes.

Ensuring An Adequate Supply of Highly Qualified Teachers to Meet Local Needs

Technical Assistance to Support Regional and Local Efforts. The New York State Education Department will provide annual, detailed, regional workforce and supply and demand data to regional representatives of teacher preparation programs, local school districts and others to help them develop a shared understanding of the data and assess the effectiveness of their strategies for addressing them. The Department encourages educators to advise high school students, community college students and four-year students who have yet to declare a major about careers based on accurate teacher labor market information for math, science and other subjects. The Department also encourages educators to develop alternative teacher preparation programs in areas where they are needed to attract second career individuals into teaching for specific vacancies in districts. Many regions have already begun these discussions and the Department's data and technical assistance will support their efforts.

Incentives for Retired Teachers to Return to Teaching. New York's growing pool of retired teachers can help immediately to reduce shortages. The Regents have requested a legislative proposal that would enable retired teachers in identified shortage areas to return to teaching without a pension penalty and are aggressively advancing it.

Incentives for Teachers. Financial incentives play an important role in attracting and retaining teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, geographic areas and schools. The New York State Education Department advocates for the State's Teachers of Tomorrow program, the State's Teacher Opportunity Corps program, the New York City Teaching Fellows program, federal loan forgiveness for teachers and other State and federal programs that provide financial incentives to

teachers. The 2006-2007 New York State Budget included a new Math and Science Teaching Incentive Program to increase the supply of math and science teachers and the federal government has similar initiatives. In addition, the Department encourages districts to create their own incentive programs, such as the new Housing Incentive program in New York City, which aims to attract experienced and certified math, science and special education teachers to New York City's highest need schools.

Review of Teacher Certification Requirements. When the Regents adopted a comprehensive Teaching Policy in 1998, they committed to modification of elements of that policy when necessary. The Regents have made modifications to the policy concerning teacher certification requirements in response to teacher shortages and other issues. With new data on teacher shortages and teacher effectiveness now available, further review is needed. Some of the issues currently under review include the following.

Interstate Reciprocity. Can we increase the pool of teachers who enter the teaching profession in shortage areas from states party to the interstate reciprocity agreement? The Department asks the Regents to endorse the strategy to allow teachers certified in other states, with comparable teacher certification testing requirements, to receive a comparable certificate in New York. If accepted by the Regents, the Department will advance regulations to implement this recommendation.

Supplemental Certificates. Can we change the requirements for the supplemental certificate to attract more certified teachers to second certification in a subject shortage area? For example, should existing teachers be permitted to use more related courses (i.e., cognates) to meet the educational requirement for the new certificate, reducing the time they would need to complete all requirements and reducing expenses to school districts and teachers

Special Education Certificates. Prior to 2004, New York State had one certificate for special education for all subjects in grades Pre-Kindergarten (PreK) through 12 and three disability-specific certificates for grades PreK-12. The new certification regulations that went into effect in February 2004 created nineteen separate certificate titles for Teachers of Students with Disabilities, including Birth to Grade 2, Grades 1 – 6, Grades 5 – 9 Generalist, Grades 5 – 9 Specialist (math, biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, social studies, English and languages other than English) and Grades 7 - 12 Specialist (math, biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, social studies, English and languages other than English). Concerns have been raised that the change from four K-12 certificate titles to nineteen certificate titles may be contributing to shortages that will have a significant impact on students with disabilities in “special classes” (as opposed to students in inclusive settings) because federal law requires teachers of special classes to be certified in special education and demonstrate subject matter competency for all core assignments. The Department is meeting with educators across the State, reviewing certification data by title and reviewing policy options for addressing both student needs and shortage issues.

Alternative Teacher Preparation Programs. Since 2000, when the Regents authorized alternative teacher preparation programs, multiple programs have been established in New York City and a

few upstate institutions. The Department has begun conversations with colleges and districts that are implementing alternative teacher preparation programs to identify changes that would make them more effective at meeting local district needs and will be reporting to the Board of Regents on this initiative in the near future.

Support Innovative Practices. The need for certified teachers requires us to reach beyond traditional partners and engage the entire education community and other key stakeholders. The Department has begun this work and it will continue. Two examples are listed below.

IBM Initiative. The Department is working with IBM to launch a national program to assist IBM employees make a transition to teaching in the shortage areas of math and the sciences. While this initiative is important for the additional math and science teachers it will bring to New York State, it also serves as a national model for other businesses and industries. The Department is working to ensure that the New York component of this national effort is successful and is pleased to report that approximately 50 percent of IBM's first cohort of teacher candidates is in New York State. This effort is intended to serve as a model for other corporations to support future teachers. Several additional corporations located in New York have already expressed an interest in this model.

Public Broadcasting. The public broadcasting stations in New York State have developed high quality educational materials for students and teachers, including PBS Teach Line, Video on Demand, PBS Parents, Homework Hotline, SED Programming, and PBS Kids. The Department is contracting with the Association of Public Broadcasting Stations (APBS) to prepare an initial implementation plan for a project entitled "Encouraging Entry into Teaching Shortage Areas and Key Professions." The plan is focused on underserved communities to interest individuals in those communities in preparing for critical shortages in such areas as teachers of special education, math and science and the health professions of nursing, pharmacy, physical therapy, occupational therapy and others. Once this implementation plan is fully developed, the Department, possibly in conjunction with the Association of Public Broadcasting Stations, will seek foundation and governmental grants to implement it.

Ensure That All Teachers Are Appropriately Certified and Highly Qualified. In order to fully implement the Board of Regents Teaching Policy and meet federal teacher quality goals, the Department will work with the Regents and the education community to review relevant data and severely restrict the use of incidental teaching, especially in low performing schools, thereby limiting the use of the HOUSSSE.

Table of Acronyms

AMO	Annual Measurable Objective (for teacher quality)
APPR	Annual Professional Performance Review
ATP	Alternative Teacher Preparation
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress (for student achievement)
BOCES	Boards of Cooperative Educational Services
CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers
CTE	Career and Technical Education
DCEP	District Comprehensive Educational Plan
DINI	District in Need of Improvement
EMSC	SED's Office of Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
FTE	Full-time Equivalent
HEA	Higher Education Act
HQ	Highly Qualified
HQT	Highly Qualified Teacher
HOUSSE	High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IMF	Institutional Master File
LEA	Local Educational Agency
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
NSF	National Science Foundation
NSRC	National Science Resource Center
NYC	New York City (as opposed to the Rest of State)
NYC DOE	New York City Department of Education
NYS	New York State
NYS DLC	New York State Distance Learning Consortium
OCE	SED's Office of Cultural Education
OHE	SED's Office of Higher Education
OMS	SED's Office of Operations and Management Services
OP	SED's Office of the Professions
PBS	Public Broadcasting System
PMF	Personnel Master File
RSSC	Regional School Support Center
SAHE	State Agency for Higher Education
SEA	State Education Agency
SED (or NYSED)	New York State Education Department
SINI	School in Need of Improvement
SUNY	State University of New York
SURR	School Under Registration Review
TCERT	SED's teacher certification system prior to March 2006
TEACH	SED's teacher certification system as of March 2006
USDOE	U.S. Department of Education
VESID	SED's Office of Vocational & Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities
VLS	Virtual Learning System

Part 1. Federal Teacher Quality Requirements

Federal Requirements for Teacher Quality

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) has teacher quality requirements that are implemented by federal regulations. Section 200.57(a) of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires states that receive funds under Title I, Part A of the NCLB to have a plan that:

- ensures all public elementary, middle and secondary school teachers who teach “core academic subjects” are “highly qualified” not later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year;
- establishes annual measurable objectives for each local educational agency (LEA) and school that include, at a minimum, annual increases in the percentage of:
 - “highly qualified” teachers of “core academic subjects” at each LEA and school; and
 - teachers of “core academic subjects” who are receiving “high quality” professional development to enable them to become highly qualified and effective teachers;
- ensures that Title I schools provide instruction by “highly qualified” teachers;
- ensures that minority children and children from low income families are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers;
- describes the strategies the State will use to:
 - help LEAs and schools meet the NCLB’s requirements;
 - monitor the progress of LEAs and schools in meeting the NCLB’s requirements; and
 - ensure that the NCLB’s goals are achieved and that progress is publicly reported.

Federal regulations require LEAs receiving NCLB funds to have comparable plans for their schools.

Federal Implementation of Teacher Quality Requirements

Soon after the NCLB was enacted, the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) required all states to submit teacher quality plans as part of their applications for NCLB funds. In October 2005, the USDOE notified the states that they would not face penalties if they failed to meet the NCLB’s teacher quality goals by 2005-2006 provided that they were making a good faith effort to meet the goals and demonstrated progress. Emphasizing that teacher quality is a strategy for raising student achievement, the U.S. Secretary of Education stated:

“Personnel decisions are made at the State and local levels, and the law relies on education leaders in the State to make the best educational decisions for improving student achievement.”

In March 2006, the USDOE informed the states that it would conduct a review of each state and would require states that were not making a good faith effort or demonstrating progress toward meeting the NCLB’s teacher quality goals to submit a revised teacher quality plan and/or face financial penalties. Also in March 2006, the USDOE notified states that its new interpretation of the NCLB required states to limit their use of the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE), a statutory option for teachers to demonstrate that they know the subject(s) they are teaching, after the end of school year 2005-2006.

In May 2006, the USDOE determined that New York State was making a good faith effort to comply with the NCLB's teacher quality requirements and faced no financial penalty but that New York State was required to submit a revised teacher quality plan for peer review by July 2006.

In August 2006, New York State was informed that its July 2006 plan fully met nineteen of the twenty-five required sub-elements in the USDOE's rubric for evaluating state plans, but only partially met requirements for the remaining six sub-elements. The USDOE asked New York State to submit another plan by September 29 to respond to peer review findings for those six sub-elements.

In August and September, the USDOE released new information with implications for state plans. On August 14, 2006, the USDOE issued final regulations to implement the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) that included sections on highly qualified teachers. On September 5, 2006, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings sent a letter to Chief State School Officers about the continued availability of the HOUSSE and the USDOE's plans to seek to limit the HOUSSE through the reauthorization of the NCLB.

Required Elements for Revised State Plans

The USDOE required revised state plans to address all 25 sub-elements in the six required elements that are cited on this page and the following pages. The six sub-elements with peer review findings in New York State's July 2006 plan are underlined. For each underlined sub-element, this section has a summary of the peer review finding and New York State's response to it.

Required Element 1

*The revised plan must provide a detailed analysis of the core academic subject classes in the State that are currently not being taught by highly qualified teachers. The analysis must, in particular, address schools that are not making adequate yearly progress and whether or not these schools have more acute needs than do other schools in attracting highly qualified teachers. The analysis must also identify the districts and schools around the State where significant numbers of teachers do not meet HQT standards, and examine whether or not there are particular hard-to-staff courses frequently taught by non-highly qualified teachers. **See Part 3 (Gap Analysis) and Attachments A, E and F for responses to all the questions for Required Element 1.***

- a. *Does the revised plan include an analysis of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified? Is the analysis based on accurate classroom level data?*
- b. *Does the analysis focus on the staffing needs of schools that are not making AYP? Do these schools have high percentages of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified?*
- c. *Does the analysis identify particular groups of teachers to which the State's plan must pay particular attention, such as special education teachers, mathematics or science teachers, or multi-subject teachers in rural schools?*
- d. *Does the analysis identify districts and schools around the State where significant numbers of teachers do not meet HQT standards?*
- e. *Does the analysis identify particular courses that are often taught by non-highly qualified teachers?*

Peer review finding for Required Element 1 and New York State's response. Peer reviewers found that New York State's July 2006 plan only partially met Requirement 1 because the plan's gap analysis focused on certification gaps rather than gaps in core classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the areas identified in the USDOE's rubric for the evaluation of state plans. **Response:** To address this finding, this plan includes (1) a summary of the reasons why core classes were not taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-2005 and how they were addressed; (2) four new tables containing detailed data about 2004-2005 core classes that were not taught by highly qualified teachers and new analyses of those data tables; and (3) as requested by staff at the USDOE, an explanation that final 2005-2006 data on core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers will be available in October 2006 (in accordance with the New York State Education Department's latest annual data schedule) and a description of how the 2005-2006 data will be used. **See Part 3-Gap Analysis.**

Required Element 2

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

- a. *Does the plan identify LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives for HQT?* **See Part 3 (Gap Analysis).**
- b. *Does the plan include specific steps that will be taken by LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives?* **See Action Steps, Area 7.**
- c. *Does the plan delineate specific steps the SEA will take to ensure that all LEAs have plans in place to assist all non-HQ teachers to become HQ as quickly as possible?* **See Action Steps, Area 7.**

Required Element 3

*The revised plan must include information on the technical assistance, programs, and services that the SEA will offer to assist LEAs in successfully completing their HQT plans, particularly where large groups of teachers are not highly qualified, and the resources the LEAs will use to meet their HQT goals. **See Action Steps, Areas 5 and 7 and Attachment G for responses to all questions in Required Element 3.***

- a. *Does the plan include a description of the technical assistance the SEA will provide to assist LEAs in successfully carrying out their HQT plans?*
- b. *Does the plan indicate that the staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP will be given high priority?*
- c. *Does the plan include a description of programs and services the SEA will provide to assist teachers and LEAs in successfully meeting HQT goals?*
- d. *Does the plan specifically address the needs of any subgroups of teachers identified in Requirement 1?*
- e. *Does the plan include a description of how the State will use its available funds (e.g., Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A, including the portion that goes to the State agency for higher education; other federal and State funds, as appropriate) to address the needs of teachers who are not highly qualified?*
- f. *Does the plan for the use of available funds indicate that priority will be given to the staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP?*

Peer review finding for Required Element 3 and New York State’s response. Peer reviewers found that New York State’s July 2006 plan only partially met Requirement 3 because (1) it did not adequately address the needs of subgroups of teachers identified in Requirement 1 because no subgroups were identified; and (2) it did not adequately provide an overarching funding priority for staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP. Peer reviewers found that “some individual program descriptions such as Title II, Part A for higher education include partnerships for high need schools. This description is based on program requirements and is not a funding strategy.” **Response:** To address this finding, this plan explains (1) how New York State is addressing the needs of identified subgroups of teachers; and (2) New York State’s overarching strategy to target resources to Title I districts and schools that are not making AYP (also known in New York State as “high need, low performing districts and schools”). **See Part 4-Overarching Strategies to Close the Gaps. See Part 5-Context and Action Steps, Area 4 (Recruitment and retention), Area 5 (Professional development), Area 7 (Monitoring and technical assistance) and Area 8 (Policy coherence). Also see Part 6-Example of Local Progress.**

Required Element 4

The revised plan must describe how the SEA will work with LEAs that fail to reach the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year. See Action Steps, Area 7 for responses to all questions in Required Element 4.

- a. *Does the plan indicate how the SEA will monitor LEA compliance with the LEAs’ HQT plans described in Requirement 2 and hold LEAs accountable for fulfilling their plans?*
- b. *Does the plan show how technical assistance from the SEA to help LEAs meet the 100 percent HQT goal will be targeted toward LEAs and schools that are not making AYP?*
- c. *Does the plan describe how the SEA will monitor whether LEAs attain 100 percent HQT in each LEA and school:*
 - *in the percentage of highly qualified teachers at each LEA and school; and*
 - *in the percentage of teachers who are receiving high quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers?*
- d. *Consistent with ESEA §2141, does the plan include technical assistance or corrective actions that the SEA will apply if LEAs fail to meet HQT and AYP goals?*

Required Element 5

The revised plan must explain how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for teachers not new to the profession who were hired prior to the end of the 2005-06 school year, and how the SEA will limit the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005-06 school year to multi-subject secondary teachers in rural schools eligible for additional flexibility, and multi-subject special education teachers who are highly qualified in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire. See Action Steps, Areas 7 and 9 for responses to all questions in Required Element 5.

- a. *Does the plan describe how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for all teachers not new to the profession who were hired before the end of the 2005-06 school year?*

- b. Does the plan describe how the State will limit the use of HOUSSE after the end of the 2005-06 school year to the following situations:
- Multi-subject secondary teachers in rural schools who, if HQ in one subject at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate competence in additional subjects within three years of the date of hire; or
 - Multi-subject special education teachers who are new to the profession, if HQ in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate competence in additional subjects within two years of the date of hire.

Peer review finding for Required Element 5 and New York State’s response. Peer reviewers found that New York State’s July 2006 plan only partially met Requirement 5 because the State Education Department “has not totally limited its intended use of the HOUSSE to the areas specified in this rubric. Pages 28 and 29 indicate that the SEA requests flexibility to allow use of the HOUSSE for veteran teachers who are highly qualified in one subject and assigned to another subject or where a district, despite its best efforts, must hire a teacher who is not highly qualified to teach the assigned subject so the teacher may become highly qualified over time.” **Response:** Peer reviewers appear to have misunderstood the “Recommendation” to the USDOE for HOUSSE flexibility in New York State’s July 2006 plan. New York State’s actual plan to limit the HOUSSE was in full compliance with the USDOE’s guidance at the time, as demonstrated by Item A13 of NCLB NYS Field Memo #03-2006 issued on August 4, 2006, before peer review findings on New York’s July 2006 plan were released. To address this misunderstanding and respond to new information released by the USDOE in August and September, New York State’s HOUSSE limitation plan has been revised. **See Part 5–Action Steps, Area 9.**

Required Element 6

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

- a. *Does the revised plan include a written equity plan? **This entire plan is New York State’s written equity plan.***
- b. Does the plan identify where inequities in teacher assignment exist? **See Part 3 (Gap Analysis), Attachments E and F and Action Steps, Area 1.**
- c. *Does the plan delineate specific strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment?* **See Action Steps in Areas 1-8 and Attachment G.**
- d. *Does the plan provide evidence for the probable success of the strategies it includes?* **See Attachment B.**
- e. *Does the plan indicate that the SEA will examine the issue of equitable teacher assignment when it monitors LEAs, and how this will be done?* **See Action Steps, Area 7.**

Peer review finding for Required Element 6 and New York State’s response. Peer reviewers found that New York State’s July 2006 plan only partially met Requirement 6 because “gap data describe that higher poverty LEAs were more likely to have teachers who were not highly qualified or appropriately certified. It does not identify schools within LEAs with inequities in teacher assignments and does account for experience as part of calculation of assignment inequities.” Peer reviewers said that “the SEA should begin analyzing data related to assignments of HQT and experience of teachers within districts.” **Response:** Since the response time for this plan was limited, USDOE staff advised New York State in August 2006 that it would be sufficient for the State to have a plan for identifying the distribution of teachers within districts and that it was not necessary to provide the data by September 29. To address this finding, this plan explains how New York State will (1) analyze and publish actual data on the equitable assignments of highly qualified and experienced teachers within districts; (2) use that data and analysis to promote improvement; and (3) hold districts accountable for improvement. **See Part 5-Action Steps, Area 1 (Data and reporting systems and Area 7 (Monitoring and technical assistance). Also see Part 6-Example of Local Progress.**

Part 2. New York State's Teacher Quality Agenda

The New York State Board of Regents has clear goals for teacher quality in New York State and comprehensive policies for achieving them in order to raise student achievement and close achievement gaps. New York State's teacher quality goals are closely aligned with the NCLB's teacher quality goals, as explained in New York State's December 2003 updated plan to enhance teacher quality, available at <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/nclb012004.htm>.

Since 1998, when the Regents revised their goals and policies for teacher quality, the State, institutions of higher education, school districts and others have made significant reforms. At the State level alone, reforms have included, but are not limited to:

- holding teachers and other school professionals accountable for all students' achievement by setting standards, assessing progress and publicly reporting results;
- upholding higher standards for all teacher preparation programs, including requiring accreditation and accountability based on certification examination pass rates;
- banning all uncertified teachers as of September 1, 2005 and setting higher standards for all new teachers, including an academic major, subject matter examinations, an additional 100 hours of field experience beyond student teaching, including field experience in high need schools, and, for teachers with professional certification, completion of 175 hours of professional development every five years;
- creating new pathways to certification to increase the supply of teachers for hard-to-staff schools and subject areas, and obtaining two discretionary federal grants to support teachers in alternate pathways;
- requiring districts to (1) provide mentoring for all first-year teachers, paid for, in part, by increases in State aid; (2) create and implement professional development plans based on assessments of local needs; and (3) conduct State-defined Annual Professional Performance Reviews (APPRs) of all teachers;
- launching a state-of-the-art online certification system, called TEACH, to certify qualified applicants as quickly as possible;
- supporting teacher quality and equitable distribution with such programs as Teachers of Tomorrow, the Teacher Opportunity Corps, Troops to Teachers, Albert Shanker stipends for National Board certification, Teacher Centers, Intensive Teacher Institutes for ESOL and bilingual general and special education teachers, and, starting in 2006-2007, a new Math and Science Teaching Incentive Program with a five-year service requirement;
- funding Regional Network Partners that provide technical assistance and professional development to high need, low performing districts and schools;
- reporting on teacher supply and demand to promote local and regional planning by districts, teacher preparation institutions and other stakeholders;
- funding independent, scholarly research on the teacher workforce, the equitable distribution of teachers, the impact of Regents teaching reforms and teachers' effectiveness in raising student achievement; and
- implementing the teacher quality requirements in the NCLB and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by providing guidance and technical assistance to the field, making changes to data systems to monitor and report progress and overseeing LEAs' use of federal funds for teacher quality.

Part 3. Gap Analysis

New York State is making a good faith effort to meet State and federal teacher quality goals, has made demonstrable progress, and will continue to do so. Between 2000-2001 and 2004-2005, the latest year for which complete data are available, the percent of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers without appropriate certification for their assignments dropped from 13 to 8 percent, due primarily to the Regents phasing out the use of uncertified teachers. Preliminary data suggest that even more progress was made in 2005-2006.

Data for school year 2004-2005 were used to do a gap analysis. The data sources provide accurate data at the classroom level, as described in **Attachment A**. Data for school year 2005-2006 will be available in October 2006. The gap analysis will be updated using 2005-2006 data and the updated analysis will guide the State's policy development, monitoring, technical assistance and public reporting in school year 2006-2007.

Reasons for core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers. There were multiple reasons for classes in core subjects not to be taught by highly qualified teachers in school year 2004-2005.

- **Teacher shortages.** Like their counterparts in other states, some LEAs could not find certified and highly qualified teachers in some core subject areas because of shortages of teachers. Shortages were the most severe in high need districts and in selected subject areas such as math, science, special education and bilingual education. (The Governor, Legislature, Board of Regents, State Education Department, teacher preparation institutions, regional school support networks and districts have been working together since 2000 to address these shortages through targeted funding, alternative teacher preparation pathways and other effective strategies.)
- **Federal law.** Some districts had not yet completed the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) for all their teachers. (The State encouraged all districts and schools to complete HOUSSE by the end of school year 2005-2006, as required by federal law.)
- **State policy.** New York State permitted a small number of districts to employ uncertified teachers with Modified Temporary Licenses in 2004-2005 while they were phasing out their use of uncertified teachers. By definition, uncertified teachers were not highly qualified. (The Board of Regents ended this practice in September 2005.)
- **Out-of-field teaching.** Some LEAs and schools assigned teachers to out-of-field teaching beyond approved "incidental" teaching because of teacher shortages or administrative decisions. By definition, these teachers were not highly qualified. (Each year, the State Education Department identifies every teacher who is doing out-of-field teaching that is not approved incidental teaching and provides lists of these teachers and their assignments to LEAs for verification and technical assistance. In addition, the State Education Department plans to severely limit incidental teaching, especially in low performing schools, thereby limiting the use of the HOUSSE.)

- **Reporting errors.** One large district discovered that it submitted data with reporting errors for 2004-2005 that made it appear to have more classes not taught by highly qualified teachers than it actually had. (Starting in school year 2005-2006, this district has data quality controls that identify and correct reporting problems before data are sent to the State.)

Gap 1

Less than one percent of LEAs did not meet both the statewide Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for teacher quality and their Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target for student achievement.

Section 2141 of the NCLB requires the State to identify all LEAs that have not met their Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for teacher quality and their Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for student achievement for three consecutive years. This plan sets a statewide AMO at 90 percent for 2004-2005 (and at 95 percent for 2005-2006) to be consistent with the USDOE's standard for the states. In 2004-2005, the latest year for which complete data are available, 118 LEAs out of 832 (14 percent) had less than 90 percent of their classes in core academic subjects taught by highly qualified teachers. Of those 118 LEAs, only seven also failed to make AYP for three consecutive years. As required by Section 2141, these seven LEAs are priority districts for the State's technical assistance and monitoring in 2006-2007.

As shown in Table 1, there was a relationship in 2004-2005 between teacher quality and student achievement based on the measures required in NCLB Section 2141 for both LEAs and schools. LEAs and schools that did not make AYP for three consecutive years were more likely than other LEAs and schools not to have met teacher quality goals.

LEAs

- Of the sixteen LEAs that did not meet AYP for student achievement for three consecutive years, 44 percent (7 LEAs) did not meet the 2004-2005 statewide AMO for highly qualified teachers.
- Of the other 816 LEAs, only 14 percent (111 LEAs) did not meet the statewide AMO for highly qualified teachers.

Schools

- Of the 352 schools that did not meet AYP for three consecutive years, 72 percent (254 schools) did not meet statewide 2004-2005 AMO for highly qualified teachers.
- Of the 4,046 other schools, only 26 percent (1,070 schools) failed to meet the statewide AMO.

Attachment H contains lists of LEAs and schools with their AMO and AYP status in 2004-2005.

Table 1			
Distribution of LEAs and Schools			
by HQT AMO and AYP status in 2004-2005			
	HQT AMO status		
AYP status for 3 consecutive years	Did not meet HQT AMO	Met HQT AMO	Total
LEAs			
Did not meet AYP	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	16 (100%)
Met AYP	111 (14%)	705 (86%)	816 (100%)
All LEAs	118 (14%)	714 (86%)	832 (100%)
Schools			
Did not meet AYP	254 (72%)	98 (28%)	352 (100%)
Met AYP	1,070 (26%)	2,976 (74%)	4,046 (100%)
All schools	1,324 (30%)	3,074 (70%)	4,398 (100%)
Includes districts, charter schools, BOCES, State Schools and Special Act School Districts.			
HQT AMO denotes the statewide 2004-2005 Highly Qualified Teacher Annual Measurable Objective of 90 percent of core classes taught by highly qualified teachers. LEAs and schools that reached 90 percent met the HQT AMO.			
AYP is Adequate Yearly Progress for student achievement. LEAs and schools that did not meet AYP are "In Improvement Status." LEAs and schools that met AYP are "Not in Improvement Status" because they are making adequate progress.			

Gap 2

Students in high poverty LEAs were more likely than students in low poverty LEAs to have teachers who were not highly qualified and not appropriately certified.

In 2004-2005, highly qualified teachers taught 93 percent of classes in core academic subjects in New York State, but there were gaps between high poverty and low poverty schools. Of the more than 42,000 core classes that were not taught by highly qualified teachers, 75 percent were in the Big Five Cities – Buffalo, New York, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers – with the greatest number in New York City because of its relative size. The Big Five Cities are all high need districts, with high percentages of low income and minority students. Statewide, students in the highest poverty LEAs were more likely than students in the lowest poverty LEAs to have core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers and to have teachers who lacked appropriate certification for their teaching assignments, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Teacher qualifications by LEA poverty decile		
Poverty decile of LEAs (N = 792 LEAs)	Percent of core classes <u>not taught</u> by highly qualified teachers	Percent of teaching assignments <u>not taught</u> by appropriately certified teachers
1 (highest poverty rate)	18	18
2	16	16
3	9	9
4	3	3
5	4	4
6	2	2
7	2	2
8	2	2
9	2	2
10 (lowest poverty rate)	2	2
All deciles	7	7
Includes 792 LEAs that had enrollment and poverty data. Excludes BOCES. <i>Teaching assignments not taught by appropriately certified teachers</i> include approved "incidental" teaching that is permitted by State regulations when there are demonstrated teacher shortages. Percentages are the same in both columns although they are based on different measures.		

Gap 3

Students in high poverty LEAs were more likely than students in low poverty LEAs to have inexperienced teachers.

In 2004-2005, students in the highest poverty LEAs were nearly twice as likely as students in the lowest poverty LEAs to have inexperienced teachers, as shown in Table 3. Because the poverty decile of an LEA was positively correlated with its minority enrollment, as shown in Table 3, it is clear that minority students were more likely than non-minority students to have inexperienced teachers.

Table 3 Percent of teachers with less than 3 years experience and percent of students who are minorities by LEA poverty decile		
Poverty decile of LEAs	Percent of teachers with less than 3 years experience	Percent of students who are minorities
1 (highest poverty rate)	15	91
2	15	80
3	12	41
4	7	27
5	9	28
6	8	14
7	8	12
8	8	15
9	8	13
10 (lowest poverty rate)	8	13
All deciles	11	47
Includes 792 LEAs that had enrollment and poverty data. Excludes BOCES.		

Gap 4

In high poverty LEAs, high percentages of classes in many core academic subjects were taught by teachers without appropriate certification.

Of the more than 42,000 core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-2005, 87 percent were taught by teachers without appropriate certification, as shown in Table 4. These teachers were either (1) uncertified and holding only a modified temporary license during the last year such licenses were permitted; or (2) certified but teaching out-of-field due to shortages or administrative decisions. Preliminary 2005-2006 data for New York City, shown in **Part 6** of this plan, suggest that significant progress was made since 2004-2005 but that challenges still remain.

Attachments E and F show the percent of teachers in 2004-2005 without appropriate certification for their assignments in core and non-core subjects in New York City, the Big Four Cities (Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers) and each region of the State, and also show preliminary 2005-2006 data for New York City. Subjects with the highest percentages of teachers without appropriate certification were English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and bilingual education, languages other than English, math, science and special education, with some variation by geographic region.

Table 4 Distribution of Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in New York State in 2004-2005 (N = 42,143 core classes not taught by HQ teachers)	
Elementary general education classes with certified but not HQ teachers	4%
Elementary special education classes with certified by not HQ teachers	0%
Elementary general or special education classes without certified teachers	16%
Secondary general education classes with certified but not HQ teachers	8%
Secondary special education classes with certified but not HQ teachers	1%
Secondary general and special education classes without certified teachers	71%
TOTAL	100%
HQ means "highly qualified."	

Gap 5

In some subjects and geographic regions, the supply of new teachers was not adequate to meet demand, making it difficult for high poverty LEAs to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers.

Between 2000 and 2005, New York State certified enough new teachers from all pathways to certification to meet overall demand in all subjects except math and reading/literacy. However, in some regions of the State, including New York City, there were not enough newly certified teachers to meet demand in the arts, career and technical education, English, ESOL and bilingual education, languages other than English, sciences, social studies and special education. Shortages of certified teachers have the greatest impact on high poverty LEAs because these LEAs rely more than other LEAs on hiring inexperienced, newly certified teachers. For example, in 2004-2005, 95 percent of hires in New York City had no experience, more than twice the rate of the rest of the State. **Attachments E and F** show subjects with teacher shortages in New York City, the Rest of State (defined as New York State outside of New York City) and each geographic region of the State.

Gap 6

Demand for certified and highly qualified teachers is likely to persist.

Demand for certified and highly qualified teachers is likely to persist for at least a decade in all regions of New York State, with high poverty LEAs facing the greatest challenges as they compete with other districts and states for the pool of newly certified teachers. Retirements will cause most of the demand. In 2004-2005, 18 percent of New York State's public school workforce was age 55 or older and 48 percent was age 45 or older. Factors that are likely to sustain demand in New York State include (1) policies that raise teacher-to-student ratios, such as class size reduction, academic intervention services and first-year mentoring for new teachers; and (2) policies that increase total enrollment, such as universal pre-school, full-day kindergarten, five-year high school programs for special populations of students and high school retention initiatives. Factors that may reduce the number of vacancies for teachers include (1) higher retention rates for new teachers due to required mentoring for first-year teachers; and (2) State and local financial constraints.

Gap 7

Science, English and math classes made up the largest share of all classes not taught by highly qualified teachers statewide, but at least 5 percent of classes in nearly all subjects were taught by teachers who were not highly qualified.

Distribution of core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers. In 2004-2005, 42,143 classes in core academic subjects were not taught by highly qualified teachers. Table 5 shows the percent distribution of these classes by core academic subject area within New York State and within each of ten categories of districts based on standard Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) categories. The categories are defined in Table 4.1 on page 100 of the *Report to the Governor and Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools: Submitted July 2005* at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/655report/2005/volume1/volume1.pdf>

This analysis will be updated when final school year 2005-2006 data become available in October 2006. Data for every school in every LEA are available each year and are used for technical assistance and monitoring.

- **New York State.** Statewide, 39 percent of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers were in three core subjects: science (14 percent) English (13 percent) and math (12 percent). Another quarter (24 percent) of the classes was in “other core assignments” which include assignments in multiple core subjects or in unspecified subjects in Career and Technical Education, special education or bilingual education. When 2005-2006 data are available in October 2006, an analysis of “other core assignments” will be done to identify them more precisely. In the remaining quarter of core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, the largest share was in foreign languages (9 percent).
- **Local variation.** New York City's distribution of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-2005 was similar to the statewide distribution because New York City's core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers were 72 percent of the State total (30,134 out of 42,143). Other big cities and LEA categories varied. For example, foreign language classes were approximately one quarter of all classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in Buffalo (24 percent), Syracuse (27 percent) and high need rural LEAs (22 percent) but science classes were nearly one third of the total in Yonkers (31 percent). These local variations show why it is important to provide State and regional resources to meet local needs rather than use a one-size-fits-all approach based on statewide data.

Percent of core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers. As shown in statewide data in Table 6, more than 5 percent of core classes in nearly every subject were taught by teachers who were not highly qualified, with the exception being elementary common branch subjects and middle/secondary social studies classes. There was some local variation. For example, New York City and Rochester had far higher percentages of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers than the statewide rate, and Syracuse had 40 percent of its foreign languages classes not taught by highly qualified teachers.

New York State's plan to address the gaps in highly qualified teachers for specific core subjects is in Part 5-Action Steps, especially in Areas 4 and 5.

Table 5

Percent Distribution and Number of 2004-2005 Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers by Core Academic Subject Area within Each Need/Resource Capacity Category

Core Subject Areas	New York State – All Public Schools	Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) Categories										BOCES & State Schools
		High N/RC Districts						Average N/RC Districts	Low N/RC Districts			
		New York City	Buffalo	Rochester	Syracuse	Yonkers	Urban/Suburban Districts			Rural Districts		
Elementary (one or more subjects)	6%	7%	2%	7%	7%	3%	6%	2%	4%	6%	8%	
Arts	11%	12%	11%	10%	11%	2%	8%	9%	10%	11%	10%	
English	13%	14%	4%	10%	5%	5%	11%	8%	11%	11%	7%	
Foreign Languages	9%	5%	24%	8%	27%	5%	15%	22%	19%	23%	12%	
Mathematics	12%	13%	7%	14%	9%	18%	11%	12%	11%	10%	9%	
Reading	4%	4%	1%	2%	2%	-	4%	8%	5%	2%	3%	
Science	14%	14%	18%	4%	9%	31%	12%	14%	13%	11%	7%	
Social Studies (including civics and government, economics, geography & history)	6%	6%	4%	5%	2%	-	5%	5%	7%	6%	5%	
All other core assignments (multiple subjects, unspecified subjects, etc.)	24%	25%	29%	41%	28%	36%	28%	19%	18%	18%	40%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Number of all core classes not taught by HQT	42,143	30,134	462	716	369	105	1,921	1,416	4,251	1,964	805	

NOTE
Core classes in "other core subjects" are in multiple core subjects or unspecified subjects in Career and Technical Education (CTE), special education or bilingual education.

Table 6

2004-2005 Core Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
as a Percent of All Core Classes
by Core Academic Subject Area within Each Need/Resource Capacity Category

Core Subject Areas	New York State – All Public Schools	Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) Categories										BOCES & State Schools	
		High N/RC Districts						Average N/RC Districts					Low N/RC Districts
		New York City	Buffalo	Rochester	Syracuse	Yonkers	Urban/Suburban Districts	Rural Districts	Average N/RC Districts	Low N/RC Districts			
Elementary (one or more subjects)	4.3%	9.6%	1.0%	6.4%	4.7%	0.6%	2.2%	0.8%	0.9%	1.2%	8.8%		
Arts	6.9%	31.3%	5.9%	7.4%	7.9%	1.1%	2.4%	2.2%	1.6%	1.6%	9.6%		
English	8.7%	24.7%	3.0%	11.6%	4.3%	1.2%	4.2%	2.3%	2.1%	2.0%	8.7%		
Foreign Languages	11.2%	24.4%	28.4%	19.4%	40.7%	2.6%	10.8%	12.8%	6.4%	5.8%	33.2%		
Mathematics	7.9%	21.9%	3.7%	15.8%	8.8%	3.7%	3.9%	3.2%	2.1%	1.8%	12.3%		
Reading	7.5%	31.4%	2.0%	34.1%	4.4%	-	3.4%	4.7%	2.1%	1.1%	3.9%		
Science	9.7%	25.1%	13.1%	5.8%	9.3%	6.5%	5.0%	4.6%	2.8%	2.2%	11.8%		
Social Studies (including civics and government, economics, geography & history)	4.6%	12.9%	3.1%	7.3%	1.8%	-	2.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.3%	4.2%		
All other core assignments (multiple subjects, unspecified subjects, etc.)	10.2%	24.4%	7.6%	15.3%	10.6%	2.9%	5.5%	4.5%	2.6%	2.7%	6.7%		
Total	7.9%	21.4%	6.8%	11.6%	9.3%	2.9%	4.2%	3.5%	2.3%	2.2%	8.2%		

NOTE

Core classes in "other core subjects" are in multiple core subjects or unspecified subjects in Career and Technical Education (CTE), special education or bilingual education.

Gap 8

“Special classes” in core academic subjects for middle and secondary students with disabilities were more likely to be taught by teachers who were not highly qualified than “special classes” for elementary students with disabilities.

In New York State, some students with disabilities are taught in “special classes.” Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), special classes for core academic subjects must have certified and highly qualified special education teachers and teachers of special classes that do not include core academic subjects (and teachers that provide other special education services) must be certified special education teachers. Only special classes for core academic subjects are included in this gap analysis.

Table 7 shows the percent distribution of 2004-2005 special classes in core academic subjects that were not taught by highly qualified teachers by assignment level (elementary, middle/secondary and other) within New York State and within each of ten Need/Resource Capacity categories. It also shows the total number of special classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in each category.

This analysis will be updated when final 2005-2006 data become available in October 2006.

- Core special classes were about 10 percent of all core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in the State (4,075 out of 42,143 from Table 5) and less than one percent of all core classes statewide.
- Statewide, middle/secondary core special classes were more likely to be taught by teachers who were not highly qualified than elementary special classes (68 percent compared to 26 percent).
- New York City’s distribution of special classes not taught by highly qualified teachers resembled the statewide distribution because the City had 74 percent (3,104 out of 4,075) of the statewide total. The share of middle/secondary core special classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in the other big cities and LEA groups differed from the statewide distribution, but the total number of core special classes were so low in some of these groups that the differences were not significant.
- The LEA categories with the largest number of core special classes not taught by highly qualified teachers outside New York City were Average N/RC districts (564 classes), High Need Urban/Suburban districts (227 classes) and Low N/RC districts (219 classes).
- The last row of Table 7 shows the percent of all core special classes that were not taught by highly qualified teachers. New York City and Rochester both had more than 10 percent of core special classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-2005.

New York State began collecting data about the specific core subjects taught in middle/secondary special classes in school year 2006-2007 and will update its gap analysis when those data become available.

In addition to Table 7, the New York State Education Department has done other analyses of teacher supply and demand in special education which show that (1) there are shortages of special education teachers for core classes at the middle/secondary level in most core subjects; and (2) there are shortages of bilingual special education teachers and bilingual related school professionals. New York State’s plans to address the gaps in Table 7 and other identified gaps are presented in Part 5-Action Steps, Area 4.

Table 7

**Percent Distribution and Number of 2004-2005 “Special Classes” for Students with Disabilities
in Core Academic Subjects That Were Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
By Assignment Level within Each Need/Resource Capacity Category**

Assignment Level for Special Classes for Students with Disabilities in Core Subjects	New York State – All Public Schools	Need/Resource Capacity (N/RC) Categories										BOCES and State Schools	
		High N/RC Districts							Average N/RC Districts				Low N/RC Districts
		New York City	Buffalo	Rochester	Syracuse	Yonkers	Urban/Suburban Districts	Rural Districts	Urban/Suburban Districts	Average N/RC Districts			
Elementary assignments	26%	29%	6%	18%	24%	6%	14%	20%	13%	13%	13%	16%	
Middle/secondary assignments	68%	69%	89%	40%	66%	61%	74%	76%	68%	68%	80%	37%	
Other assignments	6%	2%	6%	42%	11%	33%	12%	5%	19%	19%	7%	48%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Number of core special classes not taught by HQT	4,075	3,104	18	111	38	18	160	111	305	305	128	82	
Number above as percent of all core special classes	8.1%	20.6%	2.4%	11.5%	7.5%	2.7%	3.2%	4.1%	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%	2.6%	

NOTES

The 4,075 core classes in this table were also included in Table 5.
Elementary assignments are special classes in Grades K-6 or when all students are eligible to take the New York State Alternate Assessment.
Middle/secondary assignments are special classes in Grades 7-12.

Gap 9

Earth science classes had the largest share of science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-2005.

New York State issues science certificates in Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics and permits teachers to meet additional qualifications for a General Science extension for teaching general science, life science or physical science in the middle grades. For New York State and each Need/Resource Capacity category, Table 8 shows the percent distribution of 2004-2005 middle/secondary science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers for each science subject and the total number of science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers.

This analysis will be updated when 2005-2006 data become available in October 2006.

- Science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers accounted for only about 13 percent of all core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers (5,384 out of 42,143) and less than one percent of all core classes statewide.
- Earth science classes were one third (33 percent) of all science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers. Another third (34 percent) were in “other sciences.” These “other sciences” included general science, life science and physical science, and science electives such as astronomy. (These “other sciences” classes may have highly qualified teachers when New York State revises its definition of a highly qualified science teacher, as explained below.)
- The distribution of science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in New York City resembled the statewide distribution because New York City’s classes were 73 percent of the statewide total (3,949 out of 5,384).
- The distribution of science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in the other big cities and LEA groups varied slightly. For example, classes in biology were approximately one third of the total in Rochester (35 percent) and Yonkers (39 percent).
- The LEA groups outside New York City with the largest total number of science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers were Average N/RC districts (564 classes), high need urban/suburban districts (227 classes) and Low N/RC districts (219 classes).

Definition of a highly qualified science teacher. Data in Table 8 were based on a definition of a highly qualified science teacher that required certified science teachers to demonstrate subject matter competency in each specific science subject they taught. Starting in school year 2006-2007, New York State will use the definition of a highly qualified science teacher in Item A-18 of the USDOE’s Title II Non-Regulatory Guidance issued on August 3, 2005. The new definition will permit a teacher certified in one science subject to be highly qualified to teach other science subjects without demonstrating additional subject matter competency in the other science subject provided that the State’s certification rules permit the teacher to teach the other science subject.

Table 8

**Percent Distribution and Number
of Middle/Secondary Science Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in 2004-2005
by Science Subject and Need/Resource Capacity Category**

Science Subject	New York State – All Public Schools	Need/Resource Capacity Categories										BOCES and State Schools
		High N/RC Districts						Average N/RC Districts	Low N/RC Districts			
		New York City	Buffalo	Rochester	Syracuse	Yonkers	Urban/Suburban Districts			Rural Districts		
Biology	19%	19%	25%	35%	6%	39%	24%	18%	22%	16%	21%	
Chemistry	8%	7%	19%	-	11%	33%	7%	6%	9%	14%	9%	
Earth Science	33%	34%	30%	15%	23%	-	22%	32%	32%	32%	19%	
Physics	6%	5%	4%	12%	14%	-	12%	18%	9%	12%	2%	
Other Sciences	34%	35%	22%	38%	46%	27%	34%	26%	28%	26%	49%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Number of science classes not taught by HQT	5,384	3,949	83	26	35	33	227	195	564	219	53	
Number above as percent of all science classes	9.7%	27.5%	13.1%	6.3%	9.5%	7.4%	5.1%	4.6%	2.8%	2.2%	9.8%	

NOTES

The 5,384 core classes in this table were also included in Table 5.

"Other sciences" includes general science, life science, and physical science as well as science electives such as astronomy.

Gap 10

Teacher qualifications and experience were not equitably distributed among schools within large districts.

For many years, the New York State Education Department has reported on the inequitable distribution of teachers between groups of districts defined by Need/Resource Capacity categories in order to improve the quality of education for all students. For example, see Table 4.8 on page 112 of the *Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools: Submitted July 2005* at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/655report/2005/volume1/volume1.pdf>. Indicators used to compare teacher quality have included:

- Pupil-Teacher Ratio
- Median Teacher Salary
- Annual Teacher Turnover Rates
- Percent Teaching Out of Certification Area
- Percent with Master's Plus 30 Hours or Doctorate
- Median Years of Experience

New York State's five large cities, which are all high need districts, have consistently had higher annual teacher turnover rates and higher rates of uncertified teachers and out-of-field teaching than other districts but they have not been significantly different from other districts on the other indicators.

The New York State Education Department has also supported independent research that has documented the inequitable distribution of teachers between groups of schools within the New York City School District. For example, see "Teacher Sorting and the Plight of Urban Schools: A Descriptive Analysis" in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Spring 2002. Vol. 24, No. 1, 37-62, by Hamilton Lankford, Susanna Loeb, and James Wyckoff at <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/ResearchPapers/tabid/103/Default.aspx>.

These research findings led to policy and practice changes in New York State and New York City that have been successful in narrowing, though not completing closing, the gaps. Preliminary results from an updated study, which is not yet available for citation, show that teacher equity gaps in the New York City School District had narrowed substantially between 2000 and 2005 when the gap was measured by multiple indicators of teacher qualifications and experience. The updated study will soon be available at <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/ResearchPapers/tabid/103/Default.aspx>.

The New York State Education Department will begin measuring the inequitable distribution of teachers between groups of schools within high need districts for public reporting in 2007. The analysis will first be done for large, high need districts and will be reported in the *Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools*. Details appear in Part 5 of this plan as part of Action Step 1.2.

Part 4. Overarching Strategies to Close the Gaps

The New York State Education Department will use four overarching strategies to ensure that:

- all classes in core academic subjects are taught by highly qualified teachers;
- low income and minority children are not taught at a higher rate than other children by unqualified, out-of-field or inexperienced teachers;
- all schools have the certified and highly qualified teachers they need; and
- all teachers have the professional support and development they need to help all children meet New York State Learning Standards and close student achievement gaps.

STRATEGY 1

Strengthen New York State’s strategy of targeting State and regional resources on high need, low performing districts and schools and holding districts and schools accountable for results.

New York State will continuously improve its strategy of targeting resources to high need, low performing districts and schools, as explained in Action Steps Areas 2 through 6. In New York State, “high need” districts are “High Need/Resource Capacity Districts” based on standard definitions, and “low performing” districts and schools” are those that are In Need of Improvement as defined by the NCLB.

STRATEGY 2

Enhance the State’s measurement of local progress toward teacher quality and student achievement goals, report on progress annually and plan strategically based on data.

New York State publishes annual data on differences in teacher quality between standard Need/Resource Capacity categories of districts as part of its overarching strategy to close gaps in student achievement and teacher quality. New York State also publishes the NCLB-required teacher quality indicator in State, district and school report cards: the percent of classes in core academic subjects not taught by highly qualified teachers.

New York State will publish additional indicators of teacher quality and the equitable distribution of teachers, as explained in Action Steps in Area 1, and use data from all its teacher quality indicators to guide strategic planning for policy, resource allocation, technical assistance and monitoring for local districts and schools.

STRATEGY 3

Strengthen teacher preparation, certification, induction, ongoing professional development, recruitment and retention with a focus on student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

New York State will continue to uphold high standards for the preparation, certification, induction and ongoing professional development of teachers and school and district leaders in order to improve teacher recruitment, effectiveness and retention. We will continue to use data to assess progress and make ongoing improvement in response to the data.

STRATEGY 4

Sustain and expand effective partnerships to achieve teacher quality goals and close student achievement gaps.

The Board of Regents and the New York State Education Department rely on many partners to help achieve their policy goals. Strong support from partners will continue to be essential to the success of the State's strategies.

Partners include:

- The federal government
- New York State's Governor and Legislature
- LEAs and schools
- Statewide and Regional Network Partners (which include Bilingual Education Technical Assistance Centers, Special Education Training and Resource Centers, School Support Services Network, Staff and Curriculum Development Network, New York State Teacher Centers, Regional Adult Education Network and Regional School Support Centers)
- The New York State Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching, the Committee of Practitioners and other SED advisory groups representing the full range of stakeholders
- the New York Comprehensive Center, funded by the U.S. Department of Education
- New York State's higher education community
- Other New York State agencies
- The business community, including the media
- The non-profit sector, including teacher unions, professional associations and foundations
- Public broadcasting stations, museums, libraries and other cultural institutions

Part 5. Action Steps

The Board of Regents and the New York State Education Department have been working with their partners to enhance teacher quality for all students since 1998, when the Regents Task Force teaching policy was adopted. The New York State Education Department's report on teacher supply and demand presented to the Board of Regents in May 2006 was a thorough analysis of remaining challenges and a description of how they are being addressed. The Regents goal is to reach State and federal goals and to have a comprehensive strategy that enhances and sustains teacher quality over time in order to improve student achievement and close achievement gaps.

Framework

New York State's action steps are organized around nine areas, listed below, that were adapted from a framework developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

1. Data and reporting systems
2. Pre-service teacher preparation and specialized knowledge and skills for high poverty LEAs
3. Certification and out-of-field teaching
4. Recruitment and retention of certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers
5. Professional development
6. Working conditions in schools and LEAs
7. Monitoring and technical assistance
8. Policy coherence
9. Limiting the use of the HOUSSSE

Action steps in all nine areas of Part 5 reflect the four overarching strategies in Part 4, Overarching Strategies to Close the Gaps.

Context

- **Overarching strategy.** New York State's overarching strategy is to provide State and regional resources to support local improvement and hold local districts and schools accountable for results by measuring and publicly reporting on progress. New York State has an overarching priority to provide funds and other resources for staffing and professional development in high need, low performing districts and schools. All the Action Steps in Part 5 of this plan are aligned with this priority.
- **Scope.** This plan focuses on action steps to be taken by the New York State Education Department (SED). The plan does not represent LEAs or SED's other partners.
- **Consultation.** SED routinely consults with the Committee of Practitioners, the Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching and other advisory groups and stakeholders about policies and procedures relating to State and federal teacher quality goals. Action steps in this plan are consistent

with consultation that occurred in the past. However, the USDOE's timeline for submitting this plan precluded SED from using its usual consultation procedures in the development of this plan.

Therefore, by December 2006, SED will review this plan with the partners whose support is essential for its success. SED will ask these partners to support the action steps in this plan. The primary partners for this consultation will include: (1) the Committee of Practitioners; (2) the State Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching; (3) teacher unions; (4) the Big Five City school districts; (5) superintendents of Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES); (6) the teacher education community as represented by the New York State Association of Teacher Educators (NYSATE) and the New York State Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (NYACTE); and (7) the Commissioner's Advisory Panel on Special Education Programs and Services. Amendments to this plan may be made as a result of this review.

- **Continuation of effective approaches.** Trend data show that existing approaches have helped New York State make progress toward meeting State and federal teacher quality goals. Therefore, some action steps call for continuing these successful approaches.
- **Measurement timing.** The results of new action steps taken in 2006-2007 are unlikely to be measured in teacher quality data that will be collected to represent the teaching workforce in October 2006. The 2006-2007 data will measure action steps that are taken up to the data collection day in October 2006. Action steps taken after the data collection day will be reflected in teacher quality data collected in October 2007 for school year 2007-2008 and in later school years. Action steps in Area 7 (monitoring and technical assistance) are likely to have the greatest impact during 2006-2007, while action steps in other areas are likely to have a longer term impact on teacher quality and the equitable distribution of teachers.
- **Implementation.** SED is organized into six major program areas: (1) Office of Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education (EMSC); (2) Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID); (3) Office of Higher Education (OHE), including the Office of Teaching Initiatives (OTI) which certifies all school professionals; (4) Office of the Professions (OP), which licenses professionals, including some who are employed in schools, such as speech-language pathologists; (5) Office of Cultural Education (OCE); and (6) the Office of Operations and Management Services (OMS), which supports the other offices and agency leadership. Because responsibility for the State's teacher quality agenda is shared by several program areas, SED has an agency-wide Teacher Quality Cabinet (TQC) to coordinate its teacher quality policies, procedures and initiatives. The TQC, which advises agency leadership, developed this plan and will ensure its implementation. Each action step in this plan is associated with the program area(s) and unit(s) that have primary responsibility for ensuring that it is implemented. **Table 5** shows the extent to which multiple program offices in SED have shared responsibility for the action steps to enhance teacher quality in New York State.
- **EMSC's structure for monitoring and technical assistance of LEAs and schools.** SED's Office of Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education (EMSC) has primary responsibility for monitoring LEAs and schools and providing them with technical assistance. Within EMSC, two offices

share responsibility for these roles, one for New York City, where a centralized approach is effective, and one for other regions of the State, which relies on the expertise and support of Regional Network Partners to assist its staff in working with schools most in need of improvement. Action steps reflect these separate approaches. The Office of School Improvement and Community Services (New York City) is noted as *EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [NYC]*, and the Office of School Improvement (Regional) is noted as *EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R]*.

Action Step	SED Program Offices *				Action Step	SED Program Offices *			
	EMSC	OHE & OP	VESID	OCE		EMSC	OHE & OP	VESID	OCE
1.1	X				5.1		X		
1.2	X				5.2	X			
1.3	X		X		5.3	X		X	
1.4	X				5.4	X	X	X	
1.5	X	X			5.5	X			
2.1		X			5.6	X	X	X	X
2.2		X			5.7		X		X
2.3		X			6.1		X		
2.4		X			6.2	X		X	
2.5	X				6.3		X		
2.6		X			6.4	X			
2.7		X			6.5	X			
3.1	X				6.6	X			
3.2	X				6.7	X			
3.3		X	X		7.1 through 7.13	X			
4.1		X	X		8.1		X		
4.2		X			8.2	X	X	X	
4.3		X			8.3	X	X	X	
4.4				X	8.4	X	X		X
4.5	X				9.1	X	X	X	
4.6	X				9.2	X	X	X	
4.7	X				9.3	X			
					9.4		X		

*SED's Office of Operations and Management Services (OMS) supports all of the Action Steps through its Office of Human Resources, Office of Legislation, Office of Counsel, Office of Information and Technology Services and other units.

Action Steps - Area 1

Data and reporting systems

- 1.1 DATA COLLECTION. Continue to collect teacher-level and assignment-level data from all public schools, verify each teacher's certification status for each assignment and provide feedback to LEAs about each teacher's certification and highly qualified status. Starting in fall 2006, revise assignment list for special classes for students with disabilities to obtain data about the specific core academic subjects taught in special classes. Continue to work with LEAs to make teacher quality data available as early as possible. Begin collecting data in school year 2006-2007 about LEAs' use of the HOUSSE to measure progress in reducing reliance on the HOUSSE over time. **See Action Steps, Area 9.** (*EMSC-INFORMATION AND REPORTING SERVICES*)
- 1.2 PUBLIC REPORTING. Continue to report to the public on indicators of statewide, LEA and school progress on teacher quality. Provide the New York City Department of Education with SED's teacher quality data for inclusion in its school report cards to ensure data consistency between the State and New York City. Starting in 2007, add new indicators on the equitable distribution of teachers, incidental and out-of-field teaching to report cards or Comprehensive Information Reports (CIR) and to the Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature about the Educational Status of the State's Schools (See NOTE). (*EMSC-INFORMATION AND REPORTING SERVICES*)

NOTE

By fall 2007, the New York State Education Department will add three indicators to School Report Cards or Comprehensive Information Reports (CIR) for each school and district:

1. the percent of all teachers with fewer than two or three years experience;
2. the annual turnover rate for all teachers with fewer than five years experience; and
3. the percent of full-time equivalent (FTE) assignments taught by teachers without appropriate certification for the assignment, including both incidental and out-of-field assignments.

These new indicators will be posted online with all other data on each school's student, teacher and performance characteristics so that the State, LEAs and the public can see the relationships between these factors. Report cards can be found at

<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2005/home.shtml>.

For an example of a CIR, see <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2005/cir/660413020000.pdf>. A database with all report card and CIR data is made available to the public at

<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2005/home.shtml>

The first new indicator is based on research showing that teachers with fewer than two or three years of experience are less likely to raise student achievement on State and local assessments than other teachers. For example, see *How Changes in Entry Requirements Alter the Teacher Workforce and Affect Student Achievement*, November 2005, Donald Boyd, Hamilton Lankford, Pamela Grossman, Susanna Loeb, and James Wyckoff, at

<http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/ResearchPapers/tabid/103/Default.aspx>. The second

indicator was selected because total turnover rates combine retirements with novice teacher attrition. Turnover among novice teachers is a better indicator of whether a school is successful at retaining its new teachers because it removes retirements from the turnover rate.

In addition, starting with the 2007 *Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature on the Educational Status of the State's Schools*, this State report card will have new data on differences between teachers among groups of schools within districts, starting with large, high need districts. Differences between groups of schools within districts will be identified for multiple indicators, such as:

1. the percent of certified teachers;
2. the percent of core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers;
3. the percent of teachers with less than two or three years of teaching experience;
4. the annual teacher turnover rate for teachers with less than five years experience; and
5. the percent of FTE assignments taught by teachers without appropriate certification for the assignment, including incidental and out-of-field assignments.

Schools will be classified into poverty and minority groups based on each school's poverty level and percent of minority students.

- 1.3 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. Continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs to improve the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of teacher-level and assignment-level data. **See Action Steps, Area 7.** (*EMSC-INFORMATION AND REPORTING SERVICES; SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] AND [NYC] & VESID*)
- 1.4 INFORMATION TOOLS. Based on pilots with 2004-2005 data, create monitoring and analysis files, described in **Attachment A, Items A.5 and A.6**, for SED, Regional Network Partners and LEAs to support monitoring, technical assistance and local and regional planning and improvement. (*EMSC-INFORMATION AND REPORTING SERVICES*)
- 1.5 BUILD CAPACITY. As resources permit, continue enhancing data systems to: (1) issue all teaching certificates online; (2) provide online, public access to the certification status of every teacher; (3) post an assignment-to-certificate crosswalk online as technical assistance for LEAs assigning duties to teachers; (4) add a new, unique, longitudinal identifier to each teacher's certification and public school employment records to permit data linking and public release; (5) obtain data from students in the teacher education pipeline to support teacher supply and demand projections and planning to avert shortages; and (6) share certification and employment data with teacher preparation institutions so that they can track their graduates for assessment and planning purposes. (*OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES; EMSC-INFORMATION AND REPORTING SERVICES; OHE-SPECIAL PROJECTS*)

Action Steps - Area 2

Pre-service teacher preparation and specialized knowledge and skills for effective teaching in high poverty LEAs

- 2.1 TEACHER PREPARATION STANDARDS. Continue to work with the more than 100 teacher preparation institutions in New York State to ensure that they meet the Regents high standards. All teacher education programs must have curricula with a general core, a content core and a pedagogical core; be accredited; have a pass rate of 80 percent or higher on all certification exams; teach required content in literacy; and require field experiences (in addition to student teaching) in high need schools and with “socioeconomically disadvantaged students, students who are English language learners and students with disabilities.” In addition, they must all demonstrate that they measure the impact of their graduates on student learning in schools and use their findings for program improvement. For complete information about program standards, please see <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/registration/teacherprep/index.htm> (OHE-COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY EVALUATION)
- 2.2 ALTERNATIVE TEACHER PREPARATION. Continue to encourage teacher preparation institutions to offer more alternative teacher preparation programs (ATP) to meet the needs of high poverty, low performing schools and support their efforts to obtain State and federal funds for this purpose. Review State regulations governing ATP programs and, as needed, recommend changes to the Board of Regents. (OHE-COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY EVALUATION)
- 2.3 SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS. Work with partners to identify research-based “best practices” for recruiting and preparing teachers to be effective in high poverty schools and to promote those practices. (OHE-COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY EVALUATION)
- 2.4 POLICY ALIGNMENT. Partner with the New York Comprehensive Center to engage faculty from teacher preparation institutions whose graduates work in high poverty schools about the importance of preparing teachers to use scientifically based reading instruction. Continue informing teacher preparation institutions about the State’s Learning Standards, model curricula and assessments in order to align teacher preparation with instruction in schools, including high poverty schools. (OHE-COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY EVALUATION)
- 2.5 RESEARCH TO INFORM POLICY. Continue to provide databases and financial support to the Education Finance Research Consortium based at the University at Albany for independent research about New York State’s teaching workforce and its effectiveness. (EMSC-EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT)
- 2.6 INFORMATION. Continue to provide teacher preparation institutions with annual teacher supply and demand data by subject within each region and each Big Five City so that these institutions can improve their program planning and student advisement and work more effectively with local and regional LEAs to increase the supply of certified teachers for high poverty schools. **See Attachments E and F.** (OHE-SPECIAL PROJECTS)

2.7 INFORMATION. Partner with colleges and universities, teacher unions and others to inventory online courses available for certification in shortage subjects and inform LEAs and teachers about them. (*OHE-COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY EVALUATION*)

Action Steps - Area 3

Certification and out-of-field teaching

- 3.1 INFORMATION TOOLS. Provide monitoring and analysis files with data on out-of-field teaching by subject to priority and other LEAs and to Regional Network Partners in support of local and regional planning. **See Action Steps 1.4, 5.3 and Area 7.** In New York City, continue working with the New York City Department of Education to provide each principal with New York City data on his/her teachers' qualifications for each assignment and work with priority LEAs to ensure appropriate placements of teachers and identify teachers needing additional support to become highly qualified. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] AND [NYC]*)
- 3.2 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. Provide technical assistance to LEAs about assigning certified teachers to in-field duties. Encourage LEAs to use all available federal and State funds to help certified teachers in surplus areas, such as elementary education, to obtain a supplementary certificate in a shortage subject. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*) **See Action Steps in Area 7.**
- 3.3 POLICY ALIGNMENT. Review certification requirements and seek authority from the Regents to remove unnecessary barriers that may be causing shortages and out-of-field teaching. For example, review certification requirements in special education to widen the scope of practice of special education teachers. (See NOTE on Special Education Certificate Review.) Starting in the 2006-2007 school year, advise LEAs and schools to use the definition of a highly qualified teacher for science subjects that appeared in Item A-18 of the USDOE's Title II Non-Regulatory Guidance issued on August 3, 2005, a definition that permits a teacher certified in one science subject to be highly qualified to teach other science subjects provided that the State's certification rules permit the teacher to teach the other science subject. Starting in 2006-2007, work with the Regents and education community to severely restrict incidental teaching, which will limit the use of the HOUSSE.

NOTE on Special Education Certificate Review. Prior to 2004, New York State had one certificate for special education for all subjects in grades Pre-Kindergarten (Pre-K) through 12 and three disability-specific certificates for grades PreK-12. The new certification regulations that went into effect in February 2004 created nineteen separate certificate titles for Teachers of Students with Disabilities, including Birth to Grade 2, Grades 1 - 6, Grades 5 - 9 Generalist, Grades 5 - 9 Specialist (math, biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, social studies, English and languages other than English) and Grades 7 - 12 Specialist (math, biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, social studies, English and languages other than English). Concerns have been raised that the change from four K-12 certificate titles to nineteen certificate titles may be contributing to shortages that will have a significant impact on students with disabilities in "special classes" (as opposed to students in inclusive settings) because federal law requires teachers of special classes to be certified in special education and demonstrate subject matter competency for all core assignments. The Department is meeting with educators across the State, reviewing certification data by title and reviewing policy options for the Board of Regents consideration to address both student needs and shortage issues.

See Action Step 8.1. (*OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES; OHE- QUALITY ASSURANCE, OHE-SPECIAL PROJECTS & VESID*)

Area 4

Recruitment and retention of certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers

New York State provides State and regional resources to support local improvement, holds local districts accountable for results and measures progress over time. New York State's priority is to provide funds and other resources for the staffing and professional development needs of high need, low performing districts and schools, as reflected in the State's teacher recruitment and retention programs. New York State also has teacher recruitment and retention programs that target resources to the specific subject areas with shortages and gaps in highly qualified teachers, including math, science and special education.

- 4.1 ALLOCATION OF FUNDS. Each year New York State provides LEAs and others with over \$61,000,000 in State (85 percent) and federal (15 percent) funds to support teacher recruitment and retention, primarily in high need, low performing LEAs and schools, from the programs described below. Continue to administer State and federal teacher recruitment and retention programs to give priority to high need, low performing LEAs and schools. Major programs are listed here. **Attachment D** has links to online information about these and other programs. (*OHE-K-16 INITIATIVES AND ACCESS; OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES; & VESID-POLICY DEVELOPMENT*)

Teachers in High Need, Low Performing LEAs and Schools

The Teachers of Tomorrow (TOT) program began in the spring of 2000 to combat the looming teacher shortage, especially in the big five City School Districts, by offering incentives and support for recruiting and retaining teachers. This New York State-funded program has provided nearly \$65,000,000 to LEAs with low performing schools, with annual appropriations ranging from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000. Only LEAs with low performing schools (that are not making AYP) and teacher shortages and/or subject-specific teacher shortages are eligible for funds. The lowest performing schools have priority. Teacher shortages are defined locally, and can include the lack of highly qualified teachers for core academic subjects. Sixty percent of TOT funds are reserved for New York City. TOT funds can be used for up to six purposes, depending upon local needs.

1. **Recruitment Incentives** are grants of up to \$3,400 (for up to four years) that can be made to teachers with initial, provisional, professional or permanent certification who agree to teach for the first time in an LEA designated teacher shortage or subject shortage area. Since inception, over 11,330 awards have been made.
2. **Certification Stipends** of up to \$2,000 can be used for test preparation workshops or other coursework that teachers need to qualify for certification. Since inception, over 6,200 awards have been made.
3. **Summer in the City Internships** enable the big five City School Districts to provide up to \$2,000 to students in teacher preparation programs for urban summer internships that can be

used for college credit and field experience required for certification. Since inception, over 3,460 awards have been made.

4. The **New York State Master Teacher Program** allows school districts with low performing schools to use a National Board Certified Teacher to serve as a Master Teacher in those schools with a \$10,000 supplement to regular salary. Since inception, over 95 awards have been made.
5. **Teacher Recruitment Tuition Reimbursement** enables LEAs to reimburse teachers up to \$2,100 per year for up to two years for approved coursework leading to certification if the teachers agree to serve for at least one year in a teacher shortage or subject shortage area for each award year. Since inception, over 7,490 awards have been made.
6. The **Summer Teacher Training Program** is only applicable to New York City. It provides funds for an intensive summer training course for teachers employed for the first time in New York City as certified teachers. Since inception, over 26,890 awards have been made.

The New York State Education Department is requesting an additional \$26,000,000 from the Governor and Legislature for the Teachers of Tomorrow program to further support mentoring for new teachers in low performing schools. For more information about the New York State Teachers of Tomorrow program, see

http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/TEACHING/TOT/teachers_of_tomorrow_introductio.htm.

The **Teacher Opportunity Corps (TOC) Program**, a New York State funded program, enhances the preparation of teachers for students at risk of not meeting State Learning Standards or graduating from high school and increases the participation of historically underrepresented groups in the teaching profession. Eligible recipients are partnerships of teacher preparation institutions of higher education and schools or districts with high concentrations of both teachers without appropriate certification and high poverty students. Partnerships with Schools Under Registration Review (the lowest performing schools in the State, based on AYP and other criteria) have the highest priority. TOC has received annual appropriations ranging from \$700,000 to \$800,000 in recent years. On average, TOC serves 530 individuals each year. For more information, see: http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/TEACHING/TOC%20RFP/teacher_opportunity_corps_fact_p.htm

Title II, Part A Teacher-Leader Quality Partnership Program, a federally-funded program under the NCLB, awards grants to partnerships consisting of an institution of higher education and its teacher education division, a college (or division) of arts and sciences, and at least one high need school district, all of which have schools that are low performing (i.e., not making AYP). Drawing on their respective experiences, skills, and knowledge, the partners work together to design and implement professional development programs that will help both pre-service and in-service teachers and school administrators meet the needs of their students in high need schools. The program is currently in the second year of a five-year funding cycle. Its funding level was

\$6,000,000 in 2005-2006. For more information, please see <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/COLLEGIATE/TLQP/dde%20description.htm>.

New York State's Teacher Recruitment project, funded through a discretionary grant obtained by the New York State Education Department through the federal Higher Education Act (HEA), helps New York City staff its hard-to-staff schools by providing financial incentives to independent colleges and universities to partner with the New York City Department of Education to offer alternative teacher preparation programs for New York City Teaching Fellows. As of fall 2006, this three-year project awarded approximately \$1,500,000 over three years to participating colleges and universities to support graduate education for over 800 new Teaching Fellows. These Fellows served in shortage areas in high need schools.

New York State's Transition to Teaching project, funded through a discretionary grant obtained by the New York State Education Department through the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as NCLB, has the same goals and operations as the Teacher Recruitment Project. As of fall 2006, this five-year project awarded approximately \$1,200,000 over three years to participating colleges and universities to support graduate education for over 700 Teaching Fellows. These Fellows serve in shortage areas in high need schools.

Other Transition to Teaching projects involving high need and low performing LEAs and schools are encouraged by the New York State Education Department. Mercy College, The City University of New York College of Staten Island, the State University of New York Empire State College and other campuses have had federally funded Transition to Teaching projects. In August 2006, the New Teacher Project obtained a five-year Transition to Teaching grant in New York City.

New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program. This State-funded program enables experienced mentor teachers in an LEA or BOCES to provide guidance and support to beginning teachers (interns) in their first or second year of teaching. Research shows that this support helps beginning teachers become effective and increases retention. While this program is not limited to high need and low performing LEAs and schools, these districts have priority for funding. This program received a State appropriation of \$6,000,000 for 2006-2007. On average this program serves approximately 1,200 teachers per year.

Math and Science Teachers

The Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP), a State-funded program, increases the number of historically underrepresented students who enroll in and complete undergraduate or graduate programs leading to teacher certification in math or science or to professional licensure or careers in mathematics, science, technology or health related fields. Data show that approximately 80 percent of teachers in New York State work in schools within 40 miles of where they went to high school, which means that recruiting teachers from minority communities can increase the supply of teachers for those communities. CSTEP received an appropriation of \$19,000,000 for 2006-2007. For more information, please refer to:

http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/COLLEGIATE/CSTEP%202004/introduction_to_cstep.htm

New York State Math and Science Teaching Incentive Program is a new State-funded program starting in spring 2007 to increase the overall supply of middle and secondary math and science teachers, which will help all LEAs, including high need, low performing LEAs, recruit the teachers they need. In this competitive program, up to 500 students enrolled in programs leading to certification as a middle or secondary level math or science teacher will receive up to four years of funds equal to the cost of public sector tuition in return for agreeing to teach in a public school for five years (or repaying the funds as a loan). For more information, please refer to <http://www.hesc.com/bulletin.nsf/0/6917B999279957A4852571AE0069C9CD?OpenDocument>.

IBM Initiative. The Department, in partnership with the teacher education community in New York State, is working with IBM to launch a national program to assist IBM employees make a transition to teaching in the shortage areas of math and the sciences. While this initiative is important for the additional math and science teachers it will bring to New York State, it also serves as a national model for other businesses and industries. The Department is working to ensure that the New York component of this national effort is successful and is pleased to report that approximately 50 percent of IBM's first cohort of teacher candidates is in New York State. This effort is intended to serve as a model for other corporations to support future teachers. Several additional corporations located in New York have already expressed an interest in this model.

Special Education Teachers

Bilingual Special Education Intensive Teacher Institute (BSE-ITI)

- BSE-ITI, a federally-funded program, provides tuition assistance for candidates pursuing certification as bilingual special education and related services personnel. This program offers assistance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and is offered to currently employed paraprofessionals and teachers seeking their initial certification as bilingual special educators. It also offers assistance to school psychologists, guidance counselors and social workers seeking initial bilingual certification.
- BSE-ITI accepts program nominations for employed personnel from chief school officers on the condition that the nominating school districts or providers will continue to employ the graduates in bilingual special education and related service positions. Program graduates are required to complete a service commitment in their certification area after graduation.
- Participating universities receive tuition assistance directly from the BSE-ITI at a negotiated rate and are required to use a bilingual certification curriculum approved by the State Education Department and recommend their graduates for New York State certification.
- The BSE-ITI addresses the specific identified bilingual staffing needs of school districts and service providers. The program links students to approved programs resulting in an increase in New York State certified bilingual special educators and related services personnel.
- This program awarded \$900,000 in 2005-2006.

Higher Education Support Center (HESC) for Systems Change. HESC for Systems Change was established in 2001 by a contract between VESID and Syracuse University's School of Education, using federal funds, to develop and sustain high quality inclusive teacher preparation programs and to engage in and support the professional development efforts of selected schools in seven regions of New York State. HESC provides its member institutions with the opportunity to meet both regionally (frequently throughout the year) and statewide (twice a year) to expand the individual institutions' capacity as they prepare new teachers to work in New York State. HESC provides a conduit for its member institutions to have the latest information from the State and have access to Department initiatives regarding the needs of our changing student population. Teacher retention and recruitment, especially in special education certification areas, are two key elements addressed by HESC. In 2004, HESC was a principal author of the document, *Keeping Quality Teachers - The Art of Retaining General and Special Education Teachers*. An accompanying DVD will be completed this year. HESC received \$875,000 in 2005-2006.

Bilingual Personnel Development Center (Bilingual Special Education University Improvement Project). Using federal funds, the Center supports SED's initiatives in staff development through various approved initiatives and provides technical assistance to institutions of higher education seeking New York State registration of their programs leading to certification in bilingual special education and related services areas. The Center develops reports on enrollment and capacity in special education and related services personnel areas that are used to inform SED on the status of personnel training statewide in both monolingual English and bilingual certification areas. The Center has also developed on-line instructional programs in bilingual special education which have been piloted to determine their success in training personnel in hard-to-staff areas. The Center received \$150,000 in 2005-2006.

- 4.2 PARTNERSHIPS AND INFORMATION. Continue the partnership that helps IBM retirees become certified teachers in math and science and invite the New York State Business Council to promote other partnerships for recruiting teachers for high poverty schools with the larger business community. Partner with other State agencies and statewide professional associations to launch a public information campaign about State, federal and private benefit programs for teachers who work in shortage subjects and high poverty schools. Such programs include the federal HEA Title IV loan forgiveness, federal scholarships, National Science Foundation (NSF) Robert Noyce Scholarship Program and NSF Math and Science Partnership Network, as listed in **Attachment C**. (*OHE- QUALITY ASSURANCE; OHE-TEACHING INITIATIVES*)
- 4.3 POLICY ALIGNMENT. Strengthen advocacy for State and federal programs that help high poverty LEAs recruit and retain teachers. For example, aggressively promote a State bill that would permit retired public servants to teach in high poverty schools without a pension penalty and develop other bills for tax incentives or other strategies. (*OHE- QUALITY ASSURANCE*)
- 4.4 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION. In partnership with public broadcasting stations, LEAs and teacher preparation institutions, develop strategies with public radio and television stations to develop public information initiatives for recruiting and retaining teachers for shortage subjects and

high poverty LEAs and schools and from high poverty and minority communities. (OCE-
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION & PUBLIC BROADCASTING)

4.5 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MONITORING. Require LEAs that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for student achievement and Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) for highly qualified teachers to have revised teacher quality plans and provide technical assistance on the development of such plans. **See Action Steps in Area 7.** (*EMSC-OFFICE OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & (NYC)*)

4.6 DISTANCE EDUCATION. Encourage LEAs to adopt distance education solutions in rural areas where highly qualified teachers are not available to teach every core subject. The New York State Distance Learning Consortium (NYSDLC), formed in 1994, oversees a broadband, two-way distance learning network that reaches school buildings throughout the State and allows classrooms to connect with one another and with cultural institutions, such as the New York Hall of Science, for virtual hands-on activities. The NYSDLC provides access to core material as well as to advanced placement courses. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R]*)

4.7 STRATEGIES TO ENSURE THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS. Submit a proposal to the Board of Regents to address inequalities in the assignment of teachers to low income and minority students. At the September 2006 meeting of the Board of Regents, the New York State Education Department asked the Board to consider a preliminary proposal that would include, among other things:

- reporting annually on the percentage of classes in core academic subjects in high poverty and high minority schools that are taught by teachers who are unqualified, out-of-field or inexperienced; and.
- defining, reducing and then eliminating the inequitable distribution of teachers by qualification and experience.

The Board of Regents and Department are currently discussing strategies to define measurable objectives, publish data to build public awareness and regulate to require local action to meet the objectives. They are considering a policy that would limit the percentage of inexperienced teachers authorized to teach in SURR schools or schools In Need of Improvement to ensure the equitable distribution of teacher talent and foster local retention strategies. They are also promoting new alternative and traditional teacher preparation programs in subjects and locations where they are needed.

To support LEAs in their efforts to equalize the distribution of certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers, the New York State Education Department will ask the Regents to advance a legislative proposal for new State funds for schools that are not making AYP. The funds could only be used by these schools to provide high quality mentoring and induction to new teachers, which would improve new teachers' effectiveness in the classroom and retention, thereby enabling these schools, over time, to have the experienced and effective teachers they need.

Area 5

Professional development

Every school district in New York State is required to provide mentoring to first-year teachers. Every teacher with an Initial Certificate (which is valid for the first five years of teaching) must receive mentoring from an employer in order to qualify for a Professional Certificate (which is valid after the first five years of teaching). A competitive State grant program provides funds to help districts implement their mentoring programs. A district's mentoring program must be aligned with its required Professional Development Plan. The Regents and Education Department are requesting an additional \$26,000,000 from the Governor and Legislature to further support mentoring for new teachers.

New York State requires all districts to have Professional Development Plans that respond to the specific learning needs of their students and to provide mentoring to first-year teachers and supports these requirements with regional networks of resources. In addition, all teachers with Professional Certificates must complete at least 175 contact hours of professional development, consistent with their districts' Professional Development Plan, every five years in order to maintain their certificate in good standing. In school year 2006-2007, the New York State Standards and Practices Board for Teaching will be identifying best practices in professional development for benchmarking purposes.

New York State has a network structure, described in Action Step 5.3, for providing resources and support to high need, low performing districts and schools in the context of local, comprehensive education planning. The State supports Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs) and other specialized networks whose services to high need, low performing districts and schools are coordinated by the RSSCs.

- 5.1 CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS. Continue to implement the State requirement for new teachers certified after February 1, 2004 – including new teachers in high poverty LEAs – to complete 175 hours of professional development every five years in order to maintain their professional certification. (*OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES*)
- 5.2 TEACHING PRACTICE REQUIREMENTS. Continue to enforce State and federal requirements for all LEAs to implement needs-based professional development plans leading to high quality professional development for effective teaching and State requirements for all teachers to have an Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) to identify strengths and professional development needs. During school year 2006-2007, engage the New York State Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching (PSPB) in the definition and identification of professional development opportunities focused on instructional practices to improve student achievement, helping to align standards, curriculum, instructional practice and assessment. Align the 175-hour requirement with promising instructional practices related to improving student achievement. These practices include those related to reading and the instruction of English Language Learners, special education students and low performing students in middle and high schools. For example, these practices might focus on the transition from eighth to ninth grade, using data systems to identify students at high risk of not graduating from high school, middle and high school literacy programs and practices designed to increase attendance by increasing their

interest in school. Continue to implement the State requirement for all first-year teachers to receive mentoring and induction in accordance with a district's mentoring and professional development plan. [EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (R) & (NYC)]

- 5.3 TARGETED FUNDING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PARTNERS. The State Education Department will continue to use New York State's Regional Network Strategy to target technical assistance and professional development to high need, low performing districts and schools in the context of local, comprehensive education planning. [EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (R) & (NYC); VESIDJ]

At the center of the Regional Network Strategy are the seven Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs), listed at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/rss/rsscnetworkdir.htm>. The RSSCs were funded, in part by NY State's Title II A statewide funds allocation, for the sole purpose of working with the State's lowest performing districts and schools, as identified by New York State on the basis of State and federal accountability measures. Funding of RSSCs began in 2001 to enable them to provide direct technical assistance to the districts and schools identified as low performing and to leverage the expertise of existing networks to target resources to these districts and schools in a "Regional Network Strategy" approach. In fulfilling the first responsibility, RSSCs act as primary liaisons with identified districts/schools and are responsible for providing and/or leveraging professional development to identified districts/schools in reading and mathematics. In fulfilling the second responsibility, RSSCs act as conveners and coordinators of regional leadership teams. It is in this second role that RSSCs will be most valuable in supporting State efforts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year and that qualified and experienced teachers are equitably distributed. **See Action Step 7.8.**

New York State has a rich array of network resources that pre-date the RSSCs. Regional RSSC leadership teams are comprised of RSSC staff and representatives of all the State networks. The purpose of these teams is to harness as many network resources as are available to address the needs of those districts and schools that are furthest from meeting State and federal accountability standards. In collaboration with each other and with the identified districts/schools, regional leadership teams look at multiple sources of district and school data to assess gaps and plan activities that focus available resources on helping these district and schools to improve.

As a result of the RSSC collaborative planning and data analysis process:

- 1) the network with the most expertise in the area of greatest need (as identified through the data analysis) is engaged in the work from the beginning, is available to help solve problems and can share best practices with the other members of the leadership team;
- 2) specialists are available to provide targeted services to the districts and schools most needing them, in such areas as addressing the needs of English Language Learners (ELLs);
- 3) the results of such service provision, as well as emerging needs, are communicated on an ongoing basis to all members of the regional leadership team so that adjustments to services can be made as they are needed;
- 4) identified districts and schools have access to a wide array of professional development opportunities that can be crafted to meet their specific needs;

- 5) identified districts and schools develop enhanced capacity to improve their own performance and practices; and
- 6) the support provided to districts and schools is coherent and focused.

The State Education Department will continue to use Title II A statewide funds to support the seven Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs). RSSCs provide support through a variety of planning, needs assessment, coordination and professional development activities. Depending on the needs identified by targeted schools and LEAs, RSSCs provide some or all of the following technical assistance support:

- work with the school leadership team to analyze data and determine teaching and learning needs;
- provide professional development for teachers, principals and/or pupil services personnel;
- develop or assist LEAs in the development and use of proven, innovative strategies to deliver targeted intensive professional development programs (particularly in ELA and mathematics), with ongoing follow-up;
- provide assistance to LEAs for the development and implementation of professional development programs for school leaders;
- support activities that ensure teachers are able to use challenging State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards and State assessments to improve instructional practices and improve student academic achievement; and
- convene Regional Network Partners at regional planning meetings to determine LEAs' needs and provide appropriate, coordinated technical assistance.

New York State networks currently working with RSSCs

- The **Bilingual Education Technical Assistance Center (BETAC)** network provides support related to English Language Learners.
- The **School Support Services Network (SSSN)** provides resources, technical assistance, professional development and other support related to non-academic needs such as school violence prevention, health, and issues of school climate and culture.
- The **Teacher Resource and Training Centers (NYS Teacher Centers)** are funded by the New York State Legislature to provide all teachers with access to high quality professional development.
- The **Staff and Curriculum Development Network (SCDN)** is a statewide network of representatives from each BOCES and the large city districts. Participants attend multi-day meetings on a quarterly basis to stay informed of NYSED initiatives and engage in their own professional development. They provide professional development to client districts and schools. SCDN members also participate in an active electronic listserv on which they pose questions to colleagues and NYSED staff and share resources and professional development opportunities with each other.

- The **Regional Adult Education Network** provides support for adult learners, including technical assistance and professional development in helping schools engage parents as partners in their children’s education.
- **District Superintendents** of the 37 regional Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) also comprise a network that meets monthly with SED leaders to discuss emerging issues and needs.
- **Special Education Training and Resource Centers (SETRCs)** provide technical assistance to school districts identified as being in the greatest need of assistance. There are 41 SETRC programs located throughout the State at each of the BOCES (except Western Suffolk BOCES, which is served by Eastern Suffolk BOCES) and in the Big Five cities. The combined centers employ approximately 110 full-time Professional Development Specialists and additional full-time and part-time personnel as support staff. SETRCs provide in-service training and professional development for teachers currently in the classroom to improve teacher quality and provide technical assistance to school districts to implement school improvement plans. New York State’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), establishes statewide baselines in key performance and compliance areas relating to the performance of students with disabilities. In response to the performance of students with disabilities in some NYS school districts, VESID has restructured and focused activities of the SETRC network to address instructional practices and improve results. In order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, VESID is directing the SETRC’s Professional Development Specialists to support school improvement activities most directly relating to instruction in such areas as literacy, behavioral support and services and the quality delivery of special education services.

5.4 PARTNERSHIPS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN LOW PERFORMING SCHOOLS.

Continue to use partnerships to provide high quality professional development to teachers and administrators in high poverty, low performing schools.

- **Coordination.** In partnership with the New York Comprehensive Center, continue to provide tri-annual, multi-day professional development for representatives of Regional Network Partners and SED staff to engage in professional development focused on ensuring that technical assistance and professional development support are provided coherently and without duplication.
- **Professional development aligned with needs of low performing schools serving minority students.** Through RSSCs and Regional Network Partners, continue to provide identified LEAs with high quality, continuous, sustained, research-based, content-based professional development opportunities aligned with LEA School Improvement Plans. Continue to focus on building the skills of teachers in working with historically underserved student groups.
- **Professional development for low performing schools serving minority students.** Continue to provide high quality, continuous, sustained and research-based professional

- development opportunities to identified LEAs through State and federal grant programs -- such as the Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program, Reading First, NCLB Title II A State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) grants, New York State Teacher Opportunity Corps, and New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program -- to enhance the knowledge and skills of teachers to work with historically underserved student groups, especially in high poverty schools.
- **Distance learning.** Encourage LEAs, particularly high poverty LEAs, to adopt distance learning solutions for professional development, to allow teachers to engage in anywhere, anytime learning to enhance their qualifications. The SUNY Learning Network allows individuals to complete graduate-level courses offered online by faculty at the State University of New York's 64 campuses. New York's public television stations offer PBS TeacherLine New York, a USDOE-funded professional development initiative that provides more than 90 online courses designed to help teachers master pedagogical techniques and course content in mathematics, reading, science, and technology integration. Each course is research-based and facilitated by a master teacher.
 - **Destination Diploma.** Continue to provide professional development to high poverty and high minority districts through Destination Diploma Forums and Urban Forums. Destination Diploma Forum participants are high school leadership teams from 127 districts statewide with low graduation rates in their high schools. Destination Diploma Forums are two-day forums to examine and promote effective strategies for improving high school graduation rates and performance on State exams. Urban Forums are provided for the Big Four Cities – Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers – and are based on topics chosen by representatives of the Big Four districts who are also instrumental in planning the forums.
 - **Core academic subjects in low performing schools in New York City.** In New York City, continue to provide direction, ongoing technical assistance and support to build the skills of New York City teachers working with historically underserved student groups, especially in high poverty schools. Continue the Department's fiscal support of several capacity building professional development activities in New York City. These activities include a series of Reading and Mathematics Institutes, the Citywide Early Childhood Conference and the Destination Diploma High School Forum. The Reading and Mathematics Institute is a series of professional development sessions for teacher staff developers and school administrators from high poverty, low performing schools and schools farthest from the State standard. The Citywide Early Childhood Conference provides curricula and support strategies that focus on effective early childhood interventions and quality early childhood programming to over 1,500 early childhood educators.
 - **School leadership.** Continue to support professional development opportunities that are designed to attract and retain school administrators, including Special Leadership Institutes and collaboration with Harvard University via the Harvard Principals' Institute. These initiatives provide opportunities for principals and superintendents of high need urban schools and districts to strengthen their professional and instructional leadership skills.
 - **Communications.** Continue to disseminate information about various professional development opportunities (such as USDOE's Teacher-to-Teacher Initiative and other regional and/or national opportunities) through listservs and SED's website. In New York City, expand

listservs to include representation from teacher and administrator bargaining organizations. Sponsor monthly conference calls involving (1) SED curriculum specialists; (2) Big Five City Math, ELA, Science and Social Studies Directors; and (3) leadership of professional associations in those curriculum areas to address shared interests and concerns.

- **The New York State Teacher Resource and Computer Training Centers (Teacher Centers)** are funded by the State to provide professional development to teachers. Teacher quality data for LEAs will be shared with the Teacher Centers so that they can develop and provide professional development targeted to teachers in low performing schools who are not highly qualified or who are inexperienced.
- **UFT Teacher Center Professional Development Program in New York City.** In partnership with the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the New York City Department of Education and community school districts, metropolitan area universities and cultural institutions, the New York State Education Department will continue to provide high quality professional development opportunities via the UFT's Teacher Center Professional Development Program. Through its unique design, the UFT Teacher Center supports high standards for students by promoting the professional growth of teachers and other educators in over 250 school-based sites and numerous outreach locations. Teacher Center professional development offerings include literacy and mathematics networks, graduate courses, conferences, seminars, summer institutes, educational forums, and symposia. For more information, please refer to <http://www.uftc.org/modelnetworks.html>

(EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]; EMSC CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT; VESID –SPECIAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE; OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES; OHE- K-16 INITIATIVES AND ACCESS PROGRAMS; OCE- EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND PUBLIC BROADCASTING)

5.5 PARTNERSHIPS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOCUSED ON SPECIFIC CORE ACADEMIC SUBJECTS. Continue to support teachers in specific core academic subjects to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified and effective and that low income and minority children are taught by teachers with the same qualifications and experience as other children. *(EMSC-CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT AND EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R])*

- **Regional School Support Centers' Reading First Programs.** Reading First is a federally funded program designed to provide states and schools with assistance to establish research-based reading programs for students in kindergarten through third grade. The purpose of Reading First is to ensure that all children learn to read well by the end of the third grade. The grants are targeted to low performing LEAs and support the establishment of a scientifically-based reading program and the provision of professional development to teachers. Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs) provide intensive on-site technical assistance and professional development to Reading First grantees in all aspects of Reading First. They also work with Building Coaches to coordinate the New York State Reading Academy coursework for teachers and principals. Each RSSC has a Reading First Coordinator, a Data Assessment Coordinator and regional coaches.
- **The New York State Reading Academy** is a set of interactive online courses for teachers, coaches, principals and other educators who wish to learn more about scientifically-based reading instruction. Reading Academy Course One, Foundations, is a 60-80 hour course

- targeted at the five Big Ideas in reading instruction, and is required for all Reading First teachers in the first year of implementation. Reading Academy Course Two, Reading for Understanding, was developed to provide a deeper understanding and knowledge in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension, and is available to Reading First teachers who need more professional development in these areas. Coaches lead teachers through application of course content to classroom practice. Also, the New York State Reading Academy includes an 8-10 hour course for Reading First Principals.
- **Mathematics Science Partnership Program.** SED administers the NCLB Title IIB Mathematics Science Partnership Program competitive grant program which focuses on building teachers' content knowledge and pedagogy in identified high need districts through partnerships with higher education. The first round of funding, worth \$ 9,000,000, provided customized professional development in math and science for twelve projects serving approximately 3,000 teachers in high need districts who were not certified in math or science. The next round of funding will be increased slightly and will be available during the 2007-10 school years.
 - **Mathematics Resource Center.** The New York State Mathematics Resource Center was funded in 2006 for a three year period to improve the quality of mathematics instruction through a system of state and regional leadership that builds the capacity of district and building level leadership in high need school districts by partnering with the State's school support networks. The Center will provide ongoing professional development to districts and schools in need of improvement based on analyses of student achievement data and teacher quality data.
 - **National Science Resources Center.** In a partnership with the National Science Resources Center (NSRC), SED provides professional development in science to leadership teams from the Big Five Cities and three Rest of State teams through the New York Enhancing Collaborative Leadership through Improved Performance in Science Education (NY ECLIPSE) project. This project, scheduled to start in 2006-2007, will provide an intensive 18-month leadership training program that will be customized for each district's needs and will use a comprehensive approach to support district-wide systemic change in inquiry-based science education.
 - **NYSED Virtual Learning System (VLS).** SED offers ongoing training and technical assistance to teachers and administrators in the Big 5 large city school districts to help them access through the VLS standards-based resources aligned to New York State Learning Standards.
 - **Statewide Learning Technology Grant Program.** The New York State Education Department administers the state's learning technology grant program. The program provides funds for professional development of teachers in high need districts to help teachers integrate and use instructional technologies in classroom practice for improved student achievement.

5.6 **ALIGN CAPACITY.** In partnership with the New York Comprehensive Center, enhance SED's comprehensive assessment strategy to provide diagnostic information to teachers to guide instruction and strengthen the professional development role of Regional School Support Centers and other network resources that serve high poverty, low performing schools. Provide teacher quality gap data and technical assistance on the use of such data to RSSC leadership teams. Link

the Public Broadcasting System's *TeacherLine New York* and Public TV's research-based literacy programs, funded through USDOE Ready to Learn, with the Regional Network Partner initiative to ensure that professional development in enhanced literacy instruction reaches the classrooms of targeted districts. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R], VESID; OHE; & OCE- EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND PUBLIC BROADCASTING*)

Continue the joint work between SED and the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) to develop and implement strategies and activities, including recruitment, retention, scholarship and staff development initiatives, to increase qualified personnel employed in hard-to-staff areas in the NYC DOE identified under the Jose P. litigation. Specific activities have been developed to increase monolingual and bilingual special education teachers, monolingual and bilingual speech teachers, bilingual school psychologists, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Occupational Therapists and Physical Therapists. [*VESID, OHE, OP, OMS*]

- 5.7 INFORMATION. Promote National Board Certification in high poverty schools by publicizing the availability of Albert Shanker stipends. As needed, seek support from foundations affiliated with the National Board for professional teaching standards to help more teachers in high poverty schools become National Board certified. See <http://www.nbpts.org/candidates/availscholar.cfm>. Through the State Library's services, enhance publicity about funding for partnerships of teacher preparation institutions and school districts that provide high quality professional development to teachers. Federal funding sources are listed in **Attachment C**. They include the National Science Foundation, which funds projects in New York City, at Hofstra University and SUNY at Stony Brook and their partners, SUNY at Brockport and its partners, SUNY at Buffalo (University Center), Cornell University, Dowling College and SUNY at Fredonia. (*OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES; OHE- K-16 INITIATIVES AND ACCESS PROGRAMS; OCE- EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND PUBLIC BROADCASTING*)

Area 6

Working conditions in schools and LEAs

- 6.1 LEADERSHIP PREPARATION. Continue to improve working conditions in schools and districts by strengthening preparation programs for school and district leaders and holding programs accountable for results under new leadership preparation program standards. (*OHE- COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY EVALUATION*)
- 6.2 LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. Continue to provide opportunities and support for existing school and district leaders to improve working conditions through professional development that helps them become more effective. **See Action Steps 5.3 and 5.4.** (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT; EMSC- CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT; VESID–SPECIAL EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE; OCE- EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND PUBLIC BROADCASTING*)
- 6.3 LEADERSHIP CERTIFICATION. Continue to improve working conditions by implementing new certification standards for school and district leaders adopted in June 2006. See <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/2006Meetings/June2006/0606heppa4.htm>. (*OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES*)
- 6.4 INFORMATION TOOLS. Provide school-level analysis files with teacher turnover and teacher experience indicators to LEAs for local planning and accountability purposes. **See Action Steps 1.4, 5.3 and in Area 7.** (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- 6.5 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. Through Regional Network Partners, continue to provide coherent and unduplicated support and leadership development for high poverty LEAs, including the use of needs assessment, planning and data analysis, that engage the LEA leadership team with the various partners serving the LEA. **See Action Step 5.3.** [*EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (R)*]
- 6.6 IDENTIFY RETENTION STRATEGIES AND ADVOCATE FOR RESOURCES. Working conditions impact teacher retention and student learning. With partners, continue to advocate for State aid for schools (for facilities, instructional resources and teacher compensation and retention) and identify additional strategies to improve retention. (*EMSC-DEPUTY COMMISSIONER*)
- 6.7 INFORMATION AND MONITORING. Continue to improve data collection and reporting about persistently dangerous schools as a strategy for reducing dangers and enhancing both working and learning conditions. Continue to monitor schools for accurate reporting of data about dangers; provide technical assistance to LEAs for accurate and complete reporting; and provide ongoing technical assistance to LEAs' leaders, parents, teachers and others to reduce incidents of violence and improve learning climates. (*EMSC- INFORMATION REPORTING SERVICES; EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)

Area 7

Monitoring and technical assistance

MONITORING

- 7.1 GUIDANCE ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS. Update all LEAs about the consequences of failing to meet AYP for student achievement and AMOs for teacher quality and SED's implementation of the NCLB's Section 2141 accountability requirements. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- If an LEA is identified as having failed to meet teacher quality AMOs (e.g., had less than 90 percent of core classes taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-2005 and less than 95 percent in 2005-06), it must, through the Consolidated Application and District Comprehensive Education Plan (DCEP) processes and as a condition of receiving Title II A funds, develop a teacher quality plan that describes the specific steps it will take to ensure that all teachers become highly qualified as quickly as possible.
 - If an LEA is identified as having failed both to meet teacher quality AMOs and to make AYP for three consecutive years, SED will enter into an agreement with the LEA on its use of LEA Title II A funds in accordance with Section 2141.
- 7.2 STRATEGIC USE OF DATA. Use the latest available teacher quality data to identify and prioritize LEAs for monitoring and technical assistance interventions. For this purpose, priority LEAs are defined as LEAs with the largest number of core classes not taught by highly qualified teachers that also did not meet AYP and AMOs. The statewide teacher quality AMO for monitoring and technical assistance priority is at least 90 percent of core classes taught by highly qualified teachers in school year 2004-2005 and 95 percent in school year 2005-2006. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & NYC*)
- 7.3 APPROVAL OF LOCAL FUNDING. For all LEAs identified as not meeting teacher quality AMOs, and for all LEAs with schools not meeting teacher quality AMOs, review 2006-2007 Consolidated Local Applications and District Comprehensive Education Plans (DCEPs) for evidence that required teacher quality plans describe sufficient and realistic strategies and activities to reach highly qualified teacher goals and equitable teacher distribution goals, including strategies and activities that address shortage area needs. For all LEAs identified as failing to meet both teacher quality AMOs and failing to make AYP for three years, and for all LEAs with schools failing to meet both teacher quality AMOs and failing to make AYP for three years, enter into an agreement with the LEA on its use of Title II A funds in accordance with Section 2141. As a precondition for approval of LEAs' 2006-2007 budgets, ensure that LEA plans describe uses of Title I professional development set-asides and Title II A funds and have sufficient and adequate strategies to meet teacher quality goals by the end of school year 2006-2007 or as soon as possible. See the notice to the field at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/nclb/nclbhome.htm> and the Addendum to the 2006-07 Consolidated Application Update and DCEP Addendum Update at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/titlei/ca0607/teacherquality.doc>. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)

- 7.4 **ALIGNMENT.** In 2006-2007, monitor priority LEAs (identified in Action Step 7.2). Revise the New York City Eight Year NCLB Monitoring Review Schedule to target priority districts and continue annual monitoring of four to six New York City regional districts' compliance with NCLB teacher quality provisions. Align the Regional 2006-2007 Title II A monitoring schedule to target priority LEAs and other high poverty and high minority districts that have an inequitable distribution of highly qualified teachers between high and low poverty schools within the LEA. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- 7.5 **MONITORING VISITS.** Assess implementation of LEAs' efforts to meet highly qualified teacher goals. Focus Regional and New York City monitoring processes on district planning for, and implementation of, equitable district and classroom placement of highly qualified and experienced teachers. Use available local teacher quality data – described in **Attachment A, Items A.5 and A.6** – as the framework for monitoring visit discussions. Continue, as part of the Title II A monitoring process, to assess district implementation of New York State's required mentoring program for new teachers. Encourage districts to use Title II A funds to mentor teachers new to the district and/or teachers changing the level at which they are teaching. Continue to ensure, as part of the Title II A monitoring process, that professional development is both aligned with each LEA's needs assessment and is high quality, continuous and sustained. Continue to ensure, as part of the Title II A monitoring process, that LEAs are appropriately using the HOUSSE. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- 7.6 **SED COORDINATION.** Establish an internal SED work group to ensure coordination of findings on highly qualified teachers by different SED units that conduct monitoring reviews, including Title I and Title III offices. Add LEAs that other offices have identified with significant HQT problems to Title II A monitoring schedules. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- 7.7 **LEAS' TEACHER QUALITY PLANS.** Use direct technical assistance approaches (workshops, on-site visits, videoconference, and phone) to assist LEAs in developing their required teacher quality plans. Provide this assistance to LEAs that: (1) have the largest number of core classes not taught by HQT and not meeting AYP; (2) are identified, through desk audits of required highly qualified teacher and equitable teacher distribution plans, as having inadequate strategies to ensure that they will reach required goals; (3) are identified by the internal coordination group (see Item 7.6) as in need of such support; and (4) voluntarily request such assistance. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- 7.8 **AGREEMENTS WITH IDENTIFIED LEAS.** For all LEAs identified as failing both to meet teacher quality AMOs and AYP for three years, and for all LEAs with schools failing both to meet teacher quality AMOs and failing to make AYP for three consecutive years, provide direct technical assistance in the development of the strategies and activities the LEA will use to improve teacher quality and ensure the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers in buildings and classrooms. Such technical assistance may include reviewing the LEA's district-level and school-

level teacher quality data with the district leadership team to determine priority needs; working with the team to plan realistic strategies for meeting those needs; and working with school leadership teams to develop professional development strategies and activities, based on scientifically-based research, that the LEA will use to meet highly qualified teacher and student learning goals. SED and/or Regional Network Partners will work directly with teachers and principals involved in such plans to determine professional development activities that meet the definition in NCLB Section 9101 and that address highly qualified teacher needs. SED will require that a reasonable portion of the LEA's Title II A funds be made available to identified schools to support their plans.

Our 2004-2005 data show that, in order to reach the goal of 100 percent highly qualified teachers by the end of school year 2006-2007, New York State's greatest need is to ensure that teachers are appropriately certified for their teaching assignments. RSSCs will play a large role in providing technical assistance to districts and schools to help them meet teacher quality AMOs and ensure that highly qualified and experienced teachers are equitably distributed in buildings and classrooms. Data on teacher quality and experience is a newly available data resource, and NYSED has already begun engaging RSSCs and the other networks in looking at this data (see Attachment G, which was used in a facilitated interactive session with all networks in May 2006, and in a presentation to SCDN in June 2006 with follow-up requested and scheduled for Nov. 2006). RSSCs will work with districts and schools to support their analysis of teacher quality data, and help them plan strategies and activities to ensure that teachers are appropriately certified in the core academic subjects they teach. NYSED will work with the RSSC leadership teams to address requirements for the equitable distribution of highly qualified and experienced teachers, including the need to consider building and classroom placements of experienced teachers. NYSED will also provide ongoing technical assistance including the provision of local data, facilitation in the use of that data, and the sharing of research-based resources to increase the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers. **See Action Steps 5.3, 5.4 and 5.6.** (EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC])

7.9 COMMUNICATION AND PARTNERSHIPS. Mobilize the P-12 and higher education communities to address teacher quality gaps. Focus on the equitable distribution of certified, highly qualified and experienced teachers. Disseminate information about New York State's equitable teacher gap and strategies to help close it to all SED partners. Respond to requests for information and technical assistance to close the gap. (EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]) **See Attachments E, F and G.**

7.10 PARTNERSHIPS IN NEW YORK CITY. Continue to coordinate SED technical assistance and support for the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) via monthly "Cross Functional Task Force" meetings where system-wide changes are planned. Task force members represent SED, the NYC DOE and the United Federation of Teachers. Continue working with the Task Force to develop strategies to assist principals in making teaching assignments that match teachers' qualifications. Continue assisting the NYC DOE in its design of programs to help all teachers become highly qualified. Continue assisting the NYC DOE to enhance the completeness, accuracy and timeliness of its teacher quality data and school-level reports generated from it.

Continue efforts (via monthly School Improvement Liaisons' Network Meetings and District Comprehensive Educational Plan (DCEP) Training Sessions) to encourage districts to use all available funds to help teachers become highly qualified; to recruit high quality certified teachers, particularly in shortage areas; and to ensure that experienced and qualified teachers are equitably distributed between classrooms of poor and minority children and those of other students.

The State Education Department will continue to work with the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) on the reconfiguration of service delivery models for students with disabilities in order to provide these students with greater access to highly qualified teachers and to the general education curriculum. As a result of existing efforts, there has already been a significant increase in the number of students with disabilities who are served in general education environments with highly qualified general education teachers collaborating with special education teachers. The State Education Department specialists on highly qualified teachers for students with disabilities will continue to serve on the NYC DOE's NCLB "cross functional team" that addresses highly qualified teacher issues and will provide technical assistance at the NYC DOE training session on October 19, 2006 and as needed. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [NYC]; VESID*)

- 7.11 SHORTAGE SUBJECTS. To the extent specific subgroups of teachers are not highly qualified, continue working with Regional Network Partners to suggest strategies and resources to help LEAs assist these teachers to become highly qualified. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- 7.12 HOUSSE LIMITATION. Continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs about implementing the HOUSSE in permissible areas. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC]*)
- 7.13 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT. Provide an array of professional development opportunities focused on the needs of priority LEAs. **See Action Steps, Area 5.** Through website links, listservs, monitoring visits, Regional Network Partner meetings and other means, share information about standards and practices supporting high quality professional development and publicize opportunities to engage in regional, statewide and national professional development. (*EMSC- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT [R] & [NYC] & EMSC-CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT*)

Area 8

Policy coherence

- 8.1 CERTIFICATION POLICY. Review certification requirements to determine their impact on shortages for high poverty schools and seek authority from the Regents to revise them, as needed, while maintaining high standards. Examples include interstate reciprocity requirements, scope of practice of new certificate titles and the impact of new certificate titles and types on teacher tenure. *(OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES)*
- 8.2 ACCOUNTABILITY POLICY. Use an accountability approach to ensure that public reporting of data and sanctions for high poverty, low performing schools and LEAs do not have the undesirable impact of discouraging effective teachers and administrators from working in them. Analyze data annually and adjust State and regional programs and priorities to address needs revealed by the data. *(EMSC, OHE AND VESID-DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS)*
- 8.3 RESOURCES. Build partnerships to maximize resources available to meet the teacher quality needs of high poverty, low performing schools. For example, seek partners for an HEA Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant. *(OHE, EMSC & VESID – DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS)*
- 8.4 COMMUNICATIONS. Enhance SED communications about funding opportunities for preparing, recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers and providing professional development to teachers in high poverty and low performing LEAs. *(EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT[R] & [NYC]; OHE- TEACHING INITIATIVES; OCE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND PUBLIC BROADCASTING)*

Area 9 Limiting the use of the HOUSSE

Use of the HOUSSE in school year 2006-2007

Most teachers in New York State who were employed before school year 2006-2007 have already used the HOUSSE if they needed to do so. As in past years, in school year 2006-2007, the HOUSSE can only be used when teachers meet Regents certification standards.

In accordance with the NCLB and IDEA, their implementing regulations and Item A-12 of USDOE guidance of August 3, 2005, the New York State Education Department will continue to permit LEAs to use the HOUSSE, only as needed, for the following groups of teachers of core academic subjects:

- certified general education and certified Career and Technical Education (CTE) teachers who are “not new to the profession;”
- certified special education teachers who are “not new to the profession;” and
- certified special education teachers of multiple core academic subjects who are highly qualified in English/language arts, math or science and who are “new” as defined in 34 CFR section 300.18(d).

Also, in accordance with USDOE guidance of March 31, 2004, the New York State Education Department will permit the use of the HOUSSE for teachers who teach multiple core academic subjects, who are highly qualified in at least one core academic subject they teach and who are employed by eligible rural LEAs. This applies both to teachers who are “new to the profession” and “not new to the profession.”

Use of the HOUSSE after school year 2006-2007

New guidance for LEAs. In response to U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings’ guidance letter of September 5, 2006, and subsequent technical assistance from her staff, the New York State Education Department will issue guidance to LEAs advising them to limit their use of the HOUSSE after school year 2006-2007 because:

- the HOUSSE may be terminated in the NCLB Reauthorization of 2007; and
- the New York State Education Department will begin working with the Regents and the education community to severely restrict the use of incidental teaching, which is one of the major reasons that LEAs use the HOUSSE.

Data collection and public reporting on LEAs’ use of the HOUSSE and incidental teaching.

To monitor LEAs’ progress in limiting the HOUSSE and incidental teaching, the New York State Education Department has begun collecting annual data, starting in fall 2006, on each LEA’s HOUSSE use in the prior school year. SED will use the new data on the HOUSSE, in combination with other data about the use of incidental and out-of-field teaching, for monitoring and technical

assistance. In 2007, in order to monitor schools' and LEAs' use of incidental and out-of-field teaching, SED will begin to use BEDS data to report publicly (in report cards or Comprehensive Information Reports) on the percentage of full-time equivalent (FTE) assignments in each school and LEA that are taught by teachers without appropriate certification, which includes both incidental and out-of-field assignments. By revealing incidental and out-of-field teaching to the publicly, SED will also put pressure on schools and LEAs to reduce their use and, thereby, the use of the HOUSSSE. Finally, SED will continue to send annual reports to LEAs showing them every out-of-field assignment for technical assistance purposes.

Limitations based on State certification standards. The HOUSSSE can only be used when teachers already meet Regents certification standards. Certified teachers who may need to use the HOUSSSE include the following.

- **Teachers doing approved incidental teaching.** State regulations adopted by the Board of Regents permit certified teachers to teach up to five classroom hours per week of incidental teaching when the assignment is approved because of a demonstrated shortage. See <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/part80-5.htm#5.3>. The regulation states:
A superintendent of schools may assign a teacher to teach a subject not covered by such a teacher's certificate or license for a period not to exceed five classroom hours a week, when no certified or qualified teacher is available after extensive and documented recruitment, and provided that approval...is obtained... To be approved, such application shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the commissioner that an incidental teaching assignment is necessary, that the teacher so assigned is the best qualified to teach the subject on an incidental basis... To obtain renewal of such approval in any subsequent year, the superintendent of schools...shall submit an application which...contains an assurance by the superintendent of schools that... the teacher who is assigned to teach the course has completed, or has agreed to complete no later than September 1st of the school year next following the first renewal of such approval, at least three semester hours of credit or a satisfactory equivalent leading to certification in the subject which the teacher is being assigned to teach; and...the teacher who is assigned to teach the course will be reimbursed by the school district for the tuition cost of any portion of the three semester hours of credit or the equivalent...

In order to be highly qualified to do incidental teaching in a core academic subject, teachers must demonstrate subject matter competency in that subject. The HOUSSSE provides an assurance that teachers doing incidental teaching have some subject matter competency. New York State is making progress in reducing teacher shortages and the need for incidental teaching. SED will work with the Regents and the education community to severely restrict the use of incidental teaching in measurable, verifiable ways. As incidental teaching is reduced, reliance on the HOUSSSE will drop significantly.

- **Teachers working in approved “experiments in organizational change” (known as experimental middle schools).** Regulations adopted by the Board of Regents permit LEAs to obtain approval for five-year experiments in organizational change in middle grades. See <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/part80-5.htm#5.12>. The regulation states:

Any school district which proposes an experiment concerned with organizational changes that alters the definition of the elementary, junior or senior high school may be granted approval of a five-year period to employ a certified teacher (or appropriately licensed teacher in the cities of New York and Buffalo) for any teaching assignment, within the scope of the experiment, for which the teacher is deemed, by the superintendent, or other legally authorized body, qualified by education and experience provided:

- (1) the proposed experiment is approved by the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the professional staff of the school district;*
- (2) the proposed experiment is approved by the Commissioner of Education;*
- (3) the proposed experiment includes appropriate procedures for evaluation; and*
- (4) the teacher meets the qualification requirements of section 120.6 of this Title, relating to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; and*
- (5) a school district may not continue the assignment of a teacher in any teaching assignment covered by an experiment in organizational change for more than five school years unless the teacher has obtained the teaching certificate or certificate extension appropriate to such assignment...*

Under the approved experiments, teachers must demonstrate subject matter competency in the core subjects they teach in accordance with the NCLB and IDEA. As teachers currently teaching under approved experiments become certified for their “experimental” assignments, they will have passed State certification exams in the subjects they are teaching and their need for the HOUSSE will end. If LEAs apply to SED for new experiments, SED will require reports on teachers’ progress in passing certification exams for teachers’ experimental assignments.

- **Teachers working in integrated academic/CTE programs.** State regulations permit certified Career and Technical Education (CTE) teachers with a bachelor’s degree to teach in State-approved integrated academic/CTE programs that may have classes students can use for high school credit in core academic subjects. Students in these classes have already earned all but the final required credit in the core subject area and must already have passed the high school exit exam in that subject. In these cases, NCLB requires that the CTE teacher be “highly qualified.” Frequently, these teachers who are experts in their subject areas demonstrate their competency through means other than examinations or coursework as set forth by NCLB. New York State has designed the HOUSSE to offer a set of qualifying criteria that are more suitable for CTE teachers. For example, a CTE health occupations teacher, who is a registered professional nurse with a bachelor’s degree, would have passed a State licensure exam in nursing, so the HOUSSE permits the teacher to use that licensure exam to demonstrate subject matter competency in core academic subjects related to nursing. Similarly, the HOUSSE enables CTE aviation teachers who pass federal occupational examinations, such as exams required by the Federal Aviation Administration, to use those exams to demonstrate subject matter competency in academic subjects related to the exams. Additionally, combinations of professional experience and development may be used to demonstrate that CTE teachers have subject matter competency to deliver CTE content for which academic credit is given. For example, when a CTE business teacher collaborates with

a mathematics teacher to develop curriculum and crosswalks for mathematics content within a CTE accounting program, this collaboration, in combination with other professional development activities, contributes to meeting HOUSSE requirements. Another example occurs when a CTE technology teacher works with a mathematics and science teacher to develop curriculum and crosswalks for mathematics and science content within a CTE pre-engineering program. HOUSSE is an important option for certified CTE teachers teaching in integrated academic/CTE programs because of the important role that CTE plays in increasing student engagement and high school graduation rates.

- **Consistent with the IDEA, middle/secondary special education teachers of special classes for students with disabilities in multiple core academic subjects who are asked to teach new core academic subjects.** Prior to 2004, New York State issued grade K-12 special education certificates that permitted teachers to teach all subjects in “special classes” of students with disabilities in Kindergarten through grade 12. When these teachers taught “special classes” to students with disabilities for high school credit in core academic subjects, they were required to work with general education teachers certified in those subjects. Now, the IDEA requires these special education teachers to demonstrate that they themselves have subject matter competency in each core subject they teach as the teacher of record in middle/secondary classes in grades 7-12. Similarly, teachers certified in special education at the middle/secondary level since 2004, when New York State’s certification standards changed, all have subject matter competency in at least one core academic subject, but not in all the subjects they may be assigned to teach in a special class with multiple core academic subjects, even though federal law requires them to demonstrate subject matter competency in every core academic subject they teach. In school year 2006-2007, most teachers of special classes in multiple core academic subjects have already used the HOUSSE or other means to demonstrate subject matter competency for the core subjects they have been teaching. However, if these teachers are assigned to teach a new subject in the future, the HOUSSE enables them to use professional development, college coursework and other means to demonstrate their subject matter competency and enables LEAs to continue offering “special classes” for students with disabilities that are required for high school graduation when such classes are required in a student’s Individualized Educational Program (IEP). New York State is making progress in reducing the number of students with disabilities who are taught in “special classes” with multiple core academic subjects, but there will always be some small number of students in such classes whose teachers may need the HOUSSE to demonstrate their subject matter competency in multiple subjects. Special classes are part of the continuum of services that New York State provides in order to comply with the IDEA requirement that each state provide a continuum of services for students with disabilities. In light of the severe shortage of special education teachers at the middle/secondary level, the IDEA recognizes the need to continue to permit LEAs to use the HOUSSE for teachers of special classes with multiple core academic subjects.
- **Visiting international teachers.** Visiting international teachers who obtain State credentials to teach in New York State often have a college major or equivalent coursework or a graduate

degree in the core academic subjects they teach. However, in the rare instances when that is not the case, New York State will permit LEAs to use the HOUSSE to enable these teachers to demonstrate their subject matter competency through teaching experience, professional development, college courses and other means. New York State will permit this very small number of teachers to use the HOUSSE so long as the HOUSSE is permitted by federal law.

To implement this HOUSSE limitation plan, the New York State Education Department will take the following action steps.

- 9.1 REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE. SED will update its August 4, 2006 HOUSSE guidance for LEAs and schools to include information about final IDEA regulations, Secretary Spellings' September 5, 2006 letter and this HOUSSE limitation plan. (*OHE-SPECIAL PROJECTS; EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT; VESID*)

- 9.2 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. SED's technical assistance, monitoring protocols and requirements for revised LEA teacher quality plans will reinforce SED's new guidance on the HOUSSE. Also, SED will continue to implement the four strategies that it submitted to the USDOE in January 2006 (cited below) in response to the USDOE's findings about the use of the HOUSSE in New York State during a November 2005 monitoring visit. The USDOE approved these strategies in April 2006. **Attachment G** is an example of SED's use of these strategies. (*EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT; VESID; OHE-SPECIAL PROJECTS*)
 - "The first strategy will be widespread dissemination of HOUSSE requirements by posting reminders on our website and in two electronic field newsletters, *EMSC News and Notes*, and *School Executive's Bulletin*."
 - "The second strategy will be targeted dissemination and technical assistance regarding HOUSSE requirements to our Regional Network Partners and SED liaisons to the networks and to the Big Five Cities. The dissemination and technical assistance will occur through listservs, presentations and workshops."
 - "The third strategy involves Title II Part A monitoring of LEAs. Data on highly qualified teacher will be analyzed to identify districts not on track to meet the June 2006 deadline. Districts furthest from meeting the June 2006 deadline will be added to the 2006-2007 monitoring schedule. A question regarding the percent of not-highly-qualified teachers who might be HOUSSE-eligible will be added to the monitoring instrument. All monitored districts will be provided with a hard-copy description of HOUSSE requirements and procedures."
 - "The fourth strategy will be to provide direct technical assistance to selected districts with Schools In Need of Improvement that are also at risk of not meeting the June 2006 highly qualified teacher requirement. The technical assistance will be provided through video-conferences and on-site meetings."

- 9.3 DATA COLLECTION AND DATA USE. SED will begin collecting data in school year 2006-2007 on LEAs' use of the HOUSSE to track the reduction in the use on the HOUSSE over time. LEAs are required to determine whether their teachers are highly qualified and to maintain records when they use the HOUSSE, so they will have the capacity to submit data on their use of the HOUSSE. SED will use the data, combined with other data on LEAs' use of incidental and out-of-field teaching, to identify LEAs whose use of the HOUSSE, incidental and teaching appears to exceed the norm or not decline over time in order to guide technical assistance and monitoring. (*EMSC-INFORMATION AND REPORTING SERVICES; EMSC-SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT*)
- 9.4 CERTIFICATION. SED will continue to implement teacher certification requirements that make virtually all newly certified teachers highly qualified so long as they are assigned to teach in their areas of certification. SED will ask LEAs to demonstrate that teachers in approved experiments in organizational changes are making required progress toward certification in their "experimental" assignments. (*OHE-OTI*)

Part 6. Example of Local Progress

The New York City School District is the largest LEA in the nation. It has over one million students and approximately 80,000 teachers. It is a high need LEA with many low performing regional districts and schools. It uses federal, State, local and other funds to meet all State and federal teacher quality goals and reports publicly on its progress.

In a successful partnership between New York State, the New York City Department of Education, its teacher union and teacher preparation institutions in the New York metropolitan area, the New York City School District has made significant progress on teacher quality and the equitable distribution of highly qualified and experienced teachers.

PROGRESS: More Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers

In school year 2004-2005, New York State found that the New York City School District had fewer than 80 percent of classes in core academic subjects taught by highly qualified teachers. In spring 2006, the New York City Department of Education presented preliminary data (shown below) showing that it made significant progress during school year 2005-2006, although it did not meet the 2005-2006 Annual Measurable Objective of 95 percent. Its progress is expected to be confirmed with final 2005-2006 data that will be available in October 2006 and to continue during school year 2006-2007.

New York City: Core Classes Preliminary 2005-2006 Data From the New York City Department of Education		
	Percent of Core Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percent of Core Classes <u>NOT</u> Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
Math	91.2%	8.8%
Sciences	84.1%	15.9%
English	88.2%	11.8%
Social Studies	90.7%	9.3%
Foreign Languages	84.7%	15.3%
Arts	68.3%	31.7%
Common Branches	96.3%	3.7%
Overall Core	89.4%	10.6%
Overall without Arts	91.3%	8.7%
NOTE. These data are subject to verification by the New York State Education Department. Verification will be complete by October 2006.		

PROGRESS: More Equitable Distribution of Teachers

The New York State Education Department is a national leader in sharing its databases (with privacy protections) with independent scholars in order to support independent research on its teacher labor market and teacher quality. One of the major findings of independent researchers was the inequitable distribution of teachers in New York City due to “sorting” in hiring, transfer and seniority policies. For example, see “Teacher Sorting and the Plight of Urban Schools: A Descriptive Analysis” in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Spring 2002. Vol. 24, No. 1, 37-62, by Hamilton Lankford, Susanna Loeb, and James Wyckoff at <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/ResearchPapers/tabid/103/Default.aspx>. In a preliminary draft of a follow-up study, researchers found that the distribution of teacher qualifications and experience in the New York City School District was far more equitable in 2005 than in earlier years. By 2005, the equity gaps between the highest and lowest poverty deciles of schools were significantly narrowed on multiple measures of equity, including the percent of teachers with less than three years experience. When the follow-up study is released in fall 2006, it will be available at <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org>. (SED will notify the USDOE when the study is released.)

REASONS FOR PROGRESS

Progress was made through a successful partnership involving New York State, its higher education community, the New York City Department of Education and the teacher union in New York City.

New York State

- **Governor and Legislature.** The Governor and Legislature provided Teachers of Tomorrow funds to help New York City and other high need, low performing districts meet their teacher recruitment and retention goals.
- **Board of Regents.** The Regents required all LEAs to phase out the use of uncertified teachers by September 1, 2005. It permitted intermediary steps, such as the use of Modified Temporary Licenses in eligible schools, to help New York City successfully meet the deadline. During the phase out period, the Regents created new pathways to teacher certification, such as math immersion, transitional certificates and supplemental certificates, and promoted alternative teacher preparation programs in order to help the New York City Department of Education meet its teacher recruitment and retention goals and replace uncertified teachers with certified and highly qualified teachers.
- **State Education Department (SED).** SED’s New York City-based and Albany-based staff provided intensive technical assistance about State and federal requirements and teacher data systems. Certification exams were offered more often in New York City and expedited certification processing was started for New York City candidates. In addition, SED obtained two discretionary federal grants to provide incentives to independent colleges and universities to create new alternative teacher preparation programs in partnership with the NYC DOE in order to increase the supply of teachers for the NYC DOE.

Higher Education Community

- **Teacher preparation institutions.** Campuses of The City University of New York and institutions in the independent sector created alternative teacher preparation programs in partnership with the NYC DOE to increase the supply of certified and highly qualified teachers for shortage subjects and hard-to-staff schools. These teachers were part of the highly selective New York City Teaching Fellows program and Teach for America program. Because of their strong college backgrounds and other qualifications, these teachers helped to create a more equitable distribution of highly qualified and experienced teachers in New York City.

Teacher Unions

- **The United Federation of Teachers.** The teachers union provided staff support to the NYC DOE's "cross functional team" on highly qualified teachers to ensure that teachers' views and needs would be represented and that the NYC DOE's efforts to improve teacher quality would be successful.

New York City Department of Education

- **LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION.** The New York City Department of Education's (NYC DOE) Office of Human Resources took the lead in (1) forming a "cross functional" team composed of representatives from all relevant units in the NYC DOE (information technology, school improvement, human resources, strategic planning, etc.), SED's New York City and Albany offices and the teacher union and (2) convening monthly team meetings to plan and implement strategies to address teacher quality issues.
- **OTHER STEPS.** The NYC DOE took many other steps to bring its teaching workforce into compliance with both State and federal requirements. The NYC DOE has provided the following summary of them.

**NYC's Progress Towards Highly Qualified (HQ)
Submitted by the New York City Department of Education
September 2006**

Since the 2002-03 school year, teachers of core academic subjects either:

- Held valid NYS certification (including the Limited Certificate); or
- Uncertified teachers unable to meet certification requirements were terminated by September 2003 for failure to obtain a valid certificate or were converted to MTLs in shortage areas. All such teachers were provided with intensive one-on-one counseling to meet certification requirements; or
- Were converted to Modified Temporary License status for the 2003-04 and 2004-05 school years to eligible schools or "grandfathered" into non-eligible schools as per State regulation.

Beginning in September 2005, 100% of newly hired teachers must either hold or otherwise be eligible for New York State teacher certification

- Certification status is monitored on a continuous basis for all teachers
- Approximately 1,200 teachers were terminated effective July 1, 2005 for failure to demonstrate eligibility for New York State teacher certification
- Approximately 1,325 teachers were terminated effective July 1, 2006 for failure to demonstrate eligibility for New York State teacher certification

In addition, the NYC DOE, in collaboration with the NY State Education Department and the United Federation of Teachers, continues to make progress towards NCLB's goal of 100% HQ. The NYC DOE uses BEDS Survey data to measure its own progress toward 100% HQ in each core subject and target resources appropriately.

Strategies launched in the past year and expected to continue through the upcoming year include:

1. Maximizing teachers assigned to their area(s) of certification by:

- **Training principals** to assign teachers to their area of certification when scheduling, with some limited flexibility consistent with State certification rules.
- **Training those individuals who support principals on HQ goals and regulations**, including HR Liaisons and UFT contacts.
- **Distributing HQ reports -- based on the BEDS Survey -- to principals** that show teachers' real-time HQ status.
- **Providing options and methods for teachers who are not HQ to become HQ** through conversion programs and utilizing school's 5% Title I set aside.
 - **Conversion program-** The Conversion program helps teachers certified in a non-shortage area subject obtain certification in a shortage area subject.
 - **Title I 5% Set Aside Funds-** Title I schools receive funds that can be used to help non-HQ teachers become HQ in core subjects. NYC DOE has worked to create models and support mechanisms for how these funds could be used.
- **Meeting regularly with NYSED to seek changes to State policies** (e.g. reciprocity of certification exams) to eliminate barriers to meeting HQ goals.
- **Creating a fast, easy way for teachers to demonstrate subject matter competency using an online HOUSSE system-** this system will be updated to meet new HOUSSE requirements.

2. Ensuring that experienced and qualified teachers are equitably distributed among classrooms with poor and minority children and those with their peers by:

- **Offering the Housing Support Program**, which recruits experienced candidates in shortage areas with a housing support incentive of \$15,000. These teachers must teach in a high needs school.
- **Offering Teachers of Tomorrow grants** to teachers in high need schools, in collaboration with SED.
- Continuing to **focus alternative and traditional teacher recruitment on shortage area subjects and high need schools** to improve equitable distribution.
- Creating a **Lead Teacher position** to support all teachers in our highest need schools. The Lead Teacher Program focuses on schools with the highest need, with applications available to SURR schools, Impact schools, and schools that are in restructuring under NCLB accountability guidelines. Lead Teachers will receive an additional \$10,000 per year.
- **Implementing new contract language** on seniority, bumping rights and out-of-field teaching to address the equitable distribution of teachers between high and low poverty schools.

3. Ensuring parents have access to information about their child's teachers and paraprofessionals.

- Informing parents of their right to request information about their child's teacher and/or paraprofessional via the school and NYC DOE Web site in 9 different languages.
<http://schools.nyc.gov/Administration/NCLB/ParentsTitle1.htm>
- Providing technical assistance to schools to ensure that parents are notified when their child is taught for more than 4 consecutive weeks by a non-HQ teacher

4. Reporting complete and accurate (and timely) HQ data to the State Education Department and U.S. Department of Education.

Our 2005-06 HQ data is more current and accurate than 2004-05, and our progress has improved significantly, primarily because we have:

- Fewer uncertified, and therefore, fewer non-HQ teachers. 100% of NYC DOE teachers are now certified, which is a dramatic improvement from 2002-03 when only 87% of teachers were certified. (98.8% certified in 2004-05; 98.6% in 2003-04). We are now working to ensure that principals place these teachers in the field that matches their certification, the second criteria for an HQ teacher.
- Assistance for principals to assign teachers to classes for which the teachers are HQ. Principals are better informed and empowered as to how assignment of teachers within their certification relates to NCLB.

- Better communications and training. With better and more frequent communications, our response rate was 100%.
- Provided principals with the real time HQ status of their teachers. NYC DOE issued BEDS Reports which showed principals the certification and HQ status of their teachers.
- In the coming year, we will be moving up the calendar for our BEDS Survey so that data can be analyzed more quickly and thoroughly.
- Work with SED to ensure that we interpret HQ data and improve certification processes to more accurately determine the percentage of HQ teachers.

5. In addition, we continue our efforts to recruit, retain, and improve the quality of the teaching force by:

- Using innovative recruitment methods to recruit shortage area teachers, like:
 - NYC Teaching Fellows <http://www.nycteachingfellows.org/> – This is the NYC DOE’s highly selective alternative certification program. Fellows complete a pre-service program (typically 7 weeks in the summer) and a full, subsidized Master’s degree program which takes approximately two years to complete. Approximately 2,000 teachers per year come through the Fellows program; over 75% in shortage subject fields. The Teaching Fellows program also has intensive Math and Science Immersion programs to help alternative certification candidates obtain certification in these critical shortage areas.
 - Teach For America – TFA is a national alternative teacher recruitment program that places college graduates in our nation’s hardest to staff schools.
 - Launching a new recruitment initiative, the Housing Support Incentive Program, to recruit experienced out-of-state candidates to teach in shortage areas in high need schools. We received over 230 applications and currently have 105 accepted participants in the program.
 - Continuing our successful teacher recruitment campaign, “Join New York’s Brightest: Teach NYC,” which resulted in more than 33,000 new teacher applications for the 2006-07 school year.
 - Continuing to focus alternative certification candidates on shortage areas. Approximately three fourths of all alternative certification candidates teach in shortage areas.
 - Continuing STEP (Summer Teaching Experience Program), which allows certified teachers from out-of-state to begin teaching and relocating in NYC in the summer.
 - Launching a new Science Immersion Teaching Fellows program to attract individuals with science backgrounds to teach in NYC DOE public schools (based on our successful Math Immersion program).

- Expanding a conversion program to help teachers certified in a non-shortage area to obtain shortage area certification.
- Focusing our national and international recruitment strategies on locations able to source shortage-area candidates.
- Coordinating with innovative programs like Math for America and IBM's Math program to recruit experienced individuals with math backgrounds to teach at the NYC DOE.
- Moving the staffing process earlier, which The New Teacher Project has shown improves teacher quality.
- Assisting uncertified teachers in gaining certification through one-on-one counseling sessions.
- Redesigning key business processes related to staffing.
- Supporting new teachers through a New Teacher Mentoring Program, Coaches, and Lead Teachers.

Attachment A Data Sources

A.1. Teacher certification (TCERT and TEACH)

New York State's TCERT teacher certification system was replaced in spring 2006 by a new system called TEACH. Teachers certified prior to TEACH's implementation will only have TCERT data elements that are listed here. Teachers certified after TEACH's implementation have additional data elements (such as college major) that are not listed here. Data are gathered as part of the administrative process of certification. This summary of TCERT data elements is based on information provided by the Office of Teaching Initiatives in December 2004.

APPROXIMATE SIZE

More than 50,000 new credentials issued each year

SELECTED DATA ELEMENTS

INDIVIDUALS

To be added: Unique ID for individual

SSN

Last name

First name

Middle Initial

Street Address

Apartment

City

State

ZIP

Date of birth (redacted)

Gender

Citizenship

IRP code (Inventory of Registered Programs)

Institution name

Degree code

Date degree conferred

Dates of exams

Exam scores

Pass/Fail status of exams

CERTIFICATE APPLICATIONS (as many as needed)

To be added: Unique ID for individual

SSN of applicant

Type of certificate (provisional, initial, etc.)

Certificate area or title

Process used to apply for or qualify for certificate

Date (effective date of certificate)

Printed (date certificate was printed)

CERTIFICATES ISSUED (as many as needed)

To be added: Unique ID for individual

SSN of certificate holder

Last name

First name

Middle initial

Type of certificate

Certificate area or title

Process by which certificate was obtained

Effective date

Cert Status (active, expired)

Recommending institution

Addressed certificate mailed to (redacted)

CST exam title

CST exam score

CST pass/fail status

A.2. Public school personnel and their assignments (Personnel Master File)

The Personnel Master File (PMF) is part of SED's Basic Education Data System (BEDS). It is the data source for school professionals employed in New York State's public schools, their assignments, their qualifications for each assignment and their work locations. The file includes teachers, administrators and other professionals. Data are gathered in an annual survey of school personnel. Many fields are pre-filled to ensure that data are accurate from year to year. Further information about the PMF is available at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/beds/home.shtml>.

APPROXIMATE SIZE (per year)

More than 220,000 individuals employed each year with more than 600,000 assignments

SELECTED DATA ELEMENTS

Instruction

TEACHERS

To be added: New TEACH ID

School or BOCES code

Last Name

First Name

Middle Initial

SSN

Gender

Degree status

NCLB Professional Development

ASSIGNMENTS (for up to 8 assignments):

Assignment code

Grade level

Registrations

Educational Experience – Years in District

Educational Experience – Years in Total

Number of months employed per year

Percent of time employed in this district

Date of birth

Current annual salary

Legal certification status

Number of weeks per year

Reported NCLB highly qualified status

Assignment certification status

Other than Instruction

EMPLOYEES

To be added: New TEACH ID

School or BOCES code

Last Name

First Name

Middle Initial

SSN

Gender

Degree status

ASSIGNMENTS (for up to 4 assignments)

Assignment code

General grade level

Number of pupils with whom employee has regular direct contact in this assignment

Educational Experience – Years in District

Educational Experience – Years in Total

Number of months employed per year

Percent of time employed in this district

Date of birth

Current annual salary

Legal certification status

Experience in this assignment area in years)

Percent of time in this assignment

Assignment certification status

A.3. School and district characteristics (Institutional Master File and related files)

The Institutional Master File (IMF) and related files are part of SED’s Basic Education Data System (BEDS). The IMF and related files are the data source for characteristics of schools, districts and BOCES. Characteristics include but are not limited to:

- Number and characteristics of students (grade level, gender, race/ethnicity, poverty, etc.)
- Number and characteristics of staff (e.g., race/ethnicity of staff, which cannot be collected on the PMF)
- Accountability and performance status (SURR, SINI, DINI, etc. computed from student-level test results)

There are approximately 5,000 building sites on the IMF and they can be aggregated to approximately 800 LEAs (districts, charter schools, BOCES and State schools). Every school and LEA has a unique BEDS ID. IMF data are aggregate data collected at the school-level or district-level. Related data files are constructed from individual level data (e.g., assessment results) aggregated to the school and district levels.

Some IMF and report card data for each school, district and BOCES are available online at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/>. In addition, files with all relevant ID codes can be requested from SED’s Office of Information and Reporting Services (IRS). More information about the IMF and related files is available at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/beds/home.shtml>.

A.4. Relationships between data sources

All data can be linked through the ID codes as shown below.

Table of IDs That Link Data Sources						
Units of analysis	Data source	ID codes				
		School employees	LEAs & schools	P-12 students	Assignments	Certificate Titles
Certification candidates & certificate recipients	TEACH	SSN *				CertTitle ID
Certificates issued	TEACH	SSN *				Cert Title ID
Public school employees	PMF	SSN *	BEDS ID		Assgmt ID	
Public school assignments	PMF	SSN *	BEDS ID		Assgmt ID	CertTitle ID
LEAs & schools	IMF +		BEDS ID			
P-12 students, their characteristics & their assessment results	New unit record system		BEDS ID	Student ID		

* Plans exist for adding a unique, publicly releasable, longitudinal ID for every individual with a TEACH and PMF record.

A.5. Analysis files for teacher quality

As a pilot with 2004-2005 data, SED created two analysis files for teacher quality. One file has school-level data; the other has district-level data. SED is using the 2004-2005 files to identify and prioritize schools and LEAs for technical assistance and monitoring during 2006-2007. Each file has data for each of the topics listed below. Analysis files will be created for future years as data become available.

School or district characteristics (from IMF and related files)

1. Year
2. Geographic region within State
3. Regional School Support Center (if applicable)
4. School or district ID and Name
5. School grade configuration
6. Title I status
7. NCLB accountability status
8. NYS accountability status (for non-Title I schools and districts)
9. SURR status
10. Student enrollment
11. Poverty status of students
12. Minority status of students
13. Teacher turnover

School or district teacher characteristics (from PMF)

14. Number of teachers
15. Certification status of teachers
16. Professional development status of teachers
17. Experience status of teachers
18. Educational attainment of teachers

Reasons for core classes not being taught by highly qualified teachers (from PMF)

19. Number of core classes
20. Number and percent of core classes not taught by HQ teachers
21. Number and percent of core classes in each March 2006 USDOE category

Characteristics of all teaching assignments held by individuals without appropriate certification (from PMF)

22. Number of all teaching assignments
23. Number and percent of all teaching assignments not held by appropriately certified individuals, in total and in each subject area (arts, career and technical education, early childhood and elementary education, English, ESOL and bilingual, languages other than English, library/school media specialist, math, physical education, reading and literacy, science, social studies and special education)

Characteristics of classes in core academic subjects not taught by highly qualified teachers (from PMF)

24. Number of all core teaching assignments
25. Number and percent of all core teaching assignments not taught by HQ teachers, in total and in each subject area (arts, career and technical education, early childhood and elementary education, English, ESOL and bilingual, languages other than English, math, reading and literacy, science, social studies and special education)

A.6. Monitoring files for teacher quality

As a pilot, SED created an Access database from 2004-2005 PMF data that generates reports for SED and Regional Network Partners. For each LEA and school, reports show the number and percent of teachers who are not appropriately certified or not highly qualified in each academic subject they teach. The New York City Department of Education provides its school-level teacher quality files to SED for monitoring purposes.

Attachment B

Evidence for Probable Success of Strategies and Action Steps

There is an extensive body of research describing the challenges of ensuring that children in high poverty schools have certified, highly qualified, effective and experienced teachers and suggesting effective approaches for addressing them. In the context of local control of schools in New York State, action steps in this plan were based on this research.

The list of selected research references in this attachment is based primarily on a literature review prepared by Dr. Cynthia Prince who heads the Teacher Quality Network of the Council of Chief State School Officers. Dr. Prince finds that there are basically four ways to achieve an equitable distribution of teachers.

1. Increase the supply of teachers for high poverty schools by increasing the pipeline of teachers in traditional and alternative routes. The pipeline can be increased with financial incentives such as scholarships and loan forgiveness and by recruiting in high poverty communities.
2. Increase the supply of teachers for high poverty schools by using incentives to redistribute existing teachers. Incentives may include housing, tax benefits, pay-for-performance, differential pay, bonuses for National Board certification and lifting pension penalties for retired teachers who are rehired.
3. Reduce demand for teachers in high poverty schools by improving the knowledge and skills of teachers already working in them so that the teachers become highly effective and have job satisfaction that encourages them to stay on the job. Strategies include targeted professional development, required and funded mentoring and induction for new teachers and the use of support such as master teachers, coaches and turn-around teams.
4. Reduce demand for teachers in high poverty schools by improving the working conditions that cause teachers to avoid or leave these schools. Strategies include policies and programs that attract and retain effective principals who can, in turn, attract effective teachers; targeting resources to improve schools and physical working conditions; and improving school safety and discipline.

Research references

The following list of references links research evidence to the action steps in this plan.

INCREASE THE PIPELINE OF TEACHERS FOR HIGH POVERTY SCHOOLS

Teacher labor markets and teacher recruitment

ACTION STEPS – AREAS 1 AND 4

SUNY at Albany, Education Finance Research Consortium, Condition Report, 2003

<http://www.albany.edu/edfin/CR03.BLLW.TeacherMkts.pdf>

<http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/ResearchPapers/tabid/103/Default.aspx>

The New Teacher Project, Research Reports, 2003 and 2005
<http://www.tntp.org/ourresearch/overview.html>

The effectiveness of various pathways to teacher certification

ACTION STEPS – AREAS 2 AND 3

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2002, September 6). Research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to "Teacher Certification Reconsidered." *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(36).
<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html>
- Education Week*. "Research Center: Alternative teacher certification."
<http://www.edweek.org/rc/issues/alternative-teacher-certification/>
- Feistritzer, C.E. *Profile of Troops to Teachers*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information. <http://www.teach-now.org/NCEI TT v3.pdf>
- Feistritzer, C.E. (2005). *Profile of alternative route teachers*. Washington, DC: National Center for Alternative Certification. <http://www.ncei.com/PART.pdf>
- Jacobson, L. "Alternative routes attracting unlikely candidates," *Education Week*, February 23, 2005. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/02/23/24altern.h24.html>
- Jacobson, L. "More teachers trained in alternative routes," *Education Week*, June 15, 2005. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/06/15/40report-1.h24.html>
- Keller, B. "Math, science graduates sign on to teach," *Education Week*, June 14, 2006. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/06/14/40tfa.h25.html>
- Laczko-Kerr, I., & Berliner, D. (2002, September 6). The effectiveness of 'Teach for America' and other under-certified teachers on student academic achievement: A case of harmful public policy." *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(37). Retrieved 6/19/06 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n37/>.
- Teacher Policy Research Center, SUNY at Albany
<http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/PolicyBriefs/tabid/148/Default.aspx>
- Viadero, D. "Teachers from alternate routes scrutinized," *Education Week*, September 28, 2005. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/09/28/05alternate.h25.html>
- Boyd, D, Grossman, P, Lankford, H., Loeb, S. & Wyckoff, J. (2006) "How Changes in Entry Requirements Alter the Teacher Workforce and Affect Student Achievement." *Education Finance and Policy*.

Financial incentives for teachers

ACTION STEPS – AREA 4

- Kirby, S., Naftel, S., & Berends, M. (1999). *Staffing at-risk school districts in Texas: Problems and prospects*, pp. 57-58. Santa Monica, CA: RAND. www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1083/.
- Prince, C. (2003). *Higher pay in hard-to-staff schools: The case for financial incentives*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Shields, P., Esch, C., Humphrey, D., Young, V., Gaston, M., & Hunt, H. (1999). *The status of the teaching profession: Research findings and policy recommendations. A report to the Teaching and California's Future Task Force*, p. 49. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. <http://www.cftl.org/documents/stp1999full.pdf>

REDUCE ATTRITION OF TEACHERS IN HIGH POVERTY SCHOOLS

Causes of attrition and the value of comprehensive induction for new teachers

ACTION STEPS – AREA 4

Alliance for Excellent Education, Issue Brief, August 2005

<http://www.all4ed.org/publications/TeacherAttrition.pdf>

New Teacher Center at the University of California, NTC Policy Brief, April 2006

http://newteachercenter.org/nyc_policy_paper.php

ECS – Ingersoll and Kralik, February 2004

http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/publications/home_publications.asp

Barnette Berry, NASSP Bulletin, March 2004, Vol. 87, No. 638, pp. 5-27.

Reducing teacher turnover through mentoring and induction

ACTION STEPS – AREA 4

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004). *Tapping the potential: Retaining and developing high quality new teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.

<http://www.all4ed.org/publications/TappingThePotential/TappingThePotential.pdf>

Center for Teaching Quality. (2006, June). "Why mentoring and induction matters and what must be done for new teachers." *Teaching Quality Across the Nation: Best Practices & Policies*, 5(2).

Education Week (2005). "Quality Counts 2005 (No Small Change: Targeting Money Toward Student Performance)." Bethesda, Md.: Author.

Ingersoll, R. (2001). "Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis," *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). "What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover?" *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2).

Villar, A. (2004). *Measuring the benefits and costs of mentor-based induction: A value-added assessment of new teacher effectiveness linked to student achievement*. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center.

IMPROVE TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS IN HIGH POVERTY SCHOOLS

National Board Certification

ACTION STEPS – AREA 5

Berry, B., & King, T. (2005, May). *Recruiting and retaining National Board Certified Teachers for hard-to-staff, low performing schools: Silver bullets or smart solutions*. Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. <http://www.teachingquality.org/pdfs/RecruitRetainHTSS.pdf>

Blair, J. "National certification found valid for teachers," *Education Week*, October 25, 2000.

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/10/25/08nbpts.h20.html?levelId=2300>

Cavalluzzo, L. (2004, November). *Is National Board Certification an effective signal of teacher quality?* Alexandria, VA: CNA Corporation. <http://www.cna.org/documents/CavalluzzoStudy.pdf>

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2005, November 29). *Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? National Board Certification as a signal of effective teaching*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411271_teacher_quality.pdf

Keller, B. "Critical study of NBPTS spurs state advisory group to act," *Education Week*, May 15, 2002. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2002/05/15/36board.h21.html?levelId=2300>

Keller, B. "Study for NBPTS raises questions about credential," *Education Week*, May 17, 2006. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/05/17/37nbpts.h25.html>

Keller, B. "NBPTS upgrades profession, most agree, despite test-score letdown," *Education Week*, June 14, 2006. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/06/14/40nbpts.h25.html>

Kennedy Manzo, K. "Ariz. study sees benefits in National-Board Certification." *Education Week*, September 15, 2004. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/09/15/03nbpts.h24.html>

Sanders, W., Ashton, J., & Wright, S.P. (2005, March 7). "Comparison of the effects of NBPTS certified teachers with other teachers on the rate of student academic progress." Report prepared for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc. http://www.nbpts.org/pdf/sas_final_report.pdf

Stone, J. (2002, May). "The value-added achievement gains of NBPTS-certified teachers in Tennessee: A brief report." *Education Consumers Consultants Network*, 2(5). <http://www.education-consumers.com/oldsite/briefs/stoneNBPTS.shtm>

Vandevoort, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Berliner, D. (2004, September 8). National Board Certified Teachers and their students' achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(46). <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n46/>

Ensuring that teachers have access to high quality professional development

ACTION STEPS – AREA 5

Koppich, J. E. (Winter 2002). "Using Well-Qualified Teachers Well: The Right Teachers in the Right Place with the Right Support Bring Success to Troubled New York City Schools." *American Educator*. 26(4).

Killian, J. (1999). Islands of Hope in a Sea of Dreams: A Research Report on the Eight Schools That Received the National Award for Model Professional Development. <http://www.wested.org/wested/pubs/online/PDawards/welcome.shtml>

Increasing the number of National Board Certified Teachers in high need schools

ACTION STEPS – AREA 5

Humphrey, D., Koppich, J., & Hough, H. (2005, March 3). Sharing the wealth: National Board Certified Teachers and the students who need them most. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(18). <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n18/>

Rotherham, A. (2004, March). *Opportunity and responsibility for National Board Certified Teachers*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute. http://www.ppionline.org/documents/Certified_Teachers_0304.pdf

California: NBCTs in California are eligible for a \$20,000 award if they work in low performing schools for four years: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/sr/nb/index.asp>

Georgia: NBCTs in Georgia receive a 10% salary supplement if they teach full-time in a Needs Improvement School: <http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/DMGetDocument.aspx/WEB%20NBPTS%20Information%20Law%20Changes%2005%20revised.doc?p=39EF345AE192D900F620BFDE9C014CE65F48E7E4CC653240FB35D5F11BB46BAFE613361C1F24DADA&Type=D>

New York: NBCTs who serve as master teachers in low performing New York State schools may receive an annual stipend of \$10,000 for up to three years through the New York State Master Teacher Program: http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/TEACHING/TOT/teachers_of_tomorrow_introductio.htm

IMPROVE WORKING CONDITIONS FOR TEACHERS IN HIGH POVERTY SCHOOLS

ACTION STEPS – AREA 6

Relationship between working conditions and student achievement

Center for Teaching Quality

<http://www.teachingquality.org/twc/whatweknow.htm>

Attachment C
Federally-funded Partnerships to Support
an Equitable Distribution of Teachers for High Need Schools

Teacher Next Door Program

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

<http://www.hud.gov/offices/hsg/sfh/reo/goodn/tnd.cfm>

Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program – FFEL and Direct Loan Programs

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

<http://studentaid.ed.gov/PORTALSWebApp/students/english/cancelstaff.jsp?tab=repaying>

NOTE: All schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) are considered low income schools for teacher loan forgiveness purposes.

Federal Perkins Loan Teacher Cancellation

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

<http://studentaid.ed.gov/PORTALSWebApp/students/english/cancelperk.jsp?tab=repaying>

Transition to Teaching grants

USDOE description:

“The Transition to Teaching program supports the recruitment and retention of highly qualified mid-career professionals, including qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who have not majored in education to teach in high need schools and districts through the development of new or enhanced alternative routes to certification.”

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/transitionteach/index.html>

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants to State Agencies for Higher Education (SAHEs)

USDOE description:

“The purpose of Title II, Part A is to help increase the academic achievement of all students by helping schools and school districts ensure that all teachers are highly qualified to teach. Through the program, State educational agencies (SEAs) and Local educational agencies (LEAs) receive funds on a formula basis, as does the State agency for higher education (SAHE). The SAHE provides competitive grants to partnerships comprised, at a minimum, of schools of education and arts and sciences along with one or more high need LEAs.”

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/index.html>

Indian Education Professional Development Grants

USDOE description:

“The program is designed to prepare and train Indians to serve as teachers and school administrators. Professional development grants are awarded to increase the number of qualified individuals in professions that serve American Indians; to provide training to qualified American Indians to become teachers, administrators, teacher aides, social workers, and ancillary education personnel; and to improve the skills of those qualified American Indians who already serve in these capacities.”

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/indianprofdev/index.html>

USDOE-Funded Mathematics and Science Partnerships, Title II, Part B

USDOE description:

“The U.S. Department of Education’s Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program is administered by the Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Program (AITQ) in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title II, Part B. The MSP supports partnerships between the mathematics, science, and/or engineering faculty of institutions of higher education and high need school districts. Other partners may include schools of education, business, and nonprofit organizations. The program’s goal is to increase student achievement through increasing teachers’ content knowledge and pedagogical skills.”

<http://www.ed-msp.net/protected/overview.jsp?.lat>

National Science Foundation-Funded Mathematics and Science Partnerships, MSPnet

NSF description:

“Through MSP, NSF awards competitive, merit-based grants to teams composed of institutions of higher education, local K-12 school systems, and their supporting partners...A major research and development effort, the MSP program responds to concern over the performance of the nation's children in mathematics and science. Institutions of higher education - their disciplinary faculty in departments of mathematics, the sciences and/or engineering, education faculty and administrators - partner with K-12 districts and others to effect deep, lasting improvement in K-12 mathematics and science education through five key features: Partnership-Driven, Teacher Quality, Quantity and Diversity, Challenging Courses and Curricula, Evidence-Based Design, and Institutional Change and Sustainability.”

<http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm>

Robert Noyce Scholarship Program

NSF description:

“The Robert Noyce Scholarship program seeks to encourage talented science, technology, engineering, and mathematics majors and professionals to become K-12 mathematics and science teachers. The program provides funds to institutions of higher education to support scholarships, stipends, and programs for students who commit to teaching in high need K-12 schools.”

http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5733&org=DUE&from=home

Copyright © 2006 Council of Chief State School Officers. All rights reserved.

This table is used with the permission of the CCSSO.

Attachment D
Links to Information about New York State Programs for Teachers

STATE CONTEXT

- New York State Learning Standards (July 1996) <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/ciai/pub.html>
- Regents Task Force on Teaching Report (1998) *New York's Commitment: Teaching to Higher Standards* <http://www.nysed.gov/facmtg/paper20.pdf>
- Summaries of Regents Meetings <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meet.html>

POLICY GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ON NCLB AND IDEA TEACHER QUALITY STANDARDS

- The NCLB's Requirements for Teachers and Title I Paraprofessionals in New York State <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/nclbhome.htm>
- Local Consolidated Application for 2006-2007 <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/titlei/ca0607/cover.htm>
- Email HELPLINE: NCLBNYS@mail.nysed.gov

ACCESS TO HQT THROUGH DISTANCE LEARNING

- New York State Distance Learning Consortium <http://www.nysdlc.org/AboutNYSDLC.shtm>

TEACHER EDUCATION

- Inventory of Registered Programs (IRP) <http://www.nysed.gov/heds/IRPSL1.html>
- Standards for Teacher Education Programs <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/>.
- Standards for Alternative Teacher Certification Programs <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/>
- Federal Grants for Alternative Teacher Certification Programs in New York City <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/>
- Pass Rates on Teacher Certification Exams for New York State Institutions <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/respublic/heir.htm>
- Distance Higher Education Initiative (DHEI) <http://web1.nysed.gov/ocue/distance/>
- Education Programs Offered at a Distance <http://web1.nysed.gov/ocue/distance/searchSubjDetail.asp?subjareanum=8>
- Regents Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/>
- PBS TeacherLine New York <http://teacherline.nylearns.org/>
- SUNY Learning Network http://sln.suny.edu/sln_aboutsln.htm

TEACHER CERTIFICATION

- General Information - Office of Teaching Initiatives <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/>
- Standards for Certification (guidance) <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/certificate/index.html>
- Standards for Certification (regulations) <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/part80.htm>
- Certification email HELPLINE: TCERT@mail.nysed.gov

TEACHING PRACTICE

- Mentoring Requirements <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/resteachers/guidemenprog.htm>
- Professional Development Requirements for Certification (Draft Guidelines) <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/resteachers/175.htm>

- Professional Development Plans – Section 100.2(dd) of Commissioner’s Regulations
<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/part100/opener.html>
- Annual Professional Performance Reviews – Section 100.2(o) of Commissioner’s Regulations
<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/part100/opener.html>
- New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/reteachers/mentorinternship.htm>
- Guidance on new teacher induction and support
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/reteachers/teacherinduction.htm>
- Albert Shanker Grant Program
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/reteachers/albertshanker.htm>
- New York State Teacher of the Year Program
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/showcase/teacherofyear.htm>
- Better Beginnings Program
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/showcase/bbawardees.htm>
- Teacher-Leader Quality Partnership Program
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/COLLEGIATE/TLQP/dde%20description.htm>
- New York State Virtual Learning System (VLS)
<http://vls.nysed.gov/vls>

TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

- General Information <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/>
- Job banks <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/career/joblinks.htm>
- Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching
http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/reteachers/standardboard_main.htm
- Teachers of Tomorrow Program <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/reteachers/tot.htm>
- Teacher Opportunity Corps
http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/TEACHING/TOC%20RFP/teacher_opportunity_corps_fact_p.htm
- Troops to Teachers Program <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/career/troopsteachers.htm>
- Science and Technology Entry Program (STEP) <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/step/step.htm>
- Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP)
http://www.highered.nysed.gov/kiap/COLLEGIATE/CSTEP%202004/introduction_to_cstep.htm
- Speech-Language Pathologists and other high need fields
<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/2005Meetings/July2005/0705brca8.htm>
- New York State Math and Science Teaching Incentive Program - **New in 2006-2007**
<http://www.hesc.com/bulletin.nsf/0/e5c556e7c96fabce85257170005aef7b?OpenDocument>

INFORMATION

- Basic Education Data System (BEDS) <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/>
- New York State Report Card (655 Report) <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/655report/home.shtml>
- New York State School Report Cards <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/reportcard/home.shtml>
- BOCES Report Cards <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2004/boces/home.shtml>
- New York City Annual Report Card <http://www.nycenet.edu/daa/ASR/>
- Teacher Supply and Demand Data – **Updated in May 2006**
<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tsdregents052006.htm>
- Education Finance Research Consortium <http://www.albany.edu/edfin/>

Attachment E

May 2006 Regents Item on *Teacher Supply and Demand*

<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tsdregents052006.htm>

Attachment F

May 2006 slide show on *The Continuing Need for Certified Teachers*

<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tsdregents052006.htm> (scroll down to find link)

Attachment G

May 2006 slide show on *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Challenge*

Attachment H

Lists of LEAs and Schools with Their AMO and AYP Status (Attachments H-1 through H-8)

- H-1. LEAs in improvement status with less than 90% HQT (N=7)
- H-2. Schools in improvement status with less than 90% HQT (N=254)
- H-3. LEAs with less than 90% HQT (N= 118, includes H-1 LEAs)
- H-4. Schools with less than 90% HQT (N=1,324, includes H-2 schools)
- H-5. LEAs with greater than or equal to 90% HQT (N= 714, includes H-7 LEAs)
- H-6. Schools with greater than or equal to 90% HQT (N=3,074, includes H-8 schools)
- H-7. LEAs in improvement status with greater than or equal to 90% HQT (N=9)
- H-8. Schools in improvement status with greater than or equal to 90% HQT (N=98)