PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

REVISED PLAN TO REACH THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER GOAL IN 2006-2007 AND BEYOND

Revised, September 2006

Secretary of Education
Gerald L. Zahorchak, D.Ed.

Contact:
Sharon Brumbaugh
Special Assistant to the Secretary

Virginia Montgomery
Bureau Director
Teacher Certification and Preparation

333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126
Telephone: 717-772-4737
Pennsylvania is committed to the goals advanced by NCLB and continues to
demonstrate its good faith implementation of the specific requirements of the
federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Moreover, Pennsylvania recognizes that
teacher quality has a major impact on student achievement and remains committed
to the goal of ensuring that every child in Pennsylvania be taught by a high quality
teacher who is equipped to teach in a way that enables every student to experience
academic success. With those goals in mind, the Pennsylvania Department of
Education (PDE) submits the following revised plan that provides specific
information on the steps Pennsylvania is taking to reach the NCLB “highly qualified
teacher” (HQT) goal in the 2006-07 school year and beyond.

Pennsylvania has a long and rich tradition of preparing high quality teachers for the
Commonwealth’s schools as well as for schools throughout the nation. Pennsylvania is one of the top five states in producing future teachers, certifying
over 13,000 new teachers each year. Since 1988, Pennsylvania has required that
teacher candidates pass rigorous tests of basic skills, general knowledge,
professional knowledge, and subject matter knowledge. Pennsylvania also
requires that every new teacher participate in an induction program conducted by
their school districts and that all teachers obtain six college credits or the equivalent
hours of professional education every five years. Additionally, all Pennsylvania
teachers are required to achieve at least three years of satisfactory teaching
experience and complete 24 post-baccalaureate credits within the first six years of
teaching to obtain Pennsylvania’s second level certificate and continue teaching.
Thereafter, Pennsylvania teachers are annually evaluated on teaching
performance, including demonstrated knowledge of subject matter content.

As a result of the Commonwealth’s long-standing commitment to teacher quality,
Pennsylvania is well on its way of reaching NCLB’s HQT goal. In March 2006, PDE
submitted updated data to the United States Department of Education in its
Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) regarding highly qualified teachers
in Pennsylvania. This data demonstrates that in 2004-05, 97.7% of all core
academic classes in Pennsylvania were taught by HQTs. (See Appendix A for
Pennsylvania’s 2004-05 HQT CSPR data that was submitted to USDE in March
2006).

While the CSPR data demonstrates that nearly all Pennsylvania teachers meet
the requirements of HQT, there are particular groups of teachers that continue to
face greater difficulty meeting HQT requirements. These include: middle school teachers who are certified in elementary education rather than in a specific middle or secondary content area; Special Education, ESL and Alternative Education teachers who provide direct instruction to special needs students, often in self-contained classrooms; teachers working under emergency permits; and teachers in high poverty schools. Many of the teachers having difficulty meeting HQT requirements fall within more than one of these groups. Pennsylvania continues to develop and implement focused strategies to address the challenges facing these teachers in attaining HQT status. The CSPR data also demonstrates that secondary students enrolled in high poverty schools are more likely than their peers to be taught by a teacher that is not highly qualified. As such, Pennsylvania plans to target teachers in these schools for assistance in becoming highly qualified.

To that end, Pennsylvania submits the following revised plan to demonstrate how it will meet the NCLB HQT goals in 2006-07 and beyond. The following plan addresses each of the USDE requirements for a revised plan as set forth in the May 12, 2006 USDE letter to the Commonwealth’s Secretary of Education, Gerald L. Zahorchak.

Requirement 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.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education contracted with the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the Pennsylvania State University (CSHE) to conduct an analysis of the distribution of highly qualified teachers in Pennsylvania. The purpose of this analysis was to identify patterns and relationships between the employment of highly qualified teachers, various school characteristics (e.g., location, poverty, and racial composition), and academic performance measured by adequate yearly progress (AYP) and Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) performance.

While the CSHE study largely confirms PDE's initial assessment of areas of need regarding HQT's, the study also provides detailed analysis of which core academic subjects in Pennsylvania schools are currently most likely to be taught by non-HQT's. The report also considers the needs of schools not making adequate yearly progress. Together, PDE's CSPR data and the CSHE report identify the Pennsylvania schools and class assignments often taught by non-HQT's, as well as
the groups of teachers, schools and districts to which PDE must pay particular attention in this revised HQT plan.

The following information provides a summary of the CSHE analysis of Pennsylvania’s 2004-05 HQT data.

By and large, most children in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, regardless of whether they attend high or low poverty schools, are taught by highly qualified teachers.

![Bar chart showing percent of assignments staffed by HQT in high and low poverty schools for 2004-2005 academic year.](chart.png)
Teacher Qualifications by Subject Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>% HQT</th>
<th>% Non-HQT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE/Elementary</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pennsylvania Department of Education
### Summary of Non-HQT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Assignments Staffed by Non-HQT's</th>
<th>Highlights from Analysis Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Findings</strong></td>
<td>2.28% (Source: CSPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Within the average Pennsylvania school, non-highly qualified teachers teach just over two percent of the class assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pennsylvania schools located in urban areas are more likely to have higher numbers of non-HQT. The data does not indicate that Pennsylvania has a high number of non-HQT teachers in urban locations, but rather that the possibility of a student having a non-HQT is much greater in urban locations than in rural or suburban locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The relationship between AYP status and non-HQTs in Pennsylvania schools appears to indicate a clear pattern, however, that relationship can be complicated by many other factors, such as poverty-level, racial/ethnic minority enrollment, and location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Poverty and/or High Minority Schools</strong></td>
<td>9.83% (Source: CSHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For high-poverty schools, the following areas have the highest proportion of assignments taught by non-HQTs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Math (22 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Science (22 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign language (20 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social Studies (17 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• English (16 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As poverty-level, racial/ethnic minority enrollment, and the proportion of assignments taught by non-HQTs increase, the mean of students' reading and math performance gradually decline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As the percentage of minority students increases, non-HQT assignments also increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pennsylvania schools with higher poverty-levels are more likely to have higher numbers of non-HQT than those schools with lower poverty-levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools not Meeting AYP</strong></td>
<td>7.27% (Source: CSHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The areas in which non-AYP schools have the greatest percentage of assignments taught by non-HQT are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social Studies (15 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Science (13 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign Languages (10 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Math (9 percent), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• English (6 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Findings</th>
<th>0.78% (Source: CSPR)</th>
<th>• Within Pennsylvania elementary schools, non-highly qualified teachers teach less than one percent of the class assignments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Poverty and/or High Minority Schools</td>
<td>3.3% (Source: CSPR)</td>
<td>• Within high-poverty elementary schools, the following areas have the highest proportion of assignments taught by non-HQTs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Art (1 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ECE/Elementary (2 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign Language (7 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools not Meeting AYP</th>
<th>2.17% (Source: CSHE)</th>
<th>• Within Non-AYP elementary schools the following areas have the highest proportion of assignments taught by non-HQTs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Art (2 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ECE/Elementary (2 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign Language (14 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle/Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Findings</th>
<th>3.8% (Source: CSPR)</th>
<th>• A school’s poverty-level had the greatest negative effect on reading and math performance, followed by minority enrollment, living in urban locations, and non-HQT representation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Poverty and/or High Minority Schools</td>
<td>11.24% (Source: CSPR)</td>
<td>• Within high-poverty middle schools, the following areas have the highest proportion of assignments taught by non-HQTs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign Languages (18 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Science (15 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Math (13 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• English (11 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Within high-poverty secondary schools, the following areas have the highest proportion of assignments taught by non-HQTs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Math (34 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Science (26 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• English (26 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social Studies (25 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign Language (22 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schools not Meeting AYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Schools 6.63%</th>
<th>Secondary Schools 6.68%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Source: CSHE)</td>
<td>(Source: CSHE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Within middle schools that did not meet AYP, there is a greater representation of non-HQTs in math and English than other content areas.
- Within non-AYP middle schools, the areas with the highest proportion of assignments that were taught by non-HQTs were:
  - Math (9 percent)
  - English (7 percent)
  - Science (7 percent)
  - Social Studies (5 percent)
- Within secondary schools that did not meet AYP the greatest non-HQT representation was in math and science.
- Within non-AYP secondary schools, the areas with the highest proportion of assignments that were taught by non-HQTs were:
  - Math (9 percent)
  - Science (7 percent)
  - Foreign Languages (7 percent)
  - Social Studies (5 percent)
  - English (5 percent)
  - Art (3 percent)

PDE plans to continue to utilize the results from the CSHE analysis of its HQT data to inform its strategies and overall plan to reach NCLB’s HQT goal and ensure that all children in Pennsylvania are taught by highly qualified and effective teachers in 2006-07 and beyond. Specifically, the state will focus on ensuring that teachers in high-poverty, high-minority districts are provided with the support that they need to achieve highly qualified status within the next year.
Requirement 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.

HQT Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's)
In 2002, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania established annual measurable objectives regarding highly qualified teachers. These AMO's are outlined in the USDE approved Pennsylvania Consolidated State Plan as follows:

- 10% of all LEAs will have 100% of their teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2002-03 school year.
- 30% of all LEAs will have 100% of their teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2003-04 school year.
- 60% of all LEAs will have 100% of their teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2004-05 school year.
- 100% of all LEAs will have 100% of their teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 year.

For the 2004-2005 school year, which is the most recent data available, of Pennsylvania’s 501 school districts:

- 233 school districts (approximately 47%) met the 100% HQT goal;
- 265 school districts had 90-99% of their teachers designated as HQT;
- only 2 districts had less than 90% of their teachers HQT – and these districts had 89% and 86% of their teachers HQT.

Further, 75% of Pennsylvania schools had 100% of their teachers designated as HQT.
Based upon this data, PDE submits the following revised AMO’s regarding HQT:

- 80% of all LEAs will have 100% of their teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 year.

- 100% of all LEAs will have 100% of their teachers highly qualified by the end of the 2006-07 year.

PDE plans to meet these objectives by taking the specific steps outlined in response to Requirements 3, 4 and 6.
Requirement 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.

Pennsylvania’s strategy for recruiting and retaining experienced and high-quality teachers in hard-to-staff schools and assignment areas throughout the Commonwealth provides districts with targeted support by offering a variety of support services that a district can call upon to address individual challenges. The Commonwealth, understanding that poor and minority students are those most likely to be taught by a non-highly qualified teacher, also has in place a cohesive plan to reverse this trend (see response to Requirement #6 below).

Generally, PDE provides technical assistance to assist LEAs in successfully completing their HQT plans, particularly when large groups of teachers are not highly qualified, through the PDE Federal Programs Annual Conference, Regional Meetings and Workshops held each year throughout the Commonwealth. (For more information on the support offered by the Commonwealth, please see the response to Requirement #4 below).

During the 2006-07 school year, PDE will expand its direct technical assistance to high need districts as relates to their HQT plans by meeting individually with district officials and providing specific information and resources on how each district can address its specific HQT needs. PDE will identify and review with the district officials a list of all non-HQTs with particular regard to hard-to-staff class assignments and hard-to-staff schools and will further assist districts with staff assignment and with appropriate staff development to move teachers to HQT status. During the 2005-06 school year, PDE began this focused technical assistance with select high poverty districts.

**Partnership Programs and Services**

Pennsylvania continues to offer schools and districts several partnership programs supported by federal, foundation, state and local funds to ensure an equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers. The following are programs active in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which strive to serve high-need school districts in achieving targeted HQT goals in high-need academic content areas.
Given that Pennsylvania’s urban districts are more likely to have substantial numbers of Non HQTs, there are several initiatives in the state that address this problem specifically:

**Philadelphia Urban Seminar**
The State System of Higher Education facilitates the Philadelphia Urban Seminar, a concentrated and concerted program to place student teachers in Philadelphia. The School District of Philadelphia is the public school partner. More specifically, 28 elementary, middle and high schools located in four regions: the Central East Region, the North Region, the Central Region and the East Region participate in the program. The university partners are all 14 of the State System institutions which produce approximately 44% of Pennsylvania’s teacher graduates each year.

The partnership is designed to place teacher education students from the 14 State System institutions in racially and ethnically diverse public schools in North Philadelphia. It is a three phase approach to providing a highly qualified, experienced and committed cadre of teachers for Philadelphia schools.

- Phase One is an intensive cultural immersion program designed to help State System pre-service teachers come to grips with the myths and stereotypes they may have about urban schools, students, parents and communities. Phase One helps pre-service teachers recognize the strengths and resiliency students bring to the classroom and the positive aspects of diversity found in large urban communities. The school district provides financial support to pre-service teachers as an inducement to involve them in the cultural immersion program.

- Phase Two is an intensive student teaching experience in an urban classroom. It is designed to provide individuals with the requisite skills, ability and mindset to be successful teachers of a diverse group of low-income, urban children.

- Phase Three is the placement of those State System graduates who were part of the program back in the Philadelphia public schools where there is a great need for certified, competent and committed teachers. In addition, the district provides a stipend as an inducement for student teachers to teach in Philadelphia and to help them offset the cost of relocating from the predominantly rural campuses of the State System to the city.

Preliminary results for Phase Two, student teaching, show that 103 student teachers were placed in Philadelphia during the 2004-05 academic year. That figure is 300% higher than targeted.

**Governor's Academy for Urban Learning**
The primary goals of the Governor's Academy for Urban Learning are to facilitate the development of Teaching and Learning Improvement Plans (with the participation of the building administrator), to empower the alignment of curricula with Pennsylvania's Academic Standards in reading and mathematics, and to demonstrate effective ways for coping with educational issues in schools, especially those schools in urban settings. The Governor's Academy for Urban
Learning provides educators in grades K-8 an intensive, rigorous professional learning opportunity designed to improve teaching and learning in Pennsylvania's urban classrooms. Goals of the Governor's Academy for Urban Learning include:

- To facilitate the development of teaching and learning improvement plans, which build upon a school district's strategic plan (with participation of the building administrator)
- To empower alignment of curricula with Pennsylvania's academic standards in reading and mathematics
- To demonstrate effective ways for coping with educational issues in schools, especially those schools in urban settings
- To enable participants to differentiate instructional and assessment strategies
- To enable participants to gain specific knowledge of how to assist students to read critically in mathematics and science content areas, to analyze and interpret literature, and to improve the quality of their reading and writing skills
- To develop and strengthen participants' ability to maximize the effective use of mathematics and technology resources, such as calculators, high-quality Internet web sites to supplement classroom instruction, and computer software
- Align language arts and mathematics curricula and lessons with Pennsylvania's academic standards
- Integrate the instruction of language arts and mathematics
- Use effective classroom management practices
- Apply effective classroom-based learning strategies in the content areas
- Apply teaching practices that are successful with diverse students especially urban student populations
- Have high expectations for diverse student populations
- Use appropriate instructional technology

This program supports math and Language Arts teachers in Pennsylvania's urban schools.

**Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Programs to State Agencies for Higher Education (SAHEs)**

USDE 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."
During the 2006-07 school year a portion of PA’s SAHE’s Title II funds (Part A) will be used as follows to assist teachers in high need LEAs in becoming highly qualified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Funds</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Projected Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRAXIS Preparation for middle level and special education teachers to become highly qualified in core academic subjects</td>
<td>Build Systems; Professional Development</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Accelerated Certification Program for Teachers Teaching on an Emergency Permit (an Intern Certificate will be issued) to become highly qualified in core academic subjects – RFP in development</td>
<td>Build Systems; Professional Development</td>
<td>$2.5 million over 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target professional development for under-prepared teachers in the area of literacy</td>
<td>Professional Development; Specialized Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>$479,120.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these SAHE programs are targeted to serve high needs schools and districts.

In addition, Pennsylvania has several initiatives targeted at recruiting promising candidates to teach in Pennsylvania and stick with the profession. These initiatives help ensure our state’s pipeline of Highly Qualified Teachers for the future:

**TEACH**

The Teachers Evolve And Change with Help pilot initiative in Pennsylvania is an important step toward assuring the future quality of our education profession. TEACH is a collaborative effort of the PA Academy for the Profession of Teaching and Learning and Pennsylvania Network of Milken Educators and PA National Teacher of the Year. Goals of the TEACH program include:

- To encourage college students to pursue a teaching career
- To establish a mechanism of support for preservice teachers through a quality mentoring experience with a master teacher
- To evaluate perceptions and public opinion of the teaching profession
- To increase the number of high-quality new teachers that stay in the profession
The TEACH program is designed to enhance both teacher recruitment and retention in districts throughout the Commonwealth.

**Transition to Teaching Grant Program**

USDE 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.”

- **DREXEL 2002**
  Mid-career professionals and others holding a baccalaureate degree with solid content knowledge in science and mathematics are recruited to become highly qualified certified teachers. The fast-track program includes distance learning courses and workshops that incorporate standards-based instruction, creative problem-solving, and critical thinking, supplemented by the MathForum mentoring and learning activities, as well as periodic group meetings. Research-based skills in using creativity and a heuristic diagnostic pedagogy are used to help the new teachers diagnose their students’ learning strengths and special needs and teach to strengths.

- **DREXEL 2004**
  The Drexel/Philadelphia/Alabama/Chester-Upland project is designed to select 375 mid-career changers and recent college graduates to be trained as highly qualified teachers through an online, streamlined teacher education program. In collaboration with Recruiting New Teachers and the Math Forum @ Drexel, the project implements new recruiting and retention strategies, incorporates rigorous pedagogy and content learning, custom designs streaming videos, and demands close interaction with high-need LEAs. The partnership will work with the Department of Education in both Pennsylvania and Alabama to facilitate systemic change in certification requirements in order to overcome barriers that discourage potential high quality teachers from entering the profession.

Both of these Transition to Teaching projects at Drexel University support the recruitment and retention of highly qualified math and science teachers in the School District of Philadelphia.
Pennsylvania also offers assistance in training highly qualified teachers to teach in hard to staff subject areas:

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.”

Math Science Partnership of Greater Philadelphia

The Math Science Partnership of Greater Philadelphia (MSPGP) is a National Science Foundation funded research grant whose aim is to improve student access to, and achievement in, challenging and advanced courses in mathematics and science; to improve the quality, quantity, and diversity of the teacher workforce through cultivation and professional development; and to understand, through research, how to effectively perform those tasks.

MSPGP focuses on improving secondary mathematics and science, grades 6-12, in an "open loop" environment typical of sprawling, densely-populated greater metropolitan areas containing hundreds of school districts and dozens of institutions of higher education.

In an effort to build the required linkages that address issues such as bringing strong local successes to scale and preventing program erosion over time, the secondary schools of 46 Pennsylvania and New Jersey districts, the science, mathematics, and education faculties of 13 colleges and universities, and the resources of a number of non-profit organizations are brought together to accomplish this work. The 46 school districts and 13 institutions of higher education are in eight Pennsylvania counties in the region outside of Philadelphia.

The Math and Science Partnership of Southwest Pennsylvania

MSPSP is a strong and integrated collaboration linking broadly distributed suburban and rural school districts with an assemblage of small to medium sized colleges and universities in the region. Together they are committed to improving the understanding and knowledge breadth of Mathematics and Science for all students in K-16. The awardee and organizing principle for this Partnership is the
Allegheny Intermediate Unit (AIU), a publicly funded service agency intermediary between local school districts and the State Department of Education.

Over five years this award will serve 134,000 K-12 students and more than 8,500 higher education students, including pre-service teachers. The emphasis of this partnership is on improving the quality of the Math and Science Educator workforce. Working in concert, district and college level leadership cadres will develop a Science Curriculum Framework to be disseminated to schools along with an already developed Mathematics Curriculum Framework.

**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.”

- **The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE),** with its 14 member Universities, is recruiting undergraduates, including community college transfer students, and science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) professionals into mathematics and science teaching careers in high schools and middle schools by offering financial assistance through a Robert Noyce Scholarship or Stipend. The project includes a comprehensive recruitment program and on-going student mentoring during the entire scholarship years and early teaching years. The project rests on an existing infrastructure, utilizing Scholarship Shepherds, the resources of the Math and Science Centers, existing advising resources, and strong school-university partnerships in the 236 school partners involved in the Collaborative for Excellence in Teacher Preparation in Pennsylvania (CETP-PA). School initiatives, including Professional Development Schools initiative and the Philadelphia Urban Seminar, provide an infrastructure for successfully introducing pre-service teachers to a career in high-need schools. The project is addressing the unique needs of novice teachers in high-need school districts by providing relevant, quality field experiences for pre-service teachers and by providing a menu of support services for novice in-service teachers, enabling 35 scholarship or stipend recipients to become successful mathematics and science teachers. Evaluation efforts address the effectiveness of the Noyce program in attracting and retaining teachers and the quality of the preparation of and teaching by the Noyce recipients.

- **The Drexel University Noyce Scholarship Program** (DUNS) addresses the increasing need for high quality teachers in the School District of Philadelphia. The School District of Philadelphia is partnering with Drexel University to prepare highly qualified teachers to fill current and expected K-12 needs, especially in mathematics and the sciences. The Noyce program enables 10 science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)
undergraduates from Drexel and 15 STEM mid-career professionals from the community to earn the credentials they need to teach mathematics and science in Philadelphia's high-need schools. These 25 Noyce recipients will be new teachers in addition to the (typically 60) high school teachers produced annually at Drexel, for a roughly 40% increase in production of highly qualified high school teachers in science and mathematics.

**NSF CETP-PA:**
The National Science Foundation Collaborative for Excellence in Teacher Preparation in Pennsylvania (NSF CETP-PA) is a systemic reform initiative of the science and mathematics teacher preparation programs of 12 campuses of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education. Strong assessment and dissemination components accompany a comprehensive program of cultural change that can serve as a national model.

During this project, scientists, mathematicians and educators from State System of Higher Education campuses are collaborating to:

- Change selected university content courses taken by education students to reflect research-based effective pedagogy
- Supplement the math and science content of science and math education courses
- Introduce the paired supervision of science and math student teachers by content and pedagogy specialists
- Provide consistency in experiences received by science and math education majors between their revised university courses, their field experiences and induction period
- Increase efforts at recruitment of underrepresented and minority public school students to pursue careers in teaching science and mathematics
- Sponsor K-12 professional development activities at each State System university, so all K-12 teachers have the knowledge, skills and commitment to teach mathematics and science that reflect the content and constructivist strategies contained in state and national standards
- Support an infrastructure and culture that promotes excellence in the preparation of elementary and secondary mathematics and science teachers.

**Specific Strategies Include:**

- Team with 11 community colleges and more than 250 public schools
- Promote and support content and pedagogy course revision and adoption by teaming K-16 faculty to revise and/or develop selected science, math, and education courses
- Develop a cadre of K-16 science and math teachers as leaders in their own educational setting
- Establish science/math/technology centers linked together and with local institutions and public schools. The role of each Center is:
1. to promote collaboration between preservice, in-service, and university faculty  
2. to sponsor educational opportunities  
3. to provide resource materials online and through a distribution network  
4. to support science, mathematics and technology programs, especially those involving teacher preparation

**Requirement 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.

To ensure school district compliance with federal Title I requirements, PDE requires school districts to submit a Consolidated Application or contract comprised of a Rider, Budget and Narrative in July of each year requesting Title I funds. In the Rider under ‘Terms and Conditions,’ PDE requires districts to comply with the requirements of Title I, Part A regarding the qualifications of teachers. PDE also requires districts to list the salaries and benefits of the Title I HQTs they hire. The Department then reviews and approves the Title I budgets to ensure that districts hire Title I HQTs. Districts also report the number of teachers working in programs supported by Title I and the number meeting the definition of Highly Qualified. PDE verifies these numbers to ensure that the teachers funded through Title I are highly qualified. PDE also requires districts to provide an assurance that all new Title I teachers hired after the beginning of the 2002-03 school year meet the definition of highly qualified.

All LEAs in Pennsylvania must report annually to PDE the total number of teachers meeting the highly qualified status. LEAs not meeting the 100% requirement must set aside 5% of their Title I allocation for professional development necessary for teachers to meet highly qualified standards. Additionally, PDE is encouraging LEA’s to use their Title II A, Title V and remaining Title I funds to support the highly qualified teachers goals of the LEA.

Those Title I schools not making AYP are required to set aside at least 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development. LEAs must target funds to schools that have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers, have the largest average class size, or are identified for School Improvement. PDE monitors LEAs to ensure that they are in compliance with these requirements.

LEAs and schools not making AYP must develop school improvement plans that address the academic needs of students. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has developed a comprehensive school improvement framework for schools and LEAs to utilize when developing plans. This framework requires schools and LEAs to consider areas such as Quality Teaching, Quality Leadership, Artful Use of Infrastructure, and Continuous Learning Ethic when developing school improvement plans. When looking through these four lenses, schools are
required to support teachers in receiving the training and professional development needed to ensure they meet not only highly qualified standards, but also the needs of their students. Funds from state, local and federal sources are used to support these plans.

PDE examines the issue of equitable teacher assignment when it monitors LEAs. The department examines district strategies to attract high quality, HQT to their high-need schools. PDE also examines the professional development activities to ensure that they are used as part of a broader strategy to eliminate the achievement gap that separates low-income and minority students from other students. PDE monitors school districts once every three years to ensure that they have developed HQT plans, have highly qualified teachers at each school and to ensure that teachers receive high quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers.

PDE also uses the Consolidated Program Review Instrument to ensure that districts hire highly qualified Title I Teachers and hire highly qualified teachers to reduce class size.

Requirement 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 who are highly qualified in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire.

NCLB requires that to be Highly Qualified teachers must have full state certification, must hold a bachelor's degree, and must demonstrate subject matter competency. NCLB provides several ways to demonstrate competency, depending on whether the teacher is "new" or "not new" to the profession and the level at which instruction occurs (elementary or secondary). NCLB also refers to the HOUSSE (or the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation) as a method by which teachers "not new to the profession" can demonstrate subject matter competency to satisfy that prong of the definition of a "highly qualified teacher". NCLB also lists the seven standards that each HOUSSE must include (set by the state, aligned with academic standards, applied uniformly, etc.) (Sec. 9101(23)(C)(iii)). The law makes no provision for the expiration of the HOUSSE option, and until recently, USDE guidance did not reference a phase-out of the HOUSSE option.
In fact, USDE’s August 2005 non-regulatory guidance includes the following question and answer:

A-12 May States offer the HOUSSE procedures as a way for experienced teachers to demonstrate subject-matter competency in the subjects they teach after the 2005-2006 school year?

YES. Even after the end of the 2005-2006 school year, States may continue to offer HOUSSE as a way of determining that individual teachers who are not new to the profession have the subject-matter competence they need to be highly qualified in each subject they teach. For example, a State’s HOUSSE can still be used after 2006 to demonstrate that the following teachers, among others, have the subject-matter knowledge they need to be highly qualified: teachers of multiple subjects in rural LEAs eligible for expanded flexibility; teachers rehired by LEAs after periods of work in other professions or retirement; teachers recruited from other Nations; teachers who are highly qualified in one subject area who are asked to teach an additional subject for which they have not yet demonstrated subject-area competency; or teachers who are hired after moving from other States.

On June 7, 2006, USDE notified Pennsylvania of its determination that Pennsylvania’s HOUSSE programs met all of the requirements of the federal law. Since that time, Pennsylvania has been actively engaged in fully implementing its HOUSSE programs.

For those teachers who are not entitled to use the flexibility identified in the federal law and guidance, Pennsylvania plans to phase-out its HOUSSE programs during the 2006-07 school year, as follows:

**BRIDGE Program Completion:**
The BRIDGE program is Pennsylvania’s HOUSSE program that not only designates a teacher as HQT when the teacher qualifies for participation in the program but also results in an additional instructional certificate when the teacher completes the program. The BRIDGE program is designed primarily for multi-content middle and secondary special education, ESL, and alternative education teachers who are “not new to the profession” and who hold at least one instructional certificate. All BRIDGE program participants must complete the program and attain full instructional certification within three years of starting the program.

Pennsylvania’s BRIDGE program closed for all new participants effective July 30, 2006. Current participants must complete the program and attain a full instructional certificate by June 30, 2009. Therefore, Pennsylvania’s BRIDGE program will be completed by all Pennsylvania teachers by June 30, 2009.

**HOUSSE HQT Designation Program**
Pennsylvania’s HOUSSE HQT Designation program is another HOUSSE program that is designed primarily for multi-content special education, ESL and alternative education teachers. However, while this HOUSSE program permits a teacher to
demonstrate subject matter competency and obtain the HQT designation, it does not result in an additional instructional certificate.

Pennsylvania began using this HOUSSE program in June 2006 and will continue to permit elementary, middle and secondary teachers who are “not new to the profession” to use this HOUSSE program to attain HQT status through the end of the 2006-07 school year.

Following June 30, 2007, the only teachers that will be permitted to utilize the HOUSSE HQT program to attain HQT status are those “not new to the profession” teachers who have developed (before June 30, 2007) in conjunction with their districts, an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) to become highly qualified. These teachers who have developed an IPDP to become highly qualified will be permitted to continue to use the HOUSSE HQT program to demonstrate subject matter competency through December 30, 2008. Thus, Pennsylvania will complete the HOUSSE HQT designation program for most teachers on June 30, 2007 and for all teachers on December 30, 2008.

A description of Pennsylvania’s HOUSSE programs is available on the PDE website www.teaching.state.pa.us.

Requirement 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.

Equity Plan
Ensuring that all Pennsylvania children receive the high-quality education that they deserve requires an effective teacher in every classroom along with school and district leadership that is focused on raising achievement. The Commonwealth’s educators – from the classroom teacher to the district superintendent – are the most important components of Pennsylvania’s strategy for educational success.

In keeping with this policy, Pennsylvania is committed to the goal that poor and minority children must not be taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers. Pennsylvania further recognizes that teacher quality has a major impact on student achievement and remains committed to the goal of ensuring that every child in Pennsylvania is taught by a high quality teacher who is equipped to teach in a way that enables every student to experience academic success.

In March 2006, PDE submitted updated data to the United States Department of Education in its Consolidated State Performance Report regarding highly qualified teachers in Pennsylvania. This data demonstrates that in 2004-05, 96.6% of Pennsylvania’s elementary school classroom assignments in high poverty schools were taught by highly qualified teachers. This is in comparison to the 99.8% HQT in elementary school classroom assignments in low poverty schools, with the
resulting gap of 3.2% between the HQT in low poverty and high poverty schools. Further, in 2004-05, 88.7% of middle/secondary school core academic classroom assignments in high poverty schools were taught by highly qualified teachers, while 98.8% of the middle/secondary school core academic classroom assignments in low poverty schools were taught by highly qualified teachers, leaving a resulting gap of 10.1% of HQT between the low poverty and high poverty schools. (See table in Requirement 1).

As set forth in detail above under Requirement #1, PDE conducted an in-depth analysis of its HQT data, specifically including the class assignments in high poverty schools that are taught by non-HQT teachers and the equitable distribution of HQT teachers in Pennsylvania schools.

As a result of the USDE peer-review analysis of Pennsylvania’s July 2006 Plan regarding the distribution of experienced teachers in Pennsylvania schools, PDE engaged in further analysis of its data regarding the equitable distribution of teachers and is now able to report the following information with regard to “experience.”

For purposes of this measurement, Pennsylvania has adopted the definition of “experience” suggested by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality in “Revising the Equitable Distribution Component of Your State’s Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers” (Laura Goe, September 2006). That is, “experience” is defined by the number of years a teacher has taught as the teacher of record. Under this definition, new teachers have zero years of teaching experience, teachers beginning their second year in the classroom have one year and so on. Further, PDE has divided teachers into two experience-level classifications: “novice” (i.e., zero, one, or two years of experience) and experienced” (i.e., three or more years of experience).

Pennsylvania performed an analysis of the 2004-05 HQT data and compared the number of years of teaching experience in three main areas:

- high poverty elementary schools versus low poverty elementary schools
- high poverty middle/secondary schools versus low poverty middle/secondary schools
- schools that attained overall Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) versus schools that did not attain overall AYP.

---

1 The poverty groupings were determined by the percentage of the student population that receives free or reduced lunch, or TANF. The schools were divided into two groups: Elementary; and Middle/Secondary. Each group was then divided into quartiles with the top quartile designated as being high poverty and the bottom quartile designated as being low poverty.
Additionally, PDE calculated the aggregate experience level of its teachers in elementary and middle/secondary schools. ²

High Poverty Elementary Schools vs. Low Poverty Elementary Schools
Table 1 lists elementary teacher groupings in high poverty schools and in low poverty schools. The percentages represent the fraction of the total number of teachers in each of the two poverty quartiles examined that fall into each experience group.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Poverty</th>
<th>Low Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a small difference of 3.5 percentage points between high and low poverty elementary schools with high poverty schools having more novice teachers and less experienced teachers. Please see Chart A for a side by side comparison of the experience groups.

² Limitations in the data collection process caused some limitations in this analysis. In some instances, teachers have more than one record with each record listing a different total years of experience for that teacher. There were approximately two-thousand such cases, and in those instances, the maximum number of years of teaching experience was used. When the CSPR was compiled, the key which would allow a backward link to each teacher’s level of experience and the related core subject area was not recorded, and therefore this analysis could not examine the varying levels of experience between the various core subject areas. In extracting data for future CSPRs, this key can be stored and that data can then be analyzed. Finally, not all grade levels in all schools had participated in the Pennsylvania State Standard Assessments (PSSA) for AYP; teachers in those schools have not been included in the AYP comparisons. As set forth more fully below, PDE has a plan in place to enhance its data collection and reporting system and, thereby, to meet the reporting requirements regarding the equitable distribution of experienced and highly qualified teachers.
Chart A

Comparison of Teaching Experience for High Poverty and Low Poverty Elementary Schools
2004-05 Academic Year

Percent of Total Teachers in Poverty Grouping

- Hi-Poverty
- Low-Poverty

Experience Grouping

Novice
Experienced
High Poverty Middle/Secondary Schools vs. Low Poverty Middle/Secondary Schools

Table 2 lists middle/secondary teacher groupings in high poverty schools and in low poverty schools. The percentages represent the fraction of the total number of teachers in the two poverty quartiles examined that fall into each experience group.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle/Secondary Schools</th>
<th>High Poverty</th>
<th>Low Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates a difference of 4.4 percentage points in experience between high and low poverty middle/secondary schools. Please see Chart B for a side by side comparison of the experience groups.

Chart B

Comparison of Teaching Experience in High and Low Poverty Middle/Secondary Schools
2004-05 Academic Year
Schools that Attained Overall Adequate Yearly Progress vs. those that Did Not

Table 3 lists groupings of teachers in all schools that achieved AYP and in all schools that did not achieve AYP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs. Exp.</th>
<th>Reached Overall AYP</th>
<th>Did Not Reach Overall AYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The experience groupings indicate that schools not attaining AYP are staffed with teachers having less experience than those that attained AYP. Chart C gives a graphical depiction of this.

Chart C
Years of Service Statewide

Table 4 depicts a breakdown of teaching experience for core content teachers statewide and in both elementary and secondary schools. It is notable that only 12.3% of elementary teachers and only 15.6% of secondary teachers are designated as being novices to the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs. Exp.</th>
<th>All Schools</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of this data and analysis regarding “experience” and with the analysis of HQT summarized above, Pennsylvania is better positioned to focus on policies, programs, and practices that support the equitable distribution of its highly qualified and experienced teachers.

Based upon the results of our analysis and toward the goal of ensuring that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by teachers that are inexperienced and/or are not highly qualified, Pennsylvania is pursuing the following strategies:

- Pennsylvania is engaged in the review of a comprehensive report of its teacher preparation and certification process and overall teacher quality issues that was recently issued through the Governor’s Commission on Training America’s Teachers.
- Pennsylvania has proposed the revision of teacher certification regulations and program approval guidelines for early childhood education, upper elementary/middle level education and special education to ensure that all future teachers have more in-depth content knowledge and pedagogical skills and are prepared to effectively teach all students, including students with special needs and English language learners.
- PDE is partnering with high poverty and struggling school districts to address specific staffing problems and to recruit and retain highly qualified and experienced teachers in high need schools and hard to fill teaching positions (e.g., special education, middle school core assignments, secondary math and science). This partnership, among other things, includes regular meetings between PDE staff and district officials, continuous review of data regarding district staff assignments and HQT status, and the provision of targeted assistance to address recruitment, retention and staffing assignments.
- PDE is partnering with high poverty districts to assist uncertified or out-of-field teachers to move from emergency permits to full certification. PDE
already has had a great deal of success in this area; across the state, districts that had previously relied heavily on emergency permits, now do so much less frequently. Philadelphia, for example, has significantly reduced its reliance on emergency permits. Since the 2001-02 school year, the School District of Philadelphia has reduced its use of emergency permits from a high of 4,968 in 2001-02 to 2,167 in 2004-05. Further, of these 2,167 emergency permits, slightly less than 1,300 core academic assignments were taught by teachers on long term emergency permits. During the 2006-07 school year, the School District of Philadelphia will continue to significantly reduce its use of emergency permits.

- PDE is assisting all school districts to develop strategies to decrease the number of teachers who are teaching beyond the scope of their current certification and to increase teacher retention, through high quality professional development, teacher reassignment and distance learning.

These strategies will result in the improved distribution of highly qualified, experienced and effective teachers in high need and struggling schools and districts. More specifically, Pennsylvania’s equity plan is research-based, provides for financial support and technical assistance, incorporates high quality professional development, and includes the following necessary components:

A. Policy Coherence
The foundation of Pennsylvania’s plan to ensure an equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers in high need districts is the comprehensive review of Pennsylvania’s policies and regulations regarding teacher quality, teacher preparation and the teacher certification process. Although Pennsylvania continues to push towards the 100% HQT goal, Pennsylvania is not satisfied with merely meeting the technical requirements of the federal law but rather, and as set forth more fully below, is committed to the continuous and effective reform of its teacher preparation and certification system.

**Governor’s Commission on Training America’s Teachers**
In August 2005 Governor Rendell issued an Executive Order establishing the Training America’s Teachers Commission. The Governor’s Commission is comprised of representatives from higher education teacher preparation programs, public school districts, teachers’ unions, policy makers, and state officials. Since August 2005, the Commission has been engaged in a deliberative process focusing on the knowledge and teaching skills with which Pennsylvania’s teacher preparation programs must equip future teachers; a seamless system of preservice and inservice teacher education for lifelong learning; ways to meet the shortages and geographic imbalances in the supply and demand for high quality teachers; and more strategic ways to enhance the state’s economic development potential through the intellectual capital provided by teacher education. Based upon this review, the Commission delivered its final report and recommendations to the
Governor during the summer of 2006 and included four categories of recommendations:

1. Recommendations to Improve Initial Preparation, Induction, and Professional Development of teachers: These recommendations call for improvements in university-based teacher education programs and especially in their clinical practice components; improved oversight of those programs by the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE); improved and extended induction programs for new teachers; more focused continuing professional education, especially in the first few years of a teacher’s career; differentiated staffing patterns in school districts; and state support for induction as well as for professional development schools, teachers seeking certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and other innovative practices to support the transition from collegiate training to initial practice in schools.

2. Recommendations to Respond to Shortages of High Quality Teachers: While Pennsylvania produces more new teachers every year than the public schools hire, Pennsylvania continues to have shortages in a number of subject areas and several high-need school districts. The Commission’s recommendations call for pilot projects and a loan forgiveness program to encourage more men and women to teach in high-need areas; state support for urban clinical experiences for future teachers, as well as for “grow-your-own” programs in high-need districts; a streamlined and standardized intern certification program to encourage people with degrees in other fields to enter the field of teaching with appropriate preparation to teach the content they already know; a more open approach to cross-state certification reciprocity; increased efforts by high-need districts to recruit and retain high quality teachers; and efforts by districts and universities to increase the pipeline of math and science teachers and teachers of color.

3. Recommendations to Increase the Economic Competitiveness of Teacher Education: Previous recommendations focus on improving our teacher education system and making it more responsive to the state’s own needs. Pennsylvania will continue to attract students from other states as long as we have large numbers of high-quality programs, since many other states simply lack the infrastructure to produce enough teachers to serve their own schools. The Commission’s recommendations that relate specifically to the economic competitiveness of teacher education call for establishment and support of specialized teacher education consortia of universities, school districts, and intermediate units to develop and disseminate state-of-the-art practice in high-need subject areas, including math and science teaching, and teaching in urban districts; an increase in the 10 percent out-of-state enrollment cap for State System of Higher Education universities; and the more open approach to reciprocity previously mentioned.

A copy of the full Commission report is available at http://www.pateach.org

The Department is currently reviewing the Commission’s recommendations and will develop an implementation plan in October 2006. The Department anticipates that the implementation of many of the Commission’s recommendations during the 2006-07 school year and beyond will further enhance its efforts to comprehensively address teacher quality issues in Pennsylvania.

Revision of Certification Policies: Implementing Standards-Based Educational Reform in Our Teacher Preparation Programs

Good teaching produces improved student achievement. Simply put, quality teachers are more effective in helping the students to successfully learn content. Thus, in a time of heightened accountability for public school systems, reform efforts focused on strengthening the pool of talented and competent teachers are most likely to produce benefits in academic outcomes.

- Teacher quality, after factoring in home and other environmental factors, has the greatest impact on student achievement.3
- Teacher effectiveness relates strongly to teacher preparation and certification.4 Students from similar socioeconomic backgrounds score lower on reading and math if they are in schools with uncertified teachers.5
- States that have implemented educational reform efforts that include a strong emphasis on pre-service and in-service teacher education (e.g., Connecticut and North Carolina) demonstrated substantial gains in student achievement. Further, states that have demonstrated the best student achievement rates over time (e.g., Wisconsin and Minnesota) traditionally have the highest standards for pre-service education of teachers.6
- Nationally, teacher preparation programs are not producing beginning teachers who are ready to succeed in teaching in the modern

5 Darling-Hammond, L. (May 2002) Is California on the Right Track?
classroom. Inadequate preparation can lead to teachers leaving the profession as under-prepared instructors are more likely to quit teaching.

With this knowledge in mind, on June 29, 2006, the State Board of Education announced its intention to revise the requirements of Pennsylvania’s teaching certificates. The proposed revisions will provide needed skills to teachers working with all children who are likely to be in their classrooms. Education is an evolutionary field, constantly changing as society transforms and knowledge increases. Pennsylvania’s institutions of higher education have been effective in preparing teachers; however, it is time to consider how the programs that they offer can be strengthened to adjust to changing demographic trends and national and local policy trends. Proposed revisions reflect the changing nature of classrooms in Pennsylvania and focus on helping teachers to be better prepared to work with students. Specifically:

- Pennsylvania classrooms are more diverse in 2005 compared to 1999 (last time the Limitations section, Chapter 49.85, was amended) and are projected to become increasingly more diverse through 2025 with greater proportions of minorities.\(^9\)
- To ensure that teachers are able to teach in fully inclusive classrooms, dual certification in “regular” education and special education is becoming more prevalent in the U.S. in recent years.\(^10\)
- Since the 1980’s, the United States educational system has been challenged with the finding that many children are not acquiring the literacy and other skills that promote academic and lifelong success.\(^11\)
- Finally, greater accountability for student progress emphasizes the need for teachers to ensure that all students in the classroom are learning.

Given these forces of change in education and the research on effective teaching, the principles underlying the proposed certification changes are:

1. Assure opportunities for prospective teachers to gain in-depth knowledge of child development and content appropriate for the age group they are teaching.
2. Assure opportunities for prospective teachers to be able to effectively teach all learners – racially and ethnically diverse

---

7 Summary from the Center for Education publication, Improving Mathematics Education: Resources for Decision Making (2001) at [http://www.nap.edu/books/0309083001/index.html](http://www.nap.edu/books/0309083001/index.html)
students, students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, etc.

Description of the Proposed Certification Revisions
For instructional certificates issued on or after January 1, 2012, the grade level limitations will be changed for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education to the following:

- **Early Childhood** (Pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, grades one through three or ages 3 through 8).
- **Elementary/Middle** (Grades four through eight or ages 9 through 14). Elementary/Middle certificates permit instruction in any subject in grades four, five and six and in a core academic subject or subjects in grades seven and eight.
- **Special Education/Primary** (Pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, grades one through eight or ages 3 through 14) with early childhood (Pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, grades one through three or ages 3 through 8).
- **Special Education/Middle** (Pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, grades one through eight or ages 3 through 14) with Elementary/Middle (Grades four through eight or ages 9 through 14 as specified in (b)(2)).
- **Special Education/Secondary** in a core academic subject (Grades seven through twelve or ages 11 through 21).

Further, all teacher education preparation programs would be required to include information on instruction of students with disabilities and English language learners. Specifically, all teacher education programs would require at least nine credits (270 hours), or an equivalent combination thereof, on accommodations and adaptations for students with disabilities in an inclusive setting. Within the content of those nine credits or 270 hours, instruction in literacy skills development and cognitive skill development for students with disabilities must be included. At least 3 credits or 90 additional hours, or an equivalent combination thereof, shall address the instructional needs of English language learners. For purposes of calculating hours and credits, one credit equals 30 hours or coursework. Hours can include classroom instruction, field experiences, supervised research, and major research projects.

**PDE Executive Coordination of Teacher Quality Issues**
During the 2006-07 school year, PDE plans to accelerate its commitment to improving teacher quality and meeting HQT requirements through central coordination of all policy and program initiatives related to teacher quality issues, including the implementation of the Governor’s Commission recommendations, certification revisions, and HQT issues. A Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education will coordinate this critical work through the relevant program offices.
The Special Assistant will support PDE’s targeted assistance to high need districts. Highlights of this work include:

- Monthly meetings between PDE and School District of Philadelphia officials to review and address teacher quality needs.
- Quarterly meetings between PDE and all high poverty and struggling school districts to review and address teacher quality, including Non-HQT assignments and hard to fill needs.
- PRAXIS preparation assistance and test fee waivers for teachers in high need districts and hard to staff positions. PDE is partnering with high poverty districts and the Educational Testing Service to offer test preparation workshops and the waiver of fees for non-highly qualified teachers in high poverty districts.

B. Data and Reporting Systems
Pennsylvania continues to implement its plan to significantly improve its data collection and reporting system regarding teacher quality. This improvement will result in the enhanced ability of PDE to identify and correct inequities in the distribution of experienced and highly qualified teachers in high-poverty/high minority schools vs. low-poverty/low-minority schools.

In the past, Pennsylvania has been unable to provide all of the required HQT data in its Consolidated State Performance Reports and Annual State Report Cards. PDE has not had, and still does not fully have, the data-collection capability to calculate directly the numbers and percentages of individual classes taught by highly-qualified teachers. PDE will have that capability by 2008, thanks in large part to a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. In the meanwhile, for this year’s CSPR and Annual State Report Card, PDE has significantly improved the accuracy of its data reports, and will refine those reports even more in 2007.

Under the existing system, schools report to PDE the “teaching assignments” for all of their teachers; up to three teaching assignments can be reported. PDE maintains a “crosswalk” that aligns teaching assignments to certification areas. When the Department receives the inventory of teaching assignments from the schools, they are cross-referenced to the PDE record of teachers’ certifications in order to determine if the teachers hold HQT status for those assignments. With the 2006 CSPR all assignments are cross-referenced in this way; in prior years only the first, or primary, assignment was cross-referenced.

PDE does recognize that the under the current structure teaching assignments do not directly reflect the number of classes taught, and thus, the data serves only as a proxy for those numbers. The PDE data-collection system, known as ESPP, does not have the capability to get to those direct numbers. PDE is confident that, as a proxy, our enumeration of teaching assignments gives the state, and the U.S. Department of Education, an accurate estimate of the numbers of classes being taught by highly-qualified teachers. For the 2006 report, for example, 97.3% of
teachers were reported as having only one assignment and 97.8% of those teachers were appropriately certified for that assignment.

PDE realizes, however, that the development of the capability to get directly to the numbers of classes themselves is critical, and PDE has begun that process. The timeline is to have this new process in place in the spring of 2008. In the fall of 2005 the Office of Information Technology received a four million dollar Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant from U.S. Department of Education for this purpose.

The project is known as Pennsylvania Secure ID (PaSID). Through PaSID, all students and teachers throughout the state will receive a unique identifying number that will be entered into a master database. These identifiers will be matched to a variety of other, relational, databases. One such database will be a complete inventory of individual classes in individual schools. In the case of teachers, their individual IDs will also be linked to PDE’s record of teacher certifications.

The PaSID project itself extends far beyond the tracking of highly qualified teachers, but specificity can be used for our Consolidated State Performance Report and Annual Report Cards. That is, the new system will allow us to link every teacher in the Commonwealth to every class he or she is teaching and to her or his certification(s), and to cross-reference those two. By means of this system, we will be able to report directly and accurately the numbers and percentages of all classes in all schools being taught by highly qualified teachers.

A project as extensive as PaSID will take years to become fully functional in all of its parts. At present, students in grades 3, 5, 8 and 11, those who have recently taken the state-wide PSSA exams, have been assigned individual identifiers, and the relational data bases are being put in place. Because of the critical nature of our need to comply with this reporting requirement, the teacher/classroom/certification component will be added to the system beginning in the winter of 2007. We anticipate that it will be fully operational by early 2008. In the interim, PDE will continue to evaluate and publicly report its progress on HQT goals and specifically on the equitable distribution of experienced and highly qualified teachers.

C. Teacher Preparation
Pennsylvania continues to implement research-based strategies to successfully recruit, prepare and retain teachers for high-poverty, low-performing schools. These strategies include state and locally-funded financial incentive programs quality alternative route programs in high need schools, and effective induction programs.
Financial Incentives

**Accountability Block Grants**
The Accountability Block Grant provides Pennsylvania school districts with financial assistance to implement effective educational practices and initiatives to improve student achievement. The legislation identifies eleven proven practices as acceptable expenditures of Accountability Block Grant funds, three of which directly support enhanced teacher quality:

- professional education;
- math and literacy teacher coaching; and
- financial incentives to highly qualified tenured teachers to work in the most academically challenged schools in a district, or providing financial incentives to aid in the recruitment of certificated math, science, language arts and English as a Second Language teachers to work in the most academically challenged schools in a district.

Funding amounts for ABG’s are determined by a set formula:
- 75% of allocated funding is determined by the percentage of students scoring below proficiency on the PSSA as a way to target those students who need the extra assistance the most.
- 25% of allocated funding is determined by the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on the PSSA in an effort to maintain the achievement of those students.

In the 2005-06 school year:
- 92 school districts used ABG to provide additional high quality professional education; and
- 101 school districts currently use the funding to hire math and literacy coaches.

**School District of Philadelphia Incentive Program**
The School District of Philadelphia has established an incentive program for teachers in its critical subject areas and in its pre-identified “incentive schools.” Through this program, a teacher may earn a $1500 bonus at the completion of the school year if the teacher receives a satisfactory rating in a “critical subject area”. The critical subject areas include: Mathematics, Chemistry, Physics, Spanish, Special Education and Bi-lingual Education (Asian and Spanish Language). Additionally, teachers in “Incentive Schools” receive tuition reimbursement and increased professional development. The School District of Philadelphia also offers its new hires the following incentives: new teacher coaches; paid summer pre-service; rent reduction; bonuses for National Board Certification and student loan forgiveness.
Quality Alternative Route Programs in High Need Schools

**Teach For America:** The School District of Philadelphia continues to employ Teach For America graduates in its high need schools. In 2005-06, the school district used 196 Teach For America teachers in its high need schools. The students that these teachers served were 80% African-American and/or Latino and over 80% were eligible for free or reduced lunch. The TFA program utilizes PDE’s intern certification program to ensure that its recruits meet the definition of a highly qualified teacher.

**TNTP:** The New Teacher Project/Philadelphia Teaching Fellows (PTF) recruits professionals and recent college graduates to teach in the School District of Philadelphia’s high-need schools. PTF selects a cohort of candidates to meet the District’s critical need areas including: special education, mathematics, science, and bilingual education. The PTF utilizes Pennsylvania’s intern certification program to ensure that its recruits meet the definition of a highly qualified teacher.

**Troops To Teachers:** The federal Troops to Teachers program is a partnership between the Department of Education and the existing 37 teacher intern programs of the 96 colleges and universities that prepare Pennsylvania’s teachers for the classroom.

- Currently in Pennsylvania there are 142 active veterans that have submitted TTT applications to teach in Pennsylvania.
- 58 of these active veterans are currently teaching in Pennsylvania.
- Of the employed veteran teachers, 75% are teaching in a high needs district.
- 31% are teaching in the Philadelphia School District; 12% in Harrisburg School District, two districts that have had difficulty in attracting and retaining HQTs.

**ABCTE:** Pennsylvania recognizes the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE) as an acceptable alternative route to gain a certificate and its assessment as equivalent to the state’s licensure tests. ABCTE teachers receive one-year teaching permits in elementary education, English, or math and establish a mentor relationship with either St. Joseph’s University or Point Park University. After one year of teaching, the mentor university determines if the candidate is eligible for an Instructional I certificate.

**Effective Induction programs and professional development programs**
PDE is working to enhance requirements for induction programs for first year teachers. Every school district’s induction plan must include a mentorship component between the first year teacher and an experienced HQT teacher or induction team member. (See section F below for additional information on Pennsylvania’s professional development requirements).
D. Out-of-Field Teaching

**ACT Grant Program in Pennsylvania**

Pennsylvania is continuing its commitment to the Accelerated Certification for Teachers Program. The ACT program provides accelerated certification programs for highly qualified professionals seeking a career in the Pennsylvania education system, and at the same time assists high-need school districts in providing Highly Qualified educators to their students.

The ACT program addresses the professional preparation needs of a growing population of individuals who already have at least a bachelor's degree, considerable subject knowledge, and want to become teachers. The purposes of the ACT grant program are to: enable teachers currently teaching with an Emergency Permit to become high qualified subject area certificate holders; recruit minority candidates to serve as highly qualified teachers and role models in high need content areas and districts; and implement technology via Distance Education models.

The ACT Program currently provides certification avenues to highly qualified candidates to meet the needs of five sponsoring high need school districts (Allentown, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, Reading, and York City) in five high need certification areas (Math, Sciences, ESL, Spanish, and Special Education). The ACT Grant funds are provided to cover the cost of tuition for all participants. Candidates enroll in the accelerated program and complete a series of courses that range from 12-24 months, depending upon the area of certification. The various institutions of higher education, sponsoring school districts, and PDE have worked together to develop a series of required courses for each certification area and the colleges deliver these courses using flexible and innovative practices. Some college programs are delivered on-site in the various school districts. Most coursework is completed while the candidate is working full time in a high need school district and requires the successful candidate to make a commitment to remain at the high need district for an established period of time.

**Elimination of Emergency Permits**

PDE is working to immediately reduce and eventually eliminate the use of long-term emergency permits in Pennsylvania. At the same time, Pennsylvania continues to recognize alternative avenues to certification in Pennsylvania including Pennsylvania’s intern certification program and national teacher training programs such as Teach for America, the American Board for Certification for Teacher Excellence, Troops to Teachers and The New Teacher Project/Philadelphia Teaching Fellows. PDE will continue to encourage districts to use these pathways to attract mid-career professionals and top-of-class graduates to staff hard to fill teaching positions in place of emergency permits.

The School District of Philadelphia has significantly reduced its reliance on emergency permits since the 2001-02 school year. Philadelphia has reduced its
use of emergency permits from a high of 4,968 in 2001-02 to 2,167 in 2004-05. Further, of these 2,167 emergency permits, slightly less than 1,300 core academic assignments were taught by teachers on long term emergency permits. PDE is actively engaged with the School District of Philadelphia and other high need school districts in moving teachers from emergency permits to full certification and highly qualified teacher status.

E. Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers
As set forth above, Pennsylvania is committed to ensuring that incentives and technical assistance are provided to LEAs to help them recruit and retain experienced and highly qualified teachers, with specific emphasis on high need middle and secondary schools.

National Board Certification Initiative
As enacted, Pennsylvania’s 2006-07 budget includes $1.2 million to enable 500 Pennsylvania teachers to earn National Board certification. The goal of the proposal is to ensure that teachers in the most challenging schools and hard-to-staff subjects will receive top priority for the state grants to pay their National Board certification fee. First priority will go to teachers in schools that are classified as “In Need of Improvement” or “Corrective Action” under NCLB. Second priority will go to secondary math and science teachers and early childhood education teachers. Teachers who earn the National Board certification and have their certification fee paid for by the state must agree to continue teaching for at least two years in a Pennsylvania school district. The budget will fund 100% of the $2,500 certification fee that is not covered by federal funds or other private grants; up to three days of paid leave so teachers can prepare their National Board portfolio for certification assessment; and four regional centers of excellence that will recruit and assist National Board Candidates.

F. Professional Development
Act 48 Requirements
Pennsylvania law requires each school entity in Pennsylvania – including school districts, intermediate units, area career and technical centers and charter schools - to submit a Professional Education plan to PDE. The Professional Education Plan sets out each district’s strategy for training school personnel at all stages of their careers. School districts are required to examine their student-level data, establish their professional education goals from the data, design an action plan with activities that meet their identified needs, and then evaluate the effectiveness of the training. Additionally, PDE is developing enhanced professional education guidelines that will require districts with teachers who are not highly qualified to use the districts’ professional development programs to achieve the 100% HQT goal. PDE plans to issue the new guidelines during the 2006-07 school year.

Further, throughout their careers, all certified educators are required to complete 180 hours of professional development that is related to an area of the professional educator’s assignment or certification and, if the educator is employed by a school
entity, complies with their school entity’s plan every five years. The 180-hour requirement can be met with six college credits, six credits of continuing professional education courses, 180 clock hours of continuing professional education, or any combination of collegiate studies, continuing professional education courses or other programs, activities or learning experiences equivalent to 180 hours. For the purposes of calculating hours and credits, one credit of collegiate study or continuing professional education course is equivalent to 30 hours of continuing professional education.

Governor’s Institutes
PDE also provides direct professional education, including week-long intensive summer institutes and academies including the Governor’s Institutes and the Governor’s Academy on Urban Learning Education (see above, Requirement 3). The 2006 Pennsylvania Governor’s Institutes for Educators are part of a series of summer professional education programs sponsored by the Pennsylvania Department of Education that are designed to insure the creation of challenging learning environments in the Commonwealth’s public, private and non-public schools. Each of the institutes provides an intellectually rigorous program of study that will improve academic classrooms and thereby assist educators in improving their students’ academic achievement. The programs are rich with opportunities to deepen subject area knowledge and include real-world experiences that help educators make the link to the Pennsylvania Academic Standards, reading and math (anchors), classroom assessments and technologies. Annually, approximately 3700 educators from across the state participate in the Governor’s Institutes.

Professional Development Schools: Universities and school districts throughout Pennsylvania have partnered to establish 73 professional development schools. These schools provide longer and more in-depth clinical experiences for teacher education candidates, provide opportunities for on-site teaching of university courses in PK-12 schools, and offer more focused professional development opportunities for current teachers. The teacher preparing universities and professional development schools are located across the Commonwealth.

On-line Professional Development
PDE provides an Online Pennsylvania Education Network (OPEN). Currently, there are 31 courses available at no cost to Pennsylvania educators, and OPEN is working on offering cohort-based courses requiring the integration of content with practice in teachers’ own classrooms.

G. Specialized Knowledge and Skills
As noted above, Pennsylvania is engaged in the comprehensive revision of its teacher preparation and certification requirements to ensure that all teachers are fully prepared to effectively teach all students. Additionally, experienced teachers may access various high quality professional development opportunities to develop
specialized knowledge and skills to serve students in high poverty, low performing schools.

Reciprocity Agreements
PDE is reviewing its policies and practices regarding out of state candidates to remove any unnecessary hurdles that prevent or unnecessarily delay experienced and high quality teachers that are certified by other states from teaching in Pennsylvania. Specifically, PDE is planning to pursue a reciprocity agreement with Puerto Rico to meet the need for bi-lingual teachers in several high need districts and expects to have this in place during the 2006-07 school year.

H. Working Conditions
Pennsylvania is working to improve the working conditions in hard-to-staff schools through both the Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership Initiative and the Distinguished Educator Initiative.

Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership (PIL) Initiative
Recognizing the critical role that school leaders play in creating an environment that fosters effective teaching and learning, Pennsylvania has launched a statewide, standards-based professional development program for school principals and other leaders. The standards that guide this program are:

1. The leader has the knowledge and skills to think and plan strategically, creating an organizational vision around personalized student success.
2. The leader is grounded in standards-based systems theory and design and is able to transfer that knowledge to his/her job as the architect of standards-based reform in the school.
3. The leader knows how to access and use appropriate data to inform decision-making at all levels of the system.
4. The leader creates a culture of teaching and learning with an emphasis on learning.
5. The leader manages resources for effective results.
6. The leader collaborates, communicates, engages, and empowers others inside and outside of the organization to pursue excellence in learning.
7. The leader operates in a fair and equitable manner with personal and professional dignity.
8. The leader advocates for children and public education in the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
9. The leader supports professional growth of self and others through practice and inquiry.

This cohort-based program is available statewide through eight regional centers to all principals who are in their first three years of service. The curriculum is derived from the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL), a division of the National Center for Education and the Economy, and the classroom experience is followed
up with job-imbedded practices. Principals from high-poverty schools and schools in improvement are given a priority rating for selection into the program.

Six of the eight regional centers will also offer professional development programs based on these standards to more experienced principals and other school leaders in the 2006-2007 school year. It is expected that all eight regions will offer this extended training by the 2007-2008 school year.

**Pennsylvania’s Distinguished Educator Initiative**

The Distinguished Educator Initiative is one component of the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s efforts to provide support and targeted assistance to struggling districts.

Distinguished Educators work as part of a team, providing their expertise to assist struggling districts in identifying instructional or systemic barriers and critical gaps to improving student achievement, and then work alongside the district’s staff to overcome the barriers and fill the gaps. Participating districts are struggling academically, but demonstrate a clear readiness to receive technical assistance.

Distinguished Educators are current or retired administrators, teachers, specialists and consultants with a wide range of experience and expertise. They are chosen to serve in one of two capacities: as full-time members of a core Distinguished Educator team focused on instructional leadership and/or curriculum, or as specialists that provide specific assistance in more targeted areas of need. Core team members consist of full-time experts in leadership and/or curriculum who have demonstrated abilities in the following areas:

- **Strategic Planning.** Expertise in district/school improvement planning, with experience in writing, implementing and/or evaluating districts/schools.
- **District Leadership.** Expertise in district-level leadership, district/school governance, school boards, capacity-building.
- **School Leadership.** Expertise in school-level leadership, including school governance, instructional leadership, and “artful use of infrastructure.” Leadership may specialize in early childhood/elementary or secondary.
- **Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment.** Expertise in quality teaching, including curriculum, assessment, and instruction as a system, as well as in the classroom.
- **Math and/or Literacy.** Expertise in quality teaching using research-based strategies and programs in math and/or literacy.

Distinguished Educator specialists are called upon to provide specialized assistance in targeted areas. Specialty team members may work part-time, or may be employed full-time and support a number of core teams across the state. Areas of specialty include:

- **Budget and Finance.** Expertise in district/school budgets.
Special education and/or ESL. Expertise in instruction and regulatory issues for students with disabilities and/or English Language Learners.

Parent and Community. Expertise in assessing public will, and building connections with parents and community.

Human Resources. Expertise in all aspects of personnel, including union relations.

Communications. Expertise in communicating with and through the media.

Technology. Expertise in using technology for operations and instruction.

Safe Schools. Expertise in school safety, discipline and order for learning.

Professional Development. Expertise in research-based professional development.

Student Services. Expertise in mental health, drug and alcohol prevention, migrant education, federal programs, among others.

The Distinguished Educator role is flexible in order to meet the unique needs of different districts, schools and students. While in one school system the Distinguished Educator may serve as a coach/mentor, in another district, he or she may drive more prescriptive solutions if that school or district is not showing adequate improvement in student achievement after a given amount of time. Additionally, Distinguished Educators provide feedback to enable their experience to form policy and regulations at the state level.

PDE provides Distinguished Educators the tools they need to provide targeted support that is structured to meet the needs of an individual district. Distinguished Educators receive a comprehensive status report of their assigned districts, with data on student achievement, district finances, and the various supports already in place in the district, to begin their work with district stakeholders. Team members are asked to make a two-year commitment to this work, to ensure that districts receive the consistent support that is critical to district-wide improvement.

During the 2005-06 school year, Distinguished Educators served 15 school districts and PDE plans to expand the program to additional districts in 2006-07 and beyond.

Monitoring Equitable Teacher Assignments
Pennsylvania recognizes that in order to achieve the goal of 100% HQT in all local educational agencies/school districts in the Commonwealth, PDE must do more then provide districts with targeted support. We must ensure that all districts are adequately monitored related to equitable teacher assignments and Highly Qualified Teacher requirements.

To that end, PDE provides technical assistance to LEAs in successfully completing their HQT plans, prior to the implementation of any statutorily
required improvement plan. When large groups of teachers are not highly qualified, PDE provides this assistance through the PDE Federal Programs Annual Conference, Regional Meetings and Workshops held each year throughout the Commonwealth.

Furthermore, during the 2006-07 school year, PDE will expand its direct technical assistance to high need districts as relates to their HQT plans by meeting individually with district officials and providing specific information and resources on how each district can address its specific HQT needs. PDE will identify and review with the district officials a list of all non-HQTs with particular regard to hard-to-staff class assignments and hard-to-staff schools and will further assist districts with staff assignment and with appropriate staff development to move teachers to HQT status. During the 2005-06 school year, PDE began this focused technical assistance with select high poverty districts.

All LEAs in Pennsylvania must report annually to PDE the total number of teachers meeting the highly qualified status. LEAs not meeting the 100% requirement must set aside 5% of their Title I allocation for professional development necessary for teachers to meet highly qualified standards. Additionally, PDE continues to encourage LEA’s to use their Title II A, Title V and remaining Title I funds to support the highly qualified teachers goals of the LEA.

Those Title I schools not making AYP are required to set aside at least 10% of their Title I allocation for professional development. LEAs must target funds to schools that have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers, have the largest average class size, or are identified for School Improvement. PDE monitors LEAs to ensure that they are in compliance with these requirements.

LEAs and schools not making AYP must develop school improvement plans that address the academic needs of students. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has developed a comprehensive school improvement framework for schools and LEAs to utilize when developing plans. This framework, called “Getting Results,” requires schools and LEAs to consider areas such as Quality Teaching, Quality Leadership, Artful Use of Infrastructure, and Continuous Learning Ethic when developing school improvement plans. When looking through these four lenses, schools are required to support teachers in receiving the training and professional development needed to ensure they meet not only highly qualified standards, but also the needs of their students. Funds from state, local and federal sources are used to support these plans. The “Getting Results” framework for School Improvement may be accessed on the PDE website at www.pde.state.pa.us.

PDE also examines the issue of equitable teacher assignment when it monitors LEAs. PDE monitors all school districts once every three years to ensure that they have developed HQT plans, have highly qualified teachers at each school and to ensure that teachers receive high quality professional development to
enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers. During this on-site monitoring, the department examines district strategies to attract high quality teachers to their schools. The department pays particular attention to how high needs districts attract HQT and retain experienced professional teachers. PDE also examines each district’s professional development activities to ensure that they are used as part of a broader strategy to eliminate the achievement gap that separates low-income and minority students from other students. PDE uses the Consolidated Program Review Instrument to ensure that districts hire highly qualified Title I Teachers and hire highly qualified teachers to reduce class size.

By December 31, 2006. PDE plans to review and revise its consolidated application and program review documents to ensure that all school districts who have not met the HQT requirements:

- provide a clear explanation as to why the district did not meet the HQT;
- identify subgroups of teachers particularly challenged to meet the HQT requirements;
- identify specific actions that will be taken by the district to meet the HQT requirements and to ensure the equitable distribution of experienced and HQT teachers within the district’s schools;
- demonstrate how they will use their federal funds to meet the HQT requirements; and
- explain how that planned use of federal funds is tied to increasing student achievement.

Throughout the 2006-07 school year, PDE will convene new working groups to continue to review and measure the effectiveness of the HQT equity plan. PDE will encourage participation from all members of Pennsylvania’s educational community with special emphasis on participation from parents and advocates from low income and traditionally under-served communities.
### APPENDIX A

**Pennsylvania Department of Education**

**Consolidated State Performance Report**

**2004-05 HQT Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Total Number of Core Academic Classes*</th>
<th>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Schools in State</td>
<td>107,749</td>
<td>105,292</td>
<td>97.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Poverty Schools</td>
<td>11,964</td>
<td>11,565</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Poverty Schools</td>
<td>12,098</td>
<td>12,074</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Elementary Schools</td>
<td>54,211</td>
<td>53,789</td>
<td>99.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Poverty Schools</td>
<td>10,491</td>
<td>9,312</td>
<td>88.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Poverty Schools</td>
<td>17,037</td>
<td>16,847</td>
<td>98.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Secondary Schools</td>
<td>53,411</td>
<td>51,379</td>
<td>96.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note – All Pennsylvania data is reported by the first, second and third assignment that each teacher performs. Ninety-seven percent of all teachers in Pennsylvania instruct in a single (first) assignment area.*