

An Update to Virginia's Teacher Equity Plan

December 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Section 1: Progress Toward Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution	2
<i>A: Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers Relative to Poverty</i>	2
<i>B: Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers Relative to Minority Status</i>	4
<i>C: Distribution of Teachers Relative to Experience</i>	5
<i>D: Distribution of Effective Teachers According to AYP Performance</i>	5
<i>E: Identification of Hard-to-Staff Schools</i>	8
<i>F: Distribution of Teachers by State Superintendent's Regions</i>	10
<i>G: Areas of Critical Teacher Shortages</i>	11
<i>H: Regional Analysis of HQT Distribution by Content Areas</i>	11
Section 2: How Virginia Works with School Divisions Not Meeting the 100 Percent Highly Qualified Teacher Goal	12
<i>A: State Monitoring of School Division Compliance and Implementation</i>	12
<i>B. Provision for Technical Assistance or Corrective Actions to School Divisions that Fail to Meet HQT and AYP Goals</i>	13
Section 3: State Equity Plan - Goals and Steps	14

INTRODUCTION

Providing a highly qualified and effective teacher in every classroom is an integral component of Virginia's plan to ensure all children receive a high-quality education. Inherent in Virginia's education plan is the commitment to: 1) address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between high and low-poverty schools, and 2) ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.

Recognizing the critical role that teacher quality plays in ensuring a high-quality education for all students, Virginia has developed and implemented a wide range of targeted activities designed to address three key strategies. The activities focus on ensuring that all children, particularly those in high needs schools, are taught by highly qualified, effective teachers. Many of these activities were outlined in Virginia's State Equity Plan that was submitted to and approved by the United States Department of Education (USED) in 2006. The plan included numerous examples to ensure the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers across the state. Activities in the original plan and the updated plan have been organized around the following six categories: 1) data and reporting systems; 2) teacher preparation and out-of-field strategies; 3) recruitment and retention strategies; 4) professional development and specialized skills; 5) improving working conditions; and 6) policy coherence. By implementing and refining the strategies and activities outlined in the plan, Virginia continues to achieve success in ensuring that all students, particularly those in high-poverty or high-minority schools, have access to highly qualified and effective teachers. This document addresses the progress that has been made since the time that the original plan was posted and provides descriptions of additional strategies and activities that have been implemented since that time.

Below are the three goals of Virginia's updated equity plan:

GOAL 1: Meet the federal benchmark of 100 percent of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers;

GOAL 2: Ensure that poor and minority students are not being taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers; and

GOAL 3: Improve teacher effectiveness to ensure that all children are being taught by effective teachers.

SECTION I - Progress Toward Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

A. Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers Relative to Poverty

1) Closing the gap

The table below shows the progress Virginia has made in increasing the number of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers at the elementary and secondary levels in high-poverty schools over the last three years. The percentage of core academic classes being taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools at the elementary level has increased from 96.6 percent in 2005-2006 to 98.0 percent in 2008-2009. The percentage of core academic classes being taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools at the secondary level has increased from 93.9 percent in 2006-2007 to 95.9 percent in 2008-2009. The table below also shows that the gap in the number of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty elementary schools compared to low-poverty elementary schools has narrowed each year from 2006-2007 to 2008-2009. At the secondary level, the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools has either decreased or remained constant each year, and has increased each year in low-poverty schools. The gap in the number of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high and low-poverty secondary schools dropped by 1.6 points from 2006-07 to 2007-08, but increased slightly from 3 points to 3.2 points in 2008-09.

Table 1.1

<i>Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in High and Low-Poverty Schools* from 2006-2007 to 2008-2009</i>			
School Type	HQT Percentage 2006-2007	HQT Percentage 2007-2008	HQT Percentage 2008-2009
All Schools in the State	96.8	97.9	98.4
High-Poverty Elementary Schools	96.6	97.5	98.0
Low-Poverty Elementary Schools	98.5	98.7	99.1
Gap Between High and Low-Poverty Elementary Schools	1.9	1.2	1.1
High-Poverty Secondary Schools	93.5	95.9	95.9
Low-Poverty Secondary Schools	98.1	98.9	99.1
Gap Between High and Low-Poverty Secondary Schools	4.6	3.0	3.2

* High-poverty schools are defined as those in the top quartile of poverty based on Free and Reduced Lunch data as reported in the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Low-poverty schools are defined as those in the bottom quartile for poverty. Quartile breaks for each year are:

	<i>High-poverty elementary</i>	<i>Low-poverty elementary</i>	<i>High-poverty secondary</i>	<i>Low-poverty secondary</i>
2006-2007	Greater than 59.2	Less than 21.7	Greater than 47.9	Less than 18.7
2007-2008	Greater than 58.4	Less than 21.8	Greater than 48.4	Less than 18.7
2008-2009	Greater than 60.1	Less than 22.4	Greater than 50.3	Less than 20.3

2) Progress Toward the 100 percent goal - statewide results

The data in Table 1.1 provide evidence that the state is making annual progress toward the goal of 100 percent of classes taught by highly qualified teachers (HQT), increasing from 96.8 percent in 2006-07 to 98.4 percent in 2008-09. At the elementary level, progress has been made in both high-poverty and low-poverty schools. At the secondary level, progress has been made each year in low-poverty schools, and rates have either increased or remained constant in high-poverty schools.

3) Progress Toward the 100 percent goal - school division results

Table 1.2 shows the progress made by divisions toward the 100 percent HQT goal since 2006-2007. For 2008-2009, 12 school divisions met the goal of 100 percent of their classes taught by highly qualified teachers. Ninety-six (96) school divisions are within five percentage points of meeting the goal.

Table 1.2

Progress of School Divisions Toward 100 Percent HQT Goal				
	Number of divisions meeting 100 percent HQT	Number of divisions from 95-100 percent	Number of divisions from 90-95 percent	Number of divisions Below 90 percent HQT
2006-2007	9	84	27	12
2007-2008	16	94	17	5
2008-2009	12	96	21	3

4) Progress Toward the 100 percent goal - individual school results

Table 1.3 shows the progress that individual schools across the state have made toward the 100 percent highly qualified teacher goal. There has been a significant increase in the number and percentage of schools reaching the 100 percent goal, and a steady decrease in the number and percentage of schools reporting less than 90 percent HQT. Additional analysis indicates that, of the 57 schools reporting fewer than 90 percent HQT, most were located in rural school divisions. Ten (10) schools were in urban settings with the remaining 14 located in suburban areas.

Table 1.3

Progress of Individual Schools Toward 100 Percent HQT Goal				
	Number and percent of schools meeting 100 percent HQT	Number and percent of schools from 95-100 percent	Number and percent of schools from 90-95 percent	Number and percent of schools below 90 percent HQT
2006-2007	48.2% (860 schools)	33.2% (610 schools)	12.0% (215 schools)	6.6% (109 schools)
2007-2008	58.0% (1039 schools)	28.8% (532 schools)	9.6% (175 schools)	3.7% (61 schools)
2008-2009	62.0% (1129 schools)	28.4% (530 schools)	6.2% (113 schools)	3.4% (57 schools)

B. Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers Relative to Minority Status

Table 1.4 shows the number of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-minority schools has increased over the past two years. Additionally, the gap between classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-minority schools, compared to classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-minority schools, has decreased.

Table 1.4

Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in High and Low-Minority Schools* from 2006-2007 to 2008-2009			
School Type	HQT Percentage 2006-2007	HQT Percentage 2007-2008	HQT Percentage 2008-2009
All Schools in the State	96.8	97.9	98.4
High-Minority Schools	95.9	97.2	97.7
Low-Minority Schools	98.1	98.8	99.1
Gap Between High and Low-minority Schools	2.3	1.6	1.4

* High-minority schools are defined as those in the top quartile for minority status. Low-minority schools are defined as those in the bottom quartile for minority status. Quartile breaks for each year were:

- 2006-2007: High-minority - greater than 59.9 percent;
Low-minority - less than 16.7 percent
- 2007-2008: High-minority - greater than 60.3 percent;
Low-minority - less than 17.2 percent
- 2008-2009: High-minority - greater than 64.1 percent;
Low-minority - less than 17.4 percent

C. Distribution of Teachers Relative to Experience

Data presented in Table 1.5 below indicate the following:

- Statewide, the distribution of teachers according to experience is approximately 25 percent inexperienced teachers (less than three years), 30 percent of moderately experienced teachers (four-ten years); and 45 percent veteran teachers (over ten years).
- The percentage of inexperienced teachers has decreased in both high-poverty and low-poverty schools over the past three years.
- Low-minority schools have a greater percentage of veteran teachers and a relatively lower percentage of inexperienced teachers.
- The gap between the percentage of inexperienced teachers in high and low-minority schools has decreased each over the past three years.

Table 1.5

<i>Comparison of High and Low-Poverty and Minority Schools Related to Teacher Experience 2006-2008</i>									
School Type	Percentage of Inexperienced Teachers (three years or less)			Percentage of Moderately Experienced Teachers (four to ten years)			Percentage of Veteran Teachers (ten years or more)		
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
Statewide	24.8	24.6	23.5	29.7	29.7	30.8	45.7	45.7	46.1
All schools	24.8	24.6	23.5	29.7	29.7	30.8	45.7	45.7	46.1
High-poverty	27.9	27.8	27.0	28.7	28.8	30.0	43.3	43.4	43.0
Low-poverty	23.2	23.1	21.4	31.0	31.0	32.1	45.9	45.9	46.5
Gap	4.7	4.7	5.6	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.5	2.5	3.5
High-minority	28.9	28.9	27.5	31.4	31.5	33.0	39.7	39.6	39.6
Low-minority	21.1	21.3	20.1	27.1	27.1	28.0	51.8	51.5	52.0
Gap	7.8	7.5	7.4	4.3	4.4	5.0	12.1	11.9	12.4

D. Distribution of Effective Teachers According to AYP Performance

In Virginia, teacher and principal evaluation systems are developed by the local school division, with approval by the school board, according to guidelines established by the Board of Education. The Code of Virginia requires that instructional personnel who have achieved continuing contract status receive formal evaluations no less than once every three years. Further, the evaluation of instructional personnel must be based, in part, on student academic progress and school gains in student learning. To date, data from these evaluations are kept on file in each school division and have not been collected by the SEA.

Virginia has developed a plan to enable the collection of teacher and principal performance data to include the following elements in order to determine and report on the distribution of effective personnel:

For each school division

- A description of the system used to evaluate teachers;
- A description of the system used to evaluate principals;
- An indication of whether the systems used to evaluate teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion;
- An indication of whether the systems used to evaluate principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion;
- The number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level; and
- The number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

For each school

- The number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Until these data become available, school Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) performance data have been used as a proxy for estimating effectiveness of the teachers by school and division, as well as the means for examining teacher distribution trends. Table 1.6 on the next page provides data regarding AYP performance based on poverty, minority status, teacher experience, and HQT distribution. To measure the effect of experience factors, AYP pass rates of schools with staffs having higher than the state average percentages of teachers at each experience ranking were examined. For example, on average, a school in Virginia is staffed with 25 percent inexperienced teachers (less than three years); 30 percent moderately experienced teachers (four to ten years); and 45 percent veteran teachers (greater than ten years). Therefore, by identifying schools that had greater than 25 percent inexperienced teachers on the staff, and then examining average AYP performance in these schools and comparing results against those schools having greater proportions of moderately experienced and veteran teachers may indicate the effect of teacher experience on student performance.

Table 1.6

Comparison of Schools According to AYP Performance			
School Type	Percentage of Schools Making AYP Targets		
Statewide	2006	2007	2008
Poverty Status			
All schools	72.8	74.2	72.0
High-poverty	69.8	63.1	64.4
Low-poverty	81.3	85.2	85.7
Gap between high and low-poverty schools	11.5	22.1	21.3
Minority Status			
High-minority	62.6	63.1	64.6
Low-minority	86.7	85.1	81.5
Gap between high and low-minority schools	24.2	22.0	16.9
Experience			
Schools with greater than 25 percent inexperienced teachers (0-3 years)	67.9	70.4	68.4
Schools with greater than 30 percent moderately experienced teachers (4-10 years)	71.2	75.9	70.9
Schools with greater than 45 percent veteran teachers (over 10 years)	79.2	79.4	73.8
HQT Distribution			
100 percent HQT	81.5	81.6	77.0
95-99 percent HQT	69.2	69.7	64.9
90-95 percent HQT	65.1	60.6	63.7
Below 90 percent HQT	64.2	52.5	54.4

Findings from data presented in Table 1.6 indicate the following:

- A gap exists between high and low-poverty schools as measured by the percentage of schools meeting AYP targets each year.
- While high-minority schools have met AYP targets each year at lower rates than low-minority schools, the percentage of high-minority schools making AYP has increased each year and the gap has decreased from 24.2 percent in 2006-2007 to 16.9 percent in 2008-2009.
- Schools with higher than average percentages of veteran teachers meet AYP targets at a higher rate than lesser experienced staffs. In 2008-2009, 73.8 percent of schools with greater than 45 percent veteran teachers made AYP, compared with 68.4 percent of schools with greater than 25 percent inexperienced teachers. The gap between the percentage of schools making AYP with greater than the state average of 25 percent inexperienced teachers and schools with greater than

the state average of 45 percent veteran teachers has decreased from 11.3 percent in 2006-2007 to 5.4 percent in 2008-2009.

E. Identification of Hard-to-Staff Schools

Recognizing that staffing schools with effective teachers is a key component to successful student performance, Virginia identifies hard-to-staff schools on an annual basis that meet at least four of the following criteria:

- Accredited with warning;
- Average daily attendance is 2.00 percentage points below the statewide average;
- Percent of special education students exceeds 150 percent of the statewide average;
- Percent of limited English proficient students exceeds 150 percent of the statewide average;
- Percent of teachers with provisional licenses exceeds 150 percent of the statewide average;
- Percent of special education teachers with conditional licenses exceeds 150 percent of the statewide average;
- Percent of inexperienced teachers hired to total teachers exceeds 150 percent of the statewide average; and
- One or more inexperienced teachers in a critical shortage area.

In 2008-2009, there were 203 schools designated as hard-to-staff, representing 62 school divisions in the state. Specialized programs such as the Hard-to-Staff Mentoring Program and the Virginia Middle School Mathematics Teacher Corps have been instituted to provide additional support to these schools.

Table 1.7

Demographic Comparison of Hard-to-Staff Schools and Other Schools in the State		
Percent of schools that are:	All Schools In State	Hard-to-Staff Schools
High-Poverty	25.0	46.2
Low-Poverty	25.0	12.6
High-Minority	25.0	52.0
Low-Minority	25.0	10.1
BOTH High-Poverty and High-Minority	14.6	33.7

Findings from data presented in Table 1.7 indicate the following:

- Hard-to-staff (HTS) schools have higher percentages of students from poverty and higher percentages of high-minority schools, compared with other schools in the state.
- 46.2 percent of hard-to-staff schools are classified as high-poverty.
- 52 percent of hard-to-staff schools are classified as high-minority.
- Over twice as many hard-to-staff schools are classified as **both** high-poverty and high-minority as other schools in the state.

Data from hard-to staff schools were analyzed and compared with high-poverty, high-minority, and all other schools in the state related to AYP performance, distribution of teachers by experience and distribution of highly qualified teachers. These data are outlined in Table 1.8 below.

Table 1.8

Student Performance and Teacher Distribution Comparison Table for 2008-2009				
	All Schools In Virginia	Hard-to-Staff Schools	High-Poverty Schools	High-Minority Schools
Percentage of Schools Making AYP	72.0	40.4	64.4	64.6
Percentage of Inexperienced Teachers (less than three years)	23.5	33.1	27.0	27.5
Percentage of Moderately Experienced Teachers (4-10 years)	30.8	31.7	30.0	33.0
Percent of Experienced Teachers (more than 10 years)	46.1	35.2	43.0	39.6
Percent of Schools with 100 Percent HQT	62.0	36.9	33.7	35.0
Percent of Schools from 95-99 percent HQT	28.4	37.9	33.7	39.8
Percent of Schools from 90-95 percent HQT	6.2	14.6	17.4	16.5
Percent of Schools with less than 90 percent HQT	3.4	10.6	15.2	8.7

Findings from data presented in Table 1.8 indicate the following:

- A lower percentage of hard-to-staff schools made AYP compared with high-poverty, high-minority, or other schools in the state. There is a 20 point gap between AYP performance in hard-to-staff schools and high-poverty schools, and a 31.6 point gap between hard-to-staff schools and other schools in the state.
- Hard-to-staff schools have a higher percentage of inexperienced teachers, compared with high-poverty, high-minority, or other schools in the state. There is a 10 point gap between hard-to-staff schools and other schools in the state, and a 6.1 point gap between hard-to-staff schools and high-poverty schools.
- Hard-to-staff schools have a lower percentage of veteran teachers, compared with high-poverty, high-minority, or other schools in the state.
- High-poverty and hard-to-staff schools have the highest percentages of schools with fewer than 90 percent highly qualified teachers.

F. Distribution of Teachers by State Superintendents' Regions

Virginia has eight designated superintendents' regions. These are geographic designations, and each region includes multiple school divisions. Data have been analyzed to determine areas of need so that priority assistance can be targeted based on that need. The chart below shows the differences between schools in each of the regions in the following six categories: 1) percentage of high-poverty schools; 2) percentage of minority students; 3) percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers; 4) percentage of inexperienced teachers (less than three years experience); 5) percentage of schools making AYP; and 6) percentage of schools classified as hard-to-staff.

Table 1.9

<i>Statewide Comparison of Teacher Quality and Performance Targets by Superintendents' Regions for 2008-2009</i>						
	Percent of High-Poverty Schools	Percent of Minority Students	Percent of Classes Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers	Percent of Inexperienced Teachers (less than three years)	Percent of Schools Making AYP	Percent of Hard-to-Staff Schools
State	25.0	43.6	98.4	23.5	72.0	10.6
Region I	32.0	51.9	98.0	25.5	77.7	15.0
Region II	32.8	55.1	98.8	20.4	65.6	7.6
Region III	12.8	41.6	96.8	24.7	69.8	13.3
Region IV	9.7	47.3	98.2	25.1	68.5	15.2
Region V	16.1	25.9	99.1	21.5	66.8	2.9
Region VI	32.4	28.5	98.2	21.1	74.3	4.9
Region VII	35.9	5.3	98.8	20.7	81.4	8.8
Region VIII	57.8	51.8	95.5	24.1	67.7	17.2

By analyzing the data by region according to the elements shown in Table 1.7 above, the state is able to target technical assistance geographically. Region VIII was identified as the region of highest need with variances in all indicators related to distribution of teachers from 2008-2009 data. The region consists primarily of rural, high-poverty school divisions. This region has the lowest average HQT percentage. Regions with the lowest percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers are Regions III and VIII. Regions with the lowest percentage of schools meeting AYP targets were Regions II and V. Regions with the highest percentage of inexperienced teachers were Regions I and IV. Regions with the highest percentage of hard-to-staff schools were Regions VIII, IV, and I.

G. Areas of Critical Teacher Shortages

According to the 2008-2009 critical shortage area survey, the following teaching areas comprised the top 10 critical shortage teaching areas in Virginia:

- 1) Special Education;
- 2) Speech-language disorders PreK-12;
- 3) Mathematics Grades 6-12;
- 4) English as a Second Language;
- 5) Foreign Languages (Spanish preK-12; Latin preK-12);
- 6) Elementary Education preK-6;
- 7) Science Grades 6-12;
- 8) Mathematics (Algebra I);
- 9) Reading Specialist; and
- 10) Career and Technical Education

Virginia has implemented numerous initiatives to address these critical needs. Examples of such initiatives include Mathematics-Science Partnership programs, Virginia Teaching Scholarships, and specialized core content academies, with particular emphasis or priority given to school divisions with critical needs.

H. Regional Analysis of HQT Distribution by Content Area

An analysis was conducted to determine if content area needs were consistent among all superintendent's regions of the state or whether there were variations according to geographic area. The results are included below in Table 1.10.

Table 1.10

Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers by Content Area and Superintendent's Region for 2008-2009									
	Statewide	Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV	Region V	Region VI	Region VII	Region VIII
Kindergarten	99.2	99.4	99.1	96.8	98.0	99.2	99.3	99.2	97.2
Grade 1	99.4	99.0	99.3	97.3	98.6	99.3	99.8	99.8	94.4
Grade 2	99.2	98.3	97.0	95.9	98.7	99.4	98.4	99.5	99.2
Grade 3	99.4	99.3	99.4	95.2	98.5	100.0	99.3	99.5	99.4
Grade 4	99.3	99.5	99.4	96.8	98.2	99.6	99.3	99.8	97.5
Grade 5	99.0	99.3	98.6	95.7	98.7	98.9	98.6	99.5	97.3
Grade 6	99.2	91.7	98.1	97.8	99.3	100.0	100.0	99.4	98.0
Grade 7	98.1	n/a	82.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.4	99.0	100.0
Reading	99.0	96.6	99.1	97.4	98.4	99.9	97.9	99.4	92.7
English	99.9	99.2	99.7	98.8	99.4	99.9	96.9	99.2	97.4
Mathematics	97.9	97.5	97.9	96.4	97.8	98.6	96.9	97.4	90.8
Science	97.8	98.1	97.5	96.6	98.2	98.2	95.8	95.2	87.1
History/Social Science	99.0	98.5	99.3	97.4	98.2	98.7	98.7	99.0	95.8
Special Education	97.8	98.3	97.2	97.9	97.8	97.7	97.6	98.5	96.8
Foreign Language	99.2	99.8	99.4	95.3	99.2	99.4	99.5	98.2	87.5
Art	99.7	99.7	99.4	100.0	99.5	99.4	100.0	100	100.0
Music	99.6	99.4	99.0	97.6	99.6	99.5	99.9	99.7	98.8

Findings from data presented in Table 1.10 indicate the following:

- At the statewide level, science, mathematics, and special education were the content areas with the largest numbers of classes taught by non-highly qualified teachers.
- For Grade 5 and History/Social Science, six regions reported less than the state average of HQT for each of these content areas.
- The lowest HQT percentages were reported in the areas of science and foreign language in Region VIII and Grade 7 in Regions II and VI.
- Region III reported less than the state average in 14 out of 17 content areas. Region VIII reported less than the state average in 12 out of 14 content areas.

SECTION II - How Virginia Is Working with School Divisions Not Meeting the Goal of 100 Percent HQT

A. State Monitoring of School Division Compliance and Implementation

Virginia monitors compliance with school divisions' HQT plans in the following ways:

- *Instructional Personnel and Licensure Report (IPAL)* – Each school division submits data on an annual basis that outlines the qualifications of each teacher. Reports are created that provide a detailed analysis for each school division and school that list all teachers who are not highly qualified, their current assignments and areas of endorsement, and the reasons why they are not highly qualified. Designated personnel in each division are able to access these reports through a secure internet connection. Additionally, the Virginia Department of Education provides a hard-copy of a verified report for each school division superintendent on an annual basis to assist with program planning and targeting of funds for the next year.
- *Annual Grant Applications for NCLB Funding* - Each school division submits an annual application for federal funds, including Title II, Part A. Within the application, school divisions indicate the current number of classes being taught by non-highly qualified teachers. In addition, strategies are outlined to meet the goal of 100 percent of classes taught by highly qualified teachers. Applications are denied, and funds are withheld until each school division has provided its plan related to attaining the HQT goal.
- *Title II, Part A, Federal Program Monitoring* - Title II, Part A, programs receive formal desk or on-site reviews to evaluate plan progress on an eight-year cycle. The monitoring protocol document is available at the following link:
<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Instruction/comp.html>
- *Monitoring Percentage of Teachers Receiving High Quality Professional Development*
 - School divisions indicate the percentages of teachers each year who have participated in high quality professional development when they submit their annual instructional personnel data. This information is included in the IPAL report that is sent to division superintendents and available online to designated school division personnel.

- Professional development plans for each school division are reviewed through the Title II, Part A, application and federal program monitoring processes. Additionally, reimbursements for professional development activities are reviewed and approved by the program specialists for Title II, Part A.

B. Provisions for Technical Assistance or Corrective Actions to School Divisions that Fail to Meet the High Qualified Teacher and AYP Goals

The following activities are provided for school divisions that fail to meet HQT and AYP goals:

- Schools that do not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets are provided technical assistance according to the statewide system of support described at the following link on the Virginia Department of Education Web site:
<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.pdf>
- Schools not meeting HQT goals in any given year must outline a plan in their annual consolidated or individual Title II, Part A, application for federal funds including measurable objectives and specific strategies and funding sources for reaching this goal. The plan must be clearly delineated before the application is fully approved and funding is released.
- Divisions that have not met AYP for three consecutive years and have not made progress toward the 100 Percent HQT goal for three consecutive years (Section 2141(c)) must outline within their annual NCLB application a comprehensive plan for increasing HQT and meeting AYP. Use of Title II, Part A, funds must coordinate with activities and goals outlined in the application. Technical assistance is provided to divisions as they develop and implement these plans. Targeted Federal Program Monitoring for Title II, Part A, in identified school divisions is conducted with priority given to school divisions on the 2141(c) watch list and divisions with relatively low percentages of highly qualified teachers.

SECTION III: State Equity Plan - Goals and Steps

Virginia's Goals to Address Any Inequities in Teacher Distribution as Evidenced by Data Findings

Goals

GOAL 1: Meet the federal benchmark of 100 percent of classes being taught by highly qualified teachers.

Goal 1 Measure: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in schools relative to poverty, minority, experience, and AYP performance

Publicly Report Progress: Virginia's Top Ten Critical Shortage Areas; State Report Card, Local Report Cards, Teacher Equity Plan

SEA Monitoring:

- Provide divisions with annual detailed verification reports on percent of classes taught by highly qualified teachers
- Title II, Part A, Federal Program Monitoring
- Annual NCLB Applications for Funds
- Creation of Section 2141(c) watch list for divisions not making progress for three consecutive years on HQT and Division AYP targets.

GOAL 2: Ensure that poor and minority students are not being taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified and out-of-field teachers.

Goal 2 Measure: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Virginia's divisions/schools, particularly urban, rural, high-poverty, and low-achieving schools

Publicly Report Progress: State Report Card, Local Report Cards, Teacher Equity Plan

SEA Monitoring: Virginia's data and reporting systems track educator data over time for the purposes of analyzing supply and demand trends, demographics, distribution, and experience; and informing the development of policies to address any inequities in the distribution of teacher quality

GOAL 3: Improve teacher effectiveness to ensure that all children are taught by highly effective teachers.

Goal 3 Measure: Number and percentage of effective and highly effective teachers in Virginia's divisions/schools, particularly urban, rural, high-poverty, and low-achieving schools

Publicly Report Progress: State Fiscal Stabilization Report on Teacher and Principal Evaluation data; Teacher Equity Plan; State, division, and local report cards

SEA Monitoring: Track student performance data by division and school through student management system (EIMS); teacher and principal evaluation data will be collected and analyzed.

Virginia's Steps to Support and Ensure the Equitable Distribution of Highly Qualified and Effective Teachers

The table below outlines the steps that Virginia will take to continue work to assure the equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers. The steps are organized to reflect required elements in the Equity Plan submitted to USED in September 2006. Examples are provided of programs that are in place or are planned in order to address each of the areas. While Virginia has developed a host of programs designed to improve instruction in all schools, the activities listed in this table are examples of some that specifically address issues in high-needs schools. As data are evaluated on an ongoing basis to determine effectiveness of activities, particularly related to high-poverty and high-minority schools, adjustments will be made and additional activities will be developed.

Element 1: Data Systems		
	Steps To Be Taken	Examples of Strategies/Programs
1.1	Collect and report on the distribution of highly qualified teachers for elementary and secondary schools by poverty level.	1) Consolidated State Performance Report 2) Instructional Personnel and Licensure Report (IPAL) 3 State and Local Report Cards
1.2	Collect data on teachers' endorsements/licenses held and HQT status; Enable educators, parents and other stakeholders to review up-to-date information on the qualifications of teachers and administrators through a web-based data system.	1) Instructional Personnel and Licensure Report (IPAL) 2) Teacher Licensure Query
1.3	Monitor, on an ongoing basis, the specific staffing needs of Virginia's schools through the generation of data reports that identify subject area shortages.	Top Ten Critical Shortage Areas Report (Annual)
1.4	Improve data systems related to licensure to decrease turnaround time for processing licenses so that areas of shortage will be identified earlier.	Teacher Education and Licensure (TEAL I)
1.5	Utilize and continuously improve a web-based recruitment system that matches divisions' teaching vacancies with prospective teachers and administrators.	Teach Virginia
1.6	Develop data system that is able to link student achievement data to teacher and classroom data.	Educational Information Management System (EIMS)
1.7	Develop a data system to collect and report longitudinal teacher quality data, including information on teacher preparation programs, teacher retention and effectiveness, school and division factors, such as poverty and student diversity.	Virginia Improves Teaching and Learning (VITAL)
1.8	Collect data related to teacher salaries by school to identify disparities between high and low-poverty/minority schools.	School Salary Survey

Element 2: Teacher Preparation and Out of Field Teaching		
	Steps To Be Taken	Examples of Strategies/Programs to address each step
2.1	Revise licensure standards and ensure that these standards serve as the foundation for preparing all of Virginia's teachers.	Revised <i>Licensure Regulations for School Personnel</i> (adopted September, 2007)
2.2	Develop an annual report on the quality of teacher education in Virginia that provides data on passing rates and the number and specialization of teachers produced by each institution of higher education.	Annual Accountability Measurement of Partnerships and Collaborations for Approved Teacher Education Programs
2.3	Advocate for college loan forgiveness programs to channel prospective teachers toward schools that have difficulty attracting sufficient numbers of qualified teachers; Provide up-to-date information on available federal loan forgiveness programs to prospective students.	1) Virginia Teaching Scholarship Loan Program 2) Federal Loan Forgiveness program
2.4	Provide a variety of professional development opportunities for teachers to become highly qualified in targeted high-poverty school divisions.	1) Highly Qualified Teacher Scholarships (targeted to high-poverty divisions with low HQT) 2) Troops to Teachers
2.5	Provide a variety of professional development opportunities for teachers to become highly qualified in targeted critical shortage areas.	1) Special Education Regional Training Grants 2) Summer Content Area Academies for Special Education and Regular Education Teachers 3) Math-Science Partnership grants
2.6	Promote partnerships that help divisions recruit and hire qualified international teachers of hard-to-fill subjects and specializations.	Visiting International Faculty
2.7	Expand high quality alternate routes to licensure.	1) Career Switcher Program 2) Experiential Learning Credit
2.8	Provide assistance to divisions in developing "Grow-Your-Own" initiatives to identify and support promising individuals to go into the teaching field.	Teachers for Tomorrow

Element 3: Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers		
	Steps To Be Taken	Examples of Strategies/Programs
3.1	Require and fund high-quality mentoring programs for all new teachers, including those who enter the profession through alternative routes.	1) Virginia New Teacher Mentoring 2) Career Switcher Mentoring 3) Clinical Faculty Mentoring
3.2	Provide additional funding to support high quality mentoring programs in hard-to-staff schools.	Hard-to-Staff Mentoring
3.2	Provide incentives and specialized training to highly qualified, highly effective teachers to teach and provide support to other teachers in high-needs schools.	Virginia Middle School Mathematics Teacher Corps
3.3	Provide prioritized funding for teachers seeking National Board Certification in high-needs schools.	Prioritized Funding for National Board Certification
3.4	Provide assistance to school divisions in recruitment efforts through the development of web-based recruitment tools.	1) Teachers-Teachers.com 2) Teachers Rock Campaign 3) Teach-In Virginia Web site
Element 4: Professional Development and Specialized Training		
	Steps To Be Taken	Examples of Strategies/Programs
4.1	Provide targeted assistance to teachers in chronically low-performing schools and school divisions that focuses on the use of data to help identify achievement gaps and raise academic performance of all students.	1) Teacher Leader Training (required for divisions that have missed state accreditation or adequate yearly progress (AYP) for four years) 2) Adolescent Content Literacy Training 3) Classroom Management Course for new teachers in targeted schools 4) Inclusion Training for teachers in targeted schools
4.2	Provide targeted assistance to school divisions through regional service offices.	1) Region VIII No Child Left Behind Partnership 2) Technical Training and Assistance Centers (T/TAC) for special education
4.3	Develop professional development academies focused on teachers in critical shortage areas.	1) Regional Summer Content Academies 2) Become One (focused on special education)
4.4	Place mathematics specialists in high-needs middle schools.	Virginia Middle School Mathematics Teacher Corps
4.5	Provide professional development opportunities to address performance issues in high-needs schools.	1) CLIMBS Training 2) Mathematics and Science Partnership 3) SAHE Teacher Quality Activities 4) Response to Intervention Pilot Program

Element 5: Working Conditions		
	Steps To Be Taken	Examples of Strategies/Programs
5.1	Strengthen school leadership through the development and implementation of new principal standards.	1) Revised <i>Licensure Regulations for School Personnel</i> (adopted September, 2007) to include Level II, Principal of Distinction designation. 2) School Leaders Licensure Assessment
5.2	Strengthen school leadership through the development of mentoring and induction programs for new building level administrators.	Virginia Elementary Principal Mentoring Program
5.3	Require building administrators to demonstrate effective leadership skills through rigorous testing to obtain licensure.	School Leaders Licensure Assessment
5.4	Provide funding to school divisions to establish or improve leadership development programs based on leadership standards.	Virginia Leadership Grants through the General Assembly
5.5	Provide recognition to high-poverty, high-minority schools that significantly raise student achievement.	Title I Distinguished Schools Awards
Element 6: Policy Coherence		
	Steps To Be Taken	Examples of Strategies/Programs
6.1	Allow teachers to add endorsements by rigorous testing.	Revised <i>Licensure Regulations for School Personnel</i> (adopted September, 2007)
6.2	Encourage continual growth and career paths for classroom teachers through revised licensure regulations to include designations of Career Teacher, Mentor Teacher, and Teacher as Leader.	Revised <i>Licensure Regulations for School Personnel</i> (adopted September, 2007)
6.3	Require school divisions to outline progress of local equity plans to ensure equitable distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers between and within schools.	1) Title II, Part A, Federal Program Monitoring 2) Annual Application for Title II, Part A, Funds