2010-2011 NEVADA PLAN FOR EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS

Table of Contents

NCLB Requirements	**p. 2**
Definitions	**pp. 3, 4**
Nevada Policy Agenda for Teacher Quality	**pp. 4, 5**
Key Goals for Equitable Distribution of Teachers	**p. 6**
Key Strategies for Equitable Distribution of Teachers	**p. 7**
Continued Strategies and Sub-Strategies Listed by Supportive Elements	**pp. 8-15**
Key Strategy #1: Data Collection and Analysis of Data	**pp. 16-23**
Key Strategy #2: Provide Technical Assistance for District EDT Plans	**pp. 23-28**

NCLB Requirements

States

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

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

NCLB requires State plans to describe:

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

Districts

The statute calls for an assurance from LEAs [Section 1112(c)(1)(L)].
The LEA plan for federal funds must include an assurance to:

> "ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers."

Definitions

Meeting "highly qualified" teacher requirements: Teachers who teach core academic subjects must –

a. hold a Bachelor's degree

b. have a state teacher's license (or hold a license to teach in Nevada obtained through alternative routes to licensure), or meet the requirements set forth in the public charter school law.

c. demonstrate subject matter competency.

(Note: A teacher meeting the NCLB "highly qualified" teacher requirement does not necessarily equate to being a "highly effective" teacher.)

"Core academic subjects" means: English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [NCLB definition Title IX, Section 9101(11)].

"Arts" is defined in NAC as visual arts, music and theater.

"Social studies" is defined NRS as history, geography, economics and government.

"**Inexperience**" has been defined in Nevada as teachers with less than 3 years of experience.

"Out-of-field" teacher is defined by NCLB as a teacher who is teaching a core academic subject or a grade level for which the teacher does not meet the NCLB definition of "highly qualified". This includes teaching without a major, with only a minor -or- without any endorsement.

Nevada "High-Need Schools"

For purposes of "Equitable Distribution of Teachers" schools considered to be "high-need" in Nevada are defined as:

- high poverty (top quartile for 10-11 is more than 75% elementary and more than 57% secondary)
- and/or high minority (>50%)
- "in need of improvement" (have not met AYP targets for 2 or more years), with
- 20% or greater non-HQT
- and/or teachers with < 3 years of teaching experience

Nevada Policy Agenda for Teacher Quality

A broad range of national research demonstrates the importance of prepared, experienced and well-supported teachers and administrators to promote long-term school improvement and to close the achievement gap, both goals of NCLB and Nevada Senate Bill 1 of the 19th Special Session of the 2003 Nevada Legislature. Nevada Revised Statute 391.100 mirrors the requirements of NCLB regarding all core teachers meeting the "highly qualified" teacher (HQT) requirements by June 30, 2006. Nevada made a significant increase in regard to teachers meeting the NCLB "highly qualified" teachers requirement - from 68.1% as of the October 1, 2005 district "Contracted Educators Report" to 80.38% as of May 2006, 86.62% as of May 2007, 89.2% of classes taught by teachers meeting "highly qualified requirements" as of May 2008, 91.71% as of May 2009, 94.93% of classes taught by teachers meeting HQT requirements as of May 2010 and 94.94% as of May 2011. All districts have had a plan to get their teachers to meet the HQT requirements since 2003 which has been updated annually as needed as part of the Title II-A consolidated application supplement for federal funds.

In 1999 the Nevada State Legislature created a statewide network of Regional Professional Development Programs (RPDP). The RPDP created Nevada Professional Development Standards. Several task forces have been created to work on the issue of teacher quality including the Nevada National Governors Association Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of Teachers and the Teacher Quality Task Force to align teacher preparation, licensing and relicensing. The Education Reform Blue Ribbon Task Force Report http://www.nevadaracetothetop.org/resources.html (November 20, 2010) addressed "educator effectiveness" in one of the five core reform areas for "recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining great teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most". Phase One of "Nevada's Promise for excellence, rigor and equity" addressed submitting a grant application for Race to

the Top funds. While not selected as a recipient in this competition for education funds, Phase Two addressed education reform recommendations.

Nevada's Strategic Plan for PreK-12 Educational Excellence lists Strategic Priority #3: *Create and implement a comprehensive effectiveness system*. It states (Appendix 2), "Spurred by national and state reform, the 2011 legislative session yielded the passage of a number of changes to state statute with regard to expectations for teachers and administrators and the roles they play in supporting student success. These efforts included a mandate for Nevada to develop, rollout, and implement a uniform system of performance evaluation that includes measures of student achievement as a part of educators' evaluations. These efforts demand a reallocation of resources and a shift in priorities for ensuring that teachers and administrators are judged through the use of multiple measures that are valid and reliable, and that they receive the necessary systems of support to sustain or increase capacity to deliver effective, learner-centered instruction."

The fact that poor and minority students are least likely to have qualified, highly effective teachers and administrators is a major contributor to the achievement gap. It follows then that recruiting highly effective educators to low-performing schools, and providing high-quality professional learning opportunities to support them in being effective in their positions will pay off in terms of better student achievement and narrowing of the achievement gap.

Nevada Goals and Strategies – Equitable Distribution of Teachers

Nevada has a plan in place to ensure that poor and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.

The USDE Monitoring of the Title II-A "Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund" Program September 15-16, 2009 reported a **"**Commendation**:** The State is commended for its proactive actions on annually updating its equitable distribution plan and continuously revisiting its strategies to address staffing inequities."

Nevada's Key Goals for Equitable Distribution of Teachers as reflected in the State Improvement Plan

1. Increase the percentage of teachers who meet NCLB "highly qualified" requirements at high poverty and high minority schools by 2 percentage points and reduce the gap in equitable distribution of teachers who have met these requirements.
   10-11: While this HQ percentage was not met (high poverty 92% - same as 09-10 - and low poverty 94% - as compared to 95% 09-10; and at high minority schools increased by 1% from 91% to 92% and low minority stayed the same at 95%), the gap between high/low poverty and minority was reduced by 1%.

- *Publicly Report Progress*: Nevada Equity Plan http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability_NCLB.htm

- *Publicly Report Progress*: State Accountability Report http://www.nevadareportcard.com
  - Not Highly Qualified Teachers in Low and High Poverty Schools
  - Core Subject Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (by district, by school, by core subject)

2. Increase the percentage of teachers who have 3 years or more of teaching experience at high poverty and high minority schools by 2 percentage points and reduce the gap in equitable distribution of experienced teachers.
   10-11: This goal was met. The percentage of experienced teachers at high poverty schools increased by 5% (from 78% to 83%) and the gap between high/low poverty schools decreased by 1% (to 7%); and high minority schools increased by 6% from 79% to 85%, and the gap between high/low poverty schools decreased by 3% (to 6%).

- *Publicly Report Progress*: Nevada Equity Plan http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability_NCLB.htm

Nevada's Key Strategies for Equitable Distribution of Teachers

1. Continuously monitor teacher distribution through data collection and analyses of identified patterns, so that Nevada poor and minority students have equitable access to experienced teachers and teachers who have met "highly qualified" requirements who are effective in teaching students to needed levels of achievement.

- *Measure*: Percentage of teachers who have met NCLB "highly qualified" requirements and/or experienced teachers in high need schools (high poverty/high minority schools in need of improvement) versus schools with low poverty/low minority and not in need of improvement.

- *Publicly Report Progress*: Nevada Equity Plan

  http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability_NCLB.htm

2. Provide technical assistance to districts in designing, implementing and analyzing plans of action for focused district policies and practices based on theories of change to coherently address inequities in teacher assignment, and in response to targeting systemic issues involving "high need schools".

   The state and districts will coordinate efforts to:

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

Nevada's Continued Strategies and Sub-Strategies Listed by Supportive Elements

Some of the strategies from the EDT plans of the 2 largest districts are listed herein:
- Clark County School District (CCSD), which has 72% of Nevada teachers, and
- Washoe County School District (WCSD), which has 15% of Nevada teachers.

Framing questions are also provided for the state and districts to continue to target and refine strategies to remedy systemic needs of "high need schools" to ensure that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.

Overall questions: Considering the need to -

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

a. is each strategy specifically targeting systemic needs of EDT defined "high need schools", or designed to have probable success based on research on the distribution of "highly qualified"/experienced teachers who get student achievement results at high needs schools, versus a "strategy that is generic across all schools" like "promoting teacher National Board Certification"?
b. are resources leveraged with intensity and focus so that these strategies come together systemically via instructional leadership support, professional development etc. to ensure poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified or out-of field teachers at higher rates than are other children?

Element 1: Data and Reporting Systems

Question: Is the teacher data and reporting system adequately identifying the information that is needed to correct inequities in the distribution of quality teachers in high-poverty/high-minority schools versus low-poverty/low-minority schools?

1.1 Collect and publicly report data on the distribution of teacher quality.

1.2 Program data for data reports on equitable distribution of teachers.

2007 Update: The Department of Information Technology (DoIT) programmed data for data reports on equitable distribution of teachers provided by the NDE Office of Licensure.

2010 Update: Data reports on equitable distribution of teachers became part of the System of Accountability Information in Nevada (SAIN).

1.3 CCSD - Develop district databases to identify and analyze teacher distribution patterns.
Report data that describe patterns of teacher turnover and mobility, specifically in designated high-need schools.

WCSD - Develop district- and school-level databases to analyze teacher distribution patterns.

Element 2: Teacher Preparation

Question: What is the plan to build a pipeline of prospective teachers for high-poverty, low-performing schools?

2.1 08-09 The NDE contacted the Teach For America program providing teachers to Clark County School District requesting the program ensure their teachers placed in Title I schools meet the NCLB "highly qualified" teacher requirements before placement by taking the subject matter competency tests.

2.2 WCSD - Establish grow-your-own programs to encourage middle and high school students to pursue teaching careers in high-need schools.

Element 3: Out-of-Field Teaching

Question: What is the plan to reduce the incidence of out-of-field teaching (particularly in mathematics, science, special education, and bilingual education/English as a Second Language) in high-poverty, low-performing schools?

3.1 CCSD - Denies transfer requests for out-of-field teachers and contracts to any new teacher applicant seeking an out-of-field position at high-poverty, low-performing schools.

3.2 CCSD - Expand the use of distance learning to permit student access to qualified teachers in other schools.

Element 4: Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers

Question: What is the plan to build a critical mass of qualified, experienced teachers willing to work in hard-to-staff schools?

4.1 AB1: The 2007 legislature created a grant fund for incentives for:

- teachers and administrators (& other personnel) who have been employed in that category of position for at least 5 years and who are employed in schools which are at-risk (determined by the Department as 65% FRL – basically T1 schools)
- and teachers who hold an endorsement in the field of mathematics, science, special education, English as a second language or other area of need within the district, as determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction [this incentive targets high need areas, but not at-risk schools.]

The financial incentive available for individual employees who participate in the program is limited to no more than $3,500 per year. The district had to notify before August 1, 2007 each employee who is currently receiving the 1/5th retirement service credit that he may elect to participate in the program of incentive pay for licensed educational personnel in lieu of the purchase of retirement service if they continue to be eligible for the program (so the 1/5th retirement service credit was being phased out).

FY11 (paid in FY12) there was $17,614,976 allocated to teachers. For the 1/5 retirement credit there were 2793 teachers who received funds ($11,749,065). For the $3,500 financial incentive there were 1,946 teachers who received funds ($5,865,910).

4.2 Target recruitment for hard-to-fill critical labor shortage positions, including hiring retirees, if needed per the Nevada Revised Statutes.

In order to offset early retirement, the Legislature passed A.B. 555/Nevada Revised Statute allowing retired staff in hard to fill positions to be rehired upon approval from the Superintendent and continue to receive their full retirement benefits while actively employed in the state. The critical shortage positions that were approved to fill for each district are on file. A list of actual hires would need to be obtained by the Superintendent from the Public Employees Retirement System of Nevada. In the past the Office of Teacher Licensure sent Clark County School District a list of secondary teachers currently not teaching in the CCSD area to help with this recruitment effort.

CCSD: Recruit retired teachers to return to classroom in critical labor shortage positions for high-need schools and/or hard-to-fill subject areas.

WCSD: Rehire retired teachers and principals specifically to work in high-need schools. They are recruited to fill critical labor shortages and to serve on School Improvement Plan teams.

4.3 CCSD – Support efforts to provide financial incentives to help attract teachers of hard-to-fill subjects to high-need schools. Assess the effectiveness of the incentives upon hiring and retaining "highly qualified" and experienced teachers.

4.4 Listed state and federal incentives on the DOE website to ensure better communication of this information to teachers and encouraged districts to do the same on their website (2006).

The "USDE Teacher Loan Forgiveness Forbearance Program" for prospective teachers to teach in subjects and schools that have 30% + free and reduced lunch has been listed on the Nevada Department of Education website http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability_NCLB.htm.

The USDE Teacher Loan Forgiveness Forbearance Program authorizes up to $17,500 in loan forgiveness to eligible highly qualified math, science and special education teachers. The loan forgiveness will provide substantial relief for existing teachers and an incentive for prospective teachers to teach in subjects and schools that have difficulty hiring "highly qualified" candidates. The loan forgiveness is available to teachers at schools that are at 30% + free and reduced lunch and to new borrowers (teachers with no outstanding loan balances prior to October 1, 1998, who borrowed eligible loans prior to October 1, 2005). For

information on the program the USDE's Federal Student Aid Customer Service hotline can be contacted at 1-800-433-7327. The Nevada Department of Education can also be contacted at 775-687-9219.

4.5 WCSD - Establish college scholarships, loans, and loan forgiveness programs to channel prospective teachers toward schools that have difficulty attracting sufficient numbers of qualified teachers. The District has supported legislation to forgive student loans for teachers who serve at targeted schools. Provide information to applicants and employees in regards to the following programs: college scholarships, USDE loan forgiveness programs, Washoe Education Association (WEA) interest-free loans to candidates for National Board Certification, Teachers' First Payment Assistance Loan Program, One-fifth year PERS service credit, and AB1 payment incentives to channel prospective teachers toward schools that have difficulty attracting sufficient numbers of qualified teachers.

4.6 CCSD - The Title I office allows Title I schools flexibility in hiring based on the school Title I plan, CCSD policies and regulations and Negotiated agreements. The amount of salary difference between the lowest and highest paid teachers is not a factor in the selection of experienced and inexperienced teachers.

4.7 CCSD - Designated high-need schools are allowed a two month early hiring and transfer period ensuring vacancies are filled with "highly qualified" experienced teachers. Following this period, provide a bi-monthly update through September for the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction and Area Managers to track individual, high-need school progress in filling vacancies.

WCSD - Language has been included in the Washoe Education Association (WEA) Agreement that allows high need schools to hire earlier and avoid receiving overage teachers who may not meet the needs of the school.

4.8 CCSD - Implement site-based mentoring programs to provide support for administrators and teachers in high-need schools.

4.9 WCSD - The district provides incentives for outstanding principals to work at high need schools. Selection of principals for these schools is based on candidates' demonstrated capacity to lead these schools. Principals' performance evaluations are based on leadership standards.

Element 5: Professional Development

Question: What is the plan to strengthen the skills, knowledge and effectiveness of teachers already working in high-poverty, low-performing schools?

5.1 Continue professional development provided by the Regional Professional Development Programs to improve the quality of teaching at schools designated as "in need of improvement".

5.2 Require curriculum self-analysis for districts and schools identified for "corrective action" (Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Alignment Tool) to help identify needed professional development.

5.3 CCSD - Develop and pilot an administrative leadership coaching program based on a formal model that addresses challenges in selected high need schools.

5.4 CCSD - Assess impact of induction and mentoring program for teachers of hard-to-fill subjects in high-need schools.

5.5 WCSD - Augment current programs to target mentoring, instructional coaching and other forms of professional development to teachers at high-poverty, low-performing schools.

Element 6: Specialized Knowledge and Skills

Question: What is the plan to ensure that teachers (and principals) have the specialized knowledge and skills they need to be effective with the populations of students typically served in high-poverty, low-performing schools (including Native American students, English language learners, students with special needs, and other students at risk)?

6.1 CCSD - Monitor teacher participation in trainings to increase teacher expertise in field of study and to enhance effectiveness in teaching in high-need schools.

Element 7: Working Conditions
(ex. time, facilities and resources, school leadership, teacher empowerment and professional development)

Question: What is the plan to improve the conditions in hard-to-staff schools that contribute to excessively high rates of teacher turnover?

7.1 CCSD - Monitor implementation of recommendations made by school support teams as per Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey results for designated high-need schools.

7.2 WCSD - Survey teachers to identify and correct conditions that contribute to staffing shortages in certain schools.

7.3 WCSD - Schools that have a high number of at risk students and Title I schools receive additional teachers, deans and clerical support via district fund allocation according to need to reduce disparities.

Element 8: Policy Coherence

Question: What is the plan to improve internal processes or revise state policies that may inadvertently contribute to local staffing inequities?

8.1 AB 1: The 2007 legislature created a grant fund for incentives for teachers who hold an endorsement in the field of mathematics, science, special education, English as a second language or other area of need within the district. This incentive targeted high need areas, but not at-risk schools. This was possibly a policy coherence problem. Since critical shortage area teachers could receive a financial incentive working at any school regardless of designation, this could deter them from wanting to go to and stay at an at risk school. On the other hand, if an at-risk school (defined as “at risk” by at least 65% free and reduced lunch) needed a math teacher, for example, and the teacher didn’t have 5 years of experience, as is a requirement for receiving a financial incentive at an at risk school otherwise, the teacher could be provided the incentive immediately even with 1 year of experience which would help the school fill their teacher needs.

8.2 AB 425 of the 2009 Legislature revised provisions governing the licensure of certain educational personnel which helps teachers meet licensure requirements more expediently, and thus “highly qualified” teacher requirements.

The Bill eliminates the requirement that new applicants for a Nevada teaching license (from out-of-state) have previous teaching experience in order to be exempt from the examinations required for the initial licensure of teachers and other educational personnel if the Commission on Professional Standards in Education determines that the examinations required for initial licensure in the other state are comparable to the examinations required for initial licensure in Nevada.

The Bill requires the Commission to conduct a review of the regulations of the Commission governing the licensure and endorsement of special education teachers to improve and enhance reciprocal licensure in Nevada of special education teachers from other states.

To reduce time to process teacher applications and ensure analysis of teachers’ “highly qualified” status upon hire:

8.3 The NDE upgraded the licensure system in the Southern Office to reduce the amount of time for licensure issuance from 12 to 14+ weeks to 2-5 weeks depending on the number of applications submitted.

8.4 CCSD - doubled support staff and added an administrator to speed up the processing time of applications. CCSD has monitored application status weekly to shorten the application process as reported May 2009.

8.5 WCSD – implemented online searchable applicant database, which includes analysis of teachers’ highly qualified status.

Nevada's Key Strategies for Equitable Distribution of Teachers

1. **Continuously monitor teacher distribution through data collection and analyses of identified patterns**, so that Nevada poor and minority students have equitable access to experienced teachers and teachers who have met "highly qualified" requirements who are effective in teaching students to needed levels of achievement.

Nevada's Data Collection and Analysis of Data

- *Publicly Report Progress*: State Accountability Report

  http://www.nevadareportcard.com
  - Not Highly Qualified Teachers in Low and High Poverty Schools
  - Core Subject Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (by district, by school, by core subject)

The following tables demonstrate improvement in equitable distribution of teachers over the years.

Table 1. Percent of Core Subject Classes Not Taught by Teachers Meeting "Highly Qualified" Requirements – in Low and High Poverty Schools

(The metric used to determine poverty quartiles is "percent of free and reduced eligible".
For FY10-11 elementary school: "low poverty" = < 31% and "high poverty" = > 75%;
secondary school: "low poverty" = < 23% and "high poverty" = >57%)

When comparing schools in the top quartile of poverty to the bottom quartile of poverty the percent of classes not taught by teachers meeting “highly qualified” requirements has reduced over the years in both categories as well as the gap between high and low poverty schools, as more teachers have met the “highly qualified” requirements.

Percent of Core Academic Classes Not Taught by Teachers Meeting “Highly Qualified” Requirements – High/Low Poverty Quartiles

State/Districts	School Year	Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Gap Between High/Low Poverty % Point Difference
State	FY11	5.7%	7.6%	1.9
	FY10	5.3%	8.3%	3.0
	FY09	9.0%	10.1%	1.1
Clark	FY11	6.7%	9.5%	2.7
	FY10	6.3%	9.7%	3.4
	FY09	11.1%	12.1%	1.0
Washoe	FY11	2.5%	0.9%	(1.6)
	FY10	1.7%	2.7%	1.0
	FY09	3.4%	1.9%	(1.5)
All Other Districts	FY11	4.9%	3.8%	(1.1)
	FY10	5.9%	9.1%	3.2
	FY09	5.5%	7.6%	2.1

Table 2. Percent of Core Subject Classes Not Taught by Teachers Meeting "Highly Qualified" Requirements – in Low and High Minority Schools

When comparing high minority schools to low minority schools the percent of classes not taught by teachers meeting "highly qualified" requirements has reduced over the years in both categories as well as the gap between high and low minority schools, as more teachers have met the "highly qualified" requirements.

Percent of Core Academic Classes Not Taught by Teachers Meeting "Highly Qualified" Requirements – Minority (High = 50% or greater; Low = < 50%)

State/Districts	School Year	Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Gap Between High/Low Minority % Point Difference
State	FY11	4.7%	7.9%	3.2
	FY10	4.5%	8.6%	4.1
	FY09	8.3%	13.5%	1.1
Clark	FY11	7.1%	8.8%	1.7
	FY10	6.0%	9.2%	3.2
	FY09	11.4%	14.9%	3.5
Washoe	FY11	2.8%	2.1%	(0.7)
	FY10	2.0%	3.1%	1.1
	FY09	4.3%	3.0%	(1.3)
All Other Districts	FY11	3.2%	4.9%	1.7
	FY10	4.4%	9.4%	5.0

Each teacher who has not yet met "highly qualified" requirements has an individual plan to meet these requirements as soon as possible and this plan is monitored through the district with oversight by the NDE. Despite significant slowed growth in 2010-2011 a primary barrier to meeting the 100% performance target of teachers who meet the NCLB "highly qualified" teacher requirements continues to be the teacher pool shortage in Nevada and thus the need to recruit teachers from out of state who often don't initially meet Nevada licensing.

Table 3. Percent of Core Subject Classes Taught by Teachers With Less Than 3 Years of Experience in Low and High Poverty Schools

The gap between high and low poverty schools continues to be reduced, as does the percent of teachers with less than 3 years of experience in each category.

Percent of Teachers with Less Than 3 Years of Experience Teaching Core Academic Classes - High/Low Poverty Quartiles

State/Districts	School Year	Low Poverty Schools	High Poverty Schools	Gap Between High/Low Poverty % Point Difference
State	FY11	10.1%	17.1%	7.0
	FY10	13.8%	22.1%	8.3
	FY09	23.4%	37.5%	14.1
Clark	FY11	8.8%	18.5%	9.7
	FY10	13.9%	23.9%	10.0
	FY09	25.4%	40.3%	14.9
Washoe	FY11	8.1%	12.9%	4.8
	FY10	10.7%	16.6%	5.9
	FY09	18.1%	29.6%	11.5
All Other Districts	FY11	20.5%	12.2%	(8.3)
	FY10	4.4%	9.4%	5.0

Table 4. Percent of Core Subject Classes Taught by Teachers With Less Than 3 Years of Experience in Low and High Minority Schools

The gap between high and low minority schools continues to be reduced, as does the percent of teachers with less than 3 years of experience in each category.

Percent of Teachers With Less Than 3 Years of Experience Teaching Core Subjects - Minority (High = 50% or greater; Low = < 50%)

State/Districts	School Year	Low Minority Schools	High Minority Schools	Gap Between High/Low Minority % Point Difference
State	FY11	9.5%	14.6%	5.1
	FY10	12.2%	20.7%	8.5
	FY09	23.5%	35.5%	12.0
Clark	FY11	8.7%	14.8%	6.1
	FY10	12.1%	21.4%	9.3
	FY09	23.7%	37.0%	13.3
Washoe	FY11	10.1%	11.7%	1.6
	FY10	12.1%	15.8%	3.7
	FY09	23.2%	27.9%	4.7
All Other Districts	FY11	10.1%	17.4%	7.3
	FY10	4.4%	9.4%	5.0

Nevada "High-Need Schools"

For purposes of "Equitable Distribution of Teachers" schools considered to be "high-need" in Nevada are defined as:

- high poverty (top quartile for 10-11 is more than 75% elementary and more than 57% secondary)
- and/or high minority (>50%)
- "in need of improvement" (have not met AYP targets for 2 or more years), with
- 20% or greater non-HQT
- and/or teachers with < 3 years of teaching experience

August 2011 there were only 48 "high need schools" identified. There were 43 high need schools identified in Clark County School District and 5 of those schools made AYP. There were 5 high need schools identified in Washoe County School District and 1 of those schools made AYP.

August 2010 there were 98 "high need schools" identified (28 fewer than in 08-09) and 12 of those made AYP.
There were 87 high-need schools identified in Clark County School district (20 fewer than in 08-09 and10 of these made AYP);
9 high-need schools in Washoe County School District (5 fewer than in 08-09 and 2 of these schools made AYP);
and 1 high-need school each in Elko and Pershing County School Districts.

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

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

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

History

The Southwest Comprehensive Center has worked with the Nevada Committee on Equitable Distribution of Teachers, to include State Department of Education staff and representatives from Clark County School District and Washoe County School District to ensure the Nevada Equity Plan is successful in correcting staffing inequities.

Nevada's Growth Rate and HQT Verification Challenges

Student Growth

From 03-04 to 06-07 there was an increase in student count each year of more than 12,000 students. However, student growth was cut in half in 07-08 as compared to 06-07, growth in 08-09 was only 3,548 students, growth in 09-10 declined by 1,065 students and growth in 10-11 only increased by 465 students. The slowed growth in Clark County School District has made it possible to have a larger pool of "highly qualified" and "experienced" teacher candidates to hire into high need schools than in previous years.

Teacher Recruitment

Despite significant slowed student growth in the past few years, a primary barrier to meeting the 100% performance target of teachers who meet the NCLB "highly qualified" teacher requirement has been the teacher pool shortage in Nevada. Nevada is unique with 70% of the teachers positioned in Clark County School District (Las Vegas) – 15,698 teachers out of the 10-11 school year State total of 22,526. Clark County as the fifth largest school district in the United States has had teacher recruitment and retention challenges. For the 10-11 school year CCSD hired 297 new teachers outside of Nevada out of the 1,227 new teachers hired; for the 09-10 school year CCSD hired 254 new teachers outside of Nevada out of the 1,014 new teachers hired; for the 08-09 school year CCSD hired 633+ new teachers outside of Nevada out of the 1784 new teachers hired, down significantly from 772 new teachers outside of Nevada out of 2,700 new teachers in 07-08. In 07-08 there were only 406 teacher preparation program completers coming out of University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Teacher Retention

Based on CCSD trend data, an average of approximately 22% of new teachers hired by the Clark County School District from 2007-2008 through 2009-2010 separated employment during their first three years. The average retention rate of new licensed personnel hired since 2005-2006 through 2009-2010 is 70%. An average of approximately 23% of new teachers hired by the Clark County School District from 2006-2007 through 2008-2009 separated employment during their first three years. Of the 2,492 new teachers hired in 2004-2005, 62.24% remained in the Clark County School District, and 37.76% separated over a five-year period.

Nevada's Key Strategies for Equitable Distribution of Teachers

2. **Provide technical assistance to districts in designing, implementing and analyzing plans of action for focused district policies and practices based on theories of change to coherently address inequities in teacher assignment, and in response to targeting systemic issues involving "high need schools".**

   The SEA and LEAs will coordinate efforts to:

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

The Nevada Department of Education will continue to:

I. Provide technical assistance to the districts, as needed, to ensure the following issues are addressed in their Equitable Distribution of Teacher (EDT) plans. As a result of the complexity of their systems and diversity of their populations, the vast majority of this technical assistance is provided to Clark and Washoe County School Districts.

A. *Data: Identification of Inequities (such as list of "high need schools" with a revolving door of teacher attrition)*
B. *Teacher Attrition Cause Data – Analyzed by School*
C. *Coherent District Policies, Strategies and Measurable Objectives to Support EDT*
D. *Probable Success of Strategies and Measurement*

II. Revisit the following guidelines provided by Learning Point for the NV and LEA EDT plans
(CCSSO powerpoint – "Presenting Evidence for the Probable Success of Your Strategies", May 8-9, 2006):

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

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

Goals:

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

Ways to ensure an equitable distribution of teachers:

Increase supply -

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

Reduce demand -

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

Strategies that are most likely to work are those that:

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

Different ways to target schools in need:

- Make it exclusive
  Ex. Teach in VA – recruit for top high need subject areas & 100 high need schools; merit pay for teachers who raise student performance
- Give priority to certain schools or teachers
  Ex. State sponsored PD; FL- 1st priority discretionary funds for schools with D & F
- Make it increasingly lucrative

Ex. CA – loan assumption program for hard to fill subjects/hard to staff schools (could be more $ or faster assumption)

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

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

Characteristics of a well-designed state teacher equity plan:

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

Clark County and Washoe County School District Equity Plans – review July 2009

The districts will continue to refine their plan for equitable distribution of teachers by looking systemically at – district hiring and transfer policies, data, identification of the underlying causes for inequity, strategies that have probable success and will be measured for success, as well as targeting individual schools as follows:

A. ***<u>District Policies to Support EDT</u>***

What are the district hiring, transfer and assignment practices for novice and veteran teachers that do not support equitable distribution of teachers, and what are the possibilities/necessities for supporting EDT to help close the achievement gap?

What evaluation process ensures that administrators assigned to low-performing schools are outstanding leaders?

B. ***<u>Data: Identification of Inequities</u>***

1. ***<u>What data collection and analysis infrastructure is in place?</u>***

2. *Report in the EDT Plan* ***<u>where inequities in teacher assignment exist</u>****. Provide inequity data by category such as special education, ESL, by grade level and by core subject area (e.g. novice teachers many of whom also do not meet "highly qualified" teacher requirements upon hire in the area of special education and secondary English, math, science and social studies).*

C. ***<u>Teacher Attrition Data – Analyzed by School</u>***

1. ***<u>Provide data on teacher turnover, as well as principal turnover</u>****:*
   - *The teacher turnover rate for the district (i.e., the number of vacant full-time equivalent slots to be filled each year minus newly created slots) and information about the grade level and subject area for the vacancies.*
   - *The teacher turnover rate for each site (i.e. the number of vacant full-time equivalent slots to be filled each year minus newly created slots) and information about the grade level and subject area for the vacancies.*

   An important element of equitable distribution is the ability of the district to easily track teacher transfers between schools so district-wide and individual patterns can be analyzed. This tracking is crucial in the development of data to support policies at the district level to address teacher transfers away from high-poverty, high-minority, and low-achieving schools.

2. ***<u>Identify and report the underlying reasons</u>*** *that poor and minority children are being taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced teachers who may not have yet met the "highly qualified" teacher requirements upon hire. A*

typical pattern is that teachers move from higher need schools to lower need schools and are replaced with novice teachers. In some schools this is a "revolving door" whereby new teachers are placed in high need schools and then they transfer to a lower need school. Appropriate support must be provided to schools that are difficult to staff, based on the systemic reason(s) why this is an issue.

One study has identified the "tipping point" for teacher quality as being when the proportion of under-qualified teachers is about 20% of the total school faculty. Beyond that point, schools no longer have the ability to improve student achievement (Shields et al. 1999).

What are the reported causes for attrition at hard to staff schools that have a pattern of high attrition (e.g. working conditions data/analysis - including leadership and curricular alignment support)?

3. ***Which high need hard-to-staff schools are being targeted for support*** *to increase the percent of experienced (3 years or greater), "highly qualified" teachers and receive support from a principal who has demonstrated capacity to lead high need schools?*
How is an outstanding principal being determined and supported?

D. ***Probable Success of Strategies and Measurement***

In outlining specific strategies for remedying this inequity, provide evidence for the probable success of the strategies included in the district plan (consider key factors found from analyzing schools that have a high percentage of "non-HQ" novice teachers at a high poverty/high minority schools, yet made AYP, in order to model that success), and
- the justification for targeting of staffing needs at specific high need schools, and
- demonstration that the district knows whether or not all the strategies it is employing in the district plan are effective.

In considering strategies, the district should leverage resources so there is intensity and focus, answering the question,
What is being done to focus resources to the neediest schools, in terms of instructional leaders, professional development etc.?

One of the action steps that was discussed in the 1-10-07 meeting with CCSD and WCSD was to provide a theory of change and a logic model that will lead to improved working conditions to ensure success in achieving the goal of recruiting/retaining

HQT/experienced/effective teachers in high need schools to close the achievement gap. These can be provided for other elements as well.

A Theory of Change provides an explanation of how change is expected to occur as a result of the strategies. It delineates the underlying assumptions upon which the strategies are based (ex. if teachers have good working conditions they will experience more teaching success and satisfaction at their schools and stay at their schools) and includes not only the components involved (improvement of specific working conditions), but also incorporates an explanation of how the change is expected to occur (steps to make this happen).

The Logic Model is a flow chart of the critical elements that include:
Inputs: resources, personnel, facilities, equipment etc. used to accomplish the activities; Activities/processes to achieve the outcomes;
Initial Outcomes: products of the activities; changes in participants' knowledge/skills/attitudes which lead to the desired outcomes;
Intermediate Outcomes: benefits to participants defined in terms of changes in behaviors that result from changes in knowledge/skills/ attitudes;
Results: results of the impact on participants and the effectiveness; ultimate outcome the plan desires to achieve.

This should result in an analysis of whether the results were actually achieved and if not, why not?
A new theory of change/logic model would be written as necessary to change the plan to achieve results.
Note: evaluators can help write these theories of change/logic models and assess results.

To be included:
- Set a goal to ensure more teachers/principals complete the survey to get data by marketing:
** the confidentiality of results*
** sharing overall results by district, as well as school results back to their schools; and*
** the fact that results will be used to improve working conditions; can give examples from other states on how working conditions were improved including through the use of the Toolkit of resources.*