
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

REVISED —HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS PLAN—

to ensure that 100 percent of Wisconsin's teachers are
highly qualified by the end of the
2006-2007 school year and beyond

August 29, 2006

Revised: September 21, 2006



Elizabeth Burmaster
State Superintendent
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Table of Contents

Overview: Wisconsin's Revised Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) Plan1

Requirement 15

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 (HQT). 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.

Requirement 212

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.

Requirement 315

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.

Requirement 439

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 2006-2007 school year.

Requirement 550

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 2005-2006 school year, and how the SEA will limit the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005-2006 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.

Requirement 651

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.

Appendixes

Appendix A – Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Project Final Report

Appendix B – 2005-2006 School Year Highly Qualified Teachers of ESEA Core Subjects (440 Districts)

Appendix C – 2005-2006 School Year Highly Qualified Teachers of ESEA Core Subjects Less Than 100 Percent Highly Qualified (172 of 440 Districts)

Appendix D – Newly Developed Highly Qualified Teacher District Plan and Highly Qualified Teacher District Plan Interim Report

Appendix E – Alternative Program for Initial Educator Licensing Based on Equivalency PI 34.17(6)(c) Application

Appendix F – Amended PI 1602-EL Emergency License Application

Appendix G – ESEA Consolidated Programs Monitoring Handbook

Appendix H – Sanctions for Title I Schools and Districts Not Making Adequate Yearly Progress

Appendix I – June 22, 2006 Henry Johnson Letter to State Superintendent Burmaster

Appendix J – Wisconsin's Equity Plan (July 7, 2006)

Appendix K - Newly Developed Title I Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant Assurances, Plan and Report.

Overview: Wisconsin's Revised Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) Plan

The *New Wisconsin Promise* and *Wisconsin's Quality Educator Initiative* are the most recent of the proactive efforts of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to assure that all teachers employed in the state's system of public education meet high standards for knowledge, skill, and performance. Meeting this goal is critical to ensuring that all children in Wisconsin will learn what they need to know and be able to do to become productive and engaged citizens of the state and of the nation. Wisconsin's focus on providing high quality education for all students and its high teacher standards and benchmarks are key contributing factors to our strong progress in meeting this goal. The results are exciting: as of the 2005-2006 school year, 98.9 percent of all teachers employed in Wisconsin are highly qualified as defined by the state and by the federal *No Child Left Behind* Act (2000). Currently 268 (60.7 percent) of the 440 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in Wisconsin meet the 100 percent goal of employing "highly qualified teachers" (HQT) set by the *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Act for the 2005-2006 school year. Of the remaining 172 LEAs, only five—Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine—employ more than seven teachers who are not highly qualified for their assignments.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is not satisfied with these results. Despite strong progress, we have not met the 100 percent HQT goal in every school in the state. There is a measurable gap between the academic achievement of children of color, students living at or below the federally defined poverty level, and their peers. There is an identified statewide shortage in the supply of highly qualified special education teachers, which has a disproportionate impact on Milwaukee Public Schools as it has the highest number of students with identified special needs in the state. And while 99.1 percent of teachers of core academic subjects in schools that meet targets for annual yearly progress are highly qualified, only 96.3 percent are HQT in those that do not meet targets for adequate yearly progress (AYP). The difference between schools that meet AYP and those that don't is largely accounted for by the percentage of special education teachers teaching core academic subjects who are not yet HQ (97.0 percent in schools meeting AYP, 90.0 percent in those that did not). However, a proportionally larger percentage of mathematics teachers employed in schools not meeting AYP are not highly qualified as well. Though not readily apparent from the data presented here, there

is also an identified need to better support the learning of limited-English proficient (LEP) students.

The *Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Project*, funded by the Joyce Foundation and completed in 2006, also has revealed that, while there is no significant difference in the distribution of highly qualified teachers across the state except for special education teachers assigned to teach core academic subjects, there are five geographic regions that do present a significant difference in the level of experience of the HQTs they employ (See Appendix A). They are the Beloit-Janesville area, the Green Bay area, the Kenosha-Racine area, the Madison area, and the Milwaukee County area. Data on teachers in these regions, which include the majority of Wisconsin's poor and minority students and which have the lowest percentages of proficiency in mathematics and reading, indicate that approximately 30 percent of teachers in schools that failed to make AYP in 2003-2004 had less than three years teaching experience as compared to 12 percent in schools that made AYP. Data indicate that the percentage of teachers with less than three years teaching experience in schools that failed to meet AYP in 2005-2006 dropped to approximately 20 percent. The clear message is that experience counts. Wisconsin's revised HQT plan and its Equity Plan focus on the recruitment, recognition, and retention of experienced teachers in these regions as well as support the professional development for the relatively high numbers of less experienced teachers currently employed in these regions.

Wisconsin's Revised Plan to Meet the HQT Target Goal

Wisconsin's response to assure that 100 percent of all core academic subject courses are taught by highly qualified teachers will focus first on assuring that there is an adequate supply of fully licensed teachers in all regions of the state to meet staffing needs. Existing strategies to provide statewide systematic support for attaining the 100 percent HQT goal are well established and have achieved a high rate of success in moving toward the target goal. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) works directly with LEAs to provide technical assistance and support to the remaining 1.1 percent of teachers who are not highly qualified so that they will attain highly qualified status by the end of the 2006-2007 school year. Specifically, DPI will:

1. Continue full implementation, in partnership with higher education, of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* to assure a sufficient supply of highly

- qualified teachers to meet existing and projected staffing needs in all schools, particularly special education teachers.
2. Implement a new statewide strategy requiring LEAs to develop and implement individualized plans for each teacher who teaches core academic subject courses under emergency licenses to become highly qualified.
 3. Connect LEAs seeking highly qualified teachers to HQ teachers seeking employment through the use of web-based support systems.
 4. Provide targeted support to recognize, reward and retain experienced and highly qualified teachers in schools that missed adequate yearly progress (AYP) or are schools identified for improvement (SIFI).
 5. Provide targeted mentoring and support for HQ teachers with less three years teaching experience employed by schools that do not meet AYP, and
 6. Strengthen and expand the existing regional support networks serving the majority of schools not meeting AYP, especially those that support the Kenosha-Racine area and Milwaukee County area.

The New Wisconsin Promise

The goal of assuring teacher quality is an element of a broader initiative to close the state and national achievement gap between children of color, economically disadvantaged students and their peers. State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster's *New Wisconsin Promise* sets out the organizing principles by which the state will deliver on its promise to provide high-quality education to all Wisconsin students and close the gap between economically disadvantaged students, students of color, and their peers. This promise states that DPI will focus its resources toward:

- Ensuring quality teachers in every classroom and strong leadership in every school.
- Improving student achievement with a focus on reading that has all students reading at or above grade level.
- Investing in early learning opportunities through the 4-year-old kindergarten, Preschool to Grade 5, and Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) class size reduction.

- Sharing responsibility by increasing parental and community involvement in our schools, libraries to address teenage literacy, drop-outs and truancy.
- Advancing career, technical and arts education to engage students in becoming active citizens by better understanding their role in the family, society, and the world of work.
- Providing effective pupil services, special education, and prevention programs to support learning and development for all students while preventing and reducing barriers to student success.

Implementation of the *New Wisconsin Promise*, including the attainment of the target goal of having 100 percent HQT is the heart of our strategy for addressing inequities in the distribution of experienced, highly qualified teachers in the state.

The data analyses that guided the development of our revised HQT plan, as well as the description of how we plan to meet and maintain the 100 percent HQT goal, are described in detail in the sections pertaining to the federal requirements for each element of the plan. This description of the plan elements is presented within the framework of the rubric used to assess the plan.

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.

1.1 Does the revised plan include an analysis of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified? Is the analysis based on accurate classroom level data?

At the end of the 2005-2006 school year, 98.9 percent of Wisconsin's employed teachers were highly qualified as defined by NCLB (See Table 1). The School District Staff and Personnel Report (PI 1202) is the primary source of data on teacher staffing and is submitted annually to the department. This report includes all classes assigned to each teacher in each school. Once this report is received, the department standardizes the aggregate data collected across class scheduling practices in districts across the state. This is done by converting class assignments to a percentage of the full time class load of each individual teacher. For example, if a teacher is teaching two classes in a block schedule each day, each class represents 50 percent of their full time class load and is reported as 0.50 FTE. The report also indicates the actual license identification number of the person teaching each course. These data are cross-referenced to the teacher licensing database and any discrepancies are identified and addressed. The percentage of teachers employed by each district that are not highly qualified based on this correlation is reported annually on the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS), which displays the most current three-year cycle of data analysis. < <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sig/index.html> >.

Table 1 shows the analysis of data collected for the 2005-2006 school year. Table 2 shows the analysis of data collected for the 2004-2005 school year, as referenced in the original submission of this plan on July 7, 2006. The data in each table presents the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) assignments representing core academic subject

courses by subject area and the percentage of teachers assigned to those FTEs that are highly qualified as well as the percentage that are not highly qualified.

Table 1. HQTs of ESEA Core Subjects in Wisconsin: 2005-2006

Core Subject Area	Core FTE	HQT		Not HQT	
		FTE	%	FTE	%
English/Language Arts	5,354.6	5,293.3	98.9%	61.4	1.1%
Mathematics	3,588.9	3,560.1	99.2%	28.8	0.8%
Science	3,374.0	3,336.3	98.9%	37.6	1.1%
Social Studies	3,282.6	3,257.9	99.2%	24.7	0.8%
Foreign Languages	1,656.5	1,633.7	98.6%	22.8	1.4%
The Arts	4,341.5	4,314.2	99.4%	27.3	0.6%
Elementary-All Subjects	20,881.6	20,783.1	99.5%	98.5	0.5%
Special Education (core)	8,092.3	7,851.3	97.0%	241.0	3.0%
Totals	50,571.9	50,029.9	98.9%	542.1	1.1%

Table 2. HQTs of ESEA Core Subjects in Wisconsin 2004-2005

Core Subject Area	Core FTE	HQT		Not HQT	
		FTE	%	FTE	%
English/Language Arts	5,494.6	5,466.2	99.5%	28.4	0.5%
Mathematics	3,578.3	3,560.4	99.5%	18.0	0.5%
Science	3,408.4	3,375.4	99.0%	33.0	1.0%
Social Studies	3,347.1	3,322.8	99.3%	24.3	0.7%
Foreign Languages	1,672.0	1,654.0	98.9%	18.1	1.1%
The Arts	4,427.4	4,408.6	99.6%	18.8	0.4%
Elementary-All Subjects	21,111.7	21,014.2	99.5%	97.5	0.5%
Special Education (core)	8,168.2	8,104.4	99.2%	63.9	0.8%
Totals	51,207.8	50,906.0	99.4%	301.8	0.6%

Both tables are presented because, since the time of the original submission, we have completed the analysis for the 2005-2006 school year. It should be noted that social studies is a core academic subject area that includes civics and government, economics, history, and geography. Although social studies is reported here as an aggregate, the LEAs report specific classes in history, economics, civics and political science, and geography, and the audit process checks that the teacher assigned is highly qualified to teach those discrete social studies subjects.

A comparison of the data in both tables reveals that 0.6 percent of teachers assigned to teach core academic subjects were not highly qualified in 2004-2005 while 1.1 percent of teachers assigned to teach academic subjects were not highly qualified in 2005-2006.

Two factors explain the apparent increase in the number of teachers who are not highly qualified. First, the 0.5 percent increase in part represents the natural fluctuation associated with annual changes in school staffing needs. Second, the increase represents a change in the HQ status of several persons holding emergency licenses, particularly in the arts and in special education assignments that include teaching at least one core academic subject course. In August of 2005, the United States Department of Education clarified its reporting requirements for highly qualified teachers in alternative route programs. The process for ensuring that the requirements are met for persons in alternative routes is amended to include assurances that content knowledge based on a major, its equivalent or a rigorous standardized test is met in order to identify an educator as highly qualified. (See amended PI 1602-EL application form with LEA assurances). This clarification resulted in a more accurate reflection of the HQ status of teachers working under an emergency license.

Because the total number of teachers who are not highly qualified is small (542.1 FTE) relative to the total number of highly qualified teachers (50, 571.9 FTE), the revised plan to meet HQT focuses on implementing a new statewide strategy requiring LEAs to develop and implement individualized plans for these teachers to become highly qualified and then monitoring for compliance. These *Highly Qualified Teacher Plans* will be submitted to the department by November 15, 2006 and progress toward completing the plans will be monitored through the *Highly Qualified Teacher District Plan Interim*

Report, due by February 15, 2007. Final reports on the status of these plans will be submitted to the department by June 30, 2007.

1.2 Does the analysis focus on the staffing needs of schools that are not making AYP? Do these schools have high percentages of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified?

Tables 3 and 4 represent the analysis of the staffing of schools that made AYP and those that did not make AYP. Teachers of courses taught in schools that did not make AYP (3,624.2 FTE) represent 7.2 percent of the total number of courses taught in Wisconsin schools (50,571.9 FTE). There was no significant difference in the percentage of teachers who were not highly qualified in all core academic subjects taught by teachers holding a regular license, except in mathematics, where schools that did not make AYP employed 34 percent (10.2 FTE) of all teachers who were not highly qualified in 2005-2006 to teach that subject. The actual number of mathematics teachers who are not highly qualified is 29, with 10 of those 29 teaching in schools that did not make AYP.

Table 3. HQTs of ESEA Core Subjects for Schools that Meet AYP: 2005-2006

Core Subject Area	Core FTE	HQT		Not HQT	
		FTE	%	FTE	%
English/Language Arts	4,773.8	4,724.7	99.0%	49.1	1.0%
Mathematics	3,101.6	3,083.0	99.4%	18.6	0.6%
Science	2,903.6	2,874.0	99.0%	29.6	1.0%
Social Studies	2,811.6	2,792.3	99.3%	19.3	0.7%
Foreign Languages	1,444.9	1,424.8	98.6%	20.1	1.4%
The Arts	4,062.0	4,041.1	99.5%	20.9	0.5%
Elementary-All Subjects	20,631.5	20,534.0	99.5%	97.5	0.5%
Special Education (core)	7,218.9	7,065.5	97.9%	153.4	2.1%
Totals	46,947.8	46,539.4	99.1%	408.4	0.9%

Table 4. HQTs of ESEA Core Subjects for Schools Not Making AYP: 2005-2006

Core Subject Area	Core FTE	HQT		Not HQT	
		FTE	%	FTE	%
English/Language Arts	580.9	568.6	97.9%	12.3	2.1%
Mathematics	487.3	477.1	97.9%	10.2	2.1%
Science	470.4	462.4	98.3%	8.0	1.7%
Social Studies	471.0	465.6	98.8%	5.5	1.2%
Foreign Languages	211.6	208.9	98.7%	2.7	1.3%
The Arts	279.5	273.1	97.7%	6.4	2.3%
Elementary-All Subjects	250.1	249.1	99.6%	1.0	0.4%
Special Education (core)	873.4	785.8	90.0%	87.6	10.0%
Totals	3,624.2	3,490.5	96.3%	133.7	3.7%

There was a significant difference between the two groups of schools in the staffing of special education courses that teach one or more core academic subject. The percentage of special education teachers teaching core subjects in schools that did not meet AYP (873.4 FTE) was 10.8 percent of the total number in Wisconsin (8,092.3 FTE). These schools also accounted for 36.3 percent of core courses in the state that were assigned to special education teachers who were not highly qualified. This impact is explained by the higher number of students with identified special needs that are served by schools that did not meet AYP and the statewide shortage in the supply of highly qualified special education teachers.

Because the total number of teaching positions in mathematics (10.2) and special education (87.6) not taught by highly qualified teachers in schools that did not make AYP is widely dispersed across several schools, the plan focuses on an individualized approach to providing technical assistance and support to teachers in these positions. This aspect of the plan is more fully described under Requirement 2.

1.3 Does the analysis identify particular groups of teachers to which the state's plan must pay particular attention, such as special education teachers, mathematics or science teachers, or multi-subject teachers in rural schools?

Statewide data on teachers who are not yet highly qualified were disaggregated by core academic content areas, with special education treated as a separate category. Special education teachers who are not highly qualified to teach core academic subjects are identified and counted once, in the special education category only. We do not currently disaggregate data within the special education category by academic content area.

A preliminary review of the statewide data indicate that while there are no particular groups of teachers that had more than 3 percent identified as not highly qualified, mathematics teachers and special education teachers who teach core academic subjects in schools that did not make AYP do warrant particular attention based on the analysis of staffing. Multi-subject teachers in rural schools are required to be highly qualified in each core academic subject that they teach.

1.4 Does the analysis identify districts and schools around the State where significant numbers of teachers do not meet HQT standards?

As of the 2005-2006 school year, 98.9 percent of all teachers employed in Wisconsin are highly qualified as defined by the state and NCLB. Currently, 268 (60.7 percent) of the 440 LEAs in Wisconsin meet the 100 percent goal of employing HQT by the 2005-2006 school year. Of the remaining 172 LEAs, five – Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine – employ more than seven teachers who are not highly qualified in their assignment (see Appendix B).

1.5 Does the analysis identify particular courses that are often taught by non-highly qualified teachers?

There are no core academic subjects that are often taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. While there is a difference between the percentage of highly qualified mathematics teachers in schools that meet AYP compared to those that don't, the total real number of teachers who are not highly qualified to teach mathematics in Wisconsin is 29.8 FTE, which is 0.8 percent of all mathematics FTE teachers in Wisconsin. Because of the number and distribution, the Department has chosen the development of an individualized plan with state monitoring.

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.

2.1 Does the plan identify LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives for HQT?

The annual measurable objective for all LEAs for the 2006-2007 school year is to achieve the target of 100 percent of core academic subjects being taught by highly qualified teachers. Analysis of data from the 2005-2006 academic year provides evidence that the following 172 LEAs have not met the annual measurable objectives for HQT. Of the 172 LEAs, five LEAs employ more than seven teachers who are not highly qualified for their assignments. Analysis of both 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 teacher licensing data indicates that 1.1 percent of core academic subjects are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified as defined by NCLB. Please refer to the narrative under Requirement 1 and to Appendix C for more detailed analyses.

2.2 Does the plan include specific steps that will be taken by LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives?

Wisconsin's strategic efforts to meet the 100% HQT target have been successful to ensure the majority of teachers are highly qualified to teach in their assignments. With 1.1% of teachers in the state not yet highly qualified, we developed a new, individualized strategy for assuring that these teachers become highly qualified in their teaching assignments by the end of the 2006-2007 academic year. Beginning this November, each district that has not meet the annual measurable objectives of 100 percent HQT based on data from the 2005-2006 school year will be required to submit a *Highly Qualified Teacher Plan* (PI 9550-IIC) and the *Highly Qualified Teacher District Plan Interim Report* (PI 9550-IIC2) as an addendum to their ESEA consolidated application and delineate strategies to ensure compliance by the end of the 2006-2007 school year (see Appendix D). That plan will include

- The list of teachers not highly qualified;

- Evidence that the district has notified each teacher not highly qualified of their status;
- Steps necessary to become highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year;
- Technical assistance that will be provided by the district to assist teachers in becoming highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

Once a school district reaches the 100 percent target goal, they must maintain that performance as a component of their comprehensive school improvement planning process. Because teacher quality data is a “point in time” measure, all LEAs that fall below the 100 percent benchmark will be notified annually of the teachers not meeting the HQT provisions and will be required to develop specific plans to assist these individuals to become highly qualified by the end of the following school year.

These plans are required of all districts, including single schools that are chartered by a chartering entity other than a school district. In Wisconsin, those entities are: the Milwaukee Common Council, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, and the Milwaukee Area Technical College. Charter schools operating under charters from these entities are defined as districts for the purposes of meeting teacher licensing requirements. The requirements include meeting the HQT target. These charter schools (see Appendix B) will be required to submit *Highly Qualified Teacher Plans* and the *Highly Qualified Teacher District Plan Interim Report*, and will be provided technical assistance and monitored according to the same timeline and requirements as all other districts.

2.3 Does the plan delineate specific steps the SEA will take to ensure that all LEAs have plans in place to assist all non-HQ teachers to become HQ as quickly as possible?

In the fall of 2006 and each fall thereafter, the DPI will notify all LEAs that have not met the 100 percent annual measurable objective for highly qualified teachers or have fallen below that goal from the previous year. All LEAs that have not met the target will be provided prioritized assistance through the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) that will be described in greater detail under Requirement 3, Section 3.2 and Requirement 4,

Section 4.2. In addition to this support, the LEAs will be provided individualized technical assistance as specified in their approved *Highly Qualified Teacher Plans*, described in Section 2.2. As indicated, LEAs will be required to submit a plan and interim report if 100 percent of their teachers assigned to teach core academic are not highly qualified. DPI will approve plans and monitor implementation through the monitoring of ESEA consolidated programs.

Once an LEA reaches the 100 percent benchmark, that benchmark must be maintained. Because teacher quality data is a point-in-time collection, all LEAs that fall below the 100 percent benchmark will be notified annually of teachers not meeting the HQ teacher provisions and will be required to submit plans for full compliance.

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.

3.1 Does the plan include a description of the technical assistance the SEA will provide to assist LEAs in successfully carrying out their HQT plans?

As noted in response to Requirement 1, there are 575 teachers of the 51,007 teachers employed in 2005-2006 who were not highly qualified to teach in their assignments. Fully half of these teachers are employed in the five LEAs – Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine – that also have the highest number of new hires and teachers with less than three years of teaching experience. Wisconsin has just completed *The Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Study*, which examined patterns of teacher distribution across the state based on teacher characteristics, including qualifications and years of experience. This study indicates that while there is no significant difference in the distribution of highly qualified teachers, there is a difference in the distribution of experienced teachers, with those teachers with less experience teaching in schools with the highest indicators of need. The recommendations of this study focused on the need to retain highly qualified and experienced teachers as a primary strategy, and to break the pattern of high teacher.

Therefore, our revised plan to meet HQT by the end of the 2006-2007 school year is comprised of six strategies, three of which focus on the immediate need to assist these 575 teachers to become highly qualified or be replaced by teachers who are highly qualified. The first three strategies listed in Section 3.1 indicate how the DPI will work with LEAs to identify alternative routes for working teachers to become highly qualified, work with LEAs to identify the precise mixture of assistance and support that will best help LEAs achieve the 100 percent HQT, and to work with LEAs to connect them to highly qualified applicants seeking employment across the state in order to replace teachers who are not highly qualified. The remaining three strategies will support this revised plan as well, but are also three key strategies in our Equity Plan.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is strongly committed to addressing the high rates of turnover that result in the loss of highly qualified teachers.

Wisconsin's revised plan to meet HQT by the end of the 2006-2007 school year utilizes the following six strategies:

1. Continue full implementation of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* to assure a sufficient supply of highly qualified teachers to meet existing and projected staffing needs in all schools, particularly special education teachers.
2. Support LEAs in developing and implementing targeted plans to assist the 1.1 percent of teachers teaching core academic subject courses to become highly qualified.
3. Connect LEAs seeking highly qualified teachers to HQ teachers seeking employment through the use of web-based support systems.
4. Provide targeted support to recognize, reward, and retain experienced and highly qualified teachers in schools that missed adequate yearly progress (AYP) or are schools identified for improvement (SIFI).
5. Provide targeted mentoring and support for HQ teachers with less than three years teaching experience employed by schools that do not meet AYP, and
6. Strengthen and expand the existing regional support networks (Cooperative Education Service Agencies (CESAs), License Renewal Support Centers (LRSCs), Responsive Education for All Children (REACH), etc.) serving the majority of schools not meeting AYP, especially those that support the Kenosha-Racine area and Milwaukee County area.

Strategy One: Full Implementation of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*

The *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* is a strong statutory and regulatory framework aimed at assuring a sufficient supply of highly qualified teachers to meet current and future staffing needs. Recognizing the need to prepare teachers who were highly qualified to teach all Wisconsin students what they need to know and be able to do as productive, successful citizens in the 21st century, the department convened the *Task Force on Restructuring Teacher Education and Licensing* in 1993. As a result of the recommendations of this Task Force, the department promulgated Wisconsin

Administrative Code Chapter PI 34, the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*, which instated a standards and performance-based system of teacher education and licensing. The new rule went into effect in June of 2000. All educators who complete programs after August 31, 2004, must meet the requirements of this rule to be licensed in Wisconsin. DPI conducts performance-based review and approval of all higher education programs leading to the initial license. A full institutional on-site review is conducted at each institution on a five-year cycle. The review focuses on documented evidence of institutional support and candidate performance, including initial passing rates on the required content knowledge test. Chapter PI 34, Subchapter III provides a detailed description of this standards-based, performance-based review and approval process < <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/tepd/PI34.html> >.

Each institution that prepares educators works with the Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing (TEPDL) team. The team provides technical assistance and support to the institution as a component of the continuous review and approval process, which includes targeted annual reviews of evidence of candidate performance and program improvement.

DPI has also established a comprehensive licensing application process that includes evidence of program completion, including a passing score on the required test of content knowledge, a background check, and a fingerprint search through the FBI's fingerprint identification service. This process assures that unqualified persons cannot secure a license.

This rule and associated legislation (ss. 118.19, 115.405, and 115.42, Wis. Stats.) establish and fund a statewide, institutionalized system to assure that teachers licensed and in practice in Wisconsin are highly qualified to teach the academic content defined by the level and category of licensure, including the core academic subjects identified in NCLB. The *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* also establishes a staged system of licensure, based on the verified professional growth of educators that can be associated with desired learning outcomes in the classroom. This staged system of licensure is intended to support the retention of highly qualified and experienced teachers in practice

in classrooms by recognizing and rewarding their demonstrated professional competence and mastery.

Strategy Two: Support LEAs' Design and Implementation of Plans to Assist Teachers to Become Highly Qualified

Wisconsin statute (ss. 118.19, 121.02, Wis. Stats.) establishes that any person seeking to teach in public schools, including state-run and charter schools, must first obtain a license or permit from the Department of Public Instruction

< <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/statutes.html> >. Again, by statute, a license may only be issued to persons who have earned a bachelors degree, who have completed an approved program of teacher preparation, and who have demonstrated mastery of the content knowledge area of the license. Persons seeking a license to teach in a core academic area must complete a major or major equivalent in that area and pass a test of content knowledge. Any teacher assigned to teach core academic subjects in which they are licensed based on these statutes and on Wisconsin Academic Code (Chapter PI 34) is highly qualified.

Practically, however, LEAs are not always able to find highly qualified teachers to teach in every core academic subject area. There are identified shortages in the supply of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers as well as in special education at all levels. Each year, the department issues a School District Audit Report for each LEA that identifies discrepancies between teaching assignments and teacher licensure. LEAs that employ teachers who are not highly qualified for their assignment are notified through this report and must follow the process for informing the department of its plan to assure that each teacher who is not highly qualified will become so by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction provides the following support and technical assistance to LEAs to assist them in designing and implementing plans to meet the HQT target:

A. Provide Emergency Licenses and Permits that Require Teachers to Become Highly Qualified

Due to geographic variation in the supply of licensed teachers in the shortage areas of special education, mathematics, and teachers of LEP students, districts may not be able to recruit or reassign teaching staff to assure that all class sections in core academic content areas are taught by teachers who are highly qualified. Chapter PI 34.21 < <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/tepd/PI34.html> > defines the emergency license, limits its scope to one specific assignment for one academic year and sets forth the rules under which such a license can be granted. The license can only be granted to teachers who hold a valid license in another category and only after the district provides evidence that a search was conducted to identify and hire a fully qualified and licensed teacher for the assignment. The teacher who is teaching under an *emergency license* must complete at least six credit hours in an approved program leading to the appropriate license each year in order for the district to request renewal of the emergency license.

Emergency permits are issued to persons who have a bachelors degree in the academic content area but do not otherwise meet the qualifications for the license. They can be assigned to teach core academic subjects only if a search has failed to identify and lead to the hire of any licensed teacher who could teach that specific assignment. This permit can only be renewed if a subsequent search fails to identify and lead to the hire of a licensed teacher, and only if the permit holder completes at least six hours toward completing an approved program leading to the license.

Holders of both emergency licenses and emergency permits generally become fully licensed through alternative pathways to licensure. Teachers on emergency licenses or permits are considered highly qualified as long as they have demonstrated their content knowledge, are enrolled in a program leading to full licensure that can be completed within three years, receive high quality professional development before and during teaching, and receive intensive supervision or mentoring. If the district does not verify that these requirements are

met, the teacher will be identified as “not highly qualified.” If they fail to complete the approved program within the three-year time limit, they will not be identified as highly qualified and the LEA will then be responsible for developing a plan to assist them in becoming highly qualified. An additional description of this process follows below.

B. Provide Alternative Pathways for Teachers to Become Highly Qualified

The *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* also established two ways that persons could be licensed as initial educators through the demonstration of equivalent qualifications. These programs are established to assure that the supply of licensed educators in hard-to-staff areas could be met in the different regions of the state. The two pathways are based on providing evidence that the applicant has completed specified, standards-based alternatives as approved by the state superintendent. All pathways include meeting statutory requirements for the licenses as well as passing the required test of content knowledge for the area of licensure. These pathways are:

Alternative routes, such as the post-baccalaureate programs, that provide an intensive, field-based process for becoming licensed for those who hold bachelors degrees in the content area. These routes are monitored and reviewed through the institutional on-site review and continuing annual review process.

Alternative programs are offered to meet the specific staffing needs of LEAs within a region and are generally provided by Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) or by the LEAs themselves. These programs are reviewed and monitored through a rigorous process coordinated by the Teacher Education, Professional Development, and Licensing Team, which also provides technical assistance and support to the entities providing these programs. The *Application for Approval of Alternative Program for Initial Educator Licensing* (Draft, January 2006) is found in Appendix E.

The state superintendent established that all alternative routes to the license ensure that candidates:

- Receive high-quality professional development that is sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction before and while teaching;
- Participate in a program of intensive supervision that consists of structured guidance and regular ongoing support for teachers, or a teacher mentoring program;
- Assume functions as a teacher for a period not to exceed three years; and
- Demonstrate satisfactory progress toward full certification as prescribed by the state.

Upon receipt of new guidance in August 2005, our process for ensuring that the requirements are met for persons in alternative routes was amended to assure that they were highly qualified in content knowledge based on a major, its equivalent, or a rigorous standardized test. The criteria for meeting the highly qualified standard in content knowledge are specific to the level and category of licensure. (See Appendix F - amended PI 1602-EL application form with LEA assurances)

C. Provide Web-based Tools to LEAs to Design and Implement Plans to Meet the HQT Target: Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools and Quality Educator Interactive

The *Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools* (WINSS) is a web-based resource provided to LEAs to develop and implement plans to assist teachers in alternative route programs to become highly qualified. This portal provides professional development needs assessment and planning tools for LEAs and individuals. It also provides links to resources such as *Quality Educator Interactive* that provide access to approved programs and professional development opportunities.

WINSS provides data, analyses, and tools to assist all LEAs to engage in the continuous school improvement process required under ss. 121.02, Wis. Stats., and in Chapter PI 8. The “Continuous School Improvement” page on the WINSS website provides links to research-based planning guides and tools, including the

“School Improvement Planning Tool” developed by North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).

WINSS also provides a “best practices” site that supports ongoing professional development of all educators. The “Professional Development” component of the site provides access to tools that guide LEAs in identifying professional development needs, developing plans for professional development initiatives, and in identifying and accessing the resources to implement those plans.

The *Quality Educator Interactive* (QEI) web portal provides web-based links to professional development planning opportunities around the state. The development and continued operation of the portal is supported by the department and is a key component of the implementation of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* process of performance-based licensing.

D. Provide Regional Support to LEAs through CESAs and LRSCs

The department also supports 12 (CESAs) and 15 (LRSCs) throughout Wisconsin. These CESAs and LRSCs provide access to high quality professional development and support for initial teacher preparation, mentor training, and the planning for professional development and advanced licensure. Several CESAs offer alternative programs to meet the specific staffing needs of LEAs in their region. CESAs and LRSCs also have been supported in the development of tools to assist LEAs to better meet the needs of their neediest schools.

Strategy Three: Connect LEAs to the HQ Teachers They Need through Web-based Resources

The Department of Public Instruction recognized that LEAs, too, need to connect to the larger supply of highly qualified teachers in the state who were seeking employment. At one time, the employment of teachers was organized at the district level and districts rarely had to recruit beyond their own regions. While this is still true for some LEAs, it is not true for the five LEAs that have the highest number of teachers who are not highly qualified. To assist these LEAs and those in more isolated geographic regions, the DPI worked with the state to develop *JobSeeker*, a web-based tool that lists all state

employment opportunities and that allows all interested applicants to submit a resume. Teachers and LEAs connect through the “Education” portal of the site, which posts open teaching positions in the state and stores teacher applications.

The use of this tool has allowed LEAs to maximize their access to highly qualified teachers looking for jobs.

Strategy Four: Recognize, Retain, and Reward Experienced Highly Qualified Teachers in Hard-to-Staff LEAs

Data indicate that fully half of all teachers who are not qualified are employed in two large urban LEAs in the state. These LEAs also have high teacher turnover, as identified in the *Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Report* (see Appendix A). In many cases, the need to hire a teacher who is not highly qualified is caused by the loss of an experienced, highly qualified staff member. To reduce the loss of highly qualified teachers, the department offers support and guidance for continuing professional development and rewards for remaining in the classroom.

Chapter PI 34 establishes a system of licensing that is based on stages in the professional career of teaching. The research on teacher retention provides evidence that teachers who are provided opportunities for advanced professional practice in their work assignments are more likely to remain in teaching in their current school. Advancement from the initial stage of licensure to the professional stage is supported through legislation, policy, and funding, including significant funding from the Title II state activities funding. These supports include:

A. Peer Review and Mentoring Grants

The Legislature provides funding in the biennial budget to support peer review and mentoring for educators (ss. 115.042, Wis. Stats.), with a preference established in the 2006-2007 funding year on the development of peer-based mentoring and support for teachers in high-need schools, defined as having a poverty rate of 30 percent or higher, failure to meet AYP, or being identified as a school identified for improvement (SIFI). This funding supplements Title II (a) funds that are used to support continuing professional development for teachers.

< <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/statutes.html> >. Action plans submitted by applicants focus primarily on the implementation of the strategies and suggested best practices presented in the *Professional Development Planning Toolkits* < <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/tepd/pdp.html> > for LEAs, initial educators, and professional educators. These toolkits developed by the department support LEAs, mentors, initial educators, and professional educators in developing the Professional Development Plans (PDPs) required by the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*.

B. Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant

Funds will be awarded to identified LEAs that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) or that have schools identified for improvement during the 2005-2006 school year to develop and implement comprehensive plans for the 2006-2007 school year. These plans must be directed to addressing identified inequities in the distribution of experienced, highly qualified teachers through alignment of district policy and resources, and strong collaboration with professional development providers such as CESAs, LRSCs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs).

District plans must:

- Develop and implement a plan to address the inequities in the distribution of experienced teachers in high needs schools.
- Provide intensive mentoring/coaching support for educators in high need schools with an emphasis on initial educators and teachers who are not currently highly qualified for their teaching assignment.
- Examine/research factors that hinder hiring and retention of highly qualified and experienced educators in high needs schools , including the examination of district and school-based policies and practices, climate and working conditions that have an impact on teacher's decisions to remain in teaching or to continue to teach in high-need schools.

- Work collaboratively with professional development providers to design and implement school and district-wide professional development plans to meet the needs of experienced teachers working in high-need schools.

C. National Board Certification Grants and Master Educator Grants

Teachers who seek certification by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards are qualified to become licensed as Wisconsin Master Educators. The holders of this license are identified as leaders in their schools and LEAs and are provided with both public recognition and financial incentives for demonstrating mastery through this process. Through ss. 115.42, Wis. Stats., < <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/statutes.html> > the state Legislature awards an initial grant of \$2,000 to successful candidates. National Board certified teachers receive an additional grant of \$2,500 each year for the nine years of the term of the license, provided that the teacher continues to teach in the state. The DPI administers and monitors this award through the provisions of Chapter PI 37 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

The department is sending a budget request to the state Legislature to double the amount awarded to National Board certified teachers and Wisconsin Master Educators who elect to relocate to or continue to teach in high-need schools, including schools that did not make AYP and that have not met the 100 percent HQT target. This incentive would be effective beginning in the 2007-09 biennial legislative budget.

Strategy Five: Support and Mentor Less-experienced Highly Qualified Teachers in LEAs Not Meeting the HQT Target

The five LEAs that employ fully half of all teachers who are not highly qualified also have higher rates of teacher turnover within the first three years of employment. Research indicates that lack of mentoring and support is one factor that contributes to the decision to leave the position. This loss of young, highly qualified teachers further depletes the regional supply of highly qualified teachers that are available to these high-need LEAs. To reduce the need to hire teachers who are not highly qualified to compensate for the loss of a highly qualified but less-experienced teacher, the department provides technical

assistance and funding to develop Initial Educator Support Systems. The *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* requires all LEAs to develop an Initial Educator Support System. The Legislature provides funding to support the establishment of these systems. This state funding supports

- A system of ongoing orientation for the initial educator,
- Mentoring provided by a qualified, trained mentor, and
- Professional development support seminars that focus on developing mastery of the performance of the Wisconsin Teacher Standards.

The funding follows the initial educator and will be disbursed beginning with 2006-2007 school year. Since the five districts with the highest number of teachers who are not highly qualified also hire the largest proportion of initial educators, they will be receiving the largest total disbursements of these funds to develop their systems of support.

Strategy Six: Strengthen and Expand Regional Support Systems Currently Serving High Need LEAs and LEAs not Meeting the HQT Target

The department has established and currently supports 12 CESAs and 15 LRSCs. These regional support systems are actively engaged in assisting LEAs in meeting their HQT target by providing and coordinating alternative programs. In addition to these regional systems, the department funds and staffs the following programs:

A. Office of Urban Education, Staff Development and Teacher Education

The department has developed an Urban Staff Development program in the Office of Urban Education in Milwaukee. This program provides technical assistance to urban school LEA personnel in the planning and implementation of professional activities for teachers and administrators by a) coordinating or conducting staff development and training; b) developing a resource library; and c) coordinating innovative and experimental programs that provide alternative routes to teacher licensing in hard-to-staff schools. This includes support for the Milwaukee Teacher Education Center (MTEC) alternative program that is offered by Milwaukee Public Schools < <http://www.mteconline.org/program.html> >.

B. Preschool to Grade 5 Program

Begun in 1986-87, central city elementary schools enrolling large numbers of economically disadvantaged students have received annual state grants averaging \$193,000 per school to support LEAs in meeting the potentially intense and pervasive needs of students living in poverty. The primary goal of the *Preschool to Grade 5 (P5)* program is to provide successful strategies for addressing the needs of economically disadvantaged students. Among these strategies are support for parental involvement and student learning through extended-day kindergartens, preschool programs, reading incentive projects, science and/or computer labs, parent training, and student tutorial services. The funds also support the hiring and continuing professional development of essential staff, including home/school workers, language arts and/or mathematics coordinators, and reading specialists. Currently, 38 schools participate from three of the five LEAs (Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine) with the highest number of teachers who are not highly qualified and with the preponderance of schools not meeting AYP.

While the P5 program has many components, there is an emphasis on professional development to improve student achievement in the core content areas. Schools develop school effectiveness proposals using a site-based management approach. Teachers, parents, community members, and administrators are directly involved in developing all school proposals which articulate how funds are used to meet identified needs of students.

The legislation provides individual schools considerable autonomy to promote site-based management, although certain guidelines apply to all schools. Individual schools must revise and submit proposals each year for review by the state Preschool to Grade 5 Advisory Council and approval by the state superintendent. Each school project must be evaluated each year based on goals and objectives. Class size in all grades below the sixth is restricted to no more than 25 students. In-service training pertaining to a school's goals and objectives is required for all instructional staff.

If an LEA has not met the HQT provisions of NCLB in funded schools, they must target funds for this purpose.

3.2 Does the plan indicate that the staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP will be given high priority?

Wisconsin's revised plan for meeting the 100 percent HQT target includes specific strategies that target staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP. Most schools that did not make AYP are located in the five LEAs that also have the highest number of teachers who are not highly qualified, so all six strategies give priority to these schools. However, three of the six strategies outlined in the plan give explicit priority to schools that did not make AYP. Section 3.1 under Requirement 3 provides a detailed description of all the following strategies:

- **Strategy 4** prioritizes funding to recognize, support and reward experienced highly qualified educators in schools that did not make AYP or are SIFI, through the Peer Review and Mentoring Grants; and doubling of the National Board Certification/Master Educator License grant for educators who relocate to or continue to work in schools that did not make AYP.
- **Strategy 5** prioritizes funding to support the development of Initial Educator Support Systems in schools that did not make AYP, because those schools are also schools that hire the highest percentage of less-experienced educators in the state. It also provides designated funding to LEAs with schools that did not make AYP in 2005-2006 to support the design and implementation of a local plan to address equity in the distribution of experienced teachers through the *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant*. The *Statewide System of Support* that is described in greater detail in Section 4.2 of Requirement 4 also gives priority to identifying and supporting the staffing and professional development needs of schools that did not make AYP.

The *Statewide System of Support* will enhance an LEA's ability to improve the effectiveness of its programs and strategies for providing support. This includes support for meeting staffing and professional development needs through the Standard Area II:

Leadership and Governance, and Standard Area V: Professional Development portions of its plan.

- **Strategy 6** places priority on expanding existing regional support for the LEAs that have not reached the HQT target. The five LEAs that employ fully half of the teachers who are not highly qualified also contain the highest percentage of schools that did not make AYP.

3.3 Does the plan include a description of programs and services the SEA will provide to assist teachers and LEAs in successfully meeting HQT goals?

An analysis of the distribution of non-highly qualified teachers in schools not making AYP indicates that there are areas of need in mathematics and special education. Our response in this section indicates how the SEA uses resources to increase the supply of highly qualified teachers in these identified areas of need. Programs supported by the department are:

Student Loan Forgiveness or Deferral

Wisconsin DPI actively disseminates information regarding both federal and state student loan forgiveness programs and assists interested educators in qualifying and applying for these deferments. The federal program is aimed at areas of teacher shortage for borrowers who had no outstanding Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program loans on July 1, 1987, but who had an outstanding FFEL Program loan on July 1, 1993. These teachers qualify for deferment of loan repayment under the Federal Stafford and Federal Supplemental Loans for Students (SLS) programs anytime within the life of the borrower's loan(s). Designated teacher shortage areas identified in the 2004-2005 academic year that are relevant to the core academic subjects are listed below:

- **Standard Areas:** English as a Second Language (ESL)/Bilingual, Sciences, Mathematics, Music, Reading, Foreign Languages
- **Special Education:** Cognitive Disabilities, Cross Categorical, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood-Special Education, Emotional/Behavioral Disorders, Learning Disabilities, Visual Disabilities

Teachers who borrow through the *Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board* or the *Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation* complete the loan deferral form available from those two sources and have the form signed by the employing administrator. Then the teacher requests from the SEA Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing Team (608-266-1879), a letter verifying the current licensure either in a shortage area or in any area if employed in a low-income school building < <http://SEA.wi.gov/tepd/loans.html> >.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships

The Title II Mathematics and Science Partnership Program discretionary grant is targeted to increasing the academic achievement of students in mathematics and science by enhancing the content knowledge and teaching skills of classroom teachers. Partnerships between high-need school LEAs and the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) faculty in institutions of higher education are at the core of these improvement efforts. DPI awards sub-grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible partnerships that must include at least one high-need LEA and an institution of higher education. A high need LEA is any LEA where mathematics or science student proficiency scores do not exceed 65 percent, based on disaggregated 2004-2005 WKCE scores, and where there is no currently active Title II, Part B grant in the same content area, and one of the following:

- At least 10 percent of the student population is from families with income below the poverty line, or
- Schools/LEAs having a Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) or meeting locale codes of 6, 7, or 8, or not achieving AYP in mathematics based on 2004-2005 data. < <http://SEA.wi.gov/cal/t2agrant.html> >.

These funds will be distributed by formula based on enrollment (20 percent) and on the number of students below the poverty line (80 percent). To be eligible to receive a sub-grant, an LEA conducts an assessment of local needs for

professional development and hiring, as identified by the LEA and school staff. These selected goals may be directly related to the school LEA requirements of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*. LEAs also may use these funds to recruit and hire highly qualified teachers. The law requires that LEAs have an annual plan with targets to have all teachers fully licensed by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

LEAs are required to target funds to schools that have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers, have the largest average class size, or are identified for improvement and use these funds to address these deficiencies.

REACH Initiative for Special Education - Responsive Education for All Children

The Department of Public Instruction established the Responsive Education for All Children (REACH) Initiative to refine and expand the *Early Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance* and the *Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success* (READS) initiatives in support of inclusive and collaborative special education. REACH will support LEAs in making systemic efforts to remove barriers to learning and enable all students to experience academic success. REACH provides the framework for the use of 15 percent of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Early Intervention Services funds to support regional, systematic efforts to support improved literacy in reading and mathematics in particular as well as for the implementation of the Response to Intervention process set forth by IDEA in 2004. REACH will establish regional centers in the coming months that will support implementation of the initiative. In particular, the grant will support a network of highly trained mentors who will provide support and high quality professional development to educators working in schools that did not make AYP. Supplemental Title I funds were utilized to ensure participation in the REACH project of Title I LEAs with schools that missed AYP or were identified for improvement.

3.4 Does the plan specifically address the needs of any subgroups of teachers identified in Requirement 1?

As indicated in Requirement 1, teachers of mathematics and special education are the two subgroups of teachers who are most likely to be not highly qualified for their assignment. The total numbers of teachers in these subgroups is 284. Approximately 34 percent of those teachers are teaching in schools that did not make AYP. Strategies in the plan that support programs and initiatives that address the needs of these subgroups are:

- **Strategy 2:** Providing alternative pathways and professional development support to assist teachers who are not highly qualified, especially those teaching under the emergency license, to become highly qualified.
- **Strategy 4:** Recognize, support, and reward experienced, highly qualified teachers.
- **Strategy 5:** Support and mentor less-experienced highly qualified teachers.
- **Strategy 6:** Strengthen and expand existing regional support.
- **Student Loan Forgiveness/Deferral**
- **The Title II Math and Science Partnership Sub-grants**
- **REACH**

These strategies and programs are described in more detail in Section 3.1 and 3.3 of Requirement 3.

3.5 Does the plan include a description of how the state will use its available funds (e.g., Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A, including the portion that goes to the state agency for higher education; other federal and state funds, as appropriate) to address the needs of teachers who are not highly qualified?

Title II, Part A funding has been used by the department to fund implementation of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*, including educator preparation program review and approval, development and implementation of the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process (WMEAP) and the Professional Development Plan design, implementation and verification process. Specific initiatives supported by this funding support **Strategy 1: Full Implementation of the Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative** and **Strategy 2: Support LEAs in Designing and Implementing Plans to**

Assist Teachers to Become Highly Qualified in Wisconsin's revised plan to meet the HQT target and are described in Section 3.1 of Requirement 3. These funds also have been directly awarded to LEAs to support action plans presented in their Consolidated Application for ESEA Title II, Part A funds. The following provides descriptions of additional uses of Title I and Title II funding that address the needs of teachers who are not highly qualified.

LEA Professional Development

The state uses Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A funds to support activities that focus on increasing the subject-matter knowledge of teachers and that assist teachers to become highly qualified. In the current fiscal year, funds have been obligated to support content area professional development in science, math, reading, social studies, language arts, fine arts, world languages, and environmental science. This professional development is implemented through direct training by DPI staff as well as collaboration with statewide organizations and CESAs. Current projects include teacher involvement in curriculum development; aligning standards, assessment and instruction; mentoring in the content areas; implementation of online professional development; and development of online training modules for both students and teachers in science. In particular, the Title II Math and Science Partnership sub-grants and REACH provide significant funding targeted to address the needs of teachers not currently highly qualified in mathematics and special education.

LEA Support for Educational Technology

The state supports activities that focus on increasing competency in the use of educational technology. To receive a license to teach in Wisconsin, an applicant must complete an approved program and demonstrate proficient performance in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions under ten performance standards that include: the teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies, including the use of technology to encourage children's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills; and the teacher uses effective verbal and nonverbal communication techniques, as well as instructional media

and technology, to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom. Title II, Part A funds are used to provide technical assistance to IHEs that prepare teachers in the development and monitoring of programs.

If the LEA has not met the HQT provisions of the NCLB in funded schools, they must target funds for this purpose.

Consolidated Application - Teacher and Principal Quality Funds

Title II, Part A funds are dispersed to LEAs by the DPI through the Consolidated Application process. To be eligible to receive funds under this program, an LEA is required to annually submit a Consolidated Application for ESEA funding < <http://www.SEA.wi.gov/esea/application.html> >. This application is for all formula programs, including the Teacher and Principal Quality Funds; Title II, Part A < <http://www.SEA.wi.gov/cal/t2agrant.html> >. The Title II, Part A sections of the application include:

- Entry of activity selection based on the allowed activities under the law,
- Entry of funds associated with these activities,
- Detailed budget and budget summary,
- Program Plan (professional development, staff development, teacher recruiting, hiring, and retention) based on the five federal goals, and
- Performance indicators.

The nine allowed activities under the law were collapsed under the following four activities:

- Providing professional development activities that improve the knowledge of teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals,
- Developing and implementing initiatives to promote retention of highly qualified teachers and principals, particularly within schools with a high percentage of low-achieving students, and activities related to PI 34, to improve the quality of teachers, principals, and superintendents through

- Developing and implementing staff advancement initiatives that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career and pay differentiation, including activities related to PI 34,
- Developing and implementing mechanisms and initiatives to assist in recruiting, hiring, and retaining highly qualified teachers, principals, and pupil services personnel.

Prior to submitting the consolidated application, LEAs are required to do the following:

- Conduct a needs assessment for the purposes of professional development and hiring highly qualified teachers,
- Consult with private schools,
- Involve parents and community in (i) needs assessment, (ii) planning, (iii) implementation, and (iv) evaluation, and
- Integrate other federal, state, and local programs and initiatives with Title II, Part A.

Professional Development Plan Design, Implementation and Verification

The *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* establishes a performance-based system of advancement to the professional and master educator licenses. The department supports activities that assess the impact of professional development programs on teacher knowledge and pedagogical skills as well as on student academic achievement. Through the verification of completion of a Professional Development Plan required of all Initial Educators, assessment of professional growth and the impact on student learning is documented. (See the Professional Development Plan Toolkits,

< <http://www.SEA.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/pdpeducator toolkit.pdf> >.

3.6 Does the plan for the use of available funds indicate that priority will be given to the staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP?

The information presented in Section 3.1 – 3.5 of Requirement 3 provides narrative description of how the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is assisting LEAs

that have not made AYP or that have schools identified for improvement to meet the HQT target goals that will also assist them in improving student academic performance. The following description highlights systemic efforts that specifically target available funding and resources across the department to assist LEAs that have not made AYP in meeting their staffing and professional development needs.

A. Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant

This initiative was announced by the State Superintendent on June 8, 2006, in response to the findings of the Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Study report, funded by the Joyce Foundation. This report indicated that high-need schools in Wisconsin were disproportionately served by teachers with less than three years teaching experience. Further analysis of the HQT and AYP data indicated that schools that failed to make AYP were also served by higher numbers of teachers who had less than three years experience.

The *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* will target funding to the LEAs operating schools that did not make AYP for the 2005-2006 school year and that have higher numbers of inexperienced teachers. These funds will be used to develop and implement comprehensive local plans to enhance recruitment and retention of effective educators in LEAs with schools identified for improvement or schools that have missed adequate yearly progress (AYP).

The *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* will award a total of \$625,000 to LEAs that meet the following criteria: a) 30 percent or higher of enrolled students qualifying for free or reduced lunches, and b) failure to make AYP in 2005-2006 or identified for improvement under NCLB definitions.

District plans must:

- Develop and implement a plan to address the inequities in the distribution of experienced teachers in high-need schools.
- Provide intensive mentoring/coaching support for educators in high need schools with an emphasis on initial educators and teachers who are not currently highly qualified for their teaching assignment.

- Examine/research factors that hinder hiring and retention of highly qualified and experienced educators in high-need schools, including the examination of district and school-based policies and practices, as well as climate and working conditions that have an impact on teachers' decisions to remain in teaching or to continue to teach in high-need schools.
- Work collaboratively with professional development providers to design and implement professional development to meet the needs of experienced teachers working in high-need schools.

B. State Funding for Peer Review and Mentoring Grants with a Priority on High Need Schools

State funding is available for educator mentoring on a competitive basis to CESAs, consortia of two or more school LEAs, or consortia consisting of CESAs and school LEAs. Applications eligible for funding receive grants based on the following criteria:

1. The extent to which teachers are involved in the program development and activities.
2. The extent to which the goals and objectives relate to the purpose of the program.
3. The extent to which the program activities are appropriate to the goals and objectives of the proposed program.
4. The adequacy of the timeline for completion of each major activity and the extent to which continuation of program activities is ensured after the grant period is completed.
5. The extent to which the program activities will enhance instruction and ultimately enhance student achievement.

In addition, priority will be given to proposals that plan to serve high-need schools. In Wisconsin most schools that missed AYP also qualify as high-need schools and have a student population where 30 percent or higher qualify for free or reduced lunches.

C. State Funding for LEAs Enrolling Concentrations of English Language Learners (ELLs)

When LEAs are identified as a district enrolling concentrations of ELLs, they are eligible for state categorical aid. The five districts that have the highest percentage of teachers who are not highly qualified and schools that did not meet AYP qualify as districts enrolling concentrations of ELL and as a result are awarded targeted funds to address staffing and professional development needs.

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 2006-2007 school year.

4.1 Does the plan indicate how the SEA will monitor LEA compliance with the LEA's HQT plans described in Requirement 2 and hold LEAs accountable for fulfilling their plans?

Wisconsin's Procedure to Monitor LEA Compliance

A. Consolidated ESEA Monitoring Process

The department annually monitors LEA compliance with the HQT provisions in Title I (A) and Title II (A) through the Consolidated ESEA entitlement monitoring process. LEAs submit applications, including a program plan, an activity summary, and a budget justification. The department approves the program plan, the activity summary, and the budget justification, assuring alignment between the goals and the budget and activity summaries. All claims are monitored closely and are addressed based on the most current approved budget.

The department's oversight and monitoring responsibilities include on-site reviews to verify compliance with the provisions of Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A. The on-site monitoring team verifies compliance for all ESEA title programs. The ESEA Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook < <http://www.SEA.wi.gov/esea/doc/monitoring.doc> > specifically addresses the HQT provisions under Title I and Title II requirements (see Appendix G, pp. 21-35). The department annually monitors LEAs that have schools identified for improvement and randomly monitors all other LEAs. The monitoring team makes additional visits whenever necessary or whenever a non-compliance issue with the provisions arises.

LEAS are monitored on compliance with the following requirements:

- The LEA is providing high quality professional development in all core academic areas. The plan is aligned with the federal goals and the activities

are sustained, connected, and are based on scientifically-based research to improve teaching and learning in all schools.

- The LEA has a plan to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified by the 2006-2007 school year.
- The LEA developed/implemented programs to ensure that all Title I paraprofessionals are highly qualified.
- The LEA uses funds under this program based on the needs assessment and targets schools that have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers, have the largest average class size, or are identified for improvement.
- The LEA's hiring policies ensure that all new hires for teacher and paraprofessional positions meet the NCLB high quality requirements prior to employment.

DPI will withhold reimbursement of ESEA entitlement expenditures until LEAs submit and have on file an approved application, including an approved *Highly Qualified Teacher Plan* for those LEAs that have not yet met the HQT 100 percent target goal. In addition, DPI will require corrective action if the Highly Qualified Teacher District Interim Report or the on-site review indicate that an LEA is not meeting the 100 percent HQT target goal.

B. School Staff and Personnel Report and District Audit Report

In the fall of 2006, LEAs that have not met the HQT target goal will be notified of the number and names of the teachers who are not yet highly qualified through the School Staff and Personnel Report. Based on an auditing report, all LEAs that have not meet the 100 percent HQT requirement will be notified and required to submit a detailed plan and interim progress report (see 2.2 and 2.3)

4.2 Does the plan show how technical assistance from the SEA to help LEAs meet the 100 percent HQT goal will be targeted toward LEAs and schools that are not making AYP?

Technical assistance that helps LEAs meet the 100 percent HQT goal is primarily targeted toward LEAs and schools that are not making AYP as well. This assistance is described in greater detail in the strategies under Requirement 3, and includes full

implementation of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*, Initial Educator Grants, Peer Review and Mentoring Grants, WINSS Comprehensive School Improvement Planning, the Wisconsin Quality Educator Interactive web portal, and other technical assistance and support.

The most comprehensive plan to support LEAs that do not make AYP or meet HQT target is the Statewide System of Support described below:

A Tool for Improving LEA Support to its Neediest Schools

In 2005, Wisconsin launched a pilot of its Statewide System of Support. Under the leadership of the department, the six largest urban LEAs in Wisconsin (Milwaukee, Madison, Racine, Kenosha, Green Bay, and Beloit) as well as Menominee Indian School (an LEA identified for improvement) collaborated in developing and piloting a rubric to assess the effectiveness of district support systems for low-performing schools. The rubric includes an assessment of District Vision, Values and Culture, Leadership and Governance, Decision Making and Accountability, Curriculum and Instruction, and Professional Development.

The *self-assessment* and subsequent peer review process are the foundation of Wisconsin's Statewide System of Support (SSOS)—as part of the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*. In addition to improving student achievement in the state's LEAs and schools identified for improvement, the driving forces behind the development of the SSOS include a desire to strengthen existing support, to build capacity for school improvement at the local level, to create resources for LEA use, and to utilize a variety of stakeholders in improving LEA support systems. The SSOS will assist a LEA in targeting specific areas to improve the support a LEA provides to its neediest schools, including professional development aimed at assisting any staff who are not highly qualified. This includes teachers who are not deemed highly effective. Increased support also is aimed at teachers who have fewer than three years of experience.

In Wisconsin, the professional development that is provided based on this self-assessment must be high quality as defined in Section 9101 (34) of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. This professional development:

- Involves multiple sessions over time and moves beyond one-day or short-term workshops or conferences.
- Helps to further individual, school, or district educational plans.
- Addresses job-related skills aimed at ultimately impacting student performance. Examples include, but are not limited to, instructional methods, classroom management, needs of special populations, curricular alignment, program development, etc.
- Includes job-embedded learning opportunities such as collaborative teams that analyze student work, school improvement teams that analyze school data and develop school improvement plans, curriculum development teams, and other sustained learning opportunities.
- May originate from a variety of sources, such as school-based, district-based, universities, professional organizations, on-line courses, independent study projects, etc.

Additionally, the self-assessment and peer review process is a resource for all LEAs to use in improving support to their neediest schools. The *District Self-Assessment Handbook*, which includes tips and guidance for collecting, analyzing and summarizing data; and using the results of the self-assessment rubric to serve and support the LEA's neediest schools more effectively. Sample timelines and agendas, data collection and analysis tools, suggested steps in getting ready for and conducting the self-assessment process are a few of the many resources available in the handbook. The handbook also contains an explanation of the self-assessment rubric, its development, and its guiding principles, which may provide LEAs with a clearer picture of how the self-assessment process is best implemented.

Conducting the self-assessment assists districts in building a comprehensive picture of district support to the LEA's neediest schools. To build this picture and

examine it effectively, districts are advised to bring stakeholders such as teachers, principals, parents, students, central office staff, and community leaders together to examine LEA effectiveness. The self-assessment process requires LEAs to look at a wide variety of data and evidence sources to complete the picture of LEA support. Critical data sources include but are not limited to student achievement data, teacher quality and retention data, focus groups, interviews, observations, and surveys.

Following the district self-assessment, the DPI facilitates a peer review process. A peer review consists of DPI staff, and staff from other LEAs, higher education, CESAs, or other partners, reviewing the results of the district self-assessment and clarifying strengths and areas for improvement. As a result of the peer review, the DPI and district reach consensus about next steps to strengthen the district support system for low-performing schools. Based on the consensus conclusions, the DPI allocates supplemental Title I funding to address the recommendations for improvement. Of highest priority in this evaluation process is helping LEAs meet the 100 percent HQT goal in the LEAs' neediest schools.

4.3 Does the plan describe how the SEA will monitor whether LEAs attain 100 percent HQT in each LEA and school?

The process by which the department will monitor LEA and school compliance with the HQT target is described in detail in Requirement 2 and 3 and is repeated here.

School Staff and Personnel Report and District Audit Report

Beginning with the 1972-73 school year, the SEA has conducted annual audits of all school LEAs to assure that only licensed teachers, and therefore, highly qualified teachers, have been hired. This audit cross references the staff and teacher personnel report submitted to the department by all LEAs each year with the DPI's teacher licensing database. A report is generated that lists any discrepancy between an educator's license and the educator's assignment(s). LEAs are sent the audit report and required to rectify any discrepancy. This includes any teacher teaching without a specific license for their specific assignment(s) and at the specific grade level, including all teachers teaching core

academic subjects identified under NCLB. Since no license can be issued without a bachelor's degree, the audit also ensures that all teachers identified as highly qualified hold at least a bachelor's degree. The department's licensing staff provides technical assistance to LEAs to address discrepancies.

Beginning in 2006-2007, as a new component of the consolidated monitoring process, LEAs that hire teachers who are not highly qualified will have to submit a plan describing how they will assist the teacher to become highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year. The *Highly Qualified Teacher Plan* and *Highly Qualified Teacher District Interim Report* are reviewed, approved, and monitored by DPI. LEAs that do not submit approved plans or that do not provide evidence through the *Highly Qualified Teacher District Interim Report* of making progress towards meeting the goal will have reimbursement for Title I expenditures withheld until they are compliant. The timeline for implementation and monitoring is as follows:

- October 2006: Initial notification sent to LEAs.
- November 15, 2006: *Highly Qualified Teacher Plans* submitted to and reviewed by department. Review includes a determination of whether the plans meet the standards for high quality professional development defined in Section 9101 (34) of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Plans that do not meet these standards must be revised by the LEA with technical assistance from the department.
- November 2006 - June 30, 2007: Targeted technical assistance will be provided to districts in accordance with the *Highly Qualified Teacher Plans*.
- February 15, 2007: The *Highly Qualified Teacher District Plan Interim Report* will be submitted and reviewed. Additional technical assistance will be provided to districts not making planned progress.
- June 30, 2007: Final reports submitted to and reviewed by the department.

4.4 Consistent with ESEA §2141, does the plan include technical assistance or corrective actions that the SEA will apply if LEAs fail to meet HQT and AYP goals?

Currently, only one LEA in Wisconsin is identified for improvement under the provisions of ESEA Section 2141(2000). This LEA is identified for improvement at Level 1 for not making adequate yearly progress at the district level. At this level, the SEA is required to provide technical assistance to the LEA and, if applicable, to the schools within the LEA that may need assistance in making AYP. If this LEA should fail to make AYP for the third consecutive year, the department would be required to assure that at least 10 percent of Title I Part A expenditures were reserved for high-quality professional development as defined under Section 9101 (34) of the *No Child Left Behind Act*.

The plan provides that LEAs that fail to meet the HQT target by the end of the 2006-2007 school year will be required to submit a satisfactory plan to target their Title I and Title II funding to achieve the 100 percent compliance target set by NCLB.

Reimbursement of Title I and Title II expenditures will be withheld until the LEA submits a satisfactory plan and demonstrates progress through the monitoring process described previously under Requirement 2 and elaborated upon in Requirement 4, Section 4.2 and 4.4. This is consistent with the requirements of ESEA Section 2141.

The Statewide System of Support (SSOS) also provides comprehensive support to LEAs to meet HQT and AYP goals. The SSOS (described in detail in Section 3.2 of Requirement 3 and in Section 4.2 of Requirement 4) provides tools that target planning in five identified areas: vision, values and culture; leadership and governance; decision-making and accountability; curriculum and instruction; and professional development.

The SSOS provides technical assistance for the development and revision of district improvement plans to address the reasons for low student performance in the grade(s), content area(s), and student group(s) in which the district did not make AYP, which is required of the LEA identified for improvement at Level 1.

LEAs that failed to meet HQT and AYP goals will also be provided technical assistance and additional funding through the *Quality Educator Professional Development and*

Retention Grant (see Requirement 3, section 3.1, Strategy 4B, p. 24). As described earlier, districts receiving this grant were identified through a cross-analysis of the data on schools not making AYP, schools not meeting HQT and schools with high numbers of teachers with less than three years experience. All SIFI in Wisconsin are in districts that are recipients of this funding, including the seven schools at Level 3, the three schools at Level 4 and the single school at Level 5.

The single LEA identified for improvement has received the largest award available through this grant. Funds provided through the *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* must be used to:

- Develop and implement a plan to address the inequities in the distribution of experienced teachers in high needs schools.
- Provide intensive mentoring/coaching support for educators in high need schools with an emphasis on initial educators and teachers who are not currently highly qualified for their teaching assignment.
- Examine/research factors that hinder hiring and retention of highly qualified and experienced educators in high needs schools, including the examination of district- and school-based policies and practices, climate, and working conditions that have an impact on teachers' decisions to remain in teaching or to continue to teach in high-need schools.
- Work collaboratively with professional development providers to design and implement school and district-wide professional development plans to meet the needs of experienced teachers working in high-need schools.

The department is working with districts not meeting AYP and the HQT target in the development of these plans and to monitor their implementation. Timelines are as follows:

- September 2006: Grant recipients notified of the award and requirements.
- September 2006 - October 2006: Provide technical assistance and support for the development of comprehensive local plans to address the equitable distribution of experienced, high-quality teachers in the district.

- October 30, 2006: Grant recipients submit the Title I *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* (see Appendix K) for review and approval by the department.
- November 2006 - June 2007: Implement local plans of action for the *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant*. Implementation will be monitored and evaluated by the department.
- April 2007 - June 2007: Evaluate plan implementation and complete final report.

Table 5 and Appendix H provide a complete graphic organization of the technical assistance and corrective actions that will apply to LEAs failing to meet HQT and AYP goals.

Table 5: Statewide System of Support for Schools Not Making Adequate Yearly Progress

Accountability Levels		AYP	Federal Title I Sanctions					State Requirements	
Non-Title I Schools	Title I Schools	Participation, Reading, Math, Graduation/ Attendance Indicators	Two-Year School Improvement Plan	School Choice	Supplemental Educational Services	Corrective Action	Restructuring	All Schools	Additional Title I Requirements
Satisfactory		Met AYP for two or more consecutive years. Met AYP this year, missed AYP previous year. Missed AYP this year, met AYP previous year.						Recognition will be provided to the schools that have made the greatest gains in closing the achievement gap or those with high poverty that have consistently exceeded their AYP objectives.	
Continuous Improvement	Continuous Improvement	Level 1 SIFI: Missed AYP for 2 consecutive years.	2-year plan in place at start of next school year 1	Implement at start of next school year 2				Keep a 2-year school improvement plan on file in the LEA.	Also submit documentation of school choice provisions to SEA.
		Level 2 SIFI: Missed AYP for 3 consecutive years.	Updated 2-year plan in place at start of next school year 1	2nd year of school choice ²	Implement at start of next school year 3				Also submit documentation of school choice and supplemental educational service provisions.
	Corrective Action	Level 3 SIFI: Missed AYP for 4 consecutive years.	Updated 2-year plan in place at start of next school year 1	3rd year of school choice ²	2nd year of supplemental educational services ³	Take corrective action. ⁴		May request consultation and review of 2-year school improvement plan.	Also submit documentation of corrective action, school choice, and supplemental educational service provisions to SEA.
		Restructuring	Level 4 SIFI: Missed AYP for 5 or more consecutive years.	Updated 2-year plan in place at start of next school year 1	4th year of school choice ²	3rd year of supplemental educational services ³	2nd year of corrective action ⁴	Restructuring plan with alternative governance in place by next year. ⁵	Submit 2-year school improvement plan for review, consultation, and/or intervention.
Continuous Improvement								Work collaboratively with SEA School Support Teams assigned to assist schools/LEAs with greatest need. ⁶	
Continuous Improvement								Work collaboratively with SEA School Support Teams assigned to assist schools/LEAs with greatest need. ⁶	

Key to Table 5: Statewide System of Support

- SIFI: School Identified for Improvement
- All Schools' requirements refer both Title I and non-Title I schools.
- 1. Use existing LEA/school improvement plan format, or access the SEA School Improvement Template on the WINSS website.
- 2. LEAs provide a choice of at least two schools that are not in SIFI status, if two such schools exist in the LEA. Transportation must be provided until AYP has been met for two consecutive years.
- 3. LEAs/schools select from the list of SEA-approved supplemental service providers.
- 4. Corrective action includes at least one of the following: replace relevant school staff, institute new curricular program, decrease school-level management, appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress, extend the school year or school day, or restructure the internal organization of the school.
- 5. Alternative governance may include any of the following: reopen as a charter school, replace all/most of the school staff relevant to the failure to make AYP, enter into a contract with a private management company, or other major restructuring that makes fundamental reform to the school's staffing and governance.
- 6. Assistance from School Support Teams will be prioritized to the neediest schools as resources and funding allow. The neediest schools will be identified through a combination of factors including: years in SIFI status, percentage of students who have not met proficiency, level of poverty, and recent trends in achievement data showing degree of growth.

Appendixes: < <http://SEA.wisconsin.gov/oea/doc/sifilevels.doc> > - Wisconsin Public Schools – Levels of Accountability

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 2005-2006 school year, and how the SEA will limit the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005-2006 school year to multi-subject secondary teachers in rural schools eligible for additional flexibility, and multi-subject special education educators who are highly qualified in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire.

5.1 Does the plan describe how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for all teachers not new to the profession who were hired before the end of the 2005-2006 school year?

Wisconsin has completed the HOUSSE process for all teachers not new to the profession who were hired before the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The U.S. Department of Education's Title II, Part A Monitoring Team, as a result of its visit in April 2006, confirmed through acceptance of the department's plan that Wisconsin's teachers of core subjects not new to the profession have demonstrated that they meet the requirements of the highly qualified provisions of NCLB. Wisconsin's highly objective uniform state standards of evaluation (HOUSSE) through consistent program approval monitoring, licensing requirements, and annual licensure audits provide assurances that Wisconsin's veteran elementary and secondary teachers have content knowledge in the core academic subjects in which they are licensed and assigned to teach (See Appendix I).

5.2 Does the plan describe how the State will limit the use of HOUSSE after the end of the 2005-2006 school year to the following situations:

Wisconsin does not intend to use HOUSSE after the end of the 2005-2006 school year. As of August 31, 2004, all teachers new to the profession are highly qualified through *Wisconsin's Quality Educator Initiative*, the major reform of the teacher education and licensing processes described in Section 3.

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.

The *Wisconsin Teacher Equity Plan* was originally submitted in tabular rather than narrative form. In this revised submission, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is submitting this narrative description of the plan as well as the original tabular presentation.

Wisconsin's Equity Plan

Wisconsin's Equity Plan is designed to address the primary area of inequity in the distribution of experienced teachers across the state. While the *Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Study* (2006) and the analysis of data on the distribution of highly qualified teachers gathered annually by the Department of Public Instruction indicate that there are no significant differences in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between schools and LEAs in the state, there is a significant difference in the average level of teacher experience between schools and LEAs. The distribution of teachers with less than three years teaching experience is almost identical to the distribution of schools that do not make AYP, that have the highest number of children of color, and that have the highest proportion of students living at or below 185 percent of the federal poverty guideline. Thus, students with the highest indicators of need are served by our least experienced teachers.

The goal of Wisconsin's Equity Plan is to increase the number of experienced, highly qualified teachers in the five geographic regions that are home to schools with the highest indicators of need. This plan focuses on recruitment, support, recognition, reward, and professional development as primary strategies in reducing high rates of turnover during the first three years of teaching. The strategies are as follows:

1. Refine and enhance data collection, analysis, and reporting systems to gain a more accurate understanding of teacher supply and demand, including current and predicted attrition rates in core academic subject areas and areas of concern in high-poverty, low-performing schools, such as special education and bilingual, English as a second language (ESL) and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL).

2. Create additional incentive programs to attract teachers to high-poverty, low-performing schools, including programs that provide grants or other financial support in recognition of evidence of teaching mastery (such as National Board certification or the Master Educator License) and evidence of positive impact on student performance.
3. Give priority in funding support of initial educators to high-poverty, low-performing schools and provide additional funding to support initial educators in these placements to reduce turnover due to isolation in the classroom.
4. Give priority to funding peer review and mentoring grants to consortia of CESAs and LEAs that serve large numbers of high-poverty, low-performing schools.
5. Give priority Title I, Part A funding to support data-driven design and implementation of professional development strategies for high-poverty, low-performing schools to assist LEAs in appropriately support their neediest schools.
6. Collect and analyze data on school climate as a component of Title I, Part A consolidated applications from all Title I schools, and use these data to develop strategies to improve conditions in hard-to-staff schools as a priority for Title I, Part A funding.
7. Strengthen existing monitoring of educator preparation to assure that all programs provide explicit preparation for teaching students in diverse contexts, including the provision of field and clinical placements in diverse settings.
8. Strengthen assessment of candidate performance on the required human relations component of teacher preparation, including assessment of candidates' ability to effectively apply knowledge and skill to meet the learning needs of diverse students in the classroom.
9. Provide for continuing support and dissemination of existing models for the preparation of teachers in hard-to-staff contexts through collaboration with IHE's and alternative program providers.

Detailed Steps within Each Strategy

Strategy 1: Refine and enhance statewide data collection and analysis

The Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing Team (TEPDL) utilizes an online teacher licensing system and database to provide ease of access and cross-referencing between the licensure database and district monitoring information and reports. The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh works with TEPDL to analyze these data to produce the annual *Supply and Demand* report for Wisconsin. Not all data is so readily accessible within the department, and the DPI's Information Technology team, School Improvement team, TEPDL, and the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh are working collaboratively to develop a data warehousing and retrieval system that will support online data collection and reporting of teacher licensing, school performance, and professional development data. The data warehousing structure will allow for ease of interface, access, and cross-reference to existing data sources as well as the development and design of new data collection strategies as needed.

The department is continuing to evaluate data from the Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Report, which is a rich source of information about the distribution of teachers and students across multiple parameters. This evaluation will be used to enhance the current *Supply and Demand Report*.

Strategy 2: Create additional incentives to teach in high-poverty, low performance schools.

Wisconsin actively disseminates information regarding federal and state loan forgiveness policies that will forgive the indebtedness of education loan recipients who elect to teach in hard-to-staff academic subject areas or school contexts, particularly high-poverty, low-achieving schools. The department also assists interested teachers in qualifying and applying for these deferments. The state will collect data regarding the number of highly qualified teachers who elect to teach in these contexts as a result of the loan forgiveness program.

Funding for the *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* for the 2006-2007 school year will be provided to high-need LEAs to develop and implement

plans to enhance recruitment and retention of effective educators in LEAs with schools identified for improvement or schools that have missed AYP (adequate yearly progress).

These plans

Total funds to be distributed to identified LEAs are \$625,000. Districts must:

- Develop and implement a plan to address the inequities in the distribution of experienced teachers in high-need schools.
- Provide intensive mentoring/coaching support for educators in high-need schools with an emphasis on initial educators and teachers who are not currently highly qualified for their teaching assignment.
- Examine/research factors that hinder hiring and retention of highly qualified and experienced educators in high-need schools, including the examination of district and school-based policies and practices, and climate and working conditions that have an impact on teacher's decisions to remain in teaching or continue to teach in high-need schools.
- Work collaboratively with professional development providers to design and implement professional development to meet the needs of experienced teachers working in high-need schools.

The department also has submitted a proposal to the U.S. Department of Education seeking funding to implement a *Teacher Incentive Program* that will provide incentives to teachers who demonstrate a positive impact on student learning based on multiple measures of student achievement, including standardized assessments. The program would be initiated in the five LEAs that serve the five geographic regions of the state with the highest levels of identified need.

Additionally, DPI is soliciting funding from the state Legislature to provide grants of up to \$5,000 annually to Wisconsin Master Educators and National Board certified teachers who elect to either relocate to high-poverty, low-performing schools or who will continue to teach in those placements.

Each program would provide professional development to support school-based leadership and recognition of the quality of the teacher's practice. The state Legislature

currently provides a \$2,500 annual grant to National Board certified teachers who continue to teach and provide leadership in their schools.

The programs will be evaluated to determine the number of experienced educators who elect to relocate to hard-to-staff schools or who elect to continue teaching in these placements as a direct result of the incentive payments that they receive for doing so. Additionally, the department will assess the impact of incentives for teachers who have demonstrated mastery and a positive impact on student learning on the retention of highly qualified, experienced and effective teachers who might otherwise have elected to leave their placements.

Strategy 3: Give priority funding to support initial educators in hard-to-staff contexts

The State of Wisconsin provides funding for the mentoring and support of initial educators in all contexts. The funding of \$375 per initial educator follows the educator. Because the five LEAs that hire the largest number of initial educators are also the LEAs that have the greatest number of schools not making AYP, serve large populations of children of color, and have high concentrations of students living at or below 185 percent of the federal poverty guideline, the majority of this funding will be awarded to these schools.

The *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* also provides additional funding to consortia of LEAs to design and implement effective support systems for all educators, including initial educators in high-need schools.

Teacher retention rates in LEAs and schools that receive this support are being monitored to determine if there is a correlation between funded programs under the grants and increased retention of teachers.

Strategy 4: Give priority to funding Peer Review and Mentoring grants in high-need schools.

To further increase the impact of state support for mentoring, the Legislature also has authorized *Peer Review and Mentoring* grants to support educators. These grants are awarded to consortia of LEAs and CESAs and as of the 2006-2007 school year, priority

is given to funding those consortia that serve large numbers of high-need schools and specifically address the needs of teachers in those contexts.

Outcomes of the projects funded through these grants will be monitored through the grant monitoring process. Final grant reports will be evaluated to determine the impact of these projects on teacher retention in hard-to-staff contexts.

Strategy 5: Give priority Title I (A) funding to support data-driven professional development for high poverty, low-performing schools

The Statewide System of Support (SSOS) is intended to support all schools in making AYP. As a component of this support, this program developed and piloted the *LEA Self-Assessment Handbook – a Tool for Improving a LEA's Support to its Neediest Schools*. The five LEAs serving students with the greatest identified needs – Milwaukee, Madison, Racine, Kenosha, Green Bay – as well as Beloit and Menominee Indian, participated in the initial pilot and provided invaluable feedback on the revision, use, and impact of this tool. Based on the positive outcomes of this pilot, this process will continue to be used with these LEAs and others to design targeted professional development for high-poverty, low performing schools. The intended outcome is the retention and increased effectiveness of teachers working in schools with the highest levels of identified need.

This self-assessment process was developed in response to LEAs' identified need to provide high-quality professional development to all teachers not currently highly qualified, including those enrolled in approved alternative routes to licensure. All LEAs that employ teachers teaching "out-of-field" are required to provide this high-quality professional development in addition to intensive supervision and mentoring.

Consolidated Applications for all program titles will require that LEAs use this tool or a tool with a similar purpose to design and implement district-wide professional development that will address the concerns of high-need schools in the district. The success of this process will be monitored through the collection of data regarding school climate and teacher beliefs and decisions regarding their impact on student outcomes in these hard-to-staff schools. Data on student performance also will be collected and analyzed to determine impact that can be attributed to targeted professional development.

The *Wisconsin Urban Schools Leadership Project*, funded by the Wallace Foundation, is a unique and exceptional professional development opportunity for practicing urban principals to join in a community of learning with colleagues, institutions of higher education and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The project is designed to foster individual growth, advance urban school leadership, and to collaboratively develop a national model of the assessment of master-level principals to demonstrate how building-level leadership in urban school settings can improve student academic performance.

The project is offered under the leadership of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction; the Office of the Governor; and in partnership with the five largest urban school districts – Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine; three universities – University of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Cardinal Stritch; and two organizations – Association of Wisconsin School Administrators and Milwaukee Partnership Academy.

Because this project includes the districts that each have more than seven teachers who are not highly qualified, the content blocks focusing on learning communities in urban schools and building instructional capacity will incorporate study of recruitment and retention of teachers at the building level as well as distribution of teachers.

The project will expand to include an additional 30 principals.

Strategy 6: Collect and analyze school climate data, including teacher dispositions, beliefs and actions relative to school climate

The DPI provides access to several free school improvement tools through the WINSS web portal. Among the tools are online surveys that assess staff and student climate issues and school alignment with the research based *Characteristics of Successful Schools*, a comprehensive school improvement planning tool.

The climate survey for staff < <http://goal.learningpt.org/winss/staff/> > includes questions about job satisfaction, work style, school environment and resources. The

“Characteristics of Successful Schools” surveys

< <http://goal.learningpt.org/winss/winss.htm> > assess seven aspects of high performing

schools including, but not limited to, professional development, leadership, and academic standards.

DPI and CESA staff provide technical assistance to LEAs that use these tools including survey administration, interpretation of results, and action planning.

Strategy 7: Strengthen existing monitoring and technical assistance for educator preparation programs to assure explicit preparation to work in diverse contexts

Wisconsin's Quality Educator Initiative established broad authority for the DPI to monitor all aspects of educator preparation in the state, and instituted a performance-based system of program approval and licensure in place of the more traditional system of verifying structural components such as syllabi. The department assigns staff to each educator preparation institution who provides technical assistance and secures support for the implementation of this initiative.

All educator programs are now required to assess candidate performance on the human relations curriculum first required by the state in 1973 and the special needs curriculum required since 1981. Candidates must demonstrate that they not only have knowledge of diverse cultures, including native cultures and history – they must demonstrate during their field and clinical placements that they can apply this knowledge to adapt instruction and provide successful learning opportunities to all students.

Many campuses have developed innovative curriculum that focuses on the history, culture, and tribal sovereignty of Native American tribes and bands in Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has designed an urban teaching program for middle childhood/early adolescence licensure that provides the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach in urban contexts and advocate for students in those contexts. These programs require explicit evidence of knowledge, skills, and dispositions as they are used in field and clinical placements.

Through the on-going review and approval of educator preparation programs and for the requirement that all programs provide specific experiences that provide candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work in diverse cultures, the department is

strengthening the preparation of all teachers in the state and assuring that all teachers will be prepared to teach in diverse contexts.

In addition, the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* also provides for the monitoring of initial educator support systems, particularly mentoring and support seminars that provide professional development specific to the needs of teachers in their placements. Full implementation of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*, beginning in 2006-2007, will strengthen targeted professional development and support in high-need schools.

Strategy 8: Strengthen assessment of candidate performance on the required human relations and diverse populations and contexts components of teacher preparation

As noted in Strategy 7, assessment of candidate performance in these areas is required. As part of the *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative*, Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing Team members provide technical assistance regarding the quality of assessment data that is provided as evidence of candidate mastery of the Wisconsin Teacher Standards. The quality of the assessment system at both the programmatic and institutional level is continually reviewed and monitored through an annual, ongoing process. Institutions determined to be in need of improvement in either the assessment of candidate's ability to teach **all** students or in candidate performance in that area will develop targeted plans to improve candidate performance as a condition for program approval. Strategy 7 and 8 in combination will assure that all teachers prepared in Wisconsin are able to adapt to teaching diverse populations in diverse and challenging contexts.

Strategy 9: Provide for continuing support and dissemination of existing models for the preparation of teachers for hard-to-staff contexts through collaboration.

Many educator programs have developed model programs for the preparation of teachers to work in hard-to-staff and diverse contexts. The goal of these programs is to increase the effectiveness of teaching in these contexts and to develop a critical mass of teachers within these contexts who are well-prepared and able to effect positive change in the performance of their students and the climate in which they learn.

The DPI has supported these innovations by securing funding, as in the case of the Transition to Teaching grant, awarded in 2002, that provided stipends to support teachers

in Milwaukee Public Schools teaching in hard-to-staff core academic subjects at the secondary level.

Students with Limited English Proficiency

The department has encouraged the development of specific programs to meet the identified staffing needs of high-need schools. DPI provides funding and technical assistance to institutions to develop accelerated, high-quality alternative routes to licensure. The department also supports the development of innovative and experimental programs that are based on the identified staffing needs of schools, including those in special education and ESL/ESOL and bilingual education. When Wisconsin's Bilingual-Bicultural Statute, ss. 115.95, Wis. Stats., was enacted in the late 1970s, LEP students were located within a relatively small number of more urban school LEAs in the southeast corner of the state. Currently, approximately 170 school LEAs have LEP students. The State of Wisconsin defines a student with limited-English proficiency as a pupil "who has difficulty with reading, writing, speaking, or comprehending in English within the academic classroom setting. PI 13.03 stipulates services to be provided to second-language learners and LEP students. Funding was provided to design and develop programs to meet this need with the result that there are several highly successful model programs for the preparation of ESL, ESOL, and Bilingual-Bicultural program educators < <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/tepd/altern.html> >.

The department also developed a bulletin, *Best Practice Considerations When Serving Limited-English Proficient (LEP) Students in K-12 Public Schools* and *Legal Responsibilities When Serving Limited-English Proficient (LEP) Students in K-12 Public Schools*, to help school leaders and staffs understand their responsibilities for meeting the needs of LEP students. Wisconsin's public schools now serve over 29,000 limited-English proficient students. While the two largest groups of LEP students are Hmong and Spanish speakers, there are at least 70 other languages represented within Wisconsin's public schools.

Programs have been created to recruit and retain teachers from underrepresented populations. The department's Office of Urban Education sponsors activities that encourage urban middle and high school students to consider teaching as a career. The program focuses on students in the Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, and Beloit areas and provides future educators with conferences and visits to local campuses.

The Milwaukee Metropolitan Teacher Education Program (MMTEP) focuses on paraprofessionals completing their bachelor's degree and completing the requirements for licensure while continuing their work in the schools. The Milwaukee Teacher Education Center (MTEC) recruits and trains eligible persons from Milwaukee through an alternative program that provides sustained support in the teaching assignment and high-quality professional development in an accelerated program to complete the requirements for licensure. Both of these programs have been highly successful in "growing our own" educators within the local community.

Currently, the department is working with the College of the Menominee Nation to support implementation of *the Northeast Wisconsin (NEW) American Indian Teacher Training Project*

< http://wdcrobcolp01.ed.gov/CFAPPS/grantaward/detail.cfm?detail_id=2367469 >

to create a four-year program leading to middle childhood/early adolescence licensure for 14 Native American teachers to meet the staffing needs of the Indian Community School and some remote rural schools that serve predominantly tribal populations.

The *Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative* also established performance-based levels of licensure. Advancement to any stage and the renewal of the license is dependent on professional development that has been verified by peers. The Professional Development Plan has resulted in strong collaborations between LEAs, CESAs, and professional organizations to develop and disseminate professional development opportunities that address the needs of teachers in all contexts.

These nine strategies are intended to improve preparation for all educators in working with diverse students in diverse and challenging settings; to improve support for early-career teachers in challenging settings; and to retain experienced, highly qualified

teachers in these settings to break the pattern of high teacher turnover between the third and fifth year of teaching.

Analysis of Data and Design of Wisconsin's Equity Plan

In order to develop a plan to assure the equitable distribution of highly qualified, experienced and effective teachers across the state, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction analyzed the current and changing demographic characteristics of schools and LEAs across the state, used data and reporting systems to evaluate and understand the patterns of teacher distribution in Wisconsin, and examined how current state-level policies and practices impacted teacher distribution relative to school need.

Results of these efforts indicate that there are five major geographic regions that have the largest populations of children of color, the highest concentrations of households living in poverty, and the highest concentrations of students entering school either learning English as a second language or with limited-English proficiency. The largest of these regions, both in terms of population and area is Milwaukee County, followed by the Kenosha-Racine area in southeastern Wisconsin. Green Bay and Madison are slightly less populous, while the final region, the Beloit-Janesville area is relatively small. Racial and ethnic minority populations in these geographic regions include African Americans, Hispanics, Hmong, Native American tribes and bands and increasing populations of Somali and Sudanese immigrants.

Previous *Wisconsin Supply and Demand Report* data indicated that teachers tend to work in close proximity to where they graduated from high school. A recent report of the National Center for Education Statistics cited a similar finding for teachers across the United States. This finding contributed to the decision to develop a regionally focused strategy for increasing the supply of both highly qualified and experienced teachers within the regions that had the greatest need. An example of one strategy, *Grow Your Own*, is the Milwaukee Teacher Education Center (MTEC), which recruits and prepares candidates who are residents of Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC), in partnership with the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) has

developed a program to recruit and train paraprofessionals already working in Milwaukee schools to become highly qualified teachers.

Changes in technology, recent changes in the rules governing teacher education and licensing in Wisconsin, and new federal support for improving teacher and student data collection and analysis in the states has led to an extensive redesign of the department's data collection and reporting systems, including an electronic interactive teacher licensing database and a statewide system of student identification and monitoring. These changes have made it possible to conduct a comprehensive study of teacher distribution in the state and determine how well the patterns of distribution meet the identified educational needs of Wisconsin's students. This study, the *Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Project*, was sponsored by the Educational Trust, funded by the Joyce Foundation and involved three mid-western states: Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin. This study and its recommendations were central to the development of the Equity Plan. See Appendix A for a summary of this report.

The recommendations of this report focus primarily on the strategies of recruitment, retention, and professional development that will assure that teachers in high-poverty, low-performing schools receive the incentives, support, and recognition that is essential to retaining their services in hard-to-staff schools. The secondary focus of the report was on systemic supports, such as policy development and implementation and data collection that have powerful impacts on the allocation of resources and other supports to create supportive climates for teaching and learning in these hard-to-staff schools.

6.1 Does the revised plan include a written equity plan?

Wisconsin's Equity Plan is presented in both the original tabular form (see Appendix H) and in narrative format under Requirement 6.

6.2 Does the plan identify where inequities in teacher assignment exist?

The plan utilizes the *Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Report*, sponsored by Education Trust and funded by the Joyce Foundation, to identify inequity in the distribution of teachers among schools and LEAs in the state. This report and the analyses of data from the 2005-2006 school year indicate that those schools that do not make AYP, serve large

populations of racial and ethnic minorities, and that have the largest proportion of second-language learners are staffed by teachers who have less than three years teaching experience. There was no significant difference in the distribution of highly qualified teachers within the state, according to these data analyses that spanned three years of data (2003-2006).

6.3 Does the plan delineate specific strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment?

The plan presents nine specific strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment. These nine strategies are presented in both the narrative and tabular presentation of the plan.

6.4 Does the plan provide evidence for the probable success of the strategies it includes?

Each strategy was developed based on the recommendations of the Education Trust as an intended outcome of the *Wisconsin Teacher Distribution Report* or other sources of data such as the *Wisconsin Supply and Demand* report. These recommendations are based on identified statewide needs and the existing knowledge base that points to recruitment of well-prepared initial teachers and retention of experienced teachers as critical to improving the performance of students in high-poverty, low-performing contexts. There is emerging evidence that initial mentoring and support efforts are successful, as evidenced by the 10 percent change in the number of teachers with less than three years experience teaching in schools that did not make AYP. This drop occurred in the 2005-2006 school year, one year after the initial implementation of mentoring and support systems in these schools. It is not possible to assert that the drop is due to mentoring offered to new teachers, but it is at least a promising potential correlation.

There is also evidence from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) that high percentages of teachers are employed within close proximity (20-80 miles) of where they attended high school. Data from the *Wisconsin Teacher Supply and Demand Report* are consistent with this finding. Thus, strategies that are focused on increasing the supply of both highly qualified and experienced teachers within the regions where there are shortages of both are most likely to be successful.

6.5 Does the plan indicate that the SEA will examine the issue of equitable teacher assignment when it monitors LEAs, and how this will be done?

The department is working directly with the LEAs receiving the *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* to ensure that the goals and the objectives of the grant are carried out within the prescribed timeframe and funding parameters. The department will meet with the participating LEAs (those with SIFI and AYP schools) in September and October of 2006 to discuss strategies the LEAs will undertake during the 2006-2007 school year to increase the equitable distribution of experienced highly qualified teachers and provide support for inexperienced teachers. Assistance will be provided to help districts develop activities, timelines, evaluation processes, and budgets for eligible schools within the districts.

The department will review interim progress toward meeting goals so that ongoing timely and targeted technical assistance can be provided. The department will collect data relevant to identified outcomes during the second semester and prepare a final report by June 30, 2007. Successful strategies that can be replicated in other high-need districts will be disseminated during the 2007-2008 school year. This technical assistance process is described in **Strategy 4B**, p. 24, and **Strategy 5**, p. 25.

The department will annually monitor the distribution of less experienced teachers within and between districts in the state through the *School Staff and Personnel Report and District Audit Report* (p. 43) and the *Wisconsin Supply and Demand Report* (pp. 62-63). As the Department identifies changes in the distribution of inexperienced teachers, districts that present an inequitable distribution will receive targeted support using successful strategies outlined and/or implemented through the *Quality Educator Professional Development and Retention Grant* or identified through strategies identified in “best practice” literature.

Beginning in 2006, LEAs that hire teachers who are not highly qualified will have to submit a plan describing how they will assist those teachers to become highly qualified by the end of the academic year. While it is anticipated that the state will achieve the 100 percent HQT target by the end of the 2006-2007 school year, this process will remain in effect to ensure that the state maintains that achievement. The process for using the

Highly Qualified Teacher Plan and *Interim Report* to review, approve and monitor teachers is described in 4.3 on p. 44. The addition of this strategy is intended to ensure that highly qualified teachers are distributed equitably across Wisconsin school districts by the end of the 2006-2007 school year as well as in future years.