

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**[REVISING STATE HQT PLANS]**



May 12, 2006

Dear Chief State School Officer:

To meet the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act requirement of having every student on grade level in reading and mathematics by 2014, we must take bold action to ensure that every student has access to a highly qualified, effective teacher. We have now finished our review of the States' implementation of the highly qualified teacher (HQT) provisions of NCLB. We found that, although most States have made progress over the past three years, none of the States is likely to reach to meet the goal of 100 percent HQT by the end of the 2005-06 school year. Therefore, we are requesting that each State submit a revised plan that details the new innovative actions the State and local education agencies will take to reach the HQT goal in 2006-07 and beyond.

The results of your review are in the enclosed document, "Assessing State Progress in Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal." Because your State was among the last to be monitored for progress in meeting the HQT provisions of NCLB, the monitoring process is not yet complete. As a result, we have not been able to complete your review and have not given the State a final rating. The review document contains information on the State's progress at the time that monitoring occurred. We expect that your response will resolve any remaining concerns, but should any issues remain unresolved, we will contact you to discuss additional steps necessary to bring the State into compliance with the law. It appears, however, that the State is unlikely to meet the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the current school year, so the Department requests that you submit a revised plan detailing specific steps you will take to reach the HQT goal in the 2006-07 school year.

It is vital that all students, especially those in schools that are not currently making adequate yearly progress (AYP), have access to highly qualified and effective teachers. States should be thinking creatively about new approaches, such as differentiated teacher compensation or new incentives to attract content-area professionals into teaching, to attract effective teachers into our neediest schools and should include those approaches in their revised plans. The Department will primarily focus on how the States' revised plans will address the relationship between districts that fail to meet HQT goals and districts and schools that do not make AYP.

The second enclosed document, "Reviewing Revised State Plans," describes specific themes you should address in your revised plan, as well as the criteria the Department will use to determine the sufficiency of the plan for reaching the HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year. Please keep in mind that this document is not intended to be a template for your plan; it is simply a list of review criteria. We expect State plans will vary widely as each State is unique.

The Department expects that State plans will include strategies to improve the distribution of effective teachers into schools that are struggling to ensure that all children can reach proficiency in mathematics and reading by 2014. I would also direct your attention to the key issues that the Department will look at when evaluating revised plans:

- The revised plan should be based on data, especially student achievement data. Schools and LEAs that are not making AYP and that have high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified should receive particular attention in the plan and should receive high priority in the allocation of resources (including but not limited to financial support, technical assistance, and high-quality professional development) to ensure that their teachers become both highly qualified and more effective. We will also look for detailed information on groups of teachers in your State, such as teachers in low-performing schools, who remain unqualified, and we expect to see these plans structured around using available resources to address the needs of these teachers.

## *Revising State HQT Plans*

- As NCLB requires, a State's plan must include a detailed, coherent set of specific activities to ensure that experienced and qualified teachers are distributed equitably among classrooms with poor and minority children and those with their peers, in keeping with NCLB requirements that all students reach proficiency by 2014. Like many States, yours has several strategies in place to address such disparities but does not yet have a comprehensive plan to address the problem. We expect that States will be more strategic than they have been in the past in encouraging schools and districts to pay attention to how qualified teachers are assigned and take new actions to address this issue. If you require technical assistance in formulating this plan, we recommend that you contact your Regional Comprehensive Center (RCC). The RCCs are working closely with the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality on this issue, and Teacher Quality Liaisons at each RCC are prepared to assist you. A list of the RCCs and contact information for their Teacher Quality Liaisons is enclosed.
- The revised plan should address how the State plans to complete the implementation of HOUSSE procedures for current teachers. The plan should also describe how the State will phase out the use of HOUSSE for teachers hired for the 2006-07 school year and beyond, except for teachers who teach multiple secondary subjects in school districts eligible to participate in the Small, Rural School Achievement program and are highly qualified in at least one core academic subject at the time of hire; new special education teachers who teach multiple core academic subjects, and who are highly qualified in either mathematics, language arts, or science at the time they are hired; and teachers who come to the United States from other countries to teach on a temporary basis.

As noted in the March 21 letter, your revised plan is due to the Department of Education on July 7, 2006. Please submit it electronically to [HQTplans@ed.gov](mailto:HQTplans@ed.gov).

During the week of July 24-28, State-level practitioners and teacher quality experts will peer review each State's plan and evaluate how effectively it addresses the remaining challenges in reaching the 100 percent HQT goal. Peer reviewers will use the "Reviewing Revised State Plans" protocol, as well as substantive guidance on strategies for improving teacher quality, to determine whether or not plans are sufficient to attain the HQT goal in 2006-07 and to maintain that goal in subsequent years.

We look forward to continuing our work with you to fully attain the national goal of improved student achievement by ensuring that all children are taught by highly qualified and effective teachers. If you have questions about preparing your revised plan, please contact Libby Witt, the team leader for HQT issues. Libby can be reached by phone at 202-260-5585 or via e-mail to <mailto:elizabeth.witt@ed.gov>. Thank you for your continued commitment to providing a quality education for each child in our Nation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Henry L. Johnson

# Reviewing Revised State Plans

Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) Goal

**State:**

**Date:**

**Overall Recommendation:**

\_\_\_\_ Accept HQT plan

\_\_\_\_ Accept HQT plan, subject to revisions described below

**Comments to support recommendation:**

**Decision**

**Approve** \_\_\_\_\_ **Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Disapprove** \_\_\_\_\_ **Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**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.

Y/N/U/NA	Evidence
	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?
	Does the analysis focus on the staffing needs of school that are not making AYP? Do these schools have high percentages of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified?
	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?
	Does the analysis identify districts and schools around the State where significant numbers of teachers do not meet HQT standards?
	Does the analysis identify particular courses that are often taught by non-highly qualified teachers?

Y=Yes; N=No; U=Undecided; NA=Not applicable

**Finding:**

\_\_\_\_ Requirement 1 has been met

\_\_\_\_ Requirement 1 has been partially met

\_\_\_\_ Requirement 1 has not been met

\_\_\_\_ Additional information needed to make determination

\_\_\_\_\_ Date Requested      \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Deadline

**Supporting Narrative:**

*Revising State HQT Plans*

**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.

Y/N/U	Evidence
	Does the plan identify LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives for HQT?
	Does the plan include specific steps that will be taken by LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives?
	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?

Y=Yes; N=No; U=Undecided

**Finding:**

\_\_\_ Requirement 2 has been met

\_\_\_ Requirement 2 has been partially met

\_\_\_ Requirement 2 has not been met

\_\_\_ Additional information needed to make determination

\_\_\_\_\_ Date Requested      \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Deadline

**Supporting Narrative:**

**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.

Y/N/U	Evidence
	Does the plan include a description of the technical assistance the SEA will provide to assist LEAs in successfully carrying out their HQT plans?
	Does the plan indicate that the staffing and professional development needs of schools that are not making AYP will be given high priority?
	Does the plan include a description of programs and services the SEA will provide to assist teachers and LEAs in successfully meeting HQT goals?
	Does the plan specifically address the needs of any subgroups of teachers identified in Requirement 1?
	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?
	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?

**SES/Choice Pilot Program Finding:**

- Requirement 3 has been met
  - Requirement 3 has been partially met
  - Requirement 3 has not been met
  - Additional information needed to make determination
- \_\_\_\_\_ Date Requested      \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Deadline

**Supporting Narrative:**

**Requirement 4:** The revised plan must describe how the SEA will work with LEAs that fail to reach the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year.

Y/N/U	Evidence
	Does the plan indicate how the SEA will monitor LEA compliance with the LEAs' HQT plans described in Requirement 2 and hold LEAs accountable for fulfilling their plans?
	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?
	Does the plan describe how the SEA will monitor whether LEAs attain 100 percent HQT in each LEA and school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the percentage of highly qualified teachers at each LEA and school; and</li> <li>• in the percentage of teachers who are receiving high-quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers?</li> </ul>
	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?

Y=Yes; N=No; U=Undecided

**Finding:**

- Requirement 4 has been met
  - Requirement 4 has been partially met
  - Requirement 4 has not been met
  - Additional information needed to make determination
- \_\_\_\_\_ Date Requested      \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Deadline

**Supporting Narrative:**

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

*Revising State HQT Plans*

Y/N/U	Evidence
	Does the plan describe how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for all teachers not new to the profession who were hired before the end of the 2005-06 school year?
	Does the plan describe how the State will limit the use of HOUSSE after the end of the 2005-06 school year to the following situations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Multi-subject secondary teachers in rural schools who, if HQ in one subject at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate competence in additional subjects within three years of the date of hire; or</li> <li>o Multi-subject special education teachers who are new to the profession, if HQ in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate competence in additional subjects within two years of the date of hire.</li> </ul>

Y=Yes; N=No; U=Undecided

**Finding:**

\_\_\_ Requirement 5 has been met

\_\_\_ Requirement 5 has been partially met

\_\_\_ Requirement 5 has not been met

\_\_\_ Additional information needed to make determination

\_\_\_\_\_ Date Requested      \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Deadline

**Supporting Narrative:**

**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.

Y/N/U	Evidence
	Does the revised plan include a written equity plan?
	Does the plan identify where inequities in teacher assignment exist?
	Does the plan delineate specific strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment?
	Does the plan provide evidence for the probable success of the strategies it includes?
	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?

Y=Yes; N=No; U=Undecided

**Finding:**

- Requirement 6 has been met
  - Requirement 6 has been partially met
  - Requirement 6 has not been met
  - Additional information needed to make determination
- \_\_\_\_\_ Date Requested      \_\_\_\_\_ Submission Deadline

**Supporting Narrative:**