

**State Plan**  
for  
**Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal**

Texas Education Agency  
Revised July 7, 2006

**Introduction**

The Revised State Plan for Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) Goal for the State of Texas was developed by the Division of NCLB Program Coordination at the Texas Education Agency in collaboration with Agency staff, local education agency (LEA) personnel, Education Service Center (ESC) staff, and representatives from educational professional organizations in the state. The general public also was provided a six-day review and comment period in which to provide input into the contents of this plan. Comments from all the participants have been reviewed and addressed appropriately within this final plan.

Texas is a "right to work" state, with no collective bargaining; accordingly, unlike other states, teachers in Texas do not negotiate union contracts which address issues like assignment. Because Texas teacher contracts routinely contain provisions allowing teachers to be assigned as needed, many experienced teachers are subject to assignment at-will, often with short notice prior to or during the school year. For these reasons, this state plan will serve as a framework for LEAs to revise their local Teacher Quality Plans and ensure that all core academic subject area teachers are highly qualified by the end of the 2006-07 school year. LEAs will be required to revise and implement their plans at the local level during the upcoming school year. Attachment 1, the *Texas Strategic Plan to Address the Teacher Shortage*, the state's long-range plan for addressing several related issues, also is hereby incorporated into this 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.**

**TEA Response:**

Data reviewed for this revised plan are based on 1,229 LEAs (including charter school LEAs), 7,908 campuses, and 294,258 teachers. These teachers serve students in more than 171,500 elementary classrooms and over 550,000 secondary classes across the state.

Highly Qualified Teacher data in Texas are collected through the state's automated grant system "eGrants." One component of the eGrants system is the NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, a campus level data report submitted annually by the LEA. Data contained in the Highly Qualified Compliance Report are submitted annually as of the end of the school year and due to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) the following July 15. These Highly Qualified Compliance Reports collect campus level data at the teacher and classroom level. See Attachment 2 for a sample campus report. Since this revised plan is due prior to the LEA reporting deadline, this data analysis and report are based on the available school year 2004-05 highly qualified data and, where applicable, 2005-06 data are extrapolated from the sample of data available on July 5, 2006. All references to 2005-06 extrapolated data are noted in the data reported below.

The 2006 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data will not be released until August 16, 2006, due to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) review of AYP data for schools/districts impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and/or Rita. Therefore, all references and data reported related to schools/districts not making AYP is calculated based on the highly qualified teacher data as of the end of the 2004-05 school year and the 2005 AYP Results (based on 2004-05 school year achievement data).

Data for comparing Texas to other large population states are from the *State and National HQT Data from EDEN, Revised 6-5-06*, report provided by Westat. This statewide data varies slightly from the 2004-05 highly qualified teacher data reported below in that the data were provided to USDE (Westat) earlier in the year and the data cited below has been retrieved from the highly qualified teacher reports as of June 21, 2006. The difference is due to a small number of LEAs that found errors, while entering 2005-06 data, and have corrected the 2004-05 data.

**Comparison of Texas to Other Large Population States and National Highly Qualified Data: 2004-05**  
Texas has a higher percentage of core academic subject area classes taught by highly qualified teachers at the elementary level than the other large population states of California, Florida, and New York (Table 1). At the secondary level, Texas exceeds the national average and leads the other large population states in all categories except low-poverty schools in New York.

**Table 1. Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers, by State: 2004-05**

	All Schools	Elementary			Secondary		
		High-Poverty	Low-Poverty	Total Elementary	High-Poverty	Low-Poverty	Total Secondary
California	74.0	75.0	81.0	78.0	61.0	81.0	73.0
Florida	92.4	93.9	95.5	94.8	87.7	93.1	90.4
New York	93.0	82.0	98.0	92.0	80.0	97.0	93.0
Texas	94.6	97.3	98.1	97.7	91.5	94.0	93.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>93.0</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>91.8</b>	<b>89.0</b>

Source: Westat, State and National HQT Data from EDEN, Revised 6-5-06.

Texas has the smallest inequity gap in the percentage of core academic subject area classes taught by highly qualified teachers between the high-poverty campuses and low-poverty campuses of the four large population states (Table 2). Texas also has a much smaller gap than the national average.

**Table 2. Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by HQT by Poverty Status of School and Gap Between High- and Low-Poverty Schools, by State: 2004-05**

	Elementary			Secondary		
	High-Poverty	Low-Poverty	Gap	High-Poverty	Low-Poverty	Gap
California	75.0	81.0	6.0	61.0	81.0	20.0
Florida	93.9	95.5	1.6	87.7	93.1	5.4
New York	82.0	98.0	16.0	80.0	97.0	17.0
Texas	97.3	98.1	0.8	91.5	94.0	2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>91.8</b>	<b>7.4</b>

Source: Westat, State and National HQT Data from EDEN, Revised 6-5-06.

Although Texas has made only a small increase per year in the percentage of core academic subject area classes taught by highly qualified teachers due to the already high percentages of highly qualified teachers, it did exceed the national average improvement (Table 3).

**Table 3. Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by HQT: 2003-04 and 2004-05**

	2003-04	2004-05	Difference
California	52.0	74.0	22.0
Florida	89	92.4	3.4
New York	92	93	1
Texas	93.8	94.6	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>

Source: Westat, State and National HQT Data from EDEN, Revised 6-5-06.

**USDE Criteria**

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?

**TEA Response:**

Based on 2004-05 highly qualified teacher data, Texas has a high percentage of all elementary and secondary classes taught by highly qualified teachers. Table 4 below identifies the percentages of classes taught by non-highly qualified teachers. For highly qualified teacher purposes in Texas, elementary is defined as grade levels PK-6 and secondary is grades 7-12.

**Table 4. Percentage of Core Academic Subject Area Classes Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers in Texas: 2004-05**

	<b>Statewide Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	Low Poverty Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers	High Poverty Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers	<b>Gap Between Low and High Poverty</b>	Low Minority Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers	High Minority Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers	<b>Gap Between Low and High Minority</b>
Total Elementary (one teacher equals one class)	<b>2.29</b>	1.95	2.66	<b>0.71</b>	1.08	3.02	<b>1.94</b>
Total Secondary (one section equals one class)	<b>6.34</b>	5.47	8.53	<b>3.06</b>	4.91	7.81	<b>2.90</b>
English	<b>5.55</b>	4.14	9.69	<b>5.55</b>	3.86	7.65	<b>3.79</b>
Reading/ Language Arts	<b>6.41</b>	5.70	8.31	<b>2.61</b>	5.23	7.69	<b>2.46</b>
Mathematics	<b>7.48</b>	7.11	8.96	<b>1.85</b>	5.34	8.66	<b>3.32</b>
Science	<b>6.49</b>	5.58	8.67	<b>3.09</b>	4.69	8.16	<b>3.47</b>
Foreign Language	<b>8.24</b>	6.43	7.03	<b>0.60</b>	8.28	9.01	<b>0.73</b>
Civics/Gov't	<b>4.50</b>	4.50	4.65	<b>0.15</b>	4.15	6.76	<b>2.61</b>
Economics	<b>5.88</b>	5.45	9.40	<b>3.95</b>	5.24	8.25	<b>3.01</b>
Arts (Music, Art, Dance, Theater)	<b>4.79</b>	4.66	7.71	<b>3.05</b>	4.01	6.08	<b>2.07</b>
History	<b>5.92</b>	4.90	7.95	<b>3.05</b>	4.38	7.53	<b>3.15</b>
Geography	<b>6.34</b>	5.17	8.74	<b>3.57</b>	6.95	6.56	<b>-0.39</b>

Source: 2004-05 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, Revised 6-21-06.

Based on extrapolated 2005-06 highly qualified teacher data, the percentage of elementary and secondary classes taught by highly qualified teachers has increased significantly and the gap between high and low poverty campuses has decreased in most areas (Table 5). The data sample size of the extrapolated data for minority campuses is not sufficient to include in this plan.

<b>Table 5. Comparison of the Percentage of Core Academic Subject Area Classes Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers in Texas: 2004-05 to 2005-06</b>					
	2004-05 Statewide Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers	2005-06 Statewide Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers	2004-05 Gap Between Low and High Poverty	2005-06 Gap Between Low and High Poverty <sup>1</sup>	Improvement in Gap Between Low and High Poverty
Total Elementary (one teacher equals one class)	2.29	<b>1.40</b>	0.71	0.63	<b>+0.08</b>
Total Secondary (one section equals one class)	6.34	<b>2.78</b>	3.06	1.99	<b>+1.07</b>
English	5.55	<b>1.92</b>	5.55	1.91	<b>+3.64</b>
Reading/ Language Arts	6.41	<b>3.25</b>	2.61	1.52	<b>+1.09</b>
Mathematics	7.48	<b>1.87</b>	1.85	1.60	<b>+0.25</b>
Science	6.49	<b>2.75</b>	3.09	2.02	<b>+1.07</b>
Foreign Language	8.24	<b>5.26</b>	0.60	1.27	<b>-0.67</b>
Civics/Government	4.50	<b>1.32</b>	0.15	0	<b>+0.15</b>
Economics	5.88	<b>11.84</b> <sup>2</sup>	3.95	0	<b>+3.95</b>
Arts (Music, Art, Dance, Theater)	4.79	<b>1.79</b>	3.05	4.07	<b>-1.02</b>
History	5.92	<b>3.56</b>	3.05	2.66	<b>+0.39</b>
Geography	6.34	<b>2.78</b>	3.57	-0.59	<b>+2.98</b>

Source: Extrapolated Data from the 2005-06 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, 7-5-06.

<sup>1</sup> The extrapolated data reflected includes about 30% more campuses reporting in the high-poverty category than in the low-poverty category.

<sup>2</sup> This percentage for Economics in the 2005-06 extrapolated data is based on a small number of teachers reported. The Agency expects the percentage to be lower when all LEAs have completed their 2005-06 data reporting.

Higher rates of Special Education teachers in the core academic subject areas are not highly qualified when compared to regular education teachers, especially at the secondary level (Table 6).

<b>Table 6. Comparison of the Percentage of Core Academic Subject Area Regular Classes and Special Education Classes Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers in Texas: 2005-06</b>		
	Regular Education Classes Taught by Non- Highly Qualified Teachers	Special Education Classes Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers
Elementary (one teacher equals one class)	1.40	2.75
Secondary (one section equals one class)	2.78	6.50
English	1.92	6.28
Reading/ Language Arts	3.25	4.05
Mathematics	1.87	8.96
Science	2.75	5.52
Foreign Language	5.26	<sup>1</sup>
Civics/Gov't	1.32	5.66
Economics	11.84	<sup>1</sup>
Arts (Music, Art, Dance, Theater)	1.79	1
History	3.56	4.82
Geography	2.78	5.07

Source: Extrapolated Data from the 2005-06 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, 7-5-06.

<sup>1</sup> Extrapolated sample size of classes is too small to be statistically valid.

Based on extrapolated 2005-06 highly qualified teacher data, the largest percentages of classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are *not* highly qualified are at the secondary level. (Note: This chart reflects only the classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified; therefore, the

percentage of teachers not highly qualified for each descriptor is based on a total of 657 classes taught by non-highly qualified teachers).

- 3.96% Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE.
- 0.46% Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE.
- 10.65% Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified, and are not in an approved alternative route program.
- 39.88% Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects.
- 37.75% Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified, and are not in an approved alternate route program.
- 7.30% Non-highly qualified for other reasons.

Source: Extrapolated Data from the 2005-06 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, 7-5-06.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

Districts meeting AYP are more likely to have 100% of the core academic subject area teachers highly qualified when compared to districts not meeting AYP. Campuses meeting AYP are much more likely to have the core academic subject areas teachers highly qualified when compared to campuses not meeting AYP (Table 7).

Table 7. Comparison of Percentage of Highly Qualified Teacher Rate at Districts and Campuses Making AYP and Not Making AYP; 2004-05				
	Meeting AYP and 100% HQT	Meeting AYP and Not 100% HQT	Not Meeting AYP and 100% HQT	Not Meeting AYP and Not 100% HQT
Districts	34.6	65.2	27.3	72.7
Campuses	64.7	35.3	33.2	66.8

Source: 2004-05 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, Revised 6-21-06 and 2005 AYP.

Of the 93 districts and 540 campuses represented above as not meeting AYP and not meeting 100% highly qualified, the majority are above 90% highly qualified (Table 8).

Table 8. Districts and Campuses Not Meeting AYP by Percentage of Highly Qualified Teachers: 2004-05				
	Not Meeting AYP and 100% HQT	Not Meeting AYP and 95.0-99.9% HQT	Not Meeting AYP and 90.0-94.9% HQT	Not Meeting AYP and less than 89.9% HQT
Districts	27.3	22.7	15.6	34.4
Campuses	33.2	25.4	17.9	23.5

Source: 2004-05 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, Revised 6-21-06 and 2005 AYP.

Of the 70 elementary campuses not meeting AYP and not reporting 100% highly qualified teachers, 54 (77.1%) have less than 25% of their classes taught by non-highly qualified teachers. At the secondary level, the highest percentages of non-highly qualified teachers on the 470 campuses not meeting AYP and not 100% highly qualified are in the areas of English, Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, and History.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

Attachment 3 lists the percentage of highly qualified teachers for each LEA in the state for 2004-05. Attachment 4 lists the percentage of highly qualified teachers in each campus in the state for 2004-05.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

Based on 2004-05 actual data and extrapolated 2005-06 highly qualified teacher data, the following groups of teachers have the highest percentage of non-highly qualified teachers in the state.

- Secondary special education teachers
- Secondary high minority school teachers
- Secondary high poverty school teachers

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

Statewide the priority core academic subject areas are secondary mathematics and foreign languages with 7.48% and 8.24%, respectively, of the classes taught by non-highly qualified teachers in 2004-05 (Table 9). For campuses not meeting AYP, the priority areas include English, Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, and History.

<b>Table 9. Statewide Core Academic Subject Area Classes: 2004-05</b>		
	<b>Statewide Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Statewide Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
Elementary (one teacher equals one class)	97.71	2.29
Total Secondary (one section equals one class)	93.66	6.34
English	94.45	5.55
Reading/ Language Arts	93.59	6.41
Mathematics	92.52	7.48
Science	93.51	6.49
Foreign Language	91.76	8.24
Civics/Government	95.50	4.50
Economics	94.12	5.88
Arts (Music, Art, Dance, Theater)	95.21	4.79
History	94.08	5.92
Geography	93.44	6.34

Source: 2004-05 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, Revised 6-21-06.

When analyzing data to ensure that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children, the most significant gap between both poverty and minority quartiles is in English classes at the secondary level (Table 10). The smallest gap between poverty campuses is in the subject area of Civics and Government, while Geography has an inverse gap in that the high minority quartile has a higher percentage of highly qualified teachers than the low minority campuses. The gap at the elementary level is not significant in either poverty or minority.

<b>Table 10. Percentage Gap Between Low Poverty/Minority and High Poverty/Minority Campuses: 2004-05</b>		
	<b>Gap Between Low and High Poverty</b>	<b>Gap Between Low and High Minority</b>
Elementary (one teacher equals one class)	0.71	1.94
Total Secondary (one section equals one class)	3.06	2.90
English	5.55	3.79
Reading/Language Arts	2.61	2.46
Mathematics	1.85	3.32
Science	3.09	3.47
Foreign Language	0.60	0.73
Civics/Gov't	0.15	2.61
Economics	3.95	3.01
Arts (Music, Art, Dance, Theater)	3.05	2.07
History	3.05	3.15
Geography	3.57	-0.39

Source: 2004-05 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report, Revised 6-21-06.

**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.**

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

Attachment 3 lists the LEAs in Texas, in descending order of percentage of highly qualified teachers based on 2004-05 end-of-year HQT data, that were not meeting the 100% highly qualified teacher in each core academic subject area requirement. Attachment 4 lists campuses with the corresponding percentage of highly qualified teachers. LEAs have been required to develop and implement written teacher recruitment and retention (Teacher Quality) plans since September of 2003. This NCLB requirement has been reiterated over the past year in preparation for the end of the 2005-06 school year and the expected flexibility described in the Secretary's October 2005 and March 2006 letters.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

TEA defines "not making progress toward the state's annual measurable objectives for two consecutive years" under the Section 2141 requirements as the following.

- The LEA's percent of highly qualified teachers is below 95%; or
- The LEA's percent of highly qualified teachers did not increase at least 5 percentage points per year and result in at least 80% of teachers being highly qualified.

This definition is expected to involve approximately 200 LEAs in Section 2141 activities. The actual list of LEAs will be identified after all LEAs submit their 2005-06 Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report to TEA, which is due July 15, 2006.

LEAs that have not made progress toward the state's annual measurable objectives for teacher quality for two consecutive years (under Section 2141 requirements) will be required to complete the state's Continuous Improvement Process currently in place under the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system as part of the interventions required of LEAs. TEA monitoring and intervention activities have been designed to focus on a data-driven and performance-based system that utilizes a continuous improvement model. Activities reflect an emphasis on data integrity, data analysis, increased student performance, and improved program effectiveness. The system for TEA monitoring is referenced as the PBM system.

The PBM system reflects the use of graduated interventions based on LEA performance as evidenced by the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) indicators and, for the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) program, performance on a set of Initial Compliance Review (ICR) indicators conducted by the Division of NCLB Program Coordination. For each individual NCLB program area, results on program-area PBMAS and ICR indicators and patterns across indicators are examined to determine required levels of intervention, including levels of compliance and/or performance review. The Interventions and Investigations unit of the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division develops and implements integrated program review processes for NCLB programs statewide that promote program effectiveness, improved student performance, and compliance with statutory requirements for students served by NCLB.

For LEAs identified as not meeting the Annual Measurable Objectives for Teacher Quality for two consecutive years under Section 2141, two processes will be required in the Continuous Improvement Planning process.

1. **Focused Data Analysis**--The purpose of the focused data analysis is to work with stakeholders to gather, disaggregate, and analyze the LEA's highly qualified teacher data to determine possible causes for areas of performance concern and address identified issues in the Continuous Improvement Plan.
2. **Continuous Improvement Plan**--The purpose of this activity is to develop and implement a continuous improvement plan (CIP) which has integrated the LEA's decisions based on the results and findings of all required intervention activities.

LEAs will receive technical assistance, on behalf of TEA, from the twenty regional Education Service Centers (ESCs). TEA will provide funding to the regional ESCs to provide the agreed upon technical assistance that is described below in Requirement 3. Additional information on the NCLB component of the PBM system is available at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/nclbmon/2006/> or in Attachment 5.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

The TEA will conduct the following activities to ensure that the LEAs in the state have the applicable highly qualified teacher plans and are implementing the plans to assist any non-highly qualified teachers to become highly qualified as soon as possible.

1. The following assurances are certified by each LEA upon receipt of Title I, Part A and/or Title II, Part A funding.
  - a. The LEA will work in consultation with campuses as the campuses develop and implement their plans or activities under sections 1118 and 1119. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(c)(1)(H)].
  - b. The LEA will comply with the requirements of section 1119 regarding the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals and professional development. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(c)(1)(I)].
  - c. The LEA will ensure, through incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies, that low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1112(c)(1)(L)].
  - d. Teachers hired after the first day of school year 2002-2003, and teaching in a core academic subject area, must be highly qualified if teaching in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1119(a)(1)].
  - e. A plan has been developed to ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the LEA are highly qualified not later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. [P.L. 107-110, Section 1119(a)(3)].
  - f. The LEA will publicly report, each year, the annual progress of the LEA as a whole and of each of the Title I, Part A campuses, in meeting the following measurable objectives—

- an annual increase in the percentage of highly qualified teachers at the LEA, to ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified not later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year; and
  - an annual increase in the percentage of teachers who are receiving high-quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers.  
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1119].
- g. The principal of each Title I, Part A campus attests annually in writing as to whether such campus is in compliance with the requirements of section 1119. Copies of attestations are maintained at each Title I, Part A campus and at the main office of the LEA; and are available to any member of the general public on request.  
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1119(i)].
  - h. The LEA will use, unless a lesser amount is sufficient, not less than 5 percent, or more than 10 percent, of Title I, Part A funds for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and not less than 5 percent of the funds for each subsequent fiscal year, for professional development activities to ensure that teachers who are not highly qualified become highly qualified not later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year, and paraprofessionals meet the requirements in section 1119.  
[P.L. 107-110, Section 1119(l)]
  - i. The LEA conducted an assessment of local needs for professional development and hiring as identified by LEA and school staff with the involvement of teachers, including teachers participating in Title I, Part A programs.  
[P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(c)(1) and (2)].
  - j. Based on the needs assessment, the LEA will target funds to schools within the LEA that (a) have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers; (b) have the largest average class size; or (c) are identified for school improvement under section 1116(b).  
[P.L. 107-110, Section 2122(b)(3)].
2. TEA will require existing Title I School Improvement Program schools (schools that have not met AYP for two or more consecutive years) that do not have 100% of their teachers highly qualified to submit their teacher quality plans for TEA review. TEA will then conduct a review of the plans and provide technical assistance to the campuses and LEAs as needed.
  3. Stage 1 School Improvement Program (SIP) schools have a TEA-required administrative mentor as part of the state's school support program to schools identified for needing improvement. These mentors will be required to review the campus' highly qualified plan and provide any necessary technical assistance in revising the plan as needed. The 2006-07 Title I SIP schools (Stage 2 and above) and LEAs (all) that do not have 100% of their teachers highly qualified will be required to submit their campus/district teacher quality plans for TEA review. TEA will then conduct a review of the plans and provide technical assistance to the campuses and LEAs as needed.
  4. TEA will review a random selection of district plans currently available on LEA web sites to ensure the teacher quality plan components are included and provide technical assistance to the campuses and LEAs as needed. TEA also may request additional LEAs to post their teacher quality plans to their web sites by November 1, 2006. TEA would then review additional plans.
  5. TEA currently has information on a majority of the districts in the existing PBMAS system component that is utilized to monitor program compliance of NCLB programs. TEA will collect a random sample, stratified by ESC region, of teacher quality plans for review and technical assistance.

6. TEA may request additional plans be submitted for review based on results of the random reviews described above.
7. For 2006-07 and beyond, additional questions regarding the teacher quality plan will be added into the Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report that is submitted by each campus to TEA annually.

**Requirement 3: The revised plan must include information on the technical assistance, 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.**

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

TEA will provide technical assistance to LEAs through the twenty regional ESCs. Technical assistance and professional development will be needs-based to specifically target areas needing improvement by the LEA and/or campus. Each ESC will have the flexibility to implement a variety of approaches and methods for service delivery to include large group, small group, clusters, and one-on-one technical assistance, professional development, and/or distance learning. Technical assistance will be offered by each ESC specifically related to the following indicators required to be included in the LEA teacher quality plans:

- Increasing the percent of highly qualified teachers;
- Increasing the percent of classes taught by highly qualified teachers;
- Increasing the percent of classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers;
- Increasing the percent of teachers receiving high-quality professional development;
- Increasing the percentage of highly qualified teachers on each campus to meet 100% by end of 2005-06, or later if the Rural or Special Education flexibility exceptions apply;
- Ensuring low-income students and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other student groups by teachers who are not highly qualified (equitable distribution plan);
- Attracting and retaining highly qualified teachers; and
- Assisting teachers not currently highly qualified to meet the highly qualified requirements in a timely manner.

TEA staff will update the existing statewide training for Highly Qualified Teachers that currently is offered in all twenty regions to include a specific module of the teacher quality plan requirements and implementation. All ESC staff has previously been trained in the campus improvement planning process.

Under the provisions of Section 2141, the ESCs also will provide the statutorily required assistance to LEAs developing the LEA improvement plan using the PBM Continuous Improvement Planning process described in Requirement 2.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

TEA will provide to each ESC a list of LEAs not meeting AYP and not meeting the 100% highly qualified requirement. The ESCs will then prioritize technical assistance and professional development needs and/or requests to ensure that the needs of the targeted LEAs are met. Each ESC will provide documentation to TEA to ensure this priority group is served.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

TEA offers a variety of options for teachers to improve their content knowledge and skills in order to meet the core academic subject area competency requirement for demonstrating highly qualified teacher status. Teachers needing to meet this requirement to demonstrate highly qualified have the options of 1) using the HOSSE procedures, 2) completing additional college coursework, or 3) adding additional subject area certifications.

Below are some examples of the various types of assistance and support provided by TEA and available to Texas teachers.

Certify by Examination

Under current State Board for Educator Certification rule, a teacher who holds an appropriate Texas classroom teaching certificate and a bachelor's degree may add classroom certification areas by successfully completing the appropriate certification examination(s) for the area(s) sought. Certification by examination is not available for:

- initial certification;
- career and technology certification based on skill and work experience;
- a class of certificate other than classroom teacher (e.g. School Counselor, Principal, Superintendent, Learning Resources/School Librarian, Educational Diagnostician);
- a certificate for which no certification examination has been developed.

Professional Development at Regional Education Service Centers

As indicated in the data analysis described in Requirement 1, many of the secondary teachers not meeting highly qualified requirements have needed additional training in the core academic subject area content knowledge. Over the past three years all ESCs have provided an abundance of training in the core academic subject areas. The ESCs will continue this core academic subject area content training through summer 2006 and beyond. ESCs also provide a variety of training in pedagogy to assist teachers.

Texas Teacher Quality Grant Program

Begun in 1985 as Title II of the Education for Economic Security Act (EESA), the Teacher Quality Grants Program is designed to support training and retention of elementary and secondary teachers. The Teacher Quality program was most recently reauthorized in 2002, funded under Title II, Part A of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (P.L. 107-110). The Act requires states to provide professional development activities in core academic subject areas in order to ensure that highly qualified teachers, paraprofessionals, and (where appropriate) principals, administrators and pupil services personnel have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects they teach.

The Teacher Quality Grants Program represents one of the largest federal initiatives for using professional development to improve teaching and learning. The original intent of the Teacher Quality Grants Program was to support professional development activities in all core academic fields. However, because of the limits on funding for the higher education grants in Texas, and because of statewide needs, primary emphasis remains on the subjects of mathematics and science. Statewide needs are identified cooperatively with the TEA and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (the state agency responsible for higher education) as required by state and federal statutes.

The specific purpose of the Teacher Quality Grants Program is to assist teachers and other staff to gain access to professional development, in core academic subjects, that:

- is sufficiently sustained, intensive, and of high quality to have a lasting and positive effect on the teachers' classroom performance;
- is tied to challenging state content standards and challenging state student performance standards;
- is integrated into the systemic reform efforts of states, school districts, and individual schools;
- reflects recent scientifically based research on teaching and learning;
- includes strong academic content and content-specific pedagogical elements;
- incorporates activities and effective strategies for serving historically underserved and underrepresented populations to promote learning and career advancements; and
- is part of the everyday life of the school and creates an orientation toward continuous improvement throughout the school.

The projects are comprised of an intensive summer component (2-4 weeks) focusing primarily on content and an academic year component blending content and discipline-related pedagogy. By statute, project partnerships must include a faculty member from an Arts and Science department or college, a faculty member from an education department or college and a high-needs school district. The faculty can be associated with a two- or four-year, public or private accredited higher education institution. The LEA must meet the poverty threshold established through census data and also have a high percentage of teachers teaching out of field. Financial and programmatic contributions by participating school districts, non-public schools, other private organizations, and the sponsoring higher education institution are encouraged.

Seventy-two projects have been recommended for funding for the 2006-2007 grant year. The awards are approximately \$85,000 each and total approximately \$5.9 million. Of the proposed projects, 25 are recommended for funding to Hispanic-serving institutions (approximately 35 percent) and three to Historically Black Colleges or Universities. In addition, 25 of the recommended projects will be awarded to independent colleges or universities, and four will be awarded to community college partners. In terms of subject areas, the recommended projects were nearly evenly divided between mathematics (38) and science (34). The projects serve both rural and urban school districts and are located in every area of the state to assist with equitable access by teachers.

### Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)

The Teacher Advancement Program is focused on attracting, retaining, developing and motivating talented people to the teaching profession. TAP's goal is to draw more talented people to the teaching profession—and keep them there—by making it more attractive and rewarding to be a teacher. TAP provides the opportunity for good teachers to earn higher salaries and advance professionally, just as in other careers, without leaving the classroom. At the same time, TAP helps teachers become the best they can be, by giving them opportunities to learn better teaching strategies and holding them accountable for their performance.

TAP is based on four elements:

(1) *Multiple Career Paths*—TAP allows teachers to pursue a variety of positions throughout their careers—career, mentor and master teacher—depending upon their interests, abilities and accomplishments. As they move up the ranks, their qualifications, roles and responsibilities increase and thus, so does their compensation. This allows good teachers to advance without having to leave the classroom.

(2) *Ongoing, Applied Professional Growth*—TAP restructures the school schedule to provide time

during the regular school day for teachers to meet, learn, plan, mentor and share with other teachers, so they can constantly improve the quality of their instruction and hence, increase their students' academic achievement. This collaborative time allows teachers to learn new instructional strategies and have greater opportunity to become more effective teachers. Ongoing Applied Professional Growth in TAP schools focuses on identified needs based on instructional issues that specific teachers face with specific students. Teachers use data to target these areas of need, instead of trying to implement the latest fad in professional development.

(3) *Instructionally Focused Accountability*—TAP has developed a comprehensive system for evaluating teachers and rewards them for how well they teach their students. Teachers are held accountable for meeting the *TAP Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Responsibility Standards*, as well as for the academic growth of their students.

(4) *Performance-Based Compensation*—TAP changes the current system by compensating teachers according to their roles and responsibilities, their performance in the classroom, and the performance of their students. The new system also encourages districts to offer competitive salaries to those who teach in "hard-to-staff" subjects and schools. By combining these elements in an effective strategy for reform, TAP is working to turn teaching from a revolving-door profession into a highly rewarding career choice. The real reward will be the outstanding education available to each and every student in the country.

The University of Texas System is managing the Texas Teacher Advancement Program on behalf of the Texas Education Agency.

#### New Teacher Project

The Texas New Teacher Project (TNTP) creates and implements high-quality alternate routes to certification to attract and prepare exceptionally talented people from non-traditional backgrounds to teach, particularly for high need areas and hard-to-staff schools. They offer high-need certified teacher recruitment programs to help school systems address specific needs and vacancies in shortage area subjects such as math, science, and special education.

The New Teacher Project, or Texas Teaching Fellows (as the program is called in Texas), enter into strategic partnerships with school districts to focus on Human Resource reforms that increase the efficiency and effectiveness of hiring processes. The focus is on improving teacher recruitment, selection, placement, pre-service training, and program administration, beginning with a thorough analysis of current efforts. The New Teacher Project staff makes recommendations and works with existing staff to implement those recommendations, building the school district or state's capacity to recruit and develop excellent new teachers for years to come.

The program staff design and implement innovative rural recruitment programs for states with large rural areas that face challenges attracting high-quality teachers. TNTP has helped coordinate the recruitment and hiring efforts of widely scattered rural districts to maximize their ability to draw new teachers to their schools. They develop innovative training and certification programs for high-achieving individuals with or without prior education backgrounds.

In all partnerships, the Texas Teaching Fellows work with individual school districts to create programs that best meet their specific needs. The New Teacher Project brings expertise gained through recruiting, selecting, training and supporting more than 13,000 new teachers in school districts across the country.

The UT System is managing the New Teacher Project in Texas on behalf of the Texas Education Agency.

### Teach for America

Teach for America is the national corps of outstanding recent college graduates of all academic majors who commit two years to teach in urban and rural public schools, and become lifelong leaders in the effort to expand educational opportunity. Their mission is to build the movement to eliminate educational inequity by enlisting some of our nation's most promising future leaders in the effort.

TFA teachers go above and beyond to ensure that more students growing up today in our nation's lowest income communities have the educational opportunities they deserve. In the long run, TFA teachers build a force of leaders with the insight and credibility that comes from having taught in a low-income community. They work from education and from every other sector to effect the fundamental changes needed to ensure that all children have an equal chance in life.

The UT System is managing the TEA-funded portion of the Teach for America program in Texas.

### Transition to Teaching Program

To address the existing shortage of certified, high-quality teachers, there is a national movement called "transition to teaching" where mid-career professionals are attracted from their current places of employment to enter the teaching profession. These individuals are trained through rigorous, effective alternative certification programs and then mentored through their first two years of teaching by highly-successful veteran teachers. The transition teachers are prepared for the teacher certification examination and receive ongoing applied professional development throughout their two-year induction program. There is a high level of interest in the state of Texas to replicate these "transition to teaching" models.

The UT System is managing the Transition to Teaching programs on behalf of the Texas Education Agency. In addition, the UT System will be charged with developing relationships between large corporations, such as IBM, with the ultimate goal of replicating these "transition to teaching" programs in Texas. The focus is on secondary math and science teachers; however, other teacher shortage areas also may be explored.

### Texas Beginning Educator Support System (TxBESS)

"Teachers do not enter the classroom as finished products. Most teachers who remain in the profession improve and grow over time. When they first enter the classroom, new teachers do not possess all the knowledge and skills they will need to become highly effective, but with experience, practice, assistance and training, novices can become better teachers.<sup>1</sup>" TxBESS began in 1999, as an initiative of the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC), as a comprehensive induction program that has proven to be highly effective in retaining Texas teachers; serving approximately 10,000 beginning teachers in over three-hundred school districts.

Beginning teachers, teachers new to a district and/or assignment, mentor teachers, principals, district administrators, the Community, and students all benefit from the systemic initiative to support beginning teachers. The standards-based trainings, including mentoring, professional development, and formative assessment are included in a complete kit of training materials for trainers, mentors, principals, district administrators, school board members, campus and district mentor coordinators, and beginning teachers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Educational Testing Service "Education Issues 2004" p22. (<http://ftp.ets.org/pub/corp/candbrief2004.pdf>)

TxBESS is economically feasible—teacher attrition is costly and has a negative impact on student achievement. The research-based program complies with federal requirements in NCLB and focuses on instruction and improving student achievement. It is extremely flexible and can be adapted to meet local needs, including assisting teachers in improving content knowledge and skills.

Evaluation reports on the TxBESS program are available at <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/txbess/evalrpt.asp>.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

The teacher quality initiatives described above are specifically designed to meet the state's needs in shortage areas of teachers in mathematics, science, and special education. These initiatives also will specifically address the needs identified in the data analysis contained in Requirement 1 in the areas of mathematics and addressing issues for hard-to-staff teachers in high poverty, high minority, and rural school districts.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

State Title I, Part A state-level activity funds and NCLB consolidated administrative funds are used to fund technical assistance and professional development opportunities provided by the twenty regional education service centers described in Requirements 2 and 3. The SAHE portion of the Title II, Part A funds continues to fund the Texas Teacher Quality Grant Program, which will continue to focus on the areas of mathematics and science. State-level and NCLB funds also fund the teacher quality initiatives described above.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

TEA will make conscientious efforts to ensure that state-level funding for teacher quality initiatives target LEAs not meeting AYP and not meeting the annual measurable objectives for teacher quality. Many of these schools already meet the criteria for participation in the initiatives previously listed.

**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.**

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

In addition to the random submission and review of LEA teacher quality plans described under Requirement 2, TEA will continue to monitor NCLB program compliance, including highly qualified teacher requirements, through the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) system which includes the NCLB Compliance component of the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS).

The PBM system reflects the use of graduated interventions based on local education agency (LEA) performance as evidenced by PBMAS indicators and, for the NCLB program, performance on a set of Initial Compliance Review (ICR) desk audit indicators conducted by the Division of NCLB Program Coordination. For each individual NCLB program area, results on program-area PBMAS and ICR indicators and patterns across indicators are examined to determine required levels of intervention, including levels of compliance and/or performance review. The Interventions and Investigations unit of the Program Monitoring and Interventions Division develops and implements integrated program review processes for NCLB programs statewide that promote program effectiveness, improved student performance, and compliance with statutory requirements for students served by NCLB.

Consistent with the process to be implemented under Section 2141, LEAs identified as not meeting the Annual Measurable Objectives for Teacher Quality will be required to implement two processes in the Continuous Improvement Planning process.

1. Focused Data Analysis--The purpose of the focused data analysis is to work with stakeholders to gather, disaggregate, and analyze the LEA's highly qualified teacher data to determine possible causes for areas of performance concern and address identified issues in the Continuous Improvement Plan.
2. Continuous Improvement Plan--The purpose of this activity is to develop and implement a continuous improvement plan (CIP) which has integrated the LEA's decisions based on the results and findings of all required intervention activities.

Beginning with school year 2007-08, this continuous improvement process will be required to be implemented by any LEA in any year that the LEA did not report 100% highly qualified teachers in the core academic subject areas and the CIP will be required to be submitted to the Texas Education Agency for review by December 15<sup>th</sup> of the following school year. For example, if an LEA does not meet the 100% highly qualified requirement by the end of the 2006-07 school year, the plan submitted to TEA by December 15, 2007, and the continuous improvement planning process must be implemented during the 2007-08 school year.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

TEA will provide technical assistance through the twenty regional ESCs to LEAs that have not met the 100% highly qualified requirement and are not making AYP. Technical assistance and professional development will be needs-based to specifically target areas needing improvement by the LEA and/or campus. Each ESC will have the flexibility to implement a variety of approaches and methods for service delivery to include large group, small group, clusters, and one-on-one technical assistance, professional development, and/or distance learning. As indicated in the data analysis described in Requirement 1, many of the secondary teachers not meeting highly qualified requirements have needed additional training in the core academic subject area content knowledge. All ESCs will continue to provide content area knowledge and skill training in the core academic subject areas. The ESCs also will provide a variety of training in pedagogy to assist teachers.

EA will provide to each ESC a list of LEAs not meeting AYP and not meeting the 100% highly qualified teacher requirement. The ESCs will then prioritize technical assistance and professional development needs and/or requests to ensure that the needs of the targeted LEAs are met. Each ESC will provide documentation to TEA to ensure this priority group is served.

TEA staff will update the existing statewide training for Highly Qualified Teachers that currently is offered in all twenty regions to include a specific module of the teacher quality plan requirements and implementation. All the ESC staff has been trained in the campus improvement planning process.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

- in the percentage of highly qualified teachers at each LEA and school; and
- in the percentage of teachers who are receiving high-quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers?

**TEA Response:**

TEA will continue to collect data on highly qualified teachers through the automated Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Reporting System. Data are collected on high quality professional development in the Title I, Part A Compliance Reporting System. Both sets of data will be monitored on an annual basis as part of the Initial Compliance Review (desk audit) portion of the NCLB Compliance Component of PBMAS previously described.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

Under the provisions of Section 2141, the ESCs also will provide the statutorily required assistance to LEAs developing the LEA improvement plans, or agreements, using the PBM Continuous Improvement Planning

process. TEA will require the implementation of this process for 1) any LEA being required to implement the Section 2141 requirements for not meeting the annual measurable objectives and AYP, as applicable, and 2) any LEA not meeting the 100% highly qualified teacher and professional development requirements.

**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.**

TEA does not believe that this requirement is reflective of the statutory intent of NCLB, and may adversely impact large numbers of teachers who are certified but assigned out-of-field in order to meet school district needs pursuant to their teaching contracts.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

TEA will require all experienced (not new to the profession) teachers who were hired before the end of the 2005-06 school year (which includes summer school offered as part of the 2005-06 school year) to complete the HOUSSE procedures for determining highly qualified teacher status by June 1, 2007, or the last day of student instruction of the Spring term 2007, whichever is later. This additional year is amalgamated with the approval by USDE of the one-year flexibility extending the highly qualified teacher deadline from the end of the 2005-06 school year to the end of the 2006-07 school year. This additional year will provide incentive and opportunity for teachers to complete any impending professional development or college coursework needed to complete their highly qualified teacher status.

**USDE Criteria:**

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:

- 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
- 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.

**TEA Response:**

After the completion of the HOUSSE process described above by the end of the 2006-07 school year for experienced (not new to the profession) teachers who were hired before the end of the 2005-06 school year, HOUSSE procedures will be approved only for the following reasons when implemented as described in TEA's *Guidance for Implementation of NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements* posted on the TEA web site at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/hqteachers.html>.

1. Multi-subject secondary teachers in eligible rural schools who, if highly qualified 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.
2. Multi-subject special education teachers who are new to the profession, if highly qualified 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.

3. Visiting international teachers, who participate in foreign teacher exchange programs officially recognized by the State Board for Educator Certification and the Texas Education Agency, may use HOUSSE for a period not to exceed three years. These visiting international exchange teachers may implement HOUSSE as described in TEA's *Guidance for Implementation of NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements* posted on the TEA web site at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/hqteachers.html>.
4. Any experienced (not new to the profession) teacher who has demonstrated highly qualified status in their teaching assignment and is subsequently asked, or required, to change teaching assignments may use HOUSSE to demonstrate highly qualified teacher status in the new assignment for one year only. This one-year allowance will provide teachers the time necessary to attempt the appropriate Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) for certification in the new assignment or to complete additional college coursework.

Because Texas teacher contracts routinely contain provisions allowing teachers to be assigned as needed, many experienced teachers are subject to assignment at-will, often with short notice prior to or during the school year. Texas is a "right to work" state, with no collective bargaining. Accordingly, unlike other states, teachers in Texas do not negotiate union contracts which address issues like assignment.

The TExES exams are offered only four times per year in October, February, April, and June/July. College terms begin at set intervals throughout the year. The inflexibility of the testing and college academic year schedules necessitate this one-year HOUSSE procedure to allow the teacher to meet the highly qualified teacher requirement while seeking permanent highly qualified teacher status.

**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.**

**USDE Criteria:**

Does the revised plan include a written equity plan?

**TEA Response:**

The short timeframe provided to states in the May 15, 2006, letter did not provide adequate time for states to properly conduct all the necessary steps for developing a high-quality equity plan. Therefore, the CCSSO model has been abbreviated, due to time constraints, and Texas’ Plan for Equitable Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers to ensure that poor or minority students are not taught at disproportionate rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers is included (Attachment 6). The attached state plan will serve as a framework for LEAs to revise their local Teacher Quality Plans and ensure that all core academic subject area teachers are highly qualified by the end of the 2006-07 school year. LEAs will be required to revise and implement their plans at the local level during the upcoming school year. Attachment 1, the *Texas Strategic Plan to Address the Teacher Shortage*, the state’s long-range plan for addressing several related issues, is also hereby incorporated into this plan. Due to time constraints and inadequate time for data collection, disaggregation, and analysis, TEA is incorporating “inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field” all under the heading of “non-highly qualified”.

**USDE Criteria:**

Does the plan identify where inequities in teacher assignment exist?

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

**TEA Response:**

Specific strategies in seven areas are identified in the plan (Attachment 6). The “Targeted Subject or Group” identified in the right-hand column align to the priority needs (or inequities) identified in the data analysis section (Requirement 1) of this plan.

**USDE Criteria:**

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

**TEA Response:**

The strategies and resources included in the plan have proven records of success for increasing the number of certified teachers in the state and providing programs that have improved the knowledge and skills of teachers. As the number of newly certified teachers in the state increases, the number of highly qualified teachers in the state will also increase since any new teacher certified in their assignment also is highly qualified. Evaluation reports of some of the strategies are included in the equity plan. Additionally, TEA guidance and monitoring of LEA plans will ensure that strategies are being implemented. TEA’s collection and analysis of data will reflect whether progress is being made.

**USDE Criteria:**

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?

**TEA Response:**

TEA will incorporate indicators related to equitable distribution of teachers into the Initial Compliance Review desk audit that is used for determining NCLB compliance and interventions in the PBM system described in Requirement 2 and contained in Attachment 5. The indicators will annually review the data reported in the Highly Qualified Teacher Compliance Report comparing high/low poverty campuses and high/low minority campuses.