

NEW INCENTIVES TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN WELL-PREPARED TEACHERS TO SERVE IN URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

We recommend that your Summit speech feature the announcement of a new initiative to help address a major challenge of the next decade: attracting and retraining well-prepared teachers for under served urban and rural areas. This initiative would combine your message on the value of public service with your Call to Action challenge to put a caring and well-prepared teacher in every classroom.

The Challenge: Over the next decade, the nation will need to hire some 2.3 million teachers. Of these, approximately 15%, or 345,000 (approximately 35,000 per year), will be hired in central cities, in schools with large concentrations of low income students. An additional 207,000 (approximately 20,000 per year) will be needed in isolated, and often poor, rural areas. These types of communities face the greatest difficulties in attracting and retaining qualified teachers. Urban areas in particular receive significantly fewer applications for positions than neighboring suburban districts, and attrition rates in urban areas can often reach 30% to 50% in the first five years. They are therefore most likely to fill classroom vacancies with teachers who lack preparation, don't meet licensure requirements, or who are teaching out of field. As a result, the students in these communities -- who need the *most* qualified teachers in order to meet higher academic standards -- often get exactly the opposite in the classroom.

The Initiative: We propose a new program to help attract and retain teachers into high poverty central city and rural schools. This new initiative would be a part of the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Title V of the Higher Education Act (HEA), to be transmitted to Congress later in the Spring or Summer. In order to allow for continued planning and consultation, we anticipate that the basic framework for this initiative be announced at the summit, while many of the details be further developed by the Education Department over the coming months.

This would be a competitive grants program, with grants provided to 100 local partnerships involving urban or rural school districts and institutions of higher education. Locally-designed programs are likely to vary considerably, according to local need and capacity. Variations in local program design will be encouraged, and will provide natural experiments that will enable us to learn about the most effective approaches. While the specific designs will vary, the funds are to be used for a combination of specific purposes:

- ▶ **Providing incentives for individuals to prepare to teach, and to remain, in under served schools.** These might include 2-3 year fellowships for undergraduate students (including for a "5th year" program that provide intensive and sustained classroom experience for undergraduates after they have acquired a strong liberal arts background); one -year graduate fellowships for post-baccalaureate students, including recent liberal arts graduate and mid-career professionals seeking to enter teaching; stipends for teachers' aides and other education paraprofessionals seeking to move up a career ladder into full teaching positions; or, 1-2 year "residencies" for beginning teachers that would provide a lighter teaching load coupled with additional time for class preparation, being

coached or mentored, or working in other ways with more experienced teachers.

Local communities might experiment with different ways of structuring incentives, from fellowships that cover tuition and fees (average \$3,500 at undergraduate public institutions) to forgivable loans, to salary supplements for beginning teachers.

- ▶ **Strengthening teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education.** These steps might include strengthening academic courses in the liberal arts schools in order to better prepare new teachers to teach rigorous content incorporated into state academic standards, or developing extended, year-long internship programs in professional development schools operated jointly by the local school district and an institution of higher education.
- ▶ **Providing strong systems of support, mentoring, and continued professional development for beginning teachers.** Research shows that a strong support system for beginning teachers can improve both teacher effectiveness and retention. Local efforts to provide support to beginning teachers might include creating year-long mentoring programs for beginning teachers that provide support and evaluate teaching skills, or establishing subject-focused learning networks for beginning and experienced teachers that help teachers share effective approaches to teaching particular subject matter

Other key features of this proposal include:

- ▶ **Partnerships between institutions of higher education and local school systems, selected competitively:** The new program would be competitive, aimed at fostering partnerships among local school districts (city or rural), institutions of higher education (both colleges of education and arts and sciences) and others as appropriate, including teacher unions and existing networks for recruiting and supporting teachers..

Successful competitors would demonstrate that they have a high quality teacher preparation program, and that the program fits into a comprehensive, thoughtful strategy for recruiting and retaining teachers. To qualify for funding, local partnership strategies would need to address the full range of teacher preparation, induction, and professional development, as well as leverage other local, state and federal resources in a strategic and coordinated fashion. As the details of this program are further developed, we will consider the feasibility and desirability of requiring matching funds from local partnerships.

- ▶ **Local flexibility:** School districts, working collaboratively with institutions of higher education that provide rigorous teacher preparation programs, would determine their greatest recruitment needs and the types of prospective teachers they wish to target (e.g., traditional-age college students, paraprofessionals, mid-career and post-baccalaureate candidates, etc.), and use the federal funds to most effectively support locally determined strategies. The variations in program approaches that will emerge as a result of this bottom up approach will provide a wide range of models that can be evaluated and, where effective, replicated elsewhere.

Budget estimates and likely impact: The Education Department proposes to fund this initiative at \$100 million a year for five years, beginning with the FY1999 budget. While the ultimate impact will be affected by local design decisions, the Education Department estimates that this initiative will help attract and retain at least 48,000 teachers into high poverty central city and rural schools. This is approximately 17% of the estimated need in those communities.

Illustrative Example:

The Philadelphia School District, in partnership with a local school of education, receives a \$5.6 million grant over five years -- supporting 480 student teachers and 120 teaching residents.

Through this grant, the local partnership:

- ▶ provides 280 \$3500 fellowships per year to undergraduate students for their junior, senior and 5th year (including 120 in the first year, and 40 new student teachers annually)
- ▶ provides 200 graduate students with a \$6,000 one-year fellowships (40 annually)
- ▶ provides 120 first and second year teachers with \$6,000 teaching residency fellowships (including 40 in the first year, and 20 new residents annually)

NEW INCENTIVES TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN WELL-PREPARED TEACHERS TO SERVE IN URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

We recommend that your Summit speech feature the announcement of a new initiative to help address a major challenge of the next decade: attracting and retraining well-prepared teachers for under served urban and rural areas. This initiative would combine your message on the value of public service with your Call to Action challenge to put a caring and well-prepared teacher in every classroom.

The new initiative would be a part of the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Title V of the Higher Education Act (HEA), to be transmitted to Congress later in the Spring or Summer. In order to allow serious planning and vetting of this proposal, we recommend that you announce the basic framework below, with the details to be filled in over the next few months:

- The new program would be competitive, aimed at fostering partnerships among local school districts (city or rural), institutions of higher education (both colleges of education and arts and sciences) and others as appropriate, including unions as well as existing recruitment and professional networks.
- Successful competitors would demonstrate that they have a high quality teacher preparation program, and that the program fits into a comprehensive, thoughtful strategy for recruiting and retaining teachers. To qualify for funding, local partnership strategies would need to address the full range of teacher preparation, induction, and inservice professional development, as well as leverage other local, state and federal resources in a strategic and coordinated fashion.
- Each partnership would use its funds to attract and retain well prepared teachers, with the lion's share supporting postsecondary fellowships for students who commit to a significant period of teaching in an urban or rural area. Local partnerships would be free to decide for themselves the proper mix among programs that support three types of prospective teachers: college undergraduates (e.g., 2-4 year fellowships that require a year-for-year commitment to teach), individuals who have completed a 4 year degree (e.g, seniors with a liberal arts degree or mid-career professionals who want to enter teaching) who will need an intensive "5th year", and paraprofessionals who will continue working and get financial help for college tuition as they work toward licensure.
- The initiative would be estimated to cost \$X million dollars over five years, beginning in FY 99, and would provide an average of \$X per prospective teacher, allowing approximately X beneficiaries to prepare for and enter the classroom. Teachers assisted would help X students around the country.

While this program would by no means meet the entire expected need, such an initiative could help catalyze system-wide improvements to substantially improve the quality of the 600,000 teachers who will need to be hired in central cities over the next decade.

April 22

11:50 am

Terry: the following page contains the data that we received from N.C.E.S on the projected percentages of teachers to ~~be hired~~ be hired (who will need to be hired) broken out by urbanicity (different kinds of regions) and by poverty level of the school. Schools were divided into 4 poverty categories depending on the percentage of students who receive free or reduced priced lunch. (Category 1 (lowest poverty) = 0% to 34% of the students receive free + reduced-price lunch; Category 2 = 35% to 49% of students receive free + reduced-price lunch, etc. . . .)

P.S.
Please excuse the messy state of the following page.

Terry, the percentages are based on a total number of teachers (to be hired) of 2.3 million. If you have questions, please call me at 401-1887. I will give the same chart to Tom Brown.
- Liz

Total # to be hired = 2.3 million

Percentage distribution of number of additional public and private elementary and secondary teachers needed over the next 18 years, by local and percent children free/reduced price lunch

Local	Percent free/reduced price lunch				
	Total	0 to 34 percent	35 to 49 percent	50 to 74 percent	75 to 100 percent
Total, total ...	100	37	13	14	17
Central city <i>69,000</i>	30	13	3	6	9
Urban fringe	20	22	3	3	2
Large/small town ..	17	10	4	2	2
Rural	23	12	2	4	8

Between 1996 + 2006

① districts or schools?

② #s

③ replacement rates

← think

Elvis, Val + Ricky

I ~~to be~~

left Tom

a message on this.

↓ This title

is misleading...

↓ We wanted the

percentage distribution

**TRANSFORMING THE VISION INTO A LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY:
AN OPTIONS PAPER FOR TITLE V**

The Title V team has developed a vision for improvement of teaching that spans the continuum of educator professional development, from initial recruitment through preservice preparation, licensure, induction, and continuing education throughout every educator's career. The next step is to translate that vision into a proposal for the reauthorization of Title V. What follows is an analysis of how we can develop that proposal.

The team's initial recommendation is that the new Title V focus mainly on the "front end" of professional development, that is, on the recruitment, initial preparation, licensure, and induction of K-12 educators. The reason for this recommendation is that the Department already has a major "in-service" program, Eisenhower Professional Development. Although Eisenhower cannot do everything -- it is underfunded, and it focuses mainly on strengthening teaching in the core academic subjects (particularly mathematics and science), not on general improvement of the profession -- the team believes that a Title V proposal that also covers continuing professional development would be perceived, in Congress and elsewhere, as overlapping with the Eisenhower program. The Department would, justifiably, have difficulty generating appropriations for two overlapping programs. Moreover, the team strongly believes that major needs in educator recruitment, preparation, licensure, and induction are not being adequately addressed through existing (primarily non-Federal efforts) and that limited Federal resources, if carefully targeted, can make a difference in those areas.

The team has identified three potential mechanisms for funding improvements in the "front end": (1) a State formula grant program; (2) a portfolio of categorical discretionary programs; and (3) a smaller number of programs (between one and three) tailored to addressing highest-priority needs in a manner that, the team believes, can have the greatest impact. For reasons set forth below, the team believes that the third of these options is most promising.

Option 1: Propose a formula grant program

The team is aware that some members of the education community will advocate creation of a State formula grant program under Title V. Such a program would allow each State to develop improved front-end systems suitable to the State's own needs and priorities. The advocates believe this option would be politically attractive, as it would be less likely, than a discretionary program, to appear to involve the Department in State and local decision-making.

However, the team believes that, with limited funding under Title V, the Federal Government can achieve the most impact if it targets funds on a limited number of promising approaches. (See discussion of these approaches under Option 3.) This type of targeting would be difficult under a formula program; more likely, any focus on real reform and improvement would be diffused.

In addition, we note that the Eisenhower State Grants program, although it is focused on inservice instruction, does authorize support for preservice activities, particularly through the portion of the program that funds competitive grants to institutions of higher education.¹ Although it appears that States use very little Eisenhower funding for preservice concerns, creation of a second formula grant authority would, as in the earlier discussion, raise the duplication issue, and probably make it difficult to generate adequate appropriations for either Eisenhower or the new program. Thus, we appear to disagree, with those members of the community who support a formula grant, about the likelihood of obtaining funding for a formula versus a competitive program.

A final problem with the formula option is that it would take considerable resources, probably several hundred million dollars annually, to make it viable, and we are skeptical that, in a

Sixteen percent of each State's funds go to the State agency for higher education (the "SAHE"). SAHEs then make competitive grants to IHEs and non-profit organizations. One of the purposes of the SAHE program is "improving teacher education programs in order to promote further innovation in teacher education..." and one of the allowable activities is "preservice training activities."

tight budget environment, adequate resources would be available.

Option 2: Propose several categorical discretionary programs

Other members of the community believe that Title V should include a fairly large number of discretionary programs dealing with distinct areas of need and priority -- much like the current Title V. While there may be little substantive difference between, on the one hand, authorization of a group of categorical programs and, on the other, an authorization of a few broader programs encompassing a range of allowable activities, continued Congressional concern about the plethora of Federal education programs (the myths about the 760 programs, the 32 literacy programs, etc.) makes it appear unwise to propose the creation of several different programs. Indeed, Congressional and Administration concern about the number of programs in the Department has resulted in the defunding of several Title V authorities in the last few years. Moreover, creation and funding of multiple programs would limit the Department's flexibility to respond to new needs and priorities.

Option 3: Propose between one and three authorities focused on highest-priority needs.

The team is proposing three individual programs. The HEA steering committee may decide, however, to put forward fewer than three authorities. In that case, any of the three proposals, or any combination of the three, could be pursued.

A description of the three proposals follows.

Option 3A: A broad discretionary program focusing on promising approaches to improvement of the front end of teacher preparation.

Under a Fund for Excellence in Teaching (but a better name is needed), the Department would fund activities likely to have a national impact on the development of "a capable and committed teacher in every classroom." Within that broad authority, we would highlight the following types of activities as particularly worthy of support:

- o Funding of national reform projects focused on the improvement of teacher recruitment, preparation, licensure, or induction. For instance, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers, is developing model core standards for licensing beginning teachers. INTASC is designing its standards to be compatible with the standards for experienced teachers developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Yet, unlike the relatively well supported NBPTS, INTASC is something of a shoestring operation, and its work is coming along much more slowly. Short-term Federal support could speed the work of the consortium and help motivate States to adopt its standards.
- o Model recruitment and preparation programs. While the Federal Government cannot, by itself, solve the problem of a pending teacher shortage (and there is reason to believe that the normal operation of the labor market may solve much of the problem), targeted efforts could help identify and validate approaches that may be followed by States, school districts, or IHEs. Several types of activities suggest themselves.

-- The Department could support model programs that enable education paraprofessionals to obtain full certification. The team finds this approach to recruitment and preparation attractive because: (1) the paraprofessional workforce is heavily minority, so programs aimed at paraprofessionals will help alleviate the under-representation of minorities in teaching; (2) minority paraprofessionals are concentrated in cities, and are unlikely to leave urban districts once they are certified, so their certification helps resolve the problem of teacher shortages in the cities; and (3) if paraprofessionals continue working during their training, the cost per person of training them may be relatively low, so a program aimed at certifying paraprofessionals may benefit from cost efficiencies.

-- The Department could support the development of model approaches to school administrator training.

Research has shown conclusively that the quality of school leadership exhibited by principals and other administrators has a major impact on teaching and learning in the classroom. In addition, like teaching, school administration faces the problem of an aging labor force and the need to recruit and train new talent in the coming years. Yet the existing array of professional development activities in the Department and other agencies does little to address the quality of administration. Because there are relatively few principals (compared to teachers), the Department may be able, with limited funds, to have a more immediate impact on the recruitment, preparation, and induction of administrators.

-- The Department could support the development and refinement of promising innovations like professional development schools (PDSs). PDSs, an idea first put forward by the "Holmes Group" on the reform of teacher education, employ a "teaching hospital"-type approach that links teachers colleges with elementary and secondary schools, gives prospective teachers a much more clinical education than is common in more traditional teacher ed programs, ensures that teacher college faculty have continuing, intensive involvement with K-12 schools, and allows schools to benefit from the research conducted by the IHEs.

The Department actually put forward support for the development of PDSs as its key Title V initiative for the last HEA reauthorization (1991-92). The idea was not accepted by Congress (except for the perfunctory inclusion of a PDS authority within a broader formula program that has never been funded), and PDSs have evolved without Federal support, with somewhat mixed results. The Department could play an important role in the expansion and improvement of professional development schools through such activities as supporting the adoption and evaluation of different PDS models and bringing together faculty from different PDSs to share information.

O Funding State efforts that combine, in a comprehensive

manner, reforms in recruitment, preparation, licensure, and induction. Improvement in the front end of teacher preparation will be most successful if States address the issues comprehensively, rather than in a piecemeal manner. Several States have received modest support, through the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management, to implement the recommendations of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, but much more could be done. The Department could fund efforts that leverage much larger amounts of State and other dollars, encourage more States to adopt reforms, and cause the reforms to take root more quickly than would be the case without Federal involvement.

Some Concerns with Option 3A

While the team believes that a broad discretionary program would be an effective mechanism for improving teacher preparation, there are issues and concerns that are likely to be raised during the legislative process.

First, a fund for excellence in teaching could become a receptacle into which Congress dumps pork barrel-type projects (as has frequently happened with the Fund for the Improvement of Education), never letting the program become the flexible, reform-oriented vehicle that we intend. One way to address this problem might be to create a policy board to set priorities for the fund, as is the case with FIPSE. However, this approach would entail more administrative overhead, and even FIPSE has not been immune from the pork barrel problem.

Second, opponents of a proposal to create a new fund could claim that it would duplicate FIE and the Eisenhower National Programs, because both are authorized to support improvements in professional development. (The Eisenhower authority even includes language on "development of innovative models for recruitment, induction, retention, and recruitment" of new teachers.) We believe, however, that a strong case can be made for creation of a single authority focused specifically on the range of "front end" professional development issues, and that neither FIE or Eisenhower National will ever be able to make much of an impact on those issues.

Third, our recommendation to go forward with a single, broad authority under Title V raises the issue of what to do about the Minority Teacher Recruitment program, the only Title V program that is currently funded. Minority Teacher Recruitment, with an appropriation of only a little over \$2 million, deals with front-end issues (including the upgrading of paraprofessionals). A case could be made either for folding the program into our proposed broader authority or continuing it as a separate activity. The team supports continuation of the current authority and giving it a funding level that allows it to do more in accomplishing its mission. In addition, we believe that recruitment and participation of minorities (as well as individuals with disabilities) should be a strong component of the entire range of activities carried out under the reauthorized Title V.

Option 3B: A discretionary program providing major support for the development of "flagship" teacher education programs.

Under this proposal the Department would make major awards -- for instance, \$5 million annually -- to approximately 10 IHEs with outstanding teacher training programs that can be looked on as national models. The institutions, places that already embody many of the reforms we believe are essential, would use the Federal resources to further nurture their programs and to provide leadership and guidance to the rest of the field. We would designate one flagship institution in each region.

This strategy would be patterned after the response to the "Flexner report," early in the century, which transformed American medical education. Key elements would include:

- o The grants would go to the IHE, not to its teachers college or education department, because the activities carried out would affect the institution as a whole; each institution would strengthen the relationship between its teacher education and arts & sciences components.
- o The recipient IHE would establish a mentoring relationship with an additional 10 or so "satellite" institutions within its region, sharing information, providing guidance, and perhaps making subgrants to

strengthen the programs in the other institutions.

- o The institutions would operationalize key components of the PDS model: a heavily clinical preservice education, strong working relationships with the K-12 system, etc., and would have programs in place, or well under development, that really prepare teachers to teach all students to high standards.
- o The teacher training program in each institution would make a strong effort to recruit minorities and disabled individuals, reflecting the demographic makeup of the region.
- o With the Federal funds, each institution would engage in a continuing process of evaluation (against its own performance goals), adjustment, and dissemination of best practices to one another and to the field.
- o Applicants would also be judged on their success in graduating and placing students.

Additional attributes that we could look for in funding these institutions include:

- o The existence (or a plan to commence) strong programs for paraprofessionals or for the preparation of school administrators.
- o Strong use of technology in the program, and preparation of teachers to use technology.
- o Involvement of the institution in reform of State licensure systems.

Issues and Concerns with Option 3B

While the team is very enthusiastic about this option, we do raise the following issues:

1. With so many teacher education programs in existence, it may be difficult (operationally and politically) to designate only ten as flagships and provide them with very

large awards. However, the political problems inherent in trying to initiate a program that makes only 10 large grants may be mitigated by our proposal to require the grantees to make subgrants to satellite institutions. If each flagship institution makes 10 subgrants, 100 IHEs in a large number of States and Congressional Districts could benefit from the program.

2. There is some risk that once the program is created, it may be difficult to avoid funding the same institutions in perpetuity, even if it would be desirable to shift the funds to other IHEs or if the original rationale for the program no longer exists.

3. OMB and the Congress may ask whether this initiative would duplicate NSF's "Collaboratives for Excellence in Teacher Preparation" program. That activity, currently funded at \$14 million, brings together all the teacher training programs in an area or State around activities to improve the preparation of new teachers. It focuses particularly on forging collaboration, within IHEs, between the colleges of arts and sciences and the schools of education (and, befitting the NSF mission, on math and the sciences). The team believes that our proposed flagship program would be more comprehensive and far-reaching than NSF's authority, but we believe that the Department will need, in the coming weeks, to flesh out the details of how the two programs would complement one another and work together.

4. The team has looked closely at the Title V reauthorization proposal of the Council for Educational Development and Research, which would also provide major grants for the improvement of teacher preparation. While our proposals are very similar, CEDAR would reserve a large portion of the money for direct grants to cooperating school districts, in order to ensure that the K-12 system is a full partner in teacher preparation reforms. The team considered this idea, but ultimately concluded that providing separate grants to LEAs would help perpetuate the historic separation of LEAs and schools of education, in addition to complicating administration of the program.

Nevertheless, while we propose that the authority provide direct support only to the flagship institutions, we believe that LEAs, particularly those that educate concentrations of at-risk children, should play a major role in the program. It would probably be advisable to require the flagships to subgrant some of their funds to those LEAs.

5. Finally, the team is unsure of what would be the appropriate average grant size under this new program; the \$5 million figure put forward at the beginning of this discussion is only a placeholder. If the HEA Steering Committee endorses our proposal, we intend to consult with outside experts in determining an appropriate figure.

Option 3C: A program of scholarships targeted to students attending schools or colleges of education undergoing serious reforms.

Under this option, the Department would make grants to schools or colleges of education undertaking serious reforms of their programs. The IHEs would provide scholarships of up to \$5,000 to students in their 3rd, 4th, and, in five-year programs, 5th years of undergraduate teacher education -- or to students entering mid-career and other non-traditional programs. Some funds could also be used to support the preparation of principals and other school administrators. Selection of recipients would focus on merit as well as student financial need.

Of the money granted to each IHE, 90 percent would be used for scholarships; institutions could retain the remainder to support upgrading and reforming of the curriculum and to work with LEAs on the induction of new teachers.

Issues and Concerns with Option 3C

Members of the team believe this type of program, if adequately funded, could provide an inducement for ed schools to undertake significant reforms and for talented undergraduates, and older students, to enter the profession. It may also have an impact on attracting minorities, individuals with disabilities, and other nontraditional candidates into the profession. By providing funds for student assistance, along with a modest amount for institutional reform, such a program may give IHEs an

incentive to adopt the reforms proposed by the National Commission, the Holmes Group, and others. If funded at \$100 million, and assuming that IHEs apply the standard 8 percent indirect cost rate applicable to professional development programs, the program could provide more than 16,400 scholarships annually.

Issues and Concerns with Option 3C

The team believes that the following significant issues merit consideration:

1. Past Federal efforts to stimulate labor markets by subsidizing the preparation of entering professionals have generally achieved only mixed results. Those type of programs are probably most effective in occupations where high costs (a particularly expensive and lengthy preparation) constitute a major barrier to entry. In other areas, like teaching, the programs have been inefficient because, for the most part, they have paid for students to obtain an education they would have obtained anyway.
2. A scholarship program that does not provide financial assistance until the third or fourth year of college is likely to face particularly difficult challenges in stimulating new entries. This occurred with the (now unfunded) Douglas Scholarships program: most recipients were junior and seniors in schools of education who had started their preservice education without any promise of receiving a Douglas Scholarship. Few were attracted to becoming teachers by the presence of the program.
3. A proposal to launch a fairly major new scholarship program for future teachers would have to be considered within the overall context of Administration proposals to expand existing sources of financial aid (particularly Pell Grants) and start new ones through the tax system. A scholarship program that does not kick in until the junior year may dovetail with the Hope Scholarships, which would terminate after the sophomore year, but may not have much of an effect on student persistence since the first two years of college, according to the research, are the ones that students have difficulty completing successfully.

4. Members of the team believe that any new program that subsidizes preparation of new teachers not just seek to increase the numbers of teachers but generate high-quality graduates. However, the teacher ed programs undertaking reforms will not necessarily be those that already have high-quality programs, and they may not be the ones attracting the best students.

5. Analysts who have looked at minority teacher development efforts have sometimes been critical of those that target students already in college. The problem is that too few members of certain minority groups successfully complete college. A program that provides a financial incentive to attract current minority undergraduates to teaching may end up drawing them away from professions where they are even less well represented. This line of reasoning favors teacher preparation programs that seek to increase the overall pool of minority college students, such as those that initially reach out to high school students.

6. Finally, more thinking needs to be done on the threshold requirements for institutional participation in the program. For example, what types of reforms would they have to be undergoing in order to obtain grants? What annual progress would we want to see on those reforms in order for the grants to continue? Would we make a partnership with elementary schools (the PDS model) a mandated component of the reforms? What kind of activities would we expect the IHEs to undertake with the 10 percent they would reserve for reform activities? How much real reform could they really be expected to achieve?



Michael Cohen
04/21/97 09:34:35 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Jonathan_Schnur @ ed.gov
cc: Maureen_McLaughlin @ ed.gov, Mike_Smith @ ed.gov, William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP
Subject: Re: incentives for teachers 

Thanks for the update to the memo, and to Maureen for the original and the faxed cost info. I think we need to pick things up a bit as we approach the summit. I don't think we will need a full-blown, comprehensive and complete proposal, but I think we need something for the President to talk about in his speech. Nobody here, including me, thinks the President will be satisfied with or well served by simply talking about options and appointing a task force to come up with a plan. This approach will fail to capitalize on the incredible media attention at the summit, and may not sufficiently focus attention on the importance of attracting well prepared people into teaching. Further, we can waste an awful lot of time just appointing and organizing a task force, time which could otherwise be spent fleshing out a legislative proposal and consulting informally and extensively.

As I read this and talk to others, it seems to be there are a couple of components to what the President could do, without reaching premature closure.

First, he can talk about what the federal government already does to make it easier for people to go into teaching -- Perkins loan cancellation/forgiveness, and income contingent repayment. There are also more specific programs underway -- National Service funds an urban education service corps, and I think there is a troops-to-teachers program, but I don't know much about it.

Second, I think there is a core idea emerging in our discussions and your materials -- a focus on attracting and retaining well prepared teachers in underserved urban and rural areas. It would be great if the President could announce the framework of an initiative to address this, leaving the details to be worked out later. I would suggest the following:

- a competitive program, aimed at partnerships between city school districts, IHE's (colleges of ed and arts and sciences) and others as appropriate, including unions, existing recruitment and/or professional networks, etc.
- competitors have to show that they have a quality preparation program/strategy, and that they are locating this program in a comprehensive, well thought out strategy for recruiting and retaining teachers, which addresses teacher preparation, induction, ongoing professional development, and which leverages other local, state and federal resources in a strategic and coordinated fashion
- that gives each partnership funds to use to attract and retain well prepared teachers -- they can figure out themselves the mix most appropriate to target, including undergraduates (e.g., four 2-4 year fellowships that require a year-for-year commitment to teach), individuals who have completed a 4 year degree (e.g, seniors with a liberal arts degree or mid-career professionals who want to enter teaching) who will need an intensive "5th year", and paraprofessionals who will continue working and get financial help for college tuition as they work toward licensure.

If the President were to announce a program centered on these components, he would make clear that this will be part of the Administrations HEA Title 5 reauthorization, to be transmitted later in

the Spring or Summer (It appears that you are aiming for late September, though at one point I thought you were aiming for June). I don't think we need a lot of details for something like this, though we would need to figure out how much we would be prepared to spend, starting in FY 99. We would also need to make some assumptions about the size of fellowships, and possible ways of dividing up funds between the three types of prospective teachers described above, so that we could estimate a range of teacher slots that would be filled through this initiative.

Third, there may some simple and appropriate steps that could be taken, or at least proposed, without much cost or complexity. For example, what about making it easier for students to use work-study funds to pay for time they spend student teaching?

Fourth, there clearly are other options to consider -- expanded loan forgiveness, tax breaks, etc. (though these approaches seem to me to be too costly, insufficiently targeted, and unlikely to make a real impact). These and other options you may want to consider should not be foreclosed by a Presidential proposal at the summit.

I think approach along these lines will give the President what just about everybody here seems to think he needs next week, while not unduly tying the hands of the Department as you proceed. This presumes that we can work our way through several things over the next few days -- (1) whether the Department is prepared to commit to an urban-focused initiative; (2) if so, the overall framework for it; and (3) a minimum level of investment for it, with the understanding that we will figure out how to pay for it during the FY 99 budget decisions. This assumes that we would be announcing something on the modest size. I would guess in the \$80-\$100 million range of 4-5 years.

APR-18-97 FRI 17:26

Computation of Cost Implications of Extending Teacher Cancellations to FFEL & FDSL

	# of New Teachers ^a	At Graduation ^b	Average Debt % with Debt ^c	Year Later ^d	Perkins Loans ^e	% with Loans Cancelled ^f	Stafford Loans ^g
Raw Data	90,920	\$13,700	40.5%	\$9,072	23.3%	6.8%	75.0%

All Teachers

$\text{c} \times \text{b} \times \text{c} \times \text{f} =$

\$378,504

Teachers @ Low-income Schools

$\text{a} \times \text{d} \times \text{c} \times \text{f} \times (\text{c/d})$

\$110,214

* From B&B 92/94
** NPSAS 90

All Teachers Year in Repayment

(\$ in 000's)	1	2	3	4	5	Total Cost
Perkins Option Forgiveness Rate	15%	15%	20%	20%	30%	
Opening balance	378,504	321,728	264,952	189,252	113,551	
Accrued interest	31,227	26,543	21,859	15,613	9,368	
Loan forgiveness	88,002	83,318	97,559	91,314	122,919	483,112
Closing balance	321,728	264,952	189,252	113,551	0	

(\$ in 000's)	1	2	3	4	5	Total Cost
Alternative Option Forgiveness Rate	33%	33%	34%			
Opening balance	378,504	253,597	128,691			
Accrued interest	31,227	20,922	10,617			
Loan forgiveness	156,133	145,828	139,308			441,269
Closing balance	253,597	128,691	(0)			

Teachers in Perkins Loan Forgiveness Eligible Schools

(\$ in 000's)	1	2	3	4	5	Total Cost
Perkins Option Forgiveness Rate	15%	15%	20%	20%	30%	
Opening balance	110,214	93,682	77,150	55,107	33,064	
Accrued interest	9,093	7,729	6,365	4,546	2,728	
Loan forgiveness	25,625	24,261	28,408	26,589	35,792	140,674
Closing balance	93,682	77,150	55,107	33,064	(0)	

(\$ in 000's)	1	2	3	4	5	Total Cost
Alternative Option Forgiveness Rate	33%	33%	34%			
Opening balance	110,214	73,843	37,473			
Accrued interest	9,093	6,092	3,091			
Loan forgiveness	45,463	42,463	40,564			128,490
Closing balance	73,843	37,473	(0)			

Handwritten signature/initials

Handwritten mark

**Computation of Cost Implications of
Providing Scholarships to Future Teachers**

Number of new teachers required	Annual # of new teachers	Value of Scholarship	First-year Cost	Five-year Costs
2,000,000	200,000	\$1,000	\$200,000,000	\$1,000,000,000
		\$3,000	\$600,000,000	\$3,000,000,000

Author: Elizabeth Eisner at WDCT01
Date: 4/22/97 12:35 PM
Priority: Urgent
TO: Tom Snyder at WDCN01
TO: Terry Dozier at WDCB02
TO: Thomas Corwin at WDCT02
TO: Valena Plisko
TO: Elois Scott
TO: Ricky Takai
Subject: Some more questions and additional information

----- Message Contents -----

Terry and Tom:

On both of your chairs I left the data that NCES had provided on the percentage of teachers to be hired by different community types and by schools in different poverty categories over the next 10 years. As I noted, Tom Snyder and NCES project that approximately 2.3 million teachers will need be hired between 1996 and 2006. The projection is that 2.1 million teachers will need to be hired to replace other teachers who will leave teaching for at least one year. Approximately 190,000 teachers will be hired into NEW TEACHING POSITIONS THAT ARE CREATED DUE TO INCREASES IN ENROLLMENT.

I did not have time to turn the percentages into raw numbers by multiplying the 2.3 million (or a little less) by the percentage in each cell. If you would like me to do so, I can do that after my meetings -- around 4:30 pm. (Please just leave me a message if you need me to do those calculations.)

Tom Snyder: I just realized that we have an important question for you about the projections. In one handwritten note that you faxed to me, you implied that the projections do not include any private school teachers. Is that true? Please clarify the extent to which private school teachers are included or are NOT included in the 2.3 million and in the percentages in the cells (which are based on replacement rates, etc.). Thank you, T0m. Please send your reply to all of the people included in this e-mail.

Terry and Tom C.: Tom Snyder also sent us an e-mail with the "replacement rates" for teachers by all of the categories of interest. I am going to forward that to you right after I send this message.

Also, Terry and Tom, please be aware that last Wednesday we did give Bill Kincaid the following projections: (These were earlier projections not broken out by poverty and "rural" was not broken out from "small town."):

Of the teachers to be hired over the next decade, 29.5% will need to be hired in the central city, 32.5% will need to be hired in the urban fringe/large town, and 38% will need to be hired in rural/small town areas.

I will be in meetings from 1:00 until about 4:15 or 4:30, but you can reach me at 401-1857 b/4 then or after 4:15/4:30. Thanks.

Liz

Author: Elizabeth Eisner at WDCT01
Date: 4/22/97 12:37 PM
Priority: Normal
TO: Terry Dozier at WDCB02
TO: Thomas Corwin at WDCT02
Subject: Re: A few more questions

----- Message Contents -----

Tom and Terry: In case you are interested, here is a message and attached file that Tom Snyder sent us last Thursday. Tx. -- Liz

Forward Header

Subject: Re: A few more questions
Author: Tom Snyder at WDCN01
Date: 4/17/97 1:22 PM

Liz,

The teacher estimates that we prepared were based on the followup of the 1993-94 SASS teacher survey. We calculated attrition rates for each of the categories, multiplied each category by ten for the ten years and recalculated the distribution. Obviously, we are holding the distribution constant. We have no model to estimate total teacher or enrollment, by locale and free/reduced price lunch. The free/reduced price lunch figures were based on school data. I am not sure we could develop a good model even if we had more time, so it seems the best thing to do is hold the replacement rates constant.

The count of teachers that we came up with on the teacher attrition calculation was 2.1 million, plus you might add the 190,000 needed for additional students (to hold pupil-teacher ratios constant). This gives you something like 2.3 million. I can't give you the details by free/reduced price lunch however, because we started running into problems with nonresponse. The new data, by locale and free/reduced price lunch, is some 20 percent below the level of the locale only data that we already provided to you, because of the nonresponse on the lunch question. This was particularly a problem with the private schools, many of which don't participate in the program anyhow. Because of their high turnover rate, the private schools figure somewhat large in the teacher attrition.

There appears to be little consistent pattern in the attrition rates across the various "poverty" levels (see attachment). Given the missing values and so forth, I would not make anything of a 1 percent difference. There are a few values that seem somewhat high, but it is hard to know if they are just some sort of anomaly. Anyhow, the evidence for high attrition rates in high poverty urban areas seems pretty meagre. Of course, most of the replacement teachers will be in moderate poverty suburban and small/large towns because those are where the population lives. Of course, there are alternative we have not explored that might negate these crude estimates. For example, it is possible that the attrition in the urban poverty areas is low because these teachers are relatively old, and that many will be retiring soon because of this age factor. This would tend to make the steady state model invalid.

Let me know if you need anything else.
Tom Snyder

Reply Separator

Subject: A few more questions
Author: Elizabeth Eisner at WDCT01
Date: 4/16/97 6:49 PM

Tom: Thanks again for the projections. We have a few more questions. First, can you tell us the number of teachers represented in each cell in the table you gave us? Or, at least tell us what the total number of teachers is for the table so that we can calculate the percentages.

Second, did you use schools or districts when creating the different poverty categories? We had asked for schools, but it just occurred to us that you may have had to use districts due to data limitations. Please just let us know.

Third, from our quick review of your data and our quick review of the distribution of schools by poverty levels, it appears that the replacement rate for teachers is about the same across schools of different poverty levels. Is this true? What are the different replacement rates across the different levels of poverty schools and across the different levels of urbanicity?

Thanks, Tom!!!

Liz

[illegible]

	K
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	75 to 100
6	percent
7	
8	
9	8.0
10	8.5
11	4.6
12	4.8
13	13.6
14	

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed

SUBJECT: Policy Announcements for the Summit

DATE: April 23, 1997

The following are potential policy announcements you could make at the upcoming Summit on service and in the radio address on Saturday.

RADIO ADDRESS

You will announce that we are sending our America Reads legislation to the Hill, and use that opportunity to emphasize AmeriCorps' role in America Reads. You can also talk about your vision of the Summit and highlight America Reads as a great example of meeting the Summit's challenge on volunteering and literacy. [Add work-study here.] In addition, you can announce that Federal agencies are making a "commitment" to the Summit that they will expand the number of schools that they have adopted or established partnerships with from approximately 1,500 schools to 2,000 schools by the year 2000. Working through partnerships established by their agencies, Federal employees tutor, purchase equipment, and hold career days.

MONDAY SPEECH AT SUMMIT

Each of the potential announcements we have developed below expand the concept of service beyond the current AmeriCorps model to focus on critical fields of service that we want to encourage young people to enter -- teaching, police, and child care. In this way, you can talk about your concept of service and about the summit's theme of young people without being too hemmed in by the current limitations on AmeriCorps' size.

Teacher Corps

[Note: this is current draft, but Mike says he is doing a fairly significant rewrite that he will get to you soon]

We recommend that your Summit speech feature the announcement of a new initiative to help address a major challenge of the next decade: attracting and retraining well-prepared teachers for under served urban and rural areas. This initiative would combine your message on the value of public service with your Call to Action challenge to put a caring and well-prepared teacher in every classroom.

The Challenge: Over the next decade, the nation will need to hire some 2 million teachers. Of these, approximately y%, or xxxxx (approximately 50,000) per year, will be hired in central cities, in schools with large concentrations of low income students. An additional zzzzz teachers per year will be needed in isolated, and often poor, rural areas. These types of communities face the greatest difficulties in attracting and retaining qualified teachers. Urban areas in particular receive

Ann Fader - Organizer
for Chinese Am
Women

significantly fewer applications for positions than neighboring suburban districts, and attrition rates in urban areas can often reach 30% to 50% in the first five years. They are therefore most likely to fill classroom vacancies with teachers who lack preparation, don't meet licensure requirements, or who are teaching out of field. As a result, the students in these communities -- who need the *most* qualified teachers in order to meet higher academic standards -- often have exactly the opposite in the classroom.

The Initiative: We propose to establish an Urban and Rural Teacher Corps, that will provide incentives for *well prepared* individuals to teach in public schools in central cities and poor rural communities. It will accomplish this by providing fellowships for teacher candidates who commit to teach in urban or rural schools, as well as incentives for participating school districts and institutions of higher education to work together to upgrade the quality of teacher preparation and provide adequate support and continued professional development for beginning teachers.

This new initiative would be a part of the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of Title V of the Higher Education Act (HEA), to be transmitted to Congress later in the Spring or Summer. In order to allow for continued planning and consultation, we anticipate that the basic framework for this initiative be announced at the summit, while many of the details be further developed by the Education Department over the coming months. The framework includes the following elements:

- ▶ **Undergraduate student fellowships:** The program would provide fellowships for \$3,000 per year, for up to three years, for undergraduate students preparing for careers in teaching. The fellowship amount is pegged to the average tuition at public institutions of higher education (approximately \$3,xxx). It is expected that students would begin the fellowship in their junior year, and continue through a "fifth year" that would provide intensive and sustained classroom experience.

Similar fellowships would be available to teachers' aides and other education paraprofessionals seeking to move up a career ladder into full teaching positions, an approach which will help increase the number of minority teachers as well. Since teachers' aides will continue to work while pursuing further education, these fellowships may need to be structured somewhat differently than for traditional undergraduates.

- ▶ **Post-baccalaureate fellowships:** The program would provide one-year fellowships of \$7500 for post-baccalaureate students, including recent liberal arts graduate and mid-career professionals seeking to enter teaching.
- ▶ **Partnerships between institutions of higher education and local school systems, selected competitively:** The new program would be competitive, aimed at fostering partnerships among local school districts (city or rural), institutions of higher education (both colleges of education and arts and sciences) and others as appropriate, including teacher unions and existing networks for recruiting and supporting teachers..

Successful competitors would demonstrate that they have a high quality teacher preparation program, and that the program fits into a comprehensive, thoughtful strategy for recruiting and retaining teachers. To qualify for funding, local partnership strategies would need to address the full range of teacher preparation, induction, and professional development, as well as leverage other local, state and federal resources in a strategic and coordinated fashion. Local partnerships will be also be required to provide matching funds; comparable foundation-funded programs have required a 2-1 matching requirement. As the details of this program are further developed, we will determine the level and structure of the local matching requirement.

- **Local flexibility:** School districts, working collaboratively with institutions of higher education that provide rigorous teacher preparation programs, would determine their greatest recruitment needs and the types of prospective teachers they wish to target (e.g., traditional-age college students, paraprofessionals, mid-career and post-baccalaureate candidates, etc.), and use the federal funds to most effectively support locally determined strategies.

Budget and Impact: The Education Department estimates that funding for this program, and the range of participants (depending upon design decisions to be made over the next few months) would be structured as follows:

	Funding level (in millions)	Range of participants
FY 1999:	\$ 35	
FY 2000:	\$ 73	
FY 2001:	\$105	
FY 2002:	\$130	
FY 2003:	\$130	
Totals:	\$473	

Police Corps

You can announce \$20 million in grants to 17 states for the Police Corps program. The Police Corps was created in your 1994 Crime Bill to increase the number of community police officers with advanced education and training, and was one of your pledges during the 1992 presidential campaign.

The Police Corps offers educational assistance to qualified college students who commit to enter the police after graduation and serve in the force for at least four years. Students accepted into the Police Corps receive up to \$7,500 in educational assistance for up to four years of undergraduate study. In addition, Corps recruits receive 16 weeks of rigorous training to help make them effective community police officers. As an incentive to police departments to take recruits, state and local law enforcement agencies receive cash assistance for employing Police

Corps officers-- \$10,000 per participant for each year of the recruit's service.

The announcement nearly triples the number of states that will receive Police Corps funds, from 6 to 17 states, and is double the funding appropriated in FY 1996 for the program. Your FY 1998 budget contains \$20 million in funding for Police Corps.

Child Care Corps

You could also announce that you will expand AmeriCorps to include a new child care corps. The child care field has great difficulty attracting and retaining qualified workers, especially well-educated and trained workers who can go on to become leaders in the field. Your recent conference on early learning was the latest confirmation that it is critical to increase the quality of child care. Yet very few of our most talented young people enter this field.

The program would offer AmeriCorps scholarships to individuals who agree to work in child care in low-income areas for two years. It would be open both to those currently working in the field and to those seeking to enter. Members of the corps would not get a stipend from AmeriCorps, but a scholarship of \$4,725 a year for two years, which could be used either to repay existing student loans or to pay for further education.

The Corporation for National Service estimates that it could support a corps of 2,000 people a year without any increase in their budget or permission from Congress, as long as these individuals get only scholarships and not stipends as well. Under pressure from members of Congress to reduce the cost of an AmeriCorps member, the Corporation has begun to diversify its basic model of offering both stipend and scholarship. Instead, it is looking to non-profit groups to fund the stipend while AmeriCorps funds the scholarship. The Corporation is in a good position to add these "scholarship only" AmeriCorps members, because its scholarship trust fund has excess funds.

Non-profit groups would apply to become part of this program, and would have to demonstrate that they could offer participants high-quality training and mentoring during their two years of service, including development of management and leadership skills.

One unknown is whether the program will attract applicants if it does not include a stipend, since child care organizations tend to be strapped for cash. Possible solutions include working with major child care organizations to see if we could line up support for the program in advance; providing some funds for training and planning support; and challenging corporations and universities to assist in this effort. Corporations could sponsor members by paying for their salaries, and universities that specialize in early childhood education could match our scholarships.

The alternative is to offer stipends, either by asking the Corporation to earmark current AmeriCorps slots for this purpose (and reduce its programs in other areas); by seeking a budget increase for this purpose either within AmeriCorps or in HHS; or by using the Corporation's demonstration authority (which would allow for only a very small program). It is also important

to note that we would need legislation if we want to require a service commitment that goes beyond the period of AmeriCorps' membership.

One important question is whether welfare recipients would be targeted as members of the corps. HHS believes we should limit these scholarships to college graduates because the greatest need is for highly trained professionals and our emphasis should be there, rather than entry level, low wage slots. They note that we could ask AmeriCorps to earmark some of its current stipended slots for welfare recipients. However, we could also create a second track for welfare recipients to get associates' degrees if we wished.

[Bruce: I'm not sure this proposal distinguishes very well how this corps would be different from regular AmeriCorps members who do child care (currently a very small number -- in the hundreds), and why it isn't actually worse than that, since it has no stipend. We should discuss this.]

Interest-free Year of Service

As you know, Rev. Tony Campolo has urged you to make it easier for college students and recent graduates to take a year off for service. Since students can already take time off for service without having to begin repayment of their loans, the only remaining barrier is the interest that accumulates on unsubsidized loans during the period of service. The cost of having the Federal government pay that interest is minimal -- \$7 million over 5 years. This is a fairly minor proposal, but it would allow young people to take time off to serve without increasing their debt burden.

FIRST LADY SPEECH AT CLOSING CEREMONY

The First Lady will represent the Administration at the closing ceremony on Tuesday. We are exploring the option that she could announce Kaiser Permanente's commitment of \$100 million over the next five years to provide health coverage to 50,000 children in California.

cc:

Council of the Great City Schools
 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. ♦ Suite 702 ♦ Washington, D.C. ♦ 20004
 (202) 393-CGCS ♦ (202) 393-2400 (fax)

Council of the
Great City Schools

FAX TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

Date: 4/22

•• Deliver To ••

NAME/TITLE: Bill Kincaid

ORGANIZATION/DISTRICT: WH / DPC

TELEPHONE: 456 2857 FAX: 456 - 7028

•• Received From ••

NAME: GABRIELA URO DEPARTMENT: Ext. 210

NUMBER OF PAGES: 3 (incl. cover sheet)

•• Comments ••

Per your request. If you want to
 speak to the woman who administers
 this, call us. Her name is
 Shirley Schwartz.

Gabriela

If you do not receive number of pages indicated or receive illegible pages,
 please notify sender at (202) 393-2427

Council FAX number: (202) 393-2400.

Atlanta
 Baltimore
 Birmingham
 Boston
 Broward County
 Buffalo
 Chicago
 Cleveland
 Columbus
 Dade County
 Dallas
 Dayton
 Denver
 Detroit
 El Paso
 Fresno
 Houston
 Indianapolis
 Long Beach
 Los Angeles
 Louisville
 Memphis
 Milwaukee
 Minneapolis
 Nashville
 New Orleans
 New York City
 Newark
 Norfolk
 Oakland
 Oklahoma City
 Omaha
 Philadelphia
 Phoenix
 Pittsburgh
 Portland
 Providence
 Rochester
 St. Louis
 St. Paul
 Sacramento
 San Diego
 San Francisco
 Seattle
 Toledo
 Tucson
 Washington, D.C.

URBAN EDUCATION SERVICE CORPS

The mission of the Urban Education Service Corps (UESC) is to enhance the educational achievement of school-age children by linking national service to improved teacher recruitment and development policies and practices for the urban setting. Primary partners for the UESC are the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS), Council of the Great City Colleges of Education (CGCCE), and Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (RNT). Together these organizations form the Urban Teacher Collaborative. UESC is funded by the Corporation for National and Community Service (AmeriCorps) as a National Direct Project. The CGCS serves as the parent organization for the project.

The Urban Education Service Corps (UESC) builds on existing public school system/college of education/community efforts in five urban areas: Philadelphia, Long Beach, Omaha, Denver, and Toledo. Each local partnership addresses school success by:

- 1) broadening the range of services available through schools to increase educational achievement for urban school-age children who lack basic academic skills;
- 2) expanding and diversifying the pool of teachers for urban schools; strengthening long-term school improvement/teacher development partnerships among urban school districts, colleges of education, and community groups; and improving teacher development practices; and
- 3) enhancing the attitude, knowledge and skills of AmeriCorps Members in community service and civic responsibility, and providing training in instructional methodologies and support for transitioning into a career opportunity in teaching.

UESC Corps Members and volunteers will be drawn from groups that vary by race, age, gender, ethnicity, and educational level. Activities to be performed by the Corps Members include: literacy tutoring/remediation; mentoring; recruiting community and parent volunteers; and developing and managing a tutoring program.

UESC projects are underway and should have Corps Members chosen and in school sites by October.

URBAN EDUCATION SERVICE CORPS***PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS***

UESC - Long Beach. Teams of Corps Members trained in the Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC) model of literacy development will be assigned, in groups of ten, to three schools. They will assist classroom teachers trained in the ELIC methods by working directly with elementary or middle school students on listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. Thirty Corps Members will be recruited for the project.

UESC-Philadelphia. Teams of Corps Members will engage in either direct service (i.e., tutoring, mentoring, social and cultural activities, homework support) or the development and management of a tutoring program involving high school students and parent/community volunteers. Corps Members will work in a Professional Development Cluster of five elementary and secondary schools in North Philadelphia, plus community-based locations. Eight full-time and 10 part-time Corps Members will be recruited.

UESC-Toledo. Teams of Corps Members will perform intensive reading and mathematics remediation services at four elementary schools on weekdays after school and will tutor and mentor K-8 grade students deficient in these subject areas during a ten-week 1996 summer institute. Volunteers from Toledo's EXCEL parent association will also be recruited. Thirty-two part-time Corps Members will participate in the project.

UESC-Denver. Teams of Corps Members will help develop students' literacy skills at two elementary Professional Development Schools. One group of corps Members will use the Success in Early Reading tutoring program, taught in English and Spanish at one school; at the other school another team of Corps Members will implement and coordinate a reading/writing project. Ten full-time Corps Members will be recruited for the project.

UESC-Omaha. Teams of Corps Members will tutor students in need of reading and mathematics remediation at three elementary schools. Members will contribute to program planning, application of specific learning strategies, and periodic evaluation and refinement. This project will expand Omaha's well-established Minority Intern Program. Fifteen part-time Corps Members will be recruited for the project.



Jonathan_Schnur @ ed.gov
04/18/97 03:59:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: William kincaid

cc:

Subject: incentives for teachers

This is truly just a start...

Forward Header

Subject: incentives for teachers

Author: Maureen McLaughlin at WDCA01

Date: 4/17/97 04:38 PM

Discussed below are some ideas that you might want to consider in helping to attract and prepare better teachers, particularly in poor urban and rural areas. Other ideas not as directly tied to incentives for students to teach in hard to serve areas are included in ED's draft paper on options for Title V (for example, flagship institutions). We will provide some estimates tomorrow on the options discussed here.

We recommend that the President jump start this conversation with his speech to the Summit on Service since our need for talented dedicated teachers to teach to high standards is vitally important. We recommend that the President lay out the issues and discuss possible options but that he not announce specific proposals. Rather he could announce a high level task force to report to him in the next four months on specific recommendations to encourage and support high quality teachers. This would allow for more careful development of the proposals. Moreover, it would match the timetable for Administration proposals for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (Title V authorizes Teacher Preparation programs). It would also match more closely the development of the 1999 budget since we would need additional resources to pay for the ideas discussed below.

We will need 2 million teachers in the year 2000, with the need particularly high in poorer parts of the nation where the challenges for teachers are greatest. Will include data--to the extent they are available--more finely broken down shortly.

Possible options that the President could discuss include:

Highlighting the loan forgiveness provisions in the HOPE Act that make forgiveness in certain situations nontaxable--in particular forgiveness extended by an educational or charitable organization to

students who do service and forgiveness under ICL in direct loans after 25 years of repayment. These have not received a lot of attention because they are quite small in relation to the credit and deduction, but have important messages attached to them that would fit the focus of the summit.

Scholarships for students who teach in underserved areas--such as \$5000 a year for each year of service after graduation. Providing these scholarships to students at colleges that have exemplary education programs would encourage and highlight reform. This would also help to get the the best trained teachers into the classrooms and schools that are most in need. Some of these students might have taught in hard-to-serve areas without the scholarship but they would be rewarded

Loan Forgiveness for students who teach in underserved areas. Loan forgiveness programs have typically not been very effective at encouraging students to do something different than they would have in the absence of the forgiveness. Two main reasons: forgiveness only affects students who borrow and the forgiveness is typically a small amount and not therefore likely to change behavior. The larger the amount of forgiveness the more likely it is to change behavior. And the more it costs the federal government.

Forgive federal income taxes for all students who teach in inner city areas for up to three years. Could encourage states to give similar forgiveness of state income taxes to these students. This forgiveness would reward all teachers beginning to teach in hard-to-serve areas; many of the students would be individuals who would have taught there anyway, some would be additional teachers. All would be recognized for their service to the community.

Another option is to target paraprofessionals already in an area to help them become teachers. They have indicated their commitment to the area by their service in other capacities in the schools and are thus likely to stay if they become teachers. Paraprofessionals are often members of minority groups.

All of the above proposals face similar implementation concerns--particularly how to identify underserved areas. The first also has issues of identifying exemplary teacher training programs in our colleges.



Reach for the Power
TEACH

RECRUITING NEW TEACHERS • 385 Concord Ave. Suite 100 • Belmont, MA 02178

FAX TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

TEL: (617) 489-6000
FAX: (617) 489-6005

DATE: 4-22-97 TIME: AM

TO: Terry Dozier FAX #: _____
PHONE #: _____

FROM: David Haselkorn

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVER SHEET: 18

COMMENTS:

MEMO

To: Mike Cohen, Terry Dozier
From: David Haselkorn
Subject: Attached
Date: April 22, 1997

Attached please find a first draft memo outlining some ideas regarding a national partnership for excellence in teaching. It focuses on the establishment of locally planned and administered urban (and rural disadvantaged) teacher corps; support for high quality innovative new pathways to teaching; and catalytic resources for fostering improved strategic planning for teacher recruitment, development, and diversity across the career continuum by SEAs, LEAs, IHEs, and others.

It is very much a first cut at these ideas. I have additional background information on loan forgiveness, paraprofessional to teacher programs, mid-career programs, minority teacher recruitment efforts, urban teacher recruitment efforts and needs, etc., that I did not include.

I also have additional ideas for articulating the rationale connecting teaching with service. As we discussed, it is important not to characterize teaching as a voluntary or charitable undertaking. It is a profession -- and the best chance we have of meeting our education goals, including our teacher recruitment challenges, is by strengthening it -- not perpetuating the myth that teachers are born and not made.

On the other hand, it is very much a profession that is in service to America, in the same way that higher learning is often characterized thus. Excellent teachers serve the nation, and the nation should not ill-serve them by failing to prepare, compensate, and support them adequately across their careers.

I think the background papers I've prepared for the Title V Task Force characterize the importance of strengthening this profession "that shapes America's future," and why I believe it is the essential profession. Those papers also contain useful discussions of value-added programs, and the importance of recruiting from non-traditional pools to ensure a fully qualified and diverse teaching force. I did not try to recapitulate their arguments in this memo.

I will be out of the office this afternoon, but you can reach me at home tonight at 617-891-6686. I will be back in the office on Wednesday, and I'm looking forward to discussing these very preliminary ideas with both of you.

N.B. Since this is essentially a first blush pass at roughing out these issues, I urge you both to look at the recommendations critically (as will I) over the next twenty four hours. The last

Mike Cohen, Terry Dozier

Page 2

April 22, 1997

thing we would want is to put forward an ill-considered proposal that might unintentionally undercut the goal of insuring a fully qualified, caring, and competent teacher in every classroom by the year 2006. FYI, I have also attached a brief background paper that Linda Darling-Hammond prepared regarding the cost effectiveness of investments in teacher quality.

Michael Cohen
Page 1
4/22/97

Memo

To: Michael Cohen
From: David Haselkorn
Subject: Urban (and Rural/Isolated/Disadvantaged) Teacher Recruitment Initiatives
Date: 4/22/97

The National Partnership for Excellence in Teaching is a two-part strategy designed to serve as a catalyst for national, state, and local efforts already underway to strengthen the teaching profession, and spur new efforts to help recruit and prepare a new generation of highly qualified teachers for poor urban and rural communities.

The proposed partnership would provide federal funding to state and district level consortia on a competitive basis to 1) establish a range of locally designed and administered teacher corps programs; and 2) provide venture capital funding to support the development of innovative and/or improved teacher preparation programs at flagship¹ schools of education in collaboration with school districts, teacher unions, non-profit organizations, community, business, and civic groups (among others).

Teacher Corps Loan Forgiveness

State and district level consortia would be encouraged to bid on RFPs to develop local and state-based partnerships for teaching excellence. These partnerships would administer expanded loan forgiveness funds that could be funded by a combination of new and existing federal programs (e.g., potentially, Title V and national service funding, as well as programs such as Goals 2000; Title I School Improvement; Title V Minority Teacher Recruitment grants; the Magnet School programs; the Eisenhower Professional Development programs; the Bilingual Professional Development program; the Special Education Personnel Developments; school to work transition money; work study; Pell grants; Hope Scholarships; Byrd Fellowships; Technology Education Grants; Star School program; etc.).

Individuals would be eligible for up to \$20,000 in forgivable education

¹Criteria would need to be established via the RFP process for determining flagship status, i.e. a high quality teacher preparing institution with a track record of successfully preparing well-qualified teachers for either rural or urban disadvantaged schools.

loans for undergraduate study (Max. \$5000 per candidate per year) and \$15000 for graduate study (Max. \$7500 per candidate per year). Loans would be forgiven in \$5,000 increments via one year of teaching service in low-wealth urban or rural school districts.² RFP criteria would seek to leverage additional state, local, institutional, and private matching funds for programs via existing state loan forgiveness and scholarship programs. (N.B. additional supplementary funding mechanisms are discussed at the end of this memo.)

The advantages of taking this approach is that awards would be made at the local and state level, and not federally. School districts working collaboratively with flagship teacher preparing institutions would determine where their greatest recruitment needs were (subject areas, teaching fields, recruitment of individuals from under represented groups, etc.) and the types of prospective teachers they wish to target (e.g., traditional-age college students, paraeducators, mid-career and post-baccalaureate candidates, etc.).

Venture Capital for High Quality New Pathways to Teaching

Across the nation a variety of innovative pathways to teaching have been created, including:

- Paraeducator-to-teacher programs (as well as other school auxiliary personnel, substitutes, and unlicensed teachers on waivers);
- Mid-career transition programs (including returning Peace Corps volunteers, Troops to Teachers, and other post-baccalaureate programs);
- Urban Education Service Corps;
- State -funded loan forgiveness and Teaching fellowship programs; and
- Community college articulated career corridors into teaching.

All of these programs show promise for developing *teaching's next generation*. However, connecting these often piecemeal programs via more comprehensive local, state and national partnerships would help ramp promising innovations up to scale. Therefore, a portion of the funding for the National Partnership for Excellence in Teaching (approx. \$10 million per year) should support the development and strengthening of both high quality innovative

² N.B. The rationale for these suggested levels is discussed below. Notwithstanding , increments , maximum loan levels, and payback terms could be adjusted, if need be.

pathways into teaching and collaborations among school districts, flagship teacher preparing institutions, and other stakeholders and/or consortia that would seek to develop strategic action plans that articulate across the entire career continuum of teaching, providing more coherent approaches to meeting the nation's teacher recruitment, development and diversity challenges.

Partnerships would consist of key stakeholders for teacher excellence: school district officials, union officials, school of education officials, representatives of nonprofit and cultural organizations, community, and civic groups, and parents. These stakeholder groups would assess local need, and develop locally informed plans to meet that need. Successful applications would need to focus on high quality teacher preparation for prospective teachers in rural and urban public schools serving predominantly low-income students such as those described above.

Typically, such programs identify nontraditional candidates and prepare them in "value-added", adult learner model teacher preparation programs. Common elements may include:

- More systematic recruitment and selection procedures for nontraditional teaching populations, particularly minorities;
- Specialized student services, including specifically tailored orientation programs, academic advising and skills workshops; preparation for licensing exams; well supervised field experiences; mentoring; personal counseling; family support; and
- Post-graduation hiring agreements with districts, preferential (and supportive) initial placement; and mentoring, support, and assessment across the initial years of teaching.

In sum, the proposed National Partnership for Excellence in Teaching will encourage states, districts, colleges, cultural organizations, and others to create new pathways to teaching careers for many of America's most challenging schools and districts. Federal matching grants would be available to help develop more coherent and strategic approaches to educator recruitment and development at the local and state level; create or strengthen new pathways into teaching; and aid exceptionally able candidates in pursuing them.

State and locally-based consortia would oversee the "packaging" of financial aid to prospective teacher corps members based on locally determined guidelines for loan forgiveness programs as well as additional pooled financial aid from a variety of federal, state, and local, as well as private sources.

Discussion and Rationale

This year a record number of students entered our nation's schools, pushing already overcrowded classrooms to their limits. By 2006, America will educate nearly three million more children than today--a total of more than 54 million youngsters. These enrollment increases are occurring just as teacher retirements are beginning to accelerate due to the advancing length of service of many in the profession. This "demographic double whammy" means that over the next decade nearly two million teachers will need to be hired to fill our classrooms. And, if we want to achieve our education goals, they will need to be the best prepared teachers our nation has ever known.

Teacher shortages have already reached critical proportions in fields such as science, mathematics, bilingual education, and special education; in regions experiencing the greatest population increases (e.g., California, Nevada, Florida, and Texas, among others); in urban schools; and for teachers from diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. In addition, attrition rates for new teachers in urban districts can often reach 30% to 50% in the first five years of teaching because of inadequate preparation (particularly for those entering teaching on emergency permits or waivers), challenging assignments, and the paucity of high-quality mentoring and induction programs available for novice teachers.

In its recent report, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) found that more than 50,000 people who lack the training for their jobs enter the teaching profession annually on emergency or provisional licenses. Most fill vacancies in resource-strapped schools in high-poverty settings. As a consequence, America's most challenging classrooms are often forced to make do with the nation's *least qualified* teachers--limiting educational opportunity for millions of school children who could benefit most from quality teaching. NCTAF also found that fewer than 75% of America's teachers can be considered fully qualified: i.e., having studied child development, learning, and teaching methods; holding degrees in their subject areas; and having passed state licensure requirements. Nearly one fourth of all secondary

teachers do not have *at least* a college minor in their main teaching field. And this condition holds true for more than 30% of the nation's mathematics teachers.

Accordingly, among its recommendations, the Commission called for establishing new incentives for recruiting highly able candidates into teaching, such as the proposed teacher corps; and funding a variety of new and innovative pathways to teaching careers. President Clinton has strongly supported the Commission's call for ensuring a fully qualified, caring, and competent teacher in every classroom by the year 2000.

The Urban Teacher Challenge

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, July 1996), of approximately 2.6 million public school teachers in the United States in 1993-95, 11% (or 286,000) were *newly hired*, of whom seven percent (182,000) had taught previously (transfers and re-entrants) and four percent (104,000) were teaching for the very first time (mainly newly-prepared graduates and delayed entrants). In the central cities, of 716,000 public school teachers, 12% (or 85,900) were newly hired. [N.B. NCES did not provide a breakdown of newly-hired vs. re-entrants for central city schools. However, for estimation purposes, RNT assumed that roughly the same ratios held and extrapolated the following: 7 percent transfers and re-entrants, or 50,120 and 5 percent newly-prepared, or 35,800. NCES should be contacted directly for more precise breakdowns, these are quick and dirty calculations given the shortness of time.] Similarly, the Council of the Great City Schools represents 47 of the nation's largest urban schools districts. Collectively, the Council estimates its member districts hired approximately 35,000 teachers in 1995-96.

Given the overall need for more than 2,000,000 teacher hires, the escalating urban teacher demand, and the growing number of teachers in low-wealth districts teaching out of field or on emergency waivers, the proposed National Partnership for Excellence in Teaching must target a critical mass of new highly-qualified and well-prepared teachers if it is to have a real impact. Therefore, we suggest a goal of *at least* 5,000 teacher-corps members a year, 50,000 new career entrants over the next ten years. A higher goal of 10,000/100,000 would be preferable but probably well beyond current budget capacity.

Here's a first cut at how the dollars might work out, although you'll have to get more reliable number crunchers at OPE/Ed or OMB to check me

out on the math:

- 2500 Teacher Corps candidates per year pursuing graduate teacher education via mid-career, post-baccalaureate, peace corps fellowships. etc.

$$2500 \times \$7500 = \$18,750,000$$

- 2500 Teacher Corps candidates per year pursuing undergraduate degrees and teacher preparation via "Teaching Fellows"-style programs, paraeducator to teacher programs, and urban education service corps models.

$$2500 \times \$5000 = \$12,500,000$$

- Venture capital fund for supporting high quality innovative new pathways to teaching at flagship teacher education institutions, as described above.

$$50 \times \$200,000 = \$10,000,000$$

- Total Proposed National Partnership for Excellence in Teaching First Year Funding

$$\$41,250,000$$

See Table A for projected cohort by cohort maximum costs for preparing 20,000 new teachers at Table A.

Additional Considerations

These numbers are rough initial estimates. It's important to remember that not all candidates would necessarily seek the maximum amount in loan forgiveness scholarships. For example, an article in last Sunday's New York Times Magazine by Louis Menand "Everybody Else's College Education," made the following points:

- Public colleges and universities enroll 11.1 million of the 14.3 million students in higher education (nearly 80% of total enrollments);
- The average cost for tuition and fees at public institutions is

\$2860 per year.

Many states limit their forgivable scholarships to tuition and fees, therefore students attending public institutions might require well below the maximum recommended award. Moreover, other forms of financial aid could kick in and the program could be structured, alternately, as last dollar scholarship awards--although this might negatively impact their incentive power. It would also be important to keep the program open to part-time students, particularly for those pursuing mid-career or paraeducator to teacher career paths, which would also lower the average award--while attenuating the time it took for graduation and career entry.

On the other side of the balance sheet, service corps models and para-to-teacher programs tend to be somewhat more expensive because of additional need for living stipends, insurance, etc. (N.B. The average Urban Education Service Corps cost per-participant is \$10,000-plus, including the Americorps' education voucher.) California's state supported paraprofessional to teacher program provides an average of \$2500 per participant; whereas a recent RNT survey of mid-career post-bac. programs pegged average annual graduate tuition at \$6836.

At least 22 states offer some form of loan forgiveness for individuals pursuing teaching careers. The North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program is probably the best known. It provides \$20,000 forgivable incentive "scholarships" to 400 high school seniors per year who enroll in four-year teacher education programs throughout the states (\$5,000 per year). Fellows are required to teach in North Carolina for four years upon graduation or repay their college tuition. The average scholastic aptitude test score of the Fellows is over 1,100 and their average college GPA is 3.5. Over 20% of the Fellows are racial minorities.

Similarly, the Golden Apple Scholars of Illinois program seeks out the "best and brightest" high school graduates statewide and supports them through college and into the first year of teaching by providing mentors, financial assistance, college counseling, and four summers of teaching internships. These latter include participation in four-paid summer institutes involving hands-on classroom experience, reflection on teaching experiences, teaching workshops taught by award-winning teachers for the first and second summers, camp counseling the third summer, and job skills and preparation to teach the fourth summer -- over four hundred hours of experience. In return, the scholars agree to teach for at least five years in an Illinois school. A public/private partnership supported by ten city, state, and community partners, its current budget exceeds \$1.7 million of which 91% is

publicly funded from the Illinois State Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, and the City of Chicago's Dept. of Human Services. The average cost per scholar is \$27,000, of which \$5000 per year represents the forgivable loan.

The Peace Corps Fellows program's tuition at Teachers College, Columbia University is \$10,440 for two semesters and a summer, of which the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund contributes \$4640 for 8 credits, the fellows pay the rest, but are earning a beginning teacher's salary after the summer semester.

These are some of the yardsticks we used at coming up with the proposed forgivable scholarship amount. As noted above, they can be adjusted up or down, and the projected number of participants expanded or reduced as budgets and other policy considerations dictate.

Finally, it is important to keep in mind the real possibilities of *pooling* existing sources of federal funding (see attachment A), and *leveraging* additional state, local, and private funds for the program. Moreover, there are any number of tweaks to existing federal aid programs that could add additional resources to the kitty. Some examples:

- Allow a greater amount of college work study assignments to coincide with student teaching in schools;
- Target the America Reads program to complement the proposed Teacher Corps (for the reasons we discussed on Sunday);
- Target more of Americorps funding toward urban education service corps models(the UESC's program officer at Americorps is Laura Hamasaka);
- Establish a revolving student loan fund for paras to take advantage of when they have to forego their income during their student teacher experience, explore the Community Banking Redevelopment Act as a possible funding stream for same.

I wish I had more time to develop these ideas and make this memo more concise, but I promised you something by early a.m. I hope this gives you some ideas.

TABLE A

This Table illustrates projected cohort by cohort costs of the program over its first seven years (the maximum length of time and amount of finding required to support 20,000 teacher corps candidates—10,000 at the undergraduate level; 10,000 at the graduate level). Costs in millions.

<u>PROGRAM YEAR</u>	<u>U.G.</u>	<u>GRAD.</u>	<u>VENTURE FUND</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
I	\$12.5	\$18.75	\$10	\$41.25
II	\$25	\$37.5	\$10	\$72.5
III	\$37.5	\$37.5	\$10	\$85
IV	\$50	\$37.5	\$10	\$97.5
V	\$37.5	\$18.75	\$10	\$66.25
VI	\$25		\$10	\$35
VII	\$12.5		\$10	<u>\$22.5</u>
			TOTAL:	\$420

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
PROGRAMS
THAT SUPPORT TEACHER PREPARATION**

Office of Postsecondary Education

**The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)
(HEA, Title X, Part A)**

This program provides financial support for innovative, nationally significant activities designed to enhance the quality of postsecondary education.

**The Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program
(HEA, Title III, Part B)**

This program provides grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities to strength their facilities and academic programs.

**Programs to Encourage Minority Students to Become Teachers
(HEA, Title V, Part E, Subpart 2)**

This program provides grants to institutions of higher education to prepare and train minority students to become elementary and secondary school teachers.

Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs

**Bilingual Education Teachers and Personnel Grants
(ESEA, Title VII, Part A)**

This program provides preservice and inservice professional development for bilingual teachers, administrators, pupil services personnel, and other educational personnel preparing to provide services for limited English proficient student.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

**Training Personnel for Education of Individuals with Disabilities
(IDEA, Part D)**

The program supports pre-service training for special education teachers and related services personnel in new and improved preparation program that are responsive to current and emerging needs.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Goals 2000

(Goals 2000: Educate American Act, Title III)

Goals 2000 provides formula grants to states to improve teaching and learning; the majority of the funds being subgranted to school districts on a competitive basis. The funds are awarded in three categories: local school improvement, professional development and preservice education.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program State & Local Grants

(ESEA, Title II, Part B)

This is a formula grant program that provides grants to states for the improvement of teaching and learning and includes funds for activities to address teacher development beginning with recruitment, preservice, and induction and continuing throughout the professional teaching career.

Title I - Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards: Improving Basic Programs Operated by School District

(ESEA, Title I, Part A)

Title I funds can be used for career ladders for paraprofessionals to obtain the education necessary to become teachers. It may also be used for all teachers for professional development which includes preservice activities.

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Vocational Educational - State Programs/State Leadership

(Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title II, Part A)

This title allows states to use up to 8.5 percent of funds they receive as part of their basic state grant for state programs and state leadership activities. These activities may include professional development activities. Eligible recipients may use funds for preservice of both vocational instructors and academic instructors working with vocational education students for integrating academic and vocational education.

Vocational Educational Act - Local Activities

(Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Title IIC)

Funds under this title can be used for comprehensive mentor programs in institutions of higher education offering comprehensive teacher preparation programs. Eligible recipients may use funds for preservice comprehensive mentor programs.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education (Vocational)

The center carries out applied research and development, dissemination and training activities that address nationally significant problems and issues in vocational education, including finding ways to promote excellence in teaching (both preservice and ongoing professional development) of those who provide vocational services.

PRO-NET Professional Development Network (Adult Education)

PRO-NET is a national vehicle for collecting and disseminating information about effective practices in adult education preservice and ongoing professional development. Resources available through PRO-NET include: national professional development conferences and technical assistance to professional development organizations for Adult Educators.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Eisenhower Professional Development - Federal Activities

(ESEA, Title II, Part A)

The Eisenhower Federal Activities Program funds discretionary grant projects of national significance that contribute to the development and implementation of high quality professional development activities. Nine grant projects are supporting statewide reform in the area of K-12 preservice teacher professional development. Consortiums are working to align state policies regarding teacher preparation, licensing, and induction at the state and local levels with challenging state content and student performance standards in the core academic subjects.

Regional Educational Laboratories

These laboratories conduct research and development efforts with schools and school districts, states, research institutions and community-based organizations designed to promote effective educational reform. They develop and implement broad-based comprehensive school improvement strategies through provision of information, teacher professional development efforts and technical assistance, and development and dissemination of research-based improvement strategies.

Regional Technology in Education Consortia

R*TECs were established in 1995 to help states, districts, schools and other education institutions use advanced technologies to support improved teaching and student achievement. They provide direct training opportunities for teachers and administrators and also work with institutions of higher education and other professional development providers to help incorporate effective uses of technology into preservice and inservice training programs.

National Educational Research and Development Centers Program

These centers carry out activities that address nationally significant problems and issues in education, such as studies to improve professional development for teachers. These centers are engaged in projects that address preservice in early childhood education, teaching students from diverse backgrounds and student placed at risk of educational failure, teaching in inner city and rural schools, and model teacher training programs to improve achievement in mathematics and science.

The Costs and Benefits of Investing in Teacher Quality

The key proposals outlined in this paper have costs associated with them, but they also have potential benefits, including increased productivity reflected in increased student achievement and reduced costs for some current expenditures that result from an unproductive system.

For example, based on the estimates of increases in student achievement associated with every \$500 spent on teacher education (see the chart we produced from the article by Hedges et al.), one can calculate that an additional investment of \$10,000 per teacher on the education of the 25% of new hires who enter without adequate preparation each year (50,000 teachers) would cost about \$500 million. This would produce achievement gains for their students (who are generally the lowest achieving students) sufficient to move them from the bottom quartile in achievement to well over the average. This could easily eliminate the need for at least 25% of current expenditures for compensatory education -- and probably more given the fact that the least prepared teachers teach most of the lowest achieving students. At minimum this would create a savings of nearly \$2 billion annually (1/4 of about \$8 billion in federal dollars each year, not including state expenditures for compensatory and remedial education) for a net savings of \$1.5 billion.

A similar argument could be marshalled for the effects of such teacher learning initiatives as National Board certification. If the estimates from the Hedges et al. study hold, the \$2,000 per teacher that a state invests in helping a teacher become Board certified would, because of the powerful learning associated with the experience -- by teachers' accounts more powerful than that derived from most of the college credits counted in most of the studies Hedges reviewed -- net test score gains for their students of about 10 percentile points for an average student (more for a very low-achieving student).

Clearly the potential increases in students achievement from strategic investments in teacher quality are the most important benefits, and these would pay off in a variety of ways, including lower need for a panoply of special projects continually proposed to deal with the effects of poor teaching and a greater capacity to meet the new high standards that states are proposing to enforce.

For more specific initiatives, states can calculate some of the other kinds of costs and benefits. For example, in an average state that prepares and hires about 2,000 new teachers each year, the costs of improving preparation and induction might be assessed as follows:¹

¹ Cost calculations come from the National Commission report on pp. 121 and following.

Improving preparation and induction

Costs of improving preparation and induction

5-year teacher education including yearlong internships in professional development schools

[These costs would be shared between universities, school systems and the state]
(2,000 candidates x \$7,000 per candidate) \$14,000,000
Estimated state share \$ 8,000,000

Mentoring supports and new licensing assessments for all beginning teachers

[These costs would be shared among school districts, candidates, and the state]
(2,000 candidates x \$6,000 per candidate) \$12,000,000
Estimated state share \$ 6,000,000

Total investment \$26,000,000 / State share \$14,000,000

Savings of improving preparation

Estimated savings from greater entry and retention rates of teachers trained in 5-year teacher education programs vs. typical entry and retention rates of teachers trained in 4-year programs¹

Savings for due to higher rates of entry. Savings on costs of educating teachers who do not complete teacher education and enter teaching (assuming training costs of \$5,000 per year in a state university and an equivalent of 2 years of training; 6,000 initial recruits needed to produce 2,000 new teachers in traditional programs [assume one year lost effort for noncompleters]; 2200 initial recruits needed to produce 2,000 new teachers in 5 and 5th year programs)

\$20,000,000 lost investment (4-year) minus
\$1,000,000 lost investment (5 year) \$19,000,000

Savings accrue to candidates, universities, and the state
Assume state pays 50% cost of teacher training
State share of savings \$ 9,500,000

Savings due to higher rates of retention and effectiveness. Savings on costs of retaining teachers prepared in 5-year vs. 4-year programs (assuming initial recruitment and beginning teacher training costs of \$500 per candidate and loss of effectiveness gained with experience conservatively estimated at \$1000 per candidate; loss of 30% of 4-year candidates = 600 x \$1500 = \$900,000; loss of 15% of

¹ Entry and retention rates estimated from studies cited in Commission report, endnote 101. For 4-year programs, of those who start as freshmen in college, the proportion who complete the program, graduate, and enter teaching is about 30% (50% who complete x 60% entry rate), and of those who enter, about 70% remain after 3 years. For 5 and 5th year models, about 90% enter teaching and about 85% or more remain after 3 years.

5-year candidates = $300 \times \$1500 = \$450,000$). Plus savings on costs of retaining teachers who are mentored in the first year of teaching³ (same cost basis as above $\times 20\%$ of new teachers = $\$1500 \times 400 = \$600,000$).

Total savings due to higher retention of 5-year candidates and higher retention of beginners who receive mentoring
\$ 1,050,000

State share of savings \$ 525,000

Additional Benefits of improving preparation and licensing

If the effects on achievement of improved teacher education and enhanced licensing standards as documented by Ferguson and Hedges et al. hold, these investments should translate into gains in student achievement for the students taught by these newly entering teachers. If we were to assume even .5 standard deviation gain in test scores for the students of each of these teachers (a very conservative estimate based on Hedges data) that pushes even 10% of their students out of the remedial zone (again, a very conservative estimate), the savings in compensatory education costs for each year of teaching for each teacher (@ 50 students/teacher averaging elementary and secondary pupil loads and 5 students saved from compensatory costs of \$1000 apiece) would equal \$5,000. Across just the population of these 2,000 beginning teachers, a very conservative estimate of savings would be \$10,000,000.

Summary

A total investment in improved teacher preparation and induction of \$28,000,000 spent in the ways described here would net savings of \$20,050,000 in lost investments in teachers who do not enter or stay in the profession, plus conservatively estimated savings of \$10,000,000 in reduced costs for compensatory education services due to increased teacher effectiveness for a grand total of \$30,050,000 in savings. In short, well spent, the programs would more than pay for themselves.

³ Assumes improved retention rates like those experienced in districts studied for the Commission report (Cincinnati, Columbus, Rochester, Toledo) of 90% from earlier rates of 70% or less.