

---

**High Standards in the Classroom: National Programs: Teacher Quality Initiatives**  
(Proposed legislation)

FY 2001 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget authority (\$000s):

|                              | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Hometown Teachers            | 0           | \$75,000    | +\$75,000     |
| Higher Standards, Higher Pay | 0           | 50,000      | +50,000       |
| Teacher Quality Incentives   | 0           | 50,000      | +50,000       |

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

These three programs will support Federal leadership activities that contribute to the improvement of teaching in our Nation's schools. Hometown Teachers; Higher Standards, Higher Pay; and Teacher Quality Incentives will help to promote high standards in the classroom by encouraging young adults to become teachers and supporting them in their undergraduate teacher training and first years of teaching, by helping school districts to reform their teacher evaluation practices, and by rewarding school districts for hiring fully certified teachers and reducing out-of-field teaching.

These teacher quality initiatives will encourage school districts to focus on the quality of teaching and learning in our classrooms because they reinforce high-quality, standards-based reform efforts. Recent research has found that teachers' expertise can have a greater impact on students' achievement than any other in-school factor. In total, these initiatives will support school districts' efforts at recruiting, training, supporting, evaluating, and hiring fully qualified teachers who have a solid academic background in the subject matter they are teaching in order to help ensure that all students can learn to challenging State standards.

**Hometown Teachers**

Many school districts experience difficulty recruiting and hiring enough fully qualified teachers, and students who attend schools with large numbers of poor children are less likely than children in wealthier districts to be taught by teachers who are fully licensed or certified and who have a solid background in the subject matter they teach. This program would provide competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention, including both long- and short-term strategies to expand and maintain their teaching staffs.

School districts receiving grants would address their teacher shortage by implementing programs that begin to develop and support potential teachers as early as middle school. At the high school level, the program could provide incentives and opportunities for student participants to become acquainted with the teaching profession, and the most promising students could receive college scholarships at the end of high school. In

college, participants could be encouraged to major in a high-need subject area, maintain a certain grade point average, and earn a teaching certificate.

After participants successfully complete college, they could receive priority for obtaining a job in their own or another participating high-poverty school district and could be required to work in one of these districts for a specific number of years in exchange for their college scholarships. Participants would be required to pay back their scholarships if they do not meet this service requirement.

Short-term strategies that school districts could use to address their teacher shortages include scholarships to undergraduates who agree to teach in the school district for a certain number of years, signing bonuses, and streamlined hiring practices. In addition, because part of the teacher shortage problem is caused by high teacher turnover rates, many districts also need to develop effective strategies for retaining their teachers. These strategies could include mentoring programs, increasing teacher salaries, and creating more desirable working conditions.

### **Higher Standards, Higher Pay**

This program would award competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to help them attract and retain high-quality teachers and principals through better pay. In order to be eligible for funding, partnerships involving school districts, local businesses, and teachers' unions would be required to develop and implement reforms to raise teacher performance, including (1) regular, rigorous peer evaluations of every teacher that include student performance as one measure; (2) professional development and intensive support to help all teachers and principals succeed; and (3) streamlined, but fair, systems to improve or remove teachers identified as low-performing through their peer evaluation. Participating partnerships would have to agree on steps to recruit talented new teachers, evaluate new teachers, reward good teaching, provide mentors for new teachers and principals, and adopt better ways to identify and to improve or remove low-performing teachers.

All teachers in participating school districts would receive a salary increase when their district implemented the program, and new teachers recruited to the district would also be eligible for the higher pay level in order to encourage talented teachers to teach in these high-poverty districts. Teachers who get advanced certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification could receive an additional salary increase.

### **Teacher Quality Incentives**

This competitive grant program would provide reward money to high-poverty school districts that demonstrate significant progress in improving teacher quality against two criteria -- increasing the percentage of certified teachers and decreasing the percentage of secondary teachers who are teaching out-of-field. Districts would compete against other districts of similar size, and those districts in each of three categories that had made the most progress over a specified time period would receive grants. To be eligible for these funds, districts must also provide assurance from the State that the State has not made any policy changes that have lowered standards for teacher

certification or licensure.

These programs would be forward-funded programs. Funds would become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

### **FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2001, the Administration proposes to fund Hometown Teachers at \$75 million; Higher Standards, Higher Pay at \$50 million; and Teacher Quality Incentives at \$50 million.

The Hometown Teachers initiative would provide competitive grants to approximately 100 high-poverty school districts to develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention.

Approximately \$2 million of Higher Standards, Higher Pay funds would be used for national activities, including a national evaluation of the program. The remaining \$48 million would be used to make competitive awards to 10 to 12 local educational agencies.

The Teacher Quality Incentives initiative would provide competitive grants to schools districts in three categories, based on their size. Approximately \$15 million would be awarded to 5 to 7 large-size school districts, \$30 million to 15 to 60 medium-size school districts, and \$5 million to 10 to 200 small-size school districts.

### **SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

This section presents selected information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired targets will be identified after a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets will be based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Performance Goal:** To help States and school districts raise the performance of educators in our Nation's schools.

**Objective:** The Hometown Teachers initiative will recruit and train highly motivated and talented students to become teachers in high-poverty school districts.

| Indicator                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <u>1999</u> | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> | <u>2002</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| District administrators will report that program participants they hire as teachers are better prepared, on average, than other newly certified teachers hired by the school district. <i>Baseline to be established in 2002.</i> |             |             |             |             |

Data for this indicator will come from surveys of the program.

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**  
**(\$000s)**

|                                        | <u>2001</u>     |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Hometown Teachers</b>               |                 |
| School districts                       | 100             |
| Peer review costs for new applications | \$30            |
| <b>Higher Standards, Higher Pay</b>    |                 |
| Grants                                 | \$47,970        |
| National Activities                    | \$2,000         |
| Peer review costs for new applications | \$30            |
| Partnerships                           | 10-12           |
| Teachers per site                      | 800             |
| <b>Teacher Quality Incentives</b>      |                 |
| Total amount available, by category:   |                 |
| Large-Size School Districts            | \$14,990        |
| Medium-Size School Districts           | \$29,990        |
| Small-Size School Districts            | \$4,990         |
| Range of awards, by category:          |                 |
| Large-Size School Districts            | \$2,000-\$3,000 |
| Medium-Size School Districts           | \$500-\$2,000   |
| Small-Size School Districts            | \$25-\$500      |
| Number of awards, by category:         |                 |
| Large-Size School Districts            | 5-7             |
| Medium-Size School Districts           | 15-60           |
| Small-Size School Districts            | 10-200          |
| Peer review costs for new applications | \$30            |

**High Standards in the Classroom: National Programs: Teacher Quality Initiatives**  
(Proposed legislation)

FY 2001 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget authority (\$000s):

|                              | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u>   | <u>Change</u>  |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Hometown Teachers            | 0           | \$75,000      | +\$75,000      |
| Higher Standards, Higher Pay | 0           | 50,000        | +50,000        |
| Teacher Quality Incentives   | <u>0</u>    | <u>50,000</u> | <u>+50,000</u> |

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

These three programs will support Federal leadership activities that contribute to the improvement of teaching in our Nation's schools. Hometown Teachers; Higher Standards, Higher Pay; and Teacher Quality Incentives will help to promote high standards in the classroom by encouraging young adults to become teachers and supporting them in their undergraduate teacher training and first years of teaching, by helping school districts to reform their teacher evaluation practices, and by rewarding school districts for hiring fully certified teachers and reducing out-of-field teaching.

These teacher quality initiatives will encourage school districts to focus on the quality of teaching and learning in our classrooms because they reinforce high-quality, standards-based reform efforts. Recent research has found that teachers' expertise can have a greater impact on students' achievement than any other in-school factor. In total, these initiatives will support school districts' efforts at recruiting, training, supporting, evaluating, and hiring fully qualified teachers who have a solid academic background in the subject matter they are teaching in order to help ensure that all students can learn to challenging State standards.

**Hometown Teachers**

Many school districts experience difficulty recruiting and hiring enough fully qualified teachers, and students who attend schools with large numbers of poor children are less likely than children in wealthier districts to be taught by teachers who are fully licensed or certified and who have a solid background in the subject matter they teach. This program would provide competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention, including both long- and short-term strategies to expand and maintain their teaching staffs.

One long-term strategy that school districts could use to address their teacher shortage is to implement programs that begin to develop and support potential teachers as early as middle school. At the high school level, the program would provide incentives and opportunities for student participants to become acquainted with the teaching profession, and the most promising students would receive college scholarships at the end of high school. In college, participants would be encouraged to major in a high-need subject

area and would be required to maintain a certain grade point average and earn a teaching certificate.

After participants successfully complete college and become fully licensed or certified, they would receive priority for obtaining a job in their own or another participating high-poverty school district and would be required to work in one of these districts for a specific number of years in exchange for their college scholarships. Participants would be required to pay back their scholarships if they do not meet this service requirement.

Short-term strategies that school districts could use to address their teacher shortages include scholarships to undergraduates who agree to teach in the school district for a certain number of years, signing bonuses, and streamlined hiring practices. In addition, because part of the teacher shortage problem is caused by high teacher turnover rates, many districts also need to develop effective strategies for retaining their teachers. These strategies could include mentoring programs, increasing teacher salaries, and creating more desirable working conditions.

### **Higher Standards, Higher Pay**

This program would award competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to help them attract and retain high-quality teachers and principals through better pay. In order to be eligible for funding, partnerships involving school districts, local businesses, and teachers' unions would be required to develop and implement reforms to raise teacher performance, including (1) regular, rigorous peer evaluations of every teacher that include student performance as one measure; (2) professional development and intensive support to help all teachers and principals succeed; and (3) streamlined, but fair, systems to improve or remove teachers identified as low-performing through their peer evaluation. Participating partnerships would have to agree on steps to recruit talented new teachers, evaluate new teachers, reward good teaching, provide mentors for new teachers and principals, and adopt better ways to identify and to improve or remove low-performing teachers.

All teachers in participating school districts would receive a salary increase when their district implemented the program, and new teachers recruited to the district would also be eligible for the higher pay level in order to encourage talented teachers to teach in these high-poverty districts. Teachers who get advanced certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification could receive an additional salary increase.

### **Teacher Quality Incentives**

This competitive grant program would provide reward money to high-poverty school districts that demonstrate significant progress in improving teacher quality against two criteria -- increasing the percentage of certified teachers and decreasing the percentage of secondary teachers who are teaching out-of-field. Districts that successfully compete for these funds would use them to supplement funds from other Federal programs that focus on improving teacher quality. Districts would compete against other districts of similar size, and those districts in each of three categories that had made the most progress over a specified time period would receive grants. I~

These programs would be forward-funded programs. Funds would become available for

obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

## **FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2001, the Administration proposes to fund Hometown Teachers at \$75 million; Higher Standards, Higher Pay at \$50 million; and Teacher Quality Incentives at \$50 million.

The Hometown Teachers initiative would provide competitive grants to approximately 100 high-poverty school districts to develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention.

Approximately \$2 million of Higher Standards, Higher Pay funds would be used for national activities, including a national evaluation of the program. The remaining \$48 million would be used to make competitive awards to 10 to 12 local educational agencies.

The Teacher Quality Incentives initiative would provide competitive grants to schools districts in three categories, based on their size. Approximately \$15 million would be awarded to 5 to 7 large-size school districts, \$30 million to 15 to 60 medium-size school districts, and \$5 million to 10 to 200 small-size school districts.

## **SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

This section presents selected information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired targets will be identified after a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets will be based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Performance Goal: To help States and school districts raise the performance of educators in our Nation's schools.**

**Objective: The Hometown Teachers initiative will recruit and train highly motivated and talented students to become teachers in high-poverty school districts.**

| <b>Indicator</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b><u>1999</u></b> | <b><u>2000</u></b> | <b><u>2001</u></b> | <b><u>2002</u></b> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| District administrators will report that program participants they hire as teachers are better prepared, on average, than other newly certified teachers hired by the school district. <i>Baseline to be established in 2002.</i> |                    |                    |                    |                    |

Data for this indicator will come from surveys of the program.

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**  
**(\$000s)**

**2001**

**Hometown Teachers**

|                                        |      |
|----------------------------------------|------|
| School districts                       | 100  |
| Peer review costs for new applications | \$30 |

**Higher Standards, Higher Pay**

|                                        |          |
|----------------------------------------|----------|
| Grants                                 | \$47,970 |
| National Activities                    | \$2,000  |
| Peer review costs for new applications | \$30     |
| Partnerships                           | 10-12    |
| Teachers per site                      | 800      |

**Teacher Quality Incentives**

|                                      |          |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Total amount available, by category: |          |
| Large-Size School Districts          | \$14,990 |
| Medium-Size School Districts         | \$29,990 |
| Small-Size School Districts          | \$4,990  |

|                               |                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Range of awards, by category: |                 |
| Large-Size School Districts   | \$2,000-\$3,000 |
| Medium-Size School Districts  | \$500-\$2,000   |
| Small-Size School Districts   | \$25-\$500      |

|                                |        |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Number of awards, by category: |        |
| Large-Size School Districts    | 5-7    |
| Medium-Size School Districts   | 15-60  |
| Small-Size School Districts    | 10-200 |

|                                        |      |
|----------------------------------------|------|
| Peer review costs for new applications | \$30 |
|----------------------------------------|------|



# Teacher Quality Rewards and Recognition

DRAFT-January 14, 2000

Awards would be made on a competitive basis to high-poverty LEAs<sup>i</sup> as rewards for and based on demonstrated progress in improving teacher quality.

## LEA application:

- State assurance that it has not made any policy changes that have lowered the standard for initial teacher certification or licensure.
- Baseline data on indicators of teacher quality (1996 as baseline?)
  - Percent of teachers who have full certification, alternative certification, another state's certification, or "academic training or demonstrated competence in the subject area in which they teach."<sup>ii</sup>
  - Percent of teachers teaching in-field<sup>iii</sup>
- Status data demonstrating progress on teacher quality indicators reported in baseline
- Strategies employed in improving teaching quality (Strategies would not be used as review criteria, but rather to expand understanding of and disseminate promising practices.)

## Grant Review:

Applicants compete within categories of LEAs (i.e. small districts with fewer than 1,500 students (n=8,921; 10.7% of students); medium districts with 1,500-24,999 students (n=5,552; 59% of students; and districts with more than 25,000 students (n=216; 30.2% of students)) within a fixed "pot of money".

Awards are determined on the basis of the composite progress of both 1) increasing the percent of certified teachers, and 2) decreasing the number of teachers teaching out-of-field.

## Size and Range of Awards:

| LEA size                  | Share of overall allocation | Range of award      | Number of awards |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 25,000+ (30% of students) | \$15 million                | \$2-3 million       | 5-7              |
| 1,500-24,999 (60%)        | \$30 million                | \$500,000-2 million | 15-60            |
| <1,499                    | \$5 million                 | \$25,000-\$500,000  | 10-200           |

## Use of Funds:

To carry out the purposes of ESEA, Title II (and HEA, Title II?)

<sup>i</sup> High-poverty LEA as defined by for Title I-A Concentration grants

<sup>ii</sup> The term "waiver" (or uncertified teacher) includes any temporary or emergency permit, license, or other authorization that permits an individual to teach in a public school classroom without having met the initial certification or licensure requirements of that state *or any other state*.

Waiver data should not include individuals who already have met the initial certification or licensure requirements of another state, but who are not yet licensed to teach in the reporting state. Nor should they include, in states that grant only provisional licenses initially, individuals who receive an initial credential (often called "provisional") but are required by the state to teach for a specified period (or meet other additional requirements) before being fully certified.

For a secondary school teacher, content knowledge means that the teacher holds at least a bachelor's degree and demonstrates a high level of competency in all subject areas in which he or she teaches through—

(a) completion of an academic major in each of the subject areas in which he or she provides instruction; or  
a level of performance on state assessments of subject area knowledge equivalent to or greater than that which the state requires for prospective teachers

(b) a level of performance on state assessments of subject area knowledge equivalent to or greater than that which the state requires for prospective teachers (Represents draft language from the upcoming guide on HEA, Title II Institutional Reporting Guide).

<sup>iii</sup> Full-time teachers in grades 7-12, with an undergraduate or graduate major or minor in their main teaching assignment field<sup>iii</sup>

---

(This option will not capture teachers who spend less than the majority of their day teaching in an area for which they are not trained.) (NCES data collection definition)

## Criteria for Teacher Quality Rewards and Recognition

### Options

January 12, 2000

- **95% of teachers who have full certification, alternative certification, another state's certification, or "academic training or demonstrated competence in the subject area in which they teach."**

The term "waiver" (or uncertified teacher) includes any temporary or emergency permit, license, or other authorization that permits an individual to teach in a public school classroom without having met the initial certification or licensure requirements of that state *or any other state*.

Waiver data should not include individuals who already have met the initial certification or licensure requirements of another state, but who are not yet licensed to teach in the reporting state. Nor should they include, in states that grant only provisional licenses initially, individuals who receive an initial credential (often called "provisional") but are required by the state to teach for a specified period (or meet other additional requirements) before being fully certified.

For a secondary school teacher, content knowledge means that the teacher holds at least a bachelor's degree and demonstrates a high level of competency in all subject areas in which he or she teaches through—

- (a) completion of an academic major in each of the subject areas in which he or she provides instruction; or
- (b) a level of performance on state assessments of subject area knowledge equivalent to or greater than that which the state requires for prospective teachers<sup>i</sup>.

- **95% of teachers teaching in-field**

Full-time teachers in grades 7-12, with an undergraduate or graduate major or minor in their main teaching assignment field<sup>ii</sup>

(This option will not capture teachers who spend less than the majority of their day teaching in an area for which they are not trained.)

- **"Comparability" in teacher quality across districts**

---

<sup>i</sup> Represents draft language from the upcoming guide on HEA, Title II Institutional Reporting Guide

<sup>ii</sup> NCES teacher surveys



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of the Deputy Secretary  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

Telephone Number: (202) 2100-1728

Fax Number: (202) 401-9027

## FAX COVER SHEET

TO: J.B. BurtinORGANIZATION: EDPC

PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

FAX: 456-5581FROM: H. Remy

## COMMENTS:

Info on teachers on waivers (non-certified)  
as defined by the state & reported in '99.

Other info coming shortly

Heidi

TOTAL PAGES (Including Cover): 5

**Clement, John**

---

To: heidiramirez, valplisko  
Cc: Ludwig, Meredith  
Subject: Information re: waivers/teaching out of field in Initial Report for TeacherPrep

Heidi, Val: I'm faxing you both three pages abstracted from the Initial Report summarizing what's in there about waiver rates in high- and low-poverty school districts, with particular attention to waivers given for teaching out-of-field. What follows is a brief summary of the detail I'm faxing you.

There are 25 states for which we know waiver rates (that is, percentage of teachers with waivers of total number of teachers) for the aggregate of high- and low-poverty school districts. For these 25 states, 20 have a higher proportion of teachers with waivers in the high-poverty districts, four have a higher proportion in the low-poverty districts, and one is a tie. The chances of such a result (or even higher numbers of states) occurring by chance if you reran history many times is

Of the 25 states, at least eight definitely include at least some teachers teaching out-of-field among their waivers. Fourteen probably don't include teaching out-of-field, but I can't be sure. (Three states: Georgia, Hawaii, and Tennessee, didn't give us waiver descriptions). Of the eight that definitely include teachers teaching out-of-field, five have (hi-pov > low-pov) and three have (low-pov > hi-pov).

Now that pretty much squeezes all the juice one can get out of the Initial Report on this subject. Hope it helps.

*SA*

Pete Weber

Cornia -

Terry Peterson

↳ pl. SAT test prep

Class Size & went to high need area

Table D: Teachers with Waivers,<sup>1</sup> by High- and Low-Poverty Districts and Selected Fields, by State: 1998

| State                       | Teachers |                       |      | Teachers in high-poverty districts |                     |      | Teachers in low-poverty districts |     |     | Waiver % Difference        |                            |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------|------------------------------------|---------------------|------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|----------------------------|----------------------------|
|                             | T        | W                     | %    | T                                  | W                   | %    | T                                 | W   | %   | High-Poverty > Low-Poverty | Low-Poverty > High-Poverty |
| Alabama <sup>1</sup>        | 26,054   | 732                   | 2.8  | 14,319                             | 497                 | 3.5  | 11,735                            | 235 | 2.0 | Alabama (3.5 > 2.0)        |                            |
| Alaska <sup>1</sup>         | 9,563    | 5                     | 0.1  | 1,223                              | 3                   | 0.3  | 8,280                             | 2   | .02 | Alaska (0.3 > 0.0)         |                            |
| Arizona <sup>1</sup>        |          |                       |      |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |
| Arkansas                    |          |                       |      |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |
| California                  |          |                       |      |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |
| Colorado                    | 37,841   | 659                   | 1.7  | 7,632                              | 302                 | 4.0  | 30,209                            | 357 | 1.2 | Colorado (4.0 > 1.2)       |                            |
| Connecticut <sup>1</sup>    | 47,096   | 106 <sup>(1)</sup>    | 0.2  | 8,397                              | 41                  | 0.5  | 36,511                            | 37  | 0.1 | Connecticut (0.5 > 0.1)    |                            |
| Delaware                    | 7,525    | 149                   | 2.0  | 130                                | 4                   | 3.1  | 7,384                             | 145 | 2.0 | Delaware (3.1 > 2.0)       |                            |
| District of Columbia        |          |                       |      |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |
| Florida <sup>2</sup>        | 65,001   | 732                   | 1.1  |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |
| Georgia <sup>1</sup>        | 86,303   | 3,290                 | 3.8  | 61,275                             | 2,428               | 4.0  | 25,028                            | 862 | 3.4 | Georgia (4.0 > 3.4)        |                            |
| Hawaii <sup>3</sup>         | 11,223   | 841                   | 7.5  | 5,498                              | 367                 | 6.7  | 5,634                             | 474 | 8.4 |                            | Hawaii (8.4 > 6.7)         |
| Idaho <sup>10</sup>         | 13,395   | 396                   | 3.0  | 755                                | 37                  | 4.9  | 12,641                            | 359 | 2.8 | Idaho (4.9 > 2.8)          |                            |
| Illinois <sup>11</sup>      |          |                       |      |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |
| Indiana <sup>12</sup>       |          | 1,149 <sup>(12)</sup> |      |                                    | 299                 |      |                                   | 631 |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Iowa <sup>14</sup>          | 34,309   | 1,463                 | 4.3  |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Kansas                      | 31,940   | 53                    | 0.2  |                                    | 15                  |      |                                   | 38  |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Kentucky                    | 46,369   | 398                   | 0.9  |                                    | 227 <sup>(14)</sup> |      |                                   | 171 |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Louisiana <sup>16</sup>     | 53,857   | 6,726                 | 12.5 | 46,232                             | 6,202               | 13.4 | 7,605                             | 524 | 6.9 | Louisiana (13.4 > 6.9)     |                            |
| Maine <sup>17</sup>         | 15,086   | 42 <sup>(17)</sup>    | 0.3  |                                    | 5                   |      |                                   | 26  |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Maryland <sup>18</sup>      | 48,489   | 2,776                 | 5.7  | 27,676                             | 2,351               | 8.5  | 20,813                            | 425 | 2.0 | Maryland (8.5 > 2.0)       |                            |
| Massachusetts <sup>19</sup> | 64,682   | 378                   | 0.6  | 16,300                             | 278                 | 1.7  | 48,382                            | 100 | 0.2 | Massachusetts (1.7 > 0.2)  |                            |
| Michigan                    |          | 452                   |      |                                    | 187                 |      |                                   | 265 |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Minnesota                   | 62,634   | 636 <sup>(19)</sup>   | 1.0  | 8,916                              | 79                  | 0.9  | 53,718                            | 557 | 1.0 |                            | Minnesota (1.0 > 0.9)      |
| Mississippi <sup>22</sup>   | 57,363   | 345                   | 0.9  |                                    | 437                 |      |                                   | 108 |     |                            | (NO)                       |
| Missouri <sup>23</sup>      |          | 3,554                 |      |                                    |                     |      |                                   |     |     |                            |                            |

MORE TABLE D...

Table D: Teachers with Waivers, by High- and Low-Poverty Districts and Selected Fields, by State: 1998, cont'd.

| State                        | Teachers |        |      | Teachers in high-poverty districts |       |      | Teachers in low-poverty districts |       |     | Waiver % Difference         |                      |
|------------------------------|----------|--------|------|------------------------------------|-------|------|-----------------------------------|-------|-----|-----------------------------|----------------------|
|                              | T        | W      | %    | T                                  | W     | %    | T                                 | W     | %   | High Pov. > Low Pov.        | Low Pov. > High Pov. |
| Alabama <sup>14</sup>        | 10,228   | 7      | 0.1  |                                    | 5.5   |      |                                   | 1.5   |     |                             | (na)                 |
| Nebraska <sup>15</sup>       | 20,008   | 252    | 1.3  | 3,555                              | 78    | 2.2  | 16,453                            | 173   | 1.1 | Nebraska (2.2 > 1.1)        |                      |
| Nevada <sup>16</sup>         | 18,396   | 197    | 1.1  | 11,411                             | 50    | 0    | 6,062                             | 126   | 2.1 |                             | Nevada (2.1 > 0.0)   |
| New Hampshire                |          |        |      |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| New Jersey <sup>17</sup>     | 89,204   | 1,014  | 1.1  |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| New Mexico <sup>18</sup>     | 35,028   | 1,994  | 5.7  | 30,976                             | 1,794 | 5.8  | 4,052                             | 200   | 4.9 | New Mexico (5.8 > 4.9)      |                      |
| New York <sup>19</sup>       | 214,309  | 19,539 | 9.1  |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| North Carolina               | 68,238   | 6,368  | 9.3  | 36,523                             | 3,652 | 10.0 | 31,715                            | 2,716 | 8.6 | North Carolina (10.0 > 8.6) |                      |
| North Dakota                 | 8,653    | 7      | 0.1  | 1,033                              | 1     | 0.1  | 5,214                             | 6     | 0.1 | TIE                         |                      |
| Ohio                         |          |        |      |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| Oklahoma                     | 47,655   | 281    | 0.6  |                                    | 146   |      |                                   | 95    |     |                             | (na)                 |
| Oregon <sup>20</sup>         | 28,799   | 302    | 1.1  | 5,463                              | 73    | 1.3  | 23,334                            | 216   | 0.9 | Oregon (1.3 > 0.9)          |                      |
| Pennsylvania                 | 109,156  | 1,795  | 1.6  | 27,815                             | 1,144 | 4.1  | 81,341                            | 651   | 0.8 | Pennsylvania (4.1 > 0.8)    |                      |
| Rhode Island <sup>21</sup>   | 11,067   | 150    | 1.4  | 2,684                              | 142   | 5.3  | 8,916                             | 8     | 0.1 | Rhode Island (5.3 > 0.1)    |                      |
| South Carolina <sup>22</sup> | 42,650   | 766    | 1.8  | 27,111                             | 615   | 2.3  | 14,951                            | 151   | 1.0 | South Carolina (2.3 > 1.0)  |                      |
| South Dakota <sup>23</sup>   | 8,643    | 295    | 3.4  | 1,729                              | 105   | 6.1  | 6,914                             | 190   | 2.7 | South Dakota (6.1 > 2.7)    |                      |
| Tennessee <sup>24</sup>      | 51,031   | 903    | 1.8  | 19,480                             | 518   | 2.7  | 31,550                            | 385   | 1.2 | Tennessee (2.7 > 1.2)       |                      |
| Texas <sup>25</sup>          | 240,951  | 42,470 | 17.6 |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| Utah                         | 23,177   | 252    | 1.0  | 260                                |       |      | 22,917                            |       |     |                             |                      |
| Vermont                      |          |        |      |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| Virginia <sup>26</sup>       | 84,231   | 5,277  | 6.2  | 21,637                             | 1,645 | 7.6  | 62,594                            | 3,632 | 5.8 | Virginia (7.6 > 5.8)        |                      |
| Washington                   | 62,607   | 418    | 0.7  |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |
| West Virginia <sup>27</sup>  |          | 2,046  |      |                                    | 1,105 |      |                                   | 153   |     |                             | (na)                 |
| Wisconsin                    | 57,017   | 1,920  | 3.4  | 7,797                              |       |      | 49,218                            |       |     |                             |                      |
| Wyoming <sup>28</sup>        | 8,156    | 183    | 2.2  | 723                                | 14    | 1.9  | 7,433                             | 169   | 2.2 |                             | Wyoming (2.2 > 1.9)  |
| American Samoa               |          |        |      |                                    |       |      |                                   |       |     |                             |                      |

Total: 20

file 4

MORE TABLED ...

Of 25 states where we can compute waiver %, 20 have  $\text{lipor} > \text{lowpor}$  & 4 have the reverse (one has a tie).

Teaching out of field, based upon answer descriptions:

|                | Yes (some) | No | Unknown (prob. no) |
|----------------|------------|----|--------------------|
| Alabama        |            |    | ✓                  |
| Alaska         |            |    | ✓                  |
| Colorado       |            |    | ✓                  |
| Connecticut    |            |    | ✓                  |
| Delaware       |            |    |                    |
| Ga? Hawaii?    |            |    |                    |
| Idaho          | ✓          |    |                    |
| Louisiana      |            |    | ✓                  |
| Maryland       |            |    | ✓                  |
| Massachusetts  |            |    | ✓                  |
| Minnesota      | ✓          |    |                    |
| Nebraska       |            |    | ✓                  |
| Nevada         | ✓          |    |                    |
| New Mexico     | ✓          |    |                    |
| North Carolina | ✓          |    |                    |
| Oregon         |            |    | ✓                  |
| Pennsylvania   |            |    | ✓                  |
| Rhode Island   |            |    | ✓                  |
| South Carolina | ✓          |    |                    |
| South Dakota   | ✓          |    |                    |
| Tennessee      | ?          |    |                    |
| Virginia       |            |    | ✓                  |
| Wyoming        | ✓          |    |                    |