

STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
23 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE  
04333-0023



JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI  
GOVERNOR



SUSAN A. GENDRON  
COMMISSIONER

**MAINE'S STATE**  
**TEACHER QUALITY**  
**EQUITY ACTION PLAN**

**2008 – 2009**

*Revised January 5, 2009*

## **Table Of Contents:**

<b>PG.</b>	
<b><u>4</u></b>	<b>Summary of: Data Sources, Problems, Strategies;</b>
<b><u>5</u></b>	<b>Narrative Introduction: “Goal # 6”</b>
<b><u>7</u></b>	<b>Strategy # 1: Offer financial incentives to encourage teachers to work in high need schools.</b>
<b><u>8</u></b>	<b>Strategy # 2: Require and fund mentoring and induction programs to give teachers the support that they need to succeed and remain in challenging schools.</b>
<b><u>9</u></b>	<b>Strategy # 3: Support the development of high quality alternative route programs to create a pool of teachers specifically for high need schools.</b>
<b><u>10</u></b>	<b>Strategy # 4: Improve working conditions to retain teacher.</b>
<b><u>12</u></b>	<b>Strategy # 5: Adopt policies to increase the number of National Board Certified Teacher in high need schools.</b>
<b><u>16</u></b>	<b>Strategy # 6: Provide intensive professional development in core academic content to teachers currently working in high need schools</b>
<b><u>18</u></b>	<b>Appendix A “Data Sources”:</b> - HQT Data Survey - HQT Data Comparison Charts - “Number of Maine Staff by Years of Experience” - Maine’s 2008-2009 Sample List of “High Need” Schools Criteria
<b><u>23</u></b>	<b>Appendix B “Strategy # 1”:</b> - Superintendent’s Informational Letter: “New Minimum Teacher Salary Requirements”

<b>PG.</b>	
<b><u>23</u></b>	<p><b>Appendix C “Strategy # 2”:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rulemaking: State Board of Education (Department of Education)</li> <li>- Chapter 118 Support Systems: Standards and Procedures for Operation Comparison Chart</li> <li>- Maine’s “Certified Mentor Trainers”</li> </ul>
<b><u>25</u></b>	<p><b>Appendix D “Strategy # 3”:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “SPARC” Special Education Alternate Route to Certification</li> <li>- The Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP)</li> </ul>
<b><u>29</u></b>	<p><b>Appendix E “Strategy # 4”:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Teacher Workload and Stressor” Report</li> <li>- The Teaching, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Survey</li> </ul>
<b><u>31</u></b>	<p><b>Appendix F “Strategy # 5”:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Salary supplement for national board-certified teachers</li> </ul>
<b><u>32</u></b>	<p><b>Appendix G “Strategy # 6”:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Maine Content Literacy Project</li> <li>- Content Literacy Learning Communities (CLLC)</li> <li>- Maine Math and Science Alliance Grant Proposal: CNEMS</li> <li>- Title II, Part A, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants</li> <li>- State of Maine Procedure for Allocating Title IIA Funds</li> <li>- Local Education Agency (LEA) Action Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers</li> <li>- Guidance for LEA Action Plans for Highly Qualified Teachers</li> <li>- “High Need Schools” Notification documents</li> <li>- 2006 - 2008: Timeline of Technical Assistance to “High Need” Schools</li> <li>- HIGH NEED SCHOOL PERFORMANCE REPORTS 2007 – 2008</li> <li>- Section 2141 HQT Status for FY09 Title II Monitoring Site Visits</li> </ul>

## **DATA SOURCES (See appendices)**

1. 2006-2007 & 2007-2008 “Highly Qualified Teacher” data for the State of Maine
  2. School AYP data for the State of Maine
  3. Title I Poverty indices (Eligibility for Free and Reduced Lunch)
  4. Inexperienced teacher data collected for 2007 – 2008 school year
- 

## **IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS**

(For a definition of “High Need School” see page 8 & 9 of this document)

1. Percentage of Highly Qualified Teachers in School is more than 5% points below the State average.
  2. School has not made AYP for “Whole School” Reading and/or Math for 2 consecutive years.
  3. School is in the “High Poverty” category (>49.9%).
  4. School employs inexperienced teachers at a greater rate than average (>5% above State average).
- 

## **PLANNED RESEARCH-BASED STRATEGIES TO REACH 100% HQT**

1. Offer financial incentives to encourage teachers to work in high need schools/LEAs
  - o “State of Maine minimum teacher salary” raised to \$30,000 in 07-08.
2. Mandate new teacher induction programs to increase recruitment and retention in challenging (high need) schools.
  - o Reflecting research-based induction practices, and standards-based certification.
3. Support alternative route to certification programs to increase recruitment and retention of “highly qualified” teachers, particularly in high need schools/LEAs.
4. Improve working conditions to retain teachers.
  - o “TeLL Survey” administered; data and facilitators’ guide disseminated, sponsored by Maine Education Association and Maine Department of Education to determine teacher working conditions.
  - o “Teacher Workload and Stressor” Report, 2004
5. Adopt policies to increase the number of National Board Certified teachers in Maine.
  - o Stipends given to candidates as supplement to tuition and fees.
  - o State funded \$3000 yearly stipend to all teachers teaching under a N.B.C.
  - o Employ N.B.C. Consultant from 2007 through 2009 to oversee/coordinate.
6. Provide intensive professional development in core academic content to non-“highly qualified” teachers currently working in high need schools.
  - o Title IIA funds, through use of revised IIA application and performance reports.
  - o Title IIA funds earmarked for technical assistance from 2006 through 2009.
7. Participation in the National Center for Special Education Personnel and Related Service Providers (Personnel Center) Grant to address shortages of Special Educators in rural and high need schools.

**Goal # 6: Poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.**

The percentage of Highly Qualified teachers in Maine for all schools, for the 2007-2008 school year, was 95.88%, which is 0.98% above the Maine State average for the previous year of 94.9%.

The elementary and secondary combined percentage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools in Maine for the 2007-2008 school year was 94.99%, 0.69% above the Maine State average for the previous year of 94.3%.

The percentage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools in Maine for the 2007-2008 school year, 94.99 was 2.76% above the average for all low poverty schools in the same year of 97.75%. These data sets indicate no statistically significant differences between high poverty schools and low poverty schools in Maine.

At present, data on a teacher's individual certification, salary, and class assignment, among other identifying factors, is available. Plans are in process to ask LEAs to submit teacher's individual HQ status into this existing "MEDMS" database, which would be accessible to the Maine Department of Education, and LEA personnel. Maine already has and uses a "Unique Teacher Identifier", which is planned to be used for the 2008-2009 data collection and analysis using the "Staff Personnel File". This establishes a method to track individual teachers' certification, HQT, and experience status, along with turnover rates and employer's location. Unfortunately due to technical constraints we were not able to incorporate these changes into our data collection system for this school year's collection period. In the interim we are sure that continuing to collect the data by subject area and school, along with the "class" data required by the CSPR, will prove invaluable in supporting schools in reaching the 100% HQT goal for the beginning of the 2009 school year. This data has already yielded important insights as to which schools/LEAs and content areas require attention and will further guide this and next year's HQT action plans.

**In this, the "Revised Plan", dated January 5, 2009,** further analysis was done to determine the number of non-HQT in some of the groups of teachers referred to (Inexperienced Teachers). This new data has been inserted into our plans as well as appropriate technical assistance, to include newly allocated monies to fund targeted assistance to identified high need schools. The survey we used in April, 2008 to collect the 2007-2008 HQT data asked for numbers of HQT or non-HQT classes taught in each core content area taught (see Appendix A). This change rendered a data set similar to that which we collected for all the previous years except 2005 - 2006. Thus we have comparative data to inform decisions on the most effective technical assistance to offer, and content area needs. The 2007-2008 data shows that there are greater needs for highly qualified special education, alternative education, foreign/world languages, and English as a Second Language teachers; thus, our technical assistance will focus on these needs by offering professional development opportunities to address those content areas. The updated 2007-2008 data is available on the Maine State Department of Education website now at:

<https://www.medms.maine.gov/medms%5Fpublic/ReportPortal/Portal.aspx?CurrentLocation=%2fPublic+Reports%2fNo+Child+Left+Behind>

A deeper investigation of data on percentages of Highly Qualified Teachers in Maine indicates there are certain “high need” LEAs and/or schools that contain significant percentages of non-highly qualified teachers. When correlated with other “high need” factors: greater than 49.9% poverty (as determined by free and reduced lunch); percentages of inexperienced teachers more than 5% points higher than the State average; and failure to meet Adequate Yearly Progress in whole school student achievement for reading or math, it is clear that certain LEAs and/or schools in Maine would benefit from various forms of technical assistance aimed at increasing teacher quality. (*See appendix A and the following criteria*)

Maine’s definition of “High Need” schools; to be used for the upcoming school year’s planned actions to reach the 100% HQT goal.

Definition: **High-Need School:** (*See Appendix A for eligible Maine schools*) a high-need school is defined as an LEA:

#### **Category A “High Need” Schools**

- A. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility, AND
- B. schools which are 5% points or more below the Maine State average for HQT (95.88%), and have been for three years or more;

#### **Category B “High Need” Schools**

- A. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility AND,
- B. schools with more than 12.8 inexperienced teachers on staff (5% points or more above the State average of 7.8%);
- C. the SAU has not met its Annual Measurable Objective for HQT for three years or more, AND is 5% points or more below the state average of 95.88%.

***Definition: “Inexperienced Teachers”:* Teachers having less than 3 years experience.**

#### **Category A AND B “High Need” Schools**

- A. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility, AND
- B. schools which are 5% points or more below the Maine State average for HQT, and have been for three years or more;
- C. schools with more than 12.8 inexperienced teachers on staff (5% points or more above the State average of 7.8%);

With increasing teacher quality in “High Need Schools” as a goal, Maine has compiled a list of those initiatives and activities that are already taking place, or planned to take place, State-wide, that are aimed at raising teacher quality. A list of these initiatives and activities can also be found in the “Maine State Teacher Quality & Equity Action Plan, Narrative # 3”. Following is a list of Maine State actions/initiatives (“Strategies”) that particularly address the lack of highly qualified teachers in “high need schools” (*see full documents referenced, in Appendices*).

**Strategy # 1,**  
**Offer financial incentives to encourage teachers to work in high need schools**

A raise in the minimum teacher salary by \$15,000 dollars has been recently legislated (See Appendix B). We feel this step will impact “High Need Schools (see definition, pg. 7) because in Maine there are a small number of metropolitan schools, mostly located in the southeastern coastal region that are able to pay their teachers a competitive salary. Thus small, rural schools become “training grounds” for larger, more affluent LEAs, such as Portland or other southern coastal towns. Highly qualified teachers tend to move to these more affluent schools, from small rural schools. By helping to “level the playing field” in salary between these two competing employers, we hope to encourage more teachers to stay, or move to, smaller, rural, higher poverty schools.

Furthermore the raise in minimum teacher salary has a direct correlation to the funding formula for education. Maine’s funding formula includes a salary matrix derived from salary data submitted by each school administrative unit. The legislated minimum of \$30,000 now becomes the required base. The matrix will provide increased State resources for the next ten years. In one rural community a teacher had to teach thirteen years prior to reaching \$30,000. This increase in allocation will enable rural and island communities to attract and retain highly qualified teachers.

In addition, the raise in minimum teacher salary will lead to subsequent increases in experienced teachers’ salaries due to the resultant upward pressure in local contracted salary schedules. This should result in greater retention of highly qualified, experienced teachers in all schools, as the research clearly indicates that many teachers leave the profession or move to more suburban school districts for higher pay.

Administrative Letter 29, Policy Code GCB, to Superintendents of Schools from Susan A. Gendron, Maine’s Commissioner of Education, Dated May 26, 2006 (*See Appendix B*) detailed recent Maine State legislation setting New Minimum Teacher Salary Requirements:

“On May 9, 2006, Governor Baldacci signed Public Law, Chapter 635 – An Act to Update Minimum Teachers’ Salaries. The law repeals the existing statutory minimum teacher salary of \$15,500 established in 1987. It requires school administrative units to pay certified teachers a minimum salary of \$27,000 for the school year beginning July 1, 2006 and \$30,000 for the school year beginning July 1, 2007 and beyond. The law provides for dedicated State funding to achieve the minimum salary requirements in FY2007 and the Legislative intent to fund the \$30,000 minimum required in FY2008 and beyond. Qualifying school administrative units will be required to submit a list of eligible certified teachers in September of each fiscal year and an adjustment will be made to the unit’s subsidy to cover the costs of the difference

between what the teacher would otherwise be paid on the local teacher salary scale and the required minimums set forth in Chapter 635.”

“Salary is just one of many factors that employees weigh when assessing the relative attractiveness of any particular job... Salary matters less when other characteristics of the workplace are personally or professionally satisfying. When they are not satisfying or the work is significantly more demanding, money matters more and can be the tipping point that determines whether teachers stay or leave. Adjusting salaries upward can compensate for less appealing aspects of jobs; conversely, improving the relative attractiveness of jobs can compensate for lower salaries.” (p. 7)<sup>1</sup>

### **Strategy # 2,**

#### **Require and fund mentoring and induction programs to give teachers the support that they need to succeed and remain in challenging schools**

The evidence for the efficacy of this strategy is well documented. As of July 2007, Maine passed new regulations requiring formally trained mentors that are assigned one-on-one to the new teacher for the full two year initial certification period aiding in meeting Maine’s Initial Teacher Certification Standards (*see Appendix C*). Maine Department of Education recommendations are to fund this through the General Purpose Aid allocation for education, for all LEAs as of August 2010 when the regulation takes full effect.

Furthermore, ongoing trainings of mentor trainers, i.e. a “train the trainer” model, have been held during the 2003 through 2008 years State-wide with the goal of building capacity for training new teacher mentors in anticipation of this redesigned induction system. Approximately 270 trainers were trained during this period representing every region in the State. This training is continuing during this school year and beyond to continue to build this capacity, and knowledge base to support high quality induction practices in the future. It was decided to use the 50% saturation point in each of the nine Superintendent regions as the goal, in order to assure that each LEA would have available trainers in reasonable proximity. That goal has already been met in every region as of summer of 2008.

The mentor training and train the trainer workshop was a product of a Title IIA TQE Grant run by the Maine Department of Education during 2001 to 2004, called *Advancing the Agenda for Results-Based Educator Certification (AARBEC)*. This research grant produced the model, training, standards, and materials upon which Maine is basing its changes to current new teacher induction program rules.

The Maine State Board of Education and the Department of Education amended the rules governing the educator certification support systems; Chapter 118. *Chapter 118: Purposes, Standards and Procedures for Educational Personnel Support Systems*, a routine, and technical rule of the State Board of Education, underwent a formal State-wide Stakeholders review and received State Board of Education approval for the Administrative Procedures Act Process to be initiated. (*See Appendix C*)

---

<sup>1</sup> Prince, C. (2003). *Higher pay in hard-to-staff schools: The case for financial incentives*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Among the amendments was the inclusion of required performance standards: Maine's Initial Teacher Certification Standards. The proposed amendments include: a "Statement of Purpose" to clarify the new "Professional Learning Community" model described; revised definitions; inclusion of educational specialists with other educational personnel; the option of including educational technicians in the local support plan, at the discretion of the LEA; procedures for use by local support systems which support educators in seeking higher certification; a requirement for approved formal training for new teacher mentors; use of the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards to receive Master Teacher Certification; a Teacher Action Plan based on the teaching standards.

"In 2002, Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin argued in a National Bureau of Economic Research report that hard-to-staff schools struggle to recruit and keep high-quality teachers precisely because those districts fail to provide effective training, valuable induction programs, and a generally supportive teaching environment."<sup>57</sup> (p. 9)<sup>2</sup>

**Strategy # 3,**  
**Support the development of high quality alternative route programs to create a pool of teachers specifically for high need schools**

This strategy is aimed, again at these small, rural schools that are often forced to accept teacher candidates that are less than fully State certified. By creating an alternate route to certification program that meets NCLB criteria, the State intends to bolster HQT percentages in these "High Need Schools", as well as others across the State, while addressing the anticipated teacher shortage of the second half of this decade.

The Maine Department of Education has given supplemental funding to the Regional Education Collaborative Network (**RECN**) through a SAHE Grant, servicing remote, rural areas of the State, which also contains several of our identified "High Need LEA's".

Information on a new Special Educators Alternate Route to Certification program (**SPARC**), (see *Appendix D*), administered by the Regional Education Collaborative Network. It is hoped that this will aid shortages of highly qualified special educators across the State, and in particular in rural schools, as this is an outreach program. This program is proving successful and well received in LEAs, with its emphasis on high-need schools, where it is difficult to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. These LEAs often find it necessary to hire teachers on a conditional certificate (not fully state certified). The SPARC program is designed to address the needs of special educators and LEAs in this *situation* (see *Appendix D*).

---

<sup>2</sup> Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004). *Tapping the potential: Retaining and developing high-quality new teachers*. Washington, DC: Author.  
<http://www.all4ed.org/publications/TappingThePotential/TappingThePotential.pdf>

**Strategy # 4,**  
**Improve working conditions to retain teachers**

This strategy is in the research stages of action. In 2004 Maine completed an extensive study of teacher working conditions and is using this data to plan appropriate actions, e.g. the raise in minimum teacher salary (*see Strategy # 1 of this Plan, and Appendix B*). Note the last line in the included “Summary and Conclusions” below, which points to the importance of salary in job satisfaction.

Furthermore in the school year of 2007 - 2008 the Maine Department of Education partnered with the Maine Education Association (Maine’s Teacher’s Association) to support the use of the Teaching, Leading and Learning Survey, sponsored and administered by the New Teacher Center at Santa Cruz, and under the direction of Eric Hirsch. This “*TeLL*” Survey was deployed across the State of Maine and results were made available to schools for the purposes of school improvement efforts. (*See Appendix E*)

Teacher turnover and attrition contribute greatly to the problem of staffing high need schools with highly qualified teachers. Research supports this:

“The organizational literature suggests that turnover rates of, for example, almost 25 percent will likely have a negative impact on organizational performance, especially if these are organizations, such as schools, for which coherence and continuity are deemed important for effectiveness (e.g., Mobley, 1982). To my knowledge there have been no studies that use national data to examine the impact of teacher turnover on school community and school performance.” (pp. 26-27)<sup>3</sup>

Maine has completed a formal research study on “Teacher Workload and Stressors” and has found certain common factors contributing to teacher attrition, retention, and job satisfaction. Further research on these factors is still needed, as they are related to high need schools, and the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers, and will be planned in the coming year. The “Summary and Conclusions” appears below, and the link to the full 36 page report is included in the appendix. (*See Appendix E*)

**Summary and Conclusions of “Teacher Workload and Stressor Report 2004”**

A Survey Conducted for: The Commissioner’s Task Force on Teacher Workload Prepared By: The Maine Education Policy Research Institute The University of Maine, Orono, Maine. The full text of the “Teacher Workload and Stressor” Report can be found at the following web address: <http://www.maine.gov/education/edleters/2006/ilet/06ilet115workload.pdf>

**The Teaching, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Survey**

The Maine Education Association and the Maine Department of Education conducted the state’s first statewide teaching conditions survey in 2008. The survey, which was administered through the New Teacher Center at the University of California at Santa Cruz in

---

<sup>3</sup> Ingersoll, R. (2001, January). “Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of schools.” Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Turnover-Ing-01-2001.pdf>

December 2007 and January 2008, was sent to all school-based, licensed educators throughout the state of Maine. The TeLL Maine Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey provides data to schools, districts, and the state about whether educators have the supportive school environments necessary for them to continue working and be successful with students. By hearing directly from educators who intimately understand teaching conditions, policymakers will have the opportunity to make data-driven decisions to develop policies that make Maine schools great places to work and learn.

(See: <http://www.tellmaine.org/> an summary can be found in Appendix E)

**Strategy # 5,**  
**Adopt policies to increase the number of National Board Certified Teachers in high**  
**need schools**

Maine has been offering scholarships to pay teachers the necessary fees to apply for and attain a National Board Certificate for several years. Legislation was passed in 2007 to pay teachers working under a valid National Board Certificate an additional \$3,000.00 per year as long as it is kept valid and they continue to teach under it. The specific language appears below and in the Appendix. (*See Appendix F*)

It must be acknowledged that many of these “High Need” schools still lag behind their more affluent counterparts in salary and benefits, in many cases even with the new minimum teacher salary. This stipend for National Board Certified teachers may prove the added incentive to stay in a school that may have been desirable in many ways, other than financial, e.g. low cost of living, access to rural recreational activities, quality of life, etc. It may also add incentive to teachers in these schools to seek further professional development by seeking this advanced certificate. Baseline data has been collected during September on numbers and locations of teachers holding National Board Certification (*see Appendix F*). This data will be used in the future to evaluate whether this strategy is having a positive effect.

**PART AAAA**

**Sec. AAAA-1. 20-A MRS §13013-A is enacted to read:**

**§13013-A. Salary supplement for national board-certified teachers**

**1. Salary supplement.** Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Education shall provide a public school teacher who has attained certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, or its successor organization, as of July 1, 2006 or thereafter with an annual national board certification salary supplement of \$3,000 for the life of the certificate. The salary supplement must be added to the teacher's base salary and must be considered in the calculation for contributions to the Maine State Retirement System. If a nationally certified teacher becomes no longer employed as a classroom teacher in the field of that teacher's national certification, the supplement ceases.

**2. Local filing; certification.** On or before October 15th annually, the superintendent of schools of a school administrative unit shall file with the commissioner a certified list of national board-certified teachers eligible to receive the salary supplement pursuant to subsection 1.

**3. Payment.** The department shall provide the salary supplement to eligible teachers no later than February 15th of each year.

Recent research indicates a correlation between National Board Certified Teachers and higher student achievement:

“In this paper, we describe the results a study assessing the relationship between the certification of teachers by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and elementary level student achievement. We examine whether NBPTS assesses the most effective applicants, whether certification by NBPTS serves as a signal of teacher quality, and whether completing the NBPTS assessment process serves as catalyst for increasing teacher effectiveness. We find consistent evidence that NBPTS is identifying the more effective teacher applicants and that National Board Certified Teachers are generally more effective than teachers who never applied to the program. The statistical significance and magnitude of the “NBPTS effect,” however, differs significantly by grade level and student type. We do not find evidence that the NBPTS certification process itself does anything to increase teacher effectiveness.” (p. 3)<sup>4</sup>

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE – June 26, 2008**

Contact: Ellen Holmes, 207-660-5589, [ellen.holmes@maine.gov](mailto:ellen.holmes@maine.gov)

New Report Shows National Teacher Certification Improves Student Achievement

**Gendron hails results confirming link**

AUGUSTA – Maine Education Commissioner Susan A. Gendron hailed the results of a recent report showing the positive impact that National Board certified teachers have on student achievement.

According to the report released in early June by the National Research Council of the National Academies, National Board certification, as well as national teaching standards, have taken the culture of teaching to a higher level. The report recognizes the potential of national certification to bring benefits to more schools and concludes that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards’ work needs strong support and coordination by states, districts and schools as well as higher education and other non-governmental groups.

The report, *Assessing Accomplished Teaching: Advanced-Level Certification Programs*, was produced by the Council following a request by Congress to develop a framework for evaluating programs that offer advanced-level certification to teachers. The Council began work on the report in 2005 and spent the next 30 months gathering and evaluating information for the final document.

---

<sup>4</sup> Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2005, November 29). *Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? National Board Certification as a signal of effective teaching*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.  
[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411271\\_teacher\\_quality.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411271_teacher_quality.pdf)

With 8,500 new nationally certified teachers last year, there are nearly 64,000 nationally certified teachers in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Maine has 119 nationally certified teachers, including 16 new ones last year. Maine ranked fifth highest in the nation for the percentage growth in new National Board certified teachers last year.

“National Board certification is an extremely rigorous application process that only the highest quality teachers can achieve,” Commissioner Gendron said. “We have heard from teachers that the process – with its self-assessment, portfolio development and other intensive preparation – is itself a highly valuable professional development experience. It is not surprising to me that the teachers who undergo this intensive work have a positive effect on student achievement.”

She added, “There is wide agreement among researchers that this certification is good for the climate of schools, good for promoting the profession, and that achievement on most measures is higher among students of these teachers.”

National Board certification is a voluntary assessment program designed to recognize and reward great teachers – and make them better. While state licensing systems set basic requirements to teach in each state, National Board certified teachers have successfully demonstrated advanced teaching knowledge, skills and practices. Certification is achieved through a rigorous, performance-based assessment that typically takes one to three years to complete.

As part of the process, teachers build a portfolio that includes student work samples, assignments, videotapes and a thorough analysis of their classroom teaching. In addition, teachers are assessed on their knowledge of the subjects they teach.

Regarded as some of the most accomplished teachers in the nation, they are routinely in the ranks of state teachers of the year, and four of the last eight National Teachers of the Year have been National Board certified. These accomplished teachers make up about two percent of the nation’s teaching force.

Ellen Holmes, a distinguished educator on loan to the Department from the Maine Education Association, said the Department provides a \$1,250 subsidy that covers half the candidate fee to many applicants. Some school districts provide part or all of the remainder; some candidates pay the difference. In 2006, Gov. John Baldacci signed into law a provision for an annual \$3,000 salary supplement for nationally certified teachers.

Holmes, herself a nationally certified teacher, helped develop the support program and is the candidate support administrator for the program in Maine.

The report found that students taught by nationally certified teachers make higher gains on achievement tests than those taught by teachers who have not applied and those who did not achieve certification. The findings are based on an analysis of the studies that the Council says meet standards of sound scientific research, including new analyses commissioned by the Council. According to the report, the “evidence is clear that National Board certification

distinguishes more effective teachers from less effective teachers with respect to student achievement.” The Council acknowledged research showing that National Board Certification has a positive impact on teacher retention and, based on its analyses, noted that nationally certified teachers are likely to stay in teaching longer than other teachers.

“The NRC further affirms what we have long believed and seen to be true – National Board certified teachers raise student achievement and are committed to improving their schools,” said Joseph A. Aguerrebere, NBPTS president and CEO. “The NRC acknowledges that National Board Certification, which was established to set high standards for teaching and measure teachers against those standards, is having a positive effect. This is news to celebrate.”

For more information about the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and National Board Certification, visit the NBPTS Web site at [www.nbpts.org](http://www.nbpts.org).

David Connerty-Marin  
Director of Communications  
Maine Department of Education  
Tel: 207-624-6880  
Cell: 207-831-3313  
Fax: 207-624-6601  
E-mail: [david.connerty-marin@maine.gov](mailto:david.connerty-marin@maine.gov)

**Strategy # 6,**  
**Provide intensive professional development in core academic content to teachers currently working in high need schools**

This details the many changes and improvements Maine is making to its administration of Title IIA funds. We offer support, technical assistance and incentives by targeting these funds toward increasing percentages of HQT in all schools, and in particular targeted “High Need Schools”. Our redesigned Title IIA Application and Performance Report will guide LEAs to use these funds in a more effective and targeted manner toward raising teacher quality. As of September 2006 the Maine Department of Education has earmarked Title IIA funds to support this technical assistance (*see Appendix G*).

The 2007-2008 data shows that there are greater needs for highly qualified special education, alternative education, and “English as a Second Language” teachers; thus, our technical assistance will focus on these needs by offering professional development opportunities to address those content areas. The updated 2007-2008 data is available on the Maine State Department of Education website now at:

<https://www.medms.maine.gov/medms%5Fpublic/ReportPortal/Portal.aspx?CurrentLocation=%2fPublic+Reports%2fNo+Child+Left+Behind>

**1.) The 2006-2007 Title IIA Applications, Competitive Grants, and reallocation criteria for 2005-2006 carryover funds have been changed to support LEAs in increasing HQT percentages as follows:**

1. 2008-2009 Title IIA applications must demonstrate funding is targeted at HQT, if below 100%, in order to have Class Size Reduction funds approved.
2. 2008-2009 Title IIA competitive grants require HQT objective and measures, and are targeted at “High Need” (high poverty, low HQT %) LEAs & schools.
3. Mentoring/Induction, 1 of 10 key strategies under Title IIA, is now one of the “categories” listed on the application, and will be posted on the website under “models of State-wide projects”.

Title IIA Documentation is included in the appendix under “Strategy # 6”. ((*See Appendix G*)

**2.) “Training of Certified Mentor Trainers by Maine State Superintendents’ Regions”:**

These trainings have been offered to “high need schools” in a regional partnership model, if the LEA/school includes mentoring and induction as one of their planned action strategies to address high numbers of inexperienced teachers.

Over 270 mentor trainers have been trained in delivering Maine’s Model of Mentor Training. This is being done to build State-wide capacity for training mentors, which is a requirement of the new rules governing new teacher induction in Maine (Chapter 118).

It was decided to use the 50% saturation point in each of the nine Superintendent regions as the goal in order to assure that each LEA would have available trainers in reasonable proximity. That goal was met as of summer 2008.

**3.) Maine Math and Science Alliance (MMSA) is currently administering a federal grant titled: “The Northern New England Co-Mentoring Network”. The goals of this grant and its planned activities are aligned with those of this “Equity Action Plan”:** **“1. meeting the targeted content and pedagogical specific needs of new teachers; 2. building the leadership capacity in science and mathematics for mentors and instructional coaches, and; 3. facilitating the incorporation of sustainable models of professional development that connect novices and experienced teachers by going beyond one-on-one mentoring support and basic induction requirements”.**

Several of the intended targeted schools of this grant are also on the State’s “High Need Schools” list; therefore an agreement has been made with MMSA that this grant membership would be offered as a possible activity/strategy to the identified “High Need Schools”.

**NNECN Center (2007-ongoing)**

The NNECN Center began as a four year, ME, NH, and VT teacher enhancement project, funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), called the Northern New England Co-Mentoring Network. The NNECN Project provided professional development to middle and high school science and mathematics mentors and new science teachers. After the NSF funding ended, the network evolved into a physical and virtual center which now offers state, regional, and national consulting services and products to support science and mathematics mentoring, instructional coaching, and new teacher induction into the science and mathematics teaching and learning community. Operating under the same philosophy of the original NNECN project, the NNECN Center provides new teachers with the content-specific support that goes beyond the general mentoring typically provided by district induction programs. The NNECN Center recognizes that science and mathematics teachers have content and pedagogical needs that are specific to their disciplines. In addition science teachers must deal with equipment and safety issues. [Click here](#) to learn more about the mentoring and new teacher support services offered through the NNECN Center.

**NNECN Center Director:** Page Keeley

**NNECN Center Maine Coordinator:** Lynn Farrin

**NNECN Center New Hampshire Coordinator:** Joyce Tugel

**NNECN Center Communications Coordinator:** Brianne Van Den Bossche

## Appendix A:

### Goal # 1: The SEA will conduct a data analysis to determine needs and responses.

Maine’s HQT data collection process includes specific data by subject, and types of teachers. Additionally a question was added to the survey asking for the number of teachers who used the HOUSSE Rubric to demonstrate “highly qualified” status by school.

The yearly LEA site monitoring visit protocol includes provisions to collect and check on this data, and compliance by LEAs. Technical assistance will be planned and given to LEAs failing to comply with this new limited use of the HOUSSE.

**Maine Department of Education  
No Child Left Behind Act  
“Highly Qualified Teacher Survey” 2007-2008**

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_ **School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMPORTANT!** Before responding to this survey, please read the **“Directions for Completing the “Highly Qualified Teacher Survey”** available at

<http://www.maine.gov/education/hqtp/forms.htm>

**THIS FORM IS PRE-POPULATED WITH THE 2006-2007 “HIGHLY QUALIFIED” TEACHER DATA. PLEASE CHECK AND UPDATE EACH FIELD BEFORE SUBMISSION.**

**A. School Organization Information Data:**

A.1 School Organization (Check the one which most applies)

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ Elementary (all self contained classes)
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ K – 8 or K - 12(combined elementary/middle)\*
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary (Middle/Jr. High, High School and/or Vocational School)

\*(fill out both B. Elementary. and C. Secondary sections - B. for your Elementary classes and C. for your Secondary classes.)

Title I School:            **Yes**            **No**

**B. Core Academic Subject Classes Data:**

**1. ELEMENTARY (self contained):**

**HOUSSE Question:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total number of elementary TEACHERS (not classes) who met the *NCLB* definition of a “Highly Qualified Teacher” by using the HOUSSE rubric.**

**B.1** How many classes does your school have this year in which the

Core academic subjects are taught?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ General Elementary(i.e., kindergarten, 3<sup>rd</sup> Gr., 5<sup>th</sup> Gr. self-contained)
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Visual/Performing Arts (art, music, theatre, dance)
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ World Languages
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills Math (i.e., Title I, pull-out, etc.)
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills English/Reading/Language Arts (i.e. Title I, pull-out, etc.)
- f. \_\_\_\_\_ Special Education (pull- out resource and self-contained)
- g. \_\_\_\_\_ English as a Second Language (pull out)
- h. \_\_\_\_\_ Other core academic subject specials (i.e. GT Math, Science, English)
  
- i. \_\_\_\_\_ **Total number of core academic subject classes taught at your school.**

**B.2** Of the classes counted in **B.1**, how many are taught by teachers who met the *NCLB* Definition of a highly qualified teacher?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ General Elementary(i.e., kindergarten, 3<sup>rd</sup> Gr., 5<sup>th</sup> Gr. self-contained)
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Visual/Performing Arts (art, music, theatre, dance)
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ World Languages
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills Math (i.e., Title I, pull out, etc.)
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills English/Reading/Language Arts (i.e. Title I, pull out, etc.)
- f. \_\_\_\_\_ Special Education (resource and self-contained)
- g. \_\_\_\_\_ English as a Second Language (pull out)
- h. \_\_\_\_\_ Other core academic subject specials (i.e. GT Math, Science, English)
  
- i. \_\_\_\_\_ **Total number of core academic subject classes taught by teachers who meet the *NCLB* definition of a “Highly Qualified Teacher”.**

**B.3** Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (This field will be automatically calculated by the MEDMS online HQT Report)

**Reasons for NON- “Highly Qualified Status” (The total reported in this section, when added to B.2.i, must equal the total number of core academic classes reported in B.1.i or MEDMS will not accept the report.)**

- j) \_\_\_\_\_ **Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE**
- k) \_\_\_\_\_ **Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE**
- l) \_\_\_\_\_ **Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)**
- m) **Other (please explain)**

**C. Secondary School (Middle/Jr. High, High School and/or Vocational School)**

**HOUSSE Question:**

**\_\_\_\_\_ Total number of secondary TEACHERS (not classes) who met the *NCLB* definition of a “Highly Qualified Teacher” by using the HOUSSE rubric.**

C.1 How many of the following types of classes does your school have this year in which the core academic subjects are taught?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ English/Language Arts/Reading
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Social Studies
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ Science
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ Mathematics
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ Visual/Performing Arts (art, music, theatre, dance)
- f. \_\_\_\_\_ World Languages
- g. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills Math (i.e., Title I, pull out, etc.)
- h. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills English/Reading/Language Arts (i.e. Title I, pull out, etc.)
- i. \_\_\_\_\_ Special Education (pull out, resource and self-contained)
- j. \_\_\_\_\_ English as a Second Language (pull out)
- k. \_\_\_\_\_ Other core academic subject specials (i.e. Middle School GT Math, GT English etc.)
- l. \_\_\_\_\_ Alternative Education core academic classes
- m. \_\_\_\_\_ **Total number of core academic subject classes taught at your school.**

C.2 Of the classes counted in C.1, how many are taught by teachers who met the *NCLB* Definition of a highly qualified teacher?

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ English/Language Arts/Reading
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Social Studies
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ Science
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ Mathematics
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ Visual/Performing Arts (art, music, theatre, dance)
- f. \_\_\_\_\_ World Languages
- g. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills Math (i.e., Title I, pull out, etc.)
- h. \_\_\_\_\_ Basic Skills English/Reading/Language Arts (i.e. Title I, pull out, etc.)
- i. \_\_\_\_\_ Special Education (resource and self-contained)
- j. \_\_\_\_\_ English as a Second Language (pull out)
- k. \_\_\_\_\_ Other core academic subject specials (i.e. Middle School GT Math, GT English etc.)
- l. \_\_\_\_\_ Alternative Education core academic classes
- m. \_\_\_\_\_ **Total number of core academic subject classes taught by teachers who meet the *NCLB* definition of a “Highly Qualified Teacher”.**

C.3 Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers  
(This field will be automatically calculated by the MEDMS online HQT Report)

**Reasons for NON- “Highly Qualified Status”** **Reasons for NON- “Highly Qualified Status”**  
**(The total reported in this section, when added to C.2.m, must equal the total number of core academic classes reported in C.1.m or MEDMS will not accept the report)**

- n) \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)
- o) \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE
- p) \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)
- q) **Other (please explain)**

## Maine's "Highly Qualified Teacher" Data Comparison 2004 - 2008

### PERCENTAGES OF *CLASSES* TAUGHT BY HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS BY CONTENT AREA

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS							
Content Area "Classes"	State Avg. 2003-2004	State Avg. 2005-2006	% Change 03-04 to 05-06	State Avg. 2006-2007	% Change 05-06 to 06-07	State Avg. 2007-2008	% Change 06-07 to 07-08
General Elementary	96.17%	97.57%	+1.40%	97.90%	+0.33%	98.74%	+0.84%
Visual/Performing Arts	93.30%	96.17%	+2.87%	95.66%	-0.51%	96.94%	+1.28%
World Languages	85.41%	86.26%	+0.85%	88.24%	+1.98%	86.34%	-1.9%
Basic Skills Math	82.00%	88.20%	+6.20%	96.54%	+8.34%	98.71%	+2.17%
Basic Skills English	90.07%	94.13%	+4.06%	98.14%	+4.01%	99.16%	+1.02%
Special Education	78.48%	93.32%	+14.84%	90.91%	-2.41%	93.29%	+2.35%
English as a Second Language	91.84%	99.49%	+7.65%	99.51%	+0.02%	100%	+0.49%
Other Core Academic Subject	95.56%	96.67%	+1.11%	97.98%	+1.31%	96.20%	-1.78%
SECONDARY SCHOOLS							
Content Area "Classes"	State Avg. 2003-2004	State Avg. 2005-2006	% Change 03-04 to 05-06	State Avg. 2006-2007	% Change 05-06 to 06-07	State Avg. 2007-2008	% Change 06-07 to 07-08
English/Language Arts/Reading	93.62%	97.22%	+3.60%	97.47%	+0.25%	98.20%	+0.84%
Social Studies	57.14%	95.13%	+37.99%	97.00%	+1.87%	97.60%	+0.60%
Science	87.71%	93.70%	+5.99%	94.04%	+0.34%	95.94%	+1.90%
Mathematics	79.25%	93.46%	+14.21%	93.61%	+0.15%	95.64%	+2.03%
Visual/Performing Arts	87.41%	97.01%	+9.6%	97.08%	+0.07%	97.82%	+0.74%
World Languages	77.72%	91.37%	+13.65%	92.01%	+0.64%	91.97%	-0.04%
Basic Skills Math	85.74%	94.44%	+8.70%	95.93%	+1.49%	96.28%	+0.35%
Basic Skills English	87.41%	96.59%	+9.18%	95.01%	+1.58%	95.89%	+0.88%
Special Education	77.72%	84.20%	+6.48%	84.35%	+0.15%	86.87%	+2.52%
English as a Second Language	85.74%	94.09%	+8.35%	95.96%	+1.87%	80.89%	-15.07%
Other Core Academic Subject	87.56%	96.04%	+8.48%	97.19%	+1.15%	96.26%	-0.93%
Alternative Education Core Academic	63.74%	80.88%	+17.14%	81.56%	+0.68%	80.18%	-1.38%

**Maine’s Consolidated School Performance Report (CSPR)  
2007 – 2008 School Year Data**

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by NOT Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by NOT Highly Qualified Teachers	Housse Rubric Teachers
All Schools in State	54808.20	52543.70	95.87 %	2264.50	4.13 %	8650.20
Elementary Level						
High-Poverty Schools	7175.70	6903.70	96.21 %	272.00	3.79 %	2023.70
Low-Poverty Schools	3254.50	3218.00	98.88 %	36.50	1.12 %	1017.50
All Elementary Schools	19790.20	19177.70	96.91 %	612.50	3.09 %	5586.70
Secondary Level						
High-Poverty Schools	5212.00	4887.00	93.76 %	325.00	6.24 %	509.00
Low-Poverty Schools	11427.00	11041.00	96.62 %	386.00	3.38 %	1000.00
All Secondary Schools	35018.00	33366.00	95.28 %	1652.00	4.72 %	3063.50

**Number of Maine Staff by Years of Experience  
Calculated Annually (Sample)**

2005-06	Zero Years	1 Years	2 Years	Total of all Staff 0-19 years of more
Women	228	340	307	11740
Men	89	125	119	4262
	317	465	426	16002

1208 = total # of “inexperienced teachers” in State

16002 = total # of teachers in State

7.55% = State average of inexperienced teachers

5% or more above State average = “high % of inexperienced teachers”

12.5% or greater = “high % of inexperienced teachers”

## **SAMPLE DATA TABLE FOR COMPARISON AND IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH NEED SCHOOLS**

SAUName	SchoolName	Teacher Count	Tea < 3 yrs exp	% w < 3 yrs exp.	07-08 HQT %	AMO Priority	AYP Status
ABC	SCHOOL #1	5	3	60.00%	100		pending
DEF	SCHOOL #2	4	2	50.00%	100		no
GHI	SCHOOL #3	7	3	42.86%	90.91		no
JKL	SCHOOL #4	11	4	36.36%	100		no

### **Appendix B**

#### **Strategy # 1,**

#### **Offer financial incentives to encourage teachers to work in high need schools**

ADMINISTRATIVE LETTER: 29  
 POLICY CODE: GCB  
 DATE: May 26, 2006  
 RE: New Minimum Teacher Salary Requirements

On May 9, 2006, Governor Baldacci signed Public Law, Chapter 635 – An Act to Update Minimum Teachers’ Salaries. The law repeals the existing statutory minimum teacher salary of \$15,500 established in 1987. It requires school administrative units to pay certified teachers a minimum salary of \$27,000 for the school year beginning July 1, 2006 and \$30,000 for the school year beginning July 1, 2007 and beyond. The law provides for dedicated State funding to achieve the minimum salary requirements in FY2007 and the Legislative intent to fund the \$30,000 minimum required in FY2008 and beyond. Qualifying school administrative units will be required to submit a list of eligible certified teachers in September of each fiscal year and an adjustment will be made to the unit’s subsidy to cover the costs of the difference between what the teacher would otherwise be paid on the local teacher salary scale and the required minimums set forth in Chapter 635.

The full text of this letter can be accessed at:  
<http://www.maine.gov/education/edlets/adletarchive.shtml#y2006>

### **Appendix C**

#### **Strategy # 2,**

#### **Require and fund mentoring and induction programs to give teachers the support that they need to succeed and remain in challenging schools**

Maine State Regulation Chapter 118: *Purposes, Standards and Procedures for Educational Personnel Support Systems* was revised and adopted in July 2007. The regulation can be accessed at: <http://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/rules/05/chaps05.htm>

**Chapter 118 Support Systems: Standards and Procedures for Operation  
Comparison Chart**

*(Highlighted sections indicate no change to existing system)*

	Current Chapter 118	Newly Adopted Chapter 118
1		A timeline allowing SAU's to use the current Chapter 118 until August 2010, and allowing for a transitional period using both documents.
2	<b>Local certification steering committees oversee the certification of their educators</b>	<b>Local certification steering committees oversee the certification of their educators</b>
3	<b>3 person support team</b> guides the beginning educator through the initial certification process	<b>1 mentor</b> guides the beginning educator through the initial certification process
4	Locally <b>approved mentor training is required</b>	Maine Department of Education <b>approved mentor training is required</b>
5	Support team members meet with beginning teachers when convenient or as needed/ requested	Mentors meet with beginning teachers at "regularly scheduled meetings" (interpretation left up to local control)
6	Earning the initial professional certificate is based on demonstration of the <b>Competencies Leading to Proficiency</b>	Earning the initial professional certificate will be based on demonstration of <b>Maine's Initial Teacher Certification Standards</b>
7	"The following standards for professional growth leading to competency shall be the basis upon which a teacher action plan is drafted, observations and assessments made, and recommendations adopted for purposes of professional-level certification."	The following language was added: "... <i>observations and needs assessments made</i> ", and " <i>The indicators accompanying each standard are meant to be used holistically to inform the assessment of the standard.</i> " Clarifying that it is a " <b>needs assessment</b> " (added elsewhere the word "assessment" occurs) and each indicator does <b>not</b> need to be demonstrated to meet the standard.
8	<b>The beginning educator must be observed 3 times per year by the support team members</b>	<b>The beginning educator must be observed 3 times per year by the mentor</b>
9	The local certification steering committee <b>shall include a majority of classroom teachers,... and at least one administrator</b>	The Professional Learning Community Support System team <b>shall include professionally certified educators, one administrator, and optionally educational technicians</b>
10	<b>Contains no language specific to the use of retired or inactive educators</b> as support team members	The language, " <b>recently active practitioners</b> " was <b>added to allow the use of mentors who may not be currently teaching, to increase the available pool.</b>
11	Teacher Action Plan <b>based on the "Standards for Professional Growth Leading to Competency"</b>	Professional Certification Action Plan <b>based on "Maine's Initial Teacher Certification Standards"</b>
12	<b>Local demonstration of the "Standards for Professional Growth Leading to Competency"</b> will be used for issuing an initial Master Teacher Certificate	<b>Local demonstration of the National Board Standards, or attainment of National Board Certification,</b> will be used for issuing an initial Master Teacher Certificate
13	No language relating to state funding	Implementation of the local revised plan is dependent upon the receipt of <u>appropriate additional funding</u> through the EPS formula
14	<b>The local certification steering committee "signs off" on teacher action plan and recommends professional certification</b>	<b>The local certification steering committee "signs off" on teacher action plan and recommends professional certification</b>

Over 270 mentor trainers have been trained in delivering Maine's Model of Mentor Training. This is being done to build State-wide capacity for training mentors, which will be a requirement of the new rules governing new teacher induction in Maine when Chapter 118 is adopted and implemented.

It was decided to use the 50% saturation point in each of the nine Superintendent regions as the goal in order to assure that each LEA would have available trainers in reasonable proximity. That goal will have already been met in all but one region by April of 2008.

### **Percentage of LEA's in Maine Superintendent's Regions with Certified Mentor Trainers as of June '08**

Region I: Aroostook: 59%  
Region III Washington: 100%  
Region V: Mid Coast: 38%  
Region VII: Cumberland: 80%  
Region IX: York: 67%

Region II: Penquis: 81%  
Region IV: Hancock: 88%  
Region VI: Western: 81%  
Region VIII: Kennebec: 75%

## **Appendix D**

### **Strategy # 3,**

### **Support the development of high quality alternative route programs to create a pool of teachers specifically for high need schools**

## **SPARC**

### **Special Education Alternate Route To Certification A Program Of ON-LINE Courses And Coaching For Individuals Seeking Special Education Certification**

*Partially Funded Through a Transitions to Teaching Grant, US Department of Education*

**SPARC: Special Education Alternate Route to Certification: *The Right Resources At the Right Time***  
School districts throughout Central and Western Maine are coping with a severe shortage of special educators. The SPARC program is designed to help individuals and districts meet this challenge in effective and efficient ways: *on-line courses and face-to-face coaching.*

**WHICH 24?** Maine requires 24 credits of coursework for special education certification. Several leaders in the special education field have come together to design the SPARC program to address the specific skills and knowledge they believe **a special educator needs to thrive and flourish** within the 24 credits required. (*Interested candidates should also check with the Maine Department of Education Office for other requirements of Special Education Certification beyond coursework.*)

**WHY A PROGRAM? WHY NOT JUST COURSES?** Some personnel will choose merely to accumulate the 24 credits needed for certification. SPARC is designed for those who are looking for cohesion and deeper application. However,

individuals who have acquired some of the 24 required credits in other ways will be welcomed into SPARC.

The SPARC program's foundation is rooted in two major principles:

- *The credits need to be focused on specific sets of skills and bodies of knowledge;*
- *Inexperienced special educators need face-to-face coaching to handle both the "real time" issues and legal aspects of working with students with disabilities.*

## What Are the Courses? What Is the Schedule?

SPARC will offer a minimum of 8 courses (3 graduate credits each) on a rotating schedule on-line. Each course is appropriate for K-12 teachers; modifications of assignments will be made based on the grade level each participant teaches.

**WHAT ARE THE COURSES? WHAT IS THE CONTENT?** The courses, as planned now, will include:

- *Coaching Practicum.* This course will provide a coach, approximately once a week, in the participant's own classroom to offer expert assistance, modeling, and advice. Sponsors of SPARC urge individuals to select this course at least once to receive the full benefit of the program.
- *Curriculum and Instruction.* Participants will learn how to develop curriculum appropriate to each student and how to design clear instructions and goals for Individual Education Plans (IEPs).
- *Classroom and Behavior Management.* Participants will explore basic principles of classroom and behavior management from prevention of problems through positive responses to chronic behaviors.
- *Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities.* This course will focus on the five elements of literacy instruction as they relate to students with disabilities: phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary.
- *Mathematics Instruction for Students with Disabilities.* This course will address the specific foundational concepts and demonstrate specific strategies for teaching mathematics to students with disabilities.
- *Special Education Rules and Regulations.* Special education laws, rules, and regulations, and their applicability in the everyday life of a special educator will be addressed in this course. Participants will learn how to manage PETs and how to develop IEPs that are meaningful and productive for the children and parents involved.
- *Achieving High Standards with Assistive Technology.* This course will explore a variety of assistive technology options which can support students with disabilities and their access to the general curriculum. Devices from the simple to more advanced will be explored.
- *Collaboration with Parents and Community Agencies.* Special educators are in constant and continuing contact with parents, social service agencies, and other support groups. This course will focus on collaboration and teaming strategies that are most effective in such settings.

**WHAT IS THE TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF COURSE OFFERINGS?** The schedule of course offerings is still in development. However, a tentative schedule is given here for individuals who wish to begin planning.

**Course Costs.** For the courses offered through Summer 2007, costs will be:

Tuition: \$810

Fees: \$ 50

Total \$860

*Additional fees may apply.*

**For Additional Information or to Register, Contact:**

Valerie Soucie at 778-7502 or [valerie.soucie@maine.edu](mailto:valerie.soucie@maine.edu)

Pam Wilson at 778-7186 or [pwilson@maine.edu](mailto:pwilson@maine.edu)

**The Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP)** is a graduate level teacher education program that leads to elementary, secondary, and special education certifications and a master's degree. Committed to equitable and engaging learning, the faculty works closely with school partners to ensure that prospective teachers are competent, caring, and qualified.

### **What the ETEP options are**

- **9-Month program:** a full-time elementary or secondary certification program that leads to a master of science in education in teaching and learning (M.S.Ed.). It begins mid-August and continues through May.
- **Unified: a two-year dual certification program with two options:**
  - A unified elementary option that combines K-8 general education certification with K-8 special education certification. All of the coursework in this option is online.
  - A unified elementary option that combines K-8 general education certification with K-12 ESL certification. All of the coursework in this option is online.
  - A unified secondary option that combines a 7-12 certification in a selected content area or a K-12 foreign language, with a 7-12 special education certification. Some of the coursework in this option is online.All three options lead to a master of science in education (M.S.Ed.) in Teaching and Learning. They are especially suitable for education paraprofessionals who want to be teachers.
- **Special Education (K-8 or 7-12):** This option will lead individuals to initial teacher certification in special education at either the K-8 or 7-12 level.
- **Newcomer:** an option designed to recruit recent immigrants and language-minority candidates into teaching, done in collaboration with Portland Public Schools.

### **What the Advantages of ETEP are**

- **Personalized and Supportive Learning:** Teacher candidates are organized into groups of 15-20. These groups work closely with faculty and school-based site coordinators, take classes together, and provide an ongoing network for interactive learning and support.
- **Intensive Mentored Internships:** Throughout the entire internship year(s) -from the first day of school in September until May-ETEP interns are placed in K-12 classrooms with experienced teachers. These classrooms serve as "learning laboratories" where interns can practice the ideas and concepts they are studying in their professional teaching courses and learn the essentials of classroom management, instructional planning, responsive teaching, and the ongoing assessment of student learning.
- **Graduate-Level Degree Program:** ETEP courses and seminars are taught by experienced USM faculty and school practitioners and provide in-depth opportunities to connect content and pedagogy. The program leads to a master of science in education.
- **School Partnerships:** ETEP was created in 1990 in close collaboration with southern Maine school districts and has remained well-connected to school partners. This relationship has kept the program vital and relevant and accounts for the high rate of job placements achieved by our graduates in their first year out of the program.

## Who ETEP serves

- **People with a bachelor's degree** who want to be elementary school, middle school, high school, or special education school teachers.
- **Career changers with a bachelor's degree** who want to become an elementary school, middle school, high school, or special education school teachers.
- **Educational technicians with a bachelor's degree** who want to change careers and become an elementary school, middle school, high school, or special education school teachers.
- **Conditionally certified teachers** seeking a master's degree as they complete coursework to fulfill teacher certification requirements.

## Steps to Applying to ETEP

1. The most important step in applying to ETEP is to read the handbook for prospective students: [ETEP Handbook for Prospective Students](#) (pdf)
2. Take the Praxis I exam: Schedule Praxis I as soon as you can, even if you need time to study for it, the longer you wait to get a test date the more likely it is that you will have difficulty getting a date and time.
3. Request official transcripts from all colleges and universities attended
4. Choose three people for letters of recommendation: These letters should be from people who know you working with kids in a teaching and learning environment. They can also be from people who can speak to your ability to be success in a graduate program.
5. Update your resume
6. Complete the application, including essay, catalog of experience, and [ETEP Program Selection Sheet](#)
7. Send all application materials to the:

Office of Graduate Admissions  
P.O. Box 9300  
Portland, ME 04104

Letters of recommendation, transcripts, etc can be sent directly to Graduate Admissions (39 Exeter Street)) and they will be held until your application has been received.

- [ETEP Program Selection Sheet](#)
- [Application for Admission to Graduate Study](#)
- [Recommendation Form](#) (pdf)

**For more information about ETEP or how to apply, please contact:**

Teacher Education Department  
(207) 780-5413  
[etep@usm.maine.edu](mailto:etep@usm.maine.edu)

## **Appendix E**

### **Strategy # 4,** **Improve working conditions to retain teachers**

The full text of the “Teacher Workload and Stressor” Report can be found at the following web address:

<http://www.maine.gov/education/edleters/2006/ilet/06ilet115workload.pdf>

#### **Excerpt:**

*Average length of school day for all teachers is approximately 7 hours, which is often increased by required before-and after-school meetings.*

*The average number of hours worked by the responding teachers, beyond the 35 hour base-line, is more than 16 hours per week.*

*Nearly all teachers have seen an increase in the amount of time spent on most job related tasks. Most notable changes were in the areas of class preparation and assessment of student work. These changes, more specifically, were related to curriculum alignment with the Maine Learning Results and various aspects of student assessments.*

*Given a list of 15 factors that could potentially increase teachers’ workload, the most frequently selected factors were: curriculum alignment with the Maine Learning Results, student assessment requirements, compliance with No Child Left Behind, and getting students to expected levels of performance.*

*Factors causing the most stress for teachers are the same as those that they perceive to have increased their workload in the last three years: compliance with No Child Left Behind, student assessment requirements, curriculum alignment with the Maine Learning Results, and getting students to expected levels of performance. Additionally, nearly one third of the respondents cited student behavior as one of the factors causing the most stress.*

*Special education programs and library/media resources were viewed as highly supportive by all teachers. Special education teachers were more likely to view education technician resources as highly supportive as were the other teachers.*

*When asked what strategies school districts have implemented to help manage time and accommodate workload, 42% described district strategies that included common planning time, release time, use of time derived from the use of specialists, sharing students, late start days and early release days. Thirty percent of the respondents commented that no strategies had been implemented and most described added responsibilities with no reduction in existing responsibilities.*

*There is a high level of dissatisfaction with teaching as a profession among respondents to the survey. Forty-four percent indicated if they could start over, they would not choose teaching. More than half (60.6%) of the respondents indicated they have seriously considered leaving the profession in the last two years.*

***See also Appendix B for “Minimum Teacher Salary Increase” documentation.***

#### **The Teaching, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Survey**

The Maine Education Association and the Maine Department of Education conducted the state’s first statewide teaching conditions survey in 2008. The survey, which was administered through the New Teacher Center at the University of California at Santa Cruz in December 2007 and

January 2008, was sent to all school-based, licensed educators throughout the state of Maine. The TeLL Maine Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey provides data to schools, districts, and the state about whether educators have the supportive school environments necessary for them to continue working and be successful with students. By hearing directly from educators who intimately understand teaching conditions, policymakers will have the opportunity to make data-driven decisions to develop policies that make Maine schools great places to work and learn.

The TeLL Maine Teaching and Learning Condition Survey included approximately ten<sup>1</sup> questions with multiple subparts, broken into six major sections: time, facilities and resources, empowerment, leadership, professional development, and mentoring. There were also questions covering the demographics of respondents, such as position held, years of experience, and educational background. Surveys were administered to teachers, principals, vice principals, and other education professionals (e.g., school counselors, psychologists, social workers, library media specialists, etc.). Most of the questions were asked of all respondents, though some were asked only of specific groups. Only teachers in their first year and those indicating that they served as mentors were asked about induction. Further, a set of questions about district support in creating positive teaching conditions was asked specifically of principals.

The survey instrument was developed by the New Teacher Center with input and guidance from a subcommittee of stakeholders and researchers including the Maine Education Association and the Maine Department of Education. A set of core, validated questions from previous teaching conditions surveys was utilized, while others were developed specifically for the state, including questions on workload and stressors adapted from the Maine Education Policy Research Institute's survey conducted for The Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Workload (Maine Education Policy Research Institute, November 2004). The statistical analyses conducted using the TeLL Maine survey data included: a factor analysis of the findings that resulted in a reorganization of the survey areas into three major categories of responses: leadership, support for practice, and workload and stress. In addition, cross tabulations of findings by future employment plans, school level, years of experience; as well as frequencies of all questions were conducted for this interim report.

Surveys were sent to all school-based educators in the State of Maine. More than 5,100 Maine educators (27 percent of all Maine educators) from across the state participated in the TeLL Maine Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey. This includes responses from 4,739 teachers, 43 principals, 14 assistant principals, and 341 other education professionals. Data is now available for 159 schools and 35 districts, thus providing critical information for making local and state level decisions to improve Maine schools. Data is only released at the school level if at least 40 percent of the school faculty responded to the survey. Data for the state is publicly available at [www.tellmaine.org](http://www.tellmaine.org). Schools and districts with a sufficient response rate received a password to access their data for their own school improvement planning. This survey data is unique in that it represents the perceptions of those who understand Maine teaching and learning conditions best—the educators who experience them every day. See: <http://www.tellmaine.org/>

## Appendix F

### Strategy # 5, Adopt policies to increase the number of National Board Certified Teachers in “high need” schools

#### PART AAAA

Sec. AAAA-1. 20-A MRS §13013-A is enacted to read:

#### §13013-A. Salary supplement for national board-certified teachers

1. Salary supplement. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Education shall provide a public school teacher who has attained certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, or its successor organization, as of July 1, 2006 or thereafter with an annual national board certification salary supplement of \$3,000 for the life of the certificate. The salary supplement must be added to the teacher's base salary and must be considered in the calculation for contributions to the Maine State Retirement System. If a nationally certified teacher becomes no longer employed as a classroom teacher in the field of that teacher's national certification, the supplement ceases.

2. Local filing; certification. On or before October 15th annually, the superintendent of schools of a school administrative unit shall file with the commissioner a certified list of national board-certified teachers eligible to receive the salary supplement pursuant to subsection 1.

3. Payment. The department shall provide the salary supplement to eligible teachers no later than February 15th of each year.

ADMINISTRATIVE LETTER: 3  
POLICY CODE: GCFC

DATE: September 14, 2006

RE: National Board Certification Salary Supplement for Teachers

On March 29, 2006, Governor Baldacci signed Public Law, Chapter 519 Part AAAA-1, which includes a provision for a salary supplement for national board certified teachers. The law provides that a public school teacher who has attained certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards shall receive an annual salary supplement of \$3,000 for the life of the certificate. The salary supplement must be added to the calculation for contributions to the Maine State Retirement System. The Department of Education is required to provide the salary supplement to eligible teachers no later than February 15th of each year and the Maine State Retirement System (MSRS) shall provide the required contribution to (MSRS).

The full text of this Administrative Letter can be accessed at:  
<http://www.maine.gov/education/edletrs/adletarchive.shtml#y2007>

# Appendix G

## Strategy # 6,

### Provide intensive professional development in core academic content to teachers currently working in high need schools

*No Child Left behind Act of 2001*

Public Law 107-110

**Title II, Part A, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants**

## The Maine Content Literacy Project

Submitted to the Maine Department of Education

Title II Part A, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

By

The University of Maine at Farmington

On Behalf of the University of Maine System  
And

The Regional Education Collaborative Network



Figure: *A Leadership Model for Improving Adolescent Literacy* (Irvin, Meltzer & Dukes, 2006)

### Abstract

The Maine Content Literacy Project (MCLP) is a collaborative effort of University of Maine System (UMS) faculty in education and arts and sciences from four campuses; 21 school districts (LEAs) throughout the state, including 10 of the 12 high needs districts identified in the guidance; 5 regional educational partnerships; and other P-16 stakeholders. Responding to the need to increase academic achievement of all students and recognizing that the greatest in-school predictor of student success is teacher effectiveness, MCLP will focus on content area and content literacy professional development needs of PK-12 teachers, leadership skill development for administrators, and collaboration between university and school faculties. The analysis of LEA-specific professional development needs and student achievement will serve as the foundation on which to base site-specific, collaboratively designed activities. Academic courses in core content areas, with a focus on literacy,

will be offered for teachers lacking “highly qualified” credentials. Using content literacy expertise led by Dr. Julie Meltzer and colleagues, MCLP will facilitate professional development for district personnel to sustain efforts and build capacity in content literacy for sustainability. Consistent with the guidance, we propose four goals: (1) increase the number of highly qualified PK-12 teachers; (2) increase the number of teachers participating in high quality content literacy professional development activities; (3) increase student achievement in core content areas through the integration of content literacy strategies, reducing the need for remedial literacy courses at the post-secondary level; and (4) create a leadership model for sustainable, capacity-building professional development in content literacy.

*See appendix C: “Certified Mentor Trainers” section*

*No Child Left behind Act of 2001*

Public Law 107-110

**Title II, Part A, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants**

## **CLLC: CONTENT LITERACY LEARNING COMMUNITIES**

**A Professional Development Partnership Coordinated by**

**Maine’s Regional Teacher Development Center Initiative**

### **Abstract**

The University of Maine System’s (USM’s) Regional Teacher Development Center (RTDC) Initiative oversee the establishment of the Content Literacy Learning Communities (CLLC) Project, a collaborative effort of UMS faculty in education and arts and sciences, schools throughout the state, regional educational partners, and other P-16 stakeholders. Responding to the failure of grade 4-12 Maine students to meet grade-level standards, and recognizing that the greatest in-school predictor of student success is teacher effectiveness, CLLC will focus on content area and content literacy professional development needs of teachers and administrators. The examination and analysis of student work will serve as a foundation on which to base site-specific, site-designed activities. CLLC will support the development of intense learning opportunities during the summer and sustained, year-round activities live and online. Integrated into the design of activities will be the use of appropriate and varied technologies. Academic courses in content areas, with a focus on literacy, will be offered for teachers lacking “highly qualified” credentials. Using content literacy expertise from the state and region, CLLC will facilitate the training of district personnel to sustain efforts and increase capacity for professional development in content literacy after the grant period has ended. CLLC has two goals: (1) To increase student achievement in reading and writing in grades 4-12; and (2) To create and implement a model for sustainable, capacity-building professional development. School-specific targets for goal achievement will be established early in the first year of the Project, once detailed needs assessments have been completed

### **Center for New Educators of Mathematics and Science**

The Center for New England Educators of Mathematics and Science (CNEMS) is a four year collaboration among 14 rural high need schools in Maine and the Maine Mathematics and Science Alliance addressing the critical need to recruit, prepare, place, support, and retain qualified high school mathematics and science teachers, while building strong teacher leadership to support a sustainable model.

CNEMS is designed to support new teachers who are recent graduates of a teacher preparation program, recently assigned to teach outside of their certification area or enter teaching through alternative certification routes. In addition, it will elevate the skills and knowledge of experienced teachers preparing them to step into new professional strictures, roles, and responsibilities for supporting new teachers and implementing standards-based mathematics and science reform efforts at the district, regional, and state level. Higher education partners will participate in the recruitment and placement of these teachers and the districts and the Maine Mathematics and Science Alliance (MMSA) will provide co-mentoring and professional development support for the new and experienced teachers enhancing their own skills and knowledge, forging new and strengthening existing collaborations with high schools.

CNEMS will build on the collaboration and the infrastructure of the MMSA and multiple strategies for increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in rural high schools. These include supports such as education scholarships, future teacher clubs, innovative professional development session's for embedded strategies, mentoring structures based on research, support fro mentors, collaborations with school districts and institutes of higher education, electronic support and reflective dialogue, and ongoing collegial contact to create a coherent and continuous curriculum of learning for experienced and new high school teachers. One focus is to increase the number of people who are interested in teaching mathematics and science through leadership in the context of improved science and mathematics learning.

CNEMS will provide a systematic approach and curriculum, while allowing for flexibility and experimentation to learn what works best in local districts. The project will built on the existing infrastructure and teacher leadership program capacity of the MMSA for supporting new teachers. It will draw upon the knowledge base about content based induction programs ( Michigan State University and WestEd. 2006), effective professional development research at the National Institute for Science Education (Loucks-Horsley, Hewson, Love & Stiles, 1998), research into international induction practices (Britton, Raizen, Paine, & Huntley, 2000), leadership strategies from the National Academy for Science and Mathematics Education Leadership (2000-present), mentoring strategies in high schools from the Northern New England Co-Mentoring Network ( 2002-2006), recruitment strategies from the Maine Mathematics and Science Teaching Excellence Collaborative (2002-2006), and electronic mentoring strategies from the NSTA Electronic Mentoring for Science Success (2004-present). The MMSA has been involved with each of these efforts, and the MMSA will continue to collaborate with the University of Maine, The University of Maine at Farmington, the University of Southern Maine, the National Science Teachers Association, and the New Teacher Center for advice on the design and implementation of the CNEMS.

*No Child Left behind Act of 2001*

Public Law 107-110

**Title II, Part A, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants**

**Abstract: Higher Literacy for Washington County** is a collaborative of **all** the schools in Washington County including the Seven High Need LEAs, SAD #19, SAD #37, Eastport, Jonesport, Machias, Pembroke, Wesley grades 4-12, with the University of Maine, Machias, and the Washington County Consortium for School Improvement (WCC) as partners. Dr. Julie Meltzer from the Center of Research Management and literacy expert/author will be working with the partners. Improving student achievement and Teacher Quality for all High Needs teachers and for all staff members is at the heart of this project.

As a result of this project there will be:

1. Increased student achievement through the increased numbers of highly qualified teachers by working with UMM, USM, Regional Teacher Development Center (RTDC), the use of data for instruction, programming by school-based literacy teams, documentation by the coach, support for the struggling readers; and the development of a school literacy plan across the curriculum.

2. Increased teacher capacity for literacy instruction for all learners through workshops, undergraduate courses, graduate courses, coaching and mentoring, book discussions, web resources, study groups, content groups, computer programs, and sharing from one site to another through ATM or Polycom.

3. Sustainable, collaborative learning communities in each school.

4. Leadership support at the regional and local level to sustain the project beyond the grant with structures and policies in place, and to drive the school's action plan to successfully lead their school in this project.

### **State of Maine Procedure for Allocating Excess Title IIA Funds**

The state educational agency (SEA) has developed procedures to identify local education agencies (LEAs) with excess Title IIA funds and to reallocate excess funds to other eligible LEAs.

#### **Reallocated Funds**

The identification of excess funds is as follows:

- Carryover funds exceeding the allowable percentage of 15%
- Funds allocated to any LEA that elected not to participate in the Title IIA program,
- Funds from an LEA that had its allocation reduced because it failed to meet the maintenance of effort requirement, or
- Funds in excess for other reasons (i.e. LEA voluntary release of funds, recovered funds that an LEA has failed to use in accordance with the law.

The SEA will reallocate excess Title IIA funds to LEAs with the greatest need for such funds for the purposes of addressing inequities inherent in, or mitigating hardships caused by the application of the allocation provisions. LEAs meeting the following criteria due to factors such as population shifts and changing economic circumstances will be considered those in greatest need:

- LEAs having the greatest increase in the percentage of children from poor families for the previous year, and
- LEAs failing to meet annual measurable objective for increasing highly qualified teachers by 2%, and
- LEA's failing to meet annual measurable objectives to increase by 2% the number of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and
- LEAs with less than the maximum allowable carryover funds from the previous school year.

#### **Application Procedure**

The SEA notifies LEAs in October of the possibility of reallocated funds. An LEA must submit to the SEA by November 30 its intent to apply for the reallocated funds by submitting documentation of the above criteria and its proposed use of the funds. Allowable uses of these funds would be the same as allowable uses for all Title IIA funds but proposed uses should address areas of identified weakness.

By January 1, the SEA will determine the amount of funds available and will establish a rank ordered list of LEAs. When a district is notified that reallocated funds are being reserved for use in their identified project, it will be necessary for the LEA to submit an Application for Reallocated Funds within thirty days. If the application is not submitted within thirty days, the SEA will offer the funds to the next prioritized LEA. The SEA will continue to fund the eligible LEAs in order of identified need to the extent possible.

**Local Education Agency (SAU) Action Plan for Teacher Quality, and Equitable Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers  
2008-2009 School Year**

SAU NAME	SUPERINTENDENT NAME (PRINT OR TYPE)	SUP. SIGNATURE /	DATE
----------	-------------------------------------	------------------	------

NAME OF DESIGNATED POINT-OF-CONTACT	TELEPHONE NUMBER	CONTACT PERSON'S E-MAIL
-------------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------

PLAN APPROVED BY (PERSON OR ENTITY) /DATE	PLAN APPROVED BY (MDOE STAFF)/DATE
---	------------------------------------

I. **NEEDS ASSESSMENT:** Enter SAU-level data from the 2007-2008 school year for the following elements.

<b>1. Core Academic Subject Teachers who are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>2. Core Academic Subject Classes taught By teachers who are NOT Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>3. Core Academic Subject Teachers who are "Inexperienced" (less than 3 years experience).</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>4. Core Academic Subject Classes that are taught by "Inexperienced" teachers (less than 3 years experience).</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>5. Core Academic Subjects, Grades, and Student Groups in Which the SAU Did NOT Make AYP based on Spring 2006 statewide assessments</b>			

<b>6. Core Academic Subjects and Grades That Have Teaching Vacancies That the SAU CANNOT Fill with HQ Teachers</b>	
<b>7. % of HQTs in high poverty schools compared to % of HQT in other schools.</b>	

Add any other data for the SAU that establishes needs related to ensuring that all core academic subject teachers are highly qualified.

II. **TARGET AUDIENCE:** Using the following chart, **identify the target audience – core academic subject teachers that are NOT highly qualified, and/or are inexperienced, and core academic subject classes taught by teachers that are NOT highly qualified, and/or are inexperienced.** Below the table, write a brief summary to describe highly qualified teacher needs in the SAU

(see sample Action Plan on page 7 of this document)

School Name and Descriptive Information	Grade(s)	Subject	No. of Classes Taught	Notes/Comments

**SUMMARY:**

III. **PLANNING COLLABORATION:** Create a list of individuals that collaborated to develop the SAU plan

Name of Individual	Position or Relationship to SAU	Contact Information	Notes
	<b>SAU Superintendent</b>		
	<b>SAU designated contact for “highly qualified” teacher issues</b>		
<b>Daniel Conley</b>	<b>Teacher Quality coordinator</b>	<a href="mailto:Dan.conley@maine.gov">Dan.conley@maine.gov</a>  624-6639	

Barbara Moody	MDOE Title II Coordinator	<a href="mailto:Barbara.moody@maine.gov">Barbara.moody@maine.gov</a> 624-6830	
	Teacher (already "highly qualified")		
	Local School Administrator		
	Other? (New Teacher Mentor, new teacher, Certification Chair, ...)		

**IV. SAU ACTIONS TO GET ALL TEACHERS HIGHLY QUALIFIED:** List and describe SAU actions to get all teachers highly qualified and to ensure that poor and minority students and those in schools identified for improvement are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other students. Refer to the Needs Assessment and Target Audience analysis to keep local needs in mind. Insert lines in the chart, as needed.

SAU Action	Person Responsible	Resources (Fund Source/ \$\$)	Complete Date	Notes
1. Appoint a system-level administrator as the single point-of-contact who will work directly with teachers and with MDOE staff on "highly qualified" issues.				
2. Consider (1) changing teacher assignments within a school, (2) within-school transfers, and (3) between-school transfers to have teachers highly qualified.				
3. Conduct a meeting with each teacher who is not yet highly qualified. Develop an individual action plan with each teacher. (see HQT "Teacher Action Statements")				

attached)				
<b>4. Schedule and conduct periodic checks for completion of agreed-upon actions.</b>				
<b>5. Ensure that each teacher who is not yet highly qualified receives support and assistance related to content knowledge and teaching skills needed for the teaching assignment, including teacher mentoring and high-quality professional development, both of which must meet the state and NCLB definitions and criteria for those professional components.</b>				
<b>6. Plan steps to increase teacher retention and thus reduce % of inexperienced teachers (induction, incentives, etc.).</b>				
<b>OTHER?</b>				

**Guidance for SAU Action Plans for Highly Qualified Teachers  
(Meeting and Maintaining the 100% Goal)**

This document provides guidance for local education agencies (SAUs) for meeting and maintaining the 100% goal of having all core academic subject teachers “highly qualified.” Information and expectations herein are based on statutory requirements in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). Laws, documents, and memoranda referenced in this guidance are available on the State Department of Education Web site at the following link: <http://www.maine.gov/education/index.shtml>

NCLB requires that all core academic subject teachers be “highly qualified” by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. Informational Letter 152 dated June 7, 2006, from Commissioner Gendron to SAU superintendents clarified that “the end of the 2005-2006 school year” is interpreted as August 31, 2006. NCLB Section 2141 describes what the state and SAUs must do if the 100% goal is not met. Specifically, SAUs that are identified “high poverty”, have a low percentage of highly qualified teachers and/or a high percentage of inexperienced teachers **will have the opportunity to:**

1. Develop or revise a plan for the SAU, in consultation with the MDOE, that describes specific actions that will be taken and uses of federal funds to assist teachers in meeting the “highly qualified teacher” requirement.
2. Develop a plan for each core academic subject teacher who is not highly qualified.
3. Develop a general plan that includes strategies for retention of inexperienced teacher, i.e. induction, targeted professional development or incentives or supports, etc.

NCLB Section 1119(a)(3) requires that **each SAU have a plan that describes actions the SAU will take to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified.** Section 2122(b)(10) requires that the plan describe how the SAU will use Title II funds to meet the requirements of Section 1119. **Additionally, the plan must include specific strategies that will be implemented to ensure that poor and minority students and those in schools identified for improvement are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers**

**at higher rates than are other students.** If the SAU has a plan that meets these requirements, the plan can be refined to describe specific actions the SAU will implement and specific uses of Title I, Title II, and other funds to support the planned actions.

SAU plans must be approved locally, through whatever mechanism is required by the SAU, and submitted to the State Department of Education if application is made for technical assistance. Submit plans by regular mail, electronic mail, or hand delivery to:

Barbara Moody  
 Title IIA Coordinator  
 Maine Department of Education  
 23 State House Station  
 Augusta, ME 04333-0023

**Or**

Daniel Conley  
 Teacher Quality, Mentoring and Induction Coordinator  
 Maine Department of Education  
 23 State House Station  
 Augusta, ME 04333-0023

This guidance is designed for SAUs that met the MDOE “High Need Schools” criteria; however, the planning template may be helpful for all SAUs to strengthen the quality and effectiveness of plans and to ensure equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers.

**SAU Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers**

1. **Needs Assessment:** As is required by NCLB Section 2122, the SAU Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers must be based on an assessment of local needs
2. **Target Audience:** This component allows the SAU to analyze data by school. For each school in the SAU that meets the “High Needs Schools” criteria, create a chart of core academic subject teachers with targeted needs.

After analyzing the chart, write a brief summary to describe highly qualified teacher needs in the SAU. For example, findings from the example may be summarized as follows:

*Ten (10) core academic subject teachers, representing 46 classes in 4 schools, are not highly qualified. Six (6) teachers and 24 classes are in the area of Mathematics. Three (3) of the four schools are high-poverty and two of the high-poverty schools did not make AYP in academic areas based on the previous year’s accountability results. Of the total classes, 42 are in middle/secondary grades.*

This analysis will determine the intensity of resources needed, and will guide development of strategies and actions.

**Example of “Target Audience Table”  
 SAU Chart of Teachers Not Highly Qualified, or Inexperienced  
 (End of 2005-2006 School Year)**

School Name (and Descriptive Information)	Grade	Subject	No. of Classes Taught	Notes/Comments
<b>XYZ High School – 78% poverty; did not make AYP in Mathematics (all students) and</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Tenured-says he will retire in 3 years</b>  <i>(Even though this teacher intends to retire, he must</i>

<b>Graduation Rate</b>				<i>agree to and complete an individual teacher plan.)</i>
	<b>9-10</b>	<b>Algebra I</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Working on academic degree in mathematics</b>
	<b>12</b>	<b>Economics</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Certified in History; did not pass Praxis II; will re-take test</b>
<b>MNO High School – 49% poverty; did not make AYP in Participation (all students)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Algebra I</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Not eligible for HOUSSE portfolio or other non-test options; refuses to take test</b>
	<b>12</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>New hire; certified, but no highly qualified applicants</b>
<b>ABC Middle School – 85% poverty; did not make AYP in Mathematics (all students and high-poverty students) and Reading (special education)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Algebra I</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Needs more points on HOUSSE portfolio</b>
	<b>7</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Not eligible for HOUSSE portfolio or other non-test options; took, but did not pass Praxis II</b>
	<b>5-8</b>	<b>Special Education: Mathematics</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Already highly qualified in English Language Arts; not eligible for HOUSSE portfolio or other non-test options in Mathematics</b>
	<b>7</b>	<b>Mathematics (Sec. B)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Already highly qualified in Science; not eligible for HOUSSE or other non-test options in Mathematics</b>
<b>DEF Elementary School – 72% poverty; made AYP</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Self-Contained</b>	<b>(4)</b> <b>(Language, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies)</b>	<b>New hire; highly qualified in GA; must receive AL certificate before requesting highly qualified review</b>
<b>ABC Middle School (see above)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>Less than 3 years experience</b>

3. **Planning Collaboration:** Name the individuals – SAU superintendent, SAU contact person for highly qualified teacher issues, MDOE contact person, teachers, school administrators – who will collaborate to develop the plan.
4. **SAU Actions:** List and describe actions by the SAU to ensure that remaining teachers become highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year and/or to increase the retention of inexperienced teachers.

#### **Teacher Plan for Demonstrating Highly Qualified Status**

The SAU must develop an individual plan for each core academic subject teacher who has not been deemed highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year and is not on track to meet the

requirement before the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year. This plan must be jointly developed, as a written agreement between the SAU and the teacher, to describe specific actions that will be taken to get the teacher highly qualified as soon as possible, but not later than September 30, 2009.

It is understood that each SAU will establish its own administrative procedures for (1) scheduling meetings with teachers, (2) developing and securing commitments and signatures for teacher plans, and (3) periodically monitoring implementation progress. It is required, however, that those procedures provide for SAU and direct communication between the SAU administrative office and each teacher for whom a plan will be developed. **The SAU superintendent and his/her designated staff must retain responsibility and accountability for teacher plans in order to demonstrate a “good faith effort” in implementing the federal and state requirements related to “highly qualified” teachers.**

If the teacher is properly certified to teach the assigned subject(s) and grade(s), the teacher completes a “Highly Qualified Teacher Action Statement” form. If not fully certified (“conditionally or targeted needs” certified) then the teacher completes the “Plan to Become a Fully Certified Teacher” form. Both of these forms may be found online at [www.maine.gov/education/hqtp](http://www.maine.gov/education/hqtp) or in the “High Need Schools Assistance Application”.

1. **Keep in mind that the high objective uniform state standard of evaluation (HOUSSE) option will no longer be a viable option after August 31, 2006, except in limited instances, and may not be used in individual teacher plans. See Superintendent’s Informational Letter # 152, dated June 7, 2006, available online at <http://www.maine.gov/education/edletrs/ilethome.htm> for more specific guidance. All other teachers must demonstrate HQ status through other approved methods, such as PRAXIS II, applicable exams, or coursework.**

STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
23 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE  
04333-0023



JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI  
GOVERNOR



SUSAN A. GENDRON  
COMMISSIONER

TO: Superintendents of Schools, Principals, and “HQT” Coordinators

FROM: Maine Department of Education, Title II Teacher Quality Office

DATE: September 23, 2008

RE: **Teacher Quality: “High Need Schools” List**

I am writing to notify you that one or more of the schools in your SAU qualify, using the criteria listed in the next paragraph, for a voluntary assistance program under Title IIA. The State has earmarked funds and personnel for this assistance.

Data from the: 2004 - 2008 Title IIA “Highly Qualified Teacher” (HQT) Survey; percentages of inexperienced teachers; and poverty levels were teacher quality indicators, required by the United States Education Department, in determining Maine’s “High Need Schools”. Maine has determined that these schools merit possible technical assistance to aid them in raising these indicators of teacher quality.

**Category A “High Need” Schools**

- C. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility, AND
- D. schools which are 5% points or more below the Maine State average for HQT (95.88%), and have been for three years or more;

**Category B “High Need” Schools**

- D. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility AND,
- E. schools with more than 12.8 inexperienced teachers on staff (5% points or more above the State average of 7.8%);
- F. the SAU has not increased its percentage of HQT for three years or more, AND is 5% points or more below the state average of 95.88%.

Definition: “Inexperienced Teachers”: Teachers having less than 3 years experience.

**Category A AND B “High Need” Schools**

- D. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility, AND
- E. schools which are 5% points or more below the Maine State average for HQT, and have been for three years or more;
- F. schools with more than 12.8 inexperienced teachers on staff (5% points or more above the State average of 7.8%);

***The “High Need Schools Assistance Application” is attached to this letter.***

If applying for assistance it is required that each “High Need School” or SAU complete the application with a team of appropriate stakeholders.

Please direct any questions regarding this matter to Daniel J. Conley, 624-6639, [dan.conley@maine.gov](mailto:dan.conley@maine.gov), or Barbara Moody, 624-6830, [barbara.moody@maine.gov](mailto:barbara.moody@maine.gov)



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
23 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE  
04333-0023

JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI  
GOVERNOR

SUSAN A. GENDRON  
COMMISSIONER

“High Need” Schools Assistance Application

2008-2009

Technical Assistance and School Assistance Funds for “High Need” Schools

The Maine Department of Education will provide Title IIA technical assistance and limited funds to create and implement a Teacher Quality Action Plan. The technical assistance will consist of site meetings in the school/LEA, or region to aid in creating an action plan to address identified needs. Funds will be allocated based on factors such as “High Need Category”, along with short and long-term Teacher Quality goals. Schools are encouraged to collaborate in a regional group, if at all possible, to maximize services and gain more from sharing professional development activities.

Title IIA “High Need” Schools applying for technical assistance and school assistance funds commit to forming a Teacher Quality Action Team of three to eight members that includes representatives from LEA leadership/administration and teachers. This team will have decision-making authority for planning professional development, and responsibility for implementing and evaluating the Teacher Quality Action Plan in 2008-2009.

We are not interested in technical assistance and school assistance funds. \_\_\_\_\_

We are interested in technical assistance with school assistance funds.

We understand that a portion of NCLB School Assistance funds are used to fund “High Need Schools” consultants’ costs. \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_ LEA \_\_\_\_\_

Principal \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Signature

Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Complete this form and send to Daniel J. Conley, Department of Education, Cross State Office Building, 23 State House Station, Augusta, Maine, 04333-0023

If you have questions, please contact Daniel J. Conley, 624-6639, [dan.conley@maine.gov](mailto:dan.conley@maine.gov) or Barbara Moody, 624-6830, [barbara.moody@maine.gov](mailto:barbara.moody@maine.gov)

---

## **2006 - 2008: Timeline of Technical Assistance to “High Need” Schools**

**December 14, 2006** – U.S. Department of Education Approval of revised Maine’s T.Q. & E. Action Plans

### **2006 – 2008 – Maine’s Mentoring and Induction of New Teachers**

Ongoing technical assistance (TA) and professional development (PD) in Mentoring and Induction of New Teachers is given in support of: Goal # 6: “Poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.”; Strategy # 2: “Require and fund Mentoring and Induction Programs to give teachers the support they need to succeed and remain in challenging (high need) schools.” This TA and PD is given both to individual SAUS and schools under the “High Need Schools” initiative of Maine’s State Equity Action Plan, and in State-wide PD in support of the revised Maine State Regulation, Chapter 118: “Purposes, Standards and Procedures for Educational Personnel Support Systems”. This regulation governs how SAU Certification Support Systems operate. The revisions, led by the MDOE Teacher Quality Specialist under the auspices of the Maine State Board of Education, and adopted July, 2007, include a one-on-one mentoring model, required mentor training, regularly scheduled meetings between mentor and mentee, and recommendation for “Professional” certification based upon demonstration of Maine’s Initial Teacher Certification Standards. For a detailed description of the initiative see:  
<http://www.maine.gov/education/teacherinduction/index.html>

### **December – January 2006**

2005-2006 HQT and other data used in ‘High Need School’ designation. “High Need” designation is correlated by: low HQT, high poverty; whole school AYP for reading or math; and high % of inexperienced teachers (see chart titles below, and Action Plans).

**January 2007** – Maine Department of Education Title II Coordinator earmarks approximately \$20,240 of “reallocated” 2005 IIA funds for use in technical assistance to “High Need Schools”.

**January 31, 2007** – Notification letter sent to 24 LEAs containing 30 “High Need Schools” (“HNS”), with attached LEA application for technical assistance.

**February 1, 2007** – Closing of application, and notification of acceptance.

**February 1 – 28, 2007** - Communication via email and phone with “HNS” to clarify nature of assistance and arrange meetings for action planning. Action planning templates and pertinent data sent to schools electronically in preparation for meetings.

**March 1 – April 30, 2007** – LEA meetings for planning appropriate strategies. LEAs informed of the approximate amount of funds available; the need for all activities to be completed no later

---

than September 30, 2007; and funds to be expended by December 31, 2007. Several LEAs requested further meetings to assist in action planning.

**May 1, 2007**– Notice sent to LEA of HQT Action Plans approval.

**May 16, 2007**– Notice sent of \$1840 allocation: \$1000 now; \$840 upon receipt of LEA “Interim Budget Report”.

**June, 2007** – Manifest sent for dispersal of initial allocation to LEAs submitting plans. Reminder sent to LEAs that have as yet sent Action Plans.

**June 19, 2007**– Reconvene TQ & E Advisory Council for update and guidance.

**July 20, 2007**– Reminder sent to LEA of July 31<sup>st</sup> deadline for “Interim Budget Report”.

**July 31, 2007** - “Interim Budget Report” received or late notice sent to LEA. Release of remaining funds if “Interim Budget Report” received.

**August 31, 2007**– “Monitoring Protocol” sent to LEAs for assessment of action plan.

**September 30, 2007** – LEA activities completed and new HQT data used to plan 07-08.

**October, 2007** – 2006 -2007 “HQT” data is collected (Data on teachers’ use the “HOUSSE”, and “HQT” by content area is now collected)

**November, 2007** – receipt of LEA Monitoring Protocols

**November, 2007** – Maine Department of Education sends notification to 2006-2007 “High Need Schools” of the offer of continuing to participate in the Maine “High Need Schools” technical assistance program.

### **2008 - 2009: Year Three of Technical Assistance to High Need Schools**

**January – June, 2008** – Ongoing collection of possible additions reflecting activities and initiatives supporting Teacher Quality in Maine.

**March, 2008** – Review Maine’s Teacher Quality and Equity Action Plans to determine revisions needed and interim outcomes achieved.

**April, 2008** – 2007 – 2008 “HQT” data is collected and analyzed to be used for identifying a second round of “High Need Schools” (Data on teachers’ use the “HOUSSE”, and “HQT” by content area continues to be collected) Completion of second HQT data collection period this year to “catch up” by collecting twice in one year. Thus Maine is now collecting the current year’s HQT data each year.

**June, 2008** –

Schools notified via email requirements: money must be spent on activities supporting LEA 2007 – 2008 school year HQT/High Need School Action Plan, or returned to MDOE; all funds must be spent no later than September 30, 2008; all expenditures must be listed in Monitoring Protocol due NLT October 10, 2008.

**July – August, 2008**

During “NCLB Team” Meetings, and in individual meetings, discuss “High Need” schools identification process with NCLB Program Coordinators (Special Services, Title I School Improvement, Title II, Title III, and Title VI) to coordinate and align technical assistance.

2007-2008 “HQT”, “AYP”, % of “Inexperienced Teachers”, and “High Poverty” status data used to identify “High Need Schools” for 2008 – 2009 school year.

**August 31, 2008**– “Monitoring Protocol” sent to LEAs for assessment of action plan.

**September 30, 2008** – LEA activities must be completed.

**September 31, 2008** - Notification of eligibility for “HNS” funds and Technical Assistance Program sent to *n ew* “High Need Schools”, with request for needs assessment meetings.

**October 10, 2008** – receipt of LEA “HNS” Monitoring Protocols

## HIGH NEED SCHOOL PERFORMANCE REPORTS 2007 - 2008

Schools					
<b>School #1</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 4 Elem Tea <b>Activities:</b> Lit. Coaching	1 MS tea and Summer Literacy Retreat	3 HS tea	WCC grant Coord, & Lit. Coach \$ on Stipends/supplies	
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 76.16  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>84.45</b> 05--06: <b>14.8</b>	06-07: <b>84.45</b>	07-08: <b>94.23</b> 08-09: <b>16.67</b>	<b>9.78% increased HQT</b>
<b>School #2</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 11 non-HQ inexp. Tea. <b>Activities:</b>				
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 89.41  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>89.41</b> 05-06: <b>26</b>	06-07: <b>93.10</b>	07-08: <b>93.10</b> 08-09: <b>22.58</b>	<b>3.69% increased HQT</b> <b>3.42% decreased inexp tea</b>
<b>School #3</b>	<b>Participants:</b> <b>Activities:</b>				
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 100  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>100</b> 05-06: <b>33.3</b>	06-07: 100	07-08: <b>100</b> 08-09: <b>14.29</b>	<b>no change in HQT</b> <b>19.01% decreased inexp tea</b>
<b>School #4</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 1 Elem Prin., <b>Activities:</b> N. T. induction system	9 HQ Mentor Tea \$ on Stipends/PD		5 non-HQ Inexp. Tea.	
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 95.92  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>95.24</b> 05-06: <b>20</b>	06-07: <b>94.87</b>	07-08: <b>97.30</b> 08-09: <b>15.38</b>	<b>2.06% increase in HQT</b> <b>4.62% decreased inexp tea</b>
<b>School #5</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 4 non-HQ Elem Tea <b>Activities:</b> Trained Mentor Trainers:	3 non-HQ HS Tea began induction program		\$ on Stipends	
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 100  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>100</b> 05-06: <b>18.75</b>	06-07: 100	07-08: <b>100</b> 08-09: <b>18.75</b>	<b>no change in HQT</b> <b>no change in inexp tea</b>
<b>School #6</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 1 non-HQ Teacher <b>Activities:</b> \$ on M.Ed. tuition for HQ				
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 99.6  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>99.56</b> 05-06: <b>13</b>	06-07: 100	07-08: <b>100</b> 08-09: <b>20</b>	<b>0.44% increase in HQT</b> <b>7% increased inexp tea</b>
<b>School #7</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 2 non-HQ elem., 3 non-HQ MS Inexp. Tea. <b>Activities:</b> Vet. Tea provided PD \$ on Stipends/PD				
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 100  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>100</b> 05-06: <b>19.2</b>	06-07: 100	07-08: <b>98.9</b> 08-09: <b>18.18</b>	<b>1.1 decrease in HQT</b> <b>0.84% decreased inexp</b>
<b>School #8</b>	<b>Participants:</b> 1 Elem Prin., <b>Activities:</b> N.T. Induction PD	\$ on Ind. Coord.		1 Induction Coord.	
	<b>LEA HQT %</b> 04-05: 100  <b>Exper. %:</b>	05-06: <b>99.08</b> 05-06: <b>20</b>	06-07: <b>99.07</b>	07-08: <b>95.78</b> 08-09: <b>10</b>	<b>3.3% decrease in HQT</b> <b>10% decreased inexp</b>

### Section 2141 HQT Status for FY09 Title II Monitoring Site Visits

Name of school					HQT
----------------	--	--	--	--	-----

208		N	February 26, 2009	BMM	SR,JG,PB	3
223		N	January 22, 2009	LP	SR,JG	3
202		N	January 26, 2009	LP	NM,JG	3
280		N	January 29, 2009	BMM	DK,NM,JG,PB	3
215		N	February 10, 2009	RT	BM,NM	3
271		N	February 11, 2009	LP	SR,BM,NM,JG	3
104		Y	March 31, 2009	BMM	JG	1
104		Y*	March 31, 2009	BMM	JG	
104		Y	March 31, 2009	BMM	JG	1
104		Y	March 31, 2009	BMM	JG	
501		N	April 07, 2009	PB	JG,DK	Award
517		N	April 29, 2009	PB	DK	2
205		N	May 04, 2009	JG	BM,DK,NM	2
999		N	May 08, 2009	JG	SR	
241		N	May 12, 2009		JG,DK,PB	
535		N	May 13, 2009	JG	DK,LP	3
291		N	May 28, 2009	PB	DK	3
506		N	June 04, 2009	BMM	JG,DK,LP	3

**HQT level descriptors:**

**Priority 1 = 79.9% or below for 3 or more years**

**Priority 2 = 89.9% or below for 3 or more years**

**Priority 3 = 99.9% or below for three or more years**

**Award = 100% for three or more years**