

Supplemental Memorandum

To: STATE BOARD MEMBERS

Date: June 27, 2003

From: William W. Vasey, Director
Professional Development and
Curriculum Support Division

Re: ITEM #10

Subject Report to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) of baseline data to reflect performance indicators listed in Goal #3 – Highly Qualified Teachers, Qualified Paraprofessionals, and High-Quality Professional Development - of the consolidated application for No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

The California Department of Education (CDE) is requesting approval of the submission of baseline data and annual measurable objectives for Highly Qualified Teachers, High-quality Professional Development, and Qualified Paraprofessionals for inclusion in the report to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) for No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This item discusses the procedures, methodology and sources to be used by the CDE to generate baseline counts and perform data collection in future years.

Performance Indicator #3.1 (Highly Qualified Teachers): The CDE recommends approval of Steps 1 through 5 for calculating baseline counts from 2002-03 California Basic Education Database System (CBEDS) Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF), approval of recommendations for Annual Measurable Objectives and approval of plans to develop Annual Performance Reports.

Performance Indicator #3.2 (High Quality Professional Development): The CDE recommends approval of a baseline count, annual measurable objectives and data collection plans. The CDE seeks the Board's guidance on mechanisms for ensuring that professional development meets the federal definition.

Performance Indicator #3.3 (Qualified Paraprofessionals): The CDE recommends approval of plans for collecting baseline data and developing statewide annual measurable objectives for assuring that all paraprofessionals are qualified.

ATTACHMENT 1 – [Performance Goal 3: Data and Reporting](#)

PERFORMANCE GOAL 3: DATA AND REPORTING

Performance Goal 3: By 2005-06 - All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Performance indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

No Child Left Behind Section 1119 (2) requires that “each state educational agency shall establish annual measurable objectives for each local educational agency and school that, at a minimum- (a) shall include an annual increase in the percentage of highly qualified teachers at each local educational agency and school, to ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects in each public elementary school and secondary school are highly qualified not later than the end of the 2005-06 school year...”

Issue – Baseline Count 3.1

The California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) is used to collect a variety of information related to students and staff in California’s public schools. The key part that includes information about certificated staff is the Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF). The PAIF is the most complete and comprehensive data system available in California for linking teacher qualifications and teacher classroom assignments. However, it was not designed for collecting NCLB-required data. Nevertheless, with appropriate assumptions applied to the data, the PAIF will enable the SBE to provide baseline counts for performance indicator #3.1. The October 2002 PAIF data are now available so the data that follow reflect the data for the 2002-03 school year.

Within the limits of the data, this issue paper provides reasonable, good-faith estimates of baseline counts for the SBE’s consideration.

California's adopted-in-concept definition contains two primary elements:

- Being fully credentialed, and
- Having demonstrated subject-matter competency in the subjects one currently teaches.

Creating the baseline requires cross-referencing every core academic subject class by the credential and subject matter authorizations of that class's teacher.

For elementary classes, this means establishing whether each classroom teacher has an elementary credential or is enrolled in an approved intern program and whether that teacher has demonstrated subject-matter competency as required by NCLB. In California that means the teacher has passed a rigorous state test or, if "not new to the profession," has demonstrated subject-matter competence through a High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation

(HOUSE). The PAIF database does report whether teachers have elementary credentials, but does not provide information on whether the teacher passed a rigorous State test. The SBE will be asked for guidance on this issue (see Step 2).

Determining which classes are taught by highly qualified teachers at the secondary level is a more complex process. PAIF identifies the subject matter area of every class assignment (most teachers will have between 4 and 6 assignments, some in the same subject matter areas). Using this data, we were able to identify core academic subject classes for inclusion in the analyses.

PAIF also reports the classroom teachers' credentials or whether they're enrolled in an approved intern program and areas in which they are authorized to teach. For every teacher, we can reasonably assume that one of their subject matter authorizations was earned through completing requirements for their single-subject secondary credential. However, we can't make the same assumptions about all authorizations held by teachers with multiple authorizations (25,138 individuals report having between 2 and 4 authorizations each). This is because there are several possible routes an individual can complete to gain a supplemental authorization, only some of which are NCLB compliant. We provide a recommendation to address this uncertainty (see Step 3).

Baseline Count 3.1

Five steps are needed to establish baseline counts on the percentage of core academic subject classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers. These are:

Step 1. Establish the number of core academic classes taught in California. (Numbers will be reported separately for elementary and secondary schools.)

Step 2. Establish an assumption about the percentage of elementary teachers likely to have passed a rigorous state test for demonstrating subject-matter competency.

Step 3. Establish a baseline of the number of secondary, single-subject teachers likely to have demonstrated subject-matter competency as a function of their single-subject, secondary credential.

Step 4. Create a baseline count (as a percentage) of core academic subject classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the aggregate.

Step 5. Create a baseline of the percentage of core academic subject classes in high poverty schools that were taught by highly qualified teachers.

The following is a discussion of these five steps.

Step 1. Establish the number of core academic classes taught in California. (Numbers will be reported separately for elementary and secondary schools.) This number becomes the denominator for calculating the percentage for the baseline.

Analyses indicate there were 176,384 elementary, multiple-subject classes and 472,907 secondary classes (most that were subject-specific).

Applying the NCLB requirements to California's teachers requires that different assumptions be applied to elementary, multiple-subject teachers than to single-subject, secondary teachers. To understand the impact of each of the options presented below, it's necessary to utilize the denominator (total number of core academic classes) that applies to each grade span.

Step 2. Establish an assumption about the percentage of elementary teachers likely to have passed a rigorous state test for demonstrating subject-matter competency.

This number includes teachers who passed a rigorous state test as well as those who completed credential requirements through the coursework option. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) indicates that about 60% of the multiple-subject credential holders have passed the MSAT and, therefore, that about 40% followed the course completion pattern, e.g., the liberal studies major. At present, it's impossible to link credential history data (from the CCTC) with class assignment data from the PAIF. (Options for remedying this data limitation are presented in Issue #3 – Annual Performance Reports for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06.) For baseline determinations, the SBE is being asked to provide guidance. Two options are presented.

Option 1. Assume that the CCTC data is representative of all teachers currently in elementary, multiple-subject classrooms. Using this figure, we can extrapolate that about 88,540 (60% of elementary credential holders) satisfy the NCLB requirement. These teachers are responsible for 93,108 classes, or 53% of all elementary classes. This assumption would create a baseline percentage of 53%.

Option 2. Assume that individuals who followed the course completion pattern are more likely to populate the classroom (given the greater resource investment required for coursework completion) and, therefore, that the percentage of highly qualified teachers in elementary classrooms was less than 60%. An assumption of 50% would result in 73,784 elementary teachers who taught the 79,257 courses that were taught by highly qualified teachers. This assumption would create a baseline percentage of 45%.

Recommendation: Adopt Option 1

Step 3. Establish a baseline of the number of secondary, single-subject teachers likely to have demonstrated subject-matter competency as a function of their single-subject, secondary credential.

Analyses show that 472,907 core academic subject classes were taught in California secondary schools in 2002-03. There were 132,947 teachers assigned to those classes.

To satisfy NCLB requirements at the secondary level, teachers must be credentialed and have demonstrated subject matter competency for every core subject they teach. In California, individuals who completed a single-subject credential satisfy the NCLB requirement for any classes they teach in that subject area. However, individuals who are authorized to teach additional subject matter areas may have gained that authorization through the supplemental authorization process which does not require a major or a major equivalent in coursework. The CCTC is unable to determine the proportion of single subject supplementary authorizations that were granted through completion of a major or major-equivalent (NCLB compliant) vs. completion of a minor or its equivalent of coursework (not NCLB compliant).

Available data indicates that 88,457 (66%) of secondary school teachers have a secondary/single-subject credential in California. Of those, about 62,000 have only one core academic subject area authorization. A smaller percent of teachers with a single authorization are teaching only in their subject-matter areas, about 29,280 individuals. These teachers represent about 131,765 subject classes. We can reasonably assert that these classes satisfy the NCLB requirements. This leads to a baseline of 28% for the secondary grade span.

Available data don't permit determination of the relationship between the remaining 72% of secondary classes and the qualifications of each class' teacher. A large number of these teachers do satisfy the NCLB requirements for, at least, part of their teaching assignment in core academic subjects and some of those will satisfy the requirements in all part of their 16 academic subject classes. This baseline reflects a conservative approach to using the available data.

Step 4. Create a baseline count (as a percentage) of core academic subject classes taught by highly qualified teachers in the aggregate.

The United State Department of Education (USDOE) requires submission of a single baseline count for Performance Indicator 3.1. This requires the SBE/CDE to create a single indicator from the separate grade-span baselines presented above.

Percent of Core Academic Classes Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers

	Core Academic Classes	Core Academic Classes Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers
Core elementary Classes	176,384	93,108
Core Secondary Classes	472,907	131,765
Total Core Classes	649,191	224,873
Percentage of Core Classes Taught by NCLB Compliant Teachers		34.6%

*These calculations assume the SBE accepted the recommendation of the CDE on Step 2.

Step 5. Create a baseline of the percentage of core academic subject classes in high poverty schools that were taught by highly qualified teachers.

For this purpose high poverty schools are the 25% of California schools with the highest rate of poverty. We will use the same methodology as presented above to generate this figure.

Issue--Annual Measurable Objective 3.1

The USDOE requires that states adopt the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal (#3) if the state utilized the Consolidated Application mechanism for gaining federal NCLB funds. Goal #3 states that, by 2005-2006, all students will have highly qualified teachers in their core academic subject classes. Once states define how the Highly Qualified Teacher requirements apply in their respective systems, they must create annual performance targets (Annual Measurable Objective) for achieving the 100% goal.

Once the assumptions for the Baseline Count for 3.1 have been determined, we can examine the size of the “gap” between baseline count and goal. With information on the distribution of teachers who do not satisfy the NCLB requirement, it’s possible to establish some expectations about the rate at which California schools are likely to reflect the NCLB goal.

Step 1. Establish an expectation for the rate at which teachers who have not yet demonstrated subject-matter competence as required by NCLB will be certified as highly qualified in each of their subject-matter areas.

Option 1. Establish the State’s Performance Target as three equal increments between the baseline count and the goal of 100%.

Timing of the HOUSE option will be tied to the Stull Act cycle so we are likely to see significant increases in each of the next two years.

Option 2. Establish a “balloon” trajectory that estimates a large increase in NCLB compliant teachers during the first year, and a lower rate of growth in the following two years.

Advantage: Option 2 creates a pressure to satisfy the NCLB requirements in the near future rather than in the second or third years. This may increase the likelihood that California LEAs and statewide can achieve the 100% goal.

Disadvantage: Option 2 may establish an unreasonable expectation for growth that cannot be met by California LEAs. It requires California schools to proceed more quickly than the federal law requires.

Option 3. Establish a trajectory that “balloons” during the third year (2004-05 to 2005-06).

Advantage: Buys time for districts to organize their resources and staff to comply with the NCLB requirement. Increases the likelihood that California will achieve its Performance Targets for the first two years. Allows the SBE to monitor the rate of growth and introduce interventions as necessary.

Disadvantages: Decreases emphasis on achieving this important goal, particularly during fiscally impacted years. May dissuade LEAs from targeting limited funding towards the goal with the result that fewer LEAs achieve the goal by the end of the third year.

Recommendation: Adopt Option 1

Issue – Annual Performance Reports for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06

Each state is required to provide annual performance reports that document that state's gains on the NCLB Performance Indicators. As stated above, California doesn't have a mechanism for collecting teacher qualification and assignment data that aligns with NCLB specifications. Creating such a data system would normally require two to three years.

The CDE has, in place, the PAIF data system that can be modified to collect data for performance indicators 3.1 for the October 2004 collection. The October 2003 survey was completed some time ago and cannot be modified. To improve the quality of data reported in the first Annual Performance Report (for 2003-2004), the CDE recommends utilizing the 2003 PAIF survey data in the same way it was utilized to generate the baseline data and to cross-check the validity of that data by collecting similar information via the Consolidated Application (ConApp to distinguish it from the State's Consolidated Application to the USDOE). By combining data from different sources, the accuracy of California's Performance Report will be substantially increased.

Option 1. *Modify the PAIF to reflect all teacher-level information required to determine whether a teacher's classes were taught by a highly qualified individual.*

Advantage: CDE would collect and manage all NCLB teacher quality data.

Disadvantage: CDE would need to modify its current data collections substantially to allow collection of NCLB data. Much of the data collection would be redundant with that currently collected by, or stored by, the CCTC.

Option 2. *Enter into a Memorandum-of-Understanding with the CCTC to enable the agencies to link databases (without using social security numbers).*

Advantages: Reduces redundant data collection by the CDE since the CCTC has teacher credential and supplementary authorization data. In addition, the CCTC intends to modify its credential system (and data collection system) to reflect requirements of NCLB.

Disadvantages: Requires a long-term MOU between two state agencies and the associated administrative burden.

It is our intention to explore each of these options. It is our preference to make Option 2 work.

The table reflects data collection and reporting options:

Source of Data	2002-03 Baseline	2003-04 First Annual Performance Report	2004-05 Second Annual Performance Report	2005-06 Third Annual Performance Report
Unchanged PAIF	X			
Unchanged PAIF		X		
Modified ConApp		X	X	
Modified PAIF			X	X
Integrate files with the CCTC			X	X

Performance indicator 3:2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term is defined in section 9101 (34)).

No Child Left Behind Section 1119 (2) requires that “each state educational agency shall establish annual measurable objectives for each local educational agency and school that, at a minimum- (b) shall include an annual increase in the percentage of teachers who are receiving high-quality professional development to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers”

Baseline Count 3.2

This is a baseline calculation using statewide professional development programs that clearly meet the NCLB definition of "high quality professional development" and that have databases with teacher level counts. There are many statewide and local programs that are not represented in the baseline count. These programs would meet the definition of "high quality professional development," however; teacher counts are not available at this time. Therefore, what is presented is a baseline count that is a very conservative estimate of the overall "high quality professional development" opportunities available to the teacher workforce.

Step 1. Total classroom teacher workforce in 2002-03 was 309,775.

Step 2. Total classroom teachers participating in "high quality professional development" statewide programs that are mutually exclusive in 2002-03 was 41,599. (Pre-Intern, Intern, Induction, or National Board Certification.) With an N= 41,599, 13.4% of the teacher workforce participated in the programs in Step 2. (See Chart 1)

Step 3. Total classroom teachers participating in "high quality professional development" statewide programs that are not mutually exclusive but have teacher counts is 42,195. (Reading and Mathematics Professional Development AB466, Reading Excellence Act, Support for Secondary Schools Reading). (See Chart 1)

Step 4. An estimate of the number of individual teachers participating in at least one statewide "high quality professional development" program that was non mutually exclusive in 2002-2003.

Assumption: Step 3 program participants were distributed evenly across the workforce.

Estimate the number of individuals participating in more than one program. Subtract the rate of participants in Step 2 from statewide programs in Step 3 (13.4%). Subtract an additional 3 % percent to estimate the number of individuals who may have participated in more than one program in Step 3.

With an N = 42,195 – 16.4% (42,195) = 35,275 participants in not mutually exclusive statewide “high quality professional development” programs.

Step 5. Baseline estimate of the percentage of individual California teachers receiving high quality professional development in 2002-03 is (N= (41,599 + 35,275 = 76,874) 24.8% of the teaching workforce.

Baseline Year 2002-2003 = 76, 824 (24.8%) of the total classroom teachers participated in "high quality professional development."

Annual Measurable Objectives

There are two parts to Performance Indicator 3.2. The first requires that we establish an annual measurable objective for participation in "high quality professional development" for the teacher population, as a whole. The second requires that we establish an annual measurable objective for the participation in "high quality professional development" for the teachers who are "not highly qualified."

Part 1

Establish a straight-line trajectory from the base year for expected teacher participation in "high quality professional development."

The percentage of teachers engaged in high quality professional development, in the aggregate, will increase from:

2002-03 = 24.8% (Baseline Year)
 2003-04 = 50%
 2004-05 = 75%
 2005-06 = 100%.

Recommendation: Adopt Part 1.

Sets out a reasonable and achievable expectation for increasing numbers of California teachers to participate in "high quality professional development" that will improve teaching and student performance.

Part 2: Option 1

Establish a trajectory that is the same as what we expect for the teacher population as a whole.

Note: Baseline specific data is not available at this time.

The percentage of "not highly qualified" teachers engaged in high quality professional development will increase from:

2002-03 = (Insufficient data available at this time)
 2003-04 = 50% 2004-05 = 75%
 2005-06 = 100%

Advantages

Establishes an achievable goal based on what we expect everybody to do.

Disadvantages

May not provide sufficient incentive and direction of resources to move teachers quickly to the "highly qualified" category to be compliant with NCLB law. Also, may send a mixed message to the teacher workforce and LEAs that we expect only normal progress for "not highly qualified teachers" to participate in development that will promote compliance with NCLB requirements.

Part 2: Option 2

Establish a trajectory that creates high expectations for “not highly qualified teachers” participation in “high quality professional development.” Note: Baseline specific data is not available at this time.

The percentage of "not highly qualified" teachers engaged in high quality professional development will increase from:

2002-03 = (Insufficient data available at this time)

2003-04 = 95%

2004-05 = 100%

2005-06 = 100%

Advantages

Prioritizes the issue of "not highly qualified" teachers and sends a focused, urgent message to teachers and LEAs.

Disadvantages

May not be doable or realistic. Good, but challenged schools may miss the target yet be making steady progress toward the goal. Teacher morale may be impacted.

Recommendation: Adopt Option 2

Data Collection

Beginning in 2003-04 and each year after we will utilize the Consolidated Application to collect data. Each year on the Consolidated Application, the LEA will report:

1. Total number of classroom teachers at each school site.
2. Total number of teachers at each school site who are "not highly qualified."
3. Total number of teachers participating in "high quality professional development" at each school site.
4. The number of "not highly qualified" teachers at each site participating in "high quality professional development."

Issue -- Applying the NCLB definition of “high quality professional development.”

How shall programs of professional development be reviewed to determine whether or not they conform to the definition of "high quality professional development" for purposes of NCLB compliance?" (as the term is defined in section 9101 (34).

Suggestions

1. The California Department of Education shall conduct an internal review of statewide programs to determine which ones meet the NCLB definition of "high quality professional development." Recommendations for modifications will be made at a future date. CDE will provide technical assistance to LEAs who will establish a review process for local programs to determine whether or not they meet the definition.

2. LEAs will assure that any program of professional development used for NCLB reporting conforms to the definition of high quality professional development.

Chart 1

Teacher level data on selected California programs that meet the NCLB definition of High Quality Professional Development.

High Quality Professional Development NCLB Act of 2001, Title IX – general Provisions, Part A – Definitions, Sec. 9101. Definitions	California Programs that meet the NCLB definition	2002-2003 teachers (N)
<p>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT includes activities that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase knowledge of core subjects to become highly qualified; • are integral to educational improvement plans; • give teachers skills to help students meet State standards, • improve classroom management; • are sustained, intensive, classroom-focused • not one-day or short-term workshops or conferences; • support teacher’s training to become highly qualified, • support instructional strategies based on scientifically based research • support strategies for improving student academic achievement; • aligned with and directly related to State academic content standards, student achievement standards, and assessments; and Programs • are developed with extensive participation of individuals served under this Act; • increase appropriate language and academic support services to limited English proficient students, including the appropriate use of curricula and assessments; • provide teachers and principals with technology applications to improve learning in the core subjects; • are regularly evaluated for impact with the findings used to improve the quality, • provide methods of teaching children with special needs; • provide ways that site level educators may work more effectively with parents. 	<p><i>Pre-Internship Program</i> 1-2 years of support for teachers to become highly qualified in their content area.</p>	9,548 (in the program)
	<p><i>Internship Program</i> 1-2 years of support in an alternative program for teachers who have met content requirements and need their preliminary credential.</p>	8,715 (in the program)
	<p><i>Induction/BTSA</i> 2 years of support and assessment for teachers who need to clear their preliminary credential.</p>	21,600 (in the program)
	<p><i>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</i> 1 year of support and assessment to prepare and take the assessments.</p>	1,700 (in the program)
	<p><i>Reading and Mathematics Professional Development Program AB 466 Training</i> 40 to 120 hours of training and support for standards based instructional materials and grade appropriate intervention strategies.</p>	21,748 (Reading) 5,367 (Math)
	<p><i>Reading Excellence Act</i> Two years of intensive, ongoing training including coaching, on scientifically based and standards-based reading instruction.</p>	1,568
	<p><i>Support for Secondary Schools Reading (SSSR)</i> Intensive development of strategies to improve reading achievement based on student needs. For administrators and teachers in 4-12th grade.</p>	13,512

Performance Indicator 3.3: Percentage of Paraprofessionals Who Are Qualified

No Child Left Behind Section 1119 requires that paraprofessionals who assist in instruction in Title I programs shall have:

- A. Completed at least two years of study at an institution of higher education;
- B. Obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or
- C. Met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal state or local academic assessment--

Knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or reading readiness, writing readiness, or mathematics readiness).

All paraprofessionals assisting in instruction in Title I programs must also have a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

Through the NCLB Consolidated State Application California assures that all paraprofessionals, excluding those working with parents or as translators, attain the qualifications stated in Sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-06 school year.

Baseline Count 3.

There are 110,779 paraprofessionals employed in California Local Education Agencies (LEAs). Title I data from the Consolidated Application and CBEDS data indicate that 65,142 of this group are employed to assist in instruction in Title I programs. Districts do not currently have baseline data to report how many of those employees meet the NCLB paraprofessional requirements. Many districts have not yet implemented the assessment option for meeting the requirements, but will be doing so over the next few months. In limited, informal surveys, district Title I and Human Resource Directors report that approximately 15-30% of currently employed Title I teacher aides may meet the requirements.

Annual Measurable Objectives

Option 1: Since NCLB does not specify that each LEA must meet annual measurable objectives toward meeting the paraprofessional requirements, data could be reported as a statewide average e.g., 100% of Title I paraprofessionals employed in California Local Education Agencies will meet the NCLB requirements by 2005-06, at the following average rate of progress on a straight-line projection:

2002-03: 20% (statewide, conservative estimate)

2003-04: 47%

2004-05: 74%

2005-06: 100%

Option #2: *Each LEA could be asked to develop annual measurable objectives for meeting the NCLB paraprofessional requirements using the following algorithm, so that 100% of Title I paraprofessionals employed by the LEA meet the requirement by 2005-06: Subtract the baseline percentage from 100%, and divide by three to obtain the minimum annual percentage point increase over the next three years. For example:*

2002-03: 40% Individual LEA Baseline

2003-04: 60%

2004-05: 80%

2005-06: 100%

Recommendation: Adopt Option 1

Data Collection

Option #1: *The total number of Title I paraprofessionals and the percentage of those paraprofessionals who meet the NCLB requirements will be collected from LEAs in the Consolidated Application, Part II, beginning in fall 2003. The Coordinated Compliance Review process will be used to monitor LEA implementation of the paraprofessional requirements. Data collected will include the following:*

- 1). Number of paraprofessionals who assist in instruction in Title I programs
- 2). Number of Title I paraprofessionals who assist in instruction and meet the NCLB requirements

Option #2: *The total number of Title I paraprofessionals and the percentage of those paraprofessionals who meet the NCLB requirements will be collected from LEAs in a separate, electronic data collection instrument to be developed. Data collected will include the same two categories as in Option #1.*

Recommendation: Adopt Option 1