11/29/2006 2:50 p.m.

Introduction:

New Hampshire's Follow The Child initiative reflects the spirit of the bi-partisan effort adopted in 2001 as the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB). Providing a quality education for each student in New Hampshire is the major goal. The charge of the Follow The Child Initiative is to address the needs of the whole child by documenting progress physically, socially, personally and academically and reporting tangible evidence of growth in each area. To accomplish that, every teacher must be highly qualified and provided with a range of professional development experiences that translate to improved student learning. A personalized education that documents evidence of student performance is the spirit on which NCLB was written. In the Follow The Child initiative, schools are accountable for each child and will follow the progress of each child until proficiency is attained. Even now, in New Hampshire the Follow The Child schools are immediately accountable for addressing the proficiency needs of each child. This means that every school is *In Need of Improvement* as long as it has even one child who does not meet the standard for proficiency. Commissioner Lyonel B. Tracy's Follow The Child initiative is part of a larger program involving growth targets for already proficient students, interim testing, and remediation activities. New Hampshire educators believe that the learning that takes place on a day to day basis intrinsically links the classroom teacher as a key partner in advancing students toward proficiency and beyond.

New Hampshire maintains a commitment to improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers. The evidence is clear as reported in *What Works in Schools Translating Research Into Action* by Robert Marzano, the study conducted by Paul Wright, Sandra Horn, and William Sanders, that the most important factor affecting student learning is

the teacher. The Title II, Part A Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant that has enabled the SEA to focus on the professional development of teachers and to connect that professional development to the classroom. The requirements for highly qualified teacher have also brought about collaboration within the SEA and changes to the certification process for new teachers. The State Agency for Higher Education grant (SAHE) continues to support the implementation of the highly qualified teacher requirements through technical assistance to large stakeholder groups and high quality professional development in core content areas.

Since 1985, the SEA's certification requirements have included the demonstration of basic skills. In 1998 the NH State Board of Education (SBE) adopted a rule that all teachers seeking initial certification from the SEA pass Praxis I or a comparable test. Candidates applying for certification in specified subject areas are also required to pass the Praxis II subject area test. In July 2005, a Praxis II exam in Elementary Education was validated in the New Hampshire. All teachers new to the field of Elementary Education are now required to take this exam for initial certification.

The following timeline summarizes critical junctures and important policy changes and procedures governing teacher training and certification for teachers.

Summary Timeline: Critical Junctures in New Hampshire's Policies Governing Teacher Training and Certification for Teachers	
Decades	**Policies Governing Teacher Training and Certification**
1970	• NH launches **Blue Ribbon Certification Committee** to study procedures and qualifications for teacher training and certification. • **Professional Standards Board** (PSB) established to develop NH's policies governing the training and certification of teachers. • Standards for certification by endorsement area established. • Minimum requirements for Elementary Professional Education Courses amended to include eighteen (18) semester hours of student teaching. • Requirements for Professional Development of all teachers amended and the periodic renewal of credentials established.
1980	• Basic skills test implemented to measure competencies in reading, writing and mathematics. • Test implemented to examine professional knowledge and proficiency in content areas where endorsement is sought. • New Professional Development requirements. Doubling the requirement from the 70s: 100 clock hours of approved staff development activities in each three year period, fifty (50) clock hours of which, at a minimum, must be within the component **Knowledge of Subject or Service Area**. • A professional development monitoring process implemented by SEA. • Praxis I and Praxis II rule adopted
1990	• Administrative Rules ED 609 governing General Education Studies in the colleges and universities changed to reflect greater preparation in the content areas. • Teacher training programs required to compose a written statement of the competencies needed by an educator in each teaching major or field of specialization.
2000-Present	• The SBE established a rule mandating that Local Professional Development Master Plans align with local educational improvement plans and the SEA curriculum frameworks to provide job-embedded professional growth for educators. • The Council for Teacher Education (CTE) is mandated to review teacher education programs in the SEA every five years on a rotating basis and to advise the State Board of Education (SBE) on approval of the programs. • CTE implemented a performance-based review process to assess the quality of the teacher preparation programs in the SEA. • The performance-based process was piloted at Plymouth State University in the spring of 2003 and is now being used with other teacher preparation programs. • A Praxis II test in Elementary Education for all Elementary teachers new to the profession will be required by July 1, 2006.

While New Hampshire's efforts to enhance the quality and effectiveness of teachers show progress over the past decades, there is always more to do. The development of this report has helped the SEA identify and reflect upon the next steps to be taken to continue to improve in the area of teacher quality and effectiveness, particularly as it translates

into improved student achievement. The SEA Plan for Highly Qualified and Effective Teachers demonstrates that NH has met the federal requirements for SEA plan approval. A great deal has been learned throughout the collaborative process.

The Process: The nature of the six focus areas (requirements 1-6) addressed in this report required input and expertise from all areas of the SEA. The collaborative process required data sharing between bureaus to identify the areas of need within the SEA. There are clearly critical elements that are common to the work of all bureaus whose primary mission is to provide outstanding learning opportunities that result in increased student outcomes for the children of New Hampshire. Teacher quality and effectiveness is critically important to accomplishing this mission. To this end, the Office of Information Technology and the SEA data professionals from the Bureau of Information Services worked to coordinate the data among the Bureau of Credentialing, the Bureau of Accountability, including the school improvement group, and the Bureau of Integrated Programs. The Bureau of Integrated Programs incorporated information from its collaboration with the Bureau of Special Education and federal title programs. The result is an emerging picture of what the data reveals from many vantage points. The SEA will use this data to coordinate technical assistance and professional development to identified schools and districts in need of improvement.

Requirement 1: The revised plan must provide a detailed analysis of the core academic subject classes in the SEA that are currently *not* being taught by highly qualified teachers. The analysis must, in particular, address schools that are not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) and whether or not these schools have more acute needs than do other schools in attracting highly qualified teachers. The analysis must also identify the districts and schools around the SEA where

significant numbers of teachers do not meet highly qualified teachers standards, and examine whether or not there are particular hard-to-staff courses frequently staffed by non- highly qualified teachers.

1.1 **ED**: *Does the revised plan include an analysis of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified? Is the analysis based on accurate classroom level data?*

SEA Response: Yes. Using 04-05 data (except as noted), the SEA has analyzed HQT data. The SEA analyzed schools and districts based on the following:

- NH School Approval designation of Elementary, Middle or Junior High, or High School
- **Table 1**: (p.7) Percentage of core classes taught by a non-hqt teacher
- **Table 2**: (p.9) AYP Risk Factor of 0-5 based on designations for the 06-07 school year:
  - 5 – 3rd year School in Need of Improvement (SINI)
  - 4 – 2nd year SINI
  - 3 – 1st year SINI
  - 2 – Did not make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2 years, but the school is not SINI because the non-AYP was for different subgroups or subjects
  - 1 – Did not make AYP in one of the last two years
  - 0 – Made AYP in both of the last two years
- **Table 3**: (p.47-48) Percentage of Core content Areas taught by non-hqt teachers
- **Table 4**: (p.12) Rural verses non-rural schools based on Rural Education Achieve Program (REAP) eligibility.
- **Table 5**: (p.14) Percentage of core content teachers who were not highly qualified. (A teacher not qualified in two core subjects was counted twice.)
- **Table 6**: (p. 34) AYP/SINI and relationship to HQT
- **Table 7**: (p. 35) Percentage of core subject teachers with less than three years of classroom experience.
- **Table 8:** (p.36) Household income as measured by the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch (F/R) statistics collected yearly on November 1
- Number of out-of-field teachers.

These designations were based on the assessment of 04-05 school year progress.

Each analysis was prepared as a one-page summary table. It was accompanied by a detailed report listing all the data for each school and sorted by the factor being evaluated. The SEA is developing new processes to make information more useful and more accessible. It is expected that next year the analysis of HQT data will be

more extensive and just one task in a comprehensive approach for using data to inform school support strategies.

These are the significant findings from the analysis:

- SINI schools do not have higher rates of non-HQT teachers and non-HQT classes.
- Schools with high AYP/SINI risk factors had higher than average rates of teachers with limited teaching experience.
- Schools with high AYP/SINI risk factors had the lowest income levels.
- Core content areas with the highest rates of non-HQT teachers were all the middle school subjects; and the sciences, English and math at the high school level.
- Rural schools, as measured by REAP, had higher percentages of non-HQT classes and teachers.

The analyses on teacher quality in this report are based on HQT data from the 2004-2005 school year. While compiling the data it was discovered that some data were missing and other data were obviously inaccurate. To establish a reasonable quality standard for the analysis, data submitted by 47 schools was excluded. To address the quality issue, the SEA has already added verification features to the data collection system. Procedures for data submission, verification and training will be reviewed.

Every year the SEA has improved its data-gathering system to ensure an accurate count of the classes that are taught by teachers who have not met the highly qualified teacher requirement. In 2003-2004, New Hampshire reported that 78% of the core content classes were taught by teachers who had met the highly qualified teacher requirement and in the 2004-2005 school year, 95% of core content classes were taught by highly qualified teachers. The preliminary 2005-2006 data indicates that 99% of all core content classes were taught by highly qualified teachers. The data demonstrates the progress of the SEA towards the 2005-2006 annual measurable objective (AMO) of 100% highly qualified teachers. **Table 1** on page 7 represents the classes that are taught by teachers who have NOT met the highly qualified requirement. The table indicates the

relationships among the percentage of non-HQT teachers and classes, experience and AYP/SINI risk.

Table 1: HQT Classes 04-05, Annual Measurable Objective-95%

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	289	92,860	3.5%	2.7%	12%	0.7
More Than 5% Not HQT	34	11,857	16.3%	13.6%	15%	1.1
5% or Less Not HQT	17	6,436	3.0%	3.8%	15%	1.0
All Classes HQT	238	74,567	0.0%	0.3%	11%	0.6

MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	63	37,855	7.4%	10.2%	18%	2.0
More Than 5% Not HQT	33	19,551	13.2%	17.9%	19%	2.4
5% or Less Not HQT	16	12,071	2.7%	3.3%	18%	1.9
All Classes HQT	14	6,233	0.0%	0.7%	18%	1.2

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	68	59,044	5.1%	8.4%	21%	1.9
More Than 5% Not HQT	28	22,557	10.9%	14.8%	22%	2.4
5% or Less Not HQT	22	22,194	2.5%	5.9%	21%	2.0
All Classes HQT	18	14,293	0.0%	1.7%	19%	1.2

1.2 **ED**: *Does the analysis focus on the staffing needs of schools that are not making AYP? Do these schools have high percentages of classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified?*

SEA Response: Schools were assigned a level of risk (0-5) based on their status of being a school in need of improvement (SINI) or not making AYP. In **Table 2** on page 9, schools were grouped based on their AYP/SINI risk level. Districts at the highest risk do not appear to have a higher percentage of non-hqt teachers. These districts do seem to have a higher percentage of new teachers.

As part of the development of a School Improvement Plan, schools and districts in need of improvement investigate and document causes for the under achievement of their students (including staff highly qualified teacher needs) and include change strategies in their plan (PDF Attachment: School Improvement and District Improvement Plan). This data may assist schools in that process. Schools in at risk level 4 and 5 are identified on **List 1** on pages 41-43.

Table 2: AYP/SINI Risk Level and Relationship to HQT Classes, HQT Teachers and Other Factors

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience
State Average/Total	289	92,860	0.7	3.5%	2.7%	12%
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)	11	5,067	4.2	5.3%	2.6%	13%
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)	18	8,553	3.0	4.3%	3.6%	15%
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)	96	38,443	1.0	4.7%	3.7%	13%
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)	164	40,797	0.0	2.2%	1.8%	11%

MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience
State Average/Total	63	37,855	2.0	7.4%	10.2%	18%
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)	13	8,556	4.0	6.2%	9.8%	20%
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)	17	12,605	3.0	8.2%	11.5%	21%
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)	22	12,097	1.1	8.8%	11.5%	17%
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)	11	4,597	0.0	2.4%	3.7%	13%

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience
State Average/Total	68	59,044	1.9	5.1%	8.4%	21%
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)	17	23,980	4.6	4.3%	7.4%	23%
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)	12	10,499	3.0	9.1%	10.2%	20%
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)	16	14,173	1.1	4.7%	8.8%	20%
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)	23	10,392	0.0	3.2%	8.1%	19%

1.3 ED: *Does the analysis identify particular groups of teachers to which the SEA's plan must pay particular attention, such as special education teachers, mathematics or science teachers, or multi-subjects teachers in rural schools*?

SEA Response: Yes, we have determined which groups of teachers will need the most support to complete the highly qualified teacher process as quickly as possible. As projected, the analysis indicates that High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) and Technical Assistance (TA) is needed in the middle grades 7-8, particularly in schools with elementary approval for K-8. Secondary math and science for general education teachers and all areas for special educators in grades 7-12 need TA and HQPD. **Table 3** on pages 47-48 is an overview of the totals in each core content area and across grade levels. The percentages in Table 3 include special education teachers.

In New Hampshire, special education teachers are licensed to teach across content areas for grades K-12. Most special education teachers also teach multiple subject areas and many did not receive content specific preparation and therefore did not meet the highly qualified teacher requirements in each area. In addition to teaching multiple subjects, special education is a critical shortage area in New Hampshire and a significant number of special education teachers are pursuing alternative certification routes.

To address the needs of NH's special education teachers, the Department will provide multiple opportunities for content specific high quality professional development. Praxis II content reviews are available through the State Agency for Higher Education grant (SAHE) known as CEIL (Content Enhanced Instructional Leadership) along with content specific professional development for special education teachers who need to meet the highly qualified requirement. Most importantly, this HQPD will build the capacity of special education teachers to provide direct instruction in the content areas to

students with disabilities. A second focus area for the SAHE grant will be elementary certified teachers (K-8) who teach multiple subjects in middle school grades 7-8. Although the teachers are certified for grades K-8, New Hampshire requires teachers to demonstrate significantly more content knowledge in grades 7-8.

The SEA will also work this year with the Professional Standards Board and the Council for Teacher Education, to require that all new teachers pass content tests before receiving a certification in New Hampshire. All new elementary education teachers must now pass the Praxis II for elementary education content knowledge to become certified in NH. The Professional Standards Board has required that content tests be added to all areas when the standards for certification are revised. In the past year, content tests have been validated for elementary education, middle school social studies and middle school English. A validation study is planned for Early Childhood Education in September and a December validation is scheduled for Reading Specialist and Reading Teacher. The special education standards are under revision and included in that discussion has been the need to incorporate content knowledge that would meet the highly qualified teacher requirements in multiple content areas.

Secondary science teachers also need support for expanding their capacity to teach multiple science areas. Technical assistance to secondary science department heads will be developed to build science content knowledge and to demonstrate content knowledge for additional areas of science for science certified teachers. There is a noticeable difference in the percentage of highly qualified teachers in rural schools, and this will be an area of focus. Rural teachers who teach multiple subjects have been given the flexibility of additional time to complete the highly qualified teacher requirements

under the guidelines provided by USDOE. The review of the data prompts many questions as inquiries are made by poverty, by AYP, and by teacher experience. The SEA plans to do an analysis of schools by geographic region to gain more insight into the characteristics of rural schools.

Table 4: **04-05 REAP Designation and Relationship to HQT Classes, HQT Teachers and Other Factors**

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	Enroll	04-05 REAP	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3 years Experience	AYP/SINI Risk
State Average/Total	289	92,860		3.5%	2.7%	12%	0.7
REAP	61	14,672	21%	6.6%	5.4%	12%	0.4
Not REAP	228	78,188	79%	2.5%	2.0%	12%	0.8

MIDDLE/JR HIGH	Number of Schools	Enroll	04-05 REAP	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3 years Experience	AYP/SINI Risk
State Average/Total	63	37,855		7.4%	10.2%	18%	2.0
REAP	3	368	5%	1.7%	2.4%	22%	0.3
Not REAP	60	37,487	95%	7.4%	10.3%	18%	2.1

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	Enroll	04-05 REAP	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3 years Experience	AYP/SINI Risk
State Average/Total	68	59,044		5.1%	8.4%	21%	1.9
REAP	7	1,151	10%	8.8%	18.1%	17%	0.4
Not REAP	61	57,893	90%	5.0%	8.0%	21%	2.1

1.4 ED: *Does the analysis identify districts and schools around the SEA where significant numbers of teachers do not meet the highly qualified teacher standards?*

SEA Response: Yes, **Table 5** on page 14 provides summary information on the number of schools in the state that did not meet the AMO of 95% highly qualified teachers for the 04-05 school year. **Table 5** shows that schools not meeting the AMO do not seem to have a higher AYP/SINI risk or higher rates of new teachers. **List 2** on pages 44-46 identifies the particular schools and districts that did not make the AMO for 2004-2005 for the total number of classes taught by teachers who have met the highly qualified requirement. The SEA is using this list and 05-06 information to assess district needs. Preliminary data for the 2005-2006 school indicates that the state had achieved 99% classes taught by highly qualified teachers as of June 2006.

Table 5: HQT Teachers 04-05, Annual Measurable Objective – 95%

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Teachers Not HQT	Classes Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	289	92,860	2.7%	3.5%	12%	0.7
More Than 5% Not HQT	39	12,012	15.9%	14.1%	14%	0.8
5% or Less Not HQT	10	4,773	3.6%	4.0%	15%	1.6
All Teachers are HQT	240	76,075	0.0%	0.8%	11%	0.6

MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Teachers Not HQT	Classes Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	63	37,855	10.2%	7.4%	18%	2.0
More Than 5% Not HQT	33	21,233	17.3%	11.9%	18%	2.3
5% or Less Not HQT	10	7,092	3.2%	2.0%	20%	1.8
All Teachers are HQT	20	9,530	0.0%	2.1%	18%	3.2

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Teachers Not HQT	Classes Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	68	59,044	8.4%	5.1%	21%	1.9
More Than 5% Not HQT	38	28,823	14.7%	8.8%	21%	1.9
5% or Less Not HQT	10	14,184	3.8%	0.9%	20%	2.6
All Teachers are HQT	20	16,037	0.0%	2.2%	21%	1.6

This table identifies the number of schools where more than 5% of the teachers do not meet the highly qualified teacher requirement.

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

SEA Response: Yes, **Table 3** on pages 47-48 identifies the specific courses that are often taught by teachers who have not met the highly qualified requirement.

Requirement 2: The revised plan must provide information on highly qualified teacher status in each LEA and the steps the SEA will take to ensure that each LEA has plans in place to assist teachers who are not highly qualified to attain highly qualified teachers status as quickly as possible.

2.1 ED: *Does the plan identify LEAs that have not met annual measurable objectives (AMO) for highly qualified teachers?*

SEA Response: Yes, the SEA has identified the percentage of classes that are taught by teachers who have not met the highly qualified teacher requirement. **List 2** on pages 44-46 identifies the schools and districts that have not met annual measurable objectives (AMO) of 95% for the 2004-2005 school year. The AMO for 2005-2006 was 100% classes taught by highly qualified teachers. While the data is still being collected for 2005-2006, preliminary results show that 99% of all core content classes were taught by teachers who have met the highly qualified teacher requirement.

The Title IIA online application identifies the districts that have not met the AMO by requiring districts to list the total number of teachers who have not met the highly qualified requirement. The online application also requires the LEA to indicate its plan to support the teachers through the highly qualified teacher process. The Title IIA Evaluation (PDFAttachment: Title IIA Evaluation 05-06) requires an LEA plan for each teacher named to meet the requirement as quickly as possible.

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

SEA Response:

The SEA employs the steps below (1-4) as a model of continuous improvement. The LEAs follow the procedures below during the Title IIA grant application process with regard to meeting the annual measurable objectives for highly qualified teachers.

Step 1: Districts complete the consolidated application for Title IIA which begins the review process.

Step 2: Applications become available during the first week of June each year. The Title IIA consultant reviews the application and the highly qualified teacher data, including the New Hampshire Educator Survey and past Title IIA evaluations.

Step 3: The IIA consultant verifies whether the district has met the AMO, and whether the district has a plan to support the teacher or teachers as they complete the requirements as quickly as possible.

Step 4: The highly qualified teacher data and the application information must identify the teachers and courses where teachers have not met the highly qualified teacher requirement. In addition to these established procedures, activities in the application must be based on the district's Master Plan. Professional development activities must address the district's needs to meet the highly qualified teacher requirement. Districts that use large portions of their allocations for reducing class size must supply details on other resources that will be used to address professional development needs within the district.

The Title IIA online application requires that LEAs identify how they will support their teachers to complete the highly qualified teacher requirements. The Title IIA evaluation requires that LEAs report on the highly qualified teacher status in the district. The 2005-2006 evaluation requires LEAs to name the teachers who have not met the highly qualified requirement and the core content classes they are teaching. The districts must also identify the steps they will take to assure that all teachers will meet the highly

qualified teacher requirement as soon as possible. Project evaluations are reviewed annually and are required for future funding of the district's Title IIA grant.

2.3 ED*: Does the plan delineate specific steps the SEA will take to ensure that all LEAs have plans in place to assist all teachers who have not met the highly qualified requirement teachers to become HQ as quickly as possible?*

SEA Response: The SEA will continue to review the information from the NH Educator Survey and the Title IIA application process including the program evaluation. As LEAs apply for Title IIA funds for the 2006-2007 school year, the benchmark remains at 100% highly qualified teachers. Districts who did not met the 100% benchmark for the 2005-2006 school year must respond with their plan for meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement. Their Title IIA application activities must reflect activities that will move them in this direction. LEAs may also indicate other methods that will be used to assist the teachers in meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement as quickly as possible. The SEA will develop a more comprehensive reporting system and an onsite monitoring system that will give priority to high need schools and districts.

The SEA will:

a. Create a template for a District Improvement Plan and require that districts that have not met AMO for two consecutive years be required to submit a highly qualified teacher improvement plan.

b. The district plan will include a process to track the progress of teachers who have not met the requirement. The SEA will create a template for LEAs. The LEAs will use this template to create a written plan for each teacher who has not met the requirement. The individual teacher plan should be signed by both the teacher and the superintendent's designee, and be maintained on file at the superintendent's office.

c. Develop an onsite monitoring component for Title IIA to be incorporated into the existing School Approval Process and articulate a plan for monitoring that will

give priority to districts and schools in need of improvement and schools that have not met the AMO for two years.

Requirement 3: The revised plan must include information on the technical assistance, programs, and services that the SEA will offer to assist the LEAs in successfully completing their highly qualified teacher plans, particularly where large groups of teachers are not highly qualified, and the resources the LEAs will use to meet their highly qualified teachers goals.

3.1 ED: *Does the plan include a description of the technical assistance the SEA will provide to assist LEAs in successfully carrying out their highly qualified teachers plans?*

SEA Response: The SEA will utilize the State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) grant entitled Content Enhancement Instructional Leadership (CEIL) to assist LEAs with their plans. This may include providing technical assistance for administrators and providing high quality professional development (HQPD) in targeted areas.

The Title IIA project manager and the Bureau of Credentialing will continue to meet with administrative groups, including special education and Title I directors, and federal program managers statewide to provide technical assistance.

The Commissioner of Education is focusing his efforts on Follow The Child professional development to promote an increase in the number of effective teachers who can employ effective instructional strategies, monitor individual student progress, personalize education for each child, employ classroom management techniques in a seamless classroom instructional design. The Commissioner's goal is to have every child reach or exceed proficiency. Both content and pedagogy sessions grounded in the Tri-State Grade Level Expectations and Grade Span Expectations will prompt educators to examine student work and evaluate the extent to which content standards are being met or exceed established expectations. LEA educators will further identify particular content

areas based on student scores on the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) and the NH Education Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP).

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

SEA Response: The information from the data analysis in this report will be used to identify the LEAs with the greatest need. The identified LEAs will be invited to participate in a technical assistance workshop by the SEA or the SAHE to identify methods and procedures to complete the highly qualified teacher process. These LEAs are given high priority by the Bureau of Accountability including the State Support System through the school improvement process. It may be possible to customize the HQPD for each of these LEAs to assist teachers who need to complete the HQT requirement.

3.3 ED: *Does the plan include a description of programs and services the SEA will provide to assist teachers and LEAs in successfully meeting highly qualified teachers goals?*

SEA Response: The SEA will continue to work with the SAHE through the CEIL project to coordinate this effort. Ongoing HQPD in content areas and content reviews for Praxis tests will be targeted to specific groups including special education teachers, multi-subject teachers in rural districts and English, math, and science for teachers in grades 7-12. In addition, high priority will be given to schools and districts that did not make AYP. Technical assistance for school administrators will continue to be developed and high

need LEAs will be encouraged to attend and participate in these sessions. The SEA will convene a cross bureau team to coordinate technical assistance to high need LEAs.

3.4 ED: *Does the plan specifically address the needs of any subgroups of teachers identified in requirement 1?*

SEA Response: The identified groups will receive additional attention and technical assistance when completing their Title IIA applications and evaluations. Attention will be focused on the LEA plan to assure that all teachers are being supported so that they may complete the highly qualified teacher process. The data analysis indicates a need for HQPD in math and the sciences in grades 7-12 for general education and special education teachers. In addition, special education teachers in grades 7-12 need HQPD and TA and support to complete their multi-subject highly qualified teacher requirements.

The SEA content consultants provide statewide technical assistance and professional development in all content areas. The Math Science Partnership (MSP) for example, ran math and science high quality professional development sessions and gave priority to teachers who needed to meet the highly qualified teacher requirement (PDF Attachment: MSP brochure) Additional examples of HQPD are attached from recent SAHE professional development opportunities in all core content areas (PDF Attachment: SAHE brochures).

3.5 ED: *Does the plan include a description of how the SEA will use its available funds (e.g., Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A, including the portion that goes to the SEA agency for higher education; other Federal and SEA funds, as appropriate) to address the needs of teachers who are not highly qualified?*

SEA Response: The SEA will use Title I, Part A funds to support professional development by requiring that Title I districts retain 10% of their entitlement to be applied towards professional development for those districts identified as in need of improvement. Title II, Part A funds will be directed to support regional and statewide professional development activities that enhance content mastery and understanding differentiated learning by targeting teams from those districts identified as in need of improvement. In addition, SEA level school improvement funds will supplement these efforts at both the district and SEA level for those non-Title I districts who are identified as in need of improvement.

In addition, the SEA will use the SAHE projects (as described above) to coordinate the HQPD and technical assistance to the districts. The SEA will coordinate its efforts with Title I, Part A. Title I Part A allows a maximum of 5% to be set aside for HQPD to support Title I schools. The LEAs receive this information through the Title I Part A consultants, in the consolidated application and through the Title I e-mail. In addition, all Title I districts in need of improvement (DINI) and schools in need of improvement (SINI) must use an additional 10% of their Title I a funds to support teachers through the highly qualified teacher process with HQPD in core content areas and in curriculum work as outlined in the School Improvement Plan. Additional support will be provided through IDEA discretionary funds to assist districts in developing individual professional development plans for those teachers, including special education teachers, who have not met the highly qualified teacher requirement.

3.6 ED: *Does the plan for the use of available funds indicate that priority will be given to the staffing and professional development needs if schools that are not making AYP?*

SEA Response: As part of the State Support System, schools are prioritized according to AYP/SINI status. This allows the SEA to target resources to the specific areas of need as stated in a School Improvement Plan. LEAs and in particular, the high need LEAs, are directed to choose activities to target areas of need in their Improvement Plans in Title I.

Title IIA applicants are directed to focus on activities that will meet their staffing and professional development needs. Activities that work toward the highly qualified teacher goal will be encouraged. All activities must be approved by the project managers in IIA and IA. Consultants work with LEAs as they prepare their consolidated applications for funds and provide assistance in the steps identified to provide specific professional development activities that will focus on recognized content areas of need. Schools that are in need of improvement are required to submit an annual progress report to document their activities and progress toward their stated goals. These reports are reviewed by SEA staff and are used as a basis for determining funding support (see SINI progress report). The standard format used in a SAHE or MSP Request for Proposals (RFPs) at the SEA requires partnerships with high need districts. The rubric for awarding the Math Science Partnership (MSP) grant awards extra points for partner districts with high percentages of non- highly qualified teachers.

Requirement 4: The revised plan must describe how the SEA will work with LEAs that fail to reach the 100 percent highly qualified teachers goal by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

4.1 ED: *Does the plan indicate how the SEA will monitor LEA compliance with the LEAs' highly qualified teacher plans described in requirement 2 and hold LEAs accountable for fulfilling their plans?*

SEA Response: Several tools are currently in place to monitor the progress of each LEA, district, and school. The NH Educator Survey records the number of highly qualified teacher classes in each grade range and by secondary subject area. The 2005-2006 Title IIA project evaluations will be reviewed to note the progress in each school and district. These will also be used to review the 2006-2007 Title IIA grant applications. The grant application requires information regarding meeting the 100% benchmark. This includes the number of teachers who are not highly qualified and the LEA or district plan to support the completion of the highly qualified teacher process. LEAs must provide a specific plan for each teacher that has not met the requirement for highly qualified teachers as part of the previous year's Title IIA evaluation and the approval process for new IIA funding.

4.2 ED: *Does the plan show how technical assistance from the SEA to help LEAs meet the 100 percent highly qualified teacher goal will be targeted toward LEAs and schools that are not making AYP?*

SEA Response: The SEA has developed a coordinated cross bureau system of school support to provide technical assistance. The states' LEAs are divided into five regional areas within the state. Each region is assigned to a lead member of the SEA's School Support Team from within the Bureau of Accountability's School Improvement Group.

Additional SEA School Support Team members include SEA consultants in the areas of curriculum, assessment, special education, Integrated Programs (which includes all the federal Titles), and adult learning.

After AYP determinations are made, the schools and districts that have not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are placed on a "watch" list. These schools and districts have access to and are notified of any and all professional development opportunities and other support offered by the SEA. To enhance the support to these identified schools and districts, the SEA will increase collaboration and communication within the SEA to coordinate and monitor supports and programs already in existence within the high need LEAs and schools.

LEAs that have not made AYP for two consecutive years must develop a District Improvement Plan with the support of the School Improvement Team. The District Improvement Plan (PDF Attachment) includes participation in a root cause analysis process that examines all aspects of the school/district, following the eight components of Comprehensive School Reform planning and Title I Schoolwide planning. Staffing and teacher effectiveness are part of this, but in the future, the SEA will require specific data related to HQT.

This year, the School Support Team will use the newly created data analysis that cross references AYP status with HQT status. The teams will focus on the identified area or areas of deficiency (reading and/or mathematics) and look at the qualifications, training, and experience of the teachers working with the particular subgroups affected. A comprehensive reporting system and monitoring tool for HQT and AYP is to be developed with the assistance of the New England Comprehensive Center (NECC).

The completed School and District Improvement Plans are reviewed and first monitored by the School Support Teams. The information gathered will be shared with any teams who will be visiting these schools and districts as part of the school approval/NEASC, special education or Title I monitoring process. Need specific technical assistance will be prioritized to target those districts and the School Support Team will pay particular attention to those districts with the highest percentage of non-highly qualified teachers.

Several initiatives supported by the SEA will target these districts. The SEA will utilize the State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) grants to assist the LEAs to meet the 100% mark through need-specific professional development in both content knowledge and/or pedagogy. The SAHE grants, which includes a new reading grant, will also partner with high need districts or LEAs to offer high quality professional development in reading instruction, analysis of reading data, and reading interventions for struggling readers across the SEA.

The NHDOE Literacy Initiative will offer a Follow The Child Leadership Institute in July for school leaders (superintendents, principals, special education directors, reading specialists, curriculum leaders, and other teacher leaders). The main focus of this four-day institute will be to support districts in evaluating and implementing a comprehensive literacy program at all levels (pre-K through 12+) in order to improve literacy instruction at all levels in all content areas. Additional components of the Institute will focus on use and analysis of assessment data, pedagogy and content knowledge in all subject areas, and how to assess other factors that affect the academic success of each student.

Additionally, New Hampshire's Reading First Program provides statewide outreach on implementing scientifically based reading instruction. New Hampshire also has contracted with School Improvement Coaches who have expertise in specific content areas and data analysis, so that they can work with districts and schools to meet their specific teaching and administrative needs. They work very closely with the NHDOE Content and Assessment Specialists. Finally, to support special education teachers who have not met the highly qualified teacher requirement, the Personnel Center Project, funded through a grant from the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) will offer additional technical assistance in developing plans for those special education teachers to meet the highly qualified requirement.

4.3 ED: *Does the plan describe how the SEA will monitor whether LEAs attain 100 percent highly qualified teachers in each LEA and school:*

- *In the percentage of highly qualified teachers at each LEA and school; and*
- *In the percentage of teachers who are receiving HQPD to enable such teachers to become highly qualified and successful classroom teachers?*

SEA Response: The monitoring tools described, including the highly qualified teachers Survey, the Title IIA application and project evaluations will be used to assess progress. During the 2006-2007 school year, the SEA will develop an on-site monitoring system using successful models (including Alabama's system) as a template.

4.4 ED: *Consistent with ESEA 2141, does the plan include technical assistance or corrective actions that the SEA will apply if the LEAs fail to meet highly qualified teachers (AMO) and AYP goals?*

SEA Response: The SEA monitors LEAs (districts) for "good faith efforts" in achieving the annual measurable objective (AMO) of 100% of all core content classes being taught by teachers who have met the highly qualified teacher requirement. LEAs annually report the information to the state as a requirement for Title II A funding. The 2005-2006 preliminary data indicates that 99% of all core content classes are taught by teachers who meet the highly qualified requirement.

Achieving and sustaining the 100% of all core content classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be a challenge based on factors that include critical shortage areas, rapidly increasing numbers of teacher retirements, relocation, attrition, illness, and new teachers with multiple subject assignments. LEAs will continue to have emergency situations that require the employment of educators who have not met the highly qualified requirements for all of their classes. Multi-subject special education teachers and secondary mathematics/sciences are two examples where LEAs make the best educational decision in the interests of students by hiring non-HQT staff to fill an emergency teaching situation and working with those teachers to expedite their highly qualified status as quickly as possible.

A new web tool, "A Guide for Improving Recruitment and Retention", has been designed through a Teacher Quality Enhancement grant to assist districts in assessing their staffing needs, recruiting, hiring, and retaining highly qualified staff. The web tool is being field tested and will be available for use in the spring. Regional training and focused training to districts in need of improvement is being designed. The link to the preview site is http://users.rcn.com/colmark/ET.

The SEA role is to monitor the efforts of the LEAs and careful attention is paid to districts that have not met annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP. As part of that role, the SEA will initiate corrective actions and technical assistance. Steps to address technical assistance and corrective action include:

- Reviewing district Professional Development Master Plans to ascertain the extent to which efforts are clearly documented to determine data that defines specific learning areas preventing the district from making AYP;
- Establishing professional learning opportunities for teachers to raise their capacity to meet the learning needs of each child;
- Beginning with technical assistance, work with districts to review the Professional Development Master Plan and the District Improvement Plan for how Title II A and other federal funds are expended to address annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP;
- Upon the determination that a school/district has failed to meet the annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP; for two or more consecutive years, the NH Department of Education will work with the school/district to design the plan for how Title II A and other federal funds will be expended.
- Specific professional learning activities in both content and pedagogy geared to personalizing the education of each child and building the range of support systems necessary, so that student progress can be documented using many methods of formative and summative assessment.
- The NH DOE will work with school districts in corrective action to review the overall manner in which funds provided under NCLB are expended and determine ways to links the funds expended to increased student performance.
- Require districts to reduce the amount of Title II A funds used for Class Size Reduction until such time that the district meets the annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP.
- At the SEA level, a cross-bureau group will focus on four particular areas (1) Program Monitoring; (2) Professional Learning; (3) Expanding technology and data collection to enhance the efficiency of the SEA; and (4) The process, procedures and policies for how federal and state funds reach and are expended by LEAs with regard to school improvement/NCLB, Follow The Child and IDEA. Additionally, there will be a deliberate focus on districts that have not met the annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP.

The SEA will:

- Send letters to LEAs that have not met the annual measurable objective for HQT for two consecutive years; and
- Require districts to define their strategy to meet the 100% HQT goal and to make AYP in their application for federal funds.

The SEA, consistent with ESEA 2141, collects LEA data with regard to adequate yearly progress (AYP). Schools and districts that fail to make progress for two consecutive years are required to submit a School/District Improvement Plan which is approved by the NH State Board of Education. Schools/districts thereafter must submit progress reports on a yearly basis to the State Board until such time that AYP has been achieved. As part of that plan, those districts failing to make AMO toward HQT, must articulate how the use of Title II Part A and other federal funds will be used to achieve the annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP.

Furthermore, as part of the corrective action process, districts will need to document how equitable teacher assignments are determined particularly in those areas where HQT has not been met and wherein AYP has not been met for either the whole school or particular subgroups.

Requirement 5: The revised plan must explain how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for teachers not new to the profession who were hired prior to the end of the 2005-06 school year, and how the SEA will discontinue the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005-06 school year (except for the situations described below).

5.1 ED: *Does the plan describe how and when the SEA will complete the HOUSSE process for all teachers <u>not new to the profession</u> who were hired before the end of the 2005-06 school year*?

SEA Response: The SEA intends to phase out the HOUSSE plan by June 30, 2008. Currently, the USDOE seems to be considering guidance around the phase out of HOUSSE because it is part of the NCLB law that teachers who are not new to the profession have the option of using HOUSSE to demonstrate content knowledge.

New Hampshire is close to 100% HQT for elementary classes in both high and low poverty schools. The preliminary data for 2005-2006 shows that 99% of the core content classes in New Hampshire are taught by teachers who have met the highly qualified teacher requirement. The majority of experienced teachers who are employed in the public school system in NH have completed the highly qualified process.

5.2 ED*: Does the plan describe how and when the SEA will discontinue the use of HOUSSE after the end of the 2005-06 school year, except in the following situations:*

- *Multi-subject teachers in rural schools who are HQ in one subject at the time of hire*
- *Multi-subject special education teachers who are new to the profession and are HQ in either math or English or science may use HOUSSE to complete the remaining subjects*

SEA Response: Teachers who are eligible for the USDOE flexibilities above will be allowed to continue to use HOUSSE to complete the highly qualified teacher process. Multi-subject teachers in rural (REAP) districts who are highly qualified in one area are also eligible to continue to use HOUSSE at a minimum through the 2006-2007 school year. New Hampshire will phase out the use of HOUSSE, with the exception of USDOE flexibilities, by the end of the 2007-2008 school year.

The Bureau of Credentialing is preparing to review highly qualified teacher documentation as new candidates enter the system and for experienced NH certified teachers who are not currently working in the public school system, but who may decide to reenter the public school workforce at a future time. HOUSSE will be one of the options for this experienced group of teachers until June 30, 2008.

The New Hampshire content area HOUSSE is the equivalence of a content major. The standards required for HOUSSE are the exact same standards required for

certification in the single subject content areas. Alternative certification candidates use the same process of demonstrating competencies that is used for the HOUSSE in New Hampshire. Because a candidate may complete the portfolio for alternative certification, it is recognized as the equivalence of a content major for meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement. After a thoughtful review of the HOUSSE processes employed in many SEAs, NH would agree with USDOE that many SEAs were not consistent with the intent of the law. HOUSSE should be the equivalence of content major.

There are many teachers in critical shortage areas including math, sciences, and special education who are not new to the profession, but who are new to the New Hampshire and would make excellent additions to the New Hampshire teacher workforce. This is critically important in attracting and retaining highly qualified and effective and experienced teachers. For this reason and after much discussion and thought, NH has decided that experienced teachers from other SEAs will be able to use the NH HOUSSE to document HQT through June 2008. The SEA does not anticipate that large numbers of experienced teachers would employ this option.

Requirement 6: The revised plan must include a copy of the SEA's written "equity plan" for ensuring that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.

6.1 ED: *Does the revised plan include a written equity plan?*

SEA Response: The SEA prepared a preliminary equity plan based on the CCSSO template (PDF Attachment: CCSSO template). The SEA recognizes that completing the template is the *first* phase in creating an action plan. The SEA will use the list of activities to create a comprehensive plan. A team of stakeholders will be convened this

fall and will include SEA staff from all bureaus as well as other stakeholders beyond the SEA to include, but not limited to Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), school administrators, and districts in need of improvement, unions, and the Commissioner's Advisory Board. The equity plan will consider the following key areas:

- Data and Reporting Systems
- Teacher Preparation
- Out-of-field Teaching
- Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers
- Professional Development
- Specialized Knowledge and Skills
- Working Conditions
- Policy Coherence

6.2 ED: *Does the plan identify where inequities in teacher assignment exist?*

SEA Response**:** The SEA has run several queries to identify where the inequities in teacher distribution exist.

- **Table 3** on page 47-48 identifies districts and schools where significant numbers of teachers did not meet the annual measurable objectives for HQT by subject in the 04-05 school year. Specific courses that are most often taught by non HQ teachers have been identified. Middle grade teachers (7-8), secondary math and science teachers and special education teachers in grades 7-12 have been identified as needing particular attention. The state will also pay particular attention to teachers in rural areas. The SEA will provide focused high quality professional development in the identified content areas and grade levels. While Table 3 is a snapshot of the state, the SEA will use the 05-06 data for Table 3 with the Cross Bureau Team (CBT). The team will review the subject area data across the state and within districts in need of improvement and schools within these districts.

- **Table 6** data from 2004-05 (page 34) provides information on the distribution of teachers in high AYP/SINI risk schools. At each level, the state has 7.4 percent or fewer classes not taught by HQT. At the elementary level, this percentage is 3.5, and at high school this percentage is 5.1. Middle/junior high has the highest percentage of classes not taught by HQT (7.4). Disaggregated by years of teacher experience, the secondary level has the highest percentage of classes taught by teachers with fewer than three years of experience (21). Middle/junior high schools follow with 18 percent, while elementary schools, on average, have 12 percent of classes taught by teachers with fewer than three years of experience. Statewide totals for these data are also available upon request.

- Schools were assigned a level of risk (page 5) based on their status of not making AYP or being a School in Need of Improvement. While schools assigned a risk level of zero had lower percentages of classes not taught by HQT, those with the highest risk level do not always have higher percentages of classes taught by non-HQ teachers. The data showed no clear patterns when looking at classes taught by teachers who were not HQ. However, schools with a zero AYP/SINI risk level almost always showed the lowest number of classes not taught by HQT. Similarly, schools with the lowest percentages of classes taught by teachers with fewer than three years of experience were associated with the lowest risk of AYP/SINI status. There was not a linear relationship between experience and AYP/SINI risk.

- **Table 7** on page 35 identifies the distribution of experienced educators across the state. To define "experienced", the SEA used designations that are assigned for credentials. A Beginning Educator's Credential (BEC) and Teachers with an Intern License represent the 'inexperienced' group with three or fewer years of teaching experience. The second credential is the Experienced Educator Credential (EEC) which represents teachers with more than three years of experience. Teachers with Professional Certificates are also counted as experienced. The state intends to use this credentialing data and the Teacher Quality Survey from the 2005-2006 school year when creating the equity plan.

- The state 04-05 state average for inexperienced teachers is 12 percent. (Table 7) The four elementary schools with the highest percentage of inexperienced teachers (45 percent) and representing 611 student enrollment out of more than 92,000 total enrollment, also had the highest rate of HQT and the highest AYP risk level (1.3). This pattern continues into the middle and secondary grades for HQT, but not for AYP risk. A test for significance will be run on all tables using the 05-06 data.

- **Table 8** on page 36 indicates that the highest risk districts have a higher percentage of inexperienced teachers, as well as classes that are taught by HQ teachers. Using the Free and Reduced Lunch (F/R) count, the poorest schools are at higher risk for not making AYP and being identified as schools in need of improvement (SINIs). These same schools are also more likely to have a greater percentage of inexperienced teachers. They also have a greater number of teachers who have met HQT. This may be related to the Title I program's earlier deadline for new hires to meet HQT requirements upon hire.

Table 6: AYP/SINI Risk Level and Relationship to HQT Classes, HQT Teachers and Other Factors (Same as Table 2**)**

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience
State Average/Total	289	92,860	0.7	3.5%	2.7%	12%
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)	11	5,067	4.2	5.3%	2.6%	13%
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)	18	8,553	3.0	4.3%	3.6%	15%
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)	96	38,443	1.0	4.7%	3.7%	13%
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)	164	40,797	0.0	2.2%	1.8%	11%

MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience
State Average/Total	63	37,855	2.0	7.4%	10.2%	18%
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)	13	8,556	4.0	6.2%	9.8%	20%
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)	17	12,605	3.0	8.2%	11.5%	21%
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)	22	12,097	1.1	8.8%	11.5%	17%
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)	11	4,597	0.0	2.4%	3.7%	13%

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience
State Average/Total	68	59,044	1.9	5.1%	8.4%	21%
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)	17	23,980	4.6	4.3%	7.4%	23%
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)	12	10,499	3.0	9.1%	10.2%	20%
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)	16	14,173	1.1	4.7%	8.8%	20%
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)	23	10,392	0.0	3.2%	8.1%	19%

Table 7: 04-05 Limited Teaching Experience and Relationship to HQT Classes, HQT Teachers, and AYP/SINI Risk Factor

Less than 3 Years of Experience

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	Enroll	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	AYP/SINI Risk
State Average/Total	289	92,860	12%	3.5%	2.7%	0.7
40% or more	4	611	45%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3
30% to 39%	11	2,352	33%	7.5%	4.8%	1.1
20-29%	41	14,456	23%	4.0%	2.2%	0.8
10% to 19%	102	35,178	14%	4.2%	3.9%	0.8
less than 10%	131	40,263	5%	2.3%	1.8%	0.6

MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH	Number of Schools	Enroll	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	AYP/SINI Risk
State Average/Total	63	37,855	18%	7.4%	10.2%	2.0
40% or more	4	895	46%	4.2%	2.2%	1.8
30% to 39%	4	1,612	36%	8.4%	12.9%	2.5
20-29%	20	15,415	24%	8.3%	10.7%	2.8
10% to 19%	20	12,978	14%	6.6%	10.6%	1.7
less than 10%	15	6,955	6%	7.2%	9.3%	1.4

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	Enroll	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	AYP/SINI Risk
State Average/Total	68	59,044	21%	5.1%	8.4%	1.9
40% or more	2	925	44%	5.8%	18.8%	2.0
30% to 39%	9	5,762	34%	3.8%	8.0%	1.8
20-29%	26	26,672	24%	5.8%	9.0%	2.3
10% to 19%	21	21,609	15%	4.6%	7.4%	2.1
less than 10%	10	4,076	7%	5.3%	7.7%	0.7

Table 8: Household Income (measured by free/Reduced Lunch Eligibility) and Relationship to HQT Classes, HQT Teachers and Other Factors

ELEMENTARY	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Free & Reduced %	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	289	92,860	20%	3.5%	2.7%	12%	0.7
Income Quartile							
4th (Highest F/R %)	84	23,399	31%-81%	3.0%	1.7%	13%	1.1
3rd (High Middle F/R %)	83	23,020	16%-31%	2.6%	2.1%	11%	0.6
2nd (Low Middle F/R %)	64	23,159	9%-16%	4.7%	4.3%	12%	0.5
1st (Lowest F/R %)	58	23,282	0%-8%	3.3%	2.7%	10%	0.4

MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Free & Reduced %	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	63	37,855	20%	7.4%	10.2%	18%	2.0
Income Quartile							
4th (Highest F/R %)	19	9,092	29%-79%	6.1%	4.9%	20%	2.6
3rd (High Middle F/R %)	16	9,720	21%-29%	6.4%	10.0%	17%	1.8
2nd (Low Middle F/R %)	17	9,530	8%-20%	11.7%	16.0%	19%	1.8
1st (Lowest F/R %)	11	9,513	1%-8%	5.5%	9.4%	16%	1.7

HIGH SCHOOL	Number of Schools	04-05 Enroll	Free & Reduced %	Classes Not HQT	Teachers Not HQT	Teachers < 3yrs Experience	AYP/SINI Risk 0-5
State Average/Total	68	59,044	13%	5.1%	8.4%	21%	1.9
Income Quartile							
4th (Highest F/R %)	20	14,743	20%-62%	3.3%	6.1%	23%	2.1
3rd (High Middle F/R %)	20	14,750	14%-20%	6.1%	10.2%	18%	1.9
2nd (Low Middle F/R %)	15	14,232	6%-14%	6.9%	10.6%	22%	2.1
1st (Lowest F/R %)	13	15,319	1%-6%	4.3%	6.7%	20%	1.6

6.3 ED: *Does the plan delineate specific strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment?*

SEA Response: The equity plan will consider the following key areas:

- Data and Reporting Systems
- Teacher Preparation
- Out-of-field Teaching
- Recruitment and Retention of Experienced Teachers

- Professional Development
- Specialized Knowledge and Skills
- Working Conditions
- Policy Coherence

The first step in planning is to collect and analyze the data. The inequities have now been identified. The CCSSO template attachment has identified the tools and programs that are currently in place in New Hampshire. The next step is to create action steps based on the work that is currently under way, focusing the programs and initiatives on the schools and districts in need. The equity plan will be developed based on the eight elements above.

6.4 ED: *Does the plan provide evidence for the probable success of the strategies it includes?*

SEA Response: The SEA followed the CCSSO template. Each of the eight identified parts of the equity plan lists work that New Hampshire is already doing. The SEA will use the list of activities to create a comprehensive plan. A team of stakeholders will be convened this fall and will include SEA staff from all bureaus as well as other stakeholders beyond the SEA. The statewide stakeholder group will review this report and the CCSSO information and articulate the equity action plan.

6.5 ED: *Does the plan indicate that the SEA will examine the issue of equitable teacher assignment when it monitors LEAs, and how this will be done?*

SEA Response: The SEA will use the data in the NH Plan for Highly Qualified and Effective Teachers report to measure the equitable distribution of teachers in the districts.

The queries designed for this report are being run for the 05-06 data and will be reviewed by the Cross Bureau Team (CBT). The focus of the CBT is to: review the data; review and revise the activities in the CCSSO template; prioritize the activities and draft a comprehensive equity plan. The equity plan draft will include the eight areas identified by CCSSO including examining teacher inequities when monitoring LEAs; professional learning; expanding technology and data collection to enhance efficiency at the SEA; and reviewing the processes and policies that impact teacher quality and school improvement. Monitoring will be part of a deliberate focus by the state for districts that have not met the annual measurable objectives for both HQT and AYP as the state works to close identified gaps. The New England Comprehensive Center (NECC) is working with the NH Department of Education to review and revise monitoring tools and systems across the agency. Monitoring gaps, overlaps, and opportunities for collaboration were identified and discussed during the first agency-wide monitoring workshop in November. The work of this group will be incorporated into the equity plan with respect to monitoring.

The SEA cross bureau team (CBT) will partner with the New England Comprehensive Center (NECC) project to expand the CBT to a statewide stakeholder group which will meet monthly. The statewide stakeholder group, which will include SEA members, practitioners, and administrators, will review and revise the drafted equity

plan and provide feedback on the document. Among the action steps in the equity plan will be a monitoring component to examine and identify inequities in the distribution of highly qualified and effective teachers.

There will be a deliberate focus on districts and schools in need of improvement. Districts and schools in need of improvement in corrective action will be required to address the distribution of teachers within the school or district as part of their work to improve. Technical assistance and corrective actions consistent with ESEA section 2141 are discussed in detail in this report in question 4. 4 (pages 26-29).

Summary: The SEA will use the information from this report in several ways.

1. The collaboration has resulted in collecting and analyzing data from all bureaus. This data will be expanded to produce greater clarity for schools and districts in need of improvement. The same analysis will be used with the data from 2005-2006.
2. A cross bureau team will be convened. The team will be charged with reviewing the data. The team will also review and refine the information in the CCSSO template. They will participate in the statewide stakeholder group and facilitate the development and implementation of the equity action plan that is to be developed this fall.
3. Convene a statewide stakeholder group to develop a written equity action plan.
4. Develop an on-site monitoring system and technical assistance programs for LEAs.

5. A cross bureau data team (a sub- group of the cross bureau team) will continue to make connections between data systems. A goal moving forward will be for each new web-based application to be able to interface with other systems. Providing accurate data and analysis of data will be a useful tool for schools and districts in need of improvement.
6. Design a model or template to track HQT plans for LEAs who have not met AMO for two consecutive years. The template will be monitored during on-site visits and during priority paper monitoring.
7. Use the data and equity action plan to develop and target HQPD statewide that meets the needs of educators statewide, especially those in identified groups.
8. Address the HOUSSE phase out by the end of the 2007-2008 school year in all areas beyond the flexibilities allowed by USDOE.
9. Share the data with stakeholders including parents and communities through the SEA website and other means.

This report has opened a new chapter for the SEA. We have learned a great deal throughout the process. We have reviewed the data from the various bureaus in connection to the important work of each bureau. The data will be used by the SEA to prioritize and focus technical assistance to high need districts. Continued collaboration within bureaus will identify commonalities and connections in data collection and reporting. All members have learned more about making connections at the SEA and providing more focused technical assistance to assist LEAs in their work.

List 1: AYP Risk 4/5 Schools and Districts List, pages 38-40

School	District	# of schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	04-05 F/R %	04-05 Core Classes			04-05 Core Teachers			Sept 2006 Teachers			Out of field
						Total	NOT HQT	NOT HQT %	Total	NOT HQT	NOT HQT %	Total	< 3yr Exp.	< 3yr %	
ELEMENTARY															
State Average/Total		289	92,860	0.7	20%	10,101	352	3.5%	5,987	164	2.7%	6,377	762	12%	122
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)		11	5,067	4.2		416	22	5.3%	308	8	2.6%	312	42	13%	16
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)		18	8,553	3.0		815	35	4.3%	505	18	3.6%	538	83	15%	12
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)		96	38,443	1.0		3,984	188	4.7%	2,386	88	3.7%	2,589	328	13%	54
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)		164	40,797	0.0		4,886	107	2.2%	2,788	50	1.8%	2,938	309	11%	40
Amherst Street School	Nashua		306	5	67%	18	0	0%	18	0	0%	20	2	10%	0
Valley View Community Elementary School	Farmington		423	5	41%	22	0	0%	22	0	0%	17	7	41%	1
Mt. Pleasant School	Nashua		333	4	46%	21	0	0%	21	0	0%	17	1	6%	0
Fairgrounds Elementary School	Nashua		593	4	45%	33	0	0%	31	0	0%	29	0	0%	0
Northwest Elementary School	Manchester		712	4	42%	34	0	0%	34	0	0%	42	8	19%	0
Towle Elementary School	Newport		155	4	38%	11	0	0%	11	0	0%	14	1	7%	2
Hillsboro-Deering Elementary School	Hillsboro-Deering Coop		592	4	34%	80	0	0%	30	0	0%	38	3	8%	0
Charlestown Middle School	Fall Mountain Regional		209	4	31%	74	11	15%	18	4	22%	13	4	31%	4
Lamprey River Elementary School	Raymond		554	4	28%	36	0	0%	36	0	0%	42	3	7%	4
Paul Elementary School	Wakefield		507	4	27%	41	6	15%	41	4	10%	34	3	9%	1
Chester Academy	Chester		683	4	3%	46	5	11%	46	0	0%	46	10	22%	4

School	District	# of schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	04-05 F/R %	04-05 Core Classes			04-05 Core Teachers			Sept 2006 Teachers			Out of field
						Total	NOT HQT	NOT HQT %	Total	NOT HQT	NOT HQT %	Total	< 3yr Exp.	< 3yr %	
MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH															
State Average/Total		63	37,855	2.0	20%	10,108	744	7.4%	2,690	274	10.2%	2,345	426	18%	149
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)		13	8,556	4.0		2,078	128	6.2%	530	52	9.8%	547	109	20%	52
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)		17	12,605	3.0		3,081	253	8.2%	849	98	11.5%	760	156	21%	32
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)		22	12,097	1.1		3,799	335	8.8%	963	111	11.5%	725	120	17%	57
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)		11	4,597	0.0		1,150	28	2.4%	348	13	3.7%	313	41	13%	8
Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School	Manchester		873	4	41%	238	1	0%	50	1	2%	58	12	21%	11
Southside Middle School	Manchester		958	4	39%	198	19	10%	49	5	10%	54	14	26%	1
Memorial Middle School	Laconia		629	4	39%	100	0	0%	22	0	0%	39	10	26%	8
Newport Middle School	Newport		283	4	39%	70	5	7%	20	1	5%	19	9	47%	5
Claremont Middle School	Claremont		459	4	36%	145	20	14%	30	0	0%	32	2	6%	3
Hillside Middle School	Manchester		957	4	35%	245	16	7%	73	7	10%	67	6	9%	4
Rochester Middle School	Rochester		1,111	4	34%	256	12	5%	57	0	0%	72	16	22%	2
Berlin Junior High School	Berlin		296	4	30%	64	6	9%	23	6	26%	18	4	22%	2
Kingswood Regional Middle School	Gov Wentworth Regional		482	4	26%	119	10	8%	37	10	27%	36	8	22%	6
Winnisquam Regional Middle School	Winnisquam Regional		451	4	26%	159	25	16%	51	10	20%	29	5	17%	1
Iber Holmes Gove Middle School	Raymond		481	4	23%	59	0	0%	4	0	0%	32	7	22%	2
Epping Middle School	Epping		264	4	17%	86	9	10%	21	3	14%	9	3	33%	2
Cooperative Middle School	Exeter Region Cooperative		1,312	4	6%	339	5	1%	93	9	10%	82	13	16%	5

School	District	# of schools	04-05 Enroll	AYP/SINI Risk	04-05 F/R %	04-05 Core Classes			04-05 Core Teachers			Sept 2006 Teachers			Out of field
						Total	NOT HQT	NOT HQT %	Total	NOT HQT	NOT HQT %	Total	< 3yr Exp.	< 3yr %	
HIGH SCHOOL															
State Average/Total		68	59,044	1.9	13%	14,242	730	5.1%	3,334	280	8.4%	3,382	705	21%	131
Risk Level 4 or 5 (SINI- 2nd or 3rd year)		17	23,980	4.6		5,354	232	4.3%	1,159	86	7.4%	1,230	280	23%	46
Risk Level 3 (SINI - 1st year)		12	10,499	3.0		2,717	247	9.1%	591	60	10.2%	613	123	20%	27
Risk Level 1 or 2 (missed AYP 1-2 yrs)		16	14,173	1.1		3,444	163	4.7%	864	76	8.8%	851	173	20%	31
Risk Level 0 (made AYP for 2 years)		16	10,392	0.0		2,727	88	3.2%	720	58	8.1%	688	129	19%	27
Berlin Senior High School	Berlin		605	5	28%	87	4	5%	35	4	11%	32	11	34%	2
Laconia High School	Laconia		825	5	25%	189	13	7%	46	0	0%	50	14	28%	5
Manchester Central High School	Manchester		2,424	5	22%	465	2	0%	100	3	3%	99	21	21%	0
Spaulding High School	Rochester		1,622	5	21%	401	23	6%	72	7	10%	78	20	26%	2
Nashua High School South	Nashua		2,189	5	21%	524	4	1%	108	2	2%	105	20	19%	6
Farmington Senior High School	Farmington		450	5	20%	96	6	6%	19	2	11%	21	3	14%	2
Kingswood Regional High School	Gov Wentworth Regional		917	5	20%	234	21	9%	53	4	8%	54	5	9%	1
Dover Senior High School	Dover		1,625	5	14%	366	15	4%	90	8	9%	83	19	23%	11
Manchester West High School	Manchester		2,141	5	14%	408	10	2%	97	5	5%	99	23	23%	6
Manchester Memorial High School	Manchester		2,218	5	13%	391	32	8%	100	23	23%	104	21	20%	2
Winnisquam Regional High School	Winnisquam Regional		557	4	19%	160	2	1%	29	2	7%	33	8	24%	0
Pembroke Academy	Pembroke		1,040	4	8%	270	16	6%	48	5	10%	56	9	16%	1
Goffstown High School	Goffstown		1,294	4	6%	349	24	7%	70	13	19%	76	28	37%	2
Salem High School	Salem		2,276	4	6%	513	0	0%	89	0	0%	106	18	17%	0
Sanborn Regional High School	Sanborn Regional		578	4	5%	85	10	12%	37	8	22%	42	19	45%	1
Merrimack High School	Merrimack		1,677	4	4%	384	47	12%	87	0	0%	96	17	18%	2
Timberlane Regional High School	Timberlane Regional		1,542	4	4%	432	3	1%	79	0	0%	96	24	25%	3

LIST 2 Schools and Districts that did not make AMO for HQT Classes	**District**	**Total Classes**	**Classes Not HQT**	**Not HQT %**
Elementary				
Strafford School	Strafford	140	50	36%
Andover Elementary School	Andover	71	21	30%
Armand R. Dupont School	Allenstown	65	17	26%
Hampstead Middle School	Hampstead	154	39	25%
Lyme Elementary School	Lyme	43	9	21%
Henry Wilson Memorial School	Farmington	69	14	20%
Wells Memorial School	Harrisville	24	4	17%
Nelson Elementary School	Nelson	6	1	17%
Antrim Elementary School	Contoocook Valley	12	2	17%
Jennie D. Blake School	Hill	6	1	17%
Nottingham Elementary School	Nottingham	99	16	16%
Groveton High School (Elem)	Northumberland	25	4	16%
Auburn Village School	Auburn	157	25	16%
Charlestown Middle School	Fall Mountain Regional	74	11	15%
Paul Elementary School	Wakefield	41	6	15%
John Perkins Elementary School	Marlow	7	1	14%
Stark Village School	Stark	7	1	14%
Greenville Elementary School	Mascenic Regional	14	2	14%
Lancaster Elementary School	White Mountains Regional	188	24	13%
Kenneth A. Brett School	Tamworth	24	3	13%
Chesterfield Central School	Chesterfield	83	10	12%
James Mastricola Upper Elementary School	Merrimack	42	5	12%
Weare Middle School	Weare	127	14	11%
Chester Academy	Chester	46	5	11%
Hillside Elementary School	Berlin	21	2	10%
Pelham Memorial School	Pelham	151	14	9%
Appleton Elementary School	Mascenic Regional	11	1	9%
Derry Village School	Derry Cooperative	38	3	8%
Webster School	Manchester	30	2	7%
Pine Tree Elementary School	Conway	16	1	6%
Green Acres School	Manchester	33	2	6%
Plainfield Elementary School	Plainfield	83	5	6%
Canaan Elementary School	Mascoma Valley Regional	17	1	6%
Enfield Elementary School	Mascoma Valley Regional	17	1	6%

List 2 continued Middle/Junior High		Total Classes	Classes Not HQT	Not HQT %
Gilford Middle School	Gilford	85	23	27%
Lebanon Junior High School	Lebanon	113	28	25%
Jaffrey-Rindge Middle School	Jaffrey-Rindge Coop	95	23	24%
Bow Memorial School	Bow	228	54	24%
Sanborn Regional Middle School	Sanborn Regional	133	31	23%
Belmont Middle School	Shaker Regional	70	14	20%
Keene Middle School	Keene	295	57	19%
Franklin Middle School	Franklin	148	28	19%
Litchfield Middle School	Litchfield	96	16	17%
Mountain View Middle School	Goffstown	210	34	16%
Merrimack Valley Middle School	Merrimack Valley	211	34	16%
Winnisquam Regional Middle School	Winnisquam Regional	159	25	16%
West Running Brook Middle School	Derry Cooperative	188	28	15%
Claremont Middle School	Claremont	145	20	14%
Kearsarge Regional Middle School	Kearsarge Regional	161	20	12%
Hollis Brookline Middle School	Hollis-Brookline Coop	133	16	12%
A. Crosby Kennett Middle School	Conway	76	9	12%
Epping Middle School	Epping	86	9	10%
Hinsdale Jr. High School	Hinsdale	30	3	10%
South Meadow School	Contoocook Valley	71	7	10%
Southside Middle School	Manchester	198	19	10%
Woodbury School	Salem	327	31	9%
Berlin Junior High School	Berlin	64	6	9%
Boynton Middle School	Mascenic Regional	113	10	9%
Kingswood Regional Middle School	Gov Wentworth Regional	119	10	8%
David R. Cawley Middle School	Hooksett	120	10	8%
Hillsboro-Deering Middle School	Hillsboro-Deering Cooperative	96	8	8%
Rundlett Middle School	Concord	241	19	8%
Gilbert H. Hood Middle School	Derry Cooperative	180	14	8%
Milford Middle School	Milford	190	14	7%
Newport Middle School	Newport	70	5	7%
Hillside Middle School	Manchester	245	16	7%
Hudson Memorial School	Hudson	303	17	6%

List 2 continued High School	District	Total Classes	Classes Not HQT	Not HQT %
Colebrook Academy	Colebrook	49	16	33%
Kennett High School	Conway	192	55	29%
John Stark Regional High School	John Stark Regional	217	58	27%
Merrimack Valley High School	Merrimack Valley	111	21	19%
Stratford Public School (High)	Stratford	36	6	17%
Milford High School	Milford	138	18	13%
Souhegan Coop High School	Souhegan Cooperative	292	37	13%
Merrimack High School	Merrimack	384	47	12%
Groveton High School	Northumberland	49	6	12%
Conval Regional High School	Contoocook Valley	600	72	12%
Sanborn Regional High School	Sanborn Regional	85	10	12%
Hinsdale Sr. High School	Hinsdale	69	8	12%
Fall Mountain Regional High School	Fall Mountain Regional	227	24	11%
Hollis-Brookline High School	Hollis-Brookline Coop	218	22	10%
Kingswood Regional High School	Gov Wentworth Regional	234	21	9%
Manchester Memorial High School	Manchester	391	32	8%
Epping Middle High School (High)	Epping	110	9	8%
Hillsboro-Deering High School	Hillsboro-Deering Coop	136	11	8%
Sunapee Sr. High School	Sunapee	62	5	8%
Littleton High School	Littleton	93	7	8%
Campbell High School	Litchfield	125	9	7%
Concord Senior High School	Concord	363	26	7%
Goffstown High School	Goffstown	349	24	7%
Laconia High School	Laconia	189	13	7%
Farmington Senior High School	Farmington	96	6	6%
Pembroke Academy	Pembroke	270	16	6%
Lin-Wood Public School (High)	Lincoln-Woodstock Coop	51	3	6%
Spaulding High School	Rochester	401	23	6%

Table 3: 04-05 HQT by Core Content Area, State Totals

Subjects	Elementary				Middle or Junior High				High School				Total			
	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT
All Subject Total	**10,354**	**4%**	**6,066**	**3%**	**10,340**	**7%**	**2,734**	**10%**	**14,285**	**5%**	**3,341**	**8%**	**34,979**	**5%**	**12,141**	**6%**
Kindergarten	616	2%	450	0%	0		0		0		0		616	2%	450	0%
Elementary Art	1,253	2%	347	3%	2	0%	1	0%	0		0		1,255	2%	348	3%
Elementary Music	1,380	1%	372	2%	3	0%	3	0%	0		0		1,383	1%	375	2%
Grades 1 - 3	2,516	2%	2431	1%	0		0		0		0		2,516	2%	2,431	1%
Grades 4 - 6	1,601	3%	1548	3%	99	4%	98	3%	0		0		1,700	3%	1,646	3%
(MS) or (HS) indicates that the subject is applicable to only that grade level.																
Art	294	2%	46	2%	983	1%	117	0%	921	0%	162	0%	2,198	1%	325	0%
Biology (HS)	0		0		12	0%	5	0%	853	6%	230	10%	865	6%	235	10%
Biology or Life Science (MS)	124	19%	40	18%	402	6%	105	9%	4	0%	0		530	9%	145	11%
Chemistry (HS)	0		0		4	0%	1	0%	476	14%	142	8%	480	14%	143	8%
Earth-Space Science (HS)	0		0		2	0%	2	0%	162	24%	65	28%	164	24%	67	27%
Earth-Space Science or General Science (MS)	121	14%	44	9%	349	8%	95	8%	4	0%	0		474	9%	139	9%
English (HS)	0		0		31	0%	9	0%	3,202	5%	700	9%	3,233	5%	709	9%
English or English Language Arts (MS)	337	7%	132	9%	1,116	8%	322	14%	12	0%	0		1,465	7%	454	12%

Table 3: 04-05 HQT by Core Content Area, State Totals (continued)

Subjects	Elementary				Middle or Junior High				High School				Total			
	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT	Total Classes	% NOT HQT	Total Teachers	% NOT HQT
French	83	23%	18	11%	212	2%	57	5%	525	3%	124	2%	820	5%	199	4%
General Science in grade 9	0		0		2	0%	1	0%	99	28%	40	33%	101	28%	41	32%
German	0		0		8	0%	4	0%	88	0%	20	0%	96	0%	24	0%
Greek (HS)	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Latin	0		0		10	0%	3	0%	132	8%	34	3%	142	7%	37	3%
Math, General Math or Remedial Math (MS)	492	12%	184	16%	1749	11%	485	15%	12	0%	0		2,253	11%	669	16%
Mathematics, General, or Remedial Math (HS)	0		0		29	0%	6	0%	2669	5%	605	9%	2,698	5%	611	9%
Music	307	11%	50	2%	942	2%	149	1%	489	2%	121	2%	1,738	3%	320	2%
Other Foreign Language	8	0%	1	0%	40	0%	5	0%	7	29%	3	33%	55	4%	9	11%
Physical Science or Chemistry or Physics in grade 9	0		0		5	0%	3	0%	507	10%	170	17%	512	10%	173	17%
Physical Science or General Science (MS)	283	13%	98	10%	920	10%	257	9%	4	0%	0		1,207	11%	355	10%
Physics (HS)	0		0		3	0%	1	0%	245	8%	96	14%	248	8%	97	13%
Reading or Language Arts (HS)	0		0		6	0%	4	0%	141	6%	32	13%	147	6%	36	11%