

GAO

Testimony

Before the Subcommittee on Higher Education,
Lifelong Learning, and Competitiveness,
Committee on Education and Labor, House of
Representatives

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 10:00 a.m. EDT
Thursday, May 17, 2007

TEACHER QUALITY

Approaches,
Implementation, and
Evaluation of Key Federal
Efforts

Statement of George A. Scott, Director
Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues





Highlights of [GAO-07-861T](#), a testimony before the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning, and Competitiveness, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives

Why GAO Did This Study

Teachers are the single largest resource in our nation's elementary and secondary education system. However, according to recent research, many teachers lack competency in the subjects they teach. In addition, research shows that most teacher training programs leave new teachers feeling unprepared for the classroom.

While the hiring and training of teachers is primarily the responsibility of state and local governments and institutions of higher education, the federal investment in enhancing teacher quality is substantial and growing. In 1998, the Congress amended the Higher Education Act (HEA) to enhance the quality of teaching in the classroom and in 2001 the Congress passed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA), which established federal requirements that all teachers of core academic subjects be highly qualified.

This testimony focuses on (1) approaches used in teacher quality programs under HEA and NCLBA, (2) the allowable activities under these acts and how recipients are using the funds, and (3) how Education supports and evaluates these activities.

This testimony is based on prior GAO reports. We updated information where appropriate.

www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-07-861T.

To view the full product, including the scope and methodology, click on the link above. For more information, contact George Scott, (202) 512-5932, scottg@gao.gov.

TEACHER QUALITY

Approaches, Implementation, and Evaluation of Key Federal Efforts

What GAO Found

While the overall goal of Title II in both HEA and NCLBA is to improve teacher quality, some of their specific approaches differ. For example, a major focus of HEA provisions is on the training of prospective teachers while NCLBA provisions focus more on improving teacher quality in the classroom and hiring highly qualified teachers. Both laws use reporting mechanisms to increase accountability; however, HEA focuses more on institutions of higher education while NCLBA focuses on schools and districts. In addition, HEA and NCLBA grants are funded differently, with HEA funds distributed through one-time competitive grants, while Title II under NCLBA provides funds annually to all states through a formula.

Both acts provide states, districts, or grantees with the flexibility to use funds for a broad range of activities to improve teacher quality, including many activities that are similar, such as professional development and recruitment. A difference is that NCLBA's Title II specifies that teachers can be hired to reduce class-size while HEA does not specifically mention class-size reduction. Districts chose to spend about one-half of their NCLBA Title II funds on class-size reduction in 2004-2005. On the other hand, professional development and recruitment efforts were the two broad areas where recipients used funds for similar activities, although the specific activities varied somewhat. Many HEA grantees we visited used their funds to fill teacher shortages in urban schools or recruit teachers from nontraditional sources, such as mid-career professionals. Districts we visited used NCLBA funds to provide bonuses, advertise open teaching positions, and attend recruitment events, among other activities.

Under both HEA and NCLBA, Education has provided assistance and guidance to recipients of these funds and is responsible for holding recipients accountable for the quality of their activities. GAO's previous work identified areas where Education could improve its assistance on teacher quality efforts and more effectively measure the results of these activities. Education has made progress in addressing GAO's concerns by disseminating more information to recipients, particularly on teacher quality requirements, and improving how the department measures the results of teacher quality activities by establishing definitions and performance targets under HEA.

While HEA and NCLBA share the goal of improving teacher quality, it is not clear the extent to which they complement each other. States, districts, schools, and grantees under both laws engage in similar activities. However, not much is known about how well, if at all, these two laws are aligned. Thus, there may be opportunities to better understand how the two laws are working together at the federal, state, and local level.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to be here this morning to discuss the federal government's efforts to improve teacher quality. Teachers are the single largest resource in our nation's elementary and secondary education system. Approximately 3 million teachers are responsible for educating over 48 million students and they account for over one half of public school expenditures (\$215 billion) each year. Research has shown that teachers play a significant role in improving student performance. However, research has also shown that many teachers—especially those in high-poverty districts—lack competency in the subjects they teach and that most teacher training programs leave new teachers feeling unprepared for the classroom.

While the hiring and training of teachers is primarily the responsibility of state and local governments and institutions of higher education, the federal investment in enhancing teacher quality is substantial and growing. In 1998, the Congress amended the Higher Education Act (HEA) to enhance the quality of teaching in the classroom by improving training programs for prospective teachers and the qualifications of current teachers. In 2001, the Congress passed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA)—the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—which established federal requirements that all teachers of core academic subjects be highly qualified. In 2006, about \$3 billion of federal funds were appropriated for NCLBA Title II and HEA Title II to address teacher quality. Given that NCLBA and HEA are both slated for reauthorization in 2007, this hearing presents a timely opportunity to explore teacher quality provisions covered under those laws.

This statement focuses on the approaches, implementation, and evaluation of teacher quality programs under HEA and NCLBA. I will first provide information on the goals, approaches, and funding of these programs. Then I will discuss the allowable activities and how recipients are using the funds. Finally, I will summarize our findings related to Education's support and evaluation of these activities.

My remarks today are drawn from previous GAO reports covering HEA teacher quality programs and Title II under NCLBA,¹ supplemented with updated information. We updated information by interviewing state officials, officials from institutions of higher education, and Education officials. We also reviewed recent studies and Education documents. We conducted our work in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

In summary:

- While the overall goal of Title II in both HEA and NCLBA is to improve teacher quality, some of the specific approaches differ. For example, HEA focuses more on training prospective teachers than NCLBA. In addition, HEA and NCLBA are funded differently, with HEA funds distributed through competitive grants, while Title II under NCLBA provides funds annually to all states through a formula.
- Both acts provide states, districts, and grantees with the flexibility to use funds for a broad range of activities to improve teacher quality, including many activities that are similar, such as professional development and recruitment. A difference is that NCLBA's Title II specifies that teachers can be hired to reduce class size, while HEA does not specifically mention class-size reduction. With the broad range of activities allowed, we found both similarities and differences in the activities undertaken.
- Under both HEA and NCLBA, Education has provided assistance and guidance to recipients of these funds and is responsible for holding recipients accountable for the quality of their activities. Our previous work identified areas in which Education could improve its assistance to states on their teacher quality efforts and more effectively measure the results of these activities. Education has made progress in addressing our concerns by disseminating more information to recipients particularly on teacher quality requirements and activities and improving how the department measures the results of teacher quality activities by, for example, establishing performance targets.

¹ GAO, *Higher Education: Activities Underway to Improve Teacher Training but Reporting on These Activities Could Be Enhanced*, [GAO-03-6](#) (Washington, D.C.: Dec. 11, 2002) and GAO, *No Child Left Behind Act: Improved Accessibility to Education's Information Could Help States Further Implement Teacher Qualification Requirements*, [GAO-06-25](#) (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 21, 2005).

Teacher Quality Provisions under HEA and NCLBA Have Somewhat Different Approaches and Are Funded Differently

While the overall goal of Title II under both HEA and NCLBA is to improve student achievement by improving the teacher workforce, some of the specific approaches differ. For example, a major focus of HEA provisions is on the training of prospective teachers (preservice training) while NCLBA provisions focus more on improving teacher quality in the classroom (in service training) and hiring highly qualified teachers. Also, both laws use reporting mechanisms to increase accountability. However, HEA focuses more on institutions of higher education while NCLBA focuses on schools and school districts. Additionally, HEA focuses on expanding the teacher workforce by supporting recruitment from other professions.

In addition, HEA and NCLBA Title II funds are distributed differently. HEA teacher quality funds are disbursed through three distinct types of grants: state, partnership, and recruitment grants. State grants are available for states to implement activities to improve teacher quality in their states by enhancing teacher training efforts, while partnership grants support the collaborative efforts of teacher training programs and other eligible partners.² Recruitment grants are available to states or partnerships for teacher recruitment activities.

All three types of grants require a match from non-federal sources. For example, states receiving state grants must provide a matching amount in cash or in-kind support from non-federal sources equal to 50 percent of the amount of the federal grant.³ All three grants are one-time competitive grants; however, state and recruitment grants are for 3 years while partnership grants are for 5 years.⁴ HEA amendments in 1998 required that 45 percent of funds be distributed to state grants, 45 percent to partnership grants, and 10 percent to recruitment grants. As of April 2007, 52 of the 59 eligible entities (states, the District of Columbia, and 8

² Eligible partnerships must include at least three partners, consisting of teacher training programs, colleges of Arts and Sciences, and eligible local school districts. Partnerships may include other groups such as state educational agencies, businesses, and nonprofit educational organizations.

³ Partnerships must match from non-federal sources 25 percent of the partnership grant in the first year, 35 percent in the second, and 50 percent in each succeeding year. States and partnerships that receive recruitment grants have the same matching requirements for these grants as they have under their separate grant programs.

⁴ According to Education, an institution of higher education can have more than one grant (simultaneously or sequentially) as long as the members of the partnership are not identical (i.e. a new partnership is formed).

territories) had received state grants.⁵ Because the authorizing legislation specifically required that entities could only receive a state grant once, only seven would be eligible to receive future state grants. In our 2002 report, we suggested that if Congress decides to continue funding teacher quality grants in the upcoming reauthorization of HEA, it might want to clarify whether all 59 entities would be eligible for state grant funding under the reauthorization, or whether eligibility would be limited to only those states that have not previously received a state grant. We also suggested that if Congress decides to limit eligibility to entities that have not previously received a state grant, it may want to consider changing the 45 percent funding allocation for state grants. In a 2005 appropriation act, Congress waived the allocation requirement. In 2006, about 9 percent of funds were awarded for state grants, 59 percent for partnership grants, and 33 percent for recruitment. When Congress reauthorizes HEA, it may want to further clarify eligibility and allocation requirements for this program.

NCLBA, funded at a much higher level than HEA, provides funds to states through annual formula grants. In 2006, Congress appropriated \$2.89 billion through NCLBA and \$59.9 million for HEA for teacher quality efforts.⁶ While federal funding for teacher initiatives was provided through two other programs prior to NCLBA, the act increased the level of funding to help states and districts implement the teacher qualification requirements. States and districts generally receive NCLBA Title II funds based on the amount they received in 2001, the percentage of children residing in the state or district, and the number of those children in low-income families. After reserving up to 1 percent of the funds for administrative purposes, states pass 95 percent of the remaining funds to the districts and retain the rest to support state-level teacher initiatives and to support NCLBA partnerships between higher education institutions and high-need districts that work to provide professional development to teachers.

While there is no formula in NCLBA for how districts are to allocate funds to specific schools, the act requires states to ensure that districts target

⁵ Since 1999, 63 partnership grants have been made to various entities, and 68 recruitment grants were made.

⁶ The funding authorizations for Title II, along with the rest of HEA, were extended through June 30, 2007, under the Third Higher Education Extension Act of 2006 (Pub. L. No. 109-292).

funds to those schools with the highest number of teachers who are not highly qualified, schools with the largest class sizes, or schools that have not met academic performance requirements for 2 or more consecutive years. In addition, districts applying for Title II funds from their states are required to conduct a districtwide needs assessment to identify their teacher quality needs. NCLBA also allows districts to transfer these funds to most other major NCLBA programs, such as those under Title I, to meet their educational priorities.⁷

Some HEA and NCLBA Funds Were Used for Similar Activities As Allowed under Both Acts

HEA provides grantees and NCLBA provides states and districts with the flexibility to use funds for a broad range of activities to improve teacher quality, including many activities that are similar under both acts. HEA funds can be used, among other activities, to reform teacher certification requirements, professional development activities, and recruitment efforts. In addition, HEA partnership grantees must use their funds to implement reforms to hold teacher preparation programs accountable for the quality of teachers leaving the program. Similarly, acceptable uses of NCLBA funds include teacher certification activities, professional development in a variety of core academic subjects, recruitment, and retention initiatives. In addition, activities carried out under NCLBA partnership grants are required to coordinate with any activities funded by HEA. Table 1 compares activities under HEA and NCLBA.

⁷ Specifically, districts are allowed to transfer up to 50 percent of the funds allocated to them under most major NCLBA programs, including Title II, into other programs under NCLBA. For example, districts may transfer a portion of their Title II funds into Title I for initiatives designed to improve student achievement.

Table 1: Examples of Activities under HEA Title II and NCLBA Title II

HEA	NCLBA
Reforming teacher certification or licensure requirements	Reforming teacher and principal certification or licensing requirements
Recruitment and retention	Recruitment and retention
Professional development	Professional development
Implement reforms within teacher preparation programs to hold the programs accountable for preparing highly competent teachers	Reforming tenure systems, implementing teacher testing for subject matter knowledge, and implementing teacher testing for State certification or licensing, consistent with Title II of HEA
Providing preservice clinical experience and mentoring	Hiring teachers to reduce class size
Disseminating information on effective practices	Developing systems to measure the effectiveness of specific professional development programs
Teacher education scholarships	Funding projects to promote reciprocity of teacher and principal certification or licensing between or among States
Follow-up services for new teachers	Support to teachers or principals

Source: GAO summary of HEA Title II and NCLBA Title II.

With the broad range of activities allowed under HEA and NCLBA, we found both similarities and differences in the activities undertaken. For example, districts chose to spend about one-half of their NCLBA Title II funds (\$1.2 billion) in 2004-2005 on class-size reduction efforts, which is not an activity specified by HEA.⁸ We found that some districts focused their class-size reduction efforts on specific grades, depending on their needs. One district we visited focused its NCLBA-funded class-size reduction efforts on the eighth grade because the state already provided funding for reducing class size in other grades. However, while class-size reduction may contribute to teacher retention, it also increases the number of classrooms that need to be staffed and we found that some districts had shifted funds away from class-size reduction to initiatives to improve teachers' subject matter knowledge and instructional skills. Similarly, Education's data showed that the percent of NCLBA district

⁸ Education surveyed approximately 800 districts and found that they spent \$1.2 billion, about half of their NCLBA Title II funds in 2004-2005, to hire more teachers in order to reduce class size. According to an Education official, no comparable HEA expenditure data is available.

funds spent on class-size reduction had decreased since 2002-2003, when 57 percent of funds were used for this purpose.

HEA and NCLBA both funded professional development and recruitment efforts, although the specific activities varied somewhat. For example, mentoring was the most common professional development activity among the HEA grantees we visited. Of the 33 HEA grant sites we visited, 23 were providing mentoring activities for teachers. In addition, some grantees used their funds to establish a mentor training program to ensure that mentors had consistent guidance. One state used the grant to develop mentoring standards and to build the capacity of trainers to train teacher mentors within each district. Some districts used NCLBA Title II funds for mentoring activities as well. We also found that states and districts used NCLBA Title II funds to support other types of professional development activities. For example, two districts we visited spent their funds on math coaches who perform tasks such as working with teachers to develop lessons that reflected state academic standards and assisting them in using students' test data to identify and address students' academic needs. Additionally, states used a portion of NCLBA Title II funds they retained to support professional development for teachers in core academic subjects. In two states that we visited, officials reported that state initiatives specifically targeted teachers who had not met the subject matter competency requirements of NCLBA. These initiatives either offered teachers professional development in core academic subjects or reimbursed them for taking college courses in the subjects taught.

Both HEA and NCLBA funds supported efforts to recruit teachers. Many HEA grantees we interviewed used their funds to fill teacher shortages in urban schools or to recruit new teachers from nontraditional sources—mid-career professionals, community college students, and middle- and high-school students. For example, one university recruited teacher candidates with undergraduate degrees to teach in a local school district with a critical need for teachers while they earn their masters in education. The program offered tuition assistance, and in some cases, the district paid a full teacher salary, with the stipulation that teachers continue teaching in the local school district for 3 years after completing the program. HEA initiatives also included efforts to recruit mid-career professionals by offering an accelerated teacher training program for prospective teachers already in the workforce. Some grantees also used their funds to recruit teacher candidates at community colleges. For example, one of the largest teacher training institutions in one state has partnered with six community colleges around the state to offer training that was not previously available. Finally, other grantees targeted middle

and high school students. For example, one district used its grant to recruit interns from 14 high-school career academies that focused on training their students for careers as teachers. Districts we visited used NCLBA Title II funds to provide bonuses to attract successful administrators, advertise open teaching positions, and attend recruitment events to identify qualified candidates. In addition, one district also used funds to expand alternative certification programs, which allowed qualified candidates to teach while they worked to meet requirements for certification.

Finally, some states used HEA funds to reform certification requirements for teachers. Reforming certification or licensing requirements was included as an allowable activity under both HEA and NCLBA to ensure that teachers have the necessary teaching skills and academic content knowledge in the subject areas. HEA grantees also reported using their funds to allow teacher training programs and colleges to collaborate with local school districts to reform the requirements for teacher candidates. For example, one grantee partnered with institutions of higher education and a partner school district to expose teacher candidates to urban schools by providing teacher preparation courses in public schools.

Education Is Working to Provide Better Assistance and Improve Its Evaluation and Oversight Efforts

Under both HEA and NCLBA, Education has provided assistance and guidance to recipients of these funds and is responsible for holding recipients accountable for the quality of their activities. In 1998, Education created a new office to administer HEA grants and provide assistance to grantees. While grantees told us that the technical assistance the office provided on application procedures was helpful, our previous work noted several areas in which Education could improve its assistance to HEA grantees, in part through better guidance. For example, we recommended that in order to effectively manage the grant program, Education further develop and maintain its system for regularly communicating program information, such as information on successful and unsuccessful practices. We noted that without knowledge of successful ways of enhancing the quality of teaching in the classroom, grantees might be wasting valuable resources by duplicating unsuccessful efforts. Since 2002, Education has made changes to improve communication with grantees and potential applicants. For example, the department presented workshops to potential applicants and updated and expanded its program Web site with information about program activities, grant abstracts, and other teacher quality resources. In addition, Education provided examples of projects undertaken to improve teacher quality and how some of these

efforts indicate improved teacher quality in its 2005 annual report on teacher quality.⁹

Education also has provided assistance to states, districts and schools using NCLBA Title II funds. The department offers professional development workshops and related materials that teachers can access online through Education's website. In addition, Education assisted states and districts by providing updated guidance. In our 2005 report, officials from most states and districts we visited who use Education's Web site to access information on teacher programs or requirements told us that they were unaware of some of Education's teacher resources or had difficulty accessing those resources. We recommended that Education explore ways to make the Web-based information on teacher qualification requirements more accessible to users of its Web site. Education immediately took steps in response to the recommendation and reorganized information on its website related to the teacher qualification requirements.

In addition to providing assistance and guidance, Education is responsible for evaluating the efforts of HEA and NCLBA recipients and for overseeing program implementation. Under HEA, Education is required to annually report on the quality of teacher training programs and the qualifications of current teachers. In 2002, we found that the information collected for this requirement did not allow Education to accurately report on the quality of HEA's teacher training programs and the qualifications of current teachers in each state. In order to improve the data that states are collecting from institutions that receive HEA teacher quality grants, and all those that enroll students who receive federal student financial assistance and train teachers, we recommended that Education should more clearly define key data terms so that states provide uniform information. Further, in 2004, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) completed a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessment¹⁰ of this program and gave it a rating of "results not demonstrated," due to a lack of performance information and program management deficiencies. Education officials told us that they had aligned HEA's data collection system with NCLBA definitions of terms such as "highly qualified teacher." However, based on

⁹ *The Secretary's Fourth Annual Report on Teacher Quality*, U.S. Department of Education (Washington, D.C.) August 2005.

¹⁰ OMB uses the PART as a diagnostic tool meant to provide a consistent approach to evaluating federal programs as part of the executive budget formulation process and as a central component of its overall governmentwide management efforts.

the PART assessment, the Administration proposed eliminating funding for HEA teacher quality grants in its proposed budgets for fiscal years 2006-2008, and redirecting the funds to other programs. Congress has continued to fund this program in fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

Education has responded to our recommendations and issues raised in the PART assessment related to evaluating grantee activities and providing more guidance to grantees on the types of information needed to determine effectiveness. When the Congress amended HEA in 1998 to provide grants to states and partnerships, it required that Education evaluate the activities funded by the grants. In 2005, Education established performance measures for two of the teacher quality enhancement programs—state grants and partnership grants—and required grantees to provide these data in their annual performance plans submitted to Education.¹¹ The performance measure for state grants is the percentage of prospective teachers who pass subject matter tests, while the measure for partnership grants is the percentage of participants who complete the program and meet the definition of being “highly qualified.” In addition, in 2006, Education included information in letters to grantees on the types of information that it requires to assess the effectiveness of its teacher quality programs. For example, in its letters to state grantees, Education noted that when reporting on quantitative performance measures, grantees must show how their actual performance compared to the targets (e.g., benchmarks or goals) that were established in the approved grant application for each budget period.

In addition, in May 2006, Education issued its final report on HEA’s partnership grants, focusing on the 25 grantees of the 1999 cohort.¹² The goal of the study was to learn about the collaborative activities taking place in partnerships. It was designed to examine approaches for preparing new and veteran teachers and to assess the sustainability of project activities after the grant ends. Among its findings, Education reported that partnerships encouraged and supported collaboration between institutions of higher education and schools to address teacher preparation needs.

¹¹ Grantees are required to submit data on how well they meet their project performance measures that they negotiate with their Education grant managers.

¹² See *Partnerships for Reform: Changing Teacher Preparation through the Title II HEA Partnership Program*: Final Report, May 2006. Department of Education, 2006.

Under NCLBA, Education holds districts and schools accountable for improvements in student academic achievement, and holds states accountable for reporting on the qualifications of teachers. NCLBA set the end of the 2005-2006 school year as the deadline for teachers of core academic subjects, such as math and science, to be highly qualified.¹³ Teachers meeting these requirements must (1) have at least a bachelor's degree, (2) be certified to teach by their state, and (3) demonstrate subject matter competency in each core academic subject they teach.¹⁴ Education collects state data on the percent of classes taught by highly qualified teachers and conducts site visits in part to determine whether states appropriately implemented highly qualified teacher provisions.¹⁵

In state reviews conducted as part of its oversight of NCLBA, Education identified several areas of concern related to states' implementation of teacher qualification requirements and provided states feedback.¹⁶ For example, some states did not include the percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified in their annual state report cards,¹⁷ as required. In addition, because some states inappropriately defined teachers as highly qualified, the data that these states reported to Education were inaccurate according to a department official. In many states, the requirements for teachers were not sufficient to demonstrate subject matter competency. Since subject matter competency is a key part of the definition of a highly qualified teacher, such states' data on the extent to which teachers have met these requirements could be misleading. Education also found that a number of

¹³ Although 2005-2006 was the original deadline, on October 15, 2005 Education sent a policy letter to the Chief State School Officers saying that states that do not quite reach the 100 percent goal by the end of the 2005-2006 school year will not lose federal funds if they are implementing the law.

¹⁴ Veteran teachers may demonstrate subject matter competency through a state-developed High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation, whereby subject matter competency is established through teaching experience, professional development, coursework, and other activities.

¹⁵ In 2003, Education aligned HEA's definition of highly qualified teacher" to that in NCLBA.

¹⁶ As of April 2006, Education officials had completed reviews of all states.

¹⁷ States must prepare and disseminate an annual report card that includes information on student achievement and the professional qualifications of teachers in the state, the percentage of teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the state not taught by highly qualified teachers. These data are presented in the aggregate and are also disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools.

states were incorrectly defining districts as high-need, in order to make more districts eligible for partnerships with higher education institutions. According to Education, each of these states corrected their data and the department will continue to monitor states to ensure they are using the appropriate data.

In addition to Education's oversight efforts, OMB completed a PART assessment of NCLBA Title II in 2005 and rated the program as "moderately effective." While OMB noted that the program is well-managed, it also noted that the program has not demonstrated cost-effectiveness and that an independent evaluation has not been completed to assess program effectiveness. In response to OMB's assessment, Education took steps to more efficiently monitor states and conducted two program studies related to teacher quality. An Education official told us that the program studies had been conducted but the department has not yet released the findings.

Concluding Observations

In conclusion, the nation's public school teachers play a key role in educating 48 million students, the majority of our future workforce. Recognizing the importance of teachers in improving student performance, the federal government, through HEA and NCLBA, has committed significant resources and put in place a series of reforms aimed at improving the quality of teachers in the nation's classrooms. With both acts up for reauthorization, an opportunity exists for the Congress to explore potential interrelationships in the goals and initiatives under each act.

While HEA and NCLBA share the goal of improving teacher quality, it is not clear the extent to which they complement each other. Our separate studies of teacher quality programs under each of the laws have found common areas for improvement, such as data quality and assistance from Education. We have also found that states, districts, schools, and grantees under both laws engage in similar activities. However, not much is known about how well, if at all, these two laws are aligned. Thus, there may be opportunities to better understand how the two laws are working together at the federal, state, and local level. For example, exploring links between efforts aimed at improving teacher preparation at institutions of higher education and efforts to improve teacher quality at the school or district level could identify approaches to teacher preparation that help schools the most.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. I welcome any questions you or other Members of this Subcommittee may have at this time.

**GAO Contacts and
Staff
Acknowledgments**

For further information regarding this testimony, please contact me at 202-512-7215. Individuals making key contributions to this testimony include Harriet Ganson, Bryon Gordon, Elizabeth Morrison, Cara Jackson, Rachel Valliere, Christopher Morehouse, and Jessica Botsford.

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.

GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's Web site (www.gao.gov). Each weekday, GAO posts newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence on its Web site. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products every afternoon, go to www.gao.gov and select "Subscribe to Updates."

Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. Government Accountability Office
441 G Street NW, Room LM
Washington, D.C. 20548

To order by Phone: Voice: (202) 512-6000
TDD: (202) 512-2537
Fax: (202) 512-6061

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm

E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

Congressional Relations

Gloria Jarmon, Managing Director, JarmonG@gao.gov (202) 512-4400
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125
Washington, D.C. 20548

Public Affairs

Paul Anderson, Managing Director, AndersonP1@gao.gov (202) 512-4800
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149
Washington, D.C. 20548