

Missouri

Revised State Plan

Highly Qualified Teachers

2006-2007

November 2006 Revision



Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
Jefferson City, Missouri

Outline

- Introduction and Background
- Requirement 1: Analysis of core subject area classes not being taught by highly qualified teachers, including
 - Specific subject areas taught by not highly qualified teachers
 - Not highly qualified teachers in buildings not making AYP
 - Groups of teachers not highly qualified
 - Districts and buildings with not highly qualified teachers
 - Courses taught by not highly qualified teachers
- Requirement 2. Information on Highly Qualified Teacher status in each school district and the steps to assist teachers in attaining HQT status
 - Identify districts that have not met AMOs for HQT
 - Steps districts that have not met AMOs will take
 - Local district plans for HQT
- Requirement 3. Information on technical assistance, programs, and services to assist school districts in completing their Highly Qualified Teacher Plan
 - Technical assistance
 - AYP
 - DESE programs
- Requirement 4. How DESE will work with school districts that fail to reach the 100 percent goal by the end of the 2006-2007 school year
 - DESE's compliance monitoring and technical assistance for HQT
 - High Quality Professional Development
- Requirement 5. The HOUSSE process for teachers not new to the profession and how DESE will limit the use of HOUSSE
 - The HOUSSE process
 - Multi-subject secondary teachers
 - Multi-subject Special Education teachers
- Requirement 6. DESE'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
 - Identification of inequities
 - Strategies
 - Evidence of success
 - DESE compliance monitoring and technical assistance
- Appendix

Introduction and Background

The Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education (DESE) has a two-decade long history of providing highly qualified teachers through a statewide teacher licensing system and content-based testing, through the Praxis II examinations, for teacher certification. In addition, teacher certification has long been an integral part of the state's Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) school accreditation program.

The assessment of candidates for teacher education and certification in Missouri was authorized by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985. The Excellence in Education Act also created a Career Ladder program to reward excellent teachers for additional education related activities beyond what is required. It also created a loan and scholarship program for prospective teachers and set minimum salaries for Missouri's teachers. In addition, in an effort to strengthen teacher requirements, the Missouri State Board of Education approved the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE) as the official assessment required for admittance into professional education programs. The State Board also approved the Praxis II: Subject Assessments/Specialty Area Tests as the official assessments required for the certification of professional school personnel.

DESE also has a long history of comprehensive data collection. The current model of "Core Data" collection is in its 18th version, beginning in 1988. In 1997, DESE embraced the technology of the Web to not only be the first state to use an online, web-based system for our Consolidated Federal Programs Application, but also to place the Core Data system online. This system is matched with the certification database to determine the certification status of each teacher and a report is generated for each school district to determine the number of not highly qualified teachers for the state's school district accreditation system.

Missouri is a state with almost 900,000 students enrolled K-12, 524 school districts and 16 charter schools as LEAs, for a total 540 LEAs, each with its own administrative structure. Each district is operated by an independent school board.

In August 2006, after a U.S. Department of Education monitoring decision, DESE sent 16,507 HOUSSE forms to Missouri's school districts to determine the highly qualified status of veteran teachers who received Missouri teacher certification before 1988 when the state began using the Praxis II subject area exams for teacher certification. The 16,507 courses reflect approximately 10% of the total number of 164,620 core academic courses taught in grades K-12. The HOUSSE forms were due from school districts by October 2, 2006. DESE staff compiled the data and applied the revisions to our overall HQT numbers, and then revised our Highly Qualified Teacher Plan.

In Missouri's current statewide report card, entitled the "Missouri Public School Accountability Report,"¹ the state reports on a variety of statistics for Missouri's schools, including school accreditation status, enrollments, attendance, graduation, and dropout rates, and NAEP and ACT scores. Also included are scores from the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP), the primary academic measure used in the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) school accreditation process and the determination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data with subgroup results. The report card includes data on highly qualified teachers, including the total number and percentage of classes taught. The data is also separated by highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools.

In 2005, the state legislature approved a change in state law (RSMo §160.522) that eliminated the requirement that each school district produce an annual "report card" for the district and for each building. Instead, DESE is now responsible for producing a "school accountability report card" for each public school district, each building and each charter school.² School districts are still required to make "vital statistics" available to parents and school patrons in a timely manner. The law was changed in order to streamline state and federal reporting requirements and to save time and money for school districts.

As a condition for receiving funds, the Federal Grants Management section provides compliance monitoring for schools receiving Title I funds. Included in the monitoring are the parent notification requirements of NCLB, including the request of information regarding the professional qualifications of their children's teachers, and that parents must be notified if their children have been assigned to or taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified. Districts failing to meet AYP and HQT goals are provided technical assistance through the Federal Instructional Improvement section.

¹ The current state report card is available at <http://dese.mo.gov/commissioner/statereportcard/src04-05.pdf>.

² Report cards for every school district and charter school are available at <http://dese.mo.gov/schooldata/>.

Requirement 1: Analysis of core subject area classes not being taught by highly qualified teachers, including

- **Specific subject areas taught by not highly qualified teachers**
- **Not highly qualified teachers in buildings not making AYP**
- **Groups of teachers not highly qualified**
- **Districts and buildings with not highly qualified teachers**
- **Courses taught by not highly qualified teachers**

Missouri's definition of a "highly qualified teacher" follows the guidelines provided in Section 9101(23) of ESEA. The requirement that teachers be highly qualified applies to all public elementary or secondary school teachers employed by a local educational agency who teach a core academic subject. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher has obtained full State certification as a teacher and holds a certificate to teach in Missouri, and does not have certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis. A highly qualified teacher also holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree and has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, either by taking the required state tests (the C-BASE and the Praxis II exam) or through Missouri's HOUSSE.

Missouri's HOUSSE was distributed to school districts in late August 2006, with data from that collection, along with existing teacher data, was analyzed and submitted to the US Department of Education in October 2006.

A review of our data shows that a large number of core academic content courses are taught by teachers that are already at highly-qualified status (96.3%), but that there is a lesser number (91.2%) at high-poverty elementary schools and 89.1% at high-poverty secondary schools (see Table I below).

Table 1: Core Academic Subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	164,065	158,063	96.3%
Elementary Level (K-8)			
High-Poverty Schools	15,001	13,681	91.2%
Low-Poverty Schools	29,136	28,740	98.6%
All Elementary Schools	83,149	80,138	96.4%
Secondary Level (9-12)			
High-Poverty Schools	9,616	8,568	89.1%
Low-Poverty Schools	35,335	34,740	98.3%
All Secondary Schools	80,916	77,925	96.3%

2004-2005 data, revised 11/15/2006

Table 2 below shows a larger number of secondary courses taught by not highly qualified teachers (6.40%) than any other area.

Table 2: Percentage of Classes Not Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers

	Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers (percent)	High-Poverty (percent)	Low-Poverty (percent)
All Classrooms	6,002 (3.7 %)	1,908 (1.07%)	818 (.46%)
Elementary (K-8)	3,011 (3.62%)	365 (3.87%)	128 (1.03%)
Secondary (9-12)	2,991 (3.70%)	1,543 (6.40%)	690 (1.27%)

Clearly there is a disparity between high-poverty and low-poverty classrooms in the state that must be addressed. Table 3 reviews the percentage of classes taught by subject matter. Language Arts courses at 5.05% and science courses at 5.76% are the two largest groups.

Table 3: Percentage of Classes by Subject

	Courses with Highly Qualified Teacher	%	Courses without Highly Qualified Teacher	%	Total Number of Courses Taught
Language Arts	35,829	95.20%	1,808	4.80%	37,637
Social Studies	23,177	97.59%	573	2.41%	23,750
Mathematics	21,711	96.10%	880	3.90%	22,591
Elementary	21,185	99.22%	167	0.78%	21,352
Science	20,005	94.55%	1,152	5.45%	21,157
Art	11,629	97.58%	289	2.42%	11,918
Music	11,273	97.04%	344	2.96%	11,617
Foreign Language	7,674	96.53%	276	3.47%	7,950
Other	5,881	96.52%	212	3.48%	6,093
Subtotal	158,364	96.53%	5,701	3.47%	164,065
<u>Educators of all courses (not just core academic) with one year experience</u>	33,245	91.87%	2,941	8.13%	36,186
Totals	191,609	95.68%	8,642	4.32%	200,251

Also, our data indicates a large number of educators with one year of experience have a large percentage (8.13%) of *not* highly qualified teachers. The data shows that DESE must target its efforts in the next year toward helping our high poverty schools increase their numbers of highly qualified teachers. Also, we must work toward increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in Language Arts, science, and mathematic courses.

There are 104 buildings in Missouri not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2006-2007 (See Appendix 1 for complete list). The 27 buildings not making AYP with at least 10% of their core academic course teachers not highly qualified will receive immediate attention in both technical and monitoring assistance (Table 4 below).

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

Table 4: Buildings not making AYP with at least 10% of teachers not highly qualified.

	District Name	School Name	Required Action	Building Poverty Rate	Percent of Teachers Not Highly Qualified
1	ST. LOUIS CITY	LIFT FOR LIFE ACADEMY (Charter)	Corrective Action	97.20%	53.01%
2	ST. LOUIS CITY	LANGSTON MIDDLE	Corrective Action	91.50%	46.72%
3	ST. LOUIS CITY	ST. LOUIS CHARTER ACADEMIES (Charter)	School Improvement	77.18%	45.71%
4	ST. LOUIS CITY	STEVENS MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	Corrective Action	89.63%	43.55%
5	ST. LOUIS CITY	L'OUVERTURE MIDDLE	Corrective Action	90.29%	36.51%
6	ST. LOUIS CITY	ETHEL HEDGEMAN LYLE ACADEMY (Charter)	School Improvement	81.45%	33.49%
7	CARUTHERSVILLE 18	CARUTHERSVILLE ELEM.	School Improvement	80.42%	32.14%
8	ST. LOUIS CITY	HUMBOLDT MIDDLE	Corrective Action	90.60%	28.09%
9	ST. LOUIS CITY	FANNING MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	Corrective Action	87.50%	24.79%
10	ST. LOUIS CITY	CARR LANE VPA MIDDLE	School Improvement	81.40%	23.39%
11	KANSAS CITY 33	CLARKE ACE MIDDLE	School Improvement	86.55%	22.95%
12	ST. LOUIS CITY	CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES (Charter)	School Improvement	89.25%	21.74%
13	WELLSTON	BISHOP MIDDLE	School Improvement	99.40%	20.69%
14	ST. LOUIS CITY	FROEBEL ELEM.	School Improvement	91.89%	19.23%
15	ST. LOUIS CITY	LONG MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED. CTR.	School Improvement	82.93%	18.07%
16	ST. LOUIS CITY	BUNCHE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	Corrective Action	88.25%	17.52%
17	ST. LOUIS CITY	ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCH. (Charter)	Corrective Action	55.51%	14.55%
18	GILLIAM C-4	GILLIAM ELEM.	School Improvement	54.35%	14.29%
19	KANSAS CITY 33	CENTRAL MIDDLE	School Improvement	91.47%	13.04%
20	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	WESTVIEW MIDDLE	Corrective Action	79.15%	12.28%
21	ST. LOUIS CITY	COLE ELEM.	School Improvement	94.78%	11.11%
22	ST. LOUIS CITY	DUNBAR AND BR.	School Improvement	89.27%	11.11%
23	ST. LOUIS CITY	COMPTON-DREW ILC MIDDLE	School Improvement	71.74%	10.10%
24	KANSAS CITY 33	C. A. FRANKLIN ELEM.	School Improvement	91.67%	10.00%
25	ST. LOUIS CITY	HICKEY ELEM.	School Improvement	85.80%	10.00%
26	ST. LOUIS CITY	MONROE ELEM.	School Improvement	83.99%	10.00%
27	ST. LOUIS CITY	OAK HILL ELEM.	School Improvement	81.40%	10.00%

DESE will develop, by December 1, 2006, a district-level Highly Qualified Teacher Plan, modeled on our online LEA Plan, to be distributed to districts. The plan will guide districts through a detailed district plan for increasing the numbers of highly-qualified teachers in all of the core academic subjects, but with particular emphasis on the areas of weaknesses in each district. In the upcoming year, as we work to create a new agency-wide online district-wide planning and application tool to replace our current paper driven Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP), we will include these HQT plans as a major emphasis of planning for overall school quality.

In order to help districts with these plans, the Federal Grants Management (FGM) section will develop the plan template, approve the submitted plans, and monitor districts for the completion of their plan as a part of our normal, comprehensive monitoring process and also through quarterly reviews of progress. FGM will continue to review each district's data as submitted through the Core Data system for such things as federally-funded positions and expenditures and the section will also review the highly qualified data to enhance its reliability and to monitor districts as they increase the numbers of highly qualified teachers. FGM will also offer assistance to districts toward the targeting of their Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A funds toward reaching the goal of having 100% of the district's teachers being highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

Also, another section of the Federal Programs Unit at DESE, the Instructional Improvement (II) section, will offer assistance to districts. Instructional Improvement is a statewide network of DESE staff, housed throughout the state that offers program improvement assistance to all schools districts, but particularly with those districts having difficulties making AYP. The Instructional Improvement staff will, in conjunction with FGM, offer assistance to districts as they complete their plans and as they fulfill the obligations set forth in the plans.

After the highly qualified teacher data was refined through the implementation of our HOUSSE standard, Missouri began a focus of resources to ensure that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children. Missouri currently uses several data and reporting strategies for both compliance and school improvement activities. Missouri collects and reports data on teacher turnover and to project teacher shortages while also collecting and reporting data on teacher salaries. Missouri, like most states, has a large turnover of first and second year teachers (see Table 3). We are currently (November 2006) examining options for incentive and support programs for inexperienced teachers with education organizations in the state. We hope to have a plan in place soon.

An online teacher certification system is used to provide current data on teacher certificates held and to ensure availability of data to examine, through compliance monitoring, that all teachers are properly credentialed in the subjects they are assigned to teach. The MSIP school accreditation process looks at the link between teacher certification and student achievement using certification and performance data collected through the online Core Data system.

In order to make teacher vacancy notifications available online, DESE created a state job bank that is used by districts that experience the greatest difficulty competing for teachers in hard-to-fill subjects.³

Missouri's "Career Ladder" program offers financial rewards to help the nearly 400 of our 540 participating districts to attract teachers of hard-to-fill subjects to high-need schools. Career Ladder can reward experienced teachers who mentor inexperienced teachers.

Professional Development and the nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) are a large part of Missouri's extensive commitment to the professional development of all teachers. Both federal and state professional development funds are available for not highly qualified teachers to develop their content knowledge to meet the requirements of NCLB's Highly Qualified Teacher goals.⁴

The Division of Teacher Quality and Urban Education's Educator Preparation and Recruitment section provide several programs to help increase the number of available highly qualified teachers in high-poverty/high-minority schools and low-poverty/low-minority schools.⁵ Programs include the Missouri Minority Teaching Scholarship, the Missouri Teacher Education Scholarship Program, the Transition to Teaching Project, and the Special Education Tuition Reimbursement Program.

Missouri is committed to fully attain the national goal of improved student achievement by ensuring that all children are taught by highly qualified and effective teachers.

Requirement 2. Information on Highly Qualified Teacher status in each school district and the steps to assist teachers in attaining HQT status

- **Identify districts that have not met AMOs for HQT**
- **Steps districts that have not met AMOs will take**
- **Local district plans for HQT**

After the completion of the Housse process in November 2006, DESE compiled the data for HQT status for each school district including the review of annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for each district. The bottom 20% of districts that haven't met AMOs will, along with those districts not meeting AYP with a high percentage of not highly qualified teachers, receive immediate attention from DESE.

In addition to the steps for local district plans for highly qualified teachers outlined in Requirement 1, DESE will integrate teachers' HQT status into the state's online Educator Certification system. The data from the recent Housse collection will be placed into

³ <http://www.moteachingjobs.com/>

⁴ <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divteachqual/leadership/profdev/> and <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divteachqual/leadership/rpdc/index.html>

⁵ <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divteachqual/teachrecruit/>

the Educator Certification database to make for consistent data on a teacher's highly qualified status available to DESE, school districts, and the teachers themselves.

DESE will require districts with high percentages of not highly qualified teachers, particularly those not making AMOs and those not making AYP, to use Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A funds to improve the numbers of courses taught by highly qualified teachers in the district. We will also encourage districts to use the 1% Professional Development funds from the state's Foundation Formula to get more teachers to highly qualified status, either through college coursework or by taking their subject's Praxis exam.

Requirement 3. Information on technical assistance, programs, and services to assist school districts in completing their Highly Qualified Teacher Plans

- **Technical assistance**
- **AYP**
- **DESE programs**

Clearly, Missouri must address the disparity between the high and low poverty schools in the state. At the elementary level (see Table 5 below), the state has a 7.4 percentage point gap (98.6 % vs. 91.2%) between high-poverty and low-poverty elementary schools. At the secondary level, the gap is even worse, at 9.2 percentage points (98.3% vs. 89.1%).

Table 5. Overview of Core Academic Courses and Highly Qualified Teachers

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	164,065	158,063	96.3%
Elementary Level (K-8)			
High-Poverty Schools	15,001	13,681	91.2%
Low-Poverty Schools	29,136	28,740	98.6%
All Elementary Schools	83,149	80,138	96.4%
Secondary Level (9-12)			
High-Poverty Schools	9,616	8,568	89.1%
Low-Poverty Schools	35,335	34,740	98.3%
All Secondary Schools	80,916	77,925	96.3%

Throughout Requirements 1 and 2 of this HQT Plan, DESE has outlined agency-wide activities designed to assist districts improve this gap and to reach 100% highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2006-2007 school year, with particular emphasis on those buildings not making AMOs and AYP. DESE will prioritize funds and technical assistance to those districts that have received AYP sanctions and have not met HQT AMOs. The funds include Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, and the one-percent High Quality Professional Development funds from the state's Foundation Formula funds. There are 104 buildings in Missouri not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2006-2007 (See Appendix 1 for complete list). The 27 buildings not making AYP with at least 10% of their core academic course teachers not highly qualified will receive immediate attention in both technical and monitoring assistance (Table 4, page 8). All districts receive an onsite monitoring as part of the state's school accreditation process known as the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). The statewide accreditation process and the federal programs monitoring both include a review of the equitable distribution of teaching assignments.

Beyond the work of the Federal Grants Management, Instructional Improvement, and other sections already discussed, DESE will offer two other opportunities for districts. Missouri's new Virtual School legislation will create online courses that make it possible for school districts to offer courses in schools where highly qualified teachers are not present. DESE will also offer sessions at our Annual Federal Programs Conference to allow school districts to hear the latest on highly qualified teacher information. Also very popular at our conferences are sessions led by other districts to share their ideas for success with other districts. At our next conference we intend to have several sessions on highly qualified teachers, including time for districts to share success stories regarding their growth in numbers of highly qualified teachers and the methods they used.

Requirement 4. How DESE will work with school districts that fail to reach the 100 percent goal by the end of the 2006-2007 school year

- **DESE's compliance monitoring and technical assistance for HQT**
- **High Quality Professional Development**

DESE will target additional monitoring scrutiny and technical assistance to those school districts that haven't yet met NCLB's goal of 100% highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2006-2007 school year. The purpose of the monitoring and assistance is to help the buildings meet their HQT goals. The state will use the 2006-2007 HQT goals as part of the criteria for "high-risk monitoring" status. Along with the criteria of large allocations, audit findings, AYP status, and other such indicators, we have added HQT goals. If a building makes no progress toward their AMO goals, an onsite visit will review the data and offer assistance. DESE will then work in collaboration with the district and the buildings not making their HQT AMOs to create a "Letter of Understanding" to make the HQT goals a clear part of any actions required by the district to continue to receive funds through the Consolidated Federal Programs application.

Technical assistance, through the Instructional Improvement section, to help districts meet the goals is also an integral part of the "Letter of Understanding."

Consistent with ESEA §2141, DESE will continue to track the status of schools that have not met HQT and AYP goals each year. At the beginning of each school year, the Core Data section at DESE will review each district's teacher data to determine the highly qualified status of all core academic subject teachers in combination with AYP data. Technical assistance, from the Federal Grants Management and Instructional Improvement sections, will assist buildings to meet their AYP and HQT goals. NCLB requires that after three consecutive years, DESE will enter into an agreement ("Letter of Understanding") that includes corrective actions, such as requiring those buildings to focus both federal and state professional development funds to exclusively increase the number of highly qualified teachers.

School districts use of High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) as defined by NCLB and funded with Title II, Part A funds in conjunction with the state funds available though the required 1% of the state funding formula for districts, is monitored through the Core Data collection system. Every teacher in the state is asked to assure that they have participated in HQPD. More than 95 percent of Missouri's teachers participate in HQPD as required by state rule and NCLB.

Requirement 5. The HOUSSE process for teachers not new to the profession and how DESE will limit the use of HOUSSE

- **The HOUSSE process**
- **Multi-subject secondary teachers**
- **Multi-subject Special Education teachers**

In August 2006, DESE sent 16,507 HOUSSE forms to Missouri's school districts to collect the highly qualified status of our veteran teachers who received Missouri teacher certification before 1988 when the state began using the Praxis II subject area exams for teacher certification. Also included in the list of HOUSSE forms were high school special education teachers whose Praxis exams are in Special Education not in the content areas they teach.

As permitted in NCLB, Missouri's HOUSSE form allows veteran teachers to prove their highly qualified status without taking the Praxis exam. Since Missouri has required the subject area Praxis II exam for years, the number of veterans without an exam in their subject area is limited. With this initial HOUSSE survey, we have captured the lifetime certificated teachers who were teaching in their content field for the 2004-2005 school year. We plan to have the HOUSSE available for eligible teachers who weren't caught in this initial year for 2006-2007. After the current school year, we anticipate a very limited need for HOUSSE with an increasing pool of teachers from the non-lifetime certified ranks, as those veteran teachers retire.

Missouri will also allow the use of HOUSSE specifically in the following situations:

1. Multi-subject secondary teachers in rural schools who, if highly qualified in one subject at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate their highly qualified status in additional subjects within three years of the date of hire, and
2. Multi-subject special education teachers who are new to the profession, if HQ in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate their highly qualified status in additional subjects with two years of the date of hire.

Requirement 6. DESE'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

- Identification of inequities
- Strategies
- Evidence of success
- DESE compliance monitoring and technical assistance

Missouri's equity plan concentrates its efforts on teachers who do not meet No Child Left Behind's criteria for highly qualified in the Kansas City and St. Louis School Districts. Although these two urban districts have a combined total of 8% of Missouri's K-12 enrollment, they have a combined total of 25.2% of Missouri's minority student enrollment. In addition, although the state percent of students eligible to receive free/reduced lunch is 41.8%, the percent for St. Louis is 83.7 and the percent for Kansas City is 80.5, almost twice that of the state as a whole. Providing equity in highly qualified teachers for these large urban districts with high numbers of minority students and high numbers of students eligible for free/reduced lunch is an important focus as Missouri strives to have all of its teachers in core subjects meet the criteria for highly qualified. Three areas of concern for equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers will be considered. They are:

- Are students in Kansas City and St. Louis taught by a large number of teachers with five years or less experience?
- Are teachers in Kansas City and St. Louis highly qualified?
- Within the districts of St. Louis and Kansas City is the distribution of highly qualified teachers equitable?

At least one strategy will be described to deal with each of these issues. As success is monitored, those strategies which prove the most effective can also be exported to other districts as appropriate.

A. Does the revised plan include a written equity plan?

1. Since 2002, Missouri has reviewed data for high poverty districts to ensure that children in those districts are not taught by inexperienced or unqualified teachers in greater percentages than in districts of low poverty. Inexperienced teachers are those who have taught five years or less. An analysis of data about years of service for Missouri teachers indicates that the largest number of individuals to leave teaching do so before they complete their fifth year of teaching. Therefore, strategies to retain highly qualified teachers during those initial five years are critical to maintaining a qualified teaching force in Missouri schools.

Data in Table 5 looks at numbers of teachers who are in their first five years of teaching for the Kansas City and St. Louis districts, Missouri's high needs,

urban districts. An analysis of Missouri's core data shows that the largest number of teachers who leave the profession before retirement leave before they complete their fifth year of teaching. This is true for St. Louis and Kansas City as well.

Table 6. Number of Teachers in their First 5 years of Experience Teaching in the District

Years of Experience	Kansas City	St. Louis
1 st Year	370	462
2 nd Year	247	351
3 rd Year	179	157
4 th Year	175	209
5 th Year	163	204
TOTAL	1134	1383

1. Unqualified teachers are those who do not meet one or more of the criteria for highly qualified. Those criteria are:
 1. Baccalaureate degree
 2. Appropriate state certification
 3. Documentation of content expertise

Missouri has required the Praxis II for certification since 1988. The HOUSS is being used for teachers who became certified before 1988.

2. The data in Table 6 shows the trend in not highly qualified teachers for the state, high poverty and low poverty districts since 2002. The data is run for each course that is being taught so a teacher may be qualified for most of the classes taught but may be teaching outside their field for one or more classes

Table 7 - Percent of Courses Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in High & Low Poverty Schools

2003		2004		2005	
High Poverty	Low Poverty	High Poverty	Low Poverty	High Poverty	Low Poverty
90.0	97.4	92.7	97.9	94.8	99.8

Although the percent of highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools has increased in the last 5 years the trend does not indicate 100% highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

- B. Does the plan identify where inequities in teacher assignment exist?
 1. The largest number (1543, see Table 8) of not-highly qualified teachers in high poverty districts are in Missouri's two urban districts, St. Louis and Kansas City.

2. The highest number and percent of not-highly qualified teachers in high poverty districts are in Language Arts (English), Math, and Science. Special Education and elementary are also areas of special concern in at least one of the districts. Both districts have larger percentages of not-highly qualified teachers than the state as a whole except for foreign language and art in Kansas City.

Table 8. Percentage of Not Highly Qualified by Content Area for State and for Kansas City and St Louis (2005)

Content Area	State	Urban District/STL	Urban District/KC
Science	5.45	11.5	11.5
Language Arts	4.80	16.4	18.8
Math	3.80	16.6	12.1
Foreign Language	3.47	4.2	1.3
Music	2.96	3.60	5.8
Art	2.72	3.60	2.0
Social Studies	2.41	9.50	4.8
Special Education	1.50	10.6	5.3
Elementary	.81	8.3	2.2

Table 9. Not Appropriately Certificated By Content Area for Expired Invalid, None, Substitute

Kansas City	Content Area	Expired	Invalid	None	Substitute	Total	% of Total
	<i>Art</i>		1	3	14	18	2.0
	<i>Language Arts/English</i>	25	45		13	83	18.8
	<i>Foreign Language</i>		12	4	5	21	1.3
	<i>Math</i>	17	45	3	19	84	16.6
	<i>Music</i>	1	4	5	8	18	5.8
	<i>Science</i>	8	20	3	27	58	11.5
	<i>Social Studies</i>	11	14	10	13	48	4.8
	<i>Special Education</i>	10	5	4	8	27	5.3
	<i>Elementary</i>	8	9	11	14	42	2.2
St. Louis							
	<i>Art</i>	8	2	12	11	33	3.6
	<i>Language Arts/English</i>	64	160	27	59	310	16.4
	<i>Foreign Language</i>	13	4	4		21	4.2
	<i>Math</i>	33	44	21	101	199	12.1
	<i>Music</i>	31	8	9	48	96	3.6
	<i>Science</i>	49	69	2	70	190	11.5
	<i>Social Studies</i>	11	21		47	79	9.5
	<i>Special Education</i>	70	19	15	76	180	10.9
	<i>Elementary</i>	9	5	10	12	36	8.3

In addition, Kansas City has 14 paraprofessionals and St. Louis has 27 paraprofessionals that do not meet NCLB requirements.

C. Does the plan designate specific strategies for addressing inequities in teacher assignment?

The following strategies will be focused on assisting Kansas City and St. Louis to reach 100% highly qualified by the end of the 2006-2007 school year.

1. The priority for the Math/Science Partnership Grants for the 06-07 school year will be for St. Louis and Kansas City and in the content area of Math. Kansas City and St. Louis will identify math teachers who are not appropriately certificated and/or who can't document content expertise. These teachers will be recruited into

courses in the University in their geographic area that will allow them to be appropriately certificated and/or document content expertise. The SEA will be responsible for negotiating the partnership with the university and the district. District personnel, with the principals leading, will be responsible for recruiting teachers into the program and for monitoring their progress. District Human Resources department in cooperation with the district Federal Programs Office will be responsible for providing incentives. The LEA will use Title II-A and, where appropriate, Title I funds to provide tuition reimbursement to teachers who finish the courses and receive a satisfactory grade as determined by the district.

2. The Math/Science Partnerships that focus on science will continue in Kansas City and St. Louis with the districts identifying teachers who can complete certification and/or content expertise during the 06-07 school year. Although any teacher may participate in this program, priority will be given to teachers from St. Louis and Kansas City in cases where space is limited. Responsibilities will be the same as those listed above.
3. On-line courses will be offered through the public television stations in Kansas City and St. Louis in language arts and math for middle school and high school teachers who need certification or content expertise in these two areas. Credit for these courses will be available through local universities. The district human resources department will work with the principals in recruiting individuals. The state will waive the registration fees for teachers who need these courses in order to meet one or more of the criteria to become highly qualified. The district will use Title II-A funds, and Title I as appropriate, to reimburse for tuition for individuals who complete these courses and receive a satisfactory grade as determined by the district. The SEA will distribute the necessary information about these courses the human resources office of these districts to be distributed to appropriate teachers. These courses will be available on the predetermined schedule of the credit-granting institution. In addition, arrangements can be made to have the on-line course offered on a special schedule for the St. Louis and Kansas City district if a minimum of 10 students sign up for the course.
4. The Kansas City and St. Louis districts will identify individuals who already have a teaching certificate and use Title II funds to pay for content course refreshers and the Praxis to assist teachers to become fully certified in the core content areas, elementary education and special education where they are currently teaching

out-of-field. Building principals will be responsible for monitoring progress. District human resources in cooperation with the district federal program office will be responsible for providing financial support.

5. The Kansas City and St. Louis districts will identify individuals with substitute certificates, who already have baccalaureate degrees and offer scholarships (using district Title II-A funds) to those who will be able to complete full certification by the end of August, 2007. The district personnel office will work with building principals to identify and recruit these individuals. The building principal will monitor progress. The SEA will add these teachers to the highly qualified data base as these individuals request and receive professional certification.
6. Kansas City and St. Louis districts will each prepare and implement a plan for mentoring teachers with 5 years of experience or less. The plan will include criteria for identifying mentor/teachers, job descriptions for "teachers as mentors" and for "teachers being mentored," a timeline for differentiated activities depending on the years of experience of the teacher being mentored, and a description of support group activities for both groups. DESE Federal Grants Management Section will work with the person(s) designated in the district to assist with resources for planning and implementation of the mentoring program. The Grants Management Section will also monitor progress and decide if a site visit is needed.

D. Does the plan provide evidence for the probable success of the strategies it includes?

The Core Data and Certification Sections will run the highly qualified data each month for Kansas City and St. Louis districts for teachers of core content areas, elementary, and special education. The director of Grants Management and one other member of the Grants Management staff will analyze the progress made in each district and discuss progress being made with the designated team from the district in each of the areas of need and for each of the strategies identified in the plan. The conversation will include any barriers to achieving 100% highly qualified by August 2007. As the districts Title II-A funds or available Title I funds are depleted, DESE has reserved SEA funds from the Title II set aside to assist these large, high poverty, high minority districts in meeting the 100% goal. Determination will be made by the DESE Federal Program staff as to when additional funds might be needed. A site visit will be made if no progress is made toward the 100% goal for 2 full months. That monitoring visit will include reviewing the processes that have been put in place as well as the

progress individuals have made toward meeting the criteria for highly qualified. Strategies that have not produced successful results will be carefully reviewed to see if barriers can be identified. Special site visits may be made to buildings whose trend data indicates they will not reach 100% highly qualified by August, 2007. When site visits are made a report will be written to the superintendent describing progress and concerns.

- E. 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? Although the data on page three indicates that the highest percentage of Not Highly Qualified Teachers are in the two urban districts of high poverty, an analysis of building level highly qualified data within the districts of St. Louis and Kansas City does not show any obvious patterns for assigning highly qualified teachers to buildings within the district. It does not show any correlation between highly qualified and poverty level. It does show that charter schools have some of the lowest levels of highly qualified staff but they are held to a different standard in No Child Left Behind and DESE's director of charter schools will work with those buildings to make sure that they meet the NCLB standard.

For buildings the human resources personnel will work with the building principals to choose from the strategies listed in this plan to reach 100% by August of 2007. First priority will be given to those buildings that are below 90%. DESE staff will assist with data analysis and with other resources as needed. DESE core data will use the data to drill down to the building level data on a regular monthly schedule for these two districts so that progress can be assessed.

The need to have highly qualified teachers in all core academic areas will be highlighted for all districts by adding a question specifically about highly qualified teachers to the Title II section of the self-monitoring checklist that all districts that receive NCLB funds complete and return during October of each school year.

A DESE onsite monitoring visit for all 540 school districts in the state, at both the district and building levels, is done at least every five years, with more frequent visits, many annual, for districts that don't make AYP, have audit issues, large allocations, or problems that arise. All districts in Missouri are monitored for all federal programs requirements, including HQT as part of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), Missouri's school accreditation process. Both the statewide accreditation process and the federal programs monitoring include a review of the equitable

distribution of teaching assignments. DESE monitors equitable teacher assignment when we review the building level Core Data submissions by districts in the fall of each year, during an onsite monitoring, and as part of the MSIP process. Districts are given reports describing their teacher's qualifications (HQT status) and years of experience. Teacher quality, particularly through years of experience and HQT status, are a large part of the newly revised MSIP process. In conjunction with federal programs monitoring, technical assistance, and the overall accreditation process, teacher quality will improve in Missouri.

Toward that goal, DESE is currently developing, through a series of meetings with agency staff and representatives of the states education organizations, a plan to examine the potential to create an incentive program to reward experienced, highly qualified teachers to serve in school buildings that currently have a large number of inexperienced. The program would help the state solve the large problem of inexperienced teachers, especially in those buildings not currently making AYP. In the coming months, DESE will hold more meetings, expanding the committee membership. The committee hopes to have a plan to submit to DESE leadership that will ask for legislative approval for a comprehensive incentives plan to help districts attract highly qualified and experience classroom teachers for the core academic subjects.

For a list of MSIP reviews, both last and current year, see <http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/schedules.html> .

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

Table 10. Number of Teachers Who Are Not (N) and Who Are (Y) Highly Qualified with the Percent Who Are (OK) Along with the Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch by Building in Kansas City (048-078) and St. Louis (115-115).

Year	County-District Code	Building Number	Building Name	Grand Total	N	Y	Pct Ok	Pct FRL
2006	048-078	1000	CENTRAL OFFICE	6		6	100.0	0
2006	048-078	1100	MANUAL CAREER & TECH. CTR.	1		1	100.0	0
2006	048-078	1130	C. R. ANDERSON ALTERNATIVE	1		1	100.0	74.2
2006	048-078	1140	FAIRVIEW ALTERNATIVE	2		2	100.0	89.7
2006	048-078	1200	CENTRAL SR. HIGH	43	1	42	97.7	70.2
2006	048-078	1220	LINCOLN COLLEGE PREP.	64	2	62	96.9	53.4
2006	048-078	1340	N.E. LAW & PUBLIC SERV. MAGNET	57	3	54	94.7	65.8
2006	048-078	1400	PASEO ACAD. OF PERFORMING ARTS	45	5	40	88.9	53.3
2006	048-078	1460	SOUTHEAST HIGH	28	2	26	92.9	69
2006	048-078	1550	TEENAGE PARENTS CTR.	6	1	5	83.3	88.1
2006	048-078	1580	VAN HORN HIGH	50	2	48	96.0	64.5
2006	048-078	1640	WESTPORT HIGH	31	3	28	90.3	60.8
2006	048-078	1915	UNIVERSITY ACADEMY	54	12	42	77.8	70.7
2006	048-078	1925	ALTA VISTA CHARTER SCH.	10	1	9	90.0	87.3
2006	048-078	1930	DON BOSCO EDUCATION CTR.	20	5	15	75.0	84.7
2006	048-078	1935	HOGAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY	28	1	27	96.4	58.6
2006	048-078	1945	GENESIS SCHOOL INC.	5	1	4	80.0	87
2006	048-078	1950	SOUTHWEST CHARTER SCH.	29	10	19	65.5	79
2006	048-078	3000	J. A. ROGERS MIDDLE	31	3	28	90.3	88.6
2006	048-078	3030	CENTRAL MIDDLE	27	3	24	88.9	91.5
2006	048-078	3040	M. L. KING MIDDLE	22		22	100.0	92.1
2006	048-078	3060	CLARKE ACE MIDDLE	14	3	11	78.6	86.6
2006	048-078	3080	K C MIDDLE SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	30		30	100.0	85.2
2006	048-078	3100	NORTHEAST MIDDLE	49	1	48	98.0	88.9
2006	048-078	3120	CLIFFORD H. NOWLIN MIDDLE	33	1	32	97.0	84.3
2006	048-078	3160	WESTPORT MIDDLE	18	2	16	88.9	87.7
2006	048-078	3915	URBAN COM. LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	17	11	6	35.3	96
2006	048-078	4040	ASKEW ELEM.	20		20	100.0	85.9
2006	048-078	4060	ATTUCKS ELEM.	15		15	100.0	80.4
2006	048-078	4120	BLENHEIM ELEM.	19	1	18	94.7	89.8
2006	048-078	4180	BRYANT ELEM.	16	1	15	93.8	87.2
2006	048-078	4240	J. S. CHICK ELEM.	18	1	17	94.4	82.8
2006	048-078	4280	HALE COOK ELEM.	15		15	100.0	85.5
2006	048-078	4290	GEO. WASHINGTON CARVER ELEM.	16		16	100.0	88
2006	048-078	4310	TRAILWOODS ENVIRONMENTAL ELEM.	25		25	100.0	87.9
2006	048-078	4330	EAST ELEM.	42		42	100.0	89.2
2006	048-078	4350	FOREIGN LANGUAGE ACADEMY	46		46	100.0	73.5
2006	048-078	4380	FAIRMONT ELEM. MAGNET	14		14	100.0	86.9
2006	048-078	4420	FAXON MONTESSORI	13		13	100.0	83.9
2006	048-078	4450	C. A. FRANKLIN ELEM.	20	2	18	90.0	89.4
2006	048-078	4460	GARFIELD ELEM.	21	2	19	90.5	97
2006	048-078	4500	GLADSTONE ELEM.	28		28	100.0	85.3
2006	048-078	4520	GRACELAND ELEM.	20	1	19	95.0	88
2006	048-078	4580	JOHN T. HARTMAN ELEM. MAGNET	18		18	100.0	82.7
2006	048-078	4700	JAMES ELEM.	21		21	100.0	93.1
2006	048-078	4760	WM. A. KNOTTS ELEM. MAGNET	21		21	100.0	88
2006	048-078	4770	NORTH ROCK CREEK/KORTE	27		27	100.0	85.1

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

			ACADEMY					
2006	048-078	4800	SANFORD B. LADD ELEM.	18		18	100.0	88.9
2006	048-078	4860	GEORGE B. LONGAN ELEM.	17		17	100.0	86.1
2006	048-078	4880	LONGFELLOW ELEM. MAGNET	18		18	100.0	90.6
2006	048-078	4900	MCCOY ELEM.	17		17	100.0	93.1
2006	048-078	5020	GEORGE MELCHER ELEM.	16	1	15	93.8	87.4
2006	048-078	5060	MILTON MOORE ELEM.	15		15	100.0	89
2006	048-078	5080	MT. WASHINGTON ELEM.	17	1	16	94.1	88.7
2006	048-078	5200	WENDELL PHILLIPS ELEM. MAGNET	22	2	20	90.9	95.4
2006	048-078	5220	PINKERTON ELEM.	19		19	100.0	88.4
2006	048-078	5240	PITCHER ELEM.	20		20	100.0	83.8
2006	048-078	5250	RICHARDSON ELEM.	20		20	100.0	93.5
2006	048-078	5320	WEST ROCK CREEK TRADITIONAL	15		15	100.0	79.8
2006	048-078	5360	SACHEL PAIGE ELEM.	36	4	32	88.9	84.9
2006	048-078	5380	SCARRITT ELEM.	19		19	100.0	88.3
2006	048-078	5420	SOUTHEAST ZOO ACADEMY	32	3	29	90.6	88.6
2006	048-078	5440	B. BANNEKER ELEM.	20		20	100.0	90.5
2006	048-078	5450	HOLLIDAY MONTESSORI	21		21	100.0	62.7
2006	048-078	5460	SUGAR CREEK ELEM.	11		11	100.0	86
2006	048-078	5500	SWINNEY/VOLKER ELEM.	19		19	100.0	88.2
2006	048-078	5570	THREE TRAILS ELEM.	15		15	100.0	80.4
2006	048-078	5580	TROOST ELEM.	18	1	17	94.4	87
2006	048-078	5630	PRIMITIVO GARCIA ELEM.	25		25	100.0	86.8
2006	048-078	5650	MARY HARMON WEEKS ELEM.	20		20	100.0	90.1
2006	048-078	5660	PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM.	18	1	17	94.4	89.5
2006	048-078	5700	WHITTIER ELEM.	21		21	100.0	85.8
2006	048-078	5740	WOODLAND ELEM.	20	1	19	95.0	90.8
2006	048-078	5780	BORDER STAR ELEM.	17	2	15	88.2	48.4
2006	048-078	6030	R. J. DELANO	10	1	9	90.0	57.5
2006	048-078	6910	ACADEMY OF KANSAS CITY	25	14	11	44.0	100
2006	048-078	6915	ALLEN VILLAGE CHARTER	18	3	15	83.3	87.2
2006	048-078	6920	LEE A. TOLBERT COM. ACADEMY	28	8	20	71.4	79.4
2006	048-078	6925	B. BANNEKER CHARTER ACADEMY	14	3	11	78.6	98
2006	048-078	6930	DELLA LAMB ELEM.	34	10	24	70.6	91.5
2006	048-078	6935	GORDON PARKS ELEM.	16	3	13	81.3	93.1
2006	048-078	6940	ACADEMIE LAFAYETTE	27	9	18	66.7	31.6
2006	048-078	6945	SCUOLA VITA NUOVA	14	7	7	50.0	90.5
2006	048-078	6950	BROOKSIDE CHARTER SCH.	15	2	13	86.7	61.9
2006	048-078	6955	DERRICK THOMAS ACADEMY	25	4	21	84.0	95.1
2006	048-078		Total	1908	161	1747	91.6	
Year	County-District Code	Building Number	Building Name	Grand Total	N	Y	Pct Ok	Pct FRL
2006	115-115	1000	CENTRAL OFFICE	1	1		0.0	0
2006	115-115	1015	GRISCOM DETENTION CTR.	4	1	3	75.0	57.6
2006	115-115	1100	MILLER CAREER ACADEMY	43	5	38	88.4	64
2006	115-115	1220	GATEWAY HIGH	85	15	70	82.4	58.1
2006	115-115	1222	COMMUNITY ACCESS JOB TRAINING	12	2	10	83.3	80.6
2006	115-115	1250	BEAUMONT HIGH	72	25	47	65.3	77.3
2006	115-115	1380	MEDA P. WASHINGTON EDUC. CTR.	18	4	14	77.8	91.7
2006	115-115	1440	CLEVELAND NJROTC ACADEMY	49	13	36	73.5	74
2006	115-115	1560	METRO HIGH	21	3	18	85.7	33.9
2006	115-115	1680	ROOSEVELT HIGH	98	20	78	79.6	84.9

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

2006	115-115	1730	SOLDAN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	54	12	42	77.8	83
2006	115-115	1800	SUMNER HIGH	59	17	42	71.2	81.3
2006	115-115	1830	VASHON HIGH	67	14	53	79.1	75.8
2006	115-115	1860	CENTRAL VISUAL/PERF. ARTS HIGH	57	13	44	77.2	66.7
2006	115-115	1910	CONSTRUCTION CAREERS CTR.	12	2	10	83.3	83.5
2006	115-115	3020	BLEWETT MIDDLE	20	3	17	85.0	90
2006	115-115	3040	BLOW MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED. CTR.	20	1	19	95.0	90.8
2006	115-115	3050	BUSCH/ACADEMIC-ATHLETIC ACAD.	15		15	100.0	73.2
2006	115-115	3070	CARR LANE VPA MIDDLE	34	8	26	76.5	80.9
2006	115-115	3110	BUNCHE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	30	4	26	86.7	88.1
2006	115-115	3130	MCKINLEY/CLASSICAL JR. ACAD.	24	3	21	87.5	41.8
2006	115-115	3140	FANNING MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	25	8	17	68.0	87.4
2006	115-115	3210	HUMBOLDT MIDDLE	24	7	17	70.8	89.1
2006	115-115	3230	GATEWAY MIDDLE	30	2	28	93.3	81
2006	115-115	3240	LANGSTON MIDDLE	31	15	16	51.6	88.6
2006	115-115	3260	LONG MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED. CTR.	25	4	21	84.0	83.2
2006	115-115	3280	L'OUVERTURE MIDDLE	23	9	14	60.9	89.7
2006	115-115	3310	NORTHWEST MIDDLE	24	11	13	54.2	89.9
2006	115-115	3370	PRUITT MILITARY ACADEMY	17	2	15	88.2	91.9
2006	115-115	3390	COMPTON-DREW ILC MIDDLE	31	2	29	93.5	71.6
2006	115-115	3400	STEVENS MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	17	8	9	52.9	88.8
2006	115-115	3420	STOWE MIDDLE	23	10	13	56.5	91.9
2006	115-115	3440	TURNER MIDDLE SCH. AND BR.	20	6	14	70.0	95.2
2006	115-115	3480	WEBSTER MIDDLE	30	8	22	73.3	93.6
2006	115-115	3520	YEATMAN MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	25	11	14	56.0	92
2006	115-115	3540	MEL CARNAHAN MIDDLE	20	4	16	80.0	86.4
2006	115-115	3910	LIFT FOR LIFE ACADEMY	28	16	12	42.9	96.7
2006	115-115	4000	ADAMS ELEM.	20	1	19	95.0	92.6
2006	115-115	4060	ASHLAND ELEM. AND BR.	28	1	27	96.4	88
2006	115-115	4080	BADEN ELEM.	20	1	19	95.0	91.5
2006	115-115	4180	BRYAN HILL ELEM.	17	1	16	94.1	96.7
2006	115-115	4200	BUDER ELEM.	23	2	21	91.3	80.2
2006	115-115	4250	AMES VISUAL/PERF. ARTS	22	2	20	90.9	81.1
2006	115-115	4320	CLARK ELEM.	15		15	100.0	82.2
2006	115-115	4360	CLAY ELEM.	18	1	17	94.4	90.7
2006	115-115	4400	COLE ELEM.	18	2	16	88.9	95.6
2006	115-115	4420	COLUMBIA ELEM. COMM. ED. CTR.	23	2	21	91.3	90.2
2006	115-115	4440	COTE BRILLIANTE ELEM.	17	3	14	82.4	95.6
2006	115-115	4470	DEWEY SCH.-INTERNAT'L. STUDIES	27	3	24	88.9	73.5
2006	115-115	4480	DUNBAR AND BR.	18	2	16	88.9	85.9
2006	115-115	4510	KOTTMAYER EARLY CHILD. CTR.	10	1	9	90.0	83.2
2006	115-115	4560	EUCLID MONTESSORI	6	2	4	66.7	73.1
2006	115-115	4580	FARRAGUT ELEM.	15		15	100.0	91.7
2006	115-115	4630	FORD-FORD BR. ELEM. COMM. ED.	20		20	100.0	90.2
2006	115-115	4660	FROEBEL ELEM.	26	5	21	80.8	92
2006	115-115	4720	GALLAUDET SCH. FOR DEAF ELEM.	11		11	100.0	86.8
2006	115-115	4730	GATEWAY ELEM.	31	1	30	96.8	76.2
2006	115-115	4760	GUNDLACH ELEM.	17		17	100.0	92
2006	115-115	4780	HAMILTON ELEM. COMMUNITY ED.	18		18	100.0	85.6
2006	115-115	4880	HENRY ELEM.	12	1	11	91.7	89.6
2006	115-115	4890	HICKEY ELEM.	20	2	18	90.0	85.9
2006	115-115	4900	HERZOG ELEM.	16	1	15	93.8	91.7
2006	115-115	4920	HODGEN ELEM.	19	1	18	94.7	96.1
2006	115-115	5020	JEFFERSON ELEM.	21	2	19	90.5	90.8

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

2006	115-115	5030	KENNARD/CLASSICAL JR. ACAD.	21	1	20	95.2	30.3
2006	115-115	5060	LACLEDE ELEM.	16	1	15	93.8	93.4
2006	115-115	5100	LEXINGTON ELEM.	17	2	15	88.2	90.8
2006	115-115	5180	LYON ACADEMY - BASIC INSTR.	17	1	16	94.1	86.4
2006	115-115	5240	MALLINCKRODT A.B.I. ELEM.	17		17	100.0	68.8
2006	115-115	5260	MANN ELEM.	17		17	100.0	78.2
2006	115-115	5280	MARK TWAIN ELEM.	17		17	100.0	96.5
2006	115-115	5340	MASON ELEM.	23		23	100.0	66.2
2006	115-115	5500	MERAMEC ELEM.	17	2	15	88.2	90.4
2006	115-115	5520	ELIAS MICHAEL ELEM.	7	1	6	85.7	80
2006	115-115	5540	MITCHELL ELEM.	18	2	16	88.9	87.4
2006	115-115	5560	MONROE ELEM.	20	2	18	90.0	83.8
2006	115-115	5590	MULLANPHY BOTANICAL GARDENS	28	2	26	92.9	73
2006	115-115	5600	OAK HILL ELEM.	20	2	18	90.0	79.7
2006	115-115	5610	EARL NANCE, SR. ELEM.	20		20	100.0	85.5
2006	115-115	5620	PEABODY ELEM.	18	2	16	88.9	94.6
2006	115-115	5740	SCRUGGS ELEM.	23	4	19	82.6	77.9
2006	115-115	5780	SHAW VISUAL/PERF. ARTS CTR.	24	3	21	87.5	73.1
2006	115-115	5800	SHENANDOAH ELEM.	15	1	14	93.3	93.4
2006	115-115	5820	SHEPARD ELEM.	18	2	16	88.9	88.7
2006	115-115	5840	SHERMAN ELEM. COMM. ED. CTR.	14		14	100.0	94.6
2006	115-115	5860	SIGEL ELEM. COMM. ED. CTR.	20	3	17	85.0	92.6
2006	115-115	5880	SIMMONS ELEM.	21		21	100.0	94.3
2006	115-115	5930	STIX EARLY CHILDHOOD CTR.	22		22	100.0	57.5
2006	115-115	5960	WALBRIDGE ELEM. COMMUNITY ED.	20		20	100.0	93
2006	115-115	5970	WOERNER ELEM.	22	2	20	90.9	82
2006	115-115	6010	WASHINGTON MONTESSORI	21		21	100.0	81
2006	115-115	6030	WILKINSON EARLY CHILDHOOD CTR.	12		12	100.0	67.6
2006	115-115	6100	MADISON I.G.E. ELEM.	14	1	13	92.9	89.8
2006	115-115	6120	WOODWARD ELEM.	22		22	100.0	90.2
2006	115-115	6140	WYMAN ELEM.	18		18	100.0	89.5
2006	115-115	6915	ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCH.	55	8	47	85.5	55.5
2006	115-115	6920	ETHEL HEDGEMAN LYLE ACADEMY	55	16	39	70.9	81.4
2006	115-115	6925	ST. LOUIS CHARTER ACADEMIES	25	9	16	64.0	77.2
2006	115-115	6930	CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES	68	15	53	77.9	93.7
2006			Total	2478	408	2070	83.5	

Appendix 1. 2006-2007 AYP - Schools Receiving Sanctions with Building Poverty Level and Percent of Core Academic Teachers Not Highly Qualified. November 11, 2006

County-District Code	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Required Action	Building Poverty Rate	Percent of Teachers Not Highly Qualified
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3910	LIFT FOR LIFE ACADEMY	Corrective Action	97.20%	53.01%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3240	LANGSTON MIDDLE	Corrective Action	91.50%	46.72%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	6925	ST. LOUIS CHARTER ACADEMIES	School Improvement	77.18%	45.71%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3400	STEVENS MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	Corrective Action	89.63%	43.55%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3280	L'OUVERTURE MIDDLE	Corrective Action	90.29%	36.51%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	6920	ETHEL HEDGEMAN LYLE ACADEMY	School Improvement	81.45%	33.49%
078012	CARUTHERSVILLE 18	4060	CARUTHERSVILLE ELEM.	School Improvement	80.42%	32.14%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3210	HUMBOLDT MIDDLE	Corrective Action	90.60%	28.09%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3140	FANNING MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED.	Corrective Action	87.50%	24.79%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3070	CARR LANE VPA MIDDLE	School Improvement	81.40%	23.39%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3060	CLARKE ACE MIDDLE	School Improvement	86.55%	22.95%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	6930	CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES	School Improvement	89.25%	21.74%
096115	WELLSTON	3000	BISHOP MIDDLE	School Improvement	99.40%	20.69%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4660	FROEBEL ELEM.	School Improvement	91.89%	19.23%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3260	LONG MIDDLE COMMUNITY ED. CTR.	School Improvement	82.93%	18.07%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3110	BUNCHE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES	Corrective Action	88.25%	17.52%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	6915	ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCH.	Corrective Action	55.51%	14.55%
097127	GILLIAM C-4	4020	GILLIAM ELEM.	School Improvement	54.35%	14.29%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3030	CENTRAL MIDDLE	School Improvement	91.47%	13.04%
096111	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	4040	WESTVIEW MIDDLE	Corrective Action	79.15%	12.28%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4400	COLE ELEM.	School Improvement	94.78%	11.11%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4480	DUNBAR AND BR.	School Improvement	89.27%	11.11%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3390	COMPTON-DREW ILC MIDDLE	School Improvement	71.74%	10.10%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4450	C. A. FRANKLIN ELEM.	School Improvement	91.67%	10.00%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4890	HICKEY ELEM.	School Improvement	85.80%	10.00%

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

County-District Code	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Required Action	Building Poverty Rate	Percent of Teachers <u>Not</u> Highly Qualified
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5560	MONROE ELEM.	School Improvement	83.99%	10.00%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5600	OAK HILL ELEM.	School Improvement	81.40%	10.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3160	WESTPORT MIDDLE	Corrective Action	87.75%	9.76%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5020	JEFFERSON ELEM.	School Improvement	90.60%	9.52%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4250	AMES VISUAL/PERF. ARTS	School Improvement	81.40%	9.09%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5970	WOERNER ELEM.	School Improvement	82.04%	8.70%
096089	FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	4010	AIRPORT ELEM.	School Improvement	90.18%	7.14%
067061	CHARLESTON R-I	4040	WARREN E. HEARNES ELEM.	School Improvement	82.53%	6.67%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4180	BRYANT ELEM.	School Improvement	87.21%	6.25%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5020	GEORGE MELCHER ELEM.	School Improvement	90.82%	6.25%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5800	SHENANDOAH ELEM.	School Improvement	92.47%	6.25%
005128	MONETT R-I	4020	MONETT ELEM.	School Improvement	55.33%	6.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3000	J. A. ROGERS MIDDLE	Corrective Action	88.58%	5.67%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5660	PHYLLIS WHEATLEY ELEM.	School Improvement	89.53%	5.56%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5580	TROOST ELEM.	School Improvement	87.40%	5.56%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4360	CLAY ELEM.	School Improvement	89.85%	5.56%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4000	ADAMS ELEM.	School Improvement	94.17%	5.00%
100061	SCOTT CO. R-IV	3000	SCOTT CO. MIDDLE	School Improvement	53.48%	4.41%
096111	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	5040	MEADOWS ELEM.	School Improvement	87.29%	3.85%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3020	BLEWETT MIDDLE	Corrective Action	90.71%	3.70%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3120	CLIFFORD H. NOWLIN MIDDLE	Corrective Action	84.36%	3.68%
010093	COLUMBIA 93	4080	EUGENE FIELD ELEM.	School Improvement	79.33%	3.57%
109003	WARREN CO. R-III	4020	DANIEL BOONE ELEM.	School Improvement	38.77%	3.03%
096088	HAZELWOOD	4250	TOWNSEND ELEM.	School Improvement	59.11%	2.86%
049142	CARTHAGE R-IX	4060	FAIRVIEW ELEM.	School Improvement	68.96%	2.38%
096111	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	3000	R. G. CENTRAL MIDDLE	Corrective Action	77.00%	2.31%
096109	NORMANDY	4145	LUCAS CROSSING ELEM. COMPLEX	School Improvement	91.57%	2.04%
057002	ELSBERRY R-II	3000	IDA CANNON MIDDLE	School Improvement	43.73%	1.75%
060077	MCDONALD CO. R-I	4040	NOEL ELEM.	School Improvement	81.40%	1.64%

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

County-District Code	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Required Action	Building Poverty Rate	Percent of Teachers <u>Not</u> Highly Qualified
035098	SENATH-HORNERSVILLE C-8	3000	HORNERSVILLE MIDDLE	School Improvement	68.65%	1.25%
111087	CLEARWATER R-I	3000	CLEARWATER MIDDLE	School Improvement	64.11%	0.94%
091092	DONIPHAN R-I	3000	DONIPHAN MIDDLE	School Improvement	65.50%	0.00%
096089	FERGUSON-FLORISSANT R-II	4320	WALNUT GROVE ELEM.	School Improvement	76.50%	0.00%
104042	GALENA R-II	1050	GALENA HIGH	School Improvement	52.80%	0.00%
048074	GRANDVIEW C-4	5020	MARTIN CITY ELEM.	School Improvement	58.76%	0.00%
078002	HAYTI R-II	4040	MATHIS ELEM.	School Improvement	78.18%	0.00%
078002	HAYTI R-II	4020	WALLACE ELEM.	Corrective Action	83.24%	0.00%
096088	HAZELWOOD	4340	ARROWPOINT ELEM.	School Improvement	58.66%	0.00%
096088	HAZELWOOD	4150	GRANNEMANN ELEM.	School Improvement	57.41%	0.00%
096088	HAZELWOOD	4020	KEEVEN ELEM.	School Improvement	73.68%	0.00%
096088	HAZELWOOD	4260	TWILLMAN ELEM.	School Improvement	81.06%	0.00%
096104	JENNINGS	2050	JENNINGS JR. HIGH	Corrective Action	82.82%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4060	ATTUCKS ELEM.	School Improvement	85.22%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5440	B. BANNEKER ELEM.	School Improvement	90.52%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4330	EAST ELEM.	School Improvement	90.28%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4350	FOREIGN LANGUAGE ACADEMY	School Improvement	73.50%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4860	GEORGE B. LONGAN ELEM.	School Improvement	86.10%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4700	JAMES ELEM.	School Improvement	93.10%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3080	K C MIDDLE SCHOOL OF THE ARTS	School Improvement	85.18%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	3040	M. L. KING MIDDLE	Corrective Action	92.06%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5650	MARY HARMON WEEKS ELEM.	School Improvement	90.13%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4770	NORTH ROCK CREEK/KORTE ACADEMY	School Improvement	85.15%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5220	PINKERTON ELEM.	School Improvement	88.24%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5630	PRIMITIVO GARCIA ELEM.	School Improvement	86.84%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5250	RICHARDSON ELEM.	School Improvement	93.47%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4800	SANFORD B. LADD ELEM.	School Improvement	88.89%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5500	SWINNEY/VOLKER ELEM.	School Improvement	88.24%	0.00%
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	4310	TRAILWOODS ENVIRONMENTAL ELEM.	School Improvement	87.90%	0.00%

Missouri's Revised State Plan for Highly Qualified Teachers for 2006-2007

County-District Code	District Name	Building Number	School Name	Required Action	Building Poverty Rate	Percent of Teachers <u>Not</u> Highly Qualified
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	5700	WHITTIER ELEM.	School Improvement	86.92%	0.00%
035102	KENNETT 39	4080	SOUTH ELEM.	School Improvement	63.88%	0.00%
035092	MALDEN R-I	4020	MALDEN ELEM.	School Improvement	75.28%	0.00%
068072	MONITEAU CO. R-V	4020	LATHAM ELEM.	School Improvement	42.00%	0.00%
096109	NORMANDY	4100	JEFFERSON ELEM.	School Improvement	77.29%	0.00%
005124	PURDY R-II	3000	PURDY MIDDLE	School Improvement	60.22%	0.00%
096110	RITENOUR	3000	HOECH MIDDLE	School Improvement	63.42%	0.00%
096110	RITENOUR	4120	KRATZ ELEM.	School Improvement	74.42%	0.00%
096110	RITENOUR	3050	RITENOUR MIDDLE	School Improvement	60.95%	0.00%
096111	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	4020	DANFORTH ELEM.	School Improvement	68.15%	0.00%
096111	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	4080	HIGHLAND ELEM.	School Improvement	96.50%	0.00%
096119	SPECL. SCH. DST. ST. LOUIS CO.	4029	ACKERMAN SCH.	School Improvement	71.33%	0.00%
096119	SPECL. SCH. DST. ST. LOUIS CO.	4069	LITZSINGER	School Improvement	63.16%	0.00%
039141	SPRINGFIELD R-XII	3140	REED MIDDLE	School Improvement	74.48%	0.00%
036136	ST. CLAIR R-XIII	4040	EDGAR MURRAY ELEM.	School Improvement	42.15%	0.00%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	3050	BUSCH/ACADEMIC-ATHLETIC ACAD.	School Improvement	73.36%	0.00%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	4760	GUNDLACH ELEM.	School Improvement	92.02%	0.00%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5260	MANN ELEM.	School Improvement	80.43%	0.00%
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	5340	MASON ELEM.	School Improvement	66.30%	0.00%
092089	WENTZVILLE R-IV	4030	HERITAGE INTERMEDIATE	School Improvement	27.13%	0.00%
009080	WOODLAND R-IV	4040	WOODLAND ELEM.	School Improvement	59.42%	0.00%
				MIN	27.13%	0.00%
				MAX	99.40%	53.01%
				AVG	78.13%	7.62%
				COUNT	104	