

Archived Information

TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT GRANTS

Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to states for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to states and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

FY 2000—\$98,000,000

FY 2001—\$98,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE OF NEW TEACHERS BY FUNDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE POLICIES THAT STRENGTHEN INITIAL LICENSING STANDARDS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE OR LOCAL POLICIES/PROGRAMS THAT REDUCE THE NUMBER OF UNCERTIFIED TEACHERS.

Indicator 1.1 Teacher certification standards. State grantees: An external panel of experts will find that all states that use their grant to strengthen initial teacher certification standards will have implemented higher standards within 3 years of the grant award. Within 1 1/2 years of the grant award, these states will have demonstrated progress toward implementation of higher standards.

Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program	<p>Status: Unable to judge because no 1999 data are available.</p> <p>However, based on a review of state grantee applications, 23 states indicated in their applications that they are in the process of reforming teacher certification standards, with either recent improvements made or intended improvements.</p> <p>The quality of these reforms is unknown; also unknown is whether grantees will actually carry out their intended reforms.</p> <p>Explanation: This is a new program, so actual performance data are not yet available. (Examples of “progress toward implementation of higher standards” include establishment of a standards committee; state legislative action on standards; or development of draft standards.)</p> <p>Sources: State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001.</p> <p>Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates. <i>Next Update:</i> 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees; State Report Card will contain self-reported data from states.</p>
2000:		100%	
2001:		100%	
2002:		100%	

Indicator 1.2 Certification rate. State, recruitment, and partnership grantees: The percentages of new and current teachers who meet their state's teacher certification requirements, including passing content knowledge and competency tests, will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: State Report Card on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001. Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000. National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> One update. <i>Next Update:</i> 2003. Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees; <u>State Report Card</u> will contain self-reported data from states.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY, PLACEMENT, AND RETENTION RATES OF WELL-PREPARED, HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS IN HIGH-NEED SCHOOLS.

Indicator 2.1 Placement and retention. Partnership and recruitment grantees: There will be an increase each year in the percentage of graduates from teacher preparation programs with partnership or recruitment grants who serve for at least 3 years in high-need schools, particularly high-poverty schools in partnership districts.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000. National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> One update. <i>Next Update:</i> 2003. Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
Indicator 2.2 Support for new teachers. Partnership and recruitment grantees: The percentage of new teachers in districts with partnerships or recruitment grants who receive ongoing support services and education from their grant program for at least their first 3 years of teaching will increase each year.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 1999 data on actual grantee performance are available.</p> <p>However, based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, 11 recruitment grantees indicated that they offered support services to new teachers <i>prior to</i> receiving Title II funds in 1999.</p> <p>Based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, all 28 recruitment grantees proposed providing support services as a component of their Title II grant; these services include mentoring, professional development, and induction programs.</p> <p>Based on a review of partnership grantee applications, all 25 partnership grantees proposed providing support services as components of their Title II grant; these services include professional development, mentoring, and peer networks.</p> <p>Explanation: This is a new program, so actual performance data are not yet available.</p>	<p>Sources: Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates. <i>Next Update:</i> 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.</p>
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVE THE ACADEMIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL TRAINING OF FUTURE TEACHERS.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 1999 data. Unable to judge.</p> <p>Explanation: This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.</p>	<p>Sources: Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> One update. <i>Next Update:</i> 2003.</p>
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 1999 data.</p> <p>Explanation: This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.</p>	<p>Sources: Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> One update. <i>Next Update:</i> 2003.</p> <p>Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.</p>
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS TO CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE THEIR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS AND MEET THE STAFFING NEEDS OF PARTNER DISTRICTS.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 1999 data on actual grantee performance are available.</p> <p>However, based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, eight recruitment grantees indicated they had a formal assessment process in place prior to receiving Title II funds.</p>	<p>Sources: Annual program performance reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> Two updates. <i>Next Update:</i> 2002.</p>
1999:	This is a new program for 1999.	New program		
2000:		New program		
2001:		New program		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	<p>Based on a review of recruitment grantee applications, 19 recruitment grantees indicated they would develop an assessment process as part of their Title II activities; assessment activities include written or oral evaluation of teachers' work, student achievement data, and interviews with supervisors.</p> <p>Based on a review of partnership applications, 23 partnership grantees indicated they will develop an assessment process as part of their Title II activities; assessment activities include evaluations by other educators, student achievement data, INTASC standards, and teachers' portfolios.</p> <p>Explanations: This is a new program, so actual program performance data are not yet available.</p>	<p>Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.</p>

Indicator 4.2 Collaboration among partners. Partnership grantees: The percentage of partnership grantees with a governance structure that conducts a formal assessment of the staffing needs of local districts, monitors the effectiveness of partnership activities, and provides funds to partnership members for new activities will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Grantees have a collaborative structure in place.</i>			Status: Progress toward target is likely.	Sources: Annual program performance reports.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Explanation: A high number of partnership grantees indicate in their program applications that they are currently undertaking many of the components of effective partnership collaboration.	<i>Frequency:</i> Annually.
1999:	100%*	New programs		<i>Next Update:</i> 2000.
2000:		100%		National Evaluation.
2001:		100%		<i>Frequency:</i> Two updates.
<i>Grantees have a formal needs assessment process in place.</i>				<i>Next Update:</i> 2002.
1999:	88%*	New programs		Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review, and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
2000:		100%		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Baseline data from applications are self-reported and may reflect <i>intended</i> program activities, not <i>actual</i> program activities. Annual program performance reports will contain self-reported data from grantees.
2001:		100%		
<i>Grantees monitor the effectiveness of partnership activities.</i>				
1999:	96%*	New programs		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		
<i>Grantees provide increasing funds to partnership members for new activities.</i>				
1999:	24%*	New programs		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		
* Baseline data				

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

None.

New or Strengthened Strategies

To expand grantee awareness of promising practices and increase the pace of change in teacher education reform, the Title II Program will disseminate information to grantees and prospective grantees in the following areas:

- ❖ Strategies that some states have used to improve certification standards, reduce the number of uncertified teachers, and hold teacher training programs accountable for training highly skilled teachers.
- ❖ Upcoming awards program for teacher education programs and the lessons learned from the award winners. For example, learn how the programs measure the effectiveness of their graduates.
- ❖ Ways in which the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology, and other related programs can be used to support the program goals.
- ❖ Best practices in the field.
- ❖ Teaching opportunities for students and recent graduates.

To meet grantee and program performance goals, including comprehensive reform of teacher preparation programs, improved teacher recruitment practices and stronger state licensure systems, the Title II Program will provide technical assistance and facilitate communication among grantees through the following means:

- ❖ Sponsoring activities such as focus groups, conferences, or workshops where participating partners can exchange information and ideas to enhance the success of the program.
- ❖ Sponsoring workshops to help grantees coordinate with the Eisenhower Professional Development Program.
- ❖ Providing technical assistance to partnerships in the development of assessment instruments.
- ❖ Helping grantee institutions share information on effective strategies.

To base program and grantee work on the best research and the best practices, the Title II Program will coordinate with other programs and organizations, such as:

- ❖ The National Science Foundation's teacher preparation programs and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's teacher preparation activities.
- ❖ The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Governor's Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the State Higher Educational Executive Officers, and other organizations, to promote program goals.
- ❖ ED's Office of Postsecondary Education programs: Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology and Gear Up, and ED's Office of Vocational Education's teacher education initiative.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ Coordination includes involving NASA's teacher preparation program grantees in technical assistance and dissemination activities with Title II grantees, starting with the first Title II project directors' conference. Coordination efforts will also involve the teacher preparation programs run through the National Science Foundation.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ The capability of the Title II office to provide extensive technical assistance to grant recipients.
- ❖ The ability of grant recipients to
 - ◆ develop leadership support in their states or on campuses,
 - ◆ build broad collaborative partnerships with key stakeholders, and
 - ◆ develop strategies to sustain the project after Federal funding ends.

Grant recipients must overcome decades of neglect for teacher preparation programs among campus leaders such as presidents, provosts, and members of the arts and sciences community. Securing the personal involvement of these leaders for the restructuring of teacher preparation programs is a crucial but often difficult task to achieve. The support and involvement of campus leaders in teacher preparation programs is a precondition to policy and practice changes (such as changing faculty expectations or creating a faculty reward system). It is also a necessary precondition for obtaining financial support that ensures that high-quality teacher preparation becomes a university-wide priority and remains a priority after Federal Title II funding ends.

- ❖ Ensuring sustained political and public interest in and support of the Title II programs.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 1.1 (state and local assessments) was modified for FY 2000. The FY 2000 indicator remains unchanged in FY 20001, except for its number, which is described above.
- ❖ Indicator 1.2 (NAEP reading and math) was modified for FY 2000 to target performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest poverty public schools as well as being renumbered as Indicator 1.1 (a shared indicator with Goals 2000). The FY 2001 indicator remains the same as FY 2000.
- ❖ Indicator 2.2 (standards and assessments) was modified by dropping the assessment indicator and including in standards piece in FY 2000 Indicator 2.1 (use of challenging standards) FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) brings back the FY 99 assessment piece that had been dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ Indicator 2.3 (research-based curriculum and instruction) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.4.
- ❖ Indicator 2.4 (extended learning time) was slightly modified in FY 2000 and numbered as Indicator 2.3.
- ❖ Indicator 2.5 (services to private school students) was modified as FY 2000 Indicator 2.7 to delete “more effective communication, consultation, and services” and substitute with “effective implementation of on-site services to students.” For FY 2001, the indicator has been dropped as described above.
- ❖ Indicator 3.2 (qualified teacher aides) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.6 to shift the focus from credentials to district support for the educational improvement through career ladders for paraprofessionals and aides. FY 2001 Indicator 2.5 retains the FY 2000 indicator and expands to include qualified staff in Title I schools.
- ❖ Indicator 4.1 (implementing high standards) was slightly modified as FY 2000 Indicator 3.1 (Establishing annual progress measures) and dropped in FY 2001.
- ❖ Indicator 4.2 (linked assessments) was modified slightly in FY 2000 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments) and substantially maintained as FY 2001 Indicator 3.2 (aligned assessments).
- ❖ Indicator 4.3 (accountability: monitoring, intervention and assistance) was significantly changed in FY 2000 indicator to assess only the provision of “effective assistance to schools not making progress through school support teams and other sources.” The FY 2001 Indicator 3.3 remains the same as FY 2000 but has been expanded to include public school enrollment options as described above.
- ❖ Indicator 5.1 (school-parent compacts) was modified in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 to delete “school staff and parents will report” and replace it with “Title I participating schools will report.” The FY 2001 Indicator 2.3 has been changed to reflect a broader assessment of the effectiveness of parental involvement programs.
- ❖ Indicator 5.2 (improved attendance and homework completion) was not included in FY 2000 Indicator 2.5 but used instead as performance data.

Dropped

- ❖ None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year’s)

Adjusted

- ❖ Several indicators have been combined since last year to reduce the overall number of indicators. The purpose of this adjustment was to combine indicators from last year’s plan that were similar to each other into one indicator for the FY 2001 plan.
- ❖ The following changes were made: former Indicators 1.3, 3.1, and 6.1 were combined to Indicator 1.2 for the FY 2001 plan; former Indicators 3.2, 3.3, and 6.3 were combined to Indicator 2.1 in the FY 2001 plan; and former Indicators 2.1 and 6.2 were combined to Indicator 2.2 for the FY 2001 plan.
- ❖ The wording of several indicators was slightly adjusted, and the indicators were given new numbers; in the FY 2001 plan, these are Indicators 3.2, 4.1, and 4.2.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 2.2 was dropped since last year’s plan. This indicator was a process indicator, measuring enrollment in academic courses, rather than an outcome indicator.

New—None.