

4

BETTER TEACHERS, BETTER SCHOOLS: Ensuring a High-Quality Education for Every Child

Next in importance to freedom and justice is popular education, without which neither freedom nor justice can be permanently maintained.

– JAMES A. GARFIELD
Twentieth President of the United States

Progressives have long viewed educational improvement as an important mechanism for promoting fundamental progressive social aims: economic expansion, individual opportunity, social equity, and a strong democracy. But today's progressives can no longer afford to view strengthening education simply as a tool. They must embrace it as a necessity.

The Center for American Progress supports a federal education agenda that builds the capacity of public education to teach all students to higher levels and graduate more of them ready for success in postsecondary education. Investing in our teacher workforce will be a critical component in building that capacity. Of course, we recognize that there are many other pressing educational issues in addition to teacher quality, such as the need for more and better early childhood education and additional time and resources for students who fall behind academically. We focus here on teacher quality because it is time to recognize that teachers are the backbone of high-quality public education, and strengthening the teacher workforce can lay the foundation for fruitful investments in other areas.

The highest caliber and most desirable candidates should be vigorously recruited and effectively trained. Once they are on the job, teachers' skills should be more systematically developed through staged career pathways, with more opportunities to be trained in clinical settings,

The factor that matters most in how much students learn is teacher quality.

greater support and better evaluation during a residency period, greater choices to advance along a meaningful career ladder as they become more expert over time, and with better pay through competitive compensation structures for all teachers that recognize and reward different roles, responsibilities, knowledge, skills, and, most importantly, positive results. Finally, teachers at every career stage should be supported enough to do their jobs well, with adequate opportunities for ongoing training, sufficient access to high-quality instructional materials and tools, and working conditions that enable them to do their best for students. Most importantly, efforts must be made to ensure that every school has high-quality teachers so that a child's address does not determine whether he or she has access to high-quality instruction.

able them to do their best for students. Most importantly, efforts must be made to ensure that every school has high-quality teachers so that a child's address does not determine whether he or she has access to high-quality instruction.

We recognize that the federal government's investment in and direct influence over public education currently is limited. Responsibility for education has historically been reserved for the states, and the federal government currently provides less than 10 percent of the funds spent on public education in the United States. The recommendations in this chapter have been crafted to provide the maximum possible benefit from federal action within these current constraints, while at the same time promoting the use of the national bully pulpit to rally widespread action concerning the issue of teacher quality and establishing a foundation for progressives to pursue the goals of greatly expanding the investment in teachers and the federal investment in education over the long term.¹

Fortunately, the time is ripe for federal education policy to focus intensively on building the teaching profession. Strong, private efforts have coalesced around this issue, resulting in bipartisan agreement around key principles. Federal policy already supplies a foothold for efforts to build teacher quality. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires that states work to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified by 2005-2006. Furthermore, the Act requires schools to make special efforts to ensure that low-income and minority children are not disproportionately taught by less-qualified teachers than their more advantaged peers.

In addition, a new consensus about the importance of teachers has emerged among researchers and policymakers, based on the results of groundbreaking research released over the past decade. Using finer-grained information based on annual growth in individual students' test scores, such research has demonstrated that school factors play a decisive role in how much students learn. The factor that matters most is *teacher quality*. One influential study in Tennessee, for example, found that two groups of students who start out with the same level of achievement can end up 50 points apart on a 100-point scale if one group is assigned three ineffective teachers in a row and the other is assigned three effective teachers in a row.² A more recent study in Texas found that the impact of classroom teaching is so great that "having five years of good teachers in a row could overcome the average seventh-grade mathematics achievement gap between lower-income kids and those from higher-income families."³

Thus, we now know that teachers—the educational resource that accounts for our biggest annual educational expenditure (nearly \$200 billion per year)⁴—are also the most critical resource for student learning. Clearly, the goal of raising achievement for all students while closing gaps

between groups is within our reach if we can recruit, cultivate, and retain highly trained and motivated individuals and make sure all students have access to their knowledge and skills.

To that end, the president and the Congress should carve out an aggressive leadership role for the federal government in promoting widespread recognition that teachers are the single greatest resource in public education and the key to helping all students reach academic proficiency. The president should work with Congress and direct federal agencies to ensure that federal policies affirm the importance of teacher quality and help drive state and local efforts to strengthen the teaching profession.

Two equally important principles should guide federal policy in this area:

First, the president and the Congress should publicly recognize and act on the premise that teachers are public education's most valuable asset. Federal education policy must make a focused commitment to building a highly qualified, adequately supported, and more professionalized teacher workforce for America's schools. The long-range goal should be to maximize the return on the nation's investment in teachers by systematically and consistently promoting practices that treat teaching as a true "clinical practice profession" much like medicine. This requires competing for talented candidates and giving them rigorous training, providing practicing teachers high-quality professional development and opportunities to earn greater compensation for positive results and their willingness to take on tougher jobs, and ensuring working conditions that enable them to do the job to the best of their abilities rather than hampering their efforts to teach all students to high levels.

Second, the president and the Congress must publicly recognize the injustice and inefficiency of regressive policies and practices that cause the nation's neediest students to bear a disproportionate cost for our historical failure to treat teachers as our most valuable resource, and act swiftly and decisively to wipe out inequitable access to good teachers. The goal should be to use our best teachers more strategically, efficiently, and equitably so as to reduce—and eventually eliminate—reliance on unqualified teachers in hard-to-staff subject areas and schools.

CURRENT STATE OF PLAY

Unfortunately, education leaders and public policymakers often fail to treat teachers as a resource at all, let alone our most valuable one. Little attention is paid to creating financial incentives and working environments necessary to recruit and retain the best and brightest Americans into teaching. Teacher preparation programs often do not provide teachers with the training they need to do the job well. Hiring practices are slipshod and often needlessly frustrate and repel good teachers rather than delivering them to the job assignments they are best suited for and where they are needed most.

Once in the classroom, teachers find too few opportunities to engage in ongoing professional development that is closely aligned with what they teach, as well as intensive and sustained enough to make a difference. More experienced teachers find few opportunities for career advancement without having to enter administration and leave classroom instruction. Moreover, poor working conditions, especially in schools serving high numbers of poor and minority

Efforts must be made to ensure that every school has high-quality teachers so that a child's address does not determine whether he or she has access to high-quality instruction.

students, drive too many teachers to look for more amenable environments in other schools or professions. The results of such neglect are predictable and, by now, well documented.

We consistently fail to attract and retain the brightest candidates at every point in the professional pipeline to teaching. For example, young people with high SAT and ACT scores are much less likely to elect teaching as a career, and those who do are twice as likely to leave the profession after only a few years.⁵ In high-poverty schools with poor working conditions, rates of overall teacher attrition are disastrously high. Between 2000 and 2001, one out of five teachers in the nation's high-poverty schools either left to teach in another school or dropped out of teaching altogether.⁶

Due to shortages in some subjects and ineffective administrative assignment practices in many schools, large numbers of secondary teachers are assigned to teach classes outside of their areas of preparation. For example, 37 percent of students in grades 7-12 are taught by a teacher who lacks a college major and state certification in the subject being taught.⁷ Rates of “out-of-field teaching” are especially high in middle schools, high-poverty schools, and shortage areas such as mathematics. For example, in 2000 a staggering seven in ten math classes in high-poverty middle schools were assigned to teachers who lacked even a college minor in mathematics or a related field.⁸

Making it into the profession, and into the right assignment, is no guarantee of success. In fact, inadequate preparation and thin on-the-job support leave many teachers feeling stranded and result in high teacher attrition rates, particularly in high-poverty schools. In a federal survey conducted in 2000, fewer than half of teachers felt “very well prepared” to implement new methods of teaching and to teach the state or district curriculum, and only about one in four felt very prepared to integrate technology into their instruction.⁹

The impact on students is not benign. For example, poor preparation, low levels of professional support and development, and lack of instructional resources can result in teachers responding to state assessments with ineffective practices such as teaching to the test that can narrow student exposure to a rich curriculum.

To make matters worse, the distribution of less-qualified, less-effective teachers is highly inequitable. No matter how qualifications are measured—by experience, subject matter expertise, academic skills and background, or proven effectiveness in raising test scores—low-income, African American, and Latino children consistently get less than their fair share of good teachers.¹⁰ Many high-poverty and high-minority schools serve as training grounds where younger teachers gain practical experience and skills before moving on to more affluent schools with better working conditions. This revolving door makes low-income and minority students about twice as likely to be assigned to inexperienced teachers,¹¹ who on average generate far smaller annual learning gains than do more experienced teachers.¹²

Unfortunately, the Bush administration has consistently squandered major opportunities to rectify these problems and improve teaching in America's public schools. It has failed to invest sufficient resources in building teacher quality, just as it has failed to provide sufficient funds for education programs and mandates generally.¹³ The administration's budgets have proposed either static funding levels or cuts for the two primary federal programs targeting teacher quality.¹⁴

Compounding these problems, officials at the Department of Education have failed to communicate, monitor, and enforce crucial teacher quality requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act for states and districts—provisions specifically intended to ensure that students have the teachers they need to achieve at high levels. As a result, many states and districts have lagged in complying with these important provisions and sometimes have simply decided not to comply at all.¹⁵

Finally, the administration has failed to capitalize on the important power of the bully pulpit to highlight the importance of teacher quality and rally support for making the difficult changes necessary to improve it. Indeed, despite the prominence of teacher quality provisions and programs in the No Child Left Behind Act, the administration has been more zealous in publicizing and pushing for accountability, school choice, privatization, and school prayer than it has teacher quality.

PROGRESSIVE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION PLAN¹⁶

Using Data for Better Decisionmaking

We must work to increase the amount, meaningfulness, and quality of information about America's teacher workforce, and encourage the use of such data for greater accountability and smarter decisionmaking. The federal government should demand better information about America's teachers, and provide enough support to enable school systems to provide it. Improved data with respect to teacher credentials and performance can be used to improve instruction and help rectify inequities in student opportunities for learning.

To offer some examples: in Chattanooga, Tennessee, the district uses value-added data to identify highly effective teachers and then provides them with incentives to teach in the highest need schools.¹⁷ This type of data analysis can also be used to identify a teacher's weaknesses so professional development can be provided in those areas. Conversely, a teacher's strengths can be identified (*e.g.*, data may demonstrate that a particular teacher is exceptionally good at teaching fractions) and that teacher can be used as a resource for teachers needing coaching in those areas.

Remarkably, only a few districts in the country have the capacity to conduct just this kind of simple but crucial analysis. This must change, and the federal government is uniquely positioned to lead a revolution in providing better information on teachers to those who need it. Simply put, better data will make every other recommendation in this report easier to implement and more likely to succeed, especially those related to measuring the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, the development of more sophisticated career advancement

systems, and more effective and equitable deployment of teachers. Data can also help build the case for larger investments in teachers. To increase the amount, meaningfulness, and quality of information about America's teacher workforce, the Center for American Progress offers the following recommendations.

The Congress should enact legislation authorizing a council to focus on the supply and distribution of teachers in the United States. Education experts agree that the nation needs more and better information on teacher supply and demand, yet there has been little effort to generate such data despite successful federal efforts in other fields. For example, in 1986 Congress passed legislation authorizing a Council on Graduate Medical Education (COGME) to engage in ongoing research regarding physician workforce trends, including supply and distribution of physicians across the United States, and to recommend actions to address identified needs.¹⁸ The Congress should incorporate lessons from COGME's work into the design of the teacher workforce council.

The Congress should pass legislation creating a \$100 million fund for the development of state-wide systems to produce data on the "value-added effectiveness" of classroom teachers in states that agree to use such information—at a minimum—in the evaluation of teacher preparation programs and federally supported professional development programs. While the data on teacher preparation and qualifications required under current federal law go a long way toward filling gaps in our knowledge about the nation's teachers, they still do not tell us enough. The "value-added" data systems being pioneered in some states and districts offer an important new opportunity to produce information about the actual performance of individual classroom teachers measured in terms of how much improvement in standardized assessment results they obtain from the students in their classrooms. Unfortunately, the development of such systems is expensive, and the spread of this new technology has been slow.

In addition, such legislation should create a clearinghouse that provides technical assistance to those seeking to establish such systems, reports on best practices in collecting and using value-added data, and improves the national research agenda by supporting studies that capitalize on value-added data.

The president should direct the secretary of education to more vigorously enforce the important data provisions that already exist in federal law. In particular, the administration should:

- *Enforce requirements for reporting information about teachers to parents and the public at large.* Current federal education laws now require the reporting of a great deal of valuable information related to teacher quality.¹⁹ Several independent studies have found that states have done an uneven and, in many cases, poor job of complying with such requirements, too often reporting data to parents and/or the Department of Education that are incomplete, inconsistent, or highly suspect.²⁰ The Department of Education is falling far short of its charge to provide clear guidance on reporting requirements and ensuring that states report accurate and reliable data related to teacher quality.²¹ The department must conscientiously and accurately communicate such requirements to states, districts, and higher education institutions. The president should insist that the provisions in the No Child Left Behind Act giving parents the "right to know" their

children’s teachers’ qualifications are thoroughly enforced, and should monitor the extent of compliance with national surveys of teachers and parents.

- *Ensure that states are not abusing flexibility under the law in how they define teacher quality.* Under a provision called “high, objective, uniform state standard of evaluation (HOUSSE),” the No Child Left Behind Act gives states considerable flexibility in how they ensure that existing teachers are “highly qualified,” and there is evidence that some states are taking inappropriate advantage of this leeway in their annual reporting of teacher qualifications.²² The president should direct the secretary of education to conduct a study of how states take advantage of the so-called HOUSSE flexibility under section 9101(23)(C)(ii) to determine how states define and are reporting information on teacher quality and in particular to determine whether states are watering down requirements for teachers to demonstrate subject-matter proficiency.
- *Ensure that federal efforts to collect data on the nation’s teachers occur in a timely and efficient manner.* In particular, the president should direct the commissioner of education statistics to craft a plan for administering the *U.S. Schools and Staffing Survey* biennially rather than every four years, including a plan for releasing results within one year of the completion of data collection. The federal *Schools and Staffing Survey* has proven to be an invaluable source of comparable, objective information on teacher qualifications across the states, and can become even more valuable as an independent check on information states must report under the No Child Left Behind Act.

Finally, to provide for efficient coordination of all of these efforts, the president should direct the secretary of education to create an inter-office task force on teacher quality. This task force should be charged with ensuring that the department is working in a coordinated, conscientious, and efficient manner to ensure wider public access to better information on America’s teaching workforce. Furthermore, the task force should monitor whether state and local reporting requirements are clearly communicated and enforced while ensuring that the federal government produces and publishes teacher-related information in a more timely and accessible manner.

Enriched Career Advancement Structures

The federal government should support the development of enriched career advancement structures that treat teaching as a clinical practice profession like medicine. Providing a carefully staged and supported entry for beginning teachers and differentiated career options for experienced teachers with competitive compensation structures that reward knowledge, skills, responsibilities and positive results would positively impact education in many ways. In particular, it would make teaching more attractive to our best and brightest young people; it would help to retain a greater number of high-quality teachers in the profession and closer to the classroom; and it would directly improve student achievement by helping new teachers

Teachers—the educational resource that accounts for our biggest annual educational expenditure (nearly \$200 billion per year)—are also the most critical resource for student learning.

become more effective more quickly and spreading the benefits of expert teachers' knowledge and skills to students outside of their own classrooms via the teachers they would mentor and assist.²³ These efforts can be particularly helpful in high-poverty schools, where new teachers often need additional support and experienced teachers need incentives to remain. In addition, compensation systems that recognize the value of teachers, coupled with career advancement systems that more effectively reward good performance—based on results—and respond to poor performance, will make larger investments in teacher salaries more politically viable and maximize the returns on such investments.

The Congress should create a \$1 billion program to invest in differentiated career pathways in at least five states and twenty school districts that will serve as large-scale demonstrations that such career structures can enhance the status of the profession,²⁴ improve teacher performance and retention, and raise student achievement. Such new avenues of advancement would offer expert teachers the opportunity to pursue a variety of positions throughout their careers, while never having to leave classroom teaching altogether, depending on their demonstrated skills and professional interests and predicated on an exchange of greater responsibilities and leadership for corresponding increases in compensation. To be eligible for such a grant, applicants must commit to incorporating the following components in their plans:

- A career ladder of at least four stages: new teachers (in residency or induction programs); career teachers, mentor teachers; and master teachers.²⁵
- Expanded roles for mentor and master teachers that are directly tied to teaching and learning, including providing support, professional development, and meaningful evaluation for other teachers; sharing responsibility for school-wide instructional leadership with administrators; and developing curricula, model lessons, and aligned benchmark assessments.
- A rigorous, transparent, and fair system for evaluating teachers at all levels, including both qualitative measures (*i.e.*, a portfolio and/or at least six classroom observations that must be evaluated based on a standard rubric describing good teaching and scored by trained mentor or master teachers) and quantitative measures (*i.e.*, measurable growth in student achievement on standardized assessments), with advancement to mentor and master status based on such evaluations.²⁶
- Significantly increased compensation commensurate with responsibilities of mentor teaching, master teaching, and any other advanced categories.
- A student testing system and data collection and analysis capacity sufficient to generate fair and accurate data that can be used to measure growth in student academic achievement.
- A system for recognizing successful classroom teaching through bonus pay based on evaluations that include both qualitative and quantitative measures, with significant weight given to measures of growth in student academic achievement attributable to an individual teacher, as well as school-wide, department-wide, or grade-level-wide measures of growth in student learning.²⁷

- Restructuring of the school calendar to allow more time for collaboration among teachers, at least 90 minutes per week to be used primarily for activities directly related to student instruction, led by mentor or master teachers.

The Congress should create a fund for the development of coordinated, staged preparation and induction programs targeted toward partnerships of higher education institutions, schools, and local education agencies, with priority given to high-need school districts and partnerships that have access to value-added data on teacher effectiveness. At an average cost of \$1.5 million per city, establishing such partnerships in 50 American cities would cost a total of only \$75 million per year. The partnership programs should be required to incorporate components reflective of two stages in teacher preparation. The first would entail the creation of close functional relationships between the teacher preparation program and local elementary and secondary schools, with such schools providing the settings enabling teacher candidates to spend greater amounts of supervised time working with students and practicing teachers. The second would include a partnership between the program and one or more local school districts, which would agree to require a residency period for new teachers.²⁸ The residency period must

include intensive support via master teachers and higher education faculty, specialized professional development opportunities for new teachers, time for collaboration with other teachers, reduced class sizes, and ongoing evaluation that culminates in an assessment of effectiveness as a condition of “graduating” from the residency program.

No matter how qualifications are measured—by experience, subject matter expertise, academic skills and background, or proven effectiveness in raising test scores—low-income, African American, and Latino children consistently get less than their fair share of good teachers.

Teacher Recruitment and Preparation

While Congress made important strides when it reauthorized the Higher Education Act in 1998, the Congress should spearhead a renewed federal effort to improve teacher recruitment and preparation, especially in institutions of higher education.

In the long term, recruitment efforts—especially in high-poverty schools—will receive a much needed boost if prospective teachers believe they will benefit from a career advancement and compensation structure that rewards good results, is commensurate with the responsibilities that a teacher assumes, and is competitive with other employment options. In addition, the two-tiered clinical preparation and residency program described in the section above will go a long way toward improving the quality of teacher preparation. Such a model can be especially important to those entering the profession through alternative programs (with fewer courses in pedagogy) by providing them with opportunities to demonstrate competency and to continue to improve teaching skills with support from more experienced staff.

But there is more that can be done to address this issue and to ensure that preparation programs are effective, including increasing accountability for teacher preparation programs and creating more efficient and focused recruitment efforts. The following three recommendations should be implemented.

We must work to increase the amount, meaningfulness, and quality of information about America's teacher workforce, and encourage the use of such data for greater accountability and smarter decisionmaking.

First, the president should convene a summit with university presidents to challenge them to take greater responsibility for ensuring that teacher preparation programs supply adequate numbers of highly qualified teachers for the nation's schools. Teacher education schools have traditionally functioned as low-cost, low-quality “cash cows” for many universities, which channel surplus funds from tuition paid by their numerous education majors into ensuring quality in more prestigious professional training programs, such as law, engineering, architecture, and medicine.²⁹ This practice undermines national and state efforts to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs and increase the supply of highly qualified teachers. During the summit, institutions implementing successful models in this area should present their strategies and data to the larger group. For example, the Texas A&M University System has seen promising results from an ambitious plan to raise the quantity while assuring quality in its production of teachers.³⁰

Second, policymakers should tighten and more clearly define provisions in federal law that require teacher training programs and the institutions supporting them to be held accountable for producing good teachers. Section 208 of the Higher Education Act requires states to establish an accountability system for identifying and providing assistance to institutions of higher education with low-performing teacher preparation programs. However, the systems most states have put in place are too weak to drive the improvements in teacher preparation the law was aiming for. Forty-six states did not identify even a single program as low-performing in 2003. Of the four states that did identify any programs as low-performing, only a total of six programs—out of approximately 1,200 institutions with teacher preparation programs nationally—were identified as low-performing.³¹ Moreover, only 19 additional programs were identified as being “at risk” for low performance.

The Congress should propose amending the Higher Education Act to strengthen accountability for teacher preparation programs—both traditional and alternative route—by requiring such accountability systems to incorporate: (1) quantitative outcomes-based data, including the passing rates of program completers on state certification exams, such as are currently required to be reported under section 207; (2) progress on teacher production goals, including the overall number of program completers, completers in shortage areas within the state or region, completers who take jobs in hard-to-staff schools, and the number of minority and/or second-language completers; and (3) information on the actual effectiveness of graduates in improving the achievement of students after they begin teaching.³² The Higher Education Act should also require teacher preparation programs to demonstrate that they incorporate courses and measures for assessing competence in key areas, including using assessments and student achievement data and technology to inform and enhance instruction, effective classroom management, and instructional techniques focused on addressing special needs and diverse groups of students.

The secretary of education should identify and propose solutions to technical loopholes in current law that can undermine efforts to improve accountability for teacher quality in higher education. For example, section 207 of the Higher Education Act requires states and institu-

tions of higher education to report the percentage of teacher preparation program completers who pass state licensure exams. However, the reported rates have been inflated in many cases because about half the states and many institutions require applicants to education schools to pass a basic skills test as a prerequisite for acceptance into teacher training or as a prerequisite to program completion. While the use of basic skills exams as screening mechanisms is not inappropriate *per se*, only exams taken by program *completers* should be used for reporting on program performance under this section. The president should direct the secretary of education to promulgate a regulation to close this loophole.

Third, the president and the Congress should ensure that federal dollars to improve teacher recruitment, preparation, licensing, and on-the-job support are adequate to the challenge and targeted toward strategies that are most effective. In particular:

- Title II of the Higher Education Act provides for competitive Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants enabling states and institution-district partnerships to work for improvements in these areas. Though the Higher Education Act authorizes \$300 million for such grants, the Bush administration requested only \$89.9 million for FY 2005. The president should request full funding for these grants. The president also should reinstate the program initiated during the Clinton administration (and zeroed out during the Bush administration) designed to prepare teachers to use and integrate technology into their instruction.
- The president also should ensure that these programs are focused on the most successful strategies in these areas.³³ For example, the president should give a priority in funding grant applicants under section 204 of the Higher Education Act, which supports teacher recruitment efforts, for efforts to put in place university-wide recruitment and improvement plans like the one described above. Under section 203, which seeks to support partnerships between states, institutions of higher education and local districts, priority should be given to partnerships designed to develop enhanced career advancement programs like those described above in the first section and those seeking to develop value-added data systems as described below in the last section regarding working conditions.
- The president should ensure that funds are going to support efforts to take on the politically more challenging task of raising standards for entry to the profession. For example, funds under section 202 of the Higher Education Act should be directed toward states seeking to raise teaching licensing standards and improving licensing tests.³⁴ In addition, the president should seek to reserve \$10 million in funding under Title II of the Higher Education Act for an independent body—such as the National Academy of Sciences—to develop national standards for teacher quality with respect to content and pedagogy.

Equitable and Efficient Distribution of Teachers

The president and Congress should provide incentives, enforce rules, and narrow barriers to decrease inequities in access to qualified teachers and to optimize the distribution of teachers according to their skills and student needs. Over the past several decades, the federal govern-

Providing a carefully staged and supported entry for beginning teachers and differentiated career options for experienced teachers with competitive compensation structures that reward knowledge, skills, responsibilities and positive results would positively impact education in many ways.

ment has worked to address the maldistribution of physicians and shortage of adequate medical care providers by specialty area and geographic region, spending billions of dollars to ensure greater access to good health care in urban and rural areas. The effort has been sustained and vigorous, and, according to the Council on Graduate Medical Education, “many of these programs have been absolutely critical to enhancing access for underserved populations in the United States.”³⁵ It is time to engage in a similar federal effort in K-12 education. Again, implementation of the career advancement system described above can be helpful in this context as new teachers will receive greater support and experienced teachers seeking mentor and master teacher positions will have incentives to work in high-poverty schools for greater pay. The following seven recommendations also should be implemented:

*First, the Congress should provide \$800 million for a program of service scholarships and forgivable loans allocated on the basis of academic merit, targeted toward shortage areas, and awarded in exchange for teaching in high-poverty and high-minority schools for at least five years.*³⁶ As noted above, rates of out-of-field teaching have reached epidemic proportions in the nation’s middle schools, particularly in subjects such as math and science. Not coincidentally, the middle grades are where U.S. students begin to fall seriously behind their international counterparts in math and science.³⁷ Therefore, a priority should be given for awards to individuals who agree to teach these subjects in shortage areas at the middle school level.

Second, the Congress should amend Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (“ESEA”) to authorize \$1 billion for a new competitive grant program that would enable districts to experiment with salary supplements to place well-qualified and effective teachers in the highest-needs schools. While districts such as Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, and Chattanooga, Tennessee, are beginning to demonstrate that such programs can provide positive benefits for low-income students,³⁸ a 2002 *Education Week* survey of 30 large school districts found that only two or three offer concrete incentives clearly targeted to hard-to-staff schools.³⁹

Third, the president should ensure that teacher equity provisions that currently exist in federal law are vigorously enforced. For example, section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA requires state plans under Title I to:

describe the specific steps the state educational agency will take to ensure that . . . schools provide instruction by highly qualified staff . . . including steps that the State educational agency will take to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, and the measures that the State educational agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such steps.

The Department of Education has failed to recognize, communicate and enforce this requirement adequately, and last year ruled that states need not submit such plans to the department. As a result, many states have not developed or published such plans.⁴⁰ The president should direct the secretary of education to promulgate a new regulation requiring that states demonstrate they have complied with this requirement. States should be required to demonstrate compliance by publishing such plans on their Web sites, along with descriptions of the measures they plan to use to evaluate progress on these steps and target dates for public reporting of progress. In the reported plan, the state should include a description of the steps that it has taken to eliminate disparities in resources and working conditions between schools that lead to disparate levels of experienced and qualified staff. It also should describe efforts to address other conditions that discourage highly qualified teachers from working at certain schools.⁴¹ The president should also direct the secretary to prioritize the monitoring and enforcement of this provision.

The president should ensure that funds are going to support efforts to take on the politically more challenging task of raising standards for entry to the profession.

Fourth, the Congress should create a \$20 million competitive demonstration grant program to enable five large- and medium-sized urban districts to overhaul outdated, ineffective hiring and recruitment practices. Cumbersome hiring and placement practices in urban districts constitute a significant and needless barrier to recruiting highly qualified teachers who are willing to teach in high-poverty and high-minority schools. The New Teacher Project has found that, counter to the prevailing notion that good teachers do not want to teach in urban districts, many qualified teachers can be recruited to teach in such schools. However, hiring and placement in such districts take so long that many of these qualified, willing teachers are forced to accept jobs in suburban districts instead.⁴² Additional funds should be allocated to support evaluation of these efforts and report best practices that other districts might consider for reforming their hiring and placement policies.

Fifth, the president and Congress should capitalize on opportunities to more directly address other district practices that reinforce inequities in access to experienced teachers. For example, districts typically spend much less to staff their higher-poverty schools because such schools find it harder to attract and retain more experienced teachers, who command higher salaries. The differences in teacher experience can result in massive inequities in actual dollars spent across schools within a district, yet financial reports hide such inequities because they misleadingly use the district's average teacher salary to report school-by-school spending.⁴³ For decades the ESEA's fiscal requirements have actually *abetted* such dishonest accounting practices by prohibiting the use of actual salaries when districts provide written assurances that they offer "comparability of services" across schools. The Congress should amend section 1120A(c)(2)(B) of the ESEA section to require districts to use actual salaries when complying with the comparability of services requirement of Title I.⁴⁴

Sixth, the president should reduce barriers that make it hard for teachers to move to states that have bigger workforce shortages. Section 2151(f) of the ESEA authorizes the secretary of education to establish a National Panel on Teacher Mobility to conduct a study on increasing salutary mobility and employment opportunities for highly qualified teachers in order to fill vacan-

The Congress should amend the ESEA to require districts to use actual salaries when complying with the comparability of services requirement of Title I.

cies in hard-to-staff schools and districts. However, the current administration has failed to act on that authority. The president should direct the secretary to establish this panel and support it in conducting the study. In addition to the activities described in section 2151(f), the panel should explore ways the federal government might stimulate public-private partnerships to assist existing efforts toward developing common certification standards and improving pension portability across states.

Working Conditions

The president and the Congress should work to improve instructional environments so teachers experience positive working conditions that maximize their effectiveness and reduce teacher turnover in high-poverty schools. Again, the Center for American Progress supports creating a more sophisticated career advancement model that incorporates team teaching, greater support from master teachers, and greater opportunities for planning and collaboration as an important step toward creating healthier working environments for teachers. Teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools are much more likely to report a lack of instructional support and resources, problems with student behavior, a greater number of students unprepared to learn at grade level, and greater worries about losing their jobs due to school performance on state assessments,⁴⁵ all of which make teaching harder and lead to greater rates of teacher turnover in such schools. Harvard researchers studying a group of beginning teachers in Massachusetts found that those who sought jobs in other schools “looked for schools that made good teaching possible” by providing good curriculum guidelines and sufficient resources, better approaches to dealing with student discipline, and more opportunities to learn from and share with colleagues.⁴⁶ The federal government can help local schools and districts address these issues by supporting efforts to monitor working conditions in schools, increasing instructional support, improving discipline and safety, and alleviating pressure to narrow instruction in order to improve performance on standardized assessments. The following recommendations should be adopted:

The president and Congress should encourage states to do a better job monitoring school conditions that make it hard for teachers to do their jobs well. North Carolina recently recognized the importance of environmental factors on teacher retention and effectiveness by creating a set of state standards related to the key components of positive working conditions for teachers. Teachers there are surveyed on an annual basis with respect to these factors and the results are provided to school and district leaders so they can use the data to inform decisionmaking. The Congress should amend the Improving Teacher Quality State Grant program under Title II of the ESEA to allow states to use grants to set up similar programs.

The president and Congress should adopt the following measures to ensure that teachers, particularly beginning teachers in hard-to-staff schools, have adequate access to instructional support, direction, and resources:

- The Congress should increase funding for research-based professional development and class-size reduction in high-poverty schools under Title II, Part A of the ESEA. Teachers want high quality professional development and smaller class sizes and both can improve

instruction and outcomes. Congress should strengthen provisions related to the quality of professional development requiring school districts to eliminate one-shot professional development sessions at both the district and school levels and requiring states to develop professional development plans that identify and align all sources of state and federal professional development funds that they administer.

- The Congress also should create a \$100 million fund to support development of instructional tools, including a uniform curriculum and standardized assessments that teachers can use to inform their instruction. States or consortia of districts and regional education agencies would be eligible. Research shows that urban districts making the greatest gains in student achievement provide a uniform curriculum or learning benchmarks aligned with state standards and tests, aligned model lessons, aligned benchmark assessments teachers or schools may administer at regular intervals, and prompt data on student performance under those diagnostic assessments.⁴⁷ Researchers studying beginning teachers have found that they often feel “lost at sea” because they are not given enough guidance on what to teach and lack access to curriculum materials aligned with state assessments.⁴⁸

- The president should ensure that existing policies do not hamper states, districts, and schools from using assessments that serve as instructional tools. The No Child Left Behind Act requires assessment systems to provide information on whether a school has made sufficient progress, but nothing in the law or regulations should prevent (indeed the Congressional Conference Report language encouraged) a complementary effort to develop assessments that help classroom teachers use results in real time to identify areas of student weakness. The president should direct the secretary of education to review the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (which was amended by the No Child Left Behind Act), regulations, and departmental guidance in order to determine whether they promote state efforts to implement assessments of student progress that can inform instruction and identify barriers to the development and use of such systems.
- The president should propose dedicating \$50 million under Title II, Part A of the ESEA grants to states and districts willing to develop comprehensive and intensive induction programs for beginning teachers. High-quality induction programs and enhanced career advancement structures (described in the first section of this chapter) are important components of a positive working environment for teachers. Until such career advancement structures are in place, the federal government should support high-

Research shows that urban districts making the greatest gains in student achievement provide a uniform curriculum or learning benchmarks aligned with state standards and tests, aligned model lessons, aligned benchmark assessments teachers or schools may administer at regular intervals, and prompt data on student performance under those diagnostic assessments.

quality induction programs in every state so new teachers are provided with important support and skill development opportunities. One recent study using federal data on teacher turnover found that beginning teachers who received no mentoring or formal induction activities were twice as likely to leave as those who received a full, intensive complement.⁴⁹ Recipients should be required to include a combination of elements of induction that research shows to be most strongly related to improved teacher retention, including mentoring by an expert colleague who teaches in the same field (if one can be found without sacrificing overall quality); common planning time or regularly scheduled collaboration with teachers in their subject area; special seminars for beginning teachers; reduced workloads or help from instructional aides; and opportunities to participate in teacher networks external to the school.

- Finally, studies show that high-quality leadership directly impacts school performance, as well as improving the working environment for teachers. However, many high-poverty schools find it just as difficult to attract, retain, and support good principals as they do teachers. The Congress should provide increased funding for the national principal recruitment program authorized under Title II of the ESEA, which would provide financial incentives and mentors to recruit and develop new principals in high-need districts, as well as professional development programs in instructional leadership and management.⁵⁰

The president and the Congress should help teachers and administrators create safer and more orderly learning environments. Important mechanisms for achieving this goal are the creation of smaller, more personalized learning environments in schools and the provision of training in classroom management. The Center for American Progress recommends:

- The president should request and the Congress should provide full funding for the smaller learning communities grants authorized under section 5441 of the ESEA. (President Bush's 2005 budget request proposed eliminating these grants.) The creation of high-quality smaller learning environments can decrease discipline and safety problems.
- Teachers also need training with respect to the best practices for managing their students' behavior. The president should propose dedicating \$25 million of professional development funding under Title II, Part A of the ESEA to programs designed to help teachers master effective classroom management techniques, as well as programs designed to help school administrators establish more effective schoolwide discipline strategies based on substantial collaboration with teachers. An ongoing study of new teachers in the Boston Public Schools found that those who felt unprepared to tackle the demands of classroom teaching were less likely to plan to stay in the profession and, according to the authors, "The most commonly expressed frustrations were with student behavior, classroom management, and discipline issues."⁵¹

The president and the Congress should ensure that statewide assessments and accountability systems required under the No Child Left Behind Act are fair, accurate, and positive tools for improving student achievement. We must ensure that assessments and accountability are tools for improved instruction, not tools for narrowing instruction and demoralizing teachers. Specifically:

- The president should request and the Congress should provide increased funding for the state assessment grants authorized under sections 6111-13 of the ESEA so states can develop high-quality, valid, and reliable assessment systems that can inform instruction and that test a broad range of knowledge and skills.
- The administration should dedicate \$100 million of professional development funding under Title II, Part A of the ESEA to research-based programs that help teachers master instructional strategies aligned with accountability goals and mechanisms in order to reduce pressure to “teach to the test.” Such instructional strategies include, for example, techniques for pacing instruction, using more frequent checkpoint assessments, and finding and using curriculum materials that are aligned with state standards and assessments.
- Finally, the president should direct the secretary of education to disseminate information about instructional practices that use diagnostic assessments and data to improve instruction and avoid year-end cramming and teaching to the test. Furthermore, the Department of Education should work with the Institute for Educational Studies to develop an agenda for further research in the area.

ENDNOTES

¹ For example, Matthew Miller, a nationally syndicated columnist and senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, has proposed an ambitious \$30 billion federal program to raise teacher salaries by 50 percent and create additional merit raises for successful inner city teachers who choose to remain in urban schools. See Matthew Miller, *The Two Percent Solution: Fixing America’s Problems in Ways Liberals and Conservatives Can Love*, (2003), at 114-137. See also The Teaching Commission, *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action*, 2004, at 28 (proposing \$30 billion investment in teacher salaries).

² William L. Sanders & June T. Rivers, “Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement,” University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center, 1996, at 3.

³ Eric A. Hanushek & Steven G. Rivkin, *How to Improve the Supply of High-Quality Teachers*, *Brookings Papers on Education Policy: 2004*, (2004). Estimates based on research using data from Texas described in National Bureau of Economic Research, “Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement,” Working Paper No. 6691, revised July 2002, at 21.

⁴ National Center for Education Statistics, *Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: School Year 2000-2001*, May 2003 (estimating salaries and benefits for instructional staff to be \$194 billion).

⁵ Education Week, *Quality Counts 2000*, Editorial Projects in Education, Jan. 13, 2000, available at <http://counts.edweek.org/reports/qc00/templates/chart.cfm?slug=intro-c3.htm> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

⁶ Richard M. Ingersoll, *Is There Really a Teacher Shortage*, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington, September 2003, at 15; Richard M. Ingersoll, *Why Do High Poverty Schools Have Difficulty Staffing Their Classrooms with High Quality Teachers*, Center for American Progress, November, 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/atf/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A521-5D6FF2E06E03%7D/Ingersoll-FINAL.pdf> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

⁷ Education Week, *Quality Counts 2003*, Editorial Projects in Education, Jan. 9, 2003, available at <http://counts.edweek.org/reports/qc03/templates/article.cfm?slug=17divide.h22> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

⁸ Craig D. Jerald & Richard M. Ingersoll, *All Talk No Action: Putting an End to Out-of-Field Teaching*, The Education Trust, August 2002, at 7.

⁹ National Center for Education Statistics, *Teacher Preparation and Professional Development: 2000*, June 2001, at v.

¹⁰ Kevin Cary, *The Real Value of Teachers*, The Education Trust, Winter 2004, at 36-37.

¹¹ National Center for Education Statistics, *Monitoring School Quality: An Indicators Report*, December 2000, at 13-14.

¹² Eric A. Hanushek & Steven G. Rivkin, *How to Improve the Supply of High-Quality Teachers*, *Brookings Papers on Education Policy: 2004*, (2004), at 16.

¹³ In March 2004, the National Conference of State Legislatures reported that states faced a \$29 billion tab to pay for federal mandates, of which more than half is education related. See National Conference of State Legislatures, *Mandate Monitor*, Mar. 31, 2004.

¹⁴ The two major programs focused on teacher quality are the Teacher Quality State Grants under the No Child Left Behind Act and the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants under the Higher Education Act. The president also has proposed elimination of the Higher Education Act program directed at ensuring that teacher preparation programs incorporate technology into their programs, so that teacher graduates are prepared to use technology to enhance their instruction.

¹⁵ See The Education Trust, *In Need of Improvement: Ten Ways the U.S. Department of Education Has Failed to Live Up to Its Teacher Quality Commitments*, August 2003; see also *Telling the Whole Truth (or Not) About Teacher Quality*, December 2003; Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, *Leaving Teachers Behind: How a Key Requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act (Putting a Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Class) Has Been Abandoned*, June 2003.

¹⁶ Many of the policy recommendations presented in this paper as originally released in December 2004 were incorporated into the Teacher Excellence for All Children Act of 2005, which was introduced June 9, 2005, in the U.S. House of Representatives by Representative George Miller and in the U.S. Senate by Senators Edward Kennedy and Richard Durbin.

¹⁷ Kevin Cary, *The Real Value of Teachers*, The Education Trust, Winter 2004.

¹⁸ Council on Graduate Medical Education, *2002 Summary Report*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, June 2002.

¹⁹ For example, section 207 of the Higher Education Act requires states and institutions of higher education to publish information about teacher preparation, including data on the percentage of education school graduates passing state licensure and certification tests; section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires states to issue report cards containing information on the professional qualifications of teachers in the state as well as inequities in teacher distribution; and section 1119 requires states and districts to report on annual progress in meeting the goals the state has set for ensuring all teachers are highly qualified by 2005-2006. Recognizing the special importance of such data to parents, section 1111 requires districts to maintain data on the training and licensure of their students' classroom teachers, inform parents of their right to request such information, and actively inform parents at the beginning of the year if their child has been assigned an under-qualified teacher.

²⁰ See e.g., The Education Trust, *Interpret With Caution: The First State Title II Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation*, June 2002; *Telling the Whole Truth (or Not) About Highly Qualified Teachers*, December 2003.

²¹ Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, *Leaving Teachers Behind: How a Key Requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act (Putting a Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Class) Has Been Abandoned*, June 2003; The Education Trust, *In Need of Improvement: Ten Ways the U.S. Department of Education Has Failed to Live Up to Its Teacher Quality Commitments*, August 2003.

²² The Education Trust, *Telling the Whole Truth (or Not) About Highly Qualified Teachers*, December 2003, at 7-8.

²³ A small but growing number of schools and districts are already testing such models, and their experiences can provide a basis for crafting federal policy in this area. For example, more than 70 schools in eight states are in various stages of implementing the well-regarded Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) developed by the Milken Family Foundation. In September 2004, Minnesota Governor Tim Pawlenty announced that federal dollars would be used to support TAP in several Minneapolis schools and on a districtwide basis in Waseca. See *Teachers Are Trying Out Performance Pay System*, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Sept. 14, 2004.

²⁴ According to polling conducted by Public Agenda for the Teaching Commission, "almost seven out of 10 young college graduates think teachers do not have good opportunities for advancement and leadership." See The Teaching Commission, *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action*, 2004, at 28.

²⁵ The career ladder could have more stages. For example, in a recent article, Arthur Wise described the creation of teaching teams with a lead teacher, a senior teacher to assist with team management, novice teachers, underprepared teachers (student teachers or transitioning professionals), and part-time teaching interns. Arthur Wise, *Teaching Teams: A 21st Century Paradigm for Organizing America's Schools*, *Education Week*, Sept. 29, 2004, at 32, 44. The Milken Family Foundation's TAP program (see note 22 above) includes a ladder comprised of "career," "mentor," and "master" teacher stages.

²⁶ This description of teacher evaluation is based closely on the evaluation component of the Milken Family Foundation's TAP program. For a detailed description, see Jennie Weiner, *Choosing a Measure of Accountability*, *What's On Tap*, Spring 2004, at 19, available at http://www.mff.org/tap/pdf/whatsontap_v2n1.pdf (last viewed May 6, 2005).

²⁷ While some view compensation systems with links to student performance with some degree of skepticism, there is evidence that sophisticated proposals such as the one advanced here are beginning to gain favor within union ranks. For example, in March 2004, Sandra Feldman, then president of the American Federation of Teachers, wrote: "Along with significantly raising pay across the board, on top of the current schedules, we would have to find a way to reward different roles, responsibilities, knowledge, skills and, yes, results. . . . [R]ewarding teachers who significantly raise achievement, either individually or as a team, can work." See Sandra Feldman, "Rethinking Teacher Compensation," *American Teacher*, March 2004, available at http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_teacher/mar04/AT_wws.html (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

²⁸ See Carnegie Corporation, *New Teachers for a New Era*, July 2001, for a more comprehensive discussion of the ideal design principles for such a program. For example, the report suggests that proven, experienced teachers from partner schools should receive some form of faculty appointment in the institution of higher education and be given titles such as clinical faculty, professor of practice, or adjunct professor.

²⁹ John Merrow, *The Teacher Shortage: Wrong Diagnosis, Phony Cures*, *Education Week*, Oct. 6, 1999, at 64 & 48. Merrow quotes Stanford University professor Linda Darling-Hammond as saying, "If you are preparing to be a teacher, you can expect about half of the tuition money you put into the till to come back to support your preparation."

³⁰ Texas A&M University System, "Press Release: A&M System Universities Continue Their Push to Increase State's Teacher Education Pipeline and Focus on Quality of Teachers Graduated," Dec. 18, 2002. Over a two-year period, the system increased total production of teacher candidates by 20 percent, African American candidates by 116 percent, and candidates in shortage areas such as math, science, special education, and bilingual education by significant percentages as well, all while ensuring that the pass rate on the state's certification exam did not decline. The University of Texas also has obtained significant results from a university-wide initiative to increase the number of math and science teachers. See The Teaching Commission, *Teaching at Risk: A Call to Action*, 2004, at 37.

³¹ U.S. Department of Education, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Third Annual Report on Teacher Quality*, July 2004, at 28.

³² While very few states currently come close to including the full range of such information in teacher preparation accountability systems, these recommendations are not without precedent. For example, several years ago Louisiana began including teacher quality indicators of each kind described above, and the state recently began pilot-testing a newly developed Value-Added Teacher Preparation Program Assessment Model. See http://asa.regents.state.la.us/TE/value_added_model for a detailed description of that effort.

³³ The GAO recently released a report raising concerns about the difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of Title II grants due to the wide range of activities allowed under the current program. See Government Accountability Office, *Activities Underway to Improve Teacher Training, but Information Collected To Assess Accountability Has Limitations*, October 2002.

³⁴ The U.S. Department of Education's annual reports on teacher quality have found that most states set minimum passing scores for teacher licensure exams "so low as to screen out only the lowest-performing individuals." See U.S. Department of Education, *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Third Annual Report on Teacher Quality*, July 2004, at 22. See also Ruth Mitchell & Patte Barth, *Not Good Enough: A Content Analysis of Teacher Licensing Exams*, The Education Trust, Spring 1999.

³⁵ Council on Graduate Medical Education, *Tenth Report: Physician Distribution and Health Care Challenges in Rural and Inner-City Areas*, February 1998, at 1.

³⁶ According to Linda Darling-Hammond and Gary Sykes, \$800 million would provide incentives of up to \$20,000 each for the estimated 40,000 new teachers and meet the nation's needs in shortage areas. Linda Darling-Hammond & Gary Sykes, *Meeting the 'Highly Qualified Teacher' Challenge*, Education Policy Analysis Archives, at 14, available at <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n33/> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

³⁷ National Center for Education Statistics, *Highlights from TIMSS: The Third International Mathematics and Science Study*, March 1999.

³⁸ Kevin Cary, *The Real Value of Teachers*, The Education Trust, Winter 2004.

³⁹ Education Week, *Quality Counts 2003*, Editorial Projects in Education, Jan. 9, 2003, available at <http://counts.edweek.org/sreports/qc03/reports/17district-t1b.cfm> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

⁴⁰ See Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, "Leaving Teachers Behind: How a Key Requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act (Putting a Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Class) Has Been Abandoned," June 2003; see also The Education Trust, *In Need of Improvement: Ten Ways the U.S. Department of Education Has Failed to Live Up to Its Teacher Quality Commitments*, August 2003, at 5-6.

⁴¹ For research identifying these conditions, see Richard M. Ingersoll, *Why Do High Poverty Schools Have Difficulty Staffing Their Classrooms with High Quality Teachers*, Center for American Progress, November 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/atf/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A521-5D6FF2E06E03%7D/Ingersoll-FINAL.pdf> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

⁴² See Jessica Levin & Meredith Quinn, *Missed Opportunities: How We Keep High-Quality Teachers Out of Urban Classrooms*, The New Teacher Project, 2003; see also Moore Johnson, et al., *The Support Gap: New Teachers' Early Experiences in High-Income and Low-Income Schools*, Education Policy Analysis Archives, October 2004.

⁴³ Marguerite Roza & Paul T. Hill, *How Within-District Spending Inequities Help Some Schools to Fail*, Brookings Papers on Education Policy: 2004, (2004).

⁴⁴ Section 1120A(c)(2)(B) currently requires that "in the determination of expenditures per pupil from State and local funds, or instructional salaries per pupil from State and local funds, staff differentials for years of employment shall not be included in such determinations."

⁴⁵ Education Week, *Quality Counts 2003*, Editorial Projects in Education, Jan. 9, 2003, at 17. Education Week conducted a special analysis of data from the *U.S. Schools and Staffing Survey*, a massive federal survey of tens of thousands of teachers, which found that teachers in high-poverty schools were twice as likely as their colleagues in low-poverty schools to report problems with parent involvement, theft, physical conflicts among students, and teacher absenteeism, among other factors. A report commissioned by the Center for American Progress and the Institute for America's Future demonstrates that teachers in high-poverty schools report discipline problems as one of the top reasons for leaving their schools and the profession. Richard M. Ingersoll, *Why Do High Poverty Schools Have Difficulty Staffing Their Classrooms with High Quality Teachers*, Center for American Progress, November 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/atf/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A521-5D6FF2E06E03%7D/Ingersoll-FINAL.pdf> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).

⁴⁶ Susan Moore Johnson & Sarah E. Birkeland, *The Schools That Teachers Choose*, Educational Leadership, May 2003.

⁴⁷ See Jason Snipes, et al., Foundations for Success: Case Studies of How Urban School Systems Improve Achievement, Council of the Great City Schools, September 2002; Wendy Togneri & Stephen E. Anderson, *Beyond Islands of Excellence: What Districts Can Do to Improve Instruction and Achievement in All Schools*, Learning First Alliance, 2003.

⁴⁸ D. Kauffman, et al., "Lost at Sea": *New Teachers' Experiences with Curriculum and Assessment*, Teachers College Record, March 2002. These findings also are expanded on with case study examples in Susan Moore Johnson and the Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, *Finders and Keepers: Helping New Teachers Survive and Thrive in Our Schools*, 2004.

⁴⁹ Thomas M. Smith & Richard M. Ingersoll, *What Are the Effects of Induction and Mentoring on Beginning Teachers Turnover?* American Educational Research Journal, Fall 2004.

⁵⁰ The program is authorized by and described in section 2151(b) of the ESEA. In FY04, Congress allocated \$12.4 million; the Bush administration has consistently sought to eliminate funding for the program.

⁵¹ See Maria McCarthy & Ellen Guiney, *Building a Professional Teaching Corps in Boston: Baseline Study of New Teachers in Boston's Public Schools*, Boston Plan for Excellence, April 2004, at 5; see also Richard M. Ingersoll, *Why Do High Poverty Schools Have Difficulty Staffing Their Classrooms with High Quality Teachers*, Center for American Progress, November 2004, available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/atf/cf/%7BE9245FE4-9A2B-43C7-A521-5D6FF2E06E03%7D/Ingersoll-FINAL.pdf> (last viewed Nov. 30, 2004).