

I.D.vi Highly Qualified Staff

No Child Left Behind Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers, in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals working in Title I schools (excluding those whose sole duties are translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), LSSs are required to report the percentages of core academic subject (CAS) classes being taught by highly qualified teachers, and the percentages of CAS classes being taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools compared to low-poverty schools. High-poverty schools are defined as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State, and low-poverty schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. NCLB also requires that school systems ensure that economically disadvantaged and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.

Plans for Reaching the 100% Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) Goal

LSS responses to Section I.D.vi in Part I and the Title II, Part A attachment in Part II will continue to serve as the school system’s Highly Qualified Teacher Improvement Plan.³ In this section, each LSS should address the factors that prevent the district from attaining the 100% HQT Goal.

³ Section 2141(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Highly Qualified Staff

Based on the Examination of Core Academic Subject Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teacher Data (Tables 6.1 - 6.3):

Table 6.1: Percentage of Core Academic Subject Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers			Table 6.2: Percentage of Core Academic Subject Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers in Title I Schools			
School Year	% of Core Academic Subject Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	% of Core Academic Subject Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	School Year	Total Number of Core Academic Subject Classes in Title I Schools	Core Academic Subject Classes in Title I Schools Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	% of Core Academic Subject Classes in Title I Schools taught by HQT
2003-2004	80.06	19.94	2008-2009	140	140	100
2004-2005	88.94	11.06				
2005-2006	89.3	10.7				
2006-2007	88.2	11.8				
2007-2008	88.17	11.83				
2008-2009	91.9	8.1				

Table 6.3: Number of Classes <u>Not</u> Taught by Highly Qualified (NHQ) Teachers by Reason														
School Year	Expired Certificate		Invalid Grade Level(s) for Certification		Testing Requirement Not Met		Invalid Subject for Certification		Missing Certification Information		Conditional Certificate		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	NHQ Classes	All Classes
2005-2006	27	3.20	19	2.25	271	32.15	242	28.71	36	4.27	248	29.42	843	8261
2006-2007	0	0.00	4	0.01	149	29.45	97	19.17	148	29.25	108	21.43	506	4276
2007-2008	30	5.73	6	1.04	126	21.98	77	13.43	0	0	117	20.41	356	4269
2008-2009	12	3.2	1	0.3	138	37.3	39	10.5	98	26.5	82	22.2	370	4160

- Describe where progress is evident.

HCPS Response:

- There was an overall increase in the percentage of core academic subject classes taught by HQ teachers in 2008-2009 (Table 6.1).
- Title I schools had 100% of core academic subject classes taught by HQT (Table 6.2).
- The numbers of classes not taught by HQT due to invalid grade level for certification, invalid subject for certification, and those teaching with conditional certificates were at an all-time low in 2008-2009 (Table 6.3).

Highly Qualified Staff

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies and the corresponding resource allocations to which you attribute the progress. What evidence does the school system have that the strategies in place are having the intended effect?

HCPS Response:

HCPS implemented a pilot program to increase notification of teachers as to requirements needed to achieve HQ status.

3. Describe where challenges are evident.

HCPS Response:

- The percentage of NHQ teachers who did not meet the testing requirement increased significantly in 2008-2009 (Table 6.3).
- Budget constraints resulted in limited human resources available to implement and monitor systems. As a result, HCPS will need to identify and train current personnel in HQ requirements in order to monitor and implement system-wide initiatives.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments and the corresponding resource allocations that were made to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

The HR office has collaborated with the technology department to develop a web-based system which houses HQ data and certification requirements that is accessible to teachers and administrators. Our office is currently working with Senior Staff to develop strategies for system introduction/training to school-based personnel.

Additional strategies to be employed in FY10 include:

- Training program for principals to increase their understanding of HQ and how class scheduling affects HQ.
- Candidates selected for employment beginning in FY10 are required to provide documentation to determine HQ status prior to employment.

Highly Qualified Staff

Based on the Examination of the Equitable Distribution of Highly Qualified Teacher Data (Tables 6.4 - 6.5):

Table 6.4: Core Academic Subject Classes Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) in High Poverty and Low Poverty Schools By Level							
		Core Academic Subject Classes Taught by HQT					
		High Poverty			Low Poverty		
		Total Classes	Taught by HQT		Total Classes	Taught by HQT	
		#	#	%	#	#	%
2005-2006							
Elementary		126	97	76.98	2299	5157	93.82
Secondary		58	50	71.89	2396	2156	89.88
2006-2007							
Elementary		30	24	80	545	514	94.31
Secondary		43	34	79.07	1761	1581	89.78
2007-2008							
Elementary		30	30	100	545	520	95.4
Secondary		43	36	83.72	1761	1598	90.74
2008-2009							
Elementary		50	50	100	482	462	95.9
Secondary		46	40	87.0	1733	1618	93.4

Table 6.5: Core Academic Subject Classes Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) in High and Low Poverty Schools By Level and Experience									
Core Academic Subject Classes									
		High Poverty				Low Poverty			
		Classes Taught by Experienced HQT*		Classes Taught by Inexperienced HQT		Classes Taught by Experienced HQT*		Classes Taught by Inexperienced HQT	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008-2009	Elementary	30	60.9	20	39.1	401	83.1	71	16.9
	Secondary	27	59.1	19	40.9	1438	83.0	295	17.0

1. Describe where progress is evident.

HCPS Response:

- There has been an increase each year in the percentage of HQ teachers in the core academic subject classes in secondary high poverty schools.
- The elementary high poverty schools continue to have 100% of core academic subject classes taught by HQ teachers.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies and the corresponding resource allocations to which you attribute the progress. Your response must include examples of incentives for voluntary transfers, the provision of professional development, recruitment programs, or other effective strategies that low-income and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. What evidence does the school system have that the strategies in place are having the intended effect?

Highly Qualified Staff

HCPS Response:

HCPS implemented a pilot program to increase notification of teachers as to requirements needed to achieve HQ status. Additional strategies to be employed in FY10 include web-based system containing teacher specific information regarding HQ status and requirements needed to achieve HQ status. Training program for principals to increase their understanding of HQ and how class scheduling effects HQ. Candidates selected for employment beginning in FY10 were required to provide documentation to determine HQ status prior to achieve HQ status.

3. Describe where challenges are evident. In your response, include teacher experience, minority status of students, and poverty status of students, where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

Budget constraints resulting in limited human resources available to implement needed monitoring systems. Need to identify and train current personnel in HQ requirements in order to monitor and implement system-wide initiatives.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments and the corresponding resource allocations that were made to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

Collaborated with technology department to develop web-based system which houses HQ data that is accessible to teachers and administrators. Currently working with Senior Staff to develop strategies for system introduction/training to school-based personnel.

Based on the Examination of Highly Qualified Teacher Retention Data (Table 6.6):

Table 6.6: Attrition Rates												
Attrition Due To (Category):	Retirement			Resignation			Dismissal/Non-renewal			Leaves		
	Numer-ator	Denom-inator	%	Numer-ator	Denom-inator	%	Numer-ator	Denom-inator	%	Numer-ator	Denom-inator	%
2006-2007	84	3160	2.66	181	3160	5.73	4	3160	0.1	40	3160	1.27
2007-2008	60	3170	1.89	150	3170	4.73	5	3170	0.15	30	3170	0.72
2008-2009	71	3132	2.26	120	3132	3.83	14	3132	0.45	37	3132	0.12

Use the data available as of September 1st following each of the school years to be reported. Report data for the entire teaching staff or for teachers of Core Academic Subject areas if those data are available. Indicate the population reflected in the data:

Entire teaching staff

Core Academic Subject area teachers

Highly Qualified Staff

1. Describe where progress is evident.

HCPS Response:

Slight increase in retirements, however significant decrease in resignations.

2. Identify the practices, programs, or strategies and the corresponding resource allocations to which you attribute the progress. What evidence does the school system have that the strategies in place are having the intended effect?

HCPS Response:

Pilot program to increase notification of teachers as to requirements needed to achieve HQ status. Additional strategies to be employed in FY10 include web-based system containing teacher specific information regarding HQ status and requirements needed to achieve HQ status. Training program for principals to increase their understanding of HQ and how class scheduling affects HQ. Candidates selected for employment beginning in FY10 were required to provide documentation to determine HQ status prior to to achieve HQ status.

3. Describe where challenges are evident.

HCPS Response:

Budget constraints resulting in limited human resources available to implement needed monitoring systems. Due to budget constraints and hiring freeze unable to move forward with development/implementation of comprehensive retention program.

4. Describe the changes or adjustments and the corresponding resource allocations that were made to ensure sufficient progress. Include timelines where appropriate.

HCPS Response:

None

Highly Qualified Staff

- Describe how the school system identifies hard-to-staff schools and critical subject-area shortages.

HCPS Response:
State reports and test scores.

- Based on the Examination of Qualified Paraprofessional Data (Table 6.7):

Table 6.7: Percentage of Qualified Paraprofessionals Working in Title I Schools			
	Total Number of Paraprofessionals Working in Title I Schools	Qualified Paraprofessionals Working in Title I Schools	
		#	%
2008-2009	165	165	100
2009-2010*	108	108	100

*As of July 1, 2009

1. Describe the strategies that the local school system will use to ensure that all paraprofessionals working in Title I schools continue to be qualified.

HCPS Response:
Review of applicants by certification department prior to hire.

High Quality Professional Development

No Child Left Behind Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high quality professional development.

Harford County Public Schools selected Option 2 in reporting on High Quality Professional Development.

Requirements for Reporting on Option 2 Activities

Harford County Public School's progress towards integrating the teacher professional development planning framework into school improvement planning is described in the following responses.

1. Has the district integrated the teacher professional development planning framework into school improvement planning guidance?

HCPS Response:

HCPS has incorporated the MSDE teacher professional development planning into the yearly School Improvement Plan document. A copy of the planning template is attached. (Appendix A) The intent of the column titled *Professional Development* was to provide a placeholder for ideas and thoughts related to the necessary professional development to support the identified strategy. The expectation for schools' use of the planning framework was to select one area of the '09-10 School Improvement Plan and use the planning steps and thinking process to fully develop a comprehensive plan for one target area. Schools were to use the actual professional development planning framework and to attach it as a part of the School Improvement Plan or to submit a plan as a separate document. The specific guidance questions have been highlighted.

Three professional development planning documents are included in the annual update. (Appendix B) These serve as a sampling of plans submitted on September 11, 2009. Looking for commonalities in the proficiency of using the planning framework it is noted that HCPS has the following challenges: (a) thinking through the intentional design of activities and ongoing evaluation is often limited and too general; (b) understanding of "job-embedded" professional development continues to revolve around meeting during teachers' planning time and doesn't get to the essence of being ongoing and relevant to the individual teacher within the context of daily work; and (c) evaluation is focused at the "effort" level and deep reflection to match impact to professional development action is not planned. Ongoing training, feedback and support will be provided to school teams throughout the 09-10 school year.

2. Has the district implemented a program to prepare principals, other school leaders, school improvement teams, and school-based professional development staff to use the teacher professional development planning framework?

HCPS Response:

The following table highlights the training activities held in the spring and summer of 2009.

Date	Participants	Duration	Topic	Format
March 2009	(choice attendance) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals 22/53 participated Instructional Facilitators 18/22 participated Content Supervisors 6/21 participated 	45-minutes 2 sessions offered as a choice in a differentiated professional development for administrators	APPENDIX C Overview of the Professional Development Logic Model	Presentation Group brainstorm
May 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Improvement Team Facilitators (teacher leaders) 56/56 participated 	3-hours 2 sessions presented to elementary and secondary	Overview of the revised School Improvement Plan template including aligning professional development	Presentation Peer review of tentative plans using feedback form
June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals 51/52 Assistant Principals 91/93 Instructional Facilitators 22/22 Content Supervisors 19/22 Teacher Mentors 38/38 School Improvement Team Facilitators (teacher leaders) 54/56 	75-minutes 3 sessions presented differentiated by level	Update of the School Improvement Plan template	Presentation
July 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals 49/52 Assistant Principals 89/93 Instructional Facilitators 20/22 Content Supervisors 0/22 – training will take place Sept 09 Teacher Mentors 38/38 School Improvement Team Facilitators (teacher leaders) 52/56 	3 ½ hours 4 opportunities for school personnel to attend. Recommended that people attend as school teams. (depending upon vacation schedules)	Appendix D 1,2,3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linking topics of focus in SIP and professional development Various professional development structures NSDC definition of professional development Defining job-embedded PD 	Presentation Jig-saw Brainstorming Sharing best practices Guided practice of beginning to link the big focus areas of SIP and the essential components of planning professional development

Date	Participants	Duration	Topic	Format
July 2009	See previous	See previous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to find time • Tips for evaluating PD • The logical thinking of planning PD • 6 steps of planning PD • Resources to support work of school teams 	See previous

3. Has the district implemented plan to prepare district staff for reviewing and providing feedback on professional development plans?

HCPS Response:

SIP in HCPS are required to be submitted to Central Office on September 11, 2009. Plans will be reviewed on September 28 and 29, 2009 by a team that includes the Coordinator of School Improvement, Coordinator of Interventions, Teacher Specialist for Instructional Technology, Coordinator of Accelerated Programs, Supervisor of Physical Education and Health, a representative from Special Education, and Coordinator of Professional Development. These team members have participated in the ongoing professional development with other groups. Prior to beginning the review of SIP/PD plans and the feedback process, time will be devoted to building a consistent expectation for each of the components. The feedback will be captured using two feedback forms. (APPENDIX E-1 and E-2)

To ensure consistency the following process will be utilized during the review/feedback work –

- Feedback form will be reviewed to make sure that all team members understand the components
- One plan will be reviewed by all team members using the feedback form
- Strengths and Considerations for Improvement will be discussed and comments will be checked for consistency
- Plans will be read by two people
- Consistency will be checked periodically throughout the process

Following the review/feedback process, the team will create a summary of strengths and weaknesses of the professional development plans. Discussion will ensue that will include possible next steps for leadership professional development that could help to address the weak areas. It may be that one section of the planning framework requires additional attention, support, and specific professional development. At this time, the Professional Development Office is anticipating a need to address possible methods of evaluation as a need and has begun to plan accordingly for the 09-10 leadership professional development plans.

4. **How is the district monitoring implementation and impact of the school-based professional development activities? Has the district reviewed school improvement plans that address the new professional development planning requirements?**

HCPS Response:

HCPS decided to make the use of the MSDE Teacher Professional Development Framework a “no fault” year for the plans submitted for the 2009-2010 school year. Once teams received the original training during the summer of 2009, several schools contacted the Coordinator of Professional Development and Coordinator of School Improvement for assistance and input on initial plans. This allowed HCPS to provide onsite support for those teams that requested the service.

At this time, no plans have been reviewed. Plans are due to be submitted to Central Office by September 11, 2009 and will not be reviewed until September 28 and 29. Teams will receive written feedback on the professional development plans in October 2009. Central Office staff including the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction and the Executive Directors of Elementary and Secondary Schools, will visit with school leadership to review the SIP and connecting professional development plans throughout the fall. Suggestions and considerations for improvements to the plan will be shared but there is not an approval process for this school year.

Monitoring of the professional development plans will occur in the School Improvement update process. Schools will be expected to report on the progress of the professional development plan.

Several opportunities exist for school leadership to participate in professional development designed to support the use of the MSDE Teacher Professional Development Planning framework and Professional Development Evaluation Guide during the 2009-2010 year. HCPS has a quarterly cycle of professional development for leadership and will focus upon leadership topics and instructional topics across the sessions. Specific sessions on evaluating professional development will occur during the second and third quarters. Other areas that may surface as needs will be incorporated after considering the findings of the review/feedback process.