



Koreen Barreras-Brown

April Campbell

Veronica Dujon

Jennifer Duval

Teresa Ferrer

Karen Gray, Chair

Rob Larson

Tawnya Lubbes

Marvin Lynn

Cecelia Monto

Rhonda Nese

Bahia Overton

Helen Richardson

Cynthia Richardson

Tony Rosilez

Hilda Rosselli

Carlos Sequeira

Markisha Smith

Maria Dantas-Whitney

2018-19 Meeting Schedule

March 14, 1-4 p.m.

May 15, 1-4 p.m.

June 12, 1-4 p.m.

Educator Equity Advisory Group

January 16, 2019, 1 – 4:00 p.m.

Room 101 Richard Woodcock Education Center

Western Oregon University, Monmouth, OR

The Black Teacher Project: <http://www.blackteacherproject.org>

Teacher Diversity in Washington State: <https://projects.seattletimes.com/2018/teacher-diversity-wa/>

Having More Black Teachers Is One of the Best Levers for Black Student Achievement

<https://phillys7thward.org/2018/12/black-teachers-one-best-levers-black-student-achievement/>

Call-In Information (888) 557-8511; Access code: 5579138#

AGENDA

- 1) Welcome and Introductions—Karen Gray (10 min)
- 2) Approval of November 7 Meeting Minutes – All P 1
- 3) BranchED's Quality Framework for Educator Preparation (45 min)
Cassandra P. Herring, Ph.D., President and Chief Executive Officer
Branch Alliance for Educator Diversity (BranchED)
- 4) Break (10 min)
- 5) Relevant Reports and Activities—Hilda Rosselli (10 min)
 - a. Novice Educators of Color Listening Session update
 - b. Elevator cards for members
 - c. 2018 Infographic
 - d. Joint Committee on Student Success (Handout) P 5
- 6) Update on Oregon Teacher Scholars Program (OTSP)--
Lala Rangel (15 min)
 - a. Updated Scholars Report (Handout) P 61
 - b. Professional Learning and Networking Events (Handout) P 63
 - c. Employment Supports
- 7) Update on Presentations on 2018 Results—Hilda, Marvin, Tony, Lala
Meeting presentations for the year—ALL (10 min) (Handout) P 65
- 8) 2018-19 Action Steps and Advisory Group Work Plan—ALL (20 min) (Handout) P 67
- 9) COSA Work Group on Educator Workforce Development—Legislative Concept—
Craig Hawkins, Morgan Allen (50 min) (Handout) P 69

10) Public Comment

Members of the public wanting to give public testimony must sign in.

There will only be one speaker from each group.

Each individual speaker or group spokesman will have three (3) minutes.

Adjourn



**Oregon Educator Equity Advisory Group
November 7, 2018 - WOU**

MINUTES

Attending: Marked with X

X	Koreen Barreras-Brown		Cecelia Monto
X	April Campbell		Rhonda Nese
	Tara Cooper	X	Bahia Overton – by phone
X	Veronica Dujon	X	Cynthia Richardson
X	Jennifer Duvall	X	Helen Richardson
X	Teresa Ferrer – by phone	X	Tony Rosilez
X	Karen Gray	X	Hilda Rosselli
X	Rob Larson – by phone		Carlos Sequeira
X	Tawnya Lubbes	X	Markisha Smith
	Marvin Lynn	X	Maria Dantas-Whitney

Visitors: Amber Ryerson, WESD
Steve Nelson, Salem-Keizer School District
(Director of Recruitment and Staffing)
Brandy Ethridge-Lipke, Representative Helfrich's Chief of Staff

Agenda Item	Discussion Notes
1) Welcome & Introductions – Karen Gray	Meeting was called to order by Chair Gray at 1:09 p.m. Roll call: See chart above Advisory members introduced themselves and shared their current concerns.
2) Approval of August 24 meeting notes	Edit #5 action steps to: “at a future meeting Helen Richardson will give a presentation about creating partnerships.” Tony Rosilez moved to approve the minutes with the noted correction, seconded by Cynthia Richardson. The motion passed unanimously.
3) Advancing Educators of Color: A Case Study from Salem-Keizer SD Steve Nelson & Cynthia Richardson	Cynthia Richardson, Office of Student Equity, Access, and Advancement at the Salem-Keizer School District shared her employment path in education from Texas to Oregon. Steve Nelson, Director of Recruitment and Staffing at Salem-Keizer School District spoke about changes in their recruitment of diverse teachers. Salem-Keizer SD has the largest number of ELL students in the

	state. The current educator workforce does not mirror the demographics of the PK-12 student population. The District's previous strategy was to go outside the state to recruit diverse teachers. However, it remained difficult to both recruit and retain enough diverse teachers to meet student needs. The district has been able to institute some changes in recruiting from an outward recruitment strategy to a "Grow Your Own" strategy, developing programs which help and encourage students and educational assistants in the district move forward on the path to licensure. Critical to this change in practice and philosophy is investment in K-12 students, leadership support, and dedicated dollars to fund programs. Three things are needed to make a difference: • Solve the community college problem of smooth transfer and articulation. • Address barriers in TSPC test passage. • Statewide promoting of education as a profession. Other lessons include: • Importance of the Superintendent's leadership and support for diversification of the educator workforce • Using AVID program to identify potential recruits and hire former AVID graduates to come back and work as tutors to earn money while in college • When implementing a grow your own, plan on a long term investment and benefits that take time to see. • When implementing scholarships, consider supporting candidates in community colleges as well as those enrolled in universities. • Split the costs for teachers seeking to add ESOL endorsement. • Identify ways to help support half time paid internships for administrator candidates. • Consider a 3 year commitment to teaching once employed for recipients of scholarships. Be prepared to manage finances for the few who will leave.
--	---

	• Use Title IIA funds when possible. • Develop an articulation process for candidates to apply for positions. • Give first interview and employment consideration for candidates who are part of the district's investments. • Use social gatherings and community based organizations to network and identify potential candidates. • Make sure that the professional learning for staff and community gatherings provide supportive environments that help candidates feel interested and welcomed. • Include equity PL to set the growth mindset within the district.
5) Break	
6) Update on Oregon Teacher Scholars Program - Hilda Rosselli, Lala Rangel, Cecelia Monto, Cynthia Richardson	Lala Rangel updated the advisory group on the progress of the Oregon Teacher Scholars Program: • There are 44 first round scholarships already awarded and enough funding for 68. • There is even distribution of scholarships throughout the universities of the state. • Cecelia Monto and Cynthia Richardson have reviewed the 2nd round of scholarship applications (18). • Several scholars have signed up to speak with legislators about the program. • Lala is working with WOU to develop a video that highlights the program which will be added to our current website. Ideas discussed: ✓ Tony suggested inviting scholars to meet with TSPC ✓ Consider connecting candidates via Zoom to further networking ✓ Sponsor an annual event for Scholars
COSA Letter	The group discussed the OEEAG's development of a response to the COSA letter received (included in this meeting packet). There was consensus to invite Craig

	Hawkins or Morgan Allen from COSA to talk with this group about their legislative proposal on workforce diversity. Karen Gray and Hilda Rosselli will develop questions for COSA and send to the advisory group for their edits and feedback prior to sending to COSA. We will invite COSA to our January meeting to answer the questions.
7) 2018-19 Action Steps and Advisory Group Work Plan	A focus of this advisory group is to complete the Educator Equity Report for the Legislature each year and develop recommendations and action steps. Chair Gray requested the group review the steps of the 2018-19 work plan and consider writing legislators a note regarding the work. It is important to align our work with other state Ed Equity work.
8) Meeting presentations for the year	Chair Gray reviewed a list of suggested presentations for our professional development this year. Hilda is working on updating the 2018-19 message cards for team members. The message cards can be used when talking with others to highlight the work of the Educator Equity Advisory Group.
9) Video clip if time allows	Time did not allow. Videoclip attached: https://youtu.be/5vIWU-Wxgog
Adjourn at 4:04 p.m.	

**State of Oregon
Legislative Fiscal Office**

900 Court St. NE, Rm. H-178
Salem, OR 97301
503-986-1828



Ken Rocco
Legislative Fiscal Officer

Paul Siebert
Deputy Legislative Fiscal Officer

To: Members of the Joint Committee on Student Success

From: Doug Wilson and Tim Walker, Legislative Fiscal Office

Date: December 12, 2018

Please find attached the recommendations of the three Joint Committee on Student Success's work groups and the preliminary cost estimates of the recommendations. As you review this information please consider the following:

1. Overall, the estimates in the attached document should be thought of as preliminary, giving the reader an idea of the size or magnitude of the costs. One reason for this is that many of the recommendations were not specific enough, so assumptions had to be made of the scale of the program or services a recommendation was addressing. Some recommendations were quite specific (e.g., decreasing class sizes), while others recommended an expansion in a specific service or program without stating specifically what the target was of that expansion.
2. Where applicable, the Quality Education Model or QEM was used for estimating the costs of a recommendation. Alternatively, some of the estimates rely on proposals already being discussed or that had been part of other efforts such as the Agency Request budget or in some cases the Governor's budget.
3. Many of the estimates are based on state-wide numbers and averages. This means that districts are treated proportionally even though there may differences between schools or districts that could affect the costs. The law of averages is assumed.
4. Many of the recommendations will require additional building space and require new construction or remodeling. For example, many districts could face space shortage if class size is reduced. This will be a district-by-district issue and is not addressed directly in the pricing of these recommendations.
5. Similarly, many of these recommendations will require additional teachers, nurses, early learning/child care professionals, and other staff. Many of these are already in short supply, a problem only added to by some of these recommendations.
6. These recommendations have been "priced" independently, meaning they do not consider the potential impact of other recommendations.

7. In some cases, the pricing of some these recommendations assume a phase-in during the first biennium while others do not. As the Joint Committee moves forward with its decisions, LFO will assist in pricing these at the recommended phase-in schedule.
8. It is assumed that any additional costs are funded with General Fund resources. There may be opportunities for federal funds or other funds in some cases and these will be explored as the process moves forward.
9. Many schools or districts have implemented some of these recommendation in whole or in part. A district might have determined that class size is a priority and invested in teachers sacrificing investments in other areas. One issue that will need some discussion by the Joint Committee is how to treat these districts that have already made the investment -- the more specific a program or service is for a funding stream the more important this is an issue.

If you have any questions, please call me (503-986-1837).

High Quality Classrooms Work Group

GOAL: Make the teaching profession more appealing by recruiting, retaining, and supporting qualified teachers in every classroom.

Recommendation #1

Establish \$20.7 million in new funding for grow-your-own programs in which districts partner with educator preparation programs to fill gaps in the educator work force. Ensure that these programs meet the following requirements:

- a. Needs-based;*
- b. Require recipients to remain in public schools in Oregon for a period of time or repay the scholarship amount;*
- c. Limit the first 1,000 slots to those seeking to become teachers, with remaining slots available to those who are candidates in other licensure categories*

The Confederation of School Administrators (COSA) has a similar proposal which provided up to 1,000 students in each “cohort” up to \$5,000 annually to offset tuition and other costs of attending college with the intent of being awarded a degree from a teacher preparation program. It would require districts or groups of districts participating in the program to provide \$1 for each \$3 for the assistance. This component of the proposal would cost up to \$15 million for the first biennia (2019-21) representing three cohorts growing to \$35 million for 2021-23 for seven cohorts. Other biennial costs in the COSA proposal included \$500,000 for planning grants to a district(s) to establish the program, \$250,000 to districts for creating teacher cadet programs, \$350,000 to ODE for administrative costs, \$300,000 to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to support the program and “barrier busting”, and \$300,000 to the new Educator Advancement Council to support their efforts around the program. The total cost of the COSA program was \$16.7 million for 2019-21. The Workgroup recommendation was \$20.7 million and LFO assumes that each cohort would increase to 1,333 and 2019-21 cost would increase to \$19 million for the student assistance portion of the cost.

Recommendation #2

Support the goal of creating networks for professional learning, establishing the Educator Advancement Council inside ODE to maximize funds for teacher training.

The 2019-21 Governor’s budget includes funding for the Educator Advancement Council (EAC) within the ODE budget. The Council would be an independent entity but would use ODE’s finance, personnel and other central office staff. This is like the relationship that the Early Learning Division and the Youth Development Division have with ODE.

The 2019-21 Governor’s budget for the EAC is \$60.9 million total funds. General Fund represents \$19.6 million of this total with the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) accounting for the remaining \$41.3 million. \$8 million of the \$60.9 million is to be transferred to HECC for early learning related assistance and the Oregon Teachers Scholars program both of which relate to other recommendations in this document. NQTL is a carve-out from the State School Fund which is to be dedicated to the EAC starting in the 2019-21 biennium based on 2017 Legislative action.

Currently NQTL funds mentoring, school district collaboration, assistance for low performing schools and districts, grants for dyslexia screening, trauma informed pilots, leadership training, and a few ODE positions.

Recommendation #3

Align collective bargaining agreements to the length of the biennium.

There is not a feasible way to “price out” this proposal since there are several factors that affect bargaining including the term of the agreement. It is very difficult to separate the impact of just one of the many factors that go into a negotiated labor agreement.

Recommendation #4

Establish a comprehensive mentorship and professional development system among Oregon’s teachers, examining Iowa’s Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) statute (Iowa Rev. Stat. 284.15) as a possible model.

Iowa established a program which pays for the costs to school districts to provide for professional development and mentoring in each district. A teacher career pathway or ladder is established with five teacher designations -- initial, career, model, mentor and lead, the last three designations each having a reduction in the time they spend in the classroom, so they can assist other teachers or provide other professional development. Each of the three last designations have reduced instruction time assignments, have longer annual contracts, and receive additional salary.

Designation	Required % of Teachers to Designate	Reduced Instructional Time Requirement	Salary Supplement
Model Teacher	10%	10%	\$2,000
Mentor Teacher	10%	25%	\$5,000
Lead Teacher	5%	50%	\$10,000

There are two cost components in this estimate -- the increased compensation for the three designations of teachers, and the cost of replacing the lost instructional time of the model, mentor and lead teachers. Assuming just under 30,000 teachers statewide, average statewide teacher compensation (based on 2016-17 salary information adjusted to 2019-21 costs), and the need to backfill the lost instructional time, the annual cost of this proposal is \$234.6 million General Fund (\$470 million General Fund biennial cost). If the assumption that the teachers hired to replace the lost instructional time are all beginning teachers and paid at a beginning salary, the annual cost is reduced to \$189.8 million (\$380 million per biennium). These estimates assume that all districts participate in the program in Oregon and would be reduced proportionately as the number of participating districts fall. If the school districts are responsible for the backfill in instructional time and the State covers the additional compensation costs of the model, mentor and lead teachers, the State costs fall to \$41.8 million General Fund annually or \$83.6 million for the biennium.

Recommendation #5

Establish a needs-based loan forgiveness or scholarship program for individuals who commit to teach in Oregon's public schools for 10 years.

The cost of a scholarship program depends on the number of participants, the size of the scholarship, tuition amount, and the anticipated annual increase in the scholarship amount. In addition, there will be some staff and other costs to administer the program.

Over the past four years there have been an average of 3,889 new teachers who did not teach in the state in the prior year. Not all of these received their teaching degrees from institutions in the state. One factor to consider is the capacity of the teacher preparation programs in the state which have decreased over number in the past few years. For the purpose of the cost of this recommendation, I have used 500 new participants in this scholarship program each year. There are estimates for both a two-year year scholarship which tracks to the time they actually spend in the teacher preparation programs, and a four-year scholarship assuming the entire four-year span a student would spend in college.

The amount of the scholarship of course is a primary driver. Tuitions range from roughly \$7,500 to \$8,500 (annual for 15 credits a quarter) for an Oregon public university, to over \$40,000 for an Oregon private college. For the purpose of this pricing, an annual scholarship amount of \$5,000 is assumed and an annual increase in the award amount of 5%.

Under these assumptions, the 2019-21 estimate for a two-year and four-year scholarship program is \$7.8 million. For the 2021-23 biennium, the cost of the two-year scholarship program increases to \$11.3 million while the four-year program increases to \$19.5 million. These estimates do not include the cost of operating the program including staff costs and initial programming costs. Another factor to consider is whether this is the final piece of a student aid package or not. If it is, the cost would likely decrease as various public and private financial aid is factored in.

A comparable loan forgiveness program would likely have a lower net cost since some of the participants would not fulfill the 10-year requirement and there would be revenues as the "loan" is paid off. A loan forgiveness program would have significantly higher administrative costs since each participant would have to be tracked for ten years and a loan payment program would have to be established or contracted out.

GOAL: Oregon's educators and administrators are prepared to teach to changing demographics and should reflect their local communities.

Recommendation #1

Support the Oregon Teacher Scholars Program

Current 2017-19 funding for this program is \$424,000 in Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) resources (carve-out from State School Fund). This provides scholarships for racially or linguistically diverse teacher candidates accepted and enrolled in a state-approved educator preparation program. Up to 68 individuals may receive \$5,000 scholarships. The Governor's budget for 2019-21 increases the amount for the program to \$1 million General Fund of

which most of the funds should be directed to the scholarships. If all the \$1 million is used for the scholarships, the total number awarded could be 200.

GOAL: Schools have facilities that are accessible, safe, healthy, secure, and meet the comprehensive educational needs of students.

Recommendation #1

Increase funding for the OSCIM grant matching program.

The Oregon School Capital Improvement Matching Program (OSCIM) provides matching funds for school districts passing local General Obligation (GO) bonds. The OSCIM Program will match a school district's local GO bond one-to-one up to \$4.0 million of local GO bond, or the amount approved in the local bond sale, whichever is less. After that, the OSCIM Program will match the local district's GO bonds between \$4.0 million and \$8.0 million based on the funding formula and priority list established by the Office of School Facilities. All grants are predicated on the successful passage of local bond measures.

In the 2015 - 17 biennium, the OSCIM Program was provided authorization to issue \$125.0 million and in 2017-19 biennium \$100.00 million. School districts requested an additional \$216.1 million over and above the budgeted levels. There were four districts that passed their bond measures that were not funded totaling \$20.8 million. Another 49 districts applied for but did not receive grants. The priority list is meant to provide funding for districts with high poverty levels and low assessed values. The real cost of this program is the General Fund debt service to pay back the bonds. Generally speaking (and depending on interest rates at the time issuance), each \$100 million of bonds require \$15.1 million General Fund debt service per biennium for ten biennia.

As to further need over and above these requests, the Office of School Facilities estimates (based on a survey of schools) that there is roughly \$5.7 billion in deferred maintenance needs in schools across the state. In addition, some of the recommendations from this Committee's work groups could increase the need for this program (e.g., smaller class size). If there is a significant increase in this program's authorized bonding amount or the next recommendation's program, there will be less bonding authority for other areas such as public universities, community colleges, and state government projects.

Recommendation #2

Increase funding for the Seismic Rehabilitation Grant Program.

The Seismic Rehabilitation Grants program was established by the 2009-11 Legislative Assembly with an initial \$15.0 million bond authorization. Each applicant must provide a seismic engineering study and provide a cost benefit analysis. A matrix is developed ranking the projects that are most in need of rehabilitation to those of least need. In general, the 20-person Advisory Committee awards grants to those projects that are most critical, and the committee also attempts to award geographically diverse projects, considering both rural and urban projects.

The Legislative Assembly authorized \$100 million in bonds for the program in 2017-19. In November 2018, the program had \$75 million available for schools and received 86 applications totaling \$200 million. The Seismic Fund has consistently been over-subscribed and has always awarded the full amount of the fund authorized by the Legislature. For perspective, the unmet need in the November 2018 cycle totals \$125 million and the General Fund debt service for each biennium would be roughly \$18.9 million.

Since 2009-11 a total of \$304.7 million has been authorized for Seismic Rehabilitation Grants. The Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) did a survey in 2007 that estimated the total need for seismic retrofitting to be \$750.0 million. ODE is working on developing a survey for the current needs. The DOGAMI figure is thought to underestimate the total need for seismic rehabilitation.

Recommendation #3

Implement the recommendations of the School Safety Task Force, establishing a statewide school safety and prevention system with four elements: 1) effective bullying and harassment prevention programs; 2) effective youth suicide prevention; 3) multi-disciplinary statewide student safety net system; and 4) promote use of the SafeOregon tip line.

The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for ODE included a proposal to address the recommendations of the School Safety Task Force including the elements listed above. The proposal requests \$1.9 million General Fund with \$1.7 million for grants to Education Service Districts and others to assist their area districts in establishing multi-disciplinary teams to develop intervention plans for students at risk of violence. The funding would be used to hire regionally based school safety and prevention specialists, youth suicide prevention specialists, and contracted services for student threat assessment training and technical assistance. The funding for the grants represent one year of the 2019-21 biennium so the two-year cost of this package increases to roughly \$3.7 million. The remaining requested funding would be used for statewide coordination of the system, the costs of a state-wide steering committee and technical assistance resources.

GOAL: Implement the policy goals of the Quality Education Model.

Recommendation #1

Provide funding to limit class sizes as recommended in the Quality Education Model and include these limits in ODE's Division 22 standards as long as funding is provided at the level recommended by the Quality Education Commission, and allowing some flexibility for districts in the rule-making process:

- 20 students in kindergarten and grade 1;
- 23 students in grades 2 and 3;
- 24 students in grades 4 and 5; and
- 29 students in core academic classes in grades 6 to 12.

Using the QEM, the following are 2019-21 costs of implementing the recommended class sizes:

• 20 students in kindergarten and grade 1	\$110.6 million
• 23 students in grades 2 and 3	\$ 53.2 million
• 24 students in grades 4 and 5	\$ 64.1 million
• 29 students in core academic classes in grades 6 to 12	<u>\$142.0 million</u>
• Total	\$369.9 million

Recommendation #2

Provide funding to support specialists in every elementary school:

- **Art teacher;**
- **Music teacher;**
- **Physical Education teacher;**
- **Talented and Gifted teacher;**
- **Teacher Librarian;**
- **English Language Learning teacher; and**
- **School Counselor or Psychologist.**

The QEM and its recommended staffing levels for these specialists are used for this estimate. This model assumes that the equivalent of 4.5 FTE of a combination of these specialist is provided to the representative elementary school in the QEM. An elementary school of 360 pupils is the size of the representative school so larger or smaller schools would receive a correspondingly proportionate amount. Currently, the statewide average staffing level for these specialists is the equivalent of 3.0 FTE, so this estimate assumes the addition of 1.5 FTE for each representative school. The total cost for adding this additional 1.5 FTE across the state is \$250.4 million General Fund for 2019-21.

Recommendation #3

Provide sufficient funding for alternative programs for special needs and at-risk students in every middle and high school

The 2018 QEM report has an estimate that addresses this recommendation. This estimate assumes that 2.0 FTE would be added to each prototype middle school to assist these students while 1.75 FTE would be added to high schools. The estimated biennial cost for this is \$192.4 million General Fund.

GOAL: Implement effective programs and interventions in order to create high-quality educational experiences for Oregon's students.

Recommendation #1

Require ODE to develop a list of evidence-based and promising practices, strategies, and programs that districts can select from for their school improvement efforts

If this recommendation is just for ODE to develop the list it would be limited to some additional ODE staff time to research, compile, and distribute the list, likely less than one FTE (roughly

\$200,000 or less). If the effort was to expand to include bringing together teachers and other educators to develop the list the cost would increase. This approach would not include any funding for financial assistance to districts for school improvement efforts.

The 2019-21 Agency Request budget included a related \$28.4 million General Fund package to expand school improvement efforts including; (1) \$19.7 million to assist additional ESSA designated Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools, (2) \$4.0 million of General Fund backfill for decreased funding in federal Title I funding for school improvement grants, and (3) \$4.7 million to backfill the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) funding for Low Performing Schools and School & District Turnaround grants as NQTL funds are redirected to the proposed new Educator Advancement Council programs.

Recommendation #2

Require ODE to establish a separate accountability system for alternative schools.

- *Require ODE to provide targeted assistance and interventions to all alternative schools and programs.*
- *Require ODE to change the standard for identifying schools as Comprehensive Support and Improvement or Targeted Support and Improvement to include more non-alternative schools.*

There have been discussions with ODE staff regarding this recommendation. ODE has begun to address this issue as it was as part of a recent Secretary of State audit. At this time, a cost estimate is not completed. LFO and ODE will continue to work on determining a cost estimate in the future.

Recommendation #3

Establish categorical funding and require schools to establish before- or after-school tutoring and supports for struggling students.

This is very similar to the previous recommendation to assist special needs and at-risk students in every middle and high school. The primary difference is that this recommendation is for all grades and not just middle and high school. Using the same assumptions in the previous recommendation of 2.00 FTE for middle schools and 1.75 FTE for high schools as well as 0.50 FTE for elementary schools, the estimate for all three levels increases to \$275.7 million General Fund for 2019-21.

Recommendation #4

Establish categorical funding and require the following elements of a statewide Talented and Gifted (TAG) program:

- *Universal screening prior to 3rd grade using the potential-to-perform eligibility standard, identifying TAG students at every school with consideration of the state's equity lens;*
- *Periodic ODE evaluation of TAG identification disparities in each school district with recommendations to remedy those disparities;*
- *Program requirements for schools and districts, including teacher training requirements and consideration of school schedules.*

Under current practice, responsibility for identifying TAG students is left to the school districts and may consist of parental referrals, teacher referrals, or some form of standardized testing. There is a lack of uniformity across the state in identifying TAG students or the use of standardized testing. Results can vary from 30% of students identified as TAG students in a school district in the Willamette Valley to 2% of students identified as TAG eligible in a coastal school district. There are two tests that are nationally recognized. They are the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) and the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT). The average costs of the tests are \$10.50 per student and the test should be applied during second grade. There are roughly 45,000 second graders in any given year and it would cost \$472,500 per year to provide a consistent test to all second graders.

Periodic ODE evaluation to identify disparities in each district with ODE providing recommendations to address the disparities would require additional staff resources. Currently ODE has one position assigned to TAG responsibilities. It would likely take up to an additional two positions at a 24-month cost of \$296,694 each to meet this part of the recommendation.

The final part of this recommendation requires further work and further direction. Teachers would have to be trained in how to deliver educational services to TAG students. Some have estimated that one teacher per school on average would need to be certified for TAG expertise. This would be an expensive venture (1,400 schools at 88,000 per year) and Pacific University is the only school in the state that provides TSPC recognized TAG certification. The cost of certification is approximately \$9,000 and requires the successful completion of 13 credit hours of coursework. There are currently only 18 individuals with TAG certifications in the state. The larger questions include; (1) what direction should be taken on addressing TAG students, (2) the intensity of the instruction, and (3) what grade levels should be included. At the minimum, it is likely that additional professional development for all teachers is needed, possibly provided by teachers with the certification.

Recommendation #5

Identify students early in high school that should be placed in honors, Advanced Placement, or International Baccalaureate classes.

This seems to be more of a recommendation for teachers to communicate with each other about individual students. ODE could provide guidance or suggested criteria on what type of student should be considered for these classes, but there should not be a significant cost to ODE to provide that guidance.

Recommendation #6

Add sufficient funding to raise the cap on funding for students identified as special needs to 14 percent and add funding to the high-needs disability account.

It is important to note that both items mentioned here are funding mechanisms and do not necessarily cover all the costs of the student covered under the items.

Current law limits the number of students eligible for the Special Education or *special needs* weighting factor in the School Funding Formula to 11% of total district base ADM. For the 2016-17 school year, 159 districts exceeded the 11% while the remaining 38 districts were under the limit or had no IEP students. Currently the statewide percent of students eligible for this designation is

13.4%. If the limit or cap was increased to 14%, the annual cost of the increased is estimated to be \$81.4 million or \$163 million per biennium based on 2016-17 data. There would still be 79 school districts over the cap at 14%. This increase would mean changing the mix of distribution under the School Funding Formula benefitting some districts at the expense of others depending on their mix of students.

For the ***High Cost Disability Cost***, the carve-out from the State School Fund was increased from \$18 million annually to \$35 million annually starting in the 2015-16 school year. With that increase, the account has been able to cover roughly around 50% of the eligible costs (above \$30,000 per high cost eligible student). Based on the OED estimate for the 2017-18 school year, the \$35 million will cover 50.8% of the eligible costs. To cover all eligible costs based on the 2017-18 school year, an additional \$33.9 million annually would be needed or \$67.9 million for the biennium. There would also be some inflation that would increase that estimate some. The carve out from the State School Fund could be increased to cover these estimated increased costs, but that would mean less funding distributed to districts for the general grant through the formula.

Recommendation #7

Add a 1.75 FTE to ODE for Title IX Coordinator positions.

This would add one full-time Operations and Policy Analyst 4 position and one part-time Operations and Policy Analyst 3 position who would need a good understanding of federal and state civil rights law. The 2019-21 estimated cost would be \$501,820 General Fund with a small increase in future biennium since the full-time position would be for 22 months as it will not be hired right at the beginning of the biennium.

College and Career Ready Work Group

GOAL: Support and promote career-connected learning by leveraging the assets of the community. Career connected learning may occur through career and technical education (CTE) or career and technical student organizations (CTSOs). Community assets include (but are not limited to) businesses, local community colleges, and universities.

Recommendation #1

Fully fund Ballot Measure 98

Ballot Measure 98 (2016) established the High School Graduation and College and Career Readiness Program to address issues relating to career and technical education, college-level educational opportunities in high schools, and dropout prevention strategies. The Legislature funded this program at \$170 million for 2017-19. The Ballot Measure's language (statutory) assumed greater funding based on \$800 annually for each student in grades nine through twelve, so the \$170 million represented roughly 60% of assumed amount. The \$800 is to be adjusted each biennium base on the growth in the State School Fund. To fully fund Ballot Measure 98 for 2019-21, it is estimated that \$303.2 million will be required based on the estimated number of high school students and the increase in the State School Fund at current service level.

Recommendation #2

Support Career Technical Student Organizations (CTSO), incentivizing districts to create and continue chapters of these organizations. Use the list of organizations currently approved by the State Board of Education and add a method by which districts can ask to have additional CTOS recognized by the state.

The 2019-21 current service level includes \$727,000 General Fund in the Student Leadership Center program which provides funding for these types of organizations (e.g., DECCA, FFA) for statewide activities as well as grants to local school-based chapters. As of June 2018, there were 284 organizations at schools in Oregon with FFA representing the largest number at 103. For the 2017-18 grant cycle (first year of the biennium), there were \$131,800 in grants to local chapters (typically around \$1,000 each) which is less than in previous years where it has been around \$200,000. Roughly \$400,000 per biennium is allocated for local chapter grants, \$100,000 is reserved for statewide training, and some of the remaining is for administering the grants through a contract with an outside organization. Increasing the amount of funding would allow more funding being available for local district activities and programs. Students involved with these organizations still must pay fees and travel costs which may be keeping more students from participating.

There was a \$3 million proposal in 2012 which would have provided \$5,000 grants to local chapters which would have helped integrate the CTSO programs into school curriculum including supporting the CTSO teacher/advisor.

According to ODE staff there already exists a process for adding new organizations so more detail is required to determine the cost of this portion of the recommendation.

GOAL: Meet the statewide 40-40-20 goal by 2025 for those 25 and under in that year and every subsequent year.

Recommendation #1

Establish or continue culturally, linguistically, and disability responsive college and career navigation programs in every middle and high school, to include programs such as ASPIRE, AVID, and/or career counselors.

Funding is the 2019-21 current service level budget for the Office of Student Assistance and Completion (OSAC) of HECC is \$634,951 total funds which will provide grants to 155 schools with ASPIRE sites at a grant size of just less than \$4,100 per biennium. The ASPIRE program is located in schools and provides a variety of services including mentoring students. The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for the ASPIRE program includes an additional \$1.1 million General Fund for grants to another 113 sites at the same grant level. Average grants have not changed for a few biennia. A further \$1.7 million General Fund in resources would add funding for another 71 sites (bringing the total number of sites to 339) and increase the average grant to \$5,120. In contrast there are approximately 435 middle and high schools.

Counselors are trained and licensed for a comprehensive counseling system in the schools involving academic, guidance and mental/behavioral health related counseling. The guidance related functions make up only a share of the work they do, and the amount varies from school to school. A recommendation from another work group found that meet the counseling standards set out in the OARs, an additional \$237.9 million is required, but that is for counselors covering academic, guidance and mental/behavioral health. A third of that cost may roughly be attributable to guidance related activities allocating \$79.3 million General Fund as the cost.

Recommendation #2

Require every school district to adopt an intervention strategy and equip every district with an early warning system for students at risk of dropping out, including students who are chronically absent.

An Early Indicator and Intervention System (EIIS) combines the use of data and structured teams to proactively identify struggling students. EIIS is designed to signal in real time when a student begins to struggle. Not all districts have utilized the technology even as many have invested in their own systems. The 2019-21 Agency Request Budget included \$1 million for: (1) training on developing and implementing student focused teams, (2) developing and providing guidance on the necessary components for an EIIS, (3) training and guidance to districts on establishing an intervention tracking system, (4) funding to enable districts to evaluate their EIIS, and (5) resources for assisting districts in acquiring information technology solutions for creating an EIIS in the second year of the biennium. The first four items were allocated \$600,000 to assist 40 districts in the package while \$400,000 was allocated for the assistance in item #5. Overall, ODE estimates that 103 districts would be assisted with the \$1 million. There is also a proposal to provide districts

\$3.00 per ADM per year to fully fund the grants in item #5 for all districts This would cost an estimated \$3.5 million General Fund in 2019-21.

Recommendation #3

Require every school district to have an intervention program for 8th graders at risk, such as a summer bridge program.

Two programs were looked at that appear to meet the objectives of this recommendation. The target group for such a program were 8th graders that scored a 1 or a 2 on the English/language arts (ELA) or Math assessment. Just over 18,000 students met the criteria for English/language arts and approximately 24,300 students for Math. This estimate assumes roughly 50% of these students would participate and adjustments were made for those students that qualified for both ELA and Math. The estimate includes class time (15 hours per week) for each program area, transportation for some students, materials, and meals. This is based on a three-week program. The estimated cost of such a program is \$21.3 million General Fund. A four-week or five-week would roughly cost proportionately more. This estimate is also a statewide average, a more refined pricing would have to look at a district-level data.

Recommendation #4

Create a statewide network of students, supported by Education Service Districts, to advise policymakers.

There are two approaches to this recommendation. A more formal robust effort would provide Education Service Districts (ESD) with funding for a part-time position in each region to organize and lead the students involved in this process, costs of holding regional meetings, and costs of participation in state-wide meetings including travel. This assumes several students in each region participating. This could cost as much as \$2.8 million with additional costs at ODE to hold the state-wide meetings and to assist with setting up the regional structure.

A second approach would be to have a selected group of students with one or more selected by each ESD with little or no regional based meeting time. The state-wide group would meet quarterly with limited ODE resources setting up the meeting and staffing it. Much of the cost would be travel reimbursement of students traveling to Salem or central location to meet with policy makers. This more limited approach would be less than \$100,000 General Fund.

Recommendation #5

Direct ODE to work with OHA to combine current student surveys into a valid, reliable statewide student and school climate survey

Currently, the Oregon Health Authority - Public Health Division (OHA-PHD) administers the Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) and the Student Wellness Surveys (SWS) in alternate years. Both surveys have similar content and topic areas but use different methodologies. Some of the key content area differences between the two surveys are that the OHT contains questions related to reproductive and sexual health, physical activity and nutrition, while SWS contains more questions related to illicit drug use and attitudes and perceptions about substance use and other risk behaviors.

Both surveys include questions related to tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use, and also questions related to school success, school climate and safety, positive youth development and mental health. In 2020, OHA-PHD will launch a single integrated Student Health Survey to improve and streamline the survey.

Recommendation #6

As resources are available, support nonprofit community organizations at work on improving student achievement through literacy programs. Direct the State Board of Education to create a list of recommended programs for districts to engage as partners.

In the 2019-21 current service level there is a small appropriation (\$51,850 General Fund) to provide state support to the Reach Out and Read Program which incorporates books into pediatric care and encourages families to read out loud. Books are distributed through medical provider's offices. Also, in the current service level is \$271,631 General Fund for the Start Making a Reader Today or SMART program. SMART is a volunteer driven tutoring program for at-risk K-3 readers. Currently, approximately 5,000 volunteers in Oregon read with over 10,000 young students. Funding also is used to purchase books. ODE estimates that the funding provided to SMART resulted in the purchase of over 10,000 books as well as funding other costs of the program. State funds are combined with other funds for these programs including donations. SMART's average cost per child is \$325 annually. These and other similar programs could be expanded to serve more preschoolers and those at-risk students in the early grades.

Recommendation #7

Require and incentivize districts to establish district- and school-level attendance teams to work with the ODE technical assistance staff and resources outlined in the state's Chronic Absenteeism Statewide Plan. Require and incentivize ESDs to establish ESD-level attendance teams to support districts.

This is like a recommendation of the Students Ready and Able to Learn work group.

Chronic absenteeism is defined as "a student missing more than ten percent of enrolled school days for any reason". In 2016, the Legislature approved \$25,000 to develop a Chronic Absenteeism plan as well as \$500,000 General Fund for pilot projects. In 2017-19, \$6.2 million was approved for grants to districts to implement the plan and to hire "coaches" to help districts. This amount is carried forward in the 2019-21 current service level budget. In the 2019-21 Agency Request budget, ODE requested \$6.6 million General Fund in additional funding mostly for grants to make sure that districts with chronic absenteeism rates of 25% (state-wide average is 17%) are addressing the issue and to support regional consortiums to target culturally specific students in each region.

Recommendation #8

Require districts to create and implement family engagement plans. Direct ODE to establish a list of recommended practices for districts.

School districts are currently required to put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents in all its schools with Title I programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The parental involvement plan insures that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning; that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school; and that parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child.

Any school district receiving Title I funds is required to have a district wide parental involvement policy. Of the 196 school districts in Oregon, 188 receive Title I funds and are therefore required to have district-wide parental involvement policies. In addition to schools, the district wide policy would also cover Head Start, Reading First, Early Reading First, Even Start, Parents As Teachers, Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters, and State-operated preschool programs. ODE is responsible for ensuring that school districts receiving Title I funds have district wide parental involvement policies that meet the ESEA requirements. The districts not receiving Title I funds typically do not have enough students meeting the Title I requirements to make it worthwhile to accept the funds. ODE may have some limited costs to research and compile a list of recommended practices.

GOAL: Establish a statewide reengagement plan for youth who have left high school.

Recommendation #1

Direct the Youth Development Division (YDD) to develop and administer a statewide reengagement system for youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who have either left school or are not making sufficient progress toward meeting the requirements for a high school diploma. Under this system, school districts or community college districts can provide youth reengagement programs. Programs must offer academic instruction either for credit toward a diploma or to help prepare for the General Educational Development (GED) test, as well as services such as academic and career counseling or coaching, and assistance with accessing services or resources that support at-risk youth. Funding will be provided via the State School Fund. The State Board of Education will be authorized to establish, by rule, criteria for participating districts or community colleges to receive funding. Establish policies within Oregon's accountability system that will not penalize school districts for attempts to reengage students.

It is unclear what is meant by funding being provided via the State School Fund (SSF). This could mean a carve-out from the SSF, but that would mean less being distributed for general educational purposes without additional SSF funding. The estimate below is priced with the assumption that grants would be provided to schools or organizations to help create and implement qualified programs that enable eligible students to reengage in education.

YDD staff at ODE estimate that there are between 23,000 and 40,000 youth state-wide that would be eligible for a program like this. Based on program experience, YDD staff suggested that 7% to 10% of the eligible population would participate with the percentage growing as time went on. This estimate assumes a 24-month period that includes 7% participation for the first year and 10% for the second year. Per student cost is set at \$7,000 per year so the estimated 24-month cost from \$27.8 million to \$53.5 million General Fund depending on size of the eligible population (between 23,000 and 40,000). There would be some YDD and ODE start-up costs to establish or identify qualified programs.

LFO would suggest that a pilot program be first established and operated for at least a year to determine the effectiveness of the program and begin to establish best practices. This would also provide information of the potential number of participants as well as a more detailed estimate of the cost per student.

GOAL: Establish a certification program for Career and Technical Education (CTE) teachers that is standardized and transferable across districts.

Recommendation #1

Establish a task force, led by the Oregon Association for Career and Technical Education (CTE), that will examine the barriers to CTE licensure and make recommendations to the legislature.

As with other task force related recommendations, the estimated cost of this recommendation depends on how robust of a process is taken. If the intent is to have a series of meetings at a central location and have limited staff participation that would require backfill of current job responsibilities, the cost is not great (e.g., \$100,000). If there is greater staff participation and the need for research and other activities, the costs increase.

GOAL: Evaluate the effectiveness of assessments for informing teacher practices in real time and for giving students information about their progress in a timely manner.

Recommendation #1

Require districts to share scores with teachers immediately upon receipt.

This should not be a significant cost to ODE or to districts.

Recommendation #2

Encourage the use of formative assessments.

Oregon currently funds a federally mandated summative assessment with General and Federal Funds which is given once near the end of the school year for grades 3 through 8 and 11th. Summative assessments provide information how schools, districts and state-level programs prepare students to meet the state content standards. There are two other type of assessments which are more student-centered -- interim assessments and formative assessment practices. The 2019-21 Agency Requested Budget included funding to address the need for these other assessments and

assessment practices. General Fund resources were requested to purchase the interim assessment for Math and English/language arts (ELA) from the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium (SBAC) which provides the current summative assessment. ODE's \$3.4 million General Fund request assumes a rollout in the second year of the biennium with a student participation rate of 100%. Based on this assumption, the interim assessment cost would be \$2.0 million General Fund per year. Other components of the request costing an estimated \$400,000 General Fund includes funding for interim assessment for science for selected grades and training and technical assistance resources especially for use of formative assessment practices. In addition, \$725,000 General Fund was designated for assessment professional development and \$250,000 General Fund to support a systemic shift to a student-centered assessment system.

Based on recent conversations with ODE, the interim assessment component of this package could be rolled out the first year with a phased-in approach of student participation. The first year of the biennium would cost \$1.3 million General Fund for the interim assessment based on a student participation rate of 50%. The second year assumes a 75% participation rate costing \$1.5 million General Fund. A full two-year package with these assumptions would be \$5.55 million General Fund when you also include the other items above.

Recommendation #3

Fund resources to mitigate the disruption to schools caused by testing, such as additional computers and test proctors to speed the process.

Disruption during the assessment testing occurs for several reasons including tying up computer labs, movement of students, and lost learning time. Testing generally happens around the month of May concentrating the disruptions over a short period of time. One solution may be to make available computers or devices which would allow students to take the tests in their own classroom. The American Institute for Research (AIR) who administers the assessments for Oregon says that devices like a Chromebook meets the technical needs. Providing resources to districts to purchase a set of these for a group of classrooms could prevent some of the disruptions and still allow for the tests to be taken within a given time frame.

Based on a set of devices for each five classrooms in the grade levels required to take the assessments and using 2017-18 class size and enrollment data, an estimated 63,164 devices would be required. At a per unit cost of \$220 with additional cost per unit for other equipment (e.g., transport cart) the total cost would be approximately \$14.5 million across the state. There would have to be consideration for those districts with limited broadband access (mainly smaller districts). These devices could be used for other uses during the year including the interim assessment discussed in the recommendation above. There would still be disruptions including that in the classroom, but other disruptions in the school would be decreased.

Recommendation #4

Include growth information (past years' scores) on individual student reports in order to give context for current scores.

This should not be a significant cost to implement this. ODE will have some programming costs as the student report is changed, but they do make changes to these reports from time to time.

Students Ready and Able to Learn Work Group

GOAL: Support healthy attached family relationships to help ensure every child is ready to learn when they enter school by providing access to services for all children and families who need them; including but not limited to, prenatal care, home visiting, education and engagement for new parents, and school readiness programs.

Recommendation #1

Expand home visiting programs to move toward voluntary universal home screening and ensure that families with identified service needs are directed to the appropriate service providers.

The Early Learning Division's (ELD) primary home visiting program is the Healthy Families Oregon program funded at \$30.7 million total funds (\$25.7 million General Fund) in the 2019-21 current service level budget. Assuming the same number of recipients (families) as estimated that will be served in 2017-19 (3,237), the estimated average cost per family will be \$9,444 total funds. For 2017-19, between 10% and 11% of the total estimated 30,000 eligible families were served. Each additional 1,000 served will cost an estimated \$9.4 million. To serve 25% of the eligible population will cost an additional \$40.3 million.

As the Joint Committee considers this recommendation, it is recommended to look at the other home visiting programs administrated by the State. Another program may be more appropriate for some of the families than this particular program.

Recommendation #2

Increase access to intensive early childhood services such as Early Head Start and Relief Nurseries.

For the 2019-21 current service level, **Early Head Start** is funded at just less than \$1.7 million (all General Fund) providing funding for 64 slots. In addition, federal funding provides for approximately 2,000 slots. The estimated need for services under this program is roughly 25,000 children. Adding another 1,000 slots would cost approximately \$25 million General Fund.

Current service level funding for **Relief Nurseries** is \$11.4 million total funds (\$9.3 million General Fund). Average funding per child is approximately \$7,700 and the anticipated 3,300 children served during 2017-19 represented under 10% of the children needing some level of service. Adding services for another 1,000 children is estimated to cost \$7.8 million General Fund for 2019-21.

Recommendation #3

Fully fund Early Intervention (EI) and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) services for children with disabilities and delayed learning.

The 2019-21 current service level budget for the Early Intervention program (up to age 3) and the Early Childhood Special Education program (age 3-5) totals \$227.5 million total funds (\$194.4 million General Fund). This federally mandated program serves all eligible children based on the need for services which is estimated at 26,000. In reality, the funding has not kept pace with the increasing costs, so service levels have been reduced over time. Based on the current estimated costs and student needs, it would take an additional \$75 million General Fund to fully fund the program for 2019-21.

Recommendation #4

Explore additional policy options to build an integrated birth-to-five system that supports children and families.

Without identification of what these options are it is impossible to provide a cost estimate. The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for ELD did include a \$10 million General Fund for a parenting education program to “support establishment, expansion and sustainability of community-based parenting education programs”. This proposal would build in part upon the foundation-funded Oregon Parenting Education Collaborative (OPEC) that is available to families in 32 counties through 15 parenting hubs. There are likely other options that meet the intent of this recommendation that can be explored.

GOAL: Provide all children with access to affordable high-quality preschool programs.

Recommendation #1

Increase access to state subsidized preschool programs for children aged 3 to 5 who have not entered kindergarten, particularly for children living at or below 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL).

The State funds two primary preschool programs for children age 3 till they attend Kindergarten. Oregon PreK program serves 8,100 children out of the approximately 20,000 eligible children under 100% of the FPL (the companion federally funded Head Start program serves another 4,400) and costs \$9,100 annually per child (2017-19 cost). Preschool Promise costs \$11,500 annually per child and serves 1,300 children of the roughly 40,000 that are eligible. 2019-21 current service level funding for Oregon PreK is \$156.4 million and is \$37.1 million for Preschool Promise.

For **OR PreK**, if the assumption is to serve half of the remaining approximately 7,500 children, eligible but not served, the 2019-21 cost would be roughly \$70 million General Fund. This is a full 24-month cost and likely would be phased-in at a lower cost. This does not address issues including transportation and compensation issues that have been brought forward by advocates.

To illustrate the cost of adding additional **Preschool Promise** capacity, the Agency Request budget for ELD included a package which increased the number children served by 10,000 including a dedicated Tribal set aside (400 slots) by the end of 2019-21. This phased-in cost was approximately \$131 million General Fund plus additional funding for agency operations and capacity building. A fully phased-in two-year estimate for the 10,000-child expansion is \$239 million plus the operations and capacity building resources.

It should be noted that these cost estimates assume that there are sufficient quality providers which in many areas of the state is an issue. There may be alternative program designs for preschool programs available, but until they are identified they cannot be “priced-out”.

Recommendation #2

Expand the early learning workforce by increasing the capacity of training and certification programs across the state.

Almost all the community colleges have some associates degree or certificate programs for early learning and education. The programs at the four-year institutions are also now very important given the recent federal and state quality efforts which require or recommend bachelor’s degrees for some of this workforce. The Governor’s budget for 2019-21 includes funding of \$7 million General Fund that would address this recommendation. Initial discussions indicate that \$1 million would be directed at efforts between community colleges and public universities to establish career paths for early learning workers seeking certificates and degrees in the subject area. This is to coordinate the programs between institutions, so students have a smoother transition. The remaining \$6 million would be for financial assistance to early learning and education students across the spectrum of programs.

GOAL: Provide sufficient resources to schools and families to meet the behavioral health, physical health, nutritional and support needs so students can reach their full potential to learn.

Recommendation #1

Increase access to behavioral and physical health services by increasing the number of counseling, mental health, school nurses, and other staff available to students. These services could be provided directly by school staff or in partnership with other organizations such as School-Based Health Centers, Community Care Organizations (CCOs), community groups, and county mental health and public health agencies.

The cost of this recommendation should be explored in more detail. This very rough estimate should be viewed as providing a perspective of what magnitude this recommendation’s cost might be. For this first attempt, the estimate relies on standards for number of nurses or counselors in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs). For the general school population, the standards call for one nurse for each 750 students, while for counselors the standard is one counselor for each 250 students for a comprehensive counseling program. These ratios are used on a total school population of 580,000 (2017-18).

For nurses, there are several nurses assigned to medically fragile or complex students or students who are dependent on a nurse to be in school. This reduced the number of students to apply the ratio to since they already had a nurse allocated to them. Based on this, the ratio or standard drives the need for 738 nurses. After factoring out the number of current nurses, the result demonstrated the need for 637 additional nurses. Based on the state average for school nurses' compensation, the net cost for nurses after adjusting for cost increases since 2017-18 is \$126.1 million for the 2019-21 biennium. It should be noted that some of this could be offset by districts (possibly with state assistance) being more aggressive in seeking Medicaid reimbursement for some of the services.

OAR 582.022.2060 requires districts to have a comprehensive counseling system which would include both advising/guidance and mental health. The 250:1 ratio is a recommendation, not a requirement. Using the same type of calculation for counselors, the ratio or standard demonstrates the need for a net increase for 1,109 more counselors. The 2019-21 estimate for this is \$237.9 million. It is likely that any serious mental health issue would have to be referred to another staff professional with more mental health related training or to an outside entity. This number should not be considered as the total need for mental or behavioral health since many school districts currently contract out for mental health services, so it is difficult to factor that into this net estimate. On the other hand, the need for mental health services was repeated over and over again as one of the primary needs for the schools. The 250:1 ratio may date back several years and may not truly reflect current needs.

This very rough estimate assumes that these needs to be filled with district hired staff. A district may find it more effective and efficient to contract with a CCO, public health department or other provider for these services based on local factors. Regardless, this is one area there should be much more work in determining what level the need is and the resources required to meet that need.

Recommendation #2

Establish a funding source/formula separate from the State School Fund specifically for school physical and mental health as well as for other “wraparound” and support services.

This is a recommendation to establish a separate funding stream for specific services. By itself this recommendation does not cost a specific amount but is a means of distributing funding to districts based on specific factors. Examples of the funding that could be distributed through this mechanism could include that outlined in recommendation #1 above or the following recommendation #3. There might be a cost to ODE to establish the initial formula and then the ongoing costs for calculating and distributing the funds like what is currently done for the general school revenue formula.

Recommendation #3

Provide greater access and connections for students and their families to wraparound and support services that address issues that prevent a student from reaching their full potential.

In general, wraparound services can be understood as offering health, behavioral health, nutrition, social services, and other supports to families and children to assist in educational success. Wraparound services can be provided in several ways including focused teams assisting individual students, a community school setting, or where the school provides a staff person (contract or

school staff) who works connecting services with the student and their family. Many schools and communities have their own models for providing wraparound services based on local views of what needed and what local services are available.

To illustrate what the cost might be statewide, the Family Access Network (FAN) model is used. FAN is a network of partners in Central Oregon including 52 K-12 public schools in Deschutes and Crook Counties and 100+ community partners including local churches, businesses, services clubs, non-profit organizations, and county departments. The school districts provide staffing in the schools to link students and families with referrals to local resources for food, clothing, stable housing, and healthcare. This model, or a similar model, could prove useful in having a resource within each school responsible for providing referrals to social services to ensure that students are ready and able to learn. The school districts in Deschutes and Crook Counties contribute 26 positions to staff the 52 schools.

There are approximately 1,410 schools in Oregon and placing a half-time advocate responsible for referrals and assistance would require 710 positions. Schools with smaller enrollments would need fewer resources while larger schools would need more. These positions would be at the instructional assistant level and it is assumed that one full-time position would staff two schools. Each FTE would cost approximately \$50,336 annually including compensation and all benefits. The total statewide cost estimate would be approximately \$71.4 million General Fund per biennium.

Recommendation #4

To address hunger of school-aged children, expand the eligibility for free/reduced lunches or make it easier for more schools to use a school wide free breakfast/lunch program.

There are two options in this recommendation -- (1) increase the income threshold for eligibility of children to get free and reduced breakfasts and lunches and (2) make it easier for schools to participate in the Community Eligibility program which provides the opportunity for schools to offer free breakfasts and lunches to all students in the school.

Currently, students are eligible for free breakfasts and lunches if their household income is at or below 130% of FPL and reduced priced meals if household income is at or below 185% of FPL. For breakfast, federal funds are used to reimburse schools \$1.75 for each free meal and \$1.45 for a reduced-price meal. For lunch, federal funds are used to reimburse school \$3.33 for each free meal and \$ 2.93 for a reduced-price meal. The first option would increase the threshold for reduced prices for students in households with relatively higher incomes. For those students in the households with higher incomes, state General Fund resources would have to be used since they are above federal eligibility levels. 2019-21 costs are:

Breakfast

Cost of covering households between 185 and 200%	\$8.5 million General Fund
Cost of covering households between 200% and 250%	\$12.9 million General Fund

Lunch

Cost of covering households between 185 and 200%	\$35.2 million General Fund
Cost of covering households between 200% and 250%	\$53.6 million General Fund

The second option is to make more schools elect Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) by providing funding so all meals served are reimbursed at a rate equivalent to the federal free rate. In the 2016-17 school year, 94 of 331 schools participating in CEP were eligible for all meals being reimbursed at the federal free rate since at least 62.5% of the students were included in the Identified Student Percentage (ISP). For those qualified schools where their ISP students make up is between 40% and 62.5%, it is estimated that \$3.9 million General Fund would be required for breakfast and \$13.3 million General Fund for lunch. This would enable 237 schools participating in the Community Eligibility program to have all meals funded at the federal free rate and add 124 schools which are eligible for Community Eligibility but don't participate because they would receive less federal meal reimbursements.

GOAL: Maximize learning time for students, including instructional time, through a longer school year, summer learning programs and increased student attendance

Recommendation #1

Increase learning time by adding additional days to the school year including factoring in those districts with alternative school periods such as four-day weeks.

The cost of adding a school day is \$51.6 million per day for 2019-21 based on the QEM. From information provided by ODE, the length of the school year in Oregon ranges from less than 140 days to over 185 days (some may be four-day per week schools). More importantly is the average length of the school day factoring in district enrollment. When this is factored in, the weighted length of the school year for the 2017-18 school year was roughly 170 days. Many policy makers would like to have a 180 school year Oregon's districts. That would mean a further investment of an additional \$516 million General Fund for 2019-21 to bring the average up to 180 days holding all other costs proportionately even

Recommendation #2

Provide resources so students have access to a three- to six-week summer learning program starting initially with low income students who are behind current education benchmarks.

The 2018 QEM report included the cost of additional summer school for struggling students at \$33 million General Fund. This amount assumes that this is an increase over and above what is already spent for this purpose. This assumed that 20% of the students would participate (excluding kindergarteners) in a 5week/5 day per week session.

Recommendation #3

Support statewide and district level efforts to reduce chronic absenteeism

.

This is similar to a recommendation of the College and Career Ready work group.

Chronic absenteeism is defined as "a student missing more than ten percent of enrolled school days for any reason". In 2016, the Legislature approved \$25,000 to develop a Chronic Absenteeism plan as well as \$500,000 General Fund for pilot projects. In 2017-19, \$6.2 million was approved for

grants to districts to implement the plan and to hire “coaches” to help districts. This amount is carried forward in the 2019-21 current service level budget. In the 2019-21 Agency Request Budget, ODE requested \$6.6 million General Fund in additional funding mostly for grants to make sure that districts with chronic absenteeism rates of 25% (state-wide average is 17%) are addressing the issue and to support regional consortiums to target culturally specific students in each region.

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Goal and Recommendations	Assumptions	<u>Millions of \$</u>			Comments
		General Fund	Other Funds		

High Quality Classroom Work Group

Supporting qualified teachers in every classroom					
1. Grow-your-own program for educator workforce.	\$5,000 annual grants to offset tuition & other costs of attending college for 1,300 students.	\$ 20.7			Builds on \$16.7 million proposal from COSA.
2. Establish the Educator Advancement Council (EAC) as part of ODE.	Locate EAC in ODE -- costs are 2019-21 Governor's budget. Represents 10 positions and grants with \$8 million of the grants transferred to HECC for Oregon Scholars program and for student financial assistance to early learning students at post-secondary institutions.	\$ 19.6	\$ 41.3		Other Funds is Network for Quality Teaching and Learning (NQTL) carveout from State School Fund.
3. Align collective bargaining to biennial two year time frame.	Not able to calculate because this is one of many issues or factors negotiated in labor agreement.				
4. Establish a comprehensive mentorship and professional development system.	Based on Iowa's system with a career path for teachers. There are two components to this cost -- (1) financial incentive for model, mentor, and lead teacher; and (2) backfill for lost instructional time of these teachers as they mentor and provide professional development.	\$ 379.6			This estimate assumes using the average beginning teacher salary for the backfill component. If the state only paid for the increased compensation portion of the cost, the estimate drops to \$41.8 million for 2019-21.
5. Establish needs based loan or scholarship program for teachers committing to teaching in Oregon for 10 years.	Assumes 500 new participants per year for \$5,000 annual scholarships for 4 years.	\$ 19.5			Two year scholarships would have an \$11.3 million two-year cost. 2019-21 costs would be less as program is phased-in.

Educators prepared to teach to changing demographics and communities

1. Support the Oregon Teacher Scholars Program.	Reflects Governor's 2019-21 budget for up to 200 scholarships of \$5,000 per year.	\$ 1.0			
---	--	--------	--	--	--

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Millions of \$

Goal and Recommendations		Assumptions		General Fund		Other Funds		Comments
--------------------------	--	-------------	--	--------------	--	-------------	--	----------

Schools have facilities that are accessible, safe, healthy, secure and meet the needs of students

1. Increase funding for the Oregon School Capital Improvement Matching (OSCIM) program at ODE.	Assume \$216.1 million in unmet need in first two biennia of program. General Fund is the potential debt service on the \$216.1 million in bonds sold for a biennium.	\$	32.6	\$	216.1	Could grow substantially given other recommendations.		
2. Increase funding for the Seismic Rehabilitation Grants for schools.	Pricing is based on \$125 million in unmet need for 2018 grant cycle. General Fund is the debt service on this unmet need for a biennium.	\$	18.9	\$	125.0	Need is likely much more than this. 2007 study by DOGAMI showed a need of \$750 million. ODE is working on updating that study.		
3. Implement the recommendations of the School Safety Task Force.	2019-21 Agency Request budget included \$1.9 million General Fund package -- \$1.7 million would be sent to ESDs to hire/contract regionally-based school safety, youth suicide prevention, and student threat specialists.	\$	3.7			Two year biennial cost for this package is \$3.7 million General Fund.		

Implement policy goals of the Quality Education Model (QEM)

1. Reduce class size in elementary grades and in core academic classes in grades 6 to 12.	K-1 to 20 students - \$110.6M, 2-3 to 23 students - \$53.2M, 4-5 to 24 students - \$64.1M, 6-12 Core classes to 29 students - \$142.0M.	\$	369.9			2019-21 biennium costs using QEM.		
2. Provide funding for support specialists in elementary school including art, music, phy ed, TAG, Librarian, ELL, & counselor.	QEM assumes that 4.5 FTE of a combination of these specialists are required for elementary school of 360 students. Assume that 3.0 FTE already exists so this cost is for an additional 1.5 FTE.	\$	250.4			2019-21 biennium costs using QEM.		
3. Provide sufficient funding for alternative programs for special needs and at-risk students in middle and high school.	QEM estimate assumes 2.0 FTE for each prototype middle school to assist these students and 1.75 FTE for high schools.	\$	192.4			2019-21 biennium costs using QEM.		

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Millions of \$

Goal and Recommendations	Assumptions	Funds			Comments
		General	Other	Funds	

Implement effective programs and interventions for high-quality educational experiences

1. Require ODE to develop list of evidence-based practices, strategies, and programs for school improvement efforts.	If only providing list cost is \$200,000 GF or less. The 2019-21 Agency Request budget included a \$28.4 million GF package including additional school improvement grants (\$19.7M) and backfill of lost federal and NQTL funds (\$8.7M).	\$	28.4		Need to check whether the grants are for one year of the biennium or two.
2. Establish separate accountability system for alternative schools.	Discussions underway with ODE to design and price out recommendation.				
3. Establish categorical funding for before- or after-school tutoring and supports for struggling students.	Similar to recommendation above. QEM estimate assumes 2.0 FTE for each prototype middle school to assist these students and 1.75 FTE for high schools as well as 0.50 FTE for elementary schools.	\$	275.7		2019-21 biennium costs using QEM.
4. Establish categorical funding for statewide TAG program.	Testing or assessment - less than \$0.5 million. Review of TAG disparities in districts up to \$0.6 million. Still working on grants for teacher training.	\$	1.1		
5. Identify students early for placement in Honors, AP or IB Classes.	Seems to be more of a need for teachers to communicate more about individual students. ODE could provide some guidance on criteria but cost would not be significant.				
6a. Add sufficient funding to raise cap on special needs students from 11% to 14%.	Current statewide special needs students is 13.4% with 159 districts exceeding current 11% limit in 2016-17. With 14% cap, there would still be 79 districts over the cap.	\$	163.0		Based on 2016-17 data. Is a two year biennial estimate. Cost assumes General Fund is added to State School Fund to cover this increase.
6b. Add funding to the High-Cost Disability Account.	Currently the Account is set at \$35 million annually as a carve-out from SSF. The estimate is to cover all additional costs based on 2017-18 need.	\$	67.9		Based on 2017-18 data. Is a two year biennial estimate. Cost assumes General Fund is added to State School Fund to cover this increase.
7. Add staff (1.75) FTE to ODE for Title IX coordinator positions.	Add one full-time and one part-time position, both of which must have good understanding of federal and state civil rights law.	\$	0.5		2019-21 cost with slight increase for 2021-23 because of phase-in of positions.

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Millions of \$

General Fund Other Funds Comments

Goal and Recommendations

Assumptions

College and Career Ready Work Group

Support career-connected learning by leveraging community assets

1. Fully fund Ballot Measure 98.	2019-21 current service level has BM fully funded based on \$800 per high school student at \$303.2 million GF. 2017-19 budget had \$170 million.	\$ -		Governor's budget includes the \$170 million maintaining the same level of funding as 2017-19.
2. Support Career Technical Student Organizations (CTSO) such as DECA and FFA.	A 2012 proposal would provide \$5,000 grants to local chapters to invest in their programs.	\$ 3.0		2019-21 current service level has \$727,000 General Fund for these organizations.

Meet the 40-40-20 goal by 2025 for those 25 and under in that year and subsequent years

1a. Establish or continue culturally, linguistically, and disability responsive college and career programs in middle & high schools through increase in the ASPIRE program.	Current ASPIRE funding serves 155 schools. A proposal to add \$2.8 million for these grants would fund an additional 184 ASPIRE sites and increase the average grants to \$5,020.	\$ 2.8		2019-21 current service level budget has \$634,951 GF for ASPIRE grants to schools. There are approximately 435 middle and high schools.
1b. Establish or continue culturally, linguistically, and disability responsive college and career programs in middle & high schools through increasing the number of high school guidance counselors.	State OAR standards for a comprehensive counseling program recommends one counselor for every 250 students. This estimate factors in the number of existing counselors so there is a need for approximately 1,100 more counselors. Guidance related functions make up only a portion of these activities so one third of the costs are allocated to this function.	\$ 79.3		This amount could overestimate the need for guidance related counselors since the 1:250 standard is for a comprehensive program including mental health, guidance and academic counseling and further analysis is needed to determine what share guidance related activities make up.
2. Require every school district have an intervention strategy and an early warning system for students at-risk of dropping out.	This calls for an Early Indicator and Intervention System (EIIIS) to track students. The ODE 2019-21 Agency Request budget included a \$1 million package to assist districts in using EIIIS systems with grants and technical assistance. Overall, 103 districts would be served.	\$ 1.0		There is also a proposal to assist all districts through a \$3 per ADM for grants to buy or develop systems. Total 2019-21 cost for this proposal is \$3.5 million General Fund.

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Goal and Recommendations		Assumptions		Millions of \$		Comments
				General Fund	Other Funds	
3. Require every district have an intervention program for 8th graders at risk, such as a summer bridge program.		Based on two existing programs, a statewide amount was estimated for those students who scored a 1 or 2 on their ELA or Math assessment. Assumes a three week program along with transportation and meals.		\$ 21.3		Assumes a 50% participation rate after accounting for those students who scored a 1 or 2 on both assessments.
4. Create a statewide network of students to advise policy makers.		A more robust effort would provide ESDs with funding to set up regionally based panels who would meet and then those panels would participate at the state level. Assumes a part-time position for each ESD.		\$ 2.8		A less intense effort would be the selection of one or two students from each region and pay for their costs of attending quarterly statewide meetings. \$100,000 or less would pay for their travel costs.
5. Combine the two current student surveys into one survey.		OHA is planning to combine their Oregon Healthy Teens survey with the Student Wellness Survey in 2020.				
6. Support nonprofit community organizations to improve student achievement through literacy programs.		The 2019-21 current service level has over \$323,000 GF for the pediatric based Reach Out and Read program and for the Start Making a Reader Today (SMART) program. Expansion of these programs could reach a greater number of children.				
7. Incentivize districts to adopt attendance teams to carry out the state's Chronic Absenteeism plan.		The 2019-21 Agency Request budget includes an additional \$6.6 million GF to add to the CSL funding of \$6.2M for grants to districts so those districts with choric absenteeism rates of 25% have resources.		\$ 6.6		Statewide chronic absenteeism rate is 17%. There is a similar recommendation in the Students Ready and Able to Learn work group.
8. Require districts to create and implement family engagement plans -- ODE to provide list of recommended practices.		Currently ESSA requires Title I districts to have some form of a parent involvement plan and implement it -- most districts are Title I districts. ODE may have some costs in providing the best practices to districts.				

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Millions of \$

Goal and Recommendations	Assumptions	Funds			Comments
		General	Other	Funds	

Establish a statewide reengagement plan for youth who have left high school

1. Direct YDD to develop and administer a statewide reengagement system for youth who have left school or are falling behind.	YDD estimates that between 23,000 and 40,000 students are eligible. Assuming a participation rate 7% in the first year and 10% in the second year and an average annual cost of \$7,000 per student, the range for a 24 month cost is \$27.8M to \$53.5M depending on number of eligible youth.	\$	53.5		Given that this is a newer concept for the state, a pilot program should operate for at least a year to determine the effectiveness of the program and to identify best practices.
---	---	----	------	--	--

Establish a certification program for CTE teachers that is standardized and transferable across districts

1. Establish a task force that will examine barriers to CTE licensure and make legislative recommendations	The cost depends on the number of meetings and staffing needs. If there is limited staff needs and no need to backfill for staff attending to task force business, the costs should be small -- e.g., \$100,000 for travel and other expenses.				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Evaluate effectiveness of assessments for informing teachers practices in real time and giving student timely information

1. Require districts to share assessment scores with teachers immediately upon receipt.	There should not be a significant cost to ODE or to districts.				
2. Encourage the use of formative assessments.	The 2019-21 Agency Request budget requested \$3.4 million GF for an interim assessment from SBAC available in the second year of the biennium; and funding for professional development, support a shift to student-centered assessment, and an interim assessment for science in selected grades.	\$	3.4		A fully funded 24-month package like this with the interim assessments available for 24 months would cost \$5.5 million General Fund. Under this proposal, first year participation would be 50% and second year participation would be 75%.
3. Mitigate disruption to schools from assessments.	This estimate assumes that every five classrooms would get a set of Chromebooks that could be used for the giving the assessment in the classroom instead of a computer lab or other central area of the school.	\$	14.5		Would represent over 63,000 devices purchased. They could be used for other functions including interim assessments. Initially a one-time cost but would need replacement schedule.
4. Include past years' scores on individual student reports.	There should be no significant cost to implement this. ODE will have programming costs.				

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Goal and Recommendations	Assumptions	<u>Millions of \$</u>			Comments
		General Fund	Other Funds		

Students Ready and Able to Learn Work Group

Support health attached family relationships to ensure every child is ready to learn

1. Expand home visiting programs to move toward voluntary universal home screening.	The estimate is based on expanding the Healthy Families Oregon program to serve 25% of the eligible population. Currently about 10% or 11% of the population is served.	\$ 40.3		There are other home visiting programs at OHA that might be more appropriate for some families.
2a. Increase access to Early Head Start.	Currently, the State funds 64 slots and the federal government funds approximately 2,000 slots. This estimate is based on the State providing another 1,000 slots.	\$ 25.0		There is an estimated population of 25,000 children who might need or would benefit from this program.
2b. Increase access to Relief Nurseries.	Current funding for this program is \$9.3 million GF and the anticipated 3,300 children served in 2017-19 represents 10% of the children. This estimate is based on adding resources for another 1,000 children.	\$ 7.8		There is also federal funding for this program, but at this time it is assumed no further federal funding is available.
3. Fully fund the Early Intervention (EI) and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) programs.	Current service level funding for 2019-21 is \$227.5 million TF (\$194.4 million GF). Total estimated cost to serve the needs of the 26,000 children is \$75 million GF higher based on most recent estimate.	\$ 75.0		This is a federally mandated program and service levels have been reduced in the past to keep within the programs' budgets.
4. Explore additional policy options of an integrated birth-to-five system.	The 2019-21 Agency Request budget for ELD included \$10 million GF for a parenting education program.	\$ 10.0		At least a portion of this request was to expand on the Oregon Parenting Education Collaborative.

Provide all children with access to affordable high-quality preschool programs

1a. Increase access to subsidized preschool programs aged 3-5 at or below 200% FPL -- OR PreK program.	The OR PreK program along with the federal Head Start program serves about 12,500 of the 20,000 children below 100% of the federal poverty level (FPL). This estimate assumes serving the remaining 7,500 children.	\$ 70.0		This likely overestimates the need as some families under 100% FPL still would not participate. This figure does not address other issues (e.g., compensation).
--	---	---------	--	---

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Goal and Recommendations		Assumptions		<u>Millions of \$</u>		Comments
				General Fund	Other Funds	
1b. Increase access to subsidized preschool programs aged 3-5 at or below 200% FPL -- Preschool Promise.		The Preschool Promise program serves children up to 200% FPL and current funding of \$37.1 million GF serves 1,300 children. The 2019-21 Agency Request budget included funding to serve another 10,000 children by the end of 19-21.		\$ 131.0		The propose package would be phased-in during the 2019-21 biennium. Full two-year funding is estimated at \$239 million GF. There would also be some costs for capacity building and limited ODE staff.
2. Expand the early learning workforce by increasing capacity of training and certification.		The 2019-21 Governor's budget includes a package to address this recommendation by proposing \$1 million GF for grants to community colleges and public universities to partner in early learning career pathways. There is also \$7 million GF for financial assistance for those earning early learning related degrees and certificates.		\$ 7.0		Need to determine the phase-in of this package to get full two year cost.

Provide sufficient resources to school and families for behavioral health, physical health, nutritional and support needs

1. Increased access to behavioral and physical health services by increasing counseling, mental health, and other staff available to students.	This estimate is priced by looking at the recommended standards in the OARs for school nurses and that for comprehensive counselors. The recommended standards for nurses for the general student population is 1:750 and for counselors is 1:250. The current number of nurses and counselors are factored in for the estimate. It is very possible that this is an underestimate, especially for behavioral and mental health.	see below			This is a rough estimate and requires significantly more work in identifying the current resources and what the needed resources are in this area. This is likely more difficult in the behavioral health area. This estimate assumes district staff, but each district needs to determine which works best depending on district staff or from some outside entity like a CCO or county public or mental health agency.
1a. Nurses			\$	126.1	
1b. Counselors			\$	237.9	

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Goal and Recommendations		Assumptions		<u>Millions of \$</u>		Comments
				General Fund	Other Funds	
2. Establish a funding source/formula separate from the State School Fund for physical, behavioral/mental health, and wrap-around services.		There is not a cost beyond the establishment and administrative costs associated with the distribution formula. This is a means of distributing funding such as that found relating to recommendations #1 and #3 under this goal.				
3. Provide access and connections for students and families to wrap-around and support services.		For this estimate it was assumed that each school should be provided resources equivalent to 0.50 FTE (half-time position) to assist students and families to connect with services in the district as well as in the wider community. This is based on a model used in Central Oregon.		\$ 71.4		This could be provided by district staff or the resources could be used to contract with other organizations to perform similar services.
4. Expand the eligibility for free/reduced lunches or make it easier for more schools to use a school-wide free breakfast/lunch program.						
4a. Increase income threshold for eligibility to get free/reduced breakfasts and lunches.		Increase to 250% of FPL for breakfasts and lunches.		\$ 110.2		
4b. Enable more schools to elect to participate in the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP).		Enables the number of schools participating to increase from 94 to 237 schools (based on 2016-17 information).		\$ 17.2		

Recommendations of the Joint Committee on Student Success's Work Groups

Goal and Recommendations		Assumptions		<u>Millions of \$\$</u>			Comments
				General Fund	Other Fund	Funds	
Maximize learning time for students through longer instruction time, longer school year, and increased student attendance							
1. Add additional days to school year to increase learning time.	Based on the QEM, each additional day costs \$51.6 million for 2019-21. Based on the current weighted number of school days of 170 days, this estimate assumes getting to 180 days per year.	\$	516.0			Would need to adjust to allow for flexibility on how to achieve this for some districts (e.g., 4 day per week school year).	
2. Provide resources for a three to six week summer learning program.	The 2018 QEM report includes an estimate for a five week (5 days per week) for summer school for struggling students. This amount assumes that this is an increase of what is being provided for now.	\$	33.0				
3. Support state-wide and district level efforts to reduce chronic absenteeism.	The 2019-21 Agency Request budget includes an additional \$6.6 million GF to add to the CSL funding of \$6.2M for grants to districts so those districts with chronic absenteeism rates of 25% have resources.	\$	6.6			Current state-wide chronic absenteeism rate is 17%. Similar to recommendation in the College and Career Ready work group.	



**The Diverse and Learner-Ready Teachers Initiative
Vision and Guidance Paper**

Ensuring a Diverse and Learner-Ready Teacher Workforce: Vision and Guidance Paper

A Diverse and Learner-Ready Teacher Workforce: A Critical Equity Issue of Our Time

Racial diversity benefits every workforce,ⁱ and our nation's schools and classrooms are no exception. Research shows that all students benefit from having a diverse group of teachers that come from a variety of backgrounds as they prepare to enter an increasingly global society.ⁱⁱ Regular exposure to and interactions with individuals from a variety of races and ethnic groups, especially during childhood, can help to combat stereotypes, strengthen students' abilities to become comfortable with peers from different backgrounds, reduce unconscious implicit biases inside and outside the classroom, and lead to innovative and greater social-cohesion.ⁱⁱⁱ Students benefit from mirrors and windows; the mirror representing the story that reflects their own culture and helps them build their own identity, and the window that offers them a view into someone else's experience. Simply stated, diversity makes us smarter. Research demonstrates that "students' exposure to other students who are different from themselves and the novel ideas and challenges that such exposure brings leads to improved cognitive skills, including critical thinking and problem solving."^{iv}

While a diverse teacher workforce is valuable for all students in a pluralistic society, a racially diverse teacher workforce is a necessary step to advance educational equity. In 2017, the Council of Chief State Schools Officers (CCSSO) partnered with the Aspen Institute Education & Society Program to develop *Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs*, ten actions state chiefs can take to create a more equitable education system in their state. **Commitment #8, Focus on Teachers and Leaders**, affirms that in order

to ensure equitable access to effective teaching, states chiefs must ensure educators are prepared to teach our increasingly diverse student population. In addition to assuring classroom teachers are effective in practice, state chiefs recognize that the race and culture of teachers also matters, particularly for students of color.^v Research demonstrates that teachers of color serve as role models, set high expectations, and support the academic growth of students of color.^{vi} Students of color are also less likely to be disciplined or expelled by teachers of color, when they are typically disciplined at disproportionately higher rates^{vii}; and more likely to be identified for gifted programs, when they are disproportionately under-identified today.^{viii} ***An effective teacher workforce is one that represents the racial diversity of students in PK12 schools.***

The lack of a racially diverse teacher workforce is one of the most critical equity issues of our time. If we are to ensure every student, across every race, ethnicity, language, family background, and/or family income, has access to the educational resources and rigor they need at the right moment in their education,^{ix} we must meaningfully and significantly increase racial

Students need "mirrors and windows"

It's really important that students have people who reflect back to them their language, their culture, their ethnicity, their religion. It doesn't mean all the people in their lives have to do that mirroring, but they should have some. And we know that in the teaching profession, there really are not enough mirrors.

Sarah Leibel, Lecturer on Education and Master Teacher in Residence in the Harvard Teacher Fellows Program

diversity in the teacher workforce. CCSSO is working with state education agency leaders to do just this, with the goal that by 2025 at least 15 states will have evidence of increased racial diversity in their teacher workforce and proof-points that all teachers demonstrate culturally responsive practice.

Change has begun in many states where critical stakeholders in policy and practice arenas have been galvanized into action. As the diversity of students in our nation's schools increases exponentially, the current pace of change in the teacher workforce lags too far behind. This report is a call to action by state chiefs, and leaders from educator preparation providers (EPPs), local education agencies (LEAs), legislatures, unions, and civic and community groups. Leading for equity requires we prioritize our commitment to students and ensure they have access to diverse and learner-ready teachers.

We can and must do better.

Our Educational Equity Challenge

While most students in our schools now are children of color, this is not the case among teachers and principals. Despite the fundamental value of a racially diverse teacher workforce, there exists a vast diversity gap between teachers and students. In America, 50% of our students identify as being a person of color compared to only 20% of their teachers and with only 2% being black men^x. The underrepresentation of teachers of color is particularly egregious in certain locales. For example, in 17 states, more than 95% of teachers are white (compared to an average of 82% of students being white in those states)^{xi}. Indeed, 40% of public schools do not have a single teacher of color.^{xii}

While we have taken initial steps towards diversifying the teacher workforce, we recognize we have a long way to go. In fact, achieving a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce will require a sustained and robust effort for many years, perhaps decades, before we witness marked differences.^{xiii} This is not surprising since the root cause of these disparities lies within systems and structures dating back to the early 20th century, designed to segregate people in public spaces based on race. Today, more than six decades since the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision that decreed separate but equal is inherently unequal when it comes to public education, and despite national and state legislative efforts to support school desegregation since then, segregated communities and schools still exist where teachers are often even more segregated than students.^{xiv} These systems have not only separated students and teachers spatially, they have contributed to the cultural divides that often exists between teachers and their students. Increasing the racial diversity of the teacher workforce must be accompanied by deliberate attention to build current as well as future teachers' capacity to enact pedagogies and practices that recognize and embrace students' cultures as assets in the classroom. Dismantling these systems and structures to address current realities and create the conditions necessary to recruit, prepare, support and retain a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce may take time, but is a necessary we must engage.

Teachers are less likely to hold high expectations and asset-based views of students in predominantly low-income African American schools, largely as a result of negative preconceptions of these students.^{xv} Such implicit or explicit bias and lack of recognition of the central role that race and racism play in the PK12 educational system can reduce the self-image and performance of students of color.^{xvi} Preparing teachers to demonstrate culturally responsive practice can help reverse such trends. Teachers must be able to support their students in developing cultural awareness and sensitivity. This is critical for supporting equitable learning outcomes for each student.

Research and evidence linking culturally responsive teaching to positive student outcomes continues to emerge.^{xvii} For instance, positive early student-teacher relationships are associated with better academic and behavioral student outcomes, and building on students' prior knowledge and experiences when introducing new content can increase students' motivation for learning and effective information processing.^{xviii}

To be truly “learner-ready,” all teachers must be prepared and receive ongoing support to respond to the needs of each student, especially since student demographics, and associated needs, will continue to shift. Successfully sustaining a “learner-ready” workforce requires a strong and supportive state environment.

In the following section, a foundation for change in states is described, followed by a vision for what success looks like in relation to the teaching and learning experiences of teachers and students if we achieve our aspirations. The final section offers policy and practice guidance to achieve the aspiration. The guidance is designed to identify specific policy levers state education agencies (SEAs) have authority over that can be activated to achieve the vision described, as well as highlight distinct responsibilities of SEAs where they have a moral imperative to lead for equity. Additionally, the guidance offered makes salient the ways in which SEAs can and must collaborate with relevant stakeholder groups to achieve our goals.

LEARNER-READY TEACHERS

The learner-ready teacher is one who is ready on day one of his or her career to model and develop in students the knowledge and skills they need to succeed today including the ability to think critically and creatively, to apply content to solving real world problems, to be literate across the curriculum, to collaborate and work in teams, and to take ownership of their own continuous learning. More specifically, learner-ready teachers have deep knowledge of their content and how to teach it; they understand the differing needs of their students, hold them to high expectations and personalize learning to ensure each learner is challenged; they care about, motivate, and actively engage students in learning; they collect, interpret, and use student assessment data to monitor progress and adjust instruction; they systematically reflect, continuously improve, and collaboratively problem solve; and they demonstrate leadership and shared responsibility for the learning of all students. (Our Responsibility, Our Promise, 2012, pp. iii-iv)

Providing a Foundation for Change

Research provides compelling evidence of the importance of a teacher workforce which reflects the ethno-racial diversity^{xxix} of students. Further, it makes clear that we must invest in all teachers to ensure they engage in culturally responsive practice. As a result, there is a growing movement among educational leaders at the national, state, and local levels to both make the necessary changes to address the critical need for a more diverse and culturally responsive workforce and to do so in collaboration. In fact, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) encourages and supports states to work in partnership with local education agencies (LEAs), educator preparation providers (EPPs), and other stakeholders to take action.^{xx}

CCSSO has worked with state chiefs over the past five years to transform how educators are prepared, anchored in the foundational report [Our Responsibility, Our Promise](#).^{xxi} Working in collaboration and partnership with EPPs, states have made significant progress to strengthen educator preparation, guided by the aspiration that all teachers will be learner-ready on their first day in the classroom.

States in [CCSSOs Network for Transforming Educator Preparation](#) (NTEP)^{xxii} pioneered efforts to achieve this aspiration, and today the majority of states have made tremendous strides towards teacher readiness on day one by leveraging three key policy levers over which they have authority: teacher preparation program approval; licensure; and data collection, analysis, and reporting.^{xxiii} By creating meaningful and robust standards for the approval of programs that prepare teachers, ensuring licensure is tied to valid and reliable measures of readiness, and ensuring all key stakeholders receive the necessary data to continuously improve, states are better able to ensure that each child in our nation's schools is taught by a learner-ready teacher. Despite this progress, NTEP states recognized that if we are truly going to fulfill our promise to assure educational equity for all students, teachers need better preparation, development, and support that more directly addresses the specific knowledge and skills necessary to teach *each* learner. In an increasingly diverse society, this requires that states prioritize the ethno-racial diversity of the teacher workforce and teachers' ability to be culturally responsive in practice.

In February 2017, CCSSO, in collaboration with the Aspen Institute Education & Society Program, released [Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs](#) (Leading for Equity),^{xxiv} a series of commitments by state education chiefs to achieve educational equity in their states. This paper codified conversations and commitments of state chiefs, civil rights and advocacy groups, and educators regarding the ways in which SEAs may address inequities. Among the actions included in *Leading for Equity* is a focus on ensuring all students have equitable access to effective teaching. More specifically, that teachers reflect the changing demographics of students in our schools, most of whom are children of color, and that they have the knowledge and skills to meet the demands of teaching diverse student populations.^{xxv} Where the focus for NTEP sat squarely in the teacher preparation or preservice space, achieving these goals will require states to take an approach that promotes learner-readiness across the career continuum.

Building and sustaining a teacher workforce that is both diverse and learner-ready necessitates intentional examination of the teacher career continuum, from recruitment and preparation to professional learning and advancement. Educational leaders need to understand both the affordances and constraints of the system across the teacher workforce to achieve this goal. Building on opportunities highlighted in *Our Responsibility, Our Promise*, urgency is now centered on reframing the discourse of the learner-ready teacher. Our responsibility is to ensure each student is taught by teachers who engage in culturally responsive practice.

Learner-Ready Teachers ARE Culturally Responsive in Practice

While the definition of learner-ready teachers includes characterizations consistent with what it means to be a culturally responsive teacher, it does not explicitly include the term *culturally responsive*. In order to establish widespread consensus on what it means to be a learner-ready and culturally responsive teacher, a working group of members of NTEP reviewed research literature and consulted with experts in the field to further refine the definition:

Teachers who engage in culturally responsive practice use strategies in the classroom that incorporate “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them”.^{xxvi} Additionally, teachers who are culturally responsive in practice “empower students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes”.^{xxvii} Studies have shown that when teachers of all races and cultural backgrounds engage in culturally responsive practice all students benefit academically and socially. Worth noting is that being a culturally responsive teacher requires engagement in a continuum of ongoing reflection, practice, and insight into the educational and social needs of each learner.^{xxviii}

As NTEP formally came to an end, SEAs continued to invest in strengthening educator preparation and prioritized goals for building a pipeline of ethno-racially diverse and culturally responsive teachers. A number of them joined together to achieve this aspiration in a new aligned action network focused on these two goals.

CCSSOs Diverse and Learner-Ready Teachers Initiative

CCSSO launched the *Diverse and Learner-Ready Teachers Initiative* (DLRT) in March 2018. This network of ten states^{xxix} and over 30 national collaborating organizations^{xxx} focuses on systems-level changes to increase the ethno-racial diversity of the teacher workforce, as well as supports future and current educators to effectively teach a diverse population of students. Because this work is critical to our mission of assuring educational equity, states are also focused on addressing a potential unintended consequence of focusing on these two goals exclusively. As previously noted, even if we begin aggressively recruiting and successfully retaining teachers of color now, achieving racial parity between teachers and students is not likely to happen within the next few decades. If it were possible, simply matching the ethno-racial diversity of teachers in a state, district, or school to that of students does not assure that students of color have opportunities to learn in classrooms led by same-race teachers. It also

does not assure white students have opportunities to learn in classrooms lead by teachers of color. For these reasons, states recognize that to be successful in this work they need to work towards a future where all students, regardless of race, experience teaching and learning with teachers of color during their PK12 schooling experience. This requires that states work in partnership with local education agencies (LEAs) and educator preparation providers (EPPs) through an equity lens to effectively address diversity gaps.

Achieving these aspirations may be difficult for many educational leaders; they will be required to first interrogate their own beliefs, values, and perceptions about people who are ethnically, racially, and culturally different than themselves. This work also calls on these leaders to engage in open, honest, and candid conversations about race and equity, within their agencies and organizations across the system. We cannot embrace diversity if we do not first commit to collaborating around our differences. Responding to this call to action will require additional or reallocated resources to ensure enduring systemic change. The way we invest our resources speaks volumes about what matters most. If educational leaders are committed to ensuring a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce, a critical equity issue of our time, they will need to demonstrate fidelity to lead for equity.

Vision Casting

A clear vision for change is critical to success. This vision must answer two fundamental questions: If we had a diverse and learner-ready workforce,

- 1) How would each student in PK12 schools experience teaching and learning?
- 2) How would each teacher in PK12 schools experience teaching and learning?

What success looks like: The student experience

If we had a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce, each student would experience teaching and learning in classrooms led by teachers from diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds. White students would have opportunities to learn from teachers of color and students of color would have opportunities to learn from teachers who reflect their ethno-racial identity throughout their PK12 schooling experiences.

If we had a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce, students would experience:

- Access to highly trained and qualified teachers who hold them to high expectations, support their self-esteem, challenge them in ways that motivate and inspire them to learn independently and seek new knowledge, and believe in their success.
- Teaching and learning as an opportunity to become their best selves as learners, teachers of others, and informed consumers and citizens.
- Meaningful access to grade level content, advanced courses and programs, and curriculum and materials that reflect cultures and histories of all different kinds of people and helps them build a stronger sense of belonging to both the school and wider community.
- Open-ended discussions, facilitated by multiple points of views and unique experiences.
- Feeling seen, heard, valued, safe, respected, cared for, and accepted regardless of their race, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, mental/physical ability.

- Teachers, principals, and other educational professionals that reflect different cultures, histories, and identities and who model cultural awareness and inclusion.
- Teachers who support their social and emotional learning.^{xxxi}
- Learning opportunities that connect their experiences and backgrounds to content in ways that values their cultures and creates safe spaces for them to engage in healthy dialogue about diversity.
- Opportunities to participate in extracurricular programs, including school clubs, student council, band/music, sports, and more as equal members of the whole school community.
- Restorative disciplinary practices that give them opportunities to work with teachers and school leaders to learn from mistakes and develop social and emotional skills.

In sum, students would experience teaching and learning that is culturally responsive, with a deliberate focus on diversity, equity and inclusion. These holistic experiences would foster academic success and personal well-being for each student.

What success looks like: The teacher experience

If we had a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce, each teacher would enter the profession having demonstrated the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to practice and deliver culturally responsive instruction to each student. Teachers would be empowered to improve outcomes for all students, regardless of their background. Throughout the course of their teaching career, each teacher would have access to meaningful professional learning opportunities to develop and grow their culturally responsive practice. Teachers would be teaching and learning in schools where their colleagues (teachers, principals, and professional staff) come from ethnically, culturally, and racially diverse backgrounds and reflect the diversity of students in their school, district, and state. With a more diverse, equitable, and supportive environment, and with greater access to tools necessary to be successful, more teachers would be retained in the profession and continue to develop their careers.

If we had a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce, teachers would experience:

- A diverse educator workforce (teachers, school, and district leaders) that include peers who share similar background and life experiences.
- A diverse group of teachers within each school working as members of a team, sharing their knowledge and skills, and contributing to the ongoing development of an inclusive school culture that is responsive to each student.
- An inclusive school culture where each teacher feels included, supported and valued regardless of race and ethnicity.
- Ownership and agency in identifying, developing, using, and sharing curricula and pedagogy that resonates with their perspectives, background, and vision for educating students.
- A community of professionals who work together to plan instructional programs that promote continuity and support equitable learning experiences for all students.

- An environment where teachers observe one another in the classroom, engage in pedagogical discussions, and collaborate to improve their teaching methods and explore new instructional strategies, particularly with an aim of strengthening culturally responsive practices.
- A safe work environment where their diverse perspectives, skill sets, and passions are welcomed.
- Equitable working conditions where teachers are not expected to do more or less just because of their race or ethnicity.
- A career that offers a professional salary comparable to that of other professions requiring a college degree or similar, complex skill set.
- Greater opportunities to advance and grow through a rewarding career in education.
- A system that provides them with the tools to be effective and drive outcomes for a diverse group of students, including students from different races and ethnicities.
- A drive to address implicit bias in the classroom and recognize the potential in every student.
- A variety of meaningful professional learning opportunities, specifically those that:
 - Encourage and support exploration of their own biases and how they surface in their teaching practice;
 - Develop their skills and capacity for choosing and using culturally responsive curriculum and material; and
 - Grow their skills and practice for supporting their students' social and emotional learning.

A Comprehensive Approach Across the Career Continuum

Ensuring a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce will require a comprehensive systems approach. Investing in random acts of improvement by implementing strategies that target discreet parts of the teacher career continuum may contribute to short-term gains but will likely not lead to enduring change that will sustain over time. Real systems change requires collaboration between education leaders from various parts across the system. To this end, if we are going to realize the vision for educational equity that reflects excellent teaching and learning experiences for every student and teacher in our nation's PK12 schools, we must also address these questions:

- *What are the actions **state education agencies (SEAs)** need to take?*
- *In what ways should SEAs collaborate with **educator preparation providers (EPPs)**?*
- *In what ways should SEAs collaborate with **local education agencies (LEAs)**?*

The following section offers policy and practice guidance for education leaders and is organized into two subsections: the preservice and in-service parts of the teacher workforce continuum. The guidance identifies actions for SEA leaders and identifies within each action the requisite collaboration with stakeholders that is critical to achieve a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce.

Preservice: Attracting, Preparing, and Placing Diverse and Learner-Ready Teachers

Many of the policy and practice recommendations in *Our Responsibility, Our Promise* continue to serve as strong guidance in the preservice space for states committed to building a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce. Additionally, the guidance offered in *Transforming Educator Preparation: Lessons Learned from Leading States*,^{xxxii} *Preparing “Learner-Ready Teachers,”*^{xxxiii} and *Leading for Equity*^{xxxiv} provides evidence-based models of emerging best practices and policies. Building on the recommendations and guidance from these foundational reports, specific actions for attracting, preparing, and placing diverse and learner-ready teachers in the workforce are described below.

- 1) **Revise and enforce licensure standards and accompanying assessments to ensure a culturally responsive teacher workforce.** Culturally responsive practice is best assessed in a nuanced way, through performance-based measures. Licensure requirements should include evidence that teachers demonstrate culturally responsive practice when teaching to college and career-ready standards. Working in partnership with stakeholders—particularly EPPs and LEAs, but also community-based organizations—states should consider updating or revising definitions for learner-ready teachers to so that the characteristics of culturally responsive practice are clear and integral in building coherent entry systems both within and across states. The next step is to translate those definitions, in partnership with stakeholders, into specific expectations and embed them into standards that will drive development of licensure assessments and preparation program curricula.
- 2) **Analyze and monitor teacher licensure requirements and create new programs to increase ethno-racial diversity of the teacher workforce.** SEAs should monitor state licensure policies that may have a disproportionate impact on teacher candidates of color, particularly men of color. Research shows there are tradeoffs in raising cut scores for teacher licensure exams and that scores on these exams are not necessarily predictive of performance in the classroom and student achievement.^{xxxv} SEAs should regularly review the impact of licensure policies and examine whether a more selective program has the desired impact on the overall quality and ethno-racial diversity of the teacher workforce. SEAs can invest in “grow your own” initiatives to develop paraprofessionals already working in the field or to build pathways to the profession for local high school students to increase the diversity of the teacher workforce. They can partner with LEAs to support residency models and district-led initiatives designed to retain teachers and expand their capacity to be culturally responsive over their career continuum. SEAs can also work together with legislatures to invest in college scholarships and/or loan forgiveness programs designed to attract people of color to the profession.^{xxxvi} Additionally, one lesson learned from NTEP was that incongruence between state licensure requirements can create barriers that may dissuade excellent teachers who move from one state to another from staying in the profession. States are encouraged to continue to align licensure policies as one way to reduce those barriers.

- 3) **Adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that teacher preparation programs recruit candidates from diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds and produce quality candidates of all backgrounds capable of demonstrating culturally responsive practice.** One important purpose of program approval is to ensure that educator preparation programs are high-quality, effective, and provide education and experiences consistent with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of an educator to serve the needs of the diverse population in today's public schools. In most states, SEAs have a statutory responsibility for adopting program approval standards that specify the levels of quality the state deems acceptable for quality assurance. The adoption and implementation of approval standards should be done in partnership with EPPs and address:
- Holistic candidate selection criteria (beyond GPA and test score) and processes that include measures more closely aligned with in-service teaching effectiveness.
 - Learning experiences designed to intentionally support candidate learning, practice, and reflection on culturally responsive teaching and pedagogy.
 - Training and professional learning for teacher education faculty, mentor teachers, and other professional staff involved in the preparation of candidates to be culturally responsive teachers (in other words, train the trainers).
 - The ethno-racial diversity of teacher education faculty, mentor teachers, and other professional staff involved in the preparation of candidates.
- 4) **Adopt and implement policies and practices to assure teacher educator effectiveness.** Teacher educators play a critical role in preparing and supporting the professional learning of teachers along their career continuum. This includes professionals working in EPPs and practicing teachers in schools who play a formal role in teaching teachers how to teach.^{xxxvii} SEA leaders should partner with EPPs and LEAs to increase the racial diversity of teacher educators and ensure teacher candidates are learning from teacher educators who demonstrate and model culturally responsive practice.^{xxxviii}

In-Service: Supporting and Keeping Diverse and Learner-Ready Teachers

The following recommendations address working conditions and supports for teachers, particularly teachers of color. If our goal is that all students have access to teachers of color throughout their PK-12 experience, efforts to recruit excellent teachers of color are effective only if teachers of color remain in the classroom. The same is true of teachers who demonstrate culturally responsive practice. Drawing on the recommendations in *Leading for Equity* and the support of the national collaborators in the DLRT Initiative, the following represents a non-exhaustive set of best practices and policies to develop and maintain a diverse and learner-ready teacher workforce.

- 1) **Annually and publicly report on multiple indicators of the diversity of the teacher workforce.** SEAs should set data-informed goals to increase the ethno-racial diversity of the teacher workforce. SEAs should monitor the diversity of new teachers enrolled in educator preparation programs and collect and publicize data on teacher diversity at both the school and district levels. In partnership with EPPs and LEAs, SEAs can analyze the extent to which the state's educator workforce reflects student demographics and identify ways to be more intentional about recruiting and retaining a more representative workforce. This includes identifying areas that continue to be impacted by segregation, as evidenced by the racial make-up of students and teachers in schools, analyzing segregation measures (i.e., dissimilarity measure and exposure^{xxxix}), identifying the root causes, and acting to dismantle those institutions and systems to ensure equitable distribution of diverse and learner-ready teachers.
- 2) **Track and report on differential teacher retention and turnover rates.** SEAs should determine if any groups of teachers, particularly teachers of color, have disproportionately high turnover rates. States should work with LEAs to collect, analyze, and understand the school-level data and provide resources or supports for improving teacher retention. This includes interrogation and analysis of root causes of teacher turnover, including those identified by the research base (e.g., compensation, teacher preparation and support, working conditions, and effective school-based leadership).^{xi}
- 3) **Dedicate federal funding to workforce diversity initiatives.** SEAs should leverage allocated federal funding to support programs among EPPs and LEAs that have traditionally yielded more teachers of color. States can use funding from a wide range of federal sources to fund existing initiatives, and design competitive grants to encourage district innovation. In addition to diversity initiatives, states can invest in areas that positively impact the recruitment, support, and retention of teachers of color, including, but not limited to, high-retention pathways into teaching,^{xli} the quality of school leaders, support for teachers to pursue National Board certification, and teacher leadership and development opportunities. Federal sources that can be leveraged to support pipeline initiatives include ESSA,^{xlii} the Higher Education Act, Perkins Career Technical Education Act, and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.
- 4) **Convene key stakeholders to analyze data and address diversity gaps where they exist.** SEAs should work closely with local stakeholders, including EPPs, two-year post-secondary institutions (e.g., community colleges), LEAs and teachers' unions, to identify areas where there are shortages of teachers of color and convene the right stakeholders

to create strategies to close those gaps. States have the resources and information to help LEAs identify the right strategies to diversify their teacher workforces.

Collaborative mechanisms, such as the equity labs that states organized to address equity gaps, provide spaces to gather the right stakeholders and work in collaboration with other experts in the state. These mechanisms also provide opportunities for LEAs to work together and share best practices in the space and create communities of practice to ensure that promising strategies can be put into practice.

5) Ensure that culturally responsive practice is one of multiple measures included on teacher evaluations, and that professional learning is required to improve practice.

SEAs can and should partner with EPPs and LEAs to adopt standards for culturally responsive practice. These standards, designed to support teacher professional learning and support systems, will ensure the workforce is learner-ready. To ensure teachers are well equipped with the knowledge and professional learning needed to be culturally responsive in practice, the state must commit resources to the training of the teachers. Investment in the professional learning of teacher educators, mentor teachers, and other professional staff supporting in-service teachers is necessary.

Conclusion

Increasing the racial diversity of the teacher workforce and ensuring teachers are not only prepared to engage in culturally responsive practice but are supported in their growth as culturally responsive practitioners is necessary for ensuring that every student—but particularly students of color—have access to effective instruction. Positive exposure to individuals from a variety of races and ethnic groups, especially in childhood, helps to break stereotypes, allows students to grow more comfort with differences, reduces unconscious implicit biases; and leads to innovation and greater social-cohesion. Without the opportunity to be taught by teachers who share their race, ethnicity, and background, students of color are at a disadvantage.

Diversity in the workforce benefits teachers, creating multicultural spaces for teachers to grow, learn, and become stronger practitioners over the course of their careers. Diversifying the teacher workforce is possible through aggressive partnerships between states, districts, and EPPs, and can lead to dramatic improvements in educational equity. By taking action, many highlighted in this report and others yet to be imagined, state leaders can make a real impact and create a new diverse and equitable environment for both students and teachers and improve our education system as a whole.

ⁱ Kerby, S. & Burns, C. (2012). *The Top 10 Economic Facts of Diversity in the Workplace: A Diverse Workplace Is Integral to a Strong Economy*. Center for American Progress, Washington. retrieved from: <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2012/07/12/11900/the-top-10-economic-facts-of-diversity-in-the-workplace/>

Goldhaber, D., Theobald, R., & Tien, C. (2015). *The theoretical and empirical arguments for diversifying the teacher workforce: A review of evidence*. Center for Education Data and Research Policy Brief. Retrieved from <http://m.cedr.us/papers/working/CEDR%20WP%202015-9.pdf>

ⁱⁱ Cherng, H. S. & Halpin, P. F. (2016). *The importance of minority teachers: Student perceptions of minority versus white teachers*. Educational Researcher, 45(7), pp. 407-420.

ⁱⁱⁱ Carter, P. L., Welner, K. G., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give all children an even chance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wells, A.S. (2014). *Seeing Past the 'Colorblind' Myth of Education Policy: Why Policymakers Should Address Racial/Ethnic Inequality and Support Culturally Diverse Schools*. National Education Policy Center, Boulder, CO. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/pb-colorblind_0.pdf

The Education Trust. (October 2017). *See Our Truth: The State of Teacher & School Leader Diversity in New York*. Retrieved from https://newyork.edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/10/See-Our-Truth_Issue-Background.pdf

^{iv} Wells, A.S., Fox, L. & Cordova-Cobo, D. (2016, February 9). *How racially diverse schools and classrooms can benefit all students*. The Century Foundation. Harvard Ed Magazine. Retrieved from <http://apps.tcf.org/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students>

Moss, J. (2016). *Where are all the teachers of color?* Retrieved from <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/ed/16/05/where-are-all-teachers-color>

^v Dee, T. S. (2001). *Teachers, Race and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment*. Working Paper 8432, National Bureau of Economic Research. pp. 195–210, retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w8432>

Dilworth, M. E. (1990). *Reading Between the Lines: Teachers and Their Racial/Ethnic Cultures*. Office of Education Research and Improvement. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED322148.pdf>

Gershenson, S., Hart, C., Lindsay, C. & Papageorge, N. (March 2017). *The Long-Run Impacts of Same-Race Teachers*. IZA Institute of Labor Economics. Bonn, Germany. Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10630.pdf>

Murray, J., and Jenkins-Scott, J. (September 2014). *We Need Teachers of Color*. Education Week. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/09/10/03murray.h34.html>

^{vi} Dee, T. S. (Spring 2004). *The race connection*. Education Next, 4(2). Retrieved from <https://www.educationnext.org/the-race-connection/>

Downer, J. T., Goble, P., Myers, S. S., & Piant, R. C. (2016). *Teacher-child racial/ethnic match within pre-kindergarten classrooms and children's early school adjustment*. Early Childhood Research Quarterly. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2016.02.007

Egalite, A. J., Kisida, B., & Winters, M. A. (2015). *Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement*. Economics of Education Review. DOI: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.01.007.

Gershenson, S., Hart, C., Lindsay, C. & Papageorge, N. (March 2017). *The Long-Run Impacts of Same-Race Teachers*. IZA Institute of Labor Economics. Bonn, Germany. Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10630.pdf>

Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., Papageorge, N. (2016). *Who believes in me? The effect of student-teacher demographic match on teacher expectations*. Economics of Education Review. DOI: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.03.002.

Villegas, A. M. & Irvine, J. J. (2010). *Diversifying the Teaching Force: An Examination of Major Arguments*. The Urban Review 42(3): 175, retrieved from http://www.montclair.edu/profilepages/media/439/user/Villegas_%26_Irvine--2010.pdf

Wright, A., Gottfried, M. A., Le, V-N. (2017). *A kindergarten teacher like me: The role of student-teacher race in social-emotional development*. American Educational Research Journal, DOI: 10.3102/0002831216635733.

Hanushek, Kain, O'Brien & Rivkin, 2005

Gershenson, S., Hart, C., Lindsay, C. & Papageorge, N. (March 2017). *The Long-Run Impacts of Same-Race Teachers*. IZA Institute of Labor Economics. Bonn, Germany. Retrieved from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10630.pdf>

Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., Papageorge, N. (2016). *Who believes in me? The effect of student-teacher demographic match on teacher expectations*. Economics of Education Review. DOI: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.03.002.

Carver Thomas, D. (April 2018). *Diversifying the Teaching Profession: How to Recruit and Retain Teachers of Color*. Learning Policy Institute.

TNTP (2018). *The Opportunity Myth: What Students Can Show Us About How School Is Letting Them Down-And How To Fix It*. The New Teacher Project, Brooklyn, NY: Retrieved from

https://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_The-Opportunity-Myth_Web.pdf

^{vii} Lindsay, C. A. & Hart, C. M. D. (2017). *Exposure to same-race teachers and student disciplinary outcomes for black students in North Carolina*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. DOI: 10.3102/0162373717693109.

^{viii} Bryan, N., & Ford, D. Y. (2014). Recruiting and retaining Black male teachers in gifted education. *Gifted Child Today*, 37(3), 156–161.

Goings, R. B., & Ford, D. Y. (2018). *Investigating the intersection of poverty and race in gifted education journals: A 15-year analysis*. Gifted Child Quarterly, 62(1), 25–36.

Grissom, J. A., & Redding, C. (2016). *Discretion and disproportionality: Explaining the underrepresentation of high-achieving students of color in gifted programs*. AERA Open, 2, 1-25.

Grissom, J. A., Rodriguez, L. A. & Kern, E. C. (2017). *Teacher and principal diversity and the representation of students of color in gifted programs: Evidence from national data*. The Elementary School Journal. DOI: 10.1086/690274.

^{ix} The Aspen Education & Society Program and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/Leading%20for%20Equity_011618.pdf

^x National Center for Education Statistics, 2017; U.S. Department of Education.

^{xi} Digest of Education Statistics, 2014. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_209.10.asp?current=yes

^{xii} Hansen, M., and Quintero, D. (2018). *Teachers in the US Are Even More Segregated than Students*. Brookings. Retrieved from www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2018/08/15/teachers-in-the-us-are-even-more-segregated-than-students/

^{xiii} Putnam, H., Hansen, M., Walsh, K., & Quintero, D. (2016). *High Hopes and Harsh Realities: The Real Challenges to Building a Diverse Workforce*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

^{xiv} Hansen, M., and Quintero, D. (2018). *Teachers in the US Are Even More Segregated than Students*. Brookings, www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2018/08/15/teachers-in-the-us-are-even-more-segregated-than-students/

^{xv} Diamond, J. B., Randolph, A., & Sillane, J. P. (2004). *Teachers' Expectations and Sense of Responsibility for Student Learning: The Importance of Race, Class, and Organizational Habitus*. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 35(1):75–98. Retrieved from [http://www.distributedleadership.org/assets/2004.-diamond.-randolph.-spillane.--teachers--expectations-and-sense-of-responsibility-for-student-learning-\(aeq\).pdf](http://www.distributedleadership.org/assets/2004.-diamond.-randolph.-spillane.--teachers--expectations-and-sense-of-responsibility-for-student-learning-(aeq).pdf)

Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., Papageorge, N. (2016). *Who believes in me? The effect of student–teacher demographic match on teacher expectations*. *Economics of Education Review*. DOI: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.03.002.

^{xvi} Farkas, G. (2003). *Racial Disparities and Discrimination in Education: What Do We know, How Do We Know It, and What Do We Need to Know?* *Teachers College Record*, 105(6), 1119-1146.

^{xvii} Bottiani, J.H., Larson, K.E., Debnam, K.J, Bischoff, C.M., & Bradshaw, C.P. (2017) *Promoting Educators' Use of Culturally Responsive Practices: A Systematic Review of Inservice Interventions*. *Journal of Teacher Education*.
Dee, T. S., & Penner, E. K. (2017). *The causal effects of cultural relevance: Evidence from an ethnic studies curriculum*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 127-166.

^{xviii} Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hamre, B.K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72, 25-638.

Perkins, D., & Salomon, G. (2012). Knowledge to go: A motivational and dispositional view of transfer. *Educational Psychologist*, 47, 248-258.

^{xix} The term *ethno-racial* combines the words ethnicity and racial. Latinos, for example, are not a “race” but an ethnicity. Using this term allows us to include the Latinx community when talking about efforts to increase the numbers of teachers who share this ethnic experience and identity.

^{xx} Add citation.

^{xxi} Council of Chief State School Officers. (2012). *Our responsibility, our promise: Transforming educator preparation and entry into the profession*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-10/Our%20Responsibility%20Our%20Promise_2012.pdf.

^{xxii} California, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington.

^{xxiii} Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Transforming educator preparation: Lessons learned from leading states*. CCSSO, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/CCSSO%20Educator%20Preparation%20Playbook.pdf>

^{xxiv} The Aspen Education & Society Program and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/Leading%20for%20Equity_011618.pdf

^{xxv} The Aspen Education & Society Program and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/Leading%20for%20Equity_011618.pdf

(pp.19-20)

^{xxvi} Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press. (p. 31). New York.

^{xxvii} Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teaching for African-American Students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (p. 16-17).

^{xxviii} Council of Chief State School Officers. (2018). *Preparing "Learner-Ready" Teachers: Guidance from NTEP States for Ensuring a Culturally Responsive Workforce*. (p. 6).

^{xxix} Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, and New York.

^{xxx} See list of national collaborating organizations in the Appendix.

^{xxxi} Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teaching for social justice: resources, relationships, and anti-racist practice. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 19(3), 133-138.

Herrera, S., Kavimandan, S., Perez, D. & Wessels, S. (2017). *Accelerating Literacy for Diverse Learners: Classroom Strategies that Integrate Social/Emotional Engagement and Academic Achievement, K-8*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

^{xxxii} Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Transforming educator preparation: Lessons learned from leading states*. CCSSO, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/CCSSO%20Educator%20Preparation%20Playbook.pdf>

^{xxxiii} Council of Chief State School Officers. (2018). *Preparing "Learner-Ready" Teachers: Guidance from NTEP States for Ensuring a Culturally Responsive Workforce*. CCSSO, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2018-02/Preparing%20Learner-Ready%20Teachers.pdf>

^{xxxiv} The Aspen Education & Society Program and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Leading for Equity: Opportunities for State Education Chiefs*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/Leading%20for%20Equity_011618.pdf

^{xxxv} Goldhaber, D. (2007). Everyone's Doing It, but What Does Teacher Testing Tell Us about Teacher Effectiveness? *The Journal of Human Resources*, 42(4), 765-794.

Goldhaber, D., Cowan, J., & Theobald, R. (2016). *Evaluating Prospective Teachers: Testing the Predictive Validity of the edTPA*. CEDR Working Paper 2016-2.2. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

^{xxxvi} Desiree Carver-Thomas, *Diversifying the Teaching Profession: How to Recruit and Retain Teachers of Color*. Learning Policy Institute. April 2018.

^{xxxvii} Educator Preparation: Teacher Educator Effectiveness Practices. Retrieved November 7, 2018, from Massachusetts Department of Education website: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/resources/teacher-educator-practices.pdf>

^{xxxviii} Develop Teacher Educators. Retrieved November 7, 2018, from Education First website: <https://education-first.com/tptc/teacher-educators/>

^{xxxix} Hansen, M. and Quintero, D. (2018, August 15). *Teachers in the US are even more segregated than students*. Brown Center Chalkboard. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2018/08/15/teachers-in-the-us-are-even-more-segregated-than-students/>

^{xl} Carver-Thomas, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and we can do about it*. Learning Policy Institute, Washington, DC.

^{xli} Carver-Thomas, D. (2018). *Diversifying the teaching profession through high-retention pathways*. Learning Policy Institute. Washington, DC.

^{xlii} Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A: Building Systems of Support for Excellent Teaching and Leading. U.S. Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 September 27, 2016.

Ensuring a Diverse and Learner-Ready Teacher Workforce: Practice and Policy Guidance

State Best Practices

Revise and enforce their licensure standards and accompanying assessments for teachers to ensure a culturally responsive teacher workforce.

- ✓ **Washington** revised teaching standards to include evidence of culturally responsive practices in the classroom. The *Pilot to Policy Grant: Advancing Systemic Equity* are two-year grants of up to \$10K for educator preparation programs that pilot work to inform policies and practices related to racial equity, community engagement, and cultural responsiveness.

Analyze and monitor teacher licensure requirements and create new programs to increase ethno-racial diversity of the teacher workforce.

- ✓ The **Illinois** Board of Higher Education has a statewide grant program for local Grow Your Own programs, which develops a pipeline of high-quality teachers to teach in hard-to-staff schools, with a specific focus on increasing the racial diversity of teachers across the state.
- ✓ **Wisconsin** offers the *Minority Undergraduate Retention Grant* which provides teacher candidates of color with a grant of up to \$2,500 per academic year. The state also offers the *Minority Teacher Loan* which provides a loan of up to \$10K per year to students of color who teach full time in Milwaukee after graduation. If these conditions are met, the state forgives 25% of the loan.
- ✓ **Louisiana** is providing competitive grants to teacher preparation programs that are innovating around candidate recruitment and program design, including community-based teacher preparation programs that are currently operational and are designed to “recruit future teachers from within their own communities, starting with high school seniors.”
- ✓ **Connecticut** has implemented a pilot program in some of their largest districts where students of color in eleventh and twelfth grade can take education courses at four partner state universities that comprise the Connecticut State University system. Participating districts must provide a counselor to students in the program and guide them towards teacher shortage areas and the advanced placement program.
- ✓ **Oregon** has partnered with the Chalkboard Project to invest more than \$5 million since 2012 to support development of university/district preparation partnerships to close systemic gaps that create barriers for underrepresented students, and to improve recruitment and retention practices to better support diverse new teachers. This work has resulted in development of teacher cadet programs, future educator clubs, and summer internships for high school students, paraeducator pathways, satellite programs preparing future educators locally, professional learning for faculty on culturally responsive practices, a new one-stop recruitment website, and \$5,000 scholarships for teacher candidates who are racially or linguistically diverse. In addition, after a review of licensing, financial, and early-career barriers to the diversification of the teacher workforce, the Oregon Teacher

Standards and Practices Commission is developing a multiple-measure approach to the assessment of subject matter and instructional practice in teacher licensure.

States should adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that teacher preparation programs recruit candidates from diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds and produce quality candidates of all backgrounds capable of demonstrating culturally responsive practice.

- ✓ **Rhode Island's** program approval standards require programs to provide candidates with opportunities to reflect on their own biases, develop deeper awareness of their views and experiences of other cultures, and understand the impact of poverty on learning. It also expects programs to ensure graduating candidates are proficient in working with English learners and students from diverse communities.
- ✓ **Maryland's** program approval standards, *Institutional Performance Criteria*, requires programs "prepare professional educators to teach a diverse student population" (ethnicity, socio-economic status, English learners, giftedness, and inclusion of students with special needs in regular classroom). Institutions are expected to document how they prepare candidates to teach students from diverse communities, as well as identify how their performance assessment system measures candidates' ability to differentiate instruction within an inclusive classroom, implement learning experiences that address the varying needs of diverse students, and collaboratively plan and teach with specialized resource personnel for a diverse student population.
- ✓ **Alabama** requires teacher preparation providers to present plans to recruit and support racially diverse populations and requires the admitted pool of candidates reflect the racial diversity of students in the state's P-12 classrooms.
- ✓ **Oregon** requires each public educator preparation program in the state to prepare a biennial plan with specific goals, strategies and deadlines for the recruitment, admission, retention and graduation of diverse educators to accomplish the goals set in their strategic plan that must be reviewed and approved by respective institutional boards of trustees and the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Annually report on multiple indicators of the diversity of the teacher workforce.

- ✓ **Oregon** requires an annual legislative report documenting the state's progress in diversifying the educator workforce, including longitudinal data on the number and percentage of:
 - (a) Diverse students enrolled in community colleges;
 - (b) Diverse students enrolled in public universities;
 - (c) Diverse students graduated from public universities;
 - (d) Diverse candidates enrolled in public approved educator preparation programs;
 - (e) Diverse candidates who have completed public approved educator preparation programs;

- (f) Diverse candidates receiving Oregon teaching or administrative licenses or registrations based on preparation in this state and preparation in other states;
- (g) Diverse educators who are newly employed in the public schools in this state; and
- (h) Diverse educators already employed in the public schools.

Track and report on differential teacher retention and turnover rates.

- ✓ **Colorado** developed the Minority Teacher Report to study and develop strategies to increase and improve the recruitment, preparation, development, and retention of high-quality teachers of color in elementary and secondary schools across the state. The report highlights the retention and turnover rates of teachers of color and makes recommendations for how each sector can address and improve disproportionalities.

Dedicate federal funding to workforce diversity initiatives

- ✓ **Tennessee** has allocated \$100K from Title II, part A to fund *Diversity Innovation Implementation Grants* to support three districts in implementing comprehensive strategies to increase the representation of teachers of color in their local schools.

Use their convening power to bring together key stakeholders to analyze data and address diversity gaps where they exist.

- ✓ **Ohio, Connecticut, Missouri and Mississippi** have led equity labs where they convened district leaders and stakeholders to share the purpose of their state equity plans, collect feedback on state-level strategies, facilitate LEA-level equity planning, and provide LEAs access to critical friends and a network of colleagues for planning and implementing strategies related to educational equity.
- ✓ **Oregon** has had a 20-member advisory group since 2014 to analyze trend data, advise on data collection, articulate opportunity gaps and raise awareness, propose action steps, and advocate for legislation to help diversify the state's educator workforce.

Ensure that teachers are evaluated on and provided feedback for their use of culturally responsive practices and require professional development to be based on needs identified through these evaluations.

- ✓ **New Mexico's** teacher evaluation and support system reflects the expectation that all teachers demonstrate knowledge of content for and respond effectively to the needs of students from diverse communities; there is also a core competency in teacher licensure requirements tied to culturally responsive practice (teachers demonstrate sensitivity and responsiveness to, acknowledge and validate, and adjust practice based on the personal ideas, learning needs, interests, and feelings of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds).

- ✓ **South Dakota's** WoLakota Mentoring Program focuses on providing mentorship to teachers new to the profession to help them better understand the culture of Native American students. Teachers in high-needs districts with large proportions of Native American students are supported, with the goal of retaining them at the same rates as teachers in other LEAs across the state. Trained mentors provide new teachers with support in embedding the Oceti Sakowin Essential Understandings and Standards into Common Core-aligned practice and materials.

DRAFT

Second Round of OTSP Scholars (awarded Winter 2019)

First Name	Last Name	University	Subject Area	Specific Ethnicity	Photo
Nayeli	Cruz	WOU	Unknown	Unknown	No photo
Rina	De Los Reyes	UOPortland	Middle/High, Spanish/ESL	Unknown	No photo
Gabriann	Hall	OSU	Middle/High, Social Studies	Native American	
Jennifer	Hastings	George Fox	Special Ed	Unknown	No photo

Kathleen	Jonathan	Corban	Elementary Ed	Unknown	No photo
Annalise	Oertwich	Linfield	Elementary Ed	Unknown	No photo
Antonio	Pena Anaya	Linfield	Unknown	Unknown	No photo
Debora	Petersen	UOPortland	Elementary Ed	Unknown	No photo
Jessica	Pichardo-Ramirez	Pacific	Unknown	Unknown	No photo

2019 Conferences										
#	Conference Name	Focus Area/s	Date	Time	Location	City	Website	Google doc sign-up	Special Notes	Added to Log
1	Northwest Teaching for Social Justice	Rethinking Our Classrooms, Organizing for Better Schools	October 20th, 2018	8am-4:30pm	Madison High School	Portland, Oregon	https://nwtstj.org/wp/	7 attended		10/1/2018
2	TeachIn Conference	Equity and Social Justice for Teachers by Teachers	November 17th, 2018	8am-4pm	University of Oregon	Eugene, Oregon	https://teachin.uoregon.edu/	6 attended		10/1/2018
3	National Teacher of the Year	Mandy Manning, ELL Teacher	January 11th, 2019	5:00pm-7:00pm	Western Oregon University	Monmouth, Oregon	https://docs.google.com/document/d/1754FqSf58BUIoGr8R5V1ra_3gl476W-w_OpNoJIT/edit?usp=sharing	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Q1U5_EwkabNysHvFC3ckzVK0r6us8ZQW5yqWV5M/edit?usp=sharing		1/2/2019
4	OABE Winter Institute	Bilingual Education	January 18 & 19, 2019	8:30am-3:30pm	Holiday Inn	Salem, Oregon	https://www.eventbrite.com/e/2019-oabe-winter-institute-tickets-50104710538	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Q8A60rV_rfv7L-WWjYcRnCA55QnCZCmLrdDFbZE/edit?usp=sharing	Two day conference, housing is not provided.	1/2/2019
5	OALA Winter Conference 2019	Latino Administrators and Educators	February 1-2nd, 2019	Starting Feb 1st at 2pm, ending Feb 2nd at 4pm	Western Oregon University	Monmouth, Oregon	https://www.eventbrite.com/e/oala-winter-conference-2019-tickets-50926877662	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1R2VPxPlx46zD2KkxLzQrrVLg313SfMugp7N6w/edit?usp=sharing	Two day conference, housing is not provided.	1/2/2019
6	Winter Recharge Retreat	New & Aspiring Educators Retreat	February 1-2nd, 2019	Not listed	Oregon Gardens	Silverton, Oregon	https://www.oregoned.org/action-center/events/aspiring-educator-retreat	Conference is at capacity, registration is closed	Free to NEA Members	1/2/2019
7	ASCD Pre-Service Teacher Conference	Preparation for Job Fairs and Interviewing	February 15th, 2019	8:00am-2:00pm	Western Oregon University	Monmouth, Oregon	https://www.cosa.k12.or.us/events/2019-ascd-pre-service-teacher-conference	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/106OVVnpIDTwt-4YmUTdM2eb85j4UbQJ38GskleR5s/edit?usp=sharing		1/2/2019
8	ORATE Educators at the Forefront	To be announced	March 8th, 2019	To be announced	University of Portland	Portland, Oregon	To be announced	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10QAX8ns0GIBs-XILsZhtGsF9QWL_510jStsIAGyuc/edit?usp=sharing		1/2/2019
9	English Learners Alliance Conference	Affirming Diversity: Culturally Responsive Practices for All	March 13-15th, 2019	To be announced	Hilton Conference Center	Eugene, Oregon	https://www.cosa.k12.or.us/events/2019-ela	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nr1mpGhqr0EOjp309f8patNxOJCnPl0BbM6BfH4/edit?usp=sharing	Three day conference, housing is not provided.	1/2/2019
10	Oregon Educators Association (formal conference name tba)	To be announced	July, 2019 (two day retreat, date is tba)	To be announced	Riverhouse on the Deschutes (hotel)	Bend, Oregon	To be announced	https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ChvFRWCMMNSlUk96ftu7Jir32_WBqzAidE-Q0aBBg/edit?usp=sharing	Two day retreat, housing will be provided to NEA Members	1/2/2019

REVISED 1/7/19 Proposed Opportunities for Conversations on the Findings of the 2018 Educator Equity Report

DATE	GROUP	LIAISON	VOLUNTEER PRESENTORS
November 1, 2018	Teacher Standards and Practices Commission	Tony	Tony (Hilda will also reference)
November 2, 2018	edTPA Summit at OSU	Hilda	
TBA	State Board of Education	Markisha	Karen, Hilda, Markisha, April
November 28	Council on Educator Advancement	Hilda	Karen, Tony, Marvin, Markisha
December 7, 2018	Government to Government	April	
December 14, 2018	Oregon Advocacy Commission	Hilda	
January 10, 2019	Ted Andrews Symposium (NASDTEC)	Tony	Tony, Marvin, Hilda
January 26-27, 2019	COSA OACOA/OASE Winter Conference	Karen?	Karen, Hilda, ?
February, March TBA	Education Subcommittees	Hilda	???
February 1-2 2019	Oregon Association of Latino Admin	Carlos	Carlos, ?
March 6th	AI/AN Advisory Panel at ODE	April	April, Bahia
March 8, 2019	Oregon Association of Teacher Educators	Maria	Maria, Karen, Cecelia, Lala
March 13-15, 2019	COSA English Learners Conference	?	?

OREGON EDUCATOR EQUITY ADVISORY GROUP
2018-19 GOALS-Approved 10.29.18

1. The Educator Equity Advisory Group will oversee the production, distribution and state wide presentation of the Oregon Annual Educator Equity Report and its findings as it relates to increasing the Oregon Education Workforce, especially increasing the numbers of teachers of linguistic and racial diversity.
2. The Educator Equity Advisory Group will oversee the Oregon Teacher Scholars Program by communicating notice of application deadlines, collecting applications, creating a selection and review committee and then communicating to successful applicants. In addition, the Group will advocate to the Oregon Legislature for additional support and funding to sustain and expand the Oregon Teacher Scholars Program to more potential educators.
3. The Educator Equity Advisory Group will align its educator diversity work with other work groups in the State such as **but not limited to** the Educator Advancement Council, the Joint Committee on Student Success, the African American Student Success Team, the American Indian/Alaska Native Advisory Committee, Confederation of School Administrators and Teachers Standards and Practices Commission and advocate for needed policy changes and/or legislation.
4. The Educator Equity Advisory Group will engage in state wide listening sessions with communities of color involving various education preparation, employment and diversification topics.
5. The Educator Equity Advisory Group will engage various experts in identified subject matter that will increase the Groups skills and knowledge as a means to increase our effectiveness and efficiency regarding increasing the preparation, recruitment, hiring, retention and promotion of education staff of color and linguistic diversity.

LC 3472
 2019 Regular Session
 12/27/18 (HRL/ps)

DRAFT

SUMMARY

Directs Department of Education to distribute grants for purpose of developing and diversifying education workforce for prekindergarten through grade 12.

Establishes Next Generation Educator Recruitment and Development Account. Appropriates moneys from General Fund to account.

Declares emergency, effective July 1, 2019.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

Relating to the education workforce; and declaring an emergency.

Whereas Oregon is becoming an increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse state; and

Whereas culturally and linguistically diverse students make up more than a third of our current students, and demographic trends show this percentage increasing significantly over time; and

Whereas the academic and social benefits of a culturally and linguistically diverse education workforce benefit all students; and

Whereas Oregon's current education workforce is not reflective of the cultural and linguistic diversity of students in this state; and

Whereas there are significant education workforce shortages in key academic concentrations, school positions and geographic areas across Oregon; and

Whereas almost 28 percent of the Oregon kindergarten through grade 12 education workforce is eligible to retire today, and there is not a sufficient statewide plan to increase the number of licensed prekindergarten through grade 12 educators; and

NOTE: Matter in **boldfaced** type in an amended section is new; matter *[italic and bracketed]* is existing law to be omitted. New sections are in **boldfaced** type.

Whereas consortiums of school districts and post-secondary institutions of education across the state have already developed successful “Grow Your Own” educator pipeline programs to fill the needs of local communities; and

Whereas the State of Oregon needs to invest in “Grow Your Own” educator pipeline development programs and expand existing programs to help grow and diversify Oregon’s prekindergarten through grade 12 education workforce; now, therefore,

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. Sections 2 to 4 of this 2019 Act are added to and made a part of ORS chapter 342.

SECTION 2. (1) The Department of Education shall use the moneys in the Next Generation Educator Recruitment and Development Account established under section 4 of this 2019 Act for the purpose of developing and diversifying the education workforce for prekindergarten through grade 12.

(2) The department shall use moneys in the account as follows:

(a) To distribute grants to school districts, education service districts or any combination of school districts and education service districts as provided by section 3 of this 2019 Act. Grants distributed under section 3 of this 2019 Act shall be based on the number of participants in a program that is funded as provided by section 3 of this 2019 Act and may not exceed \$5,000 per participant.

(b) To distribute planning grants to potential applicants for a grant described in section 3 of this 2019 Act. Planning grants distributed under this paragraph may not exceed \$25,000 per recipient. If more requests for a planning grant are submitted than moneys are available, priority shall be given to requests that will be used to establish a new partnership with an early childhood education program, a public or private post-secondary institution of education, a community-based organization or a nonprofit organization for the purpose of a grant distributed under section 3 of this 2019 Act.

1 (c) To distribute grants for programs in middle or high schools that
2 encourage students who are interested in a career in education. Grants
3 distributed under this section may not exceed \$500 per participating
4 student per biennium and may not be used for any college credit
5 courses.

6 (d) To pay for administrative expenses incurred by the Department
7 of Education, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and
8 the Educator Advancement Council. Payments for administrative ex-
9 penses shall comply with rules adopted by the State Board of Educa-
10 tion.

11 (3) For the purpose of distributing grants under subsection (2)(a) to
12 (c) of this section and coordinating implementation of the grants pro-
13 grams with the Educator Advancement Council, the department shall
14 convene an advisory group that meets at least once each quarter. The
15 advisory group shall consist of 13 members who represent the follow-
16 ing:

17 (a) The Educator Advancement Council;

18 (b) The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission;

19 (c) A public post-secondary institution of education;

20 (d) The State Advisory Council for Special Education;

21 (e) The Department of Education;

22 (f) A community-based, culturally specific African-American or-
23 ganization;

24 (g) A community-based, culturally specific Latino organization;

25 (h) A community-based, culturally specific Asian and Pacific
26 Islander organization;

27 (i) A federally recognized tribe in this state;

28 (j) Public education employees, including teachers;

29 (k) School administrators;

30 (L) School districts or education service districts that sponsor a
31 program to recruit potential educators from the community to join the

profession and be an educator in the community; and

(m) Students enrolled in a program to recruit potential educators from the community to join the profession and be an educator in the community.

(4) The State Board of Education shall adopt any rules necessary for the administration of this section and section 3 of this 2019 Act.

SECTION 3. (1) For the purpose of developing and diversifying the education workforce for prekindergarten through grade 12, the Department of Education shall distribute grants from the Next Generation Educator Recruitment and Development Account established under section 4 of this 2019 Act to school districts, education service districts or any combination of school districts and education service districts.

(2) A school district, education service district or combination of school districts and education service districts must use moneys received under this section to fund a program that recruits potential educators to join the profession and be an educator in the community.

(3) A recipient of a grant distributed under this section is encouraged to form and build partnerships with early childhood education programs, public and private post-secondary institutions of education, community-based organizations and nonprofit organizations.

(4) To receive a distribution under this section, the school district, education service district or combination of school districts and education service districts must submit an application on the form and within the timelines prescribed by the department. An application must demonstrate that:

(a) The applicant is able to match every \$3 of the grant amount with \$1 of local matching funding, which may include moneys or the cost of staff salary and benefits, management services, tuition, scholarships, fellowships, books, academic supplies, travel stipends, technology stipends, paid internships, loan forgiveness, paid practicums,

1 paid residencies, mentoring programs or professional development; and

2 (b) The program to be funded with the grant moneys has the fol-
3 lowing elements:

4 (A) Intentionally recruits racially and linguistically diverse candi-
5 dates to be educators;

6 (B) Ensures that all participants in the program receive at least two
7 years of culturally responsive mentoring;

8 (C) Provides all participants in the program with cultural compe-
9 tency training and training to prepare the participants to meet the
10 social and emotional learning needs of students;

11 (D) Ensures that all academic credits earned through the program
12 at a post-secondary institution of education are transferable between
13 all post-secondary institutions of education participating in the pro-
14 gram;

15 (E) Ensures that the hiring practices in each participating consor-
16 tium focus on training to recruit a diverse workforce, including
17 training to overcome biases; and

18 (F) Requires participants in the program to agree to work in a
19 sponsoring school district for at least two years.

20 (5) If more applicants apply for a grant under this section than
21 moneys are available for the grant, priority shall be given to appli-
22 cants that will use grant moneys to fund a program that has the fol-
23 lowing elements:

24 (a) Develops recruitment and retention partnerships with commu-
25 nity organizations or federally recognized tribes and provides a com-
26 prehensive retention plan that includes community outreach;

27 (b) Creates a plan to develop and engage mentors for all partic-
28 ipants in the program beyond the first two years;

29 (c) Exposes all participants in the program to training that is cul-
30 turally relevant for this state and that specifically includes Oregon's
31 ethnic studies requirements, including plans for students who are

1 **black or African-American, English language learner or American In-**
2 **dian or Alaskan Native;**

3 **(d) Provides expanded or universal transferability of all academic**
4 **credit earned through the program at a post-secondary institution of**
5 **education to other post-secondary institutions of education in this**
6 **state;**

7 **(e) Demonstrates progress toward the development of a workforce**
8 **that is reflective of the students that the workforce serves; and**

9 **(f) Requires participants in the program to agree to work in a**
10 **sponsoring school district for at least four years.**

11 **(6) A school district, education service district or combination of**
12 **school districts and education service districts that receives distrib-**
13 **utions of moneys under this section may use the moneys for:**

14 **(a) Expenses incurred in providing a program described in this sec-**
15 **tion, including staff salary and benefits, management services, tuition,**
16 **scholarships, fellowships, books, academic supplies, travel stipends,**
17 **technology stipends, paid internships, loan forgiveness, paid**
18 **practicums, paid residencies, mentoring programs and professional**
19 **development.**

20 **(b) Stipends for participants in a program described in this section**
21 **for a maximum of \$5,000 from the account per participant per school**
22 **year or academic year and a maximum of four school or academic**
23 **years. Participants must be enrolled at a public high school, commu-**
24 **nity college, undergraduate program or graduate program and must**
25 **be pursuing or intending to pursue a career as a prekindergarten ed-**
26 **ucator or as a licensed kindergarten through grade 12 educator in a**
27 **field identified by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission**
28 **by rule. If the participant is enrolled in a post-secondary institution**
29 **of education, the participant must demonstrate that the participant**
30 **has used all available financial aid sources before receiving any mon-**
31 **eys under this paragraph. Nothing in this paragraph limits the**

1 amount of local matching funding that may be used for a stipend.

2 (7) A school district, education service district or combination of
3 school districts and education service districts that receives a distrib-
4 ution of moneys under this section must provide annual reports to the
5 department regarding:

6 (a) The demographics of the participants in the program;

7 (b) The retention rates of participants in the program as compared
8 to other school district or education service district educators;

9 (c) The average length of employment in a sponsoring school dis-
10 trict or education service district for a person who participated in a
11 program described in this section; and

12 (d) Progress toward diversification of the education workforce as a
13 result of the program.

14 SECTION 4. (1) The Next Generation Educator Recruitment and
15 Development Account is established in the State Treasury, separate
16 and distinct from the General Fund.

17 (2) Moneys in the account are continuously appropriated to the
18 Department of Education for the purpose of section 2 of this 2019 Act.

19 SECTION 5. For the 2019-2021 biennium only, moneys in the Next
20 Generation Educator Recruitment and Development Account estab-
21 lished under section 4 of this 2019 Act shall be used as follows:

22 (1) No more than \$15,000,000 of the account shall be used for grants
23 to school districts, education service districts or any combination of
24 school districts and education service districts as provided by section
25 3 of this 2019 Act;

26 (2) No more than \$500,000 of the account shall be used for planning
27 grants as described in section 2 (2)(b) of this 2019 Act;

28 (3) No more than \$250,000 of the account shall be used for programs
29 in middle or high schools as described in section 2 (2)(c) of this 2019
30 Act;

31 (4) No more than \$350,000 of the account shall be used for adminis-

1 trative expenses incurred by the Department of Education as described
2 in section 2 (2)(d) of this 2019 Act;

3 (5) No more than \$300,000 of the account shall be used for adminis-
4 trative expenses incurred by the Teacher Standards and Practices
5 Commission to support local efforts and reduce licensing barriers as
6 described in section 2 (2)(d) of this 2019 Act; and

7 (6) No more than \$300,000 of the account shall be used for adminis-
8 trative expenses incurred by the Educator Advancement Council to
9 support local efforts and coordinate related work as described in sec-
10 tion 2 (2)(d) of this 2019 Act.

11 SECTION 6. In addition to and not in lieu of any other appropri-
12 ation, there is appropriated to the Department of Education, for the
13 biennium beginning July 1, 2019, out of the General Fund, the amount
14 of \$16,700,000, which shall be deposited into the Next Generation Edu-
15 cator Recruitment and Development Account established under sec-
16 tion 4 of this 2019 Act.

17 SECTION 7. This 2019 Act being necessary for the immediate pres-
18 ervation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is de-
19 clared to exist, and this 2019 Act takes effect July 1, 2019.