



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

April 27, 2009

**TO:** State Board of Education

**FROM:** Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

**SUBJECT:** Presentation on the Michigan Equity Plan Update and Equitable Distribution of Highly Qualified Teachers

During the March 2008 monitoring visit conducted by the United States Department of Education (USDOE), it was found that the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) did not provide evidence that it has measured or publicly reported on its progress in carrying out its plan to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act's Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) monitoring protocol specifies the following:

**Critical Element III.B.1: The SEA has a plan in place to ensure that poor and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.**

In response to this finding, the Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) will annually report to the State Board of Education (SBE) the current Highly Qualified (HQ) status of classes taught, the state's progress in implementing the Michigan "2006 NCLB Teacher Equity Plan," and the equitable distribution of teachers. This will be completed by December 31 of each year.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324



## **Michigan Equity Plan Update & Equitable Distribution Report**

Michigan's "2006 NCLB Teacher Equity Plan" was developed based on the teacher equity template provided to states by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). A large portion of this plan included analyzing the data and reporting systems being utilized by the state and strategies to eliminate out-of-field teaching. This plan can be found at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan\\_Teacher\\_Equity\\_Plan2\\_112906\\_225500\\_7.doc](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan_Teacher_Equity_Plan2_112906_225500_7.doc).

The OPPS continues to work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) to refine the state's data collection in the Registry of Education Personnel (REP) to correctly report teacher assignments and track the number and percentage of classes taught by HQ teachers in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools. For reporting purposes, high-poverty is based on highest and lowest poverty quartiles and high minority is based on the highest and lowest minority quartiles, with minority being identified all "non-white."

Public access to teaching credentials continues to be available via the MDE's "Teacher Certification Verification" website at:

<https://mdoe.state.mi.us/teachercert/>

The website provides public access to the teaching qualification of Michigan teachers. Parents and others can use this site to verify the type of teaching certificate and endorsements held by classroom teachers. Local Education Agencies (LEA) use this website to verify the certification status of teachers to assist in the appropriate assignment of them.

CEPI staff has worked closely with MDE staff to establish a link between the REP data collection system and the License 2000 (L2K) teacher certification database system and to conduct audits of teacher assignments matched against teacher qualifications. LEAs are notified of identified discrepancies and directed to take corrective action. Along with work on the REP, OPPS has collaborated with CEPI to make available to the public, reports of HQ teachers on its website. District level equitable distribution data will also be made available within the next few months. These reports can be found at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/cepi/0,1607,7-113-21423\\_30446---,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/cepi/0,1607,7-113-21423_30446---,00.html)

As a part of this data collection review and monitoring, Michigan established the Michigan Technical Assistance Project (MITAP). This technical assistance monitoring project began in September of 2007, is supervised by OPPS staff and is staffed with contracted employees. The June 2006 REP identified 89,008 teachers of core academic classes in the State of Michigan, with 96.27% of them being identified as meeting the HQ requirements. Individual LEA HQ percentages were identified and those with the lowest HQ percentage were determined to need the most technical

assistance. The following information outlines the MiTAP project as it has developed since its implementation:

- **First Round**
  - March 15, 2007 – June 15, 2007
  - 99 LEAs (Intermediate School Districts, Public School Districts, Public School Buildings, and Public School Academies) visited
  - Selection based on those LEAs reporting less than 90% HQ teachers on the June 2006 REP
  
- **Second Round**
  - July 1, 2007 – September 30, 2007
  - 172 LEAs visited
  - Selection based on those LEAs reporting 90%-95.95% HQ teachers on the June 2006 REP
  
- **Third Round**
  - October 1, 2007 – January 31, 2008
  - 231 LEAs visited
  - Selection based on those LEAs reporting 96%-99.77% HQ teachers on the June 2006 REP
  
- **Fourth Round**
  - March 1, 2008 – May 31, 2008
  - 89 LEAs visited
  - Selection based on those LEAs reporting 100% HQ teachers on the June 2006 REP
  
- **Fifth Round**
  - September 2, 2008 – January 31, 2009
  - 239 LEAs visited
  - Selection based on those LEAs reporting 100% HQ teachers on the June 2006 REP; additional LEAs were chosen for revisits
  - All LEAs have been visited upon the completion of the fifth round.
  
- **Sixth Round**
  - March 1, 2009 – June 8, 2009 (in progress)
  - 75 LEAs are scheduled to be visited
  - Selection is based on those LEAs that reported less than 100% on the December 2008 REP and those identified as needing additional assistance; 16 Public School Academies (PSA) were also identified as new.

The technical assistance process included the following elements for each LEA:

1. review of non-HQ teachers from the June 2006 REP collection (if applicable)
2. review of non-HQ teachers from the most recent REP collection
3. review of randomly sampled credentials, placement, and HQ status of teachers listed on school master schedules

4. review of procedures for identifying and verifying HQ teachers
5. review of procedures for identifying that paraprofessionals have met NCLB requirements
6. discussion of equitable distribution and strategies to rectify inequities
7. completion of a district action plan for all non-HQ teachers and verification of the "4-Week Letter" notification sent to parents of students who have been taught by a non-HQ teacher for more than four weeks

This individualized assistance to LEAs has dramatically reduced the number of out-of-field teachers in Michigan. A deeper understanding of certification requirements has resulted from each of these visits, as well as the Regional Update Meetings that OPPS staff conducts each fall. OPPS has also posted a document on its website that has attempted to eliminate confusion on what endorsement is required for specific class assignments. The "Classes That Can Be Taught" document is not all inclusive, but does provide much needed guidance. The document is available at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Classes\\_Taught\\_12-4-07\\_217692\\_7.doc](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Classes_Taught_12-4-07_217692_7.doc)

Upon review of MiTAP reports, MDE found a number of common procedures for identifying and verifying HQ teachers. Among those common procedures, the "Highly Qualified Teacher Reporting Forms" are being completed for each core academic class taught per teacher. These forms can be found at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530\\_5683\\_14795-165860--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_5683_14795-165860--,00.html)

LEAs also verify certificates, transcripts, majors, minors, experience data, and Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) and other test results documentation. Many districts utilize data collection systems that can then be accessed so that comprehensive reports can be completed that include data that verify assignments, certifications, endorsements, majors, minors, professional, or provisional certificates. In addition, a 2006 joint labor/management committee audited the files of all teachers of selected LEAs to verify that they were HQ for the classes they were scheduled to teach during the 2005-06 school year. Each year thereafter, building administrators have been required to submit their master schedules as a cross check to verify that teachers are scheduled only for those positions in which they are HQ.

All LEAs collect free and reduced lunch data by school level and grade level. The LEAs also monitor the number of teachers within their first three years (inexperienced) and collect data on student ethnicity. As MDE initially noted in the "2006 NCLB Equity Plan," collective bargaining agreements at LEAs often limit administrator control over where teachers are placed. Teachers are permitted to bid once per year on available positions. New (or inexperienced) teachers are subject to the same provisions of the contract. In such situations, MDE has no way of ensuring that a certain percentage of experienced teachers are placed in particular positions. However, layoff of instructional personnel occurs by inverse seniority. Therefore, more senior personnel are generally retained across-the-board. MiTAP monitors also found several LEAs that have since revised the terms of their bargaining agreements and displacement

procedures with respect to HQ requirements. In many small schools, all students are in the same program and attend the same school; therefore, inequities do not exist.

Equitable distribution data have been compiled using data from the fall 2007 REP. The fall 2007 REP data were used due to the ability to match it with the current CSPR data. As indicated on the "Number of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified (HQ) Status Based on the Schools' Poverty and Minority Status" table (Attachment A), 98.49% of Michigan's core academic classes are being taught by HQ teachers. Attachment B, "Number of Classes Taught by New vs. Experienced Teachers Based on the Schools' Poverty and Minority Status" indicates that 87.74% of Michigan's core academic classes are being taught by experienced teachers. A combined summary table is also provided (Attachment C).

Of the 210,518 classes taught in Michigan schools, 207,346 (98.49%) are taught by HQ teachers and 86.44% were taught by both HQ and experienced teachers. Of the 210,518 classes, 3,172 (1.51%) were taught by teachers that had not yet demonstrated HQ status. A total of 451 (0.21%) classes were taught by teachers that were both non-HQ and new to the teaching profession (or inexperienced). This 0.21% more than likely represents inexperienced teachers in special education assignments, general education out-of-field assignments, or simply errors on the LEA data submission (REP).

Overall, the majority of Michigan's classes are being taught by HQ, experienced teachers. In examining the data in relation to LEA's minority and poverty status, there is not a significant drop in HQ and experienced teachers at the high ends (high poverty and/or high minority). The range of difference between the minority/poverty situations is 1.09% or less for classes taught by HQ teachers and 6.73% or less for classes taught by experienced teachers. Minority status appears to play less of a role in whether or not a class is taught by an HQ or inexperienced teacher. The data also indicates that within the high poverty/high minority situations, the public school academies/charter schools have significantly higher number of inexperienced teachers versus the other public schools.

OPPS plans to continue the MiTAP project and continue to monitor HQ teacher requirements and equitable distribution. OPPS recently received a commendation from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ) and Learning Point Associates for the work completed on MiTAP. OPPS staff presented the project to other state education associations at a meeting in Washington, D.C. on November 10, 2008.

In addition, MDE has completed the following aspects highlighted in the "2006 Michigan NCLB Teacher Equity Plan":

Elements 2.5, 2.6, & 2.7 - MDE has revised the Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT), originally adopted by the SBE in August 1993. The new Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMT) were adopted by the SBE in May 2008. Upon entry into an approved teacher preparation program in Michigan, teacher candidates experience ongoing professional development.

These research-based standards provide a framework of rigorous subject matter knowledge from general and liberal education, relevant pedagogical knowledge for optimal student learning, achievement, and participation in a global society. Information regarding these standards is available at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SBE\\_approved\\_PSMT\\_May\\_13\\_2008+coverpg\\_258601\\_7.doc](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SBE_approved_PSMT_May_13_2008+coverpg_258601_7.doc)

Element 3.5 – The Michigan Administrative Rules Governing Teacher Certification have been revised to require non-certificated teachers to hold at least a bachelor’s degree in the subject area content or pass the MTTC subject area test to demonstrate competency prior to a Full-Year Permit approval and that they be enrolled in a teacher preparation program. Under NCLB such teacher candidates would have three years to complete their teacher preparation program. The revision of the rules also included language that minimized the use of Emergency Permits, only authorizing their use for non-core subject areas as defined by NCLB. The rules were ratified in January 2007. These revisions can be found at:

[http://www.state.mi.us/orr/emi/admincode.asp?AdminCode=Single&Admin\\_Num=39001101&Dpt=ED&RngHigh=](http://www.state.mi.us/orr/emi/admincode.asp?AdminCode=Single&Admin_Num=39001101&Dpt=ED&RngHigh=)

- Element 4.3 - Michigan’s Teacher Retirement Act was amended to allow retired teachers to return and teach full-time in shortage areas without the earnings limitation cap. Letters are mailed to all local districts regarding the shortage areas and the retirement act. Information is available on the MDE website at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530\\_5683\\_14795-158732--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_5683_14795-158732--,00.html)

Element 5.1 - MDE continues to administer the Title IIA(3) grant program for Improving Teacher Quality. Funding is provided to partnerships which design professional development to enhance preparation of teachers in high-need content areas in high priority/high poverty LEAs. At least \$400,000 is designated to serve teachers of small or rural LEAs, as long as they meet the high poverty requirement.

- Element 5.3 - Michigan continues to provide free online professional development modules for educators through the Michigan Virtual University’s Learnport professional development portal.

Element 5.5 - MDE assisted with funding 166 candidates for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process during the 2008-2009 cycle.

Element 8.2 - Michigan Legislature approved an increase in teacher certification fees beginning January 1, 2008 in order to financially assist with the redesign of the current teacher certification database (License 2000/L2K). This redesign will

better interact with REP data so as to more effectively audit teacher qualifications. The redesign of the L2K database is currently underway.

Elements 6.2 & 6.3 – OPPS is currently aligning the math portion of the MTTC Basic Skills to the High School Michigan Content Expectations. This ensures that students graduating from Michigan high schools will be provided with a Basic Skills – mathematics assessment that is commensurate with their proficiency level. Revision and alignment of the Elementary Education MTTC is currently underway to match the elementary education certification standards recently approved (January 2008). OPPS is updating and revising the Early Childhood Education test based upon the early childhood standards and is in the process of implementing several foreign language tests, including Arabic (Modern Standard), Russian, and Latin.

## Attachment A

### Number of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified (HQ) Status Based on the Schools' Poverty and Minority Status

Poverty Level	Minority Level	HQ Teachers		Not HQ Teachers		Total	
		Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent
HI	HI	31,878	98.60%	452	1.40%	32,330	100.00%
HI	IN	7,233	99.41%	43	0.59%	7,276	100.00%
HI	LO	2,929	98.75%	37	1.25%	2,966	100.00%
IN	HI	15,471	98.49%	237	1.51%	15,708	100.00%
IN	IN	58,624	98.33%	998	1.67%	59,622	100.00%
IN	LO	28,405	98.50%	433	1.50%	28,838	100.00%
LO	HI	2,348	98.66%	32	1.34%	2,380	100.00%
LO	IN	46,053	98.32%	789	1.68%	46,842	100.00%
LO	LO	14,405	98.96%	151	1.04%	14,556	100.00%
Poverty	HI	42,040	98.75%	532	1.25%	42,572	100.00%
	IN	102,500	98.40%	1,668	1.60%	104,168	100.00%
	LO	62,806	98.48%	972	1.52%	63,778	100.00%
Minority	HI	49,697	98.57%	721	1.43%	50,418	100.00%
	IN	111,910	98.39%	1,830	1.61%	113,740	100.00%
	LO	45,739	98.66%	621	1.34%	46,360	100.00%
Total	Total	207,346	98.49%	3,172	1.51%	210,518	100.00%

This report is based on data submitted by Michigan school districts through the fall 2007 Registry of Educational Personnel Collection and the fall 2007 Single Record Student Database.

"New" teachers are those staff members who were submitted with an employment status indicating a teacher in the first three years of the profession. "Experienced" are all other staff members.

Poverty Levels are derived by calculating the poverty rates (the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch) for each entity to which teachers were assigned. These were then ranked for elementary and secondary schools and then the top quarter and bottom quarter were labeled high and low, respectively.

The minority levels were determined similarly to the poverty, identifying all non-white students as minority students.

"HI" identifies the educational entities in the top category, "LO" identifies the bottom category, "IN" identifies those in-between.

## Attachment B

### Number of Classes Taught by New vs. Experienced Teachers Based on the Schools' Poverty and Minority Status

Poverty	Minority	Total Experienced Teachers		Total New Teachers		Total	
		Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent
HI	HI	27,201	84.14%	5,129	15.86%	32,330	100.00%
HI	IN	6,069	83.41%	1,207	16.59%	7,276	100.00%
HI	LO	2,532	85.37%	434	14.63%	2,966	100.00%
IN	HI	13,267	84.46%	2,441	15.54%	15,708	100.00%
IN	IN	53,299	89.39%	6,323	10.61%	59,622	100.00%
IN	LO	25,994	90.14%	2,844	9.86%	28,838	100.00%
LO	HI	2,054	86.30%	326	13.70%	2,380	100.00%
LO	IN	41,562	88.73%	5,280	11.27%	46,842	100.00%
LO	LO	12,722	87.40%	1,834	12.60%	14,556	100.00%
Poverty	HI	35,802	84.10%	6,770	15.90%	42,572	100.00%
	IN	92,560	88.86%	11,608	11.14%	104,168	100.00%
	LO	56,338	88.33%	7,440	11.67%	63,778	100.00%
Minority	HI	42,522	84.34%	7,896	15.66%	50,418	100.00%
	IN	100,930	88.74%	12,810	11.26%	113,740	100.00%
	LO	41,248	88.97%	5,112	11.03%	46,360	100.00%
Total		184,700	87.74%	25,818	12.26%	210,518	100.00%

This report is based on data submitted by Michigan school districts through the fall 2007 Registry of Educational Personnel Collection and the fall 2007 Single Record Student Database.

"New" teachers are those staff members who were submitted with an employment status indicating a teacher in the first three years of the profession. "Experienced" are all other staff members.

Poverty Levels are derived by calculating the poverty rates (the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch) for each entity to which teachers were assigned. These were then ranked for elementary and secondary schools and then the top quarter and bottom quarter were labeled high and low, respectively.

The minority levels were determined similarly to the poverty, identifying all non-white students as minority students.

"HI" identifies the educational entities in the top category, "LO" identifies the bottom category, "IN" identifies those in-between.

## Number of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified (HQ) Status for New and Experienced Teachers Based on the Schools' Poverty and Minority Status

Poverty Level	Minority Level	Experienced Teachers				New Teacher				Total	
		HQ		Not HQ		HQ		Not HQ		Number of Classes	Percent
		Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent	Number of Classes	Percent		
HI	HI	26,799	82.89%	402	1.24%	5,079	15.71%	50	0.15%	32,330	100.00%
HI	IN	6,031	82.89%	38	0.52%	1,202	16.52%	5	0.07%	7,276	100.00%
HI	LO	2,510	84.63%	22	0.74%	419	14.13%	15	0.51%	2,966	100.00%
IN	HI	13,056	83.12%	211	1.34%	2,415	15.37%	26	0.17%	15,708	100.00%
IN	IN	52,423	87.93%	876	1.47%	6,201	10.40%	122	0.20%	59,622	100.00%
IN	LO	25,613	88.82%	381	1.32%	2,792	9.68%	52	0.18%	28,838	100.00%
LO	HI	2,028	85.21%	26	1.09%	320	13.45%	6	0.25%	2,380	100.00%
LO	IN	40,913	87.34%	649	1.39%	5,140	10.97%	140	0.30%	46,842	100.00%
LO	LO	12,606	86.60%	116	0.80%	1,799	12.36%	35	0.24%	14,556	100.00%
Poverty	HI	35,340	83.01%	462	1.09%	6,700	15.74%	70	0.16%	42,572	100.00%
	IN	91,092	87.45%	1,468	1.41%	11,408	10.95%	200	0.19%	104,168	100.00%
	LO	55,547	87.09%	791	1.24%	7,259	11.38%	181	0.28%	63,778	100.00%
Minority	HI	41,883	83.07%	639	1.27%	7,814	15.50%	82	0.16%	50,418	100.00%
	IN	99,367	87.36%	1,563	1.37%	12,543	11.03%	267	0.23%	113,740	100.00%
	LO	40,729	87.85%	519	1.12%	5,010	10.81%	102	0.22%	46,360	100.00%
Total		181,979	86.44%	2,721	1.29%	25,367	12.05%	451	0.21%	210,518	100.00%

This report is based on data submitted by Michigan school districts through the fall 2007 Registry of Educational Personnel Collection and the fall 2007 Single Record Student Database.

"New" teachers are those staff members who were submitted with an employment status indicating a teacher in the first three years of the profession. "Experienced" are all other staff members.

Poverty Levels are derived by calculating the poverty rates (the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch) for each entity to which teachers were assigned. These were then ranked for elementary and secondary schools and then the top quarter and bottom quarter were labeled high and low, respectively.

The minority levels were determined similarly to the poverty, identifying all non-white students as minority students.

"HI" identifies the educational entities in the top category, "LO" identifies the bottom category, "IN" identifies those in-between.



## Michigan Equity Plan Update & Equitable Distribution Glossary

"4-Week Notification" Letter	NCLB required notification to parents of classes taught by teachers not meeting the Highly Qualified definition
CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers
CEPI	Center for Educational Performance and Information
Core Academic Classes	Defined in NCLB as: English, language arts, reading, science, mathematics, arts, foreign languages, government and civics, history, economics and geography
CSPR	Consolidated State Performance Report
ELSMT	Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers
Experienced Teacher	A teacher having taught more than 3-years
Highly Qualified (HQ) Teacher	A teacher having met state certification requirements and demonstrated core content area knowledge by way of one of having one of the following: major, passing test score on a state approved exam (MTTC), or completion of a HOUSSE option
HOUSSE options	High Objective State Standard of Evaluation as established by the <i>Michigan Definition of a Highly Qualified Teacher</i> (SBE approved April 24, 2003)
Inexperienced Teacher	A teacher within their first 3-years of completing their teacher preparation program

## Michigan Equity Plan Update & Equitable Distribution Glossary

K-12	Kindergarten through 12 <sup>th</sup> grade
License 2000 (L2K)	Current teacher certification and licensing database
Local Education Agency (LEA)	Any K-12 local school district
MDE	Michigan Department of Education
Michigan High School Content Expectations	Standards and expectations representing a vision for a rigorous and relevant high school experience for all Michigan students over the next five to ten years. Special attention has been paid to national research and support for the skills that prepare students for successful post-secondary engagement and the workplace.
MITAP	Michigan Technical Assistance Project
MTTC	Michigan Test for Teacher Certification
MTTC Basic Skills	Reading, writing and mathematics
NCCTQ	National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality
NCLB	No Child Left Behind

## Michigan Equity Plan Update & Equitable Distribution Glossary

OPPS	Office of Professional Preparation Services
Out-of-Field Teacher	A teacher assigned to a class for which they do not hold Michigan certification, endorsement or authorization
Poor and Minority Students	Poor - Based on high, in-between and low poverty quartiles established using free and reduced school lunch data  Minority - Based on high, in-between and low minority quartiles established using data from the Single Record Student Database (SRSD); minority being identified as all "non-white"
PSMT	Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers
REP	Registry of Education Personnel
SBE	State Board of Education
Unqualified Teacher (non-HQ)	A teacher not meeting the Michigan definition of Highly Qualified
USDOE	United States Department of Education