

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Teacher Recruitment and Retention: Federal, State, and Local Programs

Updated January 26, 2006

Jeffrey J. Kuenzi
Analyst in Social Legislation
Domestic Social Policy Division

Teacher Recruitment and Retention: Federal, State, and Local Programs

Summary

The recruitment and retention of a high-quality teaching force is critical to the future success of our nation's school system. To address this issue, a very wide range of programs have been put into place at the federal, state, and local levels in recent years. As Congress works to reauthorize the Higher Education Act (HEA), this issue promises to be a major part of the debate.

The requirement in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) that all teachers be *highly qualified* in many ways crystalized national attention on the teacher supply problem. Learned observers disagree over whether the problem is a matter of a general shortage of qualified teachers or an uneven social and spacial distribution of good teachers. However, most agree that successful recruitment and retention are key to meeting the long-term challenges faced by our nation's schools.

In recognition of the importance of the recruitment and retention of good teachers, policymakers at all levels of government have developed a wide variety of programs designed to increase the supply of teachers, create incentives for professional development, and improve teachers' job experience and satisfaction.

The purpose of this report is to review the range of these efforts nationwide and provide a context for the issues that may yet arise during HEA reauthorization. Title II of HEA and sections of HEA, Title IV provide the bulk of the federal effort to recruit and retain teachers. In addition to these programs, this report will discuss many teacher recruitment and retention efforts that have been initiated at the state and local levels, as well as by private foundations.

This report will be updated as significant legislative actions occur.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Taxonomy of Teacher Recruitment and Retention Programs | 2 |
| Current Federal Programs | 3 |
| Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants | 3 |
| Loan Forgiveness for Teachers | 3 |
| Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund | 4 |
| Troops to Teachers | 5 |
| Transition to Teaching | 5 |
| Non-Federal Programs | 5 |
| Foundation Programs | 6 |
| Ford Foundation Initiatives | 6 |
| Teach for America | 6 |
| Pathways to Teaching Careers | 6 |
| State Programs | 7 |
| Recruitment Scholarships | 9 |
| National Board Certification | 10 |
| Signing Bonuses | 10 |
| Alternative Route to Teaching | 11 |
| Induction Programs | 11 |
| Local Programs | 11 |
| Brenham, TX | 12 |
| New York, NY | 12 |
| Longview, WA | 12 |
| Carson, CA | 12 |
| Chicago, IL | 13 |
| Conclusion | 13 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|---|
| Table 1. State Efforts to Recruit and Retain Teachers | 8 |
|---|---|

Teacher Recruitment and Retention: Federal, State, and Local Programs

Introduction

The recruitment and retention of a high-quality teaching force is critical to the future success of our nation's school system. To address this issue, a very wide range of programs have been put into place at the federal, state, and local levels in recent years. As Congress works to reauthorize the Higher Education Act (HEA), this issue promises to be a major part of the debate.¹ Although there is widespread agreement that the nation has a teacher supply problem, learned observers disagree over whether the problem is a matter of a general shortage of qualified teachers or an uneven social and spacial distribution of good teachers.

Since the early 1980s, some researchers have warned of a coming teacher shortage driven by demographic changes that would simultaneously increase school enrollment and teacher retirement. Other analysts argue that an additional, or perhaps more important, factor contributing to the difficulty in staffing K-12 teaching positions has been the rapid turnover of newly hired teachers in hard-to-staff schools.² Current estimates suggest that, overall, about one-third of teachers leave the profession within five years of being hired; however, in certain schools the five-year attrition rate reaches 50%.³ Thus, many policymakers posit that solutions to the teacher staffing problem: (1) make as great an effort as possible to retain as to recruit new teachers, and (2) make an extra effort in schools suffering the greatest loss of newly hired teachers.

In addition to the federal programs in the HEA and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), many policies and programs designed to address teacher recruitment and retention have been initiated at the state and local levels as well as by private foundations. The purpose of this report is to review the range of current efforts nationwide and provide a context for the issues that may arise during HEA reauthorization. A description of current federal programs will be followed by a review of non-federal programs. With over 14,000 schools districts across the

¹ For an overview of HEA reauthorization, see CRS Report RL33040, *The Higher Education Act: Reauthorization Status and Issues*, by Adam Stoll.

² Richard M. Ingersoll, "A Different Approach to Solving the Teacher Shortage Problem," *Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, Teaching Quality Policy Briefs*, no. 3, Jan. 2001.

³ Anne Simmons, *A Guide to Today's Teacher Recruitment Challenges* (Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 2000).

country, it is difficult to catalogue every program in existence. Thus, the goal of this review is to cover the major state policies in existence and provide a description of how *selected* programs work at the local level.

Taxonomy of Teacher Recruitment and Retention Programs

The federal programs described below provide a significant amount of funds (approximately \$4.1 billion in FY2005) in support of a broad array of teacher recruitment and retention programs. The spectrum of activities allowed under the federal programs encompasses most (if not all) of the activities discussed in the review of non-federal programs. Indeed, some of the programs described in the “non-federal” section of this report receive federal funds. Before getting into the descriptions of these programs, a brief overview of teacher recruitment and retention programs may be useful.

Recruitment efforts can be generally divided between (1) programs that try to attract individuals who are not currently considering a career in teaching and (2) programs that provide incentives designed to influence job choice and professional development among those already in (or about to enter) the teaching profession. The first category of programs target either high school and college students or mid-career professionals who are not currently teaching. These efforts may involve early intervention in career choice such as familiarizing high school juniors and seniors with the teaching profession or later intervention in career change such as providing financial incentives (and/or alternate routes) to teacher certification.

The second category of recruitment programs targets either students in teacher education programs or currently employed educational professionals (both teachers and teacher’s aides — sometimes called paraprofessionals). Since these programs are dealing with people who have already chosen a teaching career, they create incentives (primarily financial in nature) intended to guide the course of that career — such as obtaining National Board Certification,⁴ taking a job in a hard-to-staff school, or completing an unfinished or advanced teaching degree program.

Retention policies can also be divided into two types: (1) those which are directly tied to a recruitment policy and (2) stand-alone programs. The best example of the former are scholarship programs that have a service requirement. For example, such programs may provide college seniors with money to stay for a fifth year of schooling in order to complete a teacher education program. In return, recipients are required to work for a specified number of years — perhaps in subject areas experiencing an acute shortage or in hard-to-staff schools.

An example of a stand-alone policy is an induction program that attempts to give new teachers mentoring and other support during their first few years of teaching. This induction may be related to recruitment efforts in that it may follow certain pre-service activities (such as summer training); however, it need not

⁴ A voluntary credential available to teachers who possess a bachelor’s degree and a state teaching license and have taught for at least three years.

necessarily have any real connection to those activities and may in fact function entirely separate from recruitment efforts.

Current Federal Programs

Major federal programs aimed at teacher recruitment and retention are contained in both the HEA and ESEA. These include the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants, Loan Forgiveness for Teachers, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund, Troops to Teachers, and Transition to Teaching. Each of these programs is described below.

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

These grants, authorized in HEA, Title II, consist of three competitive awards — state grants, partnership grants, and recruitment grants. Although the last are expressly targeted at teacher recruitment, the first two also contain objectives and activities meant to improve recruitment and retention. Each is awarded on a one-time basis of limited duration (three years for state and recruitment grants and five years for partnerships).

Recruitment and retention activities in these programs include the creation of alternative routes to traditional teacher preparation and certification, assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) to recruit and reward highly qualified and effective teachers, teacher education scholarships for postsecondary education that require teaching service in high-need schools, and additional assistance to high-need LEAs for attracting highly qualified teachers.

The FY2006 appropriation is \$59.9 million. Further information on this program can be found in the CRS Report RL31882, *Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (Title II, Part A of the Higher Education Act): Overview and Reauthorization Issues*.

Loan Forgiveness for Teachers

Additional federal programs intended to encourage individuals to enter and continue in the teaching profession are authorized in HEA, Title IV. For certain student loan borrowers employed as teachers in low-income schools or subject matter shortage areas, these programs provide for full or partial cancellation, deferment or forbearance, or reduced repayment obligation. Eligibility for the programs is restricted according to the type of loan, the year in which it was dispersed, years of teaching service, and teacher qualifications.

Two sections of the HEA (428J and 460) provide payment relief for Federal Family Education Loans and Direct Loans. Up to \$5,000 of such loans may be forgiven for teachers who have accrued at least five consecutive years of full-time teaching experience in a low-income school and were “new borrowers” on or after

October 1, 1998.⁵ Although loan dispersal need only precede completion of the fifth year of teaching, large numbers of qualified borrowers are not expected to “take-up” the program until FY2009.

Between FY2001 and FY2003, approximately \$1.6 million in loans were forgiven under Sections 428J and 460. The Education Department projects these figures to rise dramatically over the next decade as the number of eligible teachers increases. These estimates project cumulative program outlays of over \$1.6 billion by the end of FY2014.⁶ Further information on this program can be found in CRS Report RL32516, *Student Loan Forgiveness Programs*.

Teachers are also eligible for forgiveness of Perkins Loans under HEA Section 465. Loans made after June 30, 1972 may be cancelled based on years of qualifying service as a full-time teacher in either a low-income school or a high demand subject area including special education, mathematics, science, foreign languages, and bilingual education. Repayment is made at a rate of 15% for the first and second year of service, 20% for the third and fourth year of service, and 30% for the fifth year of service. As of June 2003, \$562 million in Perkins Loans have been cancelled under this program.⁷ Further information on this program can be found in CRS Report RL31618, *Campus-Based Student Financial Aid Programs Under the Higher Education Act*.

Teacher and Principal Training and Recruitment Fund

This ESEA program (Title II, Part A) provides grants to states (and subgrants to LEAs) on a formula basis. The formula consists of a base guarantee in an amount derived from two antecedent programs (Eisenhower and Class Size Reduction). Excess funds are distributed on the basis of each state’s (and each LEA’s) school-aged and poor population counts. High-need LEAs can also receive competitively awarded grants in partnership with higher education institutions (and their schools of arts and sciences).

This program supports numerous activities at the local, state, and national levels including a national teacher recruitment campaign along with local recruitment assistance, mentoring and training that improve professional development (particularly for special education and early childhood teachers), grants to promote advanced certification as well as reforms in teacher certification and tenure, and a clearinghouse for teacher recruitment and placement. The FY2006 appropriation for this program is \$2.94 billion. Further details on this program are laid out in CRS Report RL30834, *K-12 Teacher Quality: Issues and Legislative Action*.

⁵ P.L. 108-409, signed into law by the President on October 30, 2004, provides a one-year expansion of this amount to \$17,000 for qualified teachers in the fields of math, science, and special education.

⁶ Unpublished work by the U. S. Department of Education Budget Service, Apr. 30, 2003.

⁷ U.S. Department of Education, *2004 Campus-Based Programs Data Book*, at [<http://www.ed.gov/finaid/prof/resources/data/databook2004/index.html>].

Troops to Teachers

Another ESEA teacher recruitment program (Title II, C, 1-A) was previously authorized as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2000. Troops to Teachers is intended to (1) assist eligible members of the armed forces to obtain certification or licensing as elementary, secondary, or vocational/technical teachers; and (2) facilitate the employment of these individuals by LEAs or public charter schools that receive ESEA Title I, Part A grants or are experiencing a shortage of highly qualified teachers.

Although appropriations for this program go to the Department of Education (ED), the Secretary of Education is required to transfer most of the funds to the Department of Defense, which administers much of the program. ED is authorized to reserve up to \$10 million of each year's appropriation to award funds to state educational agencies (SEAs), institutions of higher education, or consortia of those entities to develop, implement, and demonstrate the Innovative Preretirement Certification portion of the program. The FY2006 appropriation for this program is \$14.6 million. Further details on this program are discussed in CRS Report RL30834, *K-12 Teacher Quality: Issues and Legislative Action*.

Transition to Teaching

The third ESEA program specifically aimed at addressing teacher recruitment and retention is Transition to Teaching (Title II, C, 1-B). This program authorizes competitive five-year grants to partnerships and eligible entities to establish programs to recruit and retain highly qualified mid-career professionals and recent college graduates as teachers in high-need schools. This includes the recruitment of teachers through alternative routes to certification under state-approved programs that enable individuals to be eligible for teacher certification within a reduced period of time.

An SEA and a high-need LEA may partner with (1) each other, (2) a consortium of other SEAs and/or high-need LEAs, (3) for-profit or nonprofit organizations that have a proven record of effectively recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers, or (4) institutions of higher education. Eligible activities include financial incentives to participants, pre- and post-placement induction or support activities, placement in high-need schools or short-staffed subject areas, collaborations with institutions of higher education to develop and implement long-term teacher recruitment and retention strategies (including teacher credentialing). The FY2006 appropriation for this program is \$45.5 million. Further details on this program are discussed in CRS Report RL30834, *K-12 Teacher Quality: Issues and Legislative Action*.

Non-Federal Programs

In addition to federal support, state and local funds as well as grants from private foundations provide for a broad spectrum of teacher recruitment and retention activities around the country. Some of the major efforts are reviewed in this section. Evaluation information is also provided when available.

Foundation Programs

Three major initiatives to recruit teachers that are coordinated and funded at the national level by private foundations include the Ford Foundation Minority Teacher Education Initiative, Teach For America, and the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund Pathways to Teaching Careers Program.

Ford Foundation Initiatives. The Ford Foundation provides a number of grants to improve teacher recruitment and retention through its Knowledge, Creativity, and Freedom Program. Among these are the Minority Teacher Education Initiative which helps individuals complete teacher-education programs at four- and five-year colleges and universities. As of 2000, the Minority Teacher Education Project had recruited approximately 5,000 program participants from high schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities as well as from the paraprofessional teaching ranks. Major activities in this project include identification and recruitment of participants, assessment and monitoring of progress, academic and personal support, curriculum revision, and limited financial incentives.⁸ No evaluations of this program are available.

Teach for America. Each year, Teach For America selects a corps of almost 2,000 individuals for placement as full-time, paid teachers in one of 15 low-income urban and rural public schools nationwide. Participants are primarily college graduates who did not major in education. They attend a five-week summer training institute in basic teaching skills and approaches utilized by successful teachers in low-income communities. Additional activities include induction programs, regional support networks, social activities, seasonal retreats, monthly newsletters, discussion groups and annual inter-regional conferences. An internal evaluation revealed that nearly 90% of participants complete their two-year service commitment.⁹ On the other hand, a recent evaluation found that students taught by teachers from the program scored lower on reading, mathematics, and language assessments.¹⁰

Pathways to Teaching Careers. Pathways recruits teaching candidates from two nontraditional sources: (1) paraprofessionals and noncertified teachers already working in hard-to-staff rural and urban public schools, and (2) returned Peace Corps volunteers. Participants receive scholarships and other support services that enable them to return to college or university and complete the required courses leading to full certification and teaching jobs. Since 1989, the program has provided scholarships and other forms of support to more than 9,000 prospective teachers enrolled in 149 institutions nationwide.¹¹ A six-year evaluation of the program

⁸ U.S. Department of Education, *Literature Review on Teacher Recruitment Programs*, Sept. 2000.

⁹ More information available at [<http://www.teachforamerica.org>].

¹⁰ Ildiko Laczko-Kerr and David C. Berliner, "The Effectiveness of 'Teach for America' and Other Under-certified Teachers on Student Academic Achievement: A Case of Harmful Public Policy," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 10, no. 37 (Sept. 6, 2002).

¹¹ More information available online from the Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. website at (continued...)

revealed that the program had high completion rates for its preparation programs (75%), high placement rates in targeted schools (84%), and high three-year retention rates (88%).¹²

State Programs

Several sources of information on existing state programs are available, and each produces slightly different tallies of which states have and do not have programs.¹³ Variation among these reports is primarily due to differences in program definition and funding. One source of nationally standardized information comes from a national survey conducted by *Education Week*.¹⁴ This survey collected information on actual participation in specific programs. Thus, it avoids some of the problems associated with differing program definition and does not produce positive “hits” for states with unfunded programs.

Education Week analyzed these data and produced a state-by-state checklist of recruitment and retention policies including financial incentives, alternative routes to teaching, and induction and mentorship programs for new teachers.¹⁵ This checklist is reproduced in **Table 1**. Following a brief discussion of the table are examples of each of these types of programs.

In the 1999-2000 school year, 24 states awarded loans, scholarships, or waived licensing fees in an effort to retain or recruit teachers. These efforts were targeted to subject-area shortages in 18 states and to high-need schools in seven states. Thirty-five states awarded retention bonuses to highly qualified and/or veteran teachers who acquired National Board Certification. A handful of states offered signing bonuses (five states) and/or housing assistance (six states) to teachers. Additionally, according to a survey by the Education Commission of the States, 19 states offered loan forgiveness to teachers in hard-to-staff schools during the 1998-1999 school year (not shown in the table).¹⁶

¹¹ (...continued)

[<http://www.rnt.org/resources/breaking+the+class+ceiling.pdf>].

¹² Beatriz Chu Clewell and Ana María Villegas, *Evaluation of the Dewitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund’s Pathways to Teaching Careers Program* (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Oct. 2001).

¹³ For example, see reports by Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. [<http://www.rnt.org>]; the Education Commission of the States [<http://www.ecs.org>]; *Education Week* [<http://www.edweek.org>]; U.S. Education Department [<http://www.ed.gov>]; the State Higher Education Executive Officers [<http://www.sheeo.org>]; and the Southeast Center for Teaching Quality [<http://www.teachingquality.org>].

¹⁴ Published by Editorial Projects in Education Inc. a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization based in Washington, D.C.

¹⁵ Susan E. Ansell and Melissa McCabe, “Off Target: Ensuring Qualified Teachers,” *Education Week*, vol. 22, no. 17 (*Quality Counts 2003*), Jan. 2003.

¹⁶ Education Commission of the States, *Information Clearinghouse 2000*, at [<http://www.ecs.org/>].

Table 1. State Efforts to Recruit and Retain Teachers

| State | Loan, scholarship, fee waiver | National Board certification bonus | Signing bonus | Housing assistance | Alternative route program | New teacher induction | New teacher mentoring |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Alabama | X | X | | | | | |
| Alaska | | | | | | | |
| Arizona | | | | | | | |
| Arkansas | | X | | | X | X | X |
| California | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Colorado | | | | | | X | |
| Connecticut | X | | | X | X | X | X |
| Delaware | X | X | | | X | X | X |
| District of Columbia | | X | | | X | X | X |
| Florida | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| Georgia | | X | | | X | | X |
| Hawaii | | X | | X | | | |
| Idaho | | X | | | X | X | X |
| Illinois | X | X | | | X | | X |
| Indiana | | | | | X | X | |
| Iowa | X | X | | | | X | |
| Kansas | | X | | | | | |
| Kentucky | X | X | | | X | X | X |
| Louisiana | X | X | | | X | X | |
| Maine | | | | | | X | |
| Maryland | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Massachusetts | X | X | X | | X | X | X |
| Michigan | | | | | | X | |
| Minnesota | X | | | | | X | |
| Mississippi | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Missouri | X | X | | | X | X | X |
| Montana | | X | | | | | |
| Nebraska | | | | | | | |
| Nevada | | X | X | | | | |
| New Hampshire | X | | | | X | | X |
| New Jersey | | | | | | | |
| New Mexico | | | | | | X | |
| New York | X | X | | | X | | X |
| North Carolina | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| North Dakota | X | X | | | | | |
| Ohio | | X | | | | X | |
| Oklahoma | X | X | | | | X | |
| Oregon | | | | | | | |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | X | X | |
| Rhode Island | | | | | | | |
| South Carolina | X | X | | | X | X | X |

| State | Loan, scholarship, fee waiver | National Board certification bonus | Signing bonus | Housing assistance | Alternative route program | New teacher induction | New teacher mentoring |
|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| South Dakota | | X | | | | | |
| Tennessee | X | | | | | | |
| Texas | X | X | | | X | X | X |
| Utah | X | X | | | | X | |
| Vermont | | X | | | | X | |
| Virginia | X | X | | | X | X | |
| Washington | | X | | | X | X | X |
| West Virginia | | X | | | | X | |
| Wisconsin | | X | | | X | X | X |
| Wyoming | | X | | | | | |
| U.S. | 24 | 35 | 5 | 6 | 25 | 30 | 19 |

Source: Susan E. Ansell and Melissa McCabe, “Off Target: Ensuring Qualified Teachers,” *Education Week*, vol. 22, no. 17 (*Quality Counts 2003*), Jan. 2003.

Nearly all states offer some form of alternative route to teaching, but only 25 feature “structured” programs that include both preservice-training and mentoring components.¹⁷ Of the 25, 11 target subject-area shortages, three target high-need schools, 18 require passage of a teacher-licensing exam, 14 require a minimum GPA, and 12 require work experience and/or subject-area coursework. Thirty states have an induction program for new teachers and about half of these (16) require and finance the program for all new teachers. Finally, 19 states require a mentoring program of one to three years in duration.

State programs for teacher recruitment and retention are described in fuller detail in the following paragraphs. These descriptions cover five types of programs: scholarships to attend college in return for teaching service, compensation for achieving National Board Certification, signing bonuses, alternative routes to teacher certification, and new teacher induction programs.

Recruitment Scholarships. An example of a state scholarship program that is used to recruit students into teaching careers is North Carolina’s Teaching Fellows Program. This program has been recognized for its longevity (begun in 1986) and strong funding support (\$2.8 million annually).¹⁸ Each year, about 400 high school seniors are awarded scholarships of \$6,500 per year to pay for college in return for a four-year teaching service commitment. Fellows are recruited from the most successful students (average SAT score of 1150 and average GPA of 3.6) and those least represented as teachers (20% are minorities and 30% are male). According to a recent report, 82% of the teachers who received a scholarship through the program

¹⁷ All but six states have some type of alternative route program. However, many have been criticized for their lack of structure and considered “little more than renewable emergency certificates.” See Susan E. Ansell and Melissa McCabe, “Off Target: Ensuring Qualified Teachers,” *Education Week*, vol. 22, no. 17 (*Quality Counts 2003*), Jan. 2003.

¹⁸ More information is available at [<http://www.teachingfellows.org>].

were still employed after completing their required teaching service (i.e., in their fifth year) and 73% remained after 10 years.¹⁹ The program has been a model for similar programs in development in other states including South Carolina, Hawaii, Maryland, and New Mexico.

National Board Certification. National Board Certification is a voluntary credential available to teachers who possess a bachelor's degree and a state teaching license and have taught for at least three years. To obtain this credential, teachers must demonstrate their knowledge and skills through a series of performance-based assessments.²⁰ Several states provide bonuses to teachers who attain National Board Certification including North Carolina — 12% annual salary increase; Florida — additional 10% of the statewide average teacher salary; South Carolina and Mississippi — \$7,500 and \$6,000 annual supplements respectively; and California — a one-time \$10,000 bonus plus \$20,000 for teachers in low-performing schools. These incentives may be motivated by evidence that Board certified teachers outperform comparable non-Board-certified teachers on a number of pedagogical and student outcome measures.²¹ Other researchers suggest that certification does not lead to improved student achievement.²²

Signing Bonuses. Along with a handful of states, Massachusetts established a signing bonus program in the late 1990s. The program operates through a subcontract with the Teach For America initiative mentioned earlier. Between 1998 and 2001, the Massachusetts Institute for New Teachers (MINT) gave a \$20,000 signing bonus to over 400 mid-career switchers to address the state's teacher quality and supply problems. About one-third of these individuals were either already certified or had some teaching experience. The rest, though they may be considered "subject matter experts," were given a six-week teacher training program. Teachers in the program also attended weekly mentoring sessions. An early evaluation revealed that 20% of the candidates recruited in the first year of the program's existence had left by the end of the second year.²³ On the other hand, principals who have hired MINT graduates have been very happy with the program and would continue to hire MINT graduates without reservation.²⁴

¹⁹ The Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, *Recruitment and Retention Strategies in a Regional and National Context*, Jan. 2002.

²⁰ More information is available at [<http://www.nbpts.org>].

²¹ Linda Darling-Hammond, "Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 8, no. 1 (Jan. 1, 2000). Lloyd Bond et al., *The Certification System of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: A Construct and Consequential Validity Study*, Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, UNC-Greensboro, Sept. 2000.

²² Dale Ballou and Michael Podgursky, "The Case Against Teacher Certification," *The Public Interest*, no. 132 (summer 1998), pp. 17-29.

²³ R. Clarke Fowler, "The Massachusetts Signing Bonus Program for New Teachers: A Model of Teacher Preparation Worth Copying?" *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 11, no. 13 (Apr. 22, 2003).

²⁴ According to a recent study by the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. More (continued...)

Alternative Route to Teaching. The Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (formerly Teach for Georgia) is an example of a “fast-track” program to certification for mid-career changers.²⁵ The program recruits business professionals with college degrees and a 2.5 GPA who complete a four-week summer training session followed by a semester of classroom experience in the fall. Few of the partnerships require a significant amount of training beyond the summer session. Some have criticized this program (and similar programs in other states) for uneven and inadequate training — particularly in preparation for teaching in high-need schools.²⁶ Others point to research showing that such programs recruit teachers who remain in teaching for at least as long as or longer than traditionally prepared teachers.²⁷

Induction Programs. An example of an induction program is the California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program. This program involves a two-year induction period in which a mentor teacher is partnered with a new teacher. The program is centered around the development of an Individualized Induction Plan that includes the beginning teacher’s growth goals, specific strategies for achieving those goals, and documentation of progress. The program allocates \$3,320 per new teacher with local districts expected to contribute \$2,000 to the total cost of the program. Recent evaluation data suggest that new teachers who participated in the program had a 66% lower attrition rate than those who did not receive support.²⁸

Local Programs

This section reviews selected teacher recruitment and retention efforts at the local level. These programs can be classified according to one of five target populations identified by Darling-Hammond, et al.: (1) pre-college recruitment programs; (2) university-based programs to improve recruitment and retention of students already in the pipeline; (3) efforts to develop pathways into teaching for students in community colleges; (4) programs that tap the pool of paraprofessionals and teacher aides; and (5) programs to attract mid-career professionals and other college graduates into teaching.²⁹ Examples of projects in each of the five areas are

²⁴ (...continued)
information is available at [<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mint/>].

²⁵ Some of the projects in this program are funded in part through the Troops to Teachers program described earlier.

²⁶ Lawrence Baines, Jackie McDowell, and David Foulk, “One Step Forward, Three Steps Backward: Alternative Certification Programs in Texas, Georgia, and Florida,” *Educational Horizons*, fall 2001.

²⁷ E. Feistritzer and D. Chester, *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis*, (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information, 2000) [<http://www.ncei.com>].

²⁸ The Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, *Recruitment and Retention Strategies in a Regional and National Context*, Jan. 2002.

²⁹ Linda Darling-Hammond and Gary Sykes, eds., *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999).

given below. Information on program effectiveness is discussed in cases where evaluations are available.

Brenham, TX. An example of a *pre-college program* is the Educational Pathway for Teaching Program in the Brenham Independent School District. The program targets high school students who take “future teacher courses” in child development and teaching. Participating students are awarded teacher aide certificates and teach for one year while attending community college. Then, participants can apply to the Teacher Aide Exemption Program which releases them from their teaching responsibilities in order to attend a four-year university on a full-time basis and complete the teacher certification process. Following certification students are encouraged to return to Brenham ISD to teach. No evaluation of this program is available at the present time.³⁰

New York, NY. The Teacher Opportunity Corps at Teachers College is a fifth-year *university-based program* that recruits minorities who possess a bachelor’s degree into teaching by providing financial incentives and support services to further their education. Recruits enroll in a master’s degree teacher preparation program necessary in New York State to secure a permanent state teaching certificate. The program provides a \$1,250 scholarship for part-time study and reimbursement for attending a professional conference, writing center fees, and teacher exam fees. In addition to regular graduate courses required for the M.A. at Teachers College, participants attend a cohort seminar focusing on urban settings and teaching at-risk students and undergo two semesters of student teaching experiences in schools with high enrollments of at-risk students.³¹

Longview, WA. The Elementary Education Program is a *community college program* involving a collaborative effort between Lower Columbia College, Washington State University, and area school districts including the Longview local educational agency. Its goal is to attract community college students into teaching and retain them as teachers in area schools. Participants complete two years of prerequisite course work at LCC and transfer directly into WSU’s elementary education program, a full-time course of study leading to a Bachelor of Arts and K-8 certification in two years. Other activities include field experiences, preprofessional education course work, regularly scheduled counseling and academic planning meetings at each of the two postsecondary institutions. Students also receive academic support services such as reading, writing, and mathematics assistance, as well as critical thinking, problem-solving and decision-making.³²

Carson, CA. A *paraprofessional program* called the Aide-to-Teacher (ATT) Project is a teacher recruitment and preparation project for classroom aides. Based at the California State University at Dominguez Hills, the program provides paraprofessionals with the financial, academic, and personal support to continue

³⁰ Additional information is available at [<http://texasteach.tamu.edu>].

³¹ J. Jacullo-Noto, “Minority Recruitment in Teacher Education: Problems and Possibilities,” *Urban Education*, vol. 26. no. 2 (July 1991), pp. 214-230.

³² Additional information available at [<http://www.lcc.ctc.edu/programs/eep/>].

employment as classroom aides while completing their undergraduate degree and elementary teaching credential. Financial support comes in the form of a stipend to cover the costs of student fees and books and advice on obtaining university, state, and federal aid. Non-credit, pre-university basic skills preparation is offered during the first two semesters, followed by a one-year academic program of required college-level math and English courses. After completing this coursework, participants are integrated into the liberal studies undergraduate degree program, an interdisciplinary major designed for those who wish to become elementary school teachers, with the end goals of completing the B.A. degree, passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test, and job placement. Evaluations of the program show a five-year attrition rate of 14% and an average GPA of 2.8.³³

Chicago, IL. Teachers for Chicago is a *mid-career program* that partners with the Chicago Teachers Union, nine public and private colleges and universities, and several foundations in the Chicago metropolitan area. The program recruits and trains bachelor's degree holders with no teaching experience, especially those who work in science, math, and business or have skills in working with bilingual and special education. Applicants undergo extensive screening interviews aimed at identifying individuals who would make good urban teachers. Participants receive funding from the Chicago public schools to earn a master's degree in education at a participating university in exchange for interning while in the program and committing to two years of teaching in Chicago schools.³⁴ According to an unpublished evaluation report, as of 1999, 72% of the program's 1992-1994 cohort were still teaching in the Chicago public schools. However, critics of the program argued that it screened out qualified applicants and discouraged those already possessing an advanced degree. The program is being phased out and replaced by an alternative certification program.³⁵

Conclusion

The purpose of this report was to review the range of current teacher recruitment and retention efforts nationwide and provide a context for the issues that may arise during HEA reauthorization. The programs described above cover most of that national landscape. Two general conclusions can be drawn from this review. First, a wide array of recruitment and retention programs and policies have been implemented in the U.S. — scholarships, incentives for National Board Certification, alternative routes to teaching, and induction are among the most common at the state level. Second, the federal programs on this issue provide broad support for a variety of activities — including most of those described in the state and local sections of the report.

³³ M. Warshaw, *Aide-to-Teacher Project* (Carson, CA: California State University-Dominguez Hills, Consortium for Minorities in Teaching Careers, 1992). Additional information at [<http://www.csudh.edu/soe/ppgp.htm#und>].

³⁴ Bart Gallegos, "Urban Alternative," *The American School Board Journal*, vol. 182, no. 3 (Mar. 1995), pp. 38-40.

³⁵ More information can be found at [<http://www.catalyst-chicago.org/03-01/0301tfc.htm>].