

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District

INFORMATIVE

TO: Members, Board of Education Date: April 24, 2009

FROM: Randy Ross, Director of Educational Policy

SUBJECT: **Maximizing Teacher Quality in LAUSD Schools**

COPIES: Ramon Cortines, Jim Morris, Judy Elliott, Roberta Fesler, David Holmquist, Vivian Ekchian, Cynthia Lim, Jefferson Crain, Jerry Thornton

The agenda for the Board's April 28, 2009 meeting includes the resolution, "Ensuring and Supporting Teacher Quality" (Canter and Galatzan). As reflected in numerous IAU Board informatives and presentations on teacher issues in LAUSD, we view teacher quality as the most critical element in school improvement. Accordingly, the present IAU Informative offers data and reflections designed to help inform the Board's deliberations on this resolution and teacher quality, writ large.

Defining Teacher Quality

Our premise is that the most important indicator of teacher quality is student outcomes. Teacher effectiveness in getting student results may be viewed as a function of three broad variables: knowledge, skill, and motivation. Logically, knowledge and skill are necessary for promoting student achievement, but alone they are not enough to produce high levels of growth in student achievement. The brightest, most skillful teacher may contribute little to a student's educational development if that teacher is not motivated to teach the student.

Variables that capture the essence of motivation include, for example, passion for the work and love of children (irrespective of color or circumstance). A challenge confronting LAUSD is that historically many teachers have lacked sufficient motivation to teach in LAUSD's inner-city schools. For example, in a 1985 survey, 40 percent of LAUSD's teachers said they would resign if they were forced to teach in hard-to-staff schools in the District.

The importance of the "motivation" aspect of teacher quality is made evident in a recent study of a nationally representative sample of first graders and their teachers. The researcher (Laura Logerfo) concluded that children with teachers who take a greater sense of personal responsibility for student learning (i.e., willingly accepts credit for

students' positive outcomes and also accepts blame for their negative outcomes) learn more in reading during the first grade.¹

Logerfo developed an index of teacher responsibility using teacher responses to the following four statements (percent of teachers who agree denoted in parenthesis):

- I make a difference in the lives of the children I teach. (95 percent)
- Many of the children I teach are not capable of learning the material I am supposed to teach them. (10 percent)
- The level of child misbehavior (noise, horseplay, or fighting) in this school interferes with my teaching. (17 percent)
- Routine duties and paperwork interfere with my teaching. (50 percent)

The researcher found that “about 10 percent of the difference between teachers in 1st-grade reading achievement can be explained by characteristics of the teacher. Teacher responsibility alone can explain as much as 4 percent of this variation between teachers.” Moreover, Logerfo found “this to be as large a relationship as two traditional indicators of teacher’s quality: whether the teacher holds a master’s degree and years of experience as a 1st-grade teacher.”

Much of the variation in teacher responsibility could be traced to teachers’ attitudes. Specifically, teacher responsibility was significantly correlated with:

- A teacher’s satisfaction with her work (positive correlation)
- The degree to which the teacher believes that children should know basic reading skills before reaching 1st grade (negative correlation).
- Teacher’s endorsement of daily homework for 1st graders (negative correlation).
- Teacher’s confidence in teaching learning-disabled students or English learners (positive correlation).

Notably, the following factors bore little or no relation to teacher responsibility:

- Teacher gender
- Teacher ethnicity
- Teacher educational attainment (amount of coursework)
- Teacher certification
- Teacher experience

Overall, to date education research has fallen short in quantifying how teachers contribute to student achievement. So the question remains open: Who are the best and brightest teachers?

In this regard, many education policy makers, including President Obama and his administration, have latched onto the idea that the “best and brightest” teachers are those

¹ Laura Logerfo, “Climb Every Mountain,” *Education Next*, Summer 2006 (6:3).

whose students consistently show relatively high growth in academic achievement. While teasing out which part of growth in student achievement is attributable to teacher actions and what part is attributable to other factors has proven a technical challenge, “value added” methods have shown great promise. To date, no statistical method has been perceived sufficiently valid and reliable to merit stand-alone use for teacher evaluation and/or teacher compensation. As a result, the “value-added” conceptualization of teacher effectiveness continues to wrangle with traditional notions of effectiveness that emphasize teacher traits – teacher characteristics (inputs) and teacher pedagogical practices (processes). California’s teacher evaluation process (Stull) adheres to this tradition.

While reservations regarding the use of value-added for summative purposes are sensible, the use of value-added measures for formative purposes (e.g., to help identify teachers’ strengths and weaknesses and to develop and implement plans for helping teachers to, thereby, improve their teaching knowledge and skill) has garnered greater acceptance from teachers. Many of the highest performing schools in LAUSD (and elsewhere) feature formative uses of ongoing student assessment data.

LAUSD’s 2002 Teacher Quality Strategic Plan

Resolved, That the Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District directs the Superintendent to strengthen the process by which we attract and retain the best and brightest teachers using best practices and sound research, including the District’s 2002 Teacher Quality Strategic Plan.

The “Ensuring and Supporting Teacher Quality” resolution stipulates that the District explore the feasibility of implementing a Teacher Quality Strategic Plan (TQSP) developed for the District in 2002.

TQSP states that a “quality teacher” has attributes such as the following:

1. Quality teachers have high expectations for their students and parents, their schools and themselves.
2. Quality teachers get results.
 - The academic achievement gains of their students meet district standards and improve from year to year.
 - They focus on the academic achievement of all their students, and use differentiated strategies to support those that are under-performing.
 - The attendance, deportment and social skills of their students meet district standards.
3. Quality teachers have a strong knowledge of the subjects they teach.
4. Quality teachers demonstrate a mastery of the teaching strategies and techniques appropriate for their subjects and levels.
5. Quality teachers are talented in interpersonal relations and understand that learning is a social process.
6. Quality teachers are effective, positive and constructive members of teams and exert professional and school leadership in appropriate ways.

These seem consistent with the definition we offered above.

To pursue improvements in teacher quality in LAUSD, after reviewing the District's extant teacher quality initiatives and practices, TQSP recommended the following six initiatives:

Initiative 1: Developing Future Teachers – Pre-Collegiate

- Expand Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)
- Expand Teacher Training Academy and similar programs
- Fully implement partnerships with Los Angeles and Santa Monica Community Colleges
- After-school, cross-age tutoring and teacher training as part of the expanded Beyond-the-Bell Supplemental Services Program

Initiative 2: Pre-Service Teacher Training

- Continue Career Ladder Program
- Encourage university four-year blended programs
- Encourage university fast-track credential programs
- Encourage alignment of university programs with LAUSD instructional priorities
- Encourage community college teacher education programs

Initiative 3: Engaging and Enlisting Quality Recruits

- Implement the near-term improvement plan (online application, VIP “fast track” system, Priority Staffing decentralization pilot, principal support and help desk, improved customer service model)
- Clarify management and accountability for teacher hiring
- Expand external contracting (Teach for America; New Teacher Project)
- Overhaul HR technology
- Institute a teacher career marketing package and plan

Initiative 4: Inducting, Empowering, and Advancing Early Career Teachers

- Improve and better coordinate induction programs
- Expand pre-service training for top pre-interns from 40 hours to six weeks
- Work closely with UTLA to ensure a high-quality and cost-efficient Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Program
- Grow the District Intern (D.I.) Program
- Elevate the importance and visibility of the “tenure” decision²

Initiative 5: Rewarding Service in Priority Staffing Schools and Shortage Disciplines

² Relates to, *Resolved...*, *That the Superintendent ensure beginning in the 2009-10 school year by February 1 of each year, principals must affirmatively act to recommend permanent status for a teacher and that in the absence of action, non-reelection will be triggered.*

- Strengthen the State/federal/District package of benefits (signing bonuses and service incentives, tuition reimbursement, expanded pre-service training and professional development, a new program for teacher advancement opportunities)
- Focus District's National Board Certified (NBC) teachers on API 1 & 2 schools
- Redirect California's National Board Certified (NBC) incentives to API 1 & 2 schools
- Benchmark priority school working conditions
- Strengthen Human Resources' focus on priority staffing schools
- Implement priority staffing decentralization pilots in Local District B & G
- Target incentives for special education
- Rehire top teachers reaching retirement

Initiative 6: Developing and Rewarding Excellence and Leadership Among Teachers

- Change LAUSD's National Board Certification Program Incentives and Use of 92 required hours of service
- Create a new program for teacher advancement opportunities, such as expanded roles of mentor and master teachers
- Create a linkage between master teachers and existing coaching initiative

In relation to one of the resolves in the resolution, TQSP states that “While it is critically important for a district to retain teachers, it must keep teachers that are of the highest quality. The “permanent status” decision is an extremely important one because the granting of permanency to a teacher is also the granting of tenure. For the good of the organization a district should require that decisions of permanency be deliberate decisions not passive ones. The Stull Act essentially sets up a system where not making a deliberate decision by March 15 of the second year of probation, a teacher automatically earns permanent status and, thus, tenure.” (p. 29) This is the rationale for the recommendation to elevate the importance and visibility of the “tenure” decision by establishing “...clear standards for judging whether a teacher has demonstrated the “quality” required for attaining the “permanent” teaching status (California Professional Teaching Standards) and train principals in making these judgments with probationary teachers.”

Note, however, that while TQSP defines teacher quality partly in terms of student performance, none of the six proposed initiatives link teacher quality to student achievement, per se. For example, in its discussion of the Milken Family Foundation's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), TQSP notes that TAP “...couples multiple career paths with the concept of market-driven compensation so that teachers are paid more for taking on additional work and for effective performance.” But, again, none of TQSP's recommendations make the connection between teacher quality, student achievement, and compensation embedded in TAP.

We believe that TAP has progressive features that ultimately could prove beneficial to the District's efforts to maximize teacher quality. Thus, below, we discuss this model in greater detail.³

A Progressive Model for Maximizing Teacher Quality

Given the philosophical underpinnings of the Obama administration's educational agenda, we believe that TAP provides a good structure for the District's ongoing exploration of strategies for improving teacher quality in LAUSD schools.

TAP, which gestated for about 10 years at the Milken Foundation in Santa Monica, California, is a comprehensive school reform model that strives to increase student achievement by maximizing teacher quality. Teacher quality is maximized by taking steps to attract, develop, motivate, and retain high quality teachers. To that end, TAP features four integrated elements:

- Career ladder
- Ongoing, applied professional growth
- Instructionally focused accountability
- Performance-based compensation

TAP's career ladder includes three types of teacher: (1) regular classroom teachers (career teachers), (2) mentor teachers (expert teachers who remain in the classroom, but who are also provided time and opportunities to provide professional development for other teachers); and (3) master teachers (full-time out-of-classroom teachers who provide in-classroom assistance to teachers through demonstrations, observation and feedback, as well as team teaching).

This teacher staffing structure facilitates ongoing, on-site, organic professional development that meets the specific needs of teachers at a school. In addition to the professional development support provided by mentor and master teachers, career teachers collaborate by grade or subject to review student data and to review and/or develop plans.

TAP's approach to accountability includes a comprehensive teacher evaluation process based on clearly defined instructional standards and rubrics. Teachers are held accountable for their instructional practices as well as the growth in performance of the students in their classroom as well as growth in the performance of students in the entire school.

In TAP, the accountability system is coupled with a performance-based compensation system. Teachers are paid more for: (1) excellent performance as judged by multiple experts; (2) different functions or additional responsibilities; (3) the extent of gains in student achievement in the classroom and in the school as a whole. The relative

³ For an excellent overview of the Teacher Advancement Program, see Stephen Sawchuk, "TAP: More Than Performance Pay," *Education Week*, April 1, 2009, pp. 25-27.

importance of each factor changes over time. For example, student performance becomes increasingly important in the setting of teacher compensation.

While the elements of TAP are logical, some educators and school administrators have registered concern. Table 1 below shows the degree to which teachers express a positive view toward TAP's four core elements. Over time, teachers come to accept the elements of TAP more and more. Still, however, some resistance remains for performance-based compensation and the career ladder.

Table 1: Percent of TAP teachers expressing a positive outlook toward TAP elements

TAP Element	Report 1		Report 2	
	Year 1	Year 5	2005	2008
Career ladder	72%	87%	72%	79%
Ongoing, applied professional growth	86%	95%	87%	91%
Instructionally focused accountability	88%	100%	78%	92%
Performance-based compensation	62%	80%	49%	69%

Mindful of the sensitivity associated with the uses of student achievement data to inform school improvement, the IAU has begun to develop more teacher-acceptable models that nonetheless powerfully advance the cause of teacher quality.

One key idea we presented to the Board was to acknowledge and embrace teachers who consistently get great results for students (Star Teacher Engagement Program or STEP). Under STEP, LAUSD would identify about 1,000 Star Teachers (i.e., teachers who, over time, have obtained the highest levels of academic growth for their students, with a focus on those who have enjoyed success in high-poverty schools. Star Teachers would be systematically acknowledged, honored, embraced, and supported by LAUSD as a means for improving their motivation, engagement, retention, and recruitment.

In addition, STEP would identify and develop many of these teachers (e.g., as many as half or 500) into effective school administrators. That is, the standard criteria of school leadership (competency in analysis, judgment, written and oral communication, planning and development, budgeting, etc) would be supplemented by the criterion that effective principals must also have been exemplary classroom teachers. The rationale is that effective instructional leadership (a must for teacher development under school decentralization) implies skill in getting results for students in the classroom.

Why is STEP needed? Just as stars are hard to see in a smog-dusted Los Angeles night, so are teaching stars in LAUSD. Generally, when we think of a star teacher, we think of teachers of the year; teachers who are recognized by the media (e.g., Jaime Escalante), National Board Certified teachers (of which LAUSD enjoys a sizeable contingent), and coaches of successful academic decathlon teams. Yet, many, many more teachers in

LAUSD are stars in that, as a result of their effort, their students show remarkable growth in academic achievement.

But Star Teachers who get results for kids are not always easy to glimpse. Sometimes these teachers are not well seen or well known because few of their colleagues know about how well their students are performing. In part, this is because educational systems have only recently acquired the capacity and will to make practical use of student performance data at the classroom level. Another explanation may be that teachers who consistently achieve extraordinarily high levels of academic growth for their children (e.g., Jaime Escalante) are downplayed by their colleagues because they represent a threat to mediocrity.

In this light, STEP would help to systematically increase the use, retention, and presence of teachers who consistently deliver comparatively high levels of academic growth for their students.

Teacher Professional Development and Support Programs

Resolved ... That the Superintendent perform a needs assessment and evaluation of current District teacher professional development programs, as well as programs for struggling teachers, and bring a report forward to the Board by June 9, 2009, with a strategic plan for strengthening such programs.

Assuming the District will ultimately pursue an authentic version of school decentralization, the core of an effective professional development program for a struggling teacher would include elements akin to those comprised in the Teacher Advancement Program. Similarly, a close examination of schools that participate in the IAU's Successful Schools Forum suggests that these high-poverty schools' success with all subgroups of students (including African American, Latino, and English Learners) is hugely attributable to strong instructional leaders (principal, coaches) who make daily observations of teachers' classroom practices, provide regular feedback to teachers based on observations and student performance data, and coordinate the development and implementation of customized professional development plans for teachers designed to improve teachers' knowledge, skill, and motivation to pursue academic excellence for all students.

For an LAUSD school's newer teachers, the customized professional development plan could be fueled by salary point credits (whose value dwarfs any other expenditure on professional development). In general, every 14 college-level credits acquired by a teacher merit a salary increase of about 4 percent. For teachers who have acquired the maximum number of credits (98), salary point credits account for about 28 percent of their total salary.

Moreover, principals could match struggling teachers with Star teachers who have proven consistently effective at promoting academic growth for the school (might also include National Board Certified teachers, whom TQSP suggested be deployed to API 1 and 2 schools).

Local Districts could arrange their services to support a decentralized regimen. For example, LDs could arrange training for, and coaching of, principals on basic strategies for supporting struggling teachers.

To the extent that the quality of teaching resources varies systemically among schools, LAUSD's central office would need to develop and implement strategies designed to alleviate the effects of such inequities. Programs such as the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program as well as the Priority Staffing Program (PSP) are/were designed in part to address such inequities. Below we provide additional background on these two initiatives.

Peer Assistance and Review Program

Of over 20,000 LAUSD teachers evaluated in 2003-04, 243 received below standard ratings. Of these, 223 were permanent teachers. Many of these teachers presumably received targeted support from their principals as well as District programs such as the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program, a state-funded program that began in 2000 and is operated jointly by the District and United Teachers of Los Angeles.

PAR's first priority (Component 1) is to "provide review, assistance and guidance to permanent teachers who have received either an overall below-standard Stull evaluation or a Notice of Unsatisfactory Service, in either case as a result of below-standard teaching skills." Indeed, these teachers are required to participate in the program (provided resources are available for supporting the teacher). PAR's Component 1 participants receive up to 240 hours of one-to-one assistance and review by a Consulting Teacher.

Table 2 shows that the number of permanent teachers participating in PAR's Component 1 rose from a low 29 in the program's initial year, peaked at 133 in the 2005-06 school year and currently serves 129 Component 1 teachers. In 2004-05, the year after which 223 evaluated permanent teachers received below standard evaluations, 123 permanent teachers participated in Component 1 of PAR.

Table 2
Number of Teachers Participating in the Peer Assistance and Review Program

School Year	PAR Component			Total # of participants
	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	
2000-01	29	96		125
2001-02	87	265		352
2002-03	86	258	472	816
2003-04	92	64	925	1,081
2004-05	123	-	2,431	2,554
2005-06	133	17	2,187	2,337
2006-07	125	65	2,074	2,264
2007-08	122	-	1,675	1,797
2008-09 (To date)	129	17	1,490	1,636

Source: Marsha Oh-Bilodeau, LAUSD, Peer Assistance and Review Program, April 21, 2009.

Also note that Component 2 of PAR provides up to 120 hours of one-to-one assistance and guidance to non-permanent teachers, with particular emphasis upon the District's instructional priorities and related teaching skills. Component 2 services are the second priority for the PAR Program and PAR's intent is to first serve teachers assigned to LAUSD's lowest performing schools

For various reasons – teacher support and self-initiative – presumably many teachers who received a Below Standard rating in 2004 met the standard in their subsequent Stull evaluation. Thus, the number of teachers who receive two or more consecutive Below Standard ratings is probably considerably less than one percent.

Priority Staffing Program

Periodically, the District has implemented special programs designed to address the ongoing challenges of some schools (generally low-achieving schools in high-poverty areas) in recruiting and retaining qualified teaching staff. The Priority Staffing Program (PSP) is one such program. Resurrected most recently in July 2006, PSP focused on the human resource needs of LAUSD's lowest-performing senior high schools and middle schools. A key component of PSP was to assign a full-time Teacher Adviser to each of the 22 lowest-performing (Program Improvement 4 and 5) senior high schools to strengthen recruitment and retention.

A recent internal evaluation of PSP found the following:⁴

- The Teacher Advisers supported the new teachers at each of these schools both inside and outside the classroom.

⁴ Barela, Eric, *Priority Staffing Program Evaluation Report*. Research and Planning Publication No. 2008-14, December 2008. Available Online: <http://research.lausd.net>.

- In January 2007, 11 of the 22 schools were fully staffed and by November 2007,
- 18 of the 22 schools were fully staffed.
- Eighty-five percent of all new teachers recruited by these schools in 2006-07 remained teaching in LAUSD schools in 2007-08.
- There was some evidence to suggest that the program assisted its target schools with meeting their staffing goals in fall 2007 through increased recruitment activities.

The report provides insight into how Teachers Advisers used their time. Approximately 35% of Teacher Adviser time was spent providing direct support to new teachers either by organizing and/or leading professional development meetings or by providing instructional support in classrooms through observations.

Teacher Advisers spent approximately five percent of their time engaging in recruitment activities during both the 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years. They spent more time on recruitment activities in May, July, and August 2007 than in other months. During those months, all Teacher Advisers were recruiting teachers from job fairs. Half of the Teacher Advisers were also conducting initial interviews of teacher candidates, participating on formal interview panels, and assisting administrators with final hiring decisions.

A key recommendation from the report is that the PSP should focus more on how new teachers are being supported in the classroom.

However, PSP was effectively eliminated beginning 2008-09 as a centrally administered program. While PSP schools had the discretion to use their own resources to fund this program, it's not clear how many actually did.

Evaluating Teachers in LAUSD

Resolved further, That the Superintendent present to the Board by June 9, 2009, a support and accountability system that ensures teacher evaluations are done effectively and in a timely manner, including a notification system for monthly email;

Resolved further, That the Superintendent work with administrators to develop a mandatory professional development program covering the review and evaluation of non-permanent and permanent teachers and the dismissal process, as prescribed by the District and California law, and that the proposed program, including the necessary implementation resources, such as Title II funds, be presented to the Board by June 9.

In LAUSD, teacher evaluations are composed of five areas:

1. Support for student learning
2. Planning and designing instruction
3. Classroom performance
4. Developing as professional educator
5. Punctuality, attendance, and record keeping

In all areas, the focus is on teacher actions designed to promote student learning. However, whether or not student learning, per se, actually occurs is not directly pertinent to the Stull teacher evaluation process (as implemented in LAUSD).

Historically, the likelihood of an LAUSD teacher receiving a “below standard” evaluation (Stull) rating has been virtually nil. Table 3 below shows that from 2000 to 2004, for example, the proportion of evaluated teachers who were rated below standard more than doubled from about ½ of 1 percent to 1.2 percent.⁵

*Table 3
Percent of Evaluated LAUSD Teachers Rated Below Standard
Performance*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Elementary</i>	<i>Middle School</i>	<i>Senior High School</i>	<i>All</i>
1999-2000	0.30%	1.10%	0.70%	0.55%
2000-2001	0.60%	1.60%	0.80%	0.85%
2001-2002	0.70%	1.50%	1.30%	0.99%
2002-2003	0.60%	1.80%	1.10%	0.95%
2003-2004	0.91%	2.04%	1.22%	1.20%

Thus, operationally, the Stull process is hugely pro forma. To render teacher evaluations more useful for driving improvements in student achievement, the District would need to employ a model that includes features such as those described for the Teacher Advancement Program (multifaceted evaluations that give some weight to student achievement).

Concluding Remarks

Stanley Pogrow noted in a 2001 *Kappan* article that, “Any new conversation on how to do reform right has to focus on improving the quality of teachers generally and equalizing the distribution of good teachers between low- and high-income students.” In that light, we believe that the “Ensuring and Supporting Teacher Quality” resolution could help galvanize efforts to maximize teacher quality in LAUSD for all schools and all students. While the District will likely continue to be challenged in the near term to pursue progressive reforms for promoting teacher quality (such as TAP), it is notable that some LAUSD charter schools have begun to link teacher quality to student achievement in both professional development, teacher evaluation, and teacher compensation. Likewise, the District should pursue practicable TAP-like approaches for maximizing teacher quality.

⁵ See Stephen Newton, *Stull Evaluations and Student Achievement*, LAUSD, Program Evaluation and Research Branch, January 13, 2004 and Ali Fahmy *Analysis of 2003-04 Stull Evaluations and Student Performance*, LAUSD, Program Evaluation and Research Branch, April 12, 2005.

Ensuring and Supporting Teacher Quality (Canter and Galatzan)

Whereas, Teacher quality has been proven in study after study to have a tremendous impact on student outcomes, and it is essential to the success of our students to attract, hire, and offer tenure to the best and brightest teachers.

Whereas, The California Education Code mandates that a certificated employee who has provided active service to a school district for two complete consecutive school years, shall be considered a permanent employee, referred to as “securing tenure,” upon commencement of the third consecutive year;

Where, In the Los Angeles Unified School District and under state law, in the absence of a deliberate decision to the contrary, teachers are automatically awarded permanent status on or before March 15 of their second complete consecutive year in probationary status;

Whereas, Granting tenure is a sign of confidence in a teacher’s abilities and affords teachers a high degree of security in their position, such that a tenured or permanent employee has a right to due process before dismissal;

Whereas, The District recognizes the teaching profession is increasingly complex and on-going professional development and support for teachers and principals are essential for student success;

Whereas, Despite ongoing support and professional development, some individuals may continue to receive below standard performance evaluations and are recommended for dismissal;

Whereas, The New York City Department of Education has created a Labor Support Unit in which retired administrators work directly with principals and teachers to provide guidance and general assistance in creating professional development and other support systems for struggling teachers;

Whereas, The New York City Department of Education created the Teacher Performance Unit to assist principals in understanding and following district policies, state laws, and collective bargaining rules in teacher dismissal cases; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District directs the Superintendent to strengthen the process by which we attract and retain the best and brightest teachers using best practices and sound research, including the District’s 2002 Teacher Quality Strategic Plan;

Resolved further, That the Superintendent perform a needs assessment and evaluation of current District teacher professional development programs, as well as programs for struggling teachers, and bring a report forward to the Board by June 9, 2009, with a strategic plan for strengthening such programs;

Resolved further, That the Superintendent consider implementing the New York Teacher Performance Unit model;

Resolved further, That the Superintendent present to the Board by June 9, 2009, a support and accountability system that ensures teacher evaluations are done effectively and in a timely manner, including a notification system for monthly email;

Resolved further, That the Superintendent ensure beginning in the 2009-10 school year by February 1 of each year, principals must affirmatively act to recommend permanent status for a teacher and that in the absence of action, non-reelection will be triggered;

Resolved further, That the Superintendent work with administrators to develop a mandatory professional development program covering the review and evaluation of non-permanent and permanent teachers and the dismissal process, as prescribed by the District and California law, and that the proposed program, including the necessary implementation resources, such as Title II funds, be presented to the Board by June 9; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Superintendent perform a needs assessment and evaluation of current resources dedicated to support principals in dismissing ineffective teachers, consider implementing models such as the NY Labor Support Unit, and bring a report to the Board by June 9, 2009, with a strategic plan for strengthening such programs.