A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

2

3 **5. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators** (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):* **Describe how low-income**
4 **and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate**
5 **rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA agency will use to**
6 **evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such description.[1]**

7

8 **Plan for Addressing Disproportionate Rates of Access**

9 Ohio continues to work to address gaps that reflect disproportionate access to effective, in-field and
10 experienced teachers by low-income and minority students, especially those in schools assisted under Title I,
11 Part A. (The extent to which such gaps exist are reflected in the data tables below.) Ohio's 2015 Plan to
12 Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators (2015 Educator Equity Plan), reflects equitable access
13 planning at the state and local education agency levels.

14 In the 2015 Educator Equity Plan, four root-cause categories were identified as the most likely causes for the
15 disproportionate rates:

16 • **Educator preparation**, including pre-service teacher exposure to students, schools, policies and
17 cultural competencies, and issue of teacher preparation program variation.
18 • **Hiring and deployment**, including hiring timelines, transfer and placement policies, compensation,
19 negative perceptions related to working in high-needs schools, teacher assignment practices and
20 shortages of teachers in particular content areas.
21 • **Teaching and learning conditions**, including access to professional learning opportunities, clear
22 career pathways and school leadership support.
23 • **Data use**, including the accessibility of data and data-based decision-making capacity.

24 These four categories drove the identification of strategies and supports to help influence the rates at which
25 low-income and minority students have access to excellent educators. These strategies were in four
26 categories:

27 • **Strengthen educator preparation**, including through improved accountability, support for pre-
28 service training in data-driven instruction, improved training in cultural competency and improved
29 clinical experiences;
30 • **Target hiring and deployment barriers**, including through addressing teacher shortage areas,
31 improving recruitment capacity, promoting stronger partnerships between higher education and
32 school districts, and improving principal leadership development;
33 • **Improve teaching and learning conditions**, including support for beginning principal mentoring,
34 requiring high-quality induction, surveying teaching and learning conditions and promoting teacher
35 leadership strategies,
36 • **Provide data to encourage strategic staffing and educator development**, including developing a
37 data tool to monitor equitable access, expanding access to data reports and establishing a
38 clearinghouse of best practices in alleviating equity gaps.

39

---

[1] Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

40 Details about each of these strategy areas can be found in [Ohio's 2015 Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to](#)
41 [Excellent Educators.](#) Since plan approval by the U.S. Department of Education in 2015, Ohio has worked
42 hard to implement identified strategies at both the state and local levels. Local districts are required to develop
43 plans for addressing equitable access gaps as part of their Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan
44 (CCIP) development process. The Department will continue to utilize the equity plan and implementation
45 processes to support this work and update the plan as necessary to meet state and local needs to address state
46 and local equity gaps.

47

48 Ohio's plan to use some of its Title II, Part A funds to support elements of the state's educator equity plan can
49 be found in Sec. D (2).

50 ## Measures Used to Evaluate and Report

51 Ohio has identified seven educator categories and two student categories used in calculating rates of access to
52 excellent educators. Definitions for each category are as follows.

Educator Categories	Definitions
Ineffective Teacher	A teacher receiving a final summative rating of "Ineffective" on the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.
Highly Effective Teacher	A teacher receiving a final summative rating of "Accomplished" on the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.
Ineffective Principal	A principal receiving a final summative rating of "Ineffective" or "Developing" on the Ohio Principal Evaluation System.
Highly Effective Principal	A principal receiving a final summative rating of "Accomplished" on the Ohio Principal Evaluation System.
Inexperienced Teacher	A teacher in the first or second year of teaching.
Inexperienced Principal*	A principal in the first or second year of leadership.
Out-of-Field Teacher	A teacher teaching a course for which the teacher is not properly licensed to teach (grade, core academic subject and student population).
Student Categories	Definitions
Low-income student	Any student who is known to meet any of the following conditions: either the student is eligible to receive free or reduced price lunch or a member of a household is eligible; students who themselves or whose guardians are known to be recipients of public assistance; and students whose guardians meet the Title I income guidelines.
Minority student	Any student who is a member of African-American, Multiracial, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, or Asian ethnic and racial groups.

53 *New category – cannot yet be calculated; will calculate and integrate into planning in upcoming years.*

54 Ohio does have disproportionate rates of access to excellent educators. The rates, and the gaps in rates
55 between low-income and non-low-income and minority and non-minority students, are shown in the tables
56 below. Disproportionate rate calculations were done at the student (Table 1) and building (Table 2) levels due
57 to the inability (at this time) to calculate certain measures down to the student level.

58 **Table 1. Rates, and gaps in rates, at which low-income and minority students are served by various**
59 **categories of educators.**

MEASURES	Out-of-field teacher	Inexperienced teacher	Ineffective principal	Highly Effective principal
Rate at which **Low-income students** enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are served by educator type	5.7%	67.2%	9.1%	44.9%
Rate at which **Non-low-income students** enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A are served by educator type	2.1%	55.8%	2.9%	67.9%
Gap (Differences between rates)	**3.6%**	**11.4%**	**6.2%**	**- 23.0%**
Rate at which **minority students** enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are served by educator type	6.1%	64.0%	11.5%	41.0%
Rate at which **Non-minority students** enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A are served by educator type	3.4%	57.9%	3.0%	65.6%
Gap (Differences between rates)	**2.7%**	**6.2%**	**8.5%**	**- 24.6%**

60 *Table Note: Rates are not computed for the categories of ineffective teacher and highly effective teacher since*
61 *these categories are not reported in a way that can be linked to students. However, these categories are reflected*
62 *in the building level data reported in Table 2 below.*

63 Ohio also utilizes the Educator Workforce Strength Index, designed in the state's 2015 Plan to Ensure
64 Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, as a progress measure. The Educator Workforce Strength Index
65 combines the educator measures (outlined above) to calculate[2] an index value that comprehensively captures
66 the qualities and effectiveness of the educator workforce at varying levels (state, district, school building).
67 The index values range from 0-100, 100 being the strongest educator workforce. Computations showing the
68 Education Workforce Strength Index values for schools in the highest and lowest quartiles based on low-
69 income student population and minority student population are shown below.

70 **Table 2. Highest and lowest quartile analysis using Education Workforce Strength Index, Percent**
71 **Ineffective Teacher and Percent Accomplished Teacher rates for school buildings:**

Low-Income Student Population	Educator Workforce Strength Index	% Ineffective Teachers	% Highly Effective Teachers
Title I Schools in Highest Quartile	88.8	0.25%	42.1%
Non-Title I Schools in Lowest Quartile	95.4	0.02%	70.5%
Gap	**6.6**	**0.23%**	**- 28.4%**

---

[2] The Educator Workforce Strength Index is calculated by adding the percentage point values for each available measure per school or district, dividing by the number of available measures, and subtracting from 100.

Minority Student Population	Educator Workforce Strength Index	% Ineffective Teachers	% Highly Effective Teachers
Title I Schools in Highest Quartile	88.3	0.25%	38.5%
Non-Title I Schools in Lowest Quartile	94.7	0.00%	57.4%
Gap	**6.4**	**0.25%**	**- 18.9%**

76

77   The Department will evaluate and publicly report progress on the above measures on our website:
78   http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Equity/Educator-Equity-in-Ohio. Annual updates
79   regarding our state equity gaps and our target goals will be found on the website. The data also will be
80   shared with various stakeholders, as appropriate, to develop and sustain the partnerships and supports
81   necessary to address the equitable access issue. Continual review of measures also will help the Department
82   determine if the appropriate measures are being addressed in planning and will use local plans to help inform
83   continuous improvement of equity planning measures and strategies.

84