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## Summary Report

In [month/year], the [district name] Human Resource (HR) Planning Group launched an effort to plan our staffing needs more strategically to ensure that all students in the district have access to excellent teachers and principals. The objective of this initiative was to [insert response from Handout 1 “Why are you resource-planning now?”]. This effort is especially important in light of [district’s] mission to [insert Handout 1 “Mission Statement”]. We know that delivering on [district’s] mission for each and every student requires that each and every classroom is led by a qualified and effective teacher.

Our HR planning activities are part of a wider effort within the state of Maine (and across the United States) to improve student access to effective teachers. Specifically, in May 2017, the Maine Department of Education detailed, in its Every Student Succeeds Act consolidated state plan, the state’s approach to ensuring that every student in Maine has access to effective teachers.

Effective HR planning involves reviewing data and engaging in collaborative planning to address projected and existing staff shortfalls before they become problematic. The [district] HR Planning Group consisted of [membership]. The group met from [month to month and year] to review district personnel and student data in three stages:

* In **Stage 1**, we contextualized our HR planning, considering our purpose for engaging in this planning activity.
* In **Stage 2**, we reviewed our workforce data and identified key findings and the policy implications.
* In **Stage 3**, we analyzed our workforce supply gaps and considered options for improving the data available to [district] to better understand and anticipate teacher shortages.

The results of this work are described next. The [district] HR Planning Group will continue to meet [frequency of planned meetings] to use these data to inform district policy.

### Workforce Overview

In 2017–18, [district] employed [insert total from Handout #2 Exhibit 5] full-time staff members. Our teaching workforce consisted of [insert # from Handout #2 Exhibit 6] novice teachers, [x] career-stage teachers, and [x] veteran teachers. Our teacher evaluation and professional growth ratings data show that in 2017–18, x% of our teachers were rated Effective or higher on the Teacher Evaluation and Professional Growth system, and x% were rated Ineffective or lower. Meanwhile, x% of our principals were rated Effective or higher on the Leader Evaluation and Professional Growth system, and x% were rated Ineffective or lower.

### Teacher Shortages in [District]

Recognizing that teacher shortages are multifaceted and can be represented using multiple measures (see Appendix A for further explanation), we considered the pros and cons of several approaches to defining teacher shortage. We further considered the data currently available to us and the feasibility of collecting additional data to understand our workforce needs. Based on these considerations, we reviewed the following measures of teacher shortage:

* Unfilled teacher vacancies
* [Insert Measure #2 from Handout #3]
* [Insert Measure #3 from Handout #3]

The first measure of teacher shortage that we considered was unfilled teacher vacancies (i.e., [insert district definition of vacancy]). We found that during the past 5 years, [district] had [insert #s from Handout #2 Exhibits 9 and 10] unfilled vacancies in [subject area #1], [insert #] in [subject area #2], and [insert #] in [subject area #3]. These unfilled vacancies have [increased/decreased/remained constant – insert from Handout #2 Exhibit 10] during this time period.

The second measure of teacher shortage that we considered was [insert from Handout #3 and describe].

The third measure of teacher shortage that we considered was [insert from Handout #3 and describe].

Taken together, these data tell us that [insert summary findings from Handout #3].

### Equitable Access to Effective Teachers

We found that students’ access to experienced and effective teachers was [slightly/somewhat/ very (in)equitable]. Of the [insert #] schools in [insert district], our district has:

* [Insert #] high-poverty schools, defined as [insert #s from Handout #2 Exhibit 15]
* [Insert #] high-minority schools, defined as [insert #s from Handout #2 Exhibit 15]
* [Insert #] high-risk schools, defined as [insert #s from Handout #2 Exhibit 15]
* [Insert #] isolated small schools, defined as [insert #s from Handout #2 Exhibit 15]

We examined the distribution of ineffective, inexperienced, and out-of-field teachers across these types of schools. We found that, compared with the district average, these high-need schools had [more/less/equivalent levels of] teachers who were ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced. For example, [insert one or several of the most interesting data point from Handout #2 Exhibits 15-18]. These inequities are due in part to teacher shortages; that is, there are too few [insert effective, experienced, in-field] teachers for every student in [district].

### Understanding [District’s] Teacher Shortages

Teacher shortages and inequitable access to effective teachers are the result of challenges with teacher recruitment and teacher retention. To better understand the reason for our teacher shortages, we reviewed our teacher recruitment and attrition data, including recruitment and attrition patterns and exit survey data on the reasons why teachers leave [district].

During the past 5 years, average teacher attrition (i.e., teachers leaving [district] was [insert # from Handout #2, Exhibit 12] per year. We also reviewed teachers’ stated reasons for leaving our schools before retirement. We found that x% left the district due to [reason #1], x% left due to [reason #2], and x% left due to [reason #3] [insert the top reasons for teacher attrition from Handout #2 Exhibit 11].

Alongside teacher attrition out of [district], we reviewed data on teacher recruitment into [district]. We found that our district receives, on average, [insert # from Handout #2, Exhibit 19] applications per vacancy. These applications have [increased/decreased] over time and are highest in [insert subject areas from Handout #2, Exhibit 19] and lowest in [insert subject areas from Handout #2, Exhibit 19].

These factors affecting recruitment into and attrition from [district] are not exhaustive. We hope to better understand how to attract and retain teachers in [district] through [insert information from Handout #3, Future Workforce Supply Gap Analysis and Next Steps].

### Next Steps for HR Planning

Our goal in [district] is to ensure that every student has access to teachers who can guide them to achieving their potential. We identified the following next steps to better understand our teacher shortages, the reasons behind them, and the steps we can take toward addressing them:

* [Insert Next Step #1 from Handout #4]
* [Insert Next Step #2 from Handout #4]
* [Insert Next Step #3 from Handout #4]
* [Insert Next Step #4 from Handout #4]
* [Insert Next Step #5 from Handout #4]

By [date], the [district] HR Planning Group will produce a follow-up report detailing our progress toward enacting each of the above steps.

If you have questions or would like to learn more, please contact [insert district contact name and phone/e-mail].

## Appendix A. Approaches to Defining Educator Shortage

There are several approaches to conceptualizing educator shortages, each with pros and cons to consider. These approaches are outlined in the table below.

| Educator Shortage Indicator | Considerations |
| --- | --- |
| Number of unfilled vacancies | Unfilled vacancies are easy to understand, but budget cuts (or educator shortages themselves) may lead districts to reduce the number of classes offered, artificially reducing the measure of the shortage. |
| Number of applicants per vacancy | Applicant numbers provide some indicator of the pool districts can select from but say little about whether districts can fill their vacancies with sufficiently capable educators. And, many districts do not track this information. |
| Pupil-educator ratios | Pupil-educator ratios necessarily rise with educator shortages and so can usefully indicate trends over time. But without a clear benchmark for the *desired* ratio, this indicator does not clarify whether there is a shortage. Status quo pupil-educator ratios have been used as the benchmark without consensus on whether the status quo is adequate. As such, pupil-educator ratios aren’t an accurate indicator of educator shortage. Nor are they easy to disaggregate at the district level across subject areas. Overall numbers can mask educator shortages or surpluses in particular areas. |
| Number of emergency certificates issued |  In many states emergency credentials can be issued only when a fully prepared educator can’t be found, so the prevalence of these certificates signals a shortage. However, as an option of last resort, emergency certificates alone may not capture the full scope of a shortage. |
| Number of preparation program enrollees | Preparation-program enrollment figures provide information about possible future educator shortages (or surpluses) but could reflect changes in program admissions policies as much as interest in the profession. Because these programs may accept too many candidates in surplus areas or recruit too few in shortage areas, this number has only limited significance, particularly in light of evidence that many program completers never enter the teaching profession (Cowan et al., 2015). Also, without accompanying information on educator attrition (see sidebar below), this number is of limited value, because there is less need for new educators if current educators say put.  |
| Number of (new) educators certified  | Newly certified educator numbers provide a closer estimation of new educator supply than program enrollees but don’t reflect the fact that many certified educators can’t or won’t teach in the subjects, grades, or locations where educators are needed. On its own, this number does not indicate a shortage. |
| (Total) Number of educators certified  | As above, because many certified educators can’t or won’t teach in the subjects, grades, or locations where educators are needed, this number alone does not indicate a shortage (or surplus) but does offer some useful context. |
| Number of educators leaving the profession | Educator attrition rates represent the flow of educators in only one direction. If exiting educators are easily replaced by new educators, there is no educator shortage, but there may be other problems. |
| Number of projected retirees | Same as above. |
| Perceptions of shortages by district superintendents or human resource directors | Perception surveys that calculate the percentage of district leaders who believe there is a shortage are easy to understand and can capture local and subject-specific information. But expectations among district leaders may vary, so a risk is that the more complacent district leaders’ schools will appear to have fewer educator shortages, and the least complacent more. |
| Teacher Shortage Indicator | Considerations |
| Number of unfilled vacancies | Unfilled vacancies are easy to understand, but budget cuts (or teacher shortages themselves) may lead districts to reduce the number of classes offered, artificially reducing the measure of the shortage. |
| Number of applicants per vacancy | Applicant numbers provide some indicator of the pool districts can select from but say little about whether districts can fill their vacancies with sufficiently capable teachers. And, many districts do not track this information. |
| Pupil-teacher ratios | Pupil-teacher ratios necessarily rise with teacher shortages and so can usefully indicate trends over time. But without a clear benchmark for the *desired* ratio, this indicator does not clarify whether there is a shortage. Status quo pupil-teacher ratios have been used as the benchmark without consensus on whether the status quo is adequate. As such, pupil-teacher ratios aren’t an accurate indicator of teacher shortage. Nor are they easy to disaggregate at the district level across subject areas. Overall numbers can mask teacher shortages or surpluses in particular areas. |
| Number of emergency certificates issued |  In many states emergency credentials can be issued only when a fully prepared teacher can’t be found, so the prevalence of these certificates signals a teacher shortage. However, as an option of last resort, emergency certificates alone may not capture the full scope of a teacher shortage. |
| Number of preparation program enrollees | Preparation-program enrollment figures provide information about possible future teacher shortages (or surpluses) but could reflect changes in program admissions policies as much as interest in the profession. Because these programs may accept too many candidates in surplus areas or recruit too few in shortage areas, this number has only limited significance, particularly in light of evidence that many program completers never enter the teaching profession (Cowan et al., 2015). Also, without accompanying information on teacher attrition (see sidebar below), this number is of limited value, because there is less need for new teachers if current teachers say put.  |
| Number of (new) teachers certified  | Newly certified teacher numbers provide a closer estimation of new teacher supply than program enrollees but don’t reflect the fact that many certified teachers can’t or won’t teach in the subjects, grades, or locations where teachers are needed. On its own, this number does not indicate a teacher shortage. |
| (Total) Number of teachers certified  | As above, because many certified teachers can’t or won’t teach in the subjects, grades, or locations where teachers are needed, this number alone does not indicate a teacher shortage (or surplus) but does offer some useful context. |
| Number of teachers leaving the profession | Teacher attrition rates represent the flow of teachers in only one direction. If exiting teachers are easily replaced by new teachers, there is no teacher shortage, but there may be other problems. |
| Number of projected retirees | Same as above. |
| Perceptions of shortages by district superintendents or human resource directors | Perception surveys that calculate the percentage of district leaders who believe there is a shortage are easy to understand and can capture local and subject-specific information. But expectations among district leaders may vary, so a risk is that the more complacent district leaders’ schools will appear to have fewer teacher shortages, and the least complacent more. |

*Source*: Behrstock-Sherratt, E. (2016). *Creating coherence in the teacher shortage debate: What policy leaders should know and do* (Table 1, pp. 5­–6). Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from <http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Creating-Coherence-Teacher-Shortage-Debate-June-2016.pdf>

## Appendix B. Workforce Data

Current Staff

Staff by Subject Area

{Insert ‘C\_Staff\_SubjArea’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Staff by Position

{Insert ‘C\_Staff\_Position’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Workforce

Workforce by Years of Service

{Insert ‘C\_Workforce\_Service’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Workforce by Career Stage

{Insert ‘C\_Workforce\_CareerStage’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Workforce by TEPG Rating

{Insert ‘C\_Workforce\_TEPG’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Workforce by LEPG Rating

{Insert ‘C\_Workforce\_LEPG’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Vacancies

Vacancies by Position

{Insert ‘C\_Vacancy\_Position’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Vacancies by Subject Area

{Insert ‘C\_Vacancy\_SubjectArea’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Applicants per Vacancies by Subject Area

{Insert ‘C\_VacancyApps\_SubjectArea’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Anticipated Leaves

Leave Types by Year and FTE

{Insert ‘C\_Leaves\_Type’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Number of Anticipated Leaves

{Insert ‘C\_Leaves\_Anticipated’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Student Teachers

Student Teachers by Grade

{Insert ‘C\_Teachers\_ByGrade’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Student Teachers by Subject Area

{Insert ‘C\_Teachers\_BySubj’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Educator Performance

TEPG Rating

{Insert ‘C\_TEPG’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

LEPG Rating

{Insert ‘C\_LEPG’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Equity Profile

Teacher Designations by School Designation

{Insert ‘C\_Equity\_TeacherDesig’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Percent Ineffective Teachers by School Designation

{Insert ‘C\_Equity\_IneffSchool’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Percent Out-of-Field Teachers by School Designation

{Insert ‘C\_Equity\_OOFSchool’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}

Percent Inexperienced Teachers by School Designation

{Insert ‘C\_Equity\_InexpSchool’ chart from DataTool Here, or Use DataTool Insert Feature}