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# MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** August 16, 2024

**TO:** MEMBERS, California State Board of Education

**FROM:** TONY THURMOND, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** 2021–22 Educator Equity Data

## Summary of Key Issues

California has long been committed to providing a high-quality education to all students regardless of socioeconomic status or background. Educational equity has been an articulated priority for many years. Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the California Department of Education (CDE) is expanding its previous work to recruit, prepare, and maintain a highly skilled educator workforce for the benefit of all students, especially students from historically underserved communities.

This memo includes data illustrating the various credential statuses recognized by state law, statewide teacher misassignments, and data describing the distribution of inexperienced, ineffective, and out-of-field teachers serving students of color (also referred to as minority students throughout this item) and socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) students (also referred to as low-income students throughout this item).

### Assignment Monitoring in California

Historically, teacher assignment monitoring was accomplished through a labor intensive, paper-based process in which county office of education (COE) credential analysts manually compared master schedules, course descriptions, and educator credential information. Due to the immense workload, the statute required that only one-quarter of certificated staff employed within California be reviewed annually. However, decile one to three schools under the former Academic Performance Index system were monitored annually. Therefore, the complete results of statewide monitoring were not available until the culmination of a four-year cycle. This timeline prevented the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the CDE from being able to provide the misassignment data necessary to fulfill federal reporting requirements under the ESSA.

In 2019, Assembly Bill (AB) 1219 (Chapter 782, Statutes of 2020) was enacted, which required the CTC to develop an electronic teacher assignment monitoring system known as the California State Assignment Accountability System (CalSAAS) for the purpose of annually monitoring teacher assignments.

*EC* Section 44258.9 also requires the CTC and the CDE to enter into a data-sharing agreement to facilitate the annual monitoring of teacher assignments. As part of this data-sharing agreement, the CDE is required to provide the CTC with certificated staff assignment data that are submitted to the CDE by local educational agencies (LEAs) through the annual California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) Fall 2 data submission. The CALPADS Fall 2 staff assignment and course data are necessary for the CTC to conduct the annual assignment monitoring process in CalSAAS. In return, the CTC is required to provide the CDE with annual teacher credential and assignment monitoring outcome data consistent with the California Consolidated State Plan approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) to comply with the federal ESSA. In 2019, the SBE also approved updated definitions for ineffective and out-of-field teachers for reporting purposes, which can be found on the CDE Updated Teacher Equity Definitions web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/pl/teacherequitydefinitions.asp>.

In preparation for the new assignment monitoring process, in 2019, the CDE implemented a complete overhaul of the California state course codes submitted by LEAs along with the staff and course data collected in the CALPADS Fall 2 data submission. The course code update was done specifically to provide the CTC with more detailed information about teacher course assignments to streamline the monitoring process. Additionally, the CDE and the CTC conducted over 31 in-person professional development opportunities, training over 3,300 individuals and over 1,900 participants via webinar. The sessions assisted LEAs to understand the impact of the new course code submission process with respect to the assignment monitoring process through CalSAAS. LEAs were encouraged to bring their CALPADS coordinators, curriculum and instruction staff, and human resources staff to these training sessions to ensure accuracy in reporting these data in CALPADS for the
2019–20 school year. These training sessions were followed up with additional technical support to LEAs for the 2019–20 school year when the initial assignment monitoring process was piloted through CalSAAS. By statute, the 2019–20 assignment monitoring process was for informational purposes only and was not to be used for reporting.

The execution of the data-sharing agreement between the CDE and the CTC and the development of CalSAAS allows California, for the first time, to meet the federal reporting requirements established by the ESSA. The CDE assignment data and the CTC assignment monitoring outcome data provide the basis for the DataQuest Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome (AMO) by Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) report to meet the requirements established under California’s ESSA Consolidated State Plan.

### Local Control and Accountability Plan Federal Addendum

In 2019–20, LEAs applying for ESSA funds had to complete the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Federal Addendum as part of meeting the requirements for the ESSA LEA Plan. The LCAP Federal Addendum was meant to supplement the LCAP to ensure that eligible LEAs have the opportunity to meet the LEA Plan provisions of the ESSA.

ESSA Section 1112(b)(2) requires LEAs to identify and address any disparities that result in low-income and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers. To meet this requirement, LEAs provided a description of the following in their LCAP Federal Addendum:

1. The LEA's process for identifying disparities that result in low-income and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers; and
2. How the LEA will address any disparities found during the identification process.

At the time the LCAP Federal Addendum was released, the Teaching AMO data was not yet available. LEAs were given several tools to self-identify any disparities that existed in their organization. CDE staff reviewed the LCAP Federal Addendum and provided feedback and technical assistance to LEAs.

### Data Sources and Timelines

The DataQuest Teaching AMO report and supporting downloadable data file use assignment data submitted to the CDE by LEAs through the annual CALPADS Fall 2 data submission. These data, which are submitted, reviewed, and certified by LEAs in CALPADS between October and March/April, include staff demographics and experience, staff assignments and FTE, course offerings, and student course enrollment data that are effective as of Census Day, which is the first Wednesday in October.

When the Fall 2 submission closes, the CDE extracts the necessary assignment data and transmits them to the CTC for their annual assignment monitoring process. The CTC loads the CALPADS assignment data into CalSAAS and compares these data against the CTC’s credential authorization data for each assignment based on the Statewide Educator Identification associated with the assignment. LEAs, COEs, and Monitoring Authorities are then given a 90-day period to review exceptions and determinations and make corrections where applicable. The CTC’s assignment monitoring process typically occurs between August and November.

After the CalSAAS assignment monitoring process closes, the CTC processes the assignment data to generate the applicable AMOs for each assignment and transmits the data to the CDE for analysis and reporting purposes. The data provided to the CDE map to the statuses outlined in the California’s ESSA Consolidated State Plan approved by the SBE. Some AMOs do not align with these definitions (e.g., incomplete, unknown, and not applicable [N/A]) but they are included in the report to provide a holistic understanding of the AMOs for the totality of teaching assignments reported by LEAs in CALPADS and so that the assignment FTE data will add to 100 percent in the DataQuest Teaching AMO report.

### Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome Definitions

To understand the data presented in the DataQuest Teaching AMO report, it is important to first define the following important terms:

* A “teaching assignment” is defined as a classroom-based assignment wherein a unique section of course content is being taught by one or more teachers to a specific group of students. LEAs submit course section and student course section data to CALPADS, which the CDE provides to the CTC for assignment monitoring purposes.
* An AMO is the result(s) or finding(s) from the assignment monitoring processes conducted by the CTC. Each teaching assignment is evaluated along one or more attributes or dimensions for the teaching assignment in CalSAAS to determine if or how the teacher is authorized to teach the assigned course and the students enrolled in the course. For DataQuest reporting purposes, the FTE data for each teaching assignment is aggregated and displayed for the following AMO categories: clear, out-of-field, ineffective, intern, incomplete, unknown, and N/A. More information about these AMO categories is covered in separate sections below.
* The FTE of a position is defined as the percentage of time spent working in a job classification in relation to a full-time position (100 percent or 1.0 FTE).

The DataQuest Teaching AMO report shows how much teaching FTE is associated with classroom-based teaching assignments by subject area and their corresponding AMOs. This means that teachers may be clear, out-of-field, or ineffective for all or part of their
full-time teaching assignment. For example, in the chart below the teacher who is credentialed in math is clear in their first three assignments (0.6 of their total assignment) but is considered out-of-field for the two periods (0.4 of their total assignment) they are assigned to teach history.

#### Table 1: Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome Full-Time Equivalency Example

| **Period/Assignment** | **Subject** | **FTE Value** | **AMO** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Math | 0.2 | Clear |
| 2 | Math | 0.2 | Clear |
| 3 | Math | 0.2 | Clear |
| 4 | History | 0.2 | Out-of-Field |
| 5 | History | 0.2 | Out-of-Field |

The CDE evaluates the detailed data provided by the CTC to produce a single AMO for each assignment based on a set of business rules. Table 2 defines each of the possible AMOs that could be assigned to each teaching assignment.

#### Table 2: California Definitions for Purposes of Collecting Equity Data under the Every Student Succeeds Act

| **Term** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| **Clear** | An assignment monitoring outcome of clear indicates that all relevant attributes or dimensions of the assignment were authorized by a clear or preliminary credential or authorized by a local assignment option (LAO) pursuant to Section 80005(b) of the California *Code of Regulations* (T5 §80005[b]) for specific state course codes where a credential or permit does not exist to authorize the indicated teaching assignment (e.g., student government or study hall). |
| **Ineffective Teacher** | An assignment monitoring outcome of ineffective indicates that one or more relevant attributes of the assignment had no legal authorization from a permit, credential or waiver, or one or more relevant attributes of the assignment were authorized by the following limited permits:* Provisional Internship Permits
* Short-Term Staff Permits
* Variable Term Waivers
* Substitute Permits or Teaching Permits for Statutory Leave holders serving as the teacher of record
 |
| **Out-of-Field Teacher** | An out-of-field teacher is defined as someone who has a credential but has not yet demonstrated subject matter competence in the subject area(s) or for the student population associated with the assignment. An assignment monitoring outcome of out-of-field indicates that one or more relevant attributes of the assignment were authorized by the following limited permits:* General Education Limited Assignment Permit
* Special Education Limited Assignment Permit
* Short-Term Waivers
* Emergency English Learner or Bilingual Authorization Permits
* LAOs (except for those made pursuant to T5 §80005[b])
 |
| **Intern** | An intern teacher is defined as someone who has a bachelor’s degree and has demonstrated subject matter competency in the subject area(s) or for the student population associated with the assignment, and who holds an intern credential while they complete coursework requirements to obtain a preliminary credential. |
| **Inexperienced Teacher** | A teacher who has two or fewer years of teaching experience. |
| **Minority Student** | A student who is American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, African American, Filipino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or two or more races that are not Hispanic. |
| **Low-Income Student** | A student who is eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals, also referred to SED students. |
| **Incomplete** | An assignment monitoring outcome of incomplete indicates that missing or incorrect information about the assignment was reported to CALPADS by the LEA which prevented a complete and accurate determination of the assignment authorization during the CTC assignment monitoring process. In some cases, the LEA or Monitoring Authority may have indicated that the assignment is appropriate; however, neither the CDE nor the CTC can validate the authorization basis for the assignment.  |
| **Unknown** | An assignment monitoring outcome of unknown indicates that insufficient information about the assignment was reported to CALPADS by the LEA which resulted in an unknown determination of the assignment authorization during the CTC assignment monitoring process. This outcome is often the result of LEAs not reporting an English language service associated with a course in which English learners are enrolled. Although the assignment authorization may be clear in other areas, an assignment monitoring outcome of unknown in the English learner authorization space results in an overall determination of unknown for the assignment.  |
| **N/A** | An assignment monitoring outcome of N/A indicates that the assignment either required no authorization or evaluation of the authorization was not applicable given the state course code or some other attribute of the assignment. This includes specific state course codes not evaluated during the assignment monitoring process conducted by the CTC (e.g., 9143, 9154, or 9215) or because the assignment was an online, learner-led course in which the student sets the pace of instruction, and where content and instruction are provided solely by the online application.  |

Utilizing the Teaching AMO data, CDE staff divided California’s school enrollment into quartiles. Quartile 1 has the smallest percentage of low-income and minority students and Quartile 4 has the largest percentage. The tables provided below examine the rates in which low-income and minority students being taught by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers.

#### Table 3a: Summary of 2021–22 Educator Equity Data: Minority Quartiles - Student Enrollment and Teacher Counts

| **Minority Quartile Rank** | **Number of Schools** | **Total Enrollment(N)** | **Minority Enrollment (N)** | **Minority Enrollment (%)** | **Total Teacher FTE (N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2,494 | 1,281,960 | 602,701 | 47.0% | 61,770.3 |
| 2 | 2,494 | 1,623,218 | 1,214,478 | 74.8% | 75,830.8 |
| 3 | 2,495 | 1,575,774 | 1,451,384 | 92.1% | 73,834.9 |
| 4 | 2,494 | 1,393,391 | 1,369,756 | 98.3% | 66,559.8 |
| **Statewide** | **9,977** | **5,874,343** | **4,638,319** | **79.0%** | **277,995.7** |

Table 3a displays California’s school data divided into quartiles based on the number of minority students. Quartile 1 includes schools with the lowest percentage of minority students and Quartile 4 includes schools with the highest percentage of minority students. The final column includes the number of teaching assignments in each quartile.

#### Table 3b: Summary of 2021–22 Educator Equity Data: Minority Quartiles - Inexperienced, Clear, Intern, Ineffective, and Out-of-Field Teacher Assignments

| **Minority Quartile Rank** | **Inexperienced FTE (%)** | **Clear FTE (%)** | **InternFTE (%)** | **Ineffective FTE (%)** | **Out of FieldFTE (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 11.0% | 84.3% | 1.1% | 3.4% | 6.2% |
| 2 | 11.9% | 84.6% | 1.4% | 3.5% | 4.2% |
| 3 | 13.2% | 83.3% | 1.9% | 4.5% | 4.3% |
| 4 | 13.5% | 84.1% | 2.5% | 5.8% | 2.5% |
| **Statewide** | **12.4%** | **84.1%** | **1.7%** | **4.3%** | **4.3%** |

Table 3b includes the same minority quartiles, but includes the percentage of inexperienced, clear, intern, ineffective, and out-of-field teachers assigned to the schools in each quartile. Quartile 1 that includes schools with the lowest percentage of minority students has 11 percent inexperienced FTEs while Quartile 4 with the highest percentage of minority students has 13.5 percent. Quartile 1 has 84.3 percent clear teachers, while Quartile 4 has 84.1 percent. The percentage of intern teachers assigned to Quartile 1 is 1.1 percent and the percentage of intern teachers in Quartile 4 is 2.5 percent. The difference between Quartile 1 and Quartile 4 for ineffective teachers is 3.4 percent and 5.8 percent respectively. Finally, out-of-field teachers represent 6.2 percent in Quartile 1 and 2.5 percent in Quartile 4.

#### Table 3c: Summary of 2021–22 Educator Equity Data: Minority Quartiles - Incomplete, Unknown, and Not Applicable

| **Minority Quartile Rank** | **IncompleteFTE (%)** | **UnknownFTE (%)** | **N/AFTE (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 4.5% | 0.4% | 0.2% |
| 2 | 5.6% | 0.4% | 0.2% |
| 3 | 5.6% | 0.3% | 0.1% |
| 4 | 4.8% | 0.2% | 0.1% |
| **Statewide** | **5.2%** | **0.3%** | **0.2%** |

Table 3c includes the same minority quartiles, but includes the percentage of incomplete, unknown, and N/A FTEs assigned to the schools in each quartile. Quartile 1 that includes schools with the lowest percentage of SED students has 4.5 percent incomplete FTEs, 0.4 percent unknown FTE and 0.2 percent N/A FTE. Quartile 4 with the highest percentage of minority students has 4.8 percent incomplete FTEs, 0.4 percent unknown FTEs, and 0.2 percent N/A FTEs.

#### Table 4a: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Quartiles: Student Enrollment and Teacher Counts

| **SED Quartile Rank** | **Number of Schools** | **Total Enrollment(N)** | **SED Enrollment (N)** | **SED Enrollment (%)** | **Total Teacher FTE (N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2,494 | 1,676,998 | 395,534 | 23.6% | 77,676.2 |
| 2 | 2,494 | 1,503,275 | 829,579 | 55.2% | 70,621.3 |
| 3 | 2,495 | 1,431,965 | 1,112,995 | 77.7% | 67,359.2 |
| 4 | 2,494 | 1,262,105 | 1,166,793 | 92.4% | 62,339.0 |
| **Statewide** | **9,977** | **5,874,343** | **4,638,319** | **59.7%** | **277,995.7** |

Table 4a displays California’s school data divided into quartiles based on the enrollment of SED students. Quartile 1 includes schools with the lowest percentage of SED students and Quartile 4 includes schools with the highest percentage of SED students. The final column includes the number of FTEs in each quartile.

#### Table 4b: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Quartiles: Inexperienced, Clear, Intern, Ineffective, and Out-of-Field Teacher Assignments

| **SED Quartile Rank** | **Inexperienced FTE (%)** | **Clear FTE (%)** | **InternFTE (%)** | **Ineffective FTE (%)** | **Out of FieldFTE (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 10.2% | 87.7% | 0.8% | 2.8% | 3.6% |
| 2 | 13.0% | 83.0% | 1.6% | 4.3% | 4.9% |
| 3 | 13.4% | 82.3% | 2.0% | 5.1% | 4.6% |
| 4 | 13.6% | 82.7% | 2.7% | 5.3% | 4.0% |
| **Statewide** | **12.4%** | **84.1%** | **1.7%** | **4.3%** | **4.3%** |

Table 4b includes the same SED quartiles, but includes the percentages of inexperienced, clear, intern, ineffective, and out-of-field teachers assigned to the schools in each quartile. Quartile 1 includes schools with the lowest percentage of SED students and has 10.2 percent inexperienced FTEs while Quartile 4 with the highest percentage of SED students has 13.6 percent. Quartile 1 has 87.7 percent clear teachers, while Quartile 4 has 82.7 percent. The percentage of intern teachers assigned to Quartile 1 is 0.8 percent and the percentage of intern teachers in Quartile 4 is 2.7 percent. The difference between Quartile 1 and Quartile 4 for ineffective teachers is 2.8 percent and 5.3 percent respectively. Finally, out-of-field teachers represent 3.6 percent in Quartile 1 and 4 percent in Quartile 4.

#### Table 4c: Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Quartiles: Incomplete, Unknown, and Not Applicable

| **SED Quartile Rank** | **IncompleteFTE (%)** | **UnknownFTE (%)** | **N/AFTE (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 4.6% | 0.3% | 0.1% |
| 2 | 5.5% | 0.4% | 0.2% |
| 3 | 5.6% | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| 4 | 5.0% | 0.3% | 0.1% |
| **Statewide** | **5.2%** | **0.3%** | **0.2%** |

Table 4c includes the same SED quartiles, but includes the percentages of incomplete, unknown, and N/A FTEs assigned to the schools in each quartile. Quartile 1 that includes schools with the lowest percentage of SED students has 4.6 percent incomplete FTEs, 0.3 percent unknown FTEs and 0.1 percent N/A FTE. Quartile 4 with the highest percentage of minority students has 5 percent incomplete FTEs, 0.3 percent unknown FTEs, and 0.1 percent N/A FTEs.

### Uses of the Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcome data

The Teaching AMO data are now utilized for the following reporting purposes: DataQuest reporting, the School Accountability Report Card (SARC), California School Dashboard Priority One, Williams Determinations, Teacher Equity Plan, and federal Teacher Shortage and EDFacts reporting.

In July 2023, the SBE approved the 2022–23 SARC template in which the CDE would
pre-populate teacher data utilizing Teaching AMO data. These sections of the SARC were previously self-populated by the LEA. Additionally, data labels have been updated to include terms used in the ESSA and subsequently in the Teaching AMO data. For example, Table 7 in the 2022–23 SARC template lists: Teachers Without Credentials and Misassignments (ineffective under the ESSA) and includes the Teaching AMO categories of unknown, incomplete, and N/A.

LEAs are required to address applicable Local Control Funding Formula state priorities, as well as any local priorities identified by the LEAs, in the LCAP. As part of State Priority 1, LEAs must describe the degree to which teachers in the LEAs are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed in the subject area and for the students they are teaching.

In the past, LEAs used locally available data to report this data to the California School Dashboard using the self-reflective tool. *EC* Section 52064.5(e)(2) was amended in 2020 to require the standards for local indicators to be based on objective criteria when the CDE collects or has access to reliable school level data. Given that the Teaching AMO data directly addresses this part of Priority 1, starting in the 2022–23 school year, the Teaching AMO data were directly reported to the California School Dashboard by the CDE. The CDE engaged with statewide educational partners to collect recommendations for objective criteria which were brought to the SBE for approval.

When it comes to addressing Priority 1 on the LCAP, there is no state-required metric for determining how the LEA is making progress related to how their teachers are appropriately assigned and fully credentialed for the courses and students that they teach. It is a local decision for LEAs to determine how to measure and report this progress on the LCAP. However, given that the Teaching AMO data will be reported on the SARC and the California School Dashboard, LEAs will need to consider whether their current local measures and reporting methods should be updated.

Each year the CDE reports teacher shortage data to the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Prior to the availability of the Teaching AMO data, the shortage data was self-reported through the California Basic Educational Data System. The Teaching AMO data has enabled the CDE to more accurately report shortages according to ED’s definitions. For example, ineffective teachers and those teaching out-of-field are considered a shortage due to the fact that an appropriately credentialed teacher could not be hired for that position.

### Promoting Equitable Access to Teachers Program

The CDE has developed the Promoting Equitable Access to Teachers (PEAT) Program to assist LEAs in identifying and addressing local disparities or equity gaps. A key element of the PEAT Program is a suite of equity tools designed to guide LEAs as they collect and analyze the appropriate data, conduct data analyses to identify potential equity gaps, conduct a root cause analysis and consider various strategies to address disparities, and engage stakeholders in the process.

Other PEAT resources address the topics of retention, recruitment, and diversification of the teacher workforce to directly assist LEAs to continuously improve equitable access to teachers. More recently, PEAT staff have added resources on asset-based pedagogies in order to support teachers’ and LEAs’ efficacy in serving California’s culturally rich and diverse communities. Some of these tools were initially developed to help LEAs successfully complete their LCAP Federal Addenda in the 2018–19 school year. Now, these tools serve to assist LEAs and school communities to continue addressing any equity gaps in the years ahead.

Most recently, a set of training videos was added to the PEAT website to help them understand and refine their local Teaching AMO data. The videos include an overview of the data and also topics that were chosen from common questions received by the CDE about the data. The tools are available on the CDE PEAT Program web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/pl/peat.asp>.

## Attachments

None.