

## **Teacher Disproportionality Policy Brief**

Keely Garden

---

*Recommended Citation:* Garden, Keely (2020). Teacher Disproportionality Policy Brief, *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, Fall 2020 *Special Issues on Educational Leadership Policy Briefs: Perspectives of Doctoral Students*

---

### **Executive Summary**

Teacher-student racial disproportionality is the underrepresentation of diverse peoples in the ranks of teaching staff. In the state of Connecticut 40% of students are people of color but only 8.7% of teachers are people of color (Lyons, 2019). Teacher-student racial disproportionality contributes to the achievement gap. The achievement gap is a term used to describe the disparate test scores and graduation rates between White students and Black and Brown students (Welner & Carter, 2013). The gap has lifelong negative impacts on Black and Brown people including: increased rates of school suspension rates, special education referrals, incarceration rates, substance addiction, chronic health problems, and mental illness (Ladson-Billings, 2013). The gap has also been linked to lower wages, unemployment, a lack of job training and or skills, and a lack of insurance (Ladson-Billings, 2013).

Teacher-student racial disproportionality contributes to the achievement gap because non-diverse teachers can impart stereotype threat and induce cultural conflict, whereas demographic matches between students and teachers have been shown to improve learning partnerships (Wells, et al., 2016). Diverse teachers act as role models to diverse students, increasing academic motivation (Dee, 2005). Non-diverse teachers can convey stereotype threat; viewing non-race matched students as disruptive or not likely to complete homework, creating negative student assessments that become self-fulfilling prophecies (Dee, 2005; Tyson, 2014). A diverse teaching staff can create positive outcomes for all students. Black and Brown teachers may have better classroom environments predicated on their own non-dominant person experiences (Cherng & Halpin, 2016). Research has shown that all students view diverse teachers positively and when students view their teachers positively, students are more successful

academically (Cherng & Halpin, 2016). Additionally, a diverse teaching staff demonstrates democracy at work and allows students to practice the 21st Century College and Career readiness objective of working in an ever increasingly global society (Cherng & Halpin, 2016).

In this brief I review the policy process that will reduce teacher-student racial disproportionality, with a focus on the state of Connecticut. I also examine background information on the achievement gap and teacher-student racial disproportionality and explain why the policy issue merits a place on the legislative agenda through its ability to unite three seemingly disconnected problem streams with one solution. Hiring more racially diverse teachers can reduce the achievement gap between White students and Black and Brown students, improve all students' abilities to work in diverse settings, and reduce future discrimination in hiring and retaining teachers.

Additionally, I analyze the context of the race gap in CT and I discuss the rational-comprehensive formulation of Public Act 19-74, An Act Concerning Minority Teacher Recruitment and Retention in CT (2019) (see Appendix A). This bill requires a statewide increase in the number of minority teachers and administrators by a minimum of 250 new hires each school year starting in 2020-2021. As formulated, the policy hopes to reduce the achievement gap between White students and Black and Brown students, in turn allowing the state government to reduce fiscal spending on social services and to increase tax revenues. I also cover the legitimization of the policy via stakeholder communication and inclusion and the implementation of the policy by the state legislature. This top-down policy implementation includes specific pathways to increase diverse hires such as creating teacher certification reciprocity agreements with other states, loosening the subject area test score requirements in shortage areas and for initial educators from excellent to satisfactory, offering mortgage assistance, and allowing retirees receiving benefits to teach for an additional year. I close the brief with a review of the intended and unintended consequences of the policy and methodologies for evaluating the efficacy of the legislation. The brief also details policy actors' roles for each stage of the policy process.

### **Policy Planning-Content Background**

Throughout the United States, diverse teachers are underrepresented in the ranks of public-school teachers (National Center for Education Statistics,

2017). Schools that have a higher percentage of White teachers than White students have not kept up with the changing demographics of the population they serve. In 2017 the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey found the racial/ethnic breakdown of American students aged 5-17 to be 51% White, 14% Black, 25% Hispanic, 5% Asian, 4% two or more races, 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, and less than .5% Pacific Islander (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). The NCES also determined schoolteachers to be 83.5% White non-Hispanic, 6.7% Hispanic, 6.9% non-Hispanic Black, 1.3% non-Hispanic Asian, 0.9% two or more races, 0.5% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 0.2% Pacific Islander (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). These statistics reveal an imbalance: almost 3 times as many diverse students than diverse teachers in American public schools. This teacher-student racial disproportionality negatively impacts students of color and contributes to the achievement gap (Kirby et al., 1999).

The achievement gap is a term used to describe disparate outcomes between White students and Black and Brown students (Welner & Carter, 2013). Indicators of this gap include test scores and graduation rates. “The average White 13-year-old reads at a higher level and performs better in math than the average Black or Latino 17-year-old” (Welner & Carter, 2013, p. 2). White students have graduation rates of 93.5% and Black and Latino students’ graduation rates are 66.1% and 71.4%, respectively (Welner & Carter, 2013, p. 2). The long-term effects of the achievement gap include increased rates of school suspension rates, special education referrals, incarceration rates, substance addiction, chronic health problems, and mental illness. The gap has also been linked to lower wages, unemployment, a lack of job training and or skills, and a lack of insurance (Ladson-Billings, 2013, p. 12). Teacher-student racial disproportionality is a contributing factor in these disparate outcomes.

Teacher diversity is important because demographic matches between students and teachers have been shown to improve learning partnerships (Wells, et al., 2016; Ingersoll & May, 2011; Hansen & Quintero, 2018; Cherg & Halpin, 2016; Ouazad, 2015; Dee, 2005, Carter 2013). Teachers have passive and active impacts on their students (Dee, 2005). Passive impacts can be triggered simply by the race of the teacher. On the positive end of the spectrum, teachers can act as student role models, increasing academic motivation (Dee, 2005). On the negative end, students with a different race than the teacher can experience “stereotype threat,” a psychological apprehension that negatively impacts achievement (Dee,

2005, Tyson, 2014). Active impacts of teachers can be unintended or intended biases against students. White teachers have demonstrated a propensity toward viewing Black and Hispanic students as disruptive and inattentive (Dee, 2005). When the teacher does not share the same race as the student, the teacher is 33% more likely to see the student as disruptive and 22% more likely to view the student as rarely completing her or his homework (Dee, 2005, p. 162). Milner (2012) names this effect “cultural conflict;” “leaving students feeling that their preferences, worldviews, belief systems, and actions are insignificant, disrespected, irrelevant, or subordinate to educators” (p. 702). According to Ouazad (2014), teachers perceive students of the same race more favorably, starting as early as kindergarten. Ouazad’s (2014) research determined teachers assess students of their own race better in math, English, behavior, and skills. More importantly, she determined “previous teacher assessments are more strongly correlated with later test scores than are previous test scores” (Ouazad, 2014, p. 338). These findings go a long way to explain the role of teacher-student race disproportionality in the achievement gap.

These impacts occur even with teachers who have taken a “color-blind” approach. Color blindness prevents teachers from seeing the whole picture or the whole student as it overlooks race. Blocking race as an identity factor is a privileged position that delegitimizes the real experiences of Black and Brown students (Milner, 2012). Color blindness parlays into hiring practices and devalues the assets diverse teachers bring to a school. For example, if a department is racially homogenous, the staff may write a racially homogenous curriculum. When Black and Brown experiences and culturally relevant content is left out of the curriculum it sends a message to students: a message of absence. Overlooking diverse contributions to society decreases the chance of students connecting with the material (Milner, 2012). The negative impacts of color blindness on Black and Brown students include overrepresentation in special education, underrepresentation in gifted education, over referral for disciplinary actions and expulsions and suspensions, and underrepresentation in school clubs, organizations, and prestigious areas (Milner, 2012). Again, teacher-race disproportionality influences student outcomes.

Race matching of students and teachers has obvious benefits for Black and Brown students, but there exists a dangerous potential to use this information to continue the systematic oppression of minorities by segregating teachers and students. Research has shown that diverse teachers are valuable for all students. For example, Cherng & Halpin (2016)

discovered all students have “more positive perceptions of Latino and Black teachers compared to their White counterparts” (p. 412). Prior qualitative studies have shown Latino and Black teachers have better classroom environments predicated on their own non-dominant person experiences (Cherng & Halpin, 2016). This leads to improved rapport, sensitivity, and the ability to recognize the needs of all students. Positive student perceptions of their teachers “translate[s] into better academic outcomes such as motivation, interest, and grades” (Cherng & Halpin, 2016, p. 407). Hansen and Quinteri (2018) determined “the ideals of a democratic, multicultural society are most likely to be advanced when teachers and leaders in our schools model that diversity for the nation’s youth” (para. 3). Therefore, a reduction in teacher-student racial disproportionality should be an education policy priority.

Given the far-reaching impact of the achievement gap, it is difficult to discount any group as policy actors. Obviously, diverse students and their communities suffer the most from the intergenerational effects of the gap, but all students could see improved outcomes by increasing the diversity of teachers. Educational policy makers (government and non-government), boards of education, administrators, teachers, human resource offices, parent-teacher organizations, and community groups all have influence over the hiring and retention of racially diverse teachers. Criminal justice, mental health, and physical health professionals are in great demand because of the gap, as are philanthropic organizations. Any changes to hiring norms will also result in cultural change for the institutions that perpetuate staffing inequalities. The achievement gap impacts every aspect of our society, making us all “policy actors.”

### **Policy Planning-Context Analysis**

Connecticut has the 5th biggest race gap in the United States (Troyer, 2019). This results in Whites being 13.9% more likely than people of color to graduate with a bachelor's degree or higher and 4.4% more likely than people of color to finish high school (NAEP state profiles, 2019). Connecticut Governor Ned Lamont pointed out CT students are 40% people of color but only 8.7% of CT teachers are people of color (Lyons, 2019). Diversifying the teacher workforce will improve college, career, and readiness outcomes for all students by increasing students’ abilities to work in diverse settings (Milner, 2012). As our world becomes increasingly globalized, the ability to collaborate with diverse people has become a vital skill (Friedman, 2014). Additionally, a reduction in student-teacher racial

disproportionality can reduce the achievement gap for students of color (Kirby et al., 1999; Achinstein et al., 2010; Ingersoll & May 2011).

Nationwide, half of the states already have policies in place to recruit and retain racially diverse educators (Ingersoll & May, 2011, p. 62). Their policies have been highly effective as the number of minority teachers almost doubled from 325,000 to 642,000 between the late 1980's and 2011, which is over twice the growth rate of White teachers (Ingersoll & May, 2011). The number of male minority teachers increased by 92% in that time frame, whereas, the number of White male teachers only grew by 18% (Ingersoll & May, 2011). Recruitment has been effective, but retention has been ineffective. In 2003, 47,663 diverse teachers entered the workforce (Ingersoll & May, 2011). At the end of that school year, 2004, 56,244 diverse teachers left the profession for a net loss of 8,581 diverse teachers (Ingersoll & May, 2011). The major reason listed for exiting teaching was school working conditions. Specifically, teachers reported a "lack of collective faculty decision-making influence in the school and the degree of individual instructional autonomy held by teachers in the classroom" (Ingersoll & May, 2011, p. 64). Increases in accountability including high stakes testing and the standardization of curriculum has reduced the authority of teachers. When teachers do not feel respected, especially minority teachers, they leave the profession. Male minority teachers have an especially high turnover rate (Ingersoll & May, 2011). This may be attributed to the fact that they are two to three times more likely to work in high-poverty, high-minority, public schools located in urban communities (Ingersoll & May, 2011). These schools are more likely to be labeled as failing and be taken over by corporate management companies, appointed officials, or philanthropic organizations.

In addition to failing to retain diverse teachers, the United States still discriminates against the hiring of minorities. A meta-analysis uncovered "Whites receive 36% more callbacks than African Americans, and 24% more callbacks than Latinos" (Quillan, et al., 2017, para. 1). A separate study assessed the hiring practices of an undisclosed public-school district and determined that even though 13% of their job applicants were Black, only 6% received job offers (Klein, 2017). In comparison, 70% of their job applicants were White and 77% received job offers (Klein, 2017). This disproportionality might be attributed to cultural capital including informal networks of opportunity and referrals. Additionally, color blind hiring preventing discrimination based on race also prevents hiring based on race; allowing unconscious biases and the desire to keep the status quo to creep



into hiring practices (Strauss, 2019). Without a diverse teacher workforce to model diversity for the nation's youth, it is difficult to advance "the ideals of a democratic, multicultural society" (Hansen and Quinteri, 2018, para. 3). Therefore, the hiring and retention of diverse teachers should be a national priority.

For teacher-student racial disproportionality to ascend onto the policy agenda, it must be considered important enough to merit the attention (Stewart, et al., 2008). This can be accomplished when problem(s), policy, and polity streams align (McLendon, et al., 2014, p. 88). In this case, there are multiple problems that are fighting to get on the agenda: the achievement gap between White students and Black and Brown students, improving all students' abilities to work in diverse settings, and discrimination in hiring. The policy solution for all three of these problems is hiring more racially diverse teachers. The polity, or the public's acceptance of the issue is predicated on the improved educational outcomes for all students when teacher-student racial disproportionality is decreased: a win-win situation that will capture the attention of the electorate. This one solution unites the three streams and qualifies the issue for the agenda.

Policy actors who set the agenda on teacher-student racial proportionality include micro and macro constituencies. At the micro level, student activists, parents, teachers, community leaders, or grass-roots policy actors could influence the local media to highlight the issue as a meritable concern. School districts might push the issue to close their own achievement gaps that reflect negatively on their communities. At the macro level, policy actors in a state legislature or the national Congress can propose legislation to increase teacher-student racial proportionality. Even international CEOs might emphasize the importance of creating a workforce that can interact with the global economy. Each micro and macro level policy actor has the ability to make teacher-student disproportionality "fashionable" because it is a crisis that particularly demonstrates larger issues of racism (power) in our society and it has a wide impact on the societal outcomes of our fellow humans (Stewart, et al., 2008. p. 68).

### **Policy Formulation**

In an effort to combat teacher-student racial disproportionality statewide, CT passed Public Act 19-74, An Act Concerning Minority Teacher Recruitment and Retention (2019) (see Appendix A). The bill requires all state boards of education work toward an increase in the hiring of minority

teachers and administrators by a minimum of 250 new hires each school year starting in 2020-2021. This incremental approach demonstrates policy makers are proactively attempting to create a future with more diverse teachers. The bill also stipulates that 30% of these new hires must be men. The state should add a provision to the legislation calling for additional efforts in retaining diverse teachers through mentorships and increased opportunities for roles on decision making committees. Key provisions of the legislation include creating teacher certification reciprocity agreements with other states, loosening the subject area test score requirements in shortage areas and for initial educators from excellent to satisfactory, offering mortgage assistance, and allowing retirees receiving benefits to teach for an additional year. These new policies apply to teachers who graduated from historically Black colleges, priority educational districts, and reform districts. These provisions can diversify the teacher workforce; thereby, improving the college, career, and readiness outcomes for all students as they increase their ability to work in diverse settings (Milner, 2012). Additionally, a reduction in student-teacher racial disproportionality can reduce the achievement gap for students of color (Kirby et al., 1999; Achinstein et al., 2010; Ingersoll & May 2011).

This policy formulation fits the rational-comprehensive model of decision making as the benefits outweigh the costs (Stewart, et al., 2008). The achievement gap costs the state of CT an enormous amount of money each year when Black and Brown students drop out of high school or do not attend college. The dropout rate is less than two percent in majority White school districts like Madison which only enrolls 5.72% Black and Brown students and Glastonbury which only enrolls 13.25% Black and Brown students. Whereas, the dropout rate is over sixty percent in majority-minority cities such as New Britain which enrolls 78.28% Black and Brown students and Hartford with 83% Black and Brown students (Megan, 2016; Connecticut report cards, n.d.). Belfield & Levin (2013) calculate the total lifetime fiscal cost of the achievement gap to be almost \$500,000 per high school dropout and \$760,830 per high school graduate that does not go on to college. These costs include human capital, tax payments, and social impacts such as crime reduction. According to a 2016 Dalio Foundation report, 14,000 youths dropped out of high school in CT for a total lifetime fiscal loss of \$7 billion (Megan, 2016). Therefore, this policy formation rests firmly on the rational-comprehensive model as demonstrated by the immense costs of not hiring and retaining racially diverse teachers.



The pivotal actors in the formulation of CT's policy are at the macro level of the state, because the Connecticut General Assembly proposed and passed the public act and the Governor signed it into law. Their actions may have been influenced by the micro policy actors who were able to get the issue on the agenda, including student activists, parents, teachers, community leaders, grass-roots organizers, the local media, school districts, and business leaders. Additional policy actors include the mentors and the professionals responsible for teacher certification, certification reciprocity, teacher training, teacher retirement, and the housing authority. Individuals at each of those government offices will need to create, apply, and enforce the specific details of the policy.

### **Policy Text-Legitimization**

In order to legitimize the policy, stakeholders need to be included in the process. This can be accomplished by reaching into communities and presenting information on the connection between teacher-student disproportionality and the achievement gap. The key to comprehensive stakeholder buy in is to accentuate the increases in educational outcomes that can occur for all students. Community outreach can be in the form of town hall meetings, board of education meetings, and advertising campaigns. These communiques can also be used to invite stakeholders to participate in developing the hiring processes that will increase the number of diverse teachers in the state and to recruit mentors to aid in the retention of the new diverse hires. Specific outreach can be directed toward state and local businesses, historically Black colleges, Spanish/Latino community centers, and teacher training institutions.

The policy actors responsible for the community outreach are the state legislative offices and their district representatives. Within the districts, boards of education will also need to act to garner community support. For example, in Norwalk, CT the board of education added minority teacher recruitment to the agenda under the heading "Approval of 2019-20 Priority Implementation Steps and Outcomes of the Strategic Operating Plan" (Grassili, 2019). The minutes from the meeting read "the Board of Education recognizes the diversity of the people who live in this school district and believes that this diversity should have an important bearing on all aspects of the school system's activities" (Grassili, 2019). The board mandated all personnel involved in hiring become familiar with the district's affirmative action plan, making these personnel policy actors as well. Finally, the mentors, teachers, parents, and students are also crucial policy

actors in legitimizing the policy. They can engage their social and cultural networks to reinforce the need for the policy and their belief in its efficacy.

### **Policy Implementation**

The legislature initiated the process of decreasing teacher-student racial disproportionality in CT by passing Public Act 19-74, An Act Concerning Minority Teacher Recruitment and Retention (2019) (see Appendix A). They detailed specific pathways to increase diverse hires, including creating teacher certification reciprocity agreements with other states, loosening the subject area test score requirements in shortage areas and for initial educators from excellent to satisfactory, offering mortgage assistance, and allowing retirees receiving benefits to teach for an additional year. This top-down implementation includes precise details that remove much of the “bureaucratic discretion previously enjoyed by administrative agencies in the implementation of policy” in an effort to reduce policy failure predicated on omissions from the text of the policy (Stewart, et al., 2008, p. 108). Subsequent policy implementation steps include the commissioner of education establishing certification reciprocity and the housing authority administering the mortgage program. These agencies must also communicate this information out to potential hires. This can be done by expanding formal and informal networks of opportunity to include connections with diverse credentialing and professional organizations like historically Black colleges and the National Alliance of Black School Educators. Mentors can also be sourced from these establishments. Community organizations and local school boards can recruit graduates from reform and priority school districts. Boards of education also need to review their affirmative action policies, work with their human resources department to advertise in publications that will reach racial diverse applicants, add diverse personnel to hiring committees, and train hiring committee personnel. Most importantly, funding must be set aside to adequately support these implementation measures. Finally, state governments should deny ratings of “excellent” to any school that does not demonstrate proportionality between diverse teachers and students. This form of public accountability will help bring about change in a timely manner. Once the proportionality of diverse teachers in a school district improves, the administration can access the cultural capital of the diverse staff to ensure the disproportionality does not return.

Policy implementation actors include the state legislators who proposed and voted on the policy and the governor who signed it into law. The

commissioner of education and the housing authority agencies are the actors who must carry out the detailed provisions of the act. Every entity that participates in the recruitment of diverse teachers and their mentors is a policy actor, as are the diverse teachers who apply for teaching positions in CT. This includes but is not limited to, boards of education, human resources departments, hiring committees, teacher accreditation institutions, community organizations, and parents.

### **Policy Evaluation**

The intended consequences of the policy include a reduction in teacher-student disproportionality and improved educational outcomes for Brown and Black students. Specifically, standardized test scores and graduation rates for Brown and Black students should approximate those of White students, closing the achievement gap. This would be a result of improved teacher-student learning partnerships, increased academic motivation, and a reduction in “stereotype threat” (Dee, 2005, Tyson, 2014). Eventually, the policy may also reduce the long-term negative effects of the achievement gap including: decreasing rates of school suspension rates, special education referrals, incarceration rates, substance addiction, chronic health problems, and mental illness. The policy impacts may culminate in higher wages, increased tax revenues, and reductions in social services costs (Belfield & Levin, 2013). Outcomes for all students may improve because diverse teachers have proven to create classroom environments that improve the motivation, interest, and grades of all students (Cherng & Halpin, 2016). Students will also improve their ability to work in diverse settings and hiring discrimination will be reduced.

Unintended consequences of the policy include the redistribution of power and resources into communities of color via the increase of well paying, professional jobs for Black and Brown teachers (Scott, 2012, p. 9). This in turn may create more community leaders and increase the number of positive adult-relationships students have. Diverse staff may also produce diverse curriculums that value the contributions of all members of society and may eventually lead to increases in democratic ideals (Hansen and Quinteri, 2018).

Assessing the efficacy of the policy would start with determining the number of diverse teachers hired and retained in the 2020-2021 school year. If the state meets the 250 hire standard and retains their diverse teachers, the next step would be a meta-evaluation to determine if the achievement gap

between the standardized test scores of White students and Brown and Black students was reduced (Stewart, et al., 2008). It may take years for the impact of the diverse teachers to be felt, so the state should be mindful to weigh the standardized test results based on the ratio of teacher-student disproportionality. Each year the policy is in place, there would need to be a reevaluation until proportionality is reached and the achievement gap is closed, at which point, the policy should be terminated. If the 250 hire standard was not reached or if diverse teachers were not being retained, the state would need to run a process evaluation to determine why the policy failed and then retool the policy (Stewart, et al., 2008). The state might need to offer additional resources for districts to build their capacity to hire and retain diverse teachers. Districts that are successful in making and retaining diverse teachers could collaborate with less successful towns to share best practices.

Standardized test scores are not the only measure of the success of the policy. Therefore, the state also needs to complete an impact evaluation in which the mentors, teachers, students, and parents are surveyed to document the qualitative impacts of the diverse teachers including: students' abilities to work in diverse setting and student social emotional wellness. Finally, the state should look for signs of backlash against the new policy. If such signs present, the state will need to counteract the backlash by communicating data about the efficacy of the policy to the dissatisfied stakeholders. If the backlash is valid, the state will need to retool or terminate the policy.

Assessment policy actors are composed of internal and external evaluators. Internal actors include the state department of education, district human resources professionals, the standardized testing companies, local boards of education, and the administrators who will administer the evaluations. Teachers, students, and parents who participate in the evaluation are also internal evaluators. External evaluators include community organizations, university researchers, and the media who access the results of the policy changes and share their recommendations for the future.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, Connecticut has a higher rate of teacher-student racial disproportionality than the nation as a whole (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017; Lyons, 2019). This disproportionality is contributing to the achievement gap (Kirby et al., 1999; Achinstein et al., 2010; Ingersoll &

May 2011). Therefore, reducing teacher-student racial disproportionality is a vital educational policy. This policy deserves a place on the agenda because it can solve multiple problems and please multiple polities. It can help diminish the achievement gap between White students and Black and Brown students, and it can also improve all students' capacity to work in a global society and reduce discrimination in hiring.

Connecticut's policy to reduce teacher-student racial disproportionality is formulated as Public Act 19-74 (2019) (see Appendix A). The act is rational-comprehensive; potentially saving the state as much as \$7 billion dollars (Belfield & Levin, 2013; Meghan, 2016). It also is an incremental policy that proactively seeks to create improved educational outcomes for all students, increase students' abilities to work in an increasingly global society, and reduce discrimination in hiring. The policy will need to be legitimized by the stakeholders via town hall meetings, board of education meetings, and advertising. The state department of education is already working to implement the policy with changes to the teacher certification process and boards of education have already added the policy to their agendas (Grassili, 2019). The policy will also need to be evaluated to determine its effectiveness. It is important to remember that this is an incremental policy; therefore, quantitative and qualitative evaluations should be staggered over an extended period.

Educational policy impacts students and their communities; therefore, it is the responsibility of educational leaders to advocate for policies that improve student outcomes. Educational leaders including principals, superintendents, and boards of education are the nexus between hiring and retaining the teacher workforce and teacher-student disproportionality. They must champion policies that reduce teacher-student racial disproportionality to ensure the democratic ideals of our country are represented in our schools. Democracy is predicated on the notion that diverse voices have a right to participate in civic discourse. Without diverse teachers, our students will not hear diverse voices. Our teachers and our schools need to represent the demographics of the communities they serve. Connecticut's educational leaders are the key stakeholders who can influence and act on educational policies that increase teacher diversity in our public schools.

### References

- Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., Sexton, D., & Freitas, C. (2010). Retaining Teachers of Color: A Pressing Problem and a Potential Strategy for “Hard-to-Staff” Schools. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(1), 71–107. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309355994>
- An Act Concerning Minority Teacher Recruitment and Retention of 2019, Pub. L. No. 19-74, Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 (2019).
- Belfield, C. & Levin, H.M., (2013). The cumulative costs of the opportunity gap. In P. L. Carter, & K. G. Welner (Eds.), *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 195-206). Oxford University Press.
- Cherng, H.-Y. S., & Halpin, P. F. (2016). The Importance of Minority Teachers: Student Perceptions of Minority Versus White Teachers. *Educational Researcher*, 45(7), 407–420. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16671718>
- Dee, T. (2005). A Teacher like Me: Does Race, Ethnicity, or Gender Matter? *The American Economic Review*, 95(2), 158-165. [www.jstor.org/stable/4132809](http://www.jstor.org/stable/4132809)
- Friedman, T. (2014, December 3). Youtube. The Brainwaves Video Anthology. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IclRM-yYXc0>
- Grassili, L. (2019, September 17). Norwalk public schools board of education: Regular board Meeting. Retrieved from [https://norwalkps.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_71596/File/BOE\\_MeetingDocs/2019-2020/Board%20Packet%2009-17-19.pdf](https://norwalkps.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_71596/File/BOE_MeetingDocs/2019-2020/Board%20Packet%2009-17-19.pdf)
- Hansen, M., & Quintero, D. (2018, August 15). Teachers in the US are even more segregated than students. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center->
- Ingersoll, R. M., & May, H. (2011, May). Recruitment, retention and the minority teacher shortage. Consortium for Policy Research in Education Research Report No. RR-69.
- Ingersoll, R.M., & May, H. (2011). The minority teacher shortage: Fact or able? *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(1), 62–65.
- Kirby, S. N., Berends, M., & Naftel, S. (1999). Supply and Demand of Minority Teachers in Texas: Problems and Prospects. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(1), 47–66. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737021001047>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Lack of Achievement or loss of opportunity? In P. L. Carter, & K.G.
- Lyons, K. (2019, June 4). Bill requiring more minority teachers in Connecticut schools goes to Lamont. *The CT Mirror*. <https://ctmirror.org/2019/06/04/bill-requiring-more-minority>



- McLendon, M., Cohen-Vogel, L., Wachen, J., (2014) Understanding education policy making and policy change in the American states: Learning from contemporary policy theory. In B.S. Cooper, J.G. Cibulka, & L.D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 86-117). Routledge.
- Megan, K. (n.d.). *Report shows 39,000 state youths drop out or disengage from high school*. Courant.Com. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from <https://www.courant.com/education/hc-disengaged-students-20160919-story.html>
- Milner, H. R. (2012). Beyond a test score: Explaining opportunity gaps in educational practice. *Journal of Black Studies*, 43(6), 693–718.
- NAEP state profiles. (2019). [Gov]. Nationsreportcard; National Assessment of Educational Progress. <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/profiles/stateprofile>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). Indicator 1: Population distribution [Gov]. NCES.Ed; Institute of Education Sciences: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ouazad, Amine. “Assessed by a Teacher Like Me: Race and Teacher Assessments.” *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2014, pp. 334–372.
- Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midtboen, A. (2017, September 12). Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time [Org]. PNAS;
- Stewart, J., Hedge, D., & Lester, J. (2008). *Public policy: An evolutionary approach* (3rd ed.). Thompson Wadsworth.
- Strauss, B. (2019, January 24). *Battling racial discrimination in the workplace* [Org]. D.C. Policy Center; D.C. Policy Center.
- Tyson, K. (2013). Tracking, segregation, and the opportunity gap: What we know and why it matters. In P. L. Carter, & K. G. Welner (Eds.), *Closing the opportunity gap: What America must do to give every child an even chance* (pp. 169-180). Oxford University Press.
- Wells, A. S., Fox, L., & Cordova-Cobo, D. (2016, February 9). *How racially diverse schools and classrooms can benefit all students*. <https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and>

## APPENDIX A

### Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74

## **AN ACT CONCERNING MINORITY TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened: Section 1. (NEW) (Effective from passage) For the school year commencing July 1, 2020, and each school year thereafter, the Minority Teacher Recruitment Policy Oversight Council, established pursuant to section 10-156bb of the general statutes, in consultation with the minority teacher recruitment task force, established pursuant to section 10-156aa of the general statutes, shall develop and implement strategies and utilize existing resources to ensure that at least two hundred fifty new minority teachers and administrators, of which at least thirty per cent are men, are hired and employed by local and regional boards of education each year in the state.

As used in this section, "minority" has the same meaning as provided in section 10-156bb of the general statutes. Sec. 2. Section 10-146c of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2019): (a) As used in this section: (1) "State" means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or territories or Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 2 of 8 possessions of the United States; and (2) "Educator preparation program" means a program designed to qualify an individual for [professional] certification as an educator provided by institutions of higher education or other providers, including, but not limited to, an alternate route to certification program. (b) The Commissioner of Education, or the commissioner's designee, as agent for the state shall enter into reciprocity agreements concerning educator certification reciprocity with the chief education officials for each state. If the commissioner is unable to establish a reciprocity agreement with another state, the commissioner may establish or join an interstate agreement pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. [(b)] (c) The Commissioner of Education, or the commissioner's designee, as agent for the state shall establish or join interstate agreements with other states to facilitate the certification of qualified educators from other states.

Any such interstate agreement shall include provisions requiring candidates for certification to, at a minimum, (1) hold a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college or university, (2) have fulfilled post-preparation assessments as approved by the commissioner, and (3) have successfully completed an approved educator preparation program. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 10-145b and 10-145f, as amended by this act, the State Board of Education shall issue the appropriate

[professional] certificate to any applicant, based on such applicant's qualifications, who satisfies the requirements of the appropriate interstate agreement. [(c)] (d) If the commissioner is unable to establish or join a reciprocity agreement or an interstate agreement with another state, the commissioner may create and make available a recognition statement that specifies the states, assessments and educator preparation programs that the commissioner will recognize for Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 3 of 8 purposes of issuing [professional] certification under sections 10-145b, as amended by this act, and 10-145f, as amended by this act.

(e) Not later than January 1, 2020, and annually thereafter, the commissioner shall submit a progress report on the development and implementation of reciprocity agreements and interstate agreements and any recommendations for legislation to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education, in accordance with the provisions of section 11- 4a. Sec. 3. Section 10-145l of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2019): On and after July 1, [2010] 2019, the State Board of Education shall allow an applicant for certification to teach in a subject shortage area pursuant to section 10-8b or a certified employee seeking to teach in such a subject shortage area to substitute achievement of [an excellent] a satisfactory score, as determined by the State Board of Education, on any appropriate State Board of Education approved subject area assessment for the subject area requirements for certification pursuant to section 10-145f, as amended by this act. Sec. 4. Section 8-265pp of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2019):

The Connecticut Housing Finance Authority shall develop and administer a program of mortgage assistance to certified teachers (1) employed by priority school districts pursuant to section 10-266p, (2) employed by transitional school districts pursuant to section 10-263c, (3) employed by the Technical Education and Career System at a technical education and career school located in such priority or transitional school districts, [or] (4) who teach in a subject matter shortage area pursuant to section 10-8b, (5) who graduated from a Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 4 of 8 public high school in an educational reform district, as defined in section 10-262u, or (6) who graduated from an historically black college or university or a Hispanic-serving institution, as those terms are defined in the Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329, as amended from time to time,

and reauthorized by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, P.L. 110-315, as amended from time to time. Such assistance shall be available to eligible teachers for the purchase of a house as their principal residence, provided, in the case of a teacher employed by a priority or a transitional school district, or by the Technical Education and Career System at a technical education and career school located in a priority or transitional school district, the house is located in such district. In making mortgage assistance available under the program, the authority shall utilize down payment assistance or any other appropriate housing subsidies.

The terms of any mortgage assistance shall allow the mortgagee to realize a reasonable portion of the equity gain upon sale of the mortgaged property. Sec. 5. Subsection (b) of section 10-183v of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2019): (b) A teacher receiving retirement benefits from the system may be reemployed for up to one full school year by a local board of education, the State Board of Education or by any constituent unit of the state system of higher education (1) in a position [(1)] designated by the Commissioner of Education as a subject shortage area for the school year in which the teacher is being employed, [or] (2) at a school located in a school district identified as a priority school district, pursuant to section 10-266p, for the school year in which the teacher is being employed, (3) if the teacher graduated from a public high school in an educational reform district, as defined in section 10-262u, or (4) if the teacher graduated from an historically black college or university Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 5 of 8 or a Hispanic-serving institution, as those terms are defined in the Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329, as amended from time to time, and reauthorized by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, P.L. 110-315, as amended from time to time.

Notice of such reemployment shall be sent to the board by the employer and by the retired teacher at the time of hire and at the end of the assignment. Such reemployment may be extended for an additional school year, provided the local board of education (A) submits a written request for approval to the Teachers' Retirement Board, (B) certifies that no qualified candidates are available prior to the reemployment of such teacher, and (C) indicates the type of assignment to be performed, the anticipated date of rehire and the expected duration of the assignment. Sec. 6. Subsection (a) of section 10-145b of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2019): (a) The State Board of Education, upon receipt of a proper application, shall issue an initial

educator certificate to any person who (1) holds a bachelor's degree or an advanced degree from an institution of higher education [accredited by the Board of Regents for Higher Education or Office of Higher Education or] that is regionally accredited or has received an equivalent accreditation, and (2) has completed (A) an educator preparation program approved by the State Board of Education or the appropriate governing body in the state in which the institution of higher education is located, or (B) an alternate route to certification program approved by the State Board of Education or the appropriate governing body in the state in which such alternate route to certification program is located, and satisfies the requirements for a temporary ninety-day certificate, pursuant to subsection

(c) of this section, or a resident teacher certificate, pursuant to section 10-145m. In addition, on and after July 1, 2018, each applicant shall have completed a subject area major as defined by the Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 6 of 8 State Board of Education, except (i) as provided in section 10-145l, as amended by this act, or (ii) where an applicant achieves a satisfactory evaluation on an appropriate State Board of Education approved subject area assessment [and] or has completed advanced coursework in a relevant subject area. Each such initial educator certificate shall be valid for three years, except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, and may be extended by the Commissioner of Education for an additional year for good cause upon the request of the superintendent in whose school district such person is employed or upon the request of the assessment team reviewing such person's performance. Sec. 7. Subsections (e) and (f) of section 10-145f of the general statutes are repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2019): (e) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, any person who holds a valid teaching certificate that is at least equivalent to an initial educator certificate, as determined by the State Board of Education, and such certificate is issued by a state other than Connecticut in the subject area or endorsement area for which such person is seeking certification in Connecticut shall not be required to successfully complete the competency examination and subject matter assessment pursuant to this section, if such person has either [(1)] (A) successfully completed at least three years of teaching experience or service in the endorsement area for which such person is seeking certification in Connecticut in the past ten years in a public school or a nonpublic school approved by the appropriate state board of education in such other state, or [(2)] (B) holds a master's degree or higher in the subject area for which such person is seeking certification in Connecticut. (2) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, any person

who has held a valid teaching certificate issued by the State Board of Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 7 of 8 Education and such certificate has expired shall not be required to successfully complete the subject matter assessment in the endorsement area for which such person is seeking renewal or advancement of such certificate, pursuant to this section, if such person has either (A) successfully completed at least three years of teaching experience or service in a public school or a nonpublic school under a valid teaching certificate issued by the State Board of Education or issued by a state other than Connecticut, in the past ten years in such endorsement area, or (B) holds a master's degree or higher in the subject area for which such person is seeking renewal or advancement of such certificate.

(f) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, any person who has achieved a satisfactory evaluation on an equivalent competency examination or subject area assessment required for educator certification in another state shall not be required to achieve a satisfactory evaluation on the competency examination or subject matter assessment pursuant to this section, provided the State Board of Education determines that the requirements for achieving a satisfactory evaluation on such equivalent competency examination or subject area assessment in another state are at least equivalent to the requirements prescribed by the State Board of Education for achieving a satisfactory evaluation on the competency examination or subject matter assessment pursuant to this section. (2) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, any person who has previously achieved a satisfactory evaluation on an appropriate State Board of Education approved subject area assessment for a teaching certificate that has expired shall not be required to take the appropriate subject matter assessment currently approved by the State Board of Education, provided the Commissioner of Education determines that the requirements for achieving a satisfactory evaluation on such previous subject area assessment are at least Substitute Senate Bill No. 1022 Public Act No. 19-74 8 of 8 equivalent to the requirements prescribed by the State Board of Education for such current subject matter assessment.