



U.S. Department of Education

Identifying and Addressing Priority Education Needs

Northwest

Regional Advisory Committee

December 2023

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by the Manhattan Strategy Group, LLC (MSG) under Contract #91990023F0317 with the U.S. Department of Education (Department). The report represents a collaborative effort with many individuals making important contributions, and we would like to acknowledge their assistance officially. First, the Northwest Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) would like to thank the education stakeholders who contributed public comments to the RAC and individuals who participated in surveys and interviews to provide their input on the educational needs of the Northwest region. The Northwest RAC would like to thank Dr. Renard Adams, Committee Chairperson, for his leadership, and Ms. Kristi Dille, Dr. Stephen Grubb, Dr. Joy Jansen, and Ms. Belinda Ross for their contributions to writing this report. A full list of Northwest committee members is in Appendix B. We appreciate each member for their commitment to serving on the Northwest RAC and dedicating their time and education expertise to identifying regional education needs and recommending technical assistance activities to the Secretary. Each member contributed to the data collection, needs sensing activities, identification of regional priorities, and the final report.

The RAC would also like to acknowledge Bryan Keohane, Designated Federal Official (DFO) from the U.S. Department of Education (Department), and Lymaris Santana, RAC Liaison from Education Northwest, for their assistance and support. Without their dedication, the data collection activities and production of the final report would not have been possible. The Northwest RAC also would like to thank the Manhattan Strategy Group's contract staff who assisted in collecting and organizing needs sensing documents, preparing the Regional Profile, providing logistical support for the committee's virtual public meetings, and producing the final Northwest RAC report.

Finally, we recognize the sustained help and guidance of staff from the Department's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, including Danielle Smith, Director, Program and Grantee Support Service (PGSS), Dr. Michelle Daley, Group Leader, Comprehensive Center Program, PGSS, Dr. Esley Newton, Contract Lead and Program Officer, PGSS, Muhammad Kara, Presidential Management Fellow, PGSS, and Keely Weber, Contracting Officer's Representative.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Data Collection	5
Summary of Findings	6
Overall Summary.....	6
Priorities	6
Recommendations.....	7
Priority 1: Recruitment and Retention	7
Outcomes/Findings.....	7
Technical Assistance Recommendations	7
Priority 2: Supporting Specific Student Populations	8
Outcomes/Findings.....	8
Technical Assistance Recommendations	11
Priority 3: Teacher Certification and Reciprocity	11
Outcomes/Findings.....	11
Technical Assistance Recommendations	11
Priority 4: Student Mental and Emotional Health.....	12
Outcomes/Findings.....	12
Technical Assistance Recommendations	13
Priority 5: School Climate	14
Outcomes/Findings.....	14
Technical Assistance Recommendations	14
Conclusion	16
References	17
Appendix A. Chart of Nominated, Recommended, and Serving RAC Members	A-1
Appendix B. List of RAC Members	B-1
Appendix C. Northwest Profile (Comprehensive).....	C-1
Information about Northwest Region Districts and Schools	C-2
Graduation Information.....	C-6
Student Academic Information.....	C-8
Non-Academic Information	C-9
Teacher Information	C-11

Teacher Qualifications C-11
Financial Resources by State..... C-13
Appendix D. Summary of Stakeholder Input D-1

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the activities and results of the Northwest Regional Advisory Committee (RAC), authorized under the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (ETAA) (Pub. L. 107-279; 20 U.S.C. § 9605). The 10 RACs were established to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Education (Secretary) regarding the educational needs of one of the ten regions served by the Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs) for input regarding technical assistance (TA) activities described in Section 203 of the ETAA and how those needs would be most effectively addressed. The Secretary sought recommendations for nominations to serve on the RAC from the Chief Executive Officers of States, Chief State School Officers, and education stakeholders within each region, and appointed members to the RAC in August 2023. The activities discussed in this report took place from August to November 2023.

The Northwest RAC was comprised of nine members from Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. The makeup of the membership consisted of representatives from local education agencies (LEAs), state education agencies (SEAs), institutes of higher education (IHEs), school administrators, and parents. Alaska was also in the region and while there was not a representative from that state, the data provided included Alaska and was considered along with the other states.

Members reviewed a regional profile comprised of educational statistics and other relevant data to inform their individual assessments of the challenges and educational needs in the region. The RAC additionally sought input from Chief Executive Officers of States, Chief State School Officers, REL Governing Boards, and other education stakeholders through processes including online surveys and public comment solicitations. The goal of these processes was to solicit the views and needs of schools (including public charter schools), educators, parents, teachers, administrators, local education agencies (LEAs), librarians, businesses, state education agencies (SEAs), and other customers within the region regarding the need for the activities described in 20 U.S.C. sections 9564 and 9602 and how those needs would be most effectively addressed.

The Northwest RAC held three virtual meetings to discuss and conduct its needs assessment. During the first meeting, held on September 6, 2023, the RAC reviewed educational data and public comments, deliberated, and made recommendations to address the needs of the region. During the second meeting, held on October 13, 2023, the RAC reviewed additional data, deliberated on the educational needs of their region, and voted on the top five recommended priorities to be included in a final needs assessment report. A final meeting was held on November 16, 2023, to review the subcommittees' written recommendations and vote to approve the final needs assessment report for submission to the Secretary.

The five priorities identified by committee members and discussed in further detail in this report are:

- **Priority 1:** Recruitment and retention;
- **Priority 2:** Support specific student populations;
- **Priority 3:** Teacher certification and reciprocity;

- **Priority 4:** Support student mental and emotional health; and
- **Priority 5:** School climate.

The discussions during the virtual meetings were lively and had high participation from all committee members. Each member was able to contribute their educational experience from a regional and institutional perspective as well as link observations with the data provided in the profiles. From the discussions, an overarching theme of concern for the staffing deficits schools are facing surfaced around almost every need or trend discussed. In the end, finding ways to support schools in alleviating the problems they have around fully staffing classrooms and special programs was seen as an integral part of the recommended solutions for every priority as well as being categorized into two separate priorities, Recruitment and Retention, and Teacher Certification and Reciprocity. Recommendations for addressing these priorities through the comprehensive centers included:

- Support the design and implementation of comprehensive human capital management systems.
- Promote the profession through dissemination of positive educator experiences and provide data on research conducted to find strategies that increase educator feelings of purposeful and meaningful work.
- Create a clearinghouse for educators and want-to-be educators that provides details of licensure and reciprocity requirements for states with the goal of making it easier to understand how an educator can move between states or move into teaching from another profession or degree outside of education.

A third identified priority was the need to Support Specific Student Populations. Examples of these populations are students with disabilities, English language learners, Gifted and Talented students, as well as others. While schools recognize the need to follow Federal and state law for these special populations, they often lack the staff needed to fully comply with the laws or their size makes it impossible to have the full complement of staff needed to provide all services to a student. Concerns around recruitment and retention, qualifications, and professional development of existing staff were the main areas of focus when discussing recommendations, which were the following:

- Increase the amount and quality of communication between LEAs and IHEs so that teachers, specialists, and therapists are leaving programs fully prepared to enter the teaching field.
- Provide research and data for solutions to the problem of how districts can fill specialist and therapist services.

The two other priority needs were School Climate and Student Mental Health. Again, these two priorities were seen as interconnected with the above priorities and the successful implementation of recommendations for those priorities will be beneficial to improving school climate and providing support to student mental health. It was noted that concern for these areas was increasing before the pandemic, but since that time the impact of poor mental and behavioral health and poor attendance and engagement has expanded at an alarming rate. These two areas are now the main contributing factors to educators leaving the profession or choosing not to enter it, creating more stress on schools

already struggling to be fully staffed. All RAC members agreed that these areas are a dominant factor in falling academic achievement for the students affected. Recommendations for these priorities included:

- Provide assistance to schools for creating responsive and high-quality communication between schools, families, and communities.
- Develop a database and help center for schools to find resources to support students with high mental health needs.
- Conduct research and provide data on successful reasonable interventions schools can use to improve attendance.
- Provide data and training to schools on trauma-informed practices.
- Conduct research and provide data on how to effectively address mental and behavioral health concerns in the classroom.

Many RAC members also noted the school climate and mental and behavioral health concerns are not just centered on the students. School staff members increasingly express distress around these areas and working to address all five priorities identified will be supportive of increasing positive school environments with meaningful and lasting change. The path forward for improving student achievement and outcomes travels through data and research centered around strengthening and increasing the number of people who are working in our schools.

Introduction

The Secretary of Education (Secretary) established ten Regional Advisory Committees (RACs), authorized by the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (ETAA) (20 U.S.C. sections 9601 et. seq.) and governed by the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (Public Law 92-463). The purpose of the RACs is to collect information on the education needs of each region and how those needs may be addressed through technical assistance activities provided by the Comprehensive Centers Program described in section 203 of the ETAA and other Department technical assistance activities.

RAC members are appointed by the Secretary based on recommendations from Chief Executive Officers of States, Chief State School Officers, and education stakeholders within each region. Northwest RAC membership is comprised of both Special Government Employees (SGEs) and representatives of organizations or recognizable groups of persons including state education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), including rural and urban LEAs, institutions of higher education, parents, practicing educators, including classroom teachers, principals, other school administrators, researchers, and individuals from the business community. For a complete list of Northwest RAC members, please see Appendix B.

Each RAC sought input on regional educational needs from Chief Executive Officers of States, Chief State School Officers, Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Governing Boards, and other education stakeholders in the region and the public. The Northwest RAC conducted outreach activities such as public comment surveys to obtain input from various constituencies on regional needs and how to address those needs, used statistical data from the Northwest Regional Profile (Appendix C), and deliberated during public meetings on September 6 and October 13, 2023. The RAC established one subcommittee to draft a report summarizing the results of the needs assessment and their recommendations. A final public meeting was held on November 16, 2023, to review the subcommittee's recommendations and vote to submit the final educational needs assessment report to the Secretary.

This report is based on the assessment of educational needs within the Northwest region, which includes the following states: Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. The analysis and recommendations herein represent the findings of this assessment and the advice of the Northwest RAC to the Secretary.

Data Collection

At the first meeting of the Northwest RAC, members discussed and brainstormed what people and institutions they thought would be beneficial to hear from to learn more about the needs of our region. Among the people and groups listed were state educational agencies, district and school level administrators, teachers, parents, advocacy groups for special student populations, tribal leadership, and business leaders. Along with this discussion of groups to solicit, members provided input on existing surveys and research that could provide further information beyond the state, regional, and national profiles provided in the initial information packet.

After the meeting, RAC members encouraged people and groups from those listed above to voice their ideas and needs through the completion of an online public comment survey, consisting of four questions, which many RAC members emailed as a link to individuals and organizations.

Northwest RAC received a total of 19 public comments from administrators, teachers, state and district level special programs administrators, parents, business leaders, teacher preparation professors, and one State head of education. The responses were further coded and disaggregated into a total distinct 49 comments.

Public Respondents by Commentator Category

Category	Number
Parents	8
Educator/Teachers	4
Administrators	2
Local Education Agency (School District)	1
State Educational Agency	1
Business Community	2
Other Education Stakeholder	1

One Chief State School Office also responded to the Regional Leadership comment request. All Northwest RAC public comments were uploaded into a common SharePoint file folder where RAC members were able to view them.

Members uploaded state surveys like the Idaho Youth Risk Behavior Survey 2021 to the SharePoint folder. This folder also contained a notetaking page for members to record communication that came in a different form from the public comments.

Summary of Findings

Overall Summary

General themes that emerged from public comments were literacy, math and science, qualified teachers, equity and access, mental health services, special education, school safety, and workforce preparation. As the public comments and data were reviewed, a theme of schools being stressed from a lack of people and up-to-date knowledge to educate the expanding diverse student population emerged. This diversity includes traditionally thought-of groups such as English language learners, minorities, and special education students as well as students facing emotional/behavioral challenges, mental health challenges, and other conditions and situations that require accommodations for optimal educational access. It was perceived that this stress is causing professionals to leave education early or choose to not enter it at all. A negative academic impact was also attributed to this problem, leading to school climate issues such as student absenteeism and increased debilitating anxieties for both the adult and student school populations. These general themes were further narrowed into a list of priorities.

Priorities

During the second public meeting of the Northwest RAC on Friday, October 13, members discussed the immediate needs of increasing the teaching work force to fill vacant positions and relieving the pressure of too high caseloads for regular classroom and specialist teachers. From this, the priorities of **Recruitment and Retention** and **Teacher Certification and Reciprocity** arose as being two areas to focus on for improving school effectiveness. **Supporting Specific Populations** was also decided upon as a priority. It was noted that recruitment and retention and teacher certification and reciprocity will have a big effect on this priority, but there is a need for high-quality data and methods for teachers that goes beyond making sure we have enough people to fill the positions. Likewise, the final two priorities of **Student Mental and Emotional Health** and **School Climate** will benefit from the other priorities receiving support, but these priorities also require additional support. It was voiced by the RAC members that all the recommended priorities are interconnected and improving one will have a beneficial impact on the others.

The priority needs, voted on by committee members during a public meeting on October 13, 2023, are presented below:

- **Priority 1:** Recruitment and Retention
- **Priority 2:** Supporting Specific Student Populations
- **Priority 3:** Teacher Certification and Reciprocity
- **Priority 4:** Student Mental and Emotional Health
- **Priority 5:** School Climate

For each need presented below, the committee summarized the needs, their analysis, and generated strategies to meet the needs through technical assistance.

Recommendations

Priority 1: Recruitment and Retention

Outcomes/Findings

A key finding of the Northwest Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) acknowledged that schools across the nation struggle to fill educator vacancies: teachers, support staff, bus drivers, food service, school principals, central office leadership, superintendents, technology, and health services. A focus on educator recruitment and retention ranked high as a priority in the needs sensing activities and discussions in public RAC meetings. As one member of the public commented, “Recruiting and retaining special education teachers and multilingual educators” was named as a key priority. In addition, a public commentor wrote, “We need to increase and improve the pool of qualified teachers...by making the job more appealing.” Finally, public commentors acknowledged the “...shortage of special education teachers...” as well as licensure challenges. Across all forms of outreach, recruitment and retention of the educator workforce emerged as a foundational need for school improvement.

The CARES Act and state level equivalents, as well as the passage of ESSA, has focused attention on the needs of the educator workforce. In their public discussions, RAC members emphasized that support of the educator workforce is essential to student success. This was evident in the RAC deliberations in which members spoke of the need for support to design human capital strategies scalable to rural and smaller districts as well as tools, resources, and strategies to execute such comprehensive strategies.

Technical Assistance Recommendations

The recommendations from the committee for future technical assistance from comprehensive centers in support of recruitment and retention of the educator workforce are the following:

1. Comprehensive centers could support efforts to address systemic barriers to education careers by providing **access to accurate and timely data** related to educator career options, including supply and demand and preparation program completion nationally and within states as well as increased affordability through alternative route programs.
2. Comprehensive centers could support **the design and implementation of comprehensive human capital management systems**, especially in rural areas and in smaller school systems. While large metropolitan districts may have the economy of scale to support human capital systems aligned to national standards, smaller systems will benefit from support on how to scale to the reduced size and capacity of their larger counterparts. Specific areas of focus include support, preparation, and hiring of people of color; leader development; and integration of professional standards related to talent management into principal and superintendent certification standards.
3. Comprehensive centers could support the establishment of **systems for total rewards** that feature equity and transparency. This includes support for data systems that would allow for monitoring of internal and external pay equity across lines of difference (including race and gender), models for flexible working arrangements, employee-centered focus on rewards that

includes competitive salaries, opportunities for professional growth, and especially, post COVID-19, access to physical and mental health services.

4. Comprehensive centers could support efforts to strengthen the **perception of education careers as purposeful, meaningful, and connected**. Research has suggested that nine out of 10 employees are willing to trade a part of their lifetime earnings in exchange for a greater sense of meaning (Anchor et al., 2018). Specifically, this includes strategies associated with increased autonomy at work; a workplace that supports diversity, equity, and inclusion; supportive relationships and community building; and a focus upon making public service meaningful.
5. Comprehensive centers can support **the promotion of the profession** from within as employers deliver exceptional employment experiences. In our current environment, employers must treat employees as customers, promote work-life balance, address causes of attrition, and address the gaps between employee expectations and lived experiences. In so doing, employees can best promote careers in education based upon authentic positive experiences and comprehensive centers can assist employers in ensuring a positive employee experience and disseminate these stories to the wider community.

A Chief State School Officer summarized this need and desire for support from comprehensive centers to “...design and implement professional development programs to strengthen the educator workforce.” These recommendations for comprehensive center support address the needs identified in the Northwest region.

Priority 2: Supporting Specific Student Populations

Supporting Specific Student Populations (i.e., students with disabilities, English language learners (ELLs), Gifted and Talented, etc.) is a priority identified by the Northwest RAC. Two specific groups of students were recognized, students with disabilities and ELLs, and both are protected under federal law, and each has a specific office that oversees states’ efforts in serving these students. The purpose and importance in sharing this information is that supporting these two specific student populations is mandated by federal law if students qualify for services and thus, regardless of location, funding, or staff availability, the needs of the student must be served to comply with federal law.

It should be noted that another specific student population served under the umbrella of Supporting Specific Populations is Gifted and Talented. National data was provided for this specific group of students, but not for individual Northwest states. In addition, this group of students was not brought up in any of the RAC discussions nor in public comment.

Outcomes/Findings

In the Fall of 2020, the Northwest region served over 307,727 students with disabilities ages 3 to 21 and over 213,819 ELLs.

This section is a summarization of the discussions at the Northwest RAC meetings, the online public comments (n=49), qualitative data gathered from state and national organizations, and state and national quantitative data. Respondent categories for all data include administrators, educators, local education agencies (school district), other education stakeholders (i.e., businesses, parent advocacy groups), parents, and schools.

In reviewing all the material submitted to the Northwest RAC, several areas were identified related to supporting specific student populations, which included:

1. Instruction and Professional Training
2. Staff Shortages
3. Qualifications
4. Recruitment and Retention
5. Graduation
6. Rural Districts and Funding

Before sharing the summaries for each of the identified areas it is important to note that although these areas are discussed in isolation, each impacts the other in some fashion. This is demonstrated in the summaries. In addition, it is paramount and essential to recognize that the priority of Supporting Specific Student Populations is also directly tied to and influenced by (and vice versa) the other identified priority needs of the Northwest region.

Each area is followed by a summation of both qualitative and quantitative materials submitted in the needs sensing data phase:

1. *Instruction and Professional Training*: In all qualitative data collected, the concern of students receiving high-quality instruction with expertise was shared. One area of instruction mentioned more than once was literacy and the direct instruction students with dyslexia and ELLs receive. For instruction to be of high quality and expertise, teacher preparation programs must also be at the level to provide the field with qualified and experienced special education teachers. In addition, there were specific public comments supporting both teachers and paraeducators to receive higher quality professional training so they are better prepared to instruct students. An education stakeholder shared, “create professional development programs for educators focusing on culturally responsive teaching methods” and another shared, [provide] “regular training sessions for teachers on identifying signs of learning disabilities and other special needs.” A couple of parents shared that training on “best practices for working with disabilities and [then having the expectation for] staff to incorporate [these] practices in their programs and classrooms” would be beneficial.
2. *Staff Shortages*: In the field of special education, students go through a process for eligibility and those who qualify for special education services must be served by teachers, specialists (i.e., school psychologists), and therapists (i.e., speech language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists) who hold specific qualifications. In the Northwest, particularly for rural districts, providing these mandated services is a serious and critical challenge as there is a shortage of special education teachers, school psychologists, and therapists. A state agency employee commented, “[t]here is a shortage in the state of special education teachers, both self-reported by districts and evidenced through licensure challenges. Additionally, our state is struggling to increase the number of staff in schools that [reflect] the students they serve.” An education stakeholder commented that “the need for robust special education services is often overshadowed but incredibly important” and thus, there “should be a focus on ensuring that schools are equipped to identify and serve students with special needs adequately.” Lastly, it is

important to note that all Northwest region states reported special education staff shortages in the 2022-2023 school year except for Washington. However, what is more alarming is that even some Northwest states reported special education staff shortages as far back as 2018.

3. *Qualifications:* Qualified equates to highly knowledgeable, skilled, and experienced staff (teachers, specialists, therapists, and paraprofessionals) to evaluate, instruct, and serve students with disabilities. Unfortunately, finding staff with high qualifications and solid preparation is a critical challenge. Interestingly, in a 2019 Council for Exceptional Children's *The State of the Special Education Professional Survey Report*, current special education teachers shared that only 38% of novice special education teachers are well prepared to teach students with disabilities. It was extensively discussed among RAC members how more and more teachers are partaking in alternative routes to certification that are not providing these individuals with the depth of knowledge, understanding, and foundational skill base needed to serve and support students of special populations. For instance, in Idaho, during 2019-2020, 19.6% of teachers were enrolled in an alternative route program while teaching and 13.1% of these programs were not affiliated with an institution of higher education. Interestingly, Washington only had 1% of teachers in an alternative route program while all the rest of the Northwest states had none. Lastly, during RAC conversations they discussed the level of degree needed for therapist positions and how the clinical industry is dictating and determining these qualifications. For instance, individuals who want to be a physical therapist must obtain a doctoral degree to practice; is this necessary in an educational setting? It is a concern this will deter individuals from the field of physical therapy and thus create an even larger issue with recruitment.
4. *Recruitment and Retention:* These two areas are critical challenges, particularly related to special education specialists (i.e., school psychologists or nurses) and therapists (i.e., speech language pathologists, occupational therapists, and physical therapists). The trend in the field is that students graduating from programs, which is a low number to begin with, are taking positions with private companies as the pay is better and services are virtual. In addition, the salary differences between a large district versus a small district, state to state, and/or clinical practice versus district, are variables that create difficulties in recruitment and retention. For instance, there is a huge disparity between what a rural school district can afford to pay a nurse who is coming out of the private sector. Thus, the nurse either takes a pay cut, the district does not hire the required nursing position, or the district hires the nurse for compliance and sacrifices another position due to costs.
5. *Graduation:* In reviewing state and national graduation data for students with disabilities and ELLs in the Northwest and as a discussion topic, it was eye opening to see how these two specific student populations' graduation rates did not meet the national average graduation rate specific to their populations. Comparing national and state data, all but one state (Montana) did not meet the national graduation rate of 71% for students with disabilities and none met the graduation rate (71% as well) for English language learners.
6. *Rural Districts and Funding:* Due to the significant staff shortages in serving special education students, many rural districts have no choice but to contract out for services with private contractors, usually virtual, at unacceptable, costly, and inflated prices (i.e., a school

psychologist costs \$100,000 and a speech language pathologist is \$90,000 on the low end). For small, rural districts, this could equate to their entire special education budget. One education stakeholder shared, “increasing funding for special education programs and resources [ensures] that students with different learning needs have access to specialized services.”

Technical Assistance Recommendations

The recommendations from the Northwest RAC for future technical assistance to support specific student populations are the following:

1. Open, guide, and monitor conversations and outcomes between the LEAs, colleges/universities, and licensing boards so teachers, specialists, and therapists are leaving these programs fully prepared to enter the field of teaching, particularly for students with disabilities and English language learners.
2. Open, guide, and monitor the conversations and outcomes between LEAs, colleges/universities, and licensing boards related to specialist and therapist degrees and qualifications to better meet and fit the educational field needs.
3. Assist with opening the discussions of how to support or even stop the critical challenges districts face with the costly contracting of specialist and therapist services, particularly rural school districts.

Priority 3: Teacher Certification and Reciprocity

Outcomes/Findings

Another key finding of the Northwest RAC relates to the need for improvements surrounding educator certification and reciprocity of teaching certificates across states. Even as schools and school systems try to increase retention and enhance recruitment of educators, variance in certification requirements across states and teacher certification reciprocity presents unique challenges that may be addressed by the expertise of comprehensive centers. As a public commenter stated, there are “... licensure challenges over the last year...” Support can be focused on lack of transparency of the certification process across states, options for licensure attainment across states, and assistance with cost as a barrier to educator certification.

The need for certification as a proxy for teacher quality was acknowledged in the discussions of the Northwest RAC: “Programs are needed and necessary, but programs need more guidance to prepare teachers for classrooms.” Comprehensive centers can support systems that ensure transparent workforce data including timely release of Title II reports containing teacher preparation data, facilitate the collection and reporting of state level educator supply and demand data, develop national licensure process for educators similar to FAA certification rules for pilots, traveling teacher certification similar to that of travel nurse positions, and streamline the visa application process for educator shortage areas such as special education, language learning, and STEM.

Technical Assistance Recommendations

The recommendations from the committee for future technical assistance in support of teacher certification and reciprocity are the following:

1. Comprehensive centers can support efforts to prepare paraeducators to become teachers using their day-to-day experience combined with academic coursework to reduce the barriers and costs associated with traditional student teaching programs, building on models such as the Teacher Ladder Program at Westside Community Schools and Midland University in Nebraska, as well as similar programs across the country.
2. Comprehensive centers can support efforts to speed up the time it takes for candidates with STEM degrees to obtain teacher certification. The UTeach for Texas model, established in 1977 at the University of Texas at Austin, combines evening classes with the secondary classroom experiences and mentoring necessary to ensure teacher readiness.
3. Comprehensive centers can support campaigns to returning educators who possess certification but who have left the profession or never started as teachers. The Welcome Back Proud Michigan Educator program is a campaign that allows districts to request waivers for professional learning requirements for such educators.

Across these recommendations, the RAC also acknowledged the cost of certification and the need to reduce costs to increase access: “Credentialing is costly and serves the interest of the dominant culture and creates barriers of access for the teachers we need.” Accordingly, these recommendations should be taken in the context of the wider social and political context.

Priority 4: Student Mental and Emotional Health

Outcomes/Findings

Concern for student mental and emotional health surfaced in advisory meetings and in the need sensing activities. Evidence for this concern can be found in multiple student surveys at the state and national level. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) summarized their findings by concluding, “Nearly all indicators of poor mental health and suicidal thoughts and behaviors increased from 2011 to 2021. The percentage of students who experienced persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness, seriously considered attempting suicide, made a suicide plan, and attempted suicide increased.” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021).

The Idaho Youth Risk Behavior Survey for 2021 found that 44.8% of all Idaho youth who attended a regular or charter public high school for the 2021-2022 school year said that in the past 12 months they felt sad or hopeless for two or more weeks in a row so they stopped doing some usual activities. Similar percentages were reported for the same question on the 2021 Washington Healthy Youth Survey with 45% of 12th grade, 38% of 10th grade, and 35% of 8th grade students reporting similar feelings of hopelessness. The CDC report indicates a steady increase of students nationally reporting sadness and hopelessness from 28% in 2011 to 42% in 2021. Additionally, 21.3% of Idaho high school youth reported seriously considering suicide in the last 12 months. In Washington, the numbers were 20% of 10th and 12th grade students considering suicide and 19% of 8th grade students. Again, the CDC survey supports similar findings and shows a steady increasing trend of 16% of students seriously considering suicide in 2011 to 22% in 2021.

Northwest RAC members consider this to be one of our highest priorities as it intersects with the other priorities listed in the report and further strengthens the need for more teachers, counselors, and social

services in schools. Further consideration should also be given to the fact that student mental health has been declining steadily for over ten years and the pace of this increase is creating an ever-growing gap between the personnel and services available in schools to support student mental health. This finding is consistent with the National Profile for 2019-2021 provided to the RAC, which listed inadequate access to licensed mental health professionals as one of the top two barriers for providing diagnostic mental health assessments to evaluate students for mental health disorders and for providing treatment for these.

Student mental and emotional health impacts students' abilities to learn. The impact on the student experiencing mental and emotional health problems is obvious. However, the impact extends beyond the individual student when big behavioral incidents in classrooms arise from unmanaged mental and emotional health concerns. Teachers report struggling to deal with these types of incidents in their classrooms and they express a range of effects these incidents have on other students' emotional, mental, and academic progress in the classroom. The concern for the impact of student mental and emotional health within the classroom was expressed in public comments by administrators, teachers, and parents. It has also been discussed as one of the reasons for understaffed schools as teachers feel they are unable to deal with the mental/emotional needs of today's students and therefore leave the profession early.

Technical Assistance Recommendations

The recommendations from the committee for future technical assistance in support of Student Mental and Emotional Health are the following:

1. Implementing solutions outlined for Priority 1: Teacher Recruitment and Retention and Priority 3: Licensing and Reciprocity, including Alternative Programs. Having additional available teachers, support staff, counselors, and special programs teachers would increase the number of personnel trained to work with students experiencing mental and emotional health challenges in a school and spread the load so individuals in schools do not find themselves overburdened and incapable of meeting the needs of their classes.
2. For existing teachers, technical assistance on understanding trauma-informed practices and creating an effective classroom when teaching and supporting students with emotional and behavioral health needs. Technical assistance on recognizing signs and risks for students experiencing these problems as well as resources on how to help students and their families both within the school setting and outside of it. The aim of this assistance would be to create more effective classrooms and reduce the feelings of hopelessness and ineffectiveness that teachers are reporting as a major reason for leaving the profession.
3. Consolidate and disaggregate data on student mental health and wellness to all levels of education, including local, county, state, regional, and national. One goal of this assistance would be to provide accurate information to cut through culture war distraction. With depoliticized data it is hoped that actions having an impact on students will start to arise from the information collected and these actions can be sent to teachers and schools to stop the steady increase in rates of students with poor mental and emotional health.

Priority 5: School Climate

Outcomes/Findings

Since the pandemic shutdowns of 2020, more and more students are struggling to go back to in-person learning. In Washington, only 67.2% of students regularly attended school in 2021-2022 (OSPI report card). Oregon just released attendance data for 2022-2023. The report shows “the number of Oregon kids regularly attending school last year dropped by nearly 20 percentage points from pre-pandemic levels, according to new data from the Oregon Department of Education. About 62% of Oregon students attended 90% or more of school days during the 2022-23 school year and nearly 40%, on average, missed at least 16 days out of 160 or more days. During the 2018-19 school year, about 80% of students attended class at least 90% of the year” (Baumhardt, 2023). Years of studies have shown that high rates of absenteeism correlate to lower graduation rates and academic achievement, with low socio-economic communities especially vulnerable to these effects. High rates of absenteeism also negatively impact the learning of students who are in the classroom, as teachers spend time adjusting instructional pacing to accommodate students’ missing learning and skills necessary for the class to advance. Effective attendance interventions are time and personnel resource heavy and many school districts lack the staff, financial, or community resources to effectively reach out to families and create tailored supports for each circumstance.

Technical Assistance Recommendations

The recommendations from the committee for future technical assistance in support of improving School Climate are the following:

1. Provide technical assistance in creating high-quality communications to foster partnerships between schools and families. Staff sizes and budget constraints prevent most districts from being able to have specialized people ready to work on this concern in an effective way. Another strategy is to help districts increase positive messaging around the benefits of regular school attendance. This is a problem not confined to one or two districts or one or two regions in the United States, but to the entire country. High-quality messaging and communication strategies would be beneficial to every school and is something that most schools cannot do with their current fiscal and staff resources.
2. Technical assistance can also help fill the knowledge gap for schools who do not know who they can partner with to create solutions for families. Creating and maintaining an up-to-date clearinghouse of resources, local and regional, for schools to tap into when looking for assistance with transportation, clothing, food, and health needs would provide schools with more options to offer families who are struggling to overcome the barriers to school attendance. Technical assistance on researching effective practices and data for correlating how to use these practices with individual students would be highly beneficial for schools and could create the opportunity to have a streamlined set of “best chance” options for tackling a particular concern with a student or family.
3. Increasing the number of teachers and staff at schools through the efforts recommended in earlier parts of this report will also have a positive impact on this priority. Fully staffed schools with counselors and other student support staff will give students the ability to access

professional help for anxieties and other mental and emotional behaviors that make attending school regularly difficult. It will also provide more eyes and hands to be responsive to student needs in a proactive manner so that attendance and climate concerns can be recognized early and intervened with before they become habitual or a general problem.

Conclusion

The Northwest RAC was tasked with collecting information on the education needs specific to Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington and how those needs may be addressed through technical assistance activities. After conducting various needs sensing activities that involved local, state, and regional education stakeholders, RAC members identified five priority needs:

- **Priority 1:** Recruitment and Retention
- **Priority 2:** Supporting Specific Student Populations
- **Priority 3:** Teacher Certification and Reciprocity
- **Priority 4:** Student Mental and Emotional Health
- **Priority 5:** School Climate

This report sets forth how each of these priority needs could be addressed by the Comprehensive Centers described in Section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act (ETAA) and should be considered as priorities by the US Secretary of Education under Section 207 of the ETAA.

References

- Anchor, S., Reece, A., Rosen, G. & Robinchaux, A. (2018). 9 Out of 10 People Are Willing to Earn Less Money to Do More-Meaningful Work. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2018/11/9-out-of-10-people-are-willing-to-earn-less-money-to-do-more-meaningful-work>.
- Baumhardt, A. (2023, October 26). Student absenteeism high as Oregon districts attempt to normalize going to school every day. *Oregon Capital Chronicle*. <https://oregoncapitalchronicle.com/2023/10/26/student-absenteeism-high-as-oregon-districts-attempt-to-normalize-going-to-school-every-day>.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data. www.cdc.gov/yrbs.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). Idaho Youth Risk Behavior Survey Data. <https://nccd.cdc.gov/youthonline/app/Results.aspx?LID=ID>.
- Fowler, S., Coleman, M., & Bogdan, W. (2019). The State of the Special Education Professional Survey Report. *Council for Exceptional Children*. https://exceptionalchildren.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/Special_Education_State_of_the_Profession_A_CEC_Report.pdf.
- Heynoski, K., Douglas-McNab, E., Khandaker, N., Tamang, T., & Howell, E. (2022). Shortage to surplus: 5 shifts to address the national educator shortage. *American Association of School Personnel Administrators*. <https://www.aaspa.org/national-educator-shortage->
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2022). Washington State Report Card. <https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/>.
- U.S. Department of Education. Office of Postsecondary Education (2017). Teacher Shortage Areas (TSA). <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/bteachershortageareasreport201718.pdf>.

Appendix A. Chart of Nominated, Recommended, and Serving RAC Members

Number of Individuals Nominated, Recommended, and Serving on the Northwest RAC

Region	Nominated	Recommended by the U.S. Department of Education	Declined	Resigned	Accepted, Serving
Northwest	10	9	0	0	9

Appendix B. List of RAC Members

Northwest RAC members represented local and state education agencies; institutions of higher education; parents; practicing educators, including classroom teachers; and organizations serving youth, educators, or both. Members included:

Regional Chair

- Dr. Renard Adams, Chief of Research, Assessment, and Accountability, Portland Public Schools

RAC Members

- Dr. Lisa Avery, President, Linn-Benton Community College
- Ms. Kristi Dille, Former PTA President
- Mr. Michael Angelo Grizzaffi, Special Education Director, Stillwater/Sweet Grass Special Education Cooperative
- Dr. Stephen W. Grubb, Chief Talent Officer, Highline Public Schools
- Dr. Joy Caroline Jansen, Director of Special Services, Lake Pend Oreille School District
- Dr. Christine M. T. Pitts, Founder and Principal, Pitts Consulting
- Ms. Coleen Putaansuu, Title II, Part A Lead Program Supervisor, Washington State Department of Education
- Ms. Belinda Ross, Principal, Wilbur School District

Appendix C. Northwest Profile (Comprehensive)

The following profile shows recent data compiled by the U.S. Department of Education for the Northwest region, which includes Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. Data for each state is included along with high-level data comparing information across the regions. The following topic areas are included:

- Information about Districts and Schools
- Student Enrollment Information
- Graduation Information
- Student Academic Information
- Student Non-Academic Information
- Teacher Information
- Teacher Qualifications
- Teacher Shortages
- Financial Resources
- Resources

Note that data includes the most recent tables available in July 2023. In some instances, data have not been disaggregated by jurisdiction so national data have been included as a reference point. Where appropriate, Reflection Questions have been provided for consideration.

Overall Reflection Questions

- What is your overall reaction to the data presented?
 - *Is it what you expected?*
 - *If it was not what you expected, what surprised you?*
- What other data do you need to help you better understand the needs in your jurisdiction or region?
- Are the data available at the state level or do you have access to this data through another vehicle?
- How can the needs assessment help you attain this data?
- What do you believe are the top priorities facing your jurisdiction/region?
- Why do you believe these are the top priorities facing your jurisdiction?
- What input would you like to hear from other stakeholders?
- How will you collect that input?

Information about Northwest Region Districts and Schools

Totals by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Total Number of Operating Districts (2020-21) ¹	Total Number of Operating Public Schools (2020-21) ¹	Total Number of Charter Schools (2020-21) ²	Total Number of Private Schools (Fall 2019)
Alaska	54	503	31	40
Idaho	178	774	73	160
Montana	483	826	0	120
Oregon	222	1,263	133	370
Washington	336	2,506	12	670

Note 1: Profiles were prepared using the most recent publicly available data. The most recent set of private school data provided was fall 2019, whereas the tables used for reporting the districts and public/charter school data were updated for the 2020-21 school year.

Note 2: Operating schools/districts include all those providing services at the start of the reported school year.

Student Enrollment Information

Jurisdiction	Total Public School Enrollment (Fall 2019)	Public PreK-8 Enrollment (Fall 2021)	Public Grades 9-12 Enrollment (Fall 2021)	Enrollment in Private Schools
Alaska	129,944	91,670	38,274	4,710
Idaho	314,258	216,873	97,385	19,480
Montana	150,195	105,515	44,680	9,680
Oregon	576,201	394,238	181,963	54,700
Washington	1,081,835	736,568	345,267	113,250

Note: Public schools include traditional public and charter schools.

3–5-year-old Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (% distribution by race/ethnicity) (2021)

Jurisdiction	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alaska Native	Two or More Races
Alaska	53.3%	53.6%	++	++	++	++	49.4%	53.0%
Idaho	49.1%	49.6%	++	40.5%	++	++	++	69.8%
Montana	50.5%	51.9%	++	++	++	++	44.7%	++
Oregon	44.2%	46.1%	++	40.7%	29.8%	++	++	46.2%
Washington	46.1%	48.4%	38.0%	42.8%	46.2%	++	42.9%	46.3%

++Reporting standards not met. Either there are too few cases for a reliable estimate or the coefficient of variation (CV) is 50 percent or greater.

**Public Elementary and Secondary School Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (% distribution by total)
(Fall 2021)**

Jurisdiction	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Pacific Islander	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Two or More Races
Alaska	47.2%	2.4%	7.4%	5.2%	3.1%	21.7%	13.1%
Idaho	74.2%	1.1%	19.1%	1.1%	0.3%	1.0%	3.2%
Montana	77.7%	0.7%	5.6%	0.7%	0.2%	10.6%	4.4%
Oregon	59.5%	2.3%	25.2%	4.0%	0.8%	1.2%	7.1%
Washington	50.0%	4.7%	25.4%	8.6%	1.3%	1.1%	8.9%

Number of Students by School Locale (Fall 2019)

Jurisdiction	City	Suburban	Town	Rural
Alaska	44,316	12,682	33,625	41,394
Idaho	70,036	81,193	69,877	89,964
Montana	38,074	2,518	53,549	54,456
Oregon	213,455	134,383	135,710	90,682
Washington	388,138	468,879	141,082	143,103

English Language Learners (Fall 2020)

Jurisdiction	Total	Percentage of Total Enrollment
United States	4,963,388	10.3%
Alaska	13,894	11.0%
Idaho	18,246	6.1%
Montana	3,627	2.5%
Oregon	52,230	9.3%
Washington	125,822	11.8%

Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (2019–2020)^{a, b}

Jurisdiction	Total	Percentage of Total Enrollment
United States	26,000,645 ^a	52.1%
Alaska	56,618	42.9%
Idaho	115,409	37.1%
Montana	59,559	40.2%
Oregon	262,911	47.9%
Washington	501,282	43.9%

^a For the United States data, total includes imputation for nonreporting states.

^b Imputation for survey nonresponse. State-level imputations for 2017-18 through 2019-20 were based on the reported percentages for 2015-16 (the most recent year for which percentages were reported) applied to the 2017-2018 through 2019-20 enrollments.

Special Education Enrollment Numbers by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group Served under Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) – Alaska

Age Group	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races
Ages Birth-2 (Served under IDEA, Part C)	209	21	27	56	15	377	97
Ages 3-5 (Early Childhood) (Served under IDEA Part B)	247	39	42	137	23	483	210
Ages 5 (School Age) through 21 (Served under IDEA Part B)	4,814	637	535	1,435	470	7,245	2,624

Special Education Enrollment Numbers by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group Served under Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) – Idaho

Age Group	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races
Ages Birth-2 (Served under IDEA, Part C)	19	X	15	265	X	1,446	108
Ages 3-5 (Early Childhood) (Served under IDEA Part B)	25	15	27	453	5	1,775	72
Ages 5 (School Age) through 21 (Served under IDEA Part B)	643	270	429	7,355	89	23,295	1,083

X: Data suppressed due to small size.

Special Education Enrollment Numbers by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group Served under Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) – Montana

Age Group	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races
Ages Birth-2 (Served under IDEA, Part C)	84	X	X	40	4	444	27
Ages 3-5 (Early Childhood) (Served under IDEA Part B)	84	7	11	X	X	684	38
Ages 5 (School Age) through 21 (Served under IDEA Part B)	2,630	80	189	1,107	36	13,426	818

X: Data suppressed due to small size.

Special Education Enrollment Numbers by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group Served under Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) – Oregon

Age Group	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races
Ages Birth-2 (Served under IDEA, Part C)	34	116	62	755	15	2,128	201
Ages 3-5 (Early Childhood) (Served under IDEA Part B)	83	193	175	1,723	37	4,614	433
Ages 5 (School Age) through 21 (Served under IDEA Part B)	1,354	1,656	2,388	20,593	454	47,970	5,367

Special Education Enrollment Numbers by Race/Ethnicity and Age Group Served under Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) – Washington

Age Group	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic/Latino	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Two or More Races
Ages Birth-2 (Served under IDEA, Part C)	68	616	419	1,901	106	4,908	673
Ages 3-5 (Early Childhood) (Served under IDEA Part B)	90	680	495	2,783	80	5,080	942
Ages 5 (School Age) through 21 (Served under IDEA Part B)	2,561	5,619	7,678	36,571	1,249	70,907	12,467

Student Enrollment Reflection Questions

- Based on the number of students by school locale, where are the majority of your students located?
- Looking at the enrollment distribution by race percentages, how diverse is your student population?
- How does the percentage of students qualifying as ELLs in your jurisdiction compare to the overall percentage of ELLs throughout the United States?
- How does the percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch (FRPL) in your jurisdiction compare to the overall percentage of students qualifying for FRPL throughout the United States?

Graduation Information^{b,c,d,e,f}

Demographic	United States	Alaska	Idaho	Montana	Oregon	Washington
Total ACGR for all Students	87%	79%	82%	86%	83%	83%
Percent Students with Disabilities (2019-2020)	71%	59%	59%	75%	68%	65%
Percent English Learner (2019-2020)	71%	68%	65%	65%	65%	69%
Percent Economically Disadvantaged (2019-2020)	81%	72%	74%	77%	78%	75%
Homeless Enrolled (2019-2020)	--	58%	61%	63%	61%	69%
Foster Care (2019-2020)	--	54%	40%	71%	--	50%
Private High School Graduates (2018-2019)	340,610	++	880	410	3,440	5,550

--Not available.

++Reporting standards are not met.

ACGR by Race/Ethnicity % (2019-2020)^g

Jurisdiction	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Two or More Races
Alaska	92%	88%	88%	95%	93%	92%
Idaho	84%	69%	76%	87%	65%	79%
Montana	89%	77%	82%	92%	68%	84%
Oregon	84%	76%	80%	90%	67%	81%
Washington	85%	76%	78%	89%	70%	84%

^b Numbers are the public high school 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR), by selected student characteristics for 2019-2020.

^c The time when students are identified as having certain characteristics varies by state. Depending on the state, a student may be included in a category if the relevant characteristic is reported in 9th-grade data, if the characteristic is reported in 12-grade data, or if it is reported at any point during the student’s high school years.

^d Students who met the state criteria for classification as economically disadvantaged.

^e Students who meet the definition of English Learners as outlined in the Department of Education *EDFacts* workbook. For more information, see [EDFacts Workbook](#).

^f Students identified as children with disabilities under the IDEA.

^g States either report data for a combined “Asian/Pacific Islander” group or report the “Asian” and “Pacific Islander” groups separately. Total represents either a single value reported by the state for “Asian/Pacific Islander” or an aggregation of separate values reported for “Asian” and “Pacific Islander.” “Asian/Pacific Islander” includes the “Filipino” group. Number represents the Total reported Asian/Pacific Islander.

Graduation Rates Reflection Questions

- Do you collect data on 5-year graduation cohorts? If so, how does it compare to the 4-year cohort ACGR?
- Which, if any, graduation rate would you prioritize to increase over the next 5 years?

Student Academic Information

To compare students nationally, we have provided results from the fourth and eighth grade math and reading National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results. NAEP—a congressionally mandated large-scale assessment administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)—consists of print and digital assessments in various subject areas. Three of these subjects—mathematics, reading, and science—are assessed most frequently and reported at the state and select district level, usually for grades 4 and 8. The Nation’s Report Card provides results on student performance based on gender, race/ethnicity, public or nonpublic school, teacher experience, and hundreds of other factors.

NAEP assessment results are reported as average scores on a 0-500 scale (reading, mathematics at grades 4 and 8, U.S. history, and geography) or on a 0-300 scale (mathematics at grade 12, science, writing, technology and engineering literacy, and civics). These scale scores, derived from student responses to assessment questions, summarize the overall level of performance attained by that student. Scale scores for individual students are not reported, but summary statistics describing scale scores for groups of students (demographic, gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) are reported. More information about NAEP can be found at <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>.

Academic Achievement: NAEP (2022) National and State Averages

Jurisdiction	4th Grade Math	4th Grade Reading	8th Grade Math	8th Grade Reading
United States	235	216	273	259
Alaska	226	204	270	253
Idaho	236	215	282	264
Montana	239	219	277	261
Oregon	228	210	270	257
Washington	235	217	276	262

Student Academic Factors Reflection Questions

- How did students in your jurisdiction compare to the national average of students on the NAEP results?
- Given the national average NAEP score, what goal(s) would you set for your students to achieve on the next NAEP administration? For example, would you like the results to stay stable or would you want to see a 3-point increase on 4th grade math? What do you need to achieve this goal?

Non-Academic Information

Non-academic factors for students include suspension and expulsion rates. Additionally, the most recently reported data regarding students who have carried firearms to schools and have experienced bullying (both on school property and electronically) have been included.

Percentage of Students Suspended or Expelled from Public Elementary and Secondary Schools by Gender and Ethnicity (2017–2018)ⁱ

Percent who Received Out-of-School Suspensions^j

Demographic	United States	Alaska	Idaho	Montana	Oregon	Washington
Total	5.0%	4.7%	2.6%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%
Male	6.8%	6.7%	3.8%	5.5%	5.7%	6.0%
Female	3.0%	2.6%	1.2%	2.1%	2.0%	2.2%
White	3.4%	3.2%	2.3%	2.9%	3.7%	3.5%
Black	12.3%	9.2%	4.6%	5.7%	8.5%	9.1%
Hispanic	4.0%	4.2%	3.1%	4.2%	3.8%	4.9%
Asian	1.0%	1.5%	1.1%	1.3%	1.0%	1.2%
Pacific Islander	4.9%	8.7%	2.2%	1.8%	3.8%	5.7%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	6.9%	7.3%	5.9%	10.5%	7.9%	8.3%
Two or More Races	5.5%	5.8%	2.5%	3.3%	4.5%	5.0%

Percent Expelled^k

Demographic	United States	Alaska	Idaho	Montana	Oregon	Washington
Total	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Male	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Female	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
White	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Black	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
Hispanic	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.6%
Two or More Races	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%

^kData by race/ethnicity excludes students with disabilities served only under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (i.e., those not receiving services under IDEA).

^jAn out-of-school suspension is an instance in which a student is temporarily removed from his or her regular school (either in person or virtual) for disciplinary purposes for at least half a day (but less than the remainder of the school year) to another setting (e.g., home or behavior center). Out-of-school suspensions include removals with or without the continuation of educational services.

^kExpulsions are actions taken by a local education agency to remove a student from his or her regular school (either in person or virtual) for disciplinary purposes, with or without the continuation of education services, for the remainder of the school year or longer, in accordance with local education agency policy. Expulsions also include removals resulting from violations of the Gun Free Schools Act that are modified to less than 365 days.

Firearms (2019-2020)

Jurisdiction	Total Number of Students Who Brought Firearms to or Possessed Firearms at School	Number of Students Who did this per 100,000 Students, Enrolled
United States	2,431	4.8
Alaska	8	6.1
Idaho	5	1.6
Montana	8	5.3
Oregon	22	3.6
Washington	90	7.9

Bullying (2017)

Jurisdiction	Percentage of Public School Students Bullied on School Property^l	Percentage of Public School Students Electronically Bullied^m
United States	19.0%	14.9%
Alaska	23.3%	19.8%
Idaho	25.8%	20.3%
Montana	21.6%	17.6%
Oregon	--	--
Washington	--	--

--Not available.

^lBullying was defined for respondents as “when one or more students tease, threaten, spread rumors about, hit, shove, or hurt another student over and over again.” “On school property” was not defined for survey respondents.

^mIncludes “being bullied through e-mail, chat rooms, instant messaging, websites, or texting” for 2011 through 2015, and “being bullied through texting, Instagram, Facebook, or other social media” for 2017.

Student Non-Academic Factors Reflection Questions

- What policies are in place to address recent issues of school violence?
- How does your state compare to the national average? Is this a number you would like to change? What other information do you need to make an informed decision about this issue?

Teacher Information

Jurisdiction	Total Number of Public School Teachers (Fall 2019)	Pupil/Teacher Ratio (Fall 2020)	Teachers in Private Schools
Alaska	7,484	17.6	390
Idaho	17,207	18.1	1,420
Montana	10,675	14.0	950
Oregon	30,238	20.2	4,420
Washington	62,212	18.4	9,680

Teacher Qualifications

The following table includes the highest degree earned and years of full-time teaching experience by state and United States. Data from 2011-2012 was the latest data reported at the national level.

Jurisdiction	Degree Levels, Percentage - Less than Bachelor's (2011-2012)	Degree Levels, Percentage - Bachelor's (2011-2012)	Degree Levels, Percentage - Master's (2011-2012)	Degree Levels, Percentage - Education Specialist or Doctor's (2011-2012)	Years Fulltime Experience - Less than 3 (2011-2012)	Years Fulltime Experience - 3 to 9 (2011-2012)	Years Fulltime Experience - 10 to 20 (2011-2012)	Years Fulltime Experience - Over 20 (2011-2012)
United States	3.8%	39.9%	47.7%	8.7%	9.0%	33.3%	36.4%	21.3%
Alaska	4.4%!	45.6%	41.9%	8.2%	12.9%	30.8%	39.6%	16.7%
Idaho	4.6%	55.6%	35.3%	4.4%	10.4%	30.4%	35.2%	24.0%
Montana	6.4%	55.2%	34.6%	3.8! %	9.6%	31.3%	30.5%	28.6%
Oregon	4.2%!	26.3%	59.8%	9.7%	7.2%	37.0%	35.6%	20.2%
Washington	2.9%	23.1%	62.9%	11.1%	6.2%	32.2%	34.8%	26.8%

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is between 30 and 50 percent.

Number and Percentage Distribution of Teachers Enrolled in Traditional and Alternative Programs

Jurisdiction	Number Enrolled in a Teacher Preparation Program (2019-2020)	Percentage Distribution of Enrollment by Traditional Program (2019-2020)	Percentage Distribution of Enrollment by Alternative Program-(Institute of Higher Education [IHE]) (2019-2020)	Percentage Distribution of Enrollment by Enrolled in an Alternative Program-(Not IHE based) (2019-2020)
United States	590,046	69.9%	8.3%	21.9%
Alaska	730	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Idaho	4,142	80.4%	6.5%	13.1%
Montana	2,283	99.6%	0.4%	0.0%
Oregon	3,581	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	11,275	90.5%	8.4%	1.1%

Number and Percentage Distribution of Teachers Who Completed Traditional and Alternative Programs

Jurisdiction	Number of Completers in a Teacher Preparation Program (2019-2020)	Percentage Distribution of Completers in by Traditional Program (2019-2020)	Percentage Distribution of Completers in Alternative Program-(Institute of Higher Education [IHE]) (2019-2020)	Percentage Distribution of Completers in an Alternative Program-(Not IHE based) (2019-2020)
United States	151,138	76.8%	11.4%	11.8%
Alaska	148	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Idaho	1,174	70.3%	6.0%	23.8%
Montana	557	98.6%	1.4%	0.0%
Oregon	1,424	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	3,057	84.6%	12.4%	3.0%

Teacher Information Reflection Questions

- Given national issues of teacher shortages, where are the priority areas in your state?
- What teacher preparation institutions or alternative programs does your state offer? Are these programs going to fulfill your educator needs in the next 5 years?

Financial Resources by State

Description	Alaska	Idaho	Montana	Oregon	Washington
Revenue sources for public elementary and secondary education – Federal (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$436,807	\$371,018	\$429,703	\$819,250	\$1,691,468
Revenue sources for public elementary and secondary education – State (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$1,634,812	\$2,851,763	\$909,788	\$5,316,328	\$13,959,388
Revenue sources for public elementary and secondary education – Local (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$563,815	\$19,106	\$919,260	\$3,728,193	\$4,926,320
Amounts and percentage changes of inflation-adjusted state, local, and federal revenues per pupil (FY2021)	\$20,293	\$10,629	\$15,444	\$17,585	\$18,924
Percentage change from FY20-21	0.1%	4.9%	10.2%	8.3%	4.8%
Current expenditures for public elementary and secondary education by function, and subfunction - Total (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$2,537,694	\$2,784,793	\$1,939,578	\$7,751,946	\$16,978,936
Current expenditures for public elementary and secondary education by function, and subfunction - Instruction (In thousands) (FY2021)	\$1,352,330	\$1,692,209	\$1,143,904	\$4,480,700	\$10,194,690
Current expenditures for public elementary and secondary education by function, and subfunction -Support Services (In thousands) (FY2021)	\$1,102,059	\$987,567	\$711,724	\$3,069,934	\$6,367,252
Current expenditures per pupil - Total (In thousands) (FY2021)	\$19,540	\$9,054	\$13,262	\$13,820	\$15,615
Title I expenditures per pupil - (In thousands) (FY2021)	\$604	\$191	\$495	\$290	\$235
Salaries and wages, and employee benefits for public elementary and secondary education, by function and state or jurisdiction - Total (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$2,537,694	\$2,784,793	\$1,939,578	\$7,751,946	\$16,978,936

Description	Alaska	Idaho	Montana	Oregon	Washington
Salaries and wages, and employee benefits for public elementary and secondary education, by function and state or jurisdiction - Instruction and Instruction-related total (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$1,597,672	\$1,630,038	\$1,119,399	\$3,957,935	\$10,211,690
Salaries and wages, and employee benefits for public elementary and secondary education, by function and state or jurisdiction -Support Services Total (In thousands) (FY 2021)	\$856,717	\$571,064	\$348,085	\$2,456,242	\$4,102,375

Financial Resources Reflection Questions

- Looking at the subfunction allocations, are expenditures allocated proportionately in the correct places?
- How do educator salaries in your state compare to other professional careers?

Appendix D. Summary of Stakeholder Input

Data Source	# of Responses	Time Period	Topics by Category
Public Comments	19	August 18, 2023 – October 15, 2023	Counts from the coding of the public comments. Some comments received multiple codes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining High-Priority Needs-5 • Supporting Strong Instruction and Academic Achievement-5 • Supporting Specific Student Populations-14 • Supporting Teachers, Leaders, and School Personnel-7 • Supporting Student and Educator Wellbeing-3 • Developing an Effective Technical Assistance Response-5 • Other-11
CSSO	1	September 15, 2023 – October 10, 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating the educator shortage • Recruiting and retaining staff • Racially & ethnically diverse workforce • Supporting student well-being • Ensuring all students attain academic excellence • Addressing the opportunity gap