

# Evaluation of the Missouri Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants Phase III Report

September 2023



Prepared for:



## About CTAC:

The Community Training and Assistance Center is a national not-for-profit organization with a demonstrated record of success in the fields of education and community development. CTAC builds district, state, and community capacity by providing technical assistance, conducting research and evaluation, and informing public policy. It focuses on developing leadership, planning and managerial expertise within school systems, community-based organizations, collaborative partnerships, state and municipal governments, and health and human service agencies. Since 1979, CTAC has provided assistance to hundreds of public institutions, community-based organizations, and coalitions in the United States and several other countries.

CTAC's staff is comprised of nationally recognized executives, educators, policy makers, researchers and organizers who have extensive experience working with city, county and state agencies, educational institutions, federal legislative bodies, not-for-profit organizations, philanthropic institutions and the private sector.

### Authors:

Guodong Liang, Ph.D. and William J. Slotnik

### Study Team Members:

Jim Christensen, Ed.D.

Kati Garness

Natalie Nier

Jeff Edmison

Geraldine Harge, Ed.D.

Eduardo Soto

Judy Finkel, Ed.D.

Tammy Mitchell, Ed.D.

Deborah Zych, Ed.D.

The findings, analyses, and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the Community Training and Assistance Center.

© Community Training and Assistance Center

Boston, Massachusetts

September 2023

All rights reserved

## Acknowledgements:

CTAC would like to thank Dr. Paul Katnik, Assistant Commissioner, Dr. Bobbie Jo Lewis, Coordinator of Educator Development, and Dr. Daryl Fridley, Coordinator of Educator Preparation, Office of Educator Quality, of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for their support of this evaluation. We would also like to express our gratitude for the support from Diane Gillaspie, Dr. Sandy Humbyrd, Dr. Kelli Nicholson, Kat Nicolaus, Lori Pinkston, Betsy Ridenhour, Rebecca Roberts, Dr. Terri Steffes, Diane Grep, Darryl Pannier, Joanna Haskins, and Patty Wilmes of the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS) team. We are also grateful to the many lead contacts for local education agencies (LEAs), educator preparation programs, and community colleges who provided survey responses and participated in interviews, and the district leaders, principals, and teacher leaders who participated in the study of the three LEAs.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	1
Chapter One: Introduction and Context.....	4
Chapter Two: Methodology .....	9
Chapter Three: LEA Teacher Recruitment (Grow Your Own) Grants.....	14
Chapter Four: LEA Teacher Retention Grants .....	40
Chapter Five: EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants.....	63
Chapter Six: Recommendations and Conclusion .....	81
References.....	83
Appendix A: LEA Teacher Recruitment (Grow Your Own) Strategies.....	86
Appendix B: LEA Teacher Retention Strategies.....	87
Appendix C: EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Strategies .....	88

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2021–22, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) awarded more than \$50 million, through the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants, to assist local education agencies (LEAs), educator preparation programs (EPPs), and community colleges (CCs), in recruiting and retaining effective and diverse teachers. DESE’s goal is to build an exemplary state system of educator recruitment and retention.

The Community Training and Assistance Center (CTAC) is conducting an independent evaluation of the implementation of the grants. The Phase I evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022a) built an initial understanding of the strategies selected by the grantees. The Phase II evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b) examined the initial implementation and early impact of the grants. This Phase III evaluation focused on the level of implementation and the strategies which positively impacted teacher recruitment and retention efforts. Findings of this report will help DESE address emerging challenges and strengthen the support to LEA, EPP, and CC grantees.

The following research questions (RQs) guided the Phase III evaluation:

- RQ1: What factors enhance or hinder the implementation of the teacher recruitment and retention grants?
- RQ2: What is the quality of implementation of the teacher recruitment and retention grants?
- RQ3: What is the impact of the grants on teacher recruitment and retention thus far?
- RQ4: Which strategies are improving teacher recruitment and retention efforts? Which strategies are not improving teacher recruitment and retention efforts?

### Findings

#### *LEA Teacher Recruitment (Grow Your Own) Grants*

- LEA lead contacts continue to highlight their LEA’s commitment to and the local community’s support for teacher recruitment.
- Lead contacts indicate the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants is as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.
- Most lead contacts agree that, overall, the analysis of the data they collected show the grant contributes to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.
- Nearly all lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.
- From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher recruitment grants, and the changes are particularly salient in terms of recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers and male teachers.

- Most lead contacts indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their GYO grants with key stakeholders once or twice a year.
- Lead contacts highlight the availability of financial resources and the flexibility for how they can use the funds as factors that enhance their recruitment efforts. They also identify challenges such as the lack of interest of students and staff members in taking advantage of the grant-supported opportunities, and low salary and negative perceptions of the profession, as barriers to their GYO program implementation.

### *LEA Teacher Retention Grants*

- LEA lead contacts agree the purpose of the retention grant is clear and they are aware of the availability of support from the MTDS.
- Lead contacts indicate their teacher retention grants are implemented with fidelity. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.
- Most lead contacts agree that, overall, the analysis of the data they collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher retention efforts.
- Nearly all lead contacts believe the retention strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.
- From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher retention grants.
- Lead contacts highlight the availability of financial resources, and the effective, ongoing support from DESE as factors that enhance their retention efforts. They also identify challenges such as changes in LEA leadership and the lack of personnel, and the time-limited nature of the grants, as barriers to their retention grant implementation.

### *EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants*

- EPP/CC lead contacts believe there is a high level of commitment in their EPP/CC to and support from the local community for their teacher recruitment efforts.
- EPP/CC lead contacts agree the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants is as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.
- Most EPP/CC lead contacts agree that, overall, the analysis of the data they collected show the grant contributes to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.
- Nearly all EPP/CC lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.
- From 2022 to 2023, on many indicators, higher percentages of EPP/CC lead contacts indicate seeing signs of success of their teacher recruitment grants.
- Lead contacts highlight support from EPP/CC faculty and leaders, and collaboration with LEAs and community partners as factors that enhance their recruitment efforts. They also identify challenges such as the grant timeline, and the current public perceptions of the teaching profession, as barriers to their recruitment grant implementation.

## Recommendations

Building on the accomplishments to date, the following recommendations are intended to assist DESE in providing more targeted support to LEAs, EPPs, and CCs.

- Provide additional clarification and guidance on the timeline of grant implementation.
- Provide more customized sharing and learning opportunities for grantees.
- Strengthen the support to EPP and CC grantees.
- Support the professional growth of more MLDS principals on teacher recruitment and retention.
- Expand efforts to promote the teaching profession by launching a promotional campaign with the theme, *Missouri Teaches*.

## Conclusion

Teacher recruitment and retention grantees across the state continue to indicate they implement their grants with fidelity. They believe the grants effectively contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment and retention efforts. The foundation for catalyzing innovation and achieving better results is now in place.

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

In 2021–22, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) awarded more than \$50 million, through the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants, to assist local education agencies (LEAs), educator preparation programs (EPPs), and community colleges (CCs), in recruiting and retaining effective and diverse teachers. DESE’s goal is to build an exemplary state system of educator recruitment and retention.

The Community Training and Assistance Center (CTAC) is conducting an independent evaluation of the implementation of the grants. The Phase I evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022a) built an initial understanding of the strategies selected by the grantees. The Phase II evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b) examined the initial implementation and early impact of the grants. This Phase III evaluation focused on the level of implementation and the strategies which positively impacted teacher recruitment and retention efforts. Findings of this report will help DESE address emerging challenges and strengthen the support to LEA, EPP, and CC grantees.

### The Context

#### *Teacher Shortage Across the Nation and in Missouri*

In the United States, there is a shortage of classroom teachers. It is estimated that there are at least 36,000 vacant teaching positions across the nation and 163,000 positions are being held by underqualified teachers (Nguyen et al., 2022). The challenges of teacher shortages are particularly salient for disadvantaged districts serving large numbers of high-needs students (Jones, 2022).

The COVID-19 pandemic further exacerbated the teacher shortage problem. Camp and colleagues (2023) found the teacher retention rate in Arkansas decreased by 5.3 percentage points from 79.7% in 2019–20 to 74.4% in 2022–23. In addition, more effective teachers were more likely to leave the profession post-pandemic compared to pre-pandemic.

Kraft and Lyon (2022) noted the current state of the teaching profession is at or near its lowest level in 50 years. Across four interrelated constructs—professional prestige, interest among students, preparation for entry, and job satisfaction within the profession—there was a rapid decline in the 1970s, a swift rise in the 1980s, relative stability for two decades, and a sustained drop beginning around 2010. Using nationally representative data, Redding and Nguyen (2023) also found teacher dissatisfaction has been increasing from 2003–04 to 2020–21.

What makes addressing the teacher shortage more challenging is a steady decline in enrollment in colleges of education (St. George, 2023). Between 2012–13 and 2019–20, the number of people enrolled in traditional teacher preparation programs decreased by 30 percent, and the number of people completing such programs decreased by 28 percent. Further, teacher preparation programs continue to struggle with recruiting diverse candidates.

According to a recent RAND report (Diliberti & Schwartz, 2023), by the end of 2021–22, teacher turnover increased four percentage points above pre-pandemic levels, reaching 10 percent nationally. The attrition rates were highest in urban districts, high-poverty districts, and districts serving predominately students of color. They noted that many districts tried to address these challenges by increasing teacher pay and expanding Grow Your Own programs.

In Missouri, according to the latest data available from 2019–20 to 2021–22 (DESE, 2023c), the overall teacher retention rate increased from 88.6% in 2019–20 to 90.1% in 2020–21 (a 1.5 percentage points growth), and then dropped to 88.1% in 2021–22 (a 2 percentage points decrease). Among all new hires, the percentage of first-year teachers increased steadily from 52.6% in 2019–20 to 53.8% in 2020–21, and then to 54.6% in 2021–22. The retention rate for first-year teachers, after five years of teaching, increased from 39.1% in 2019–20 to 40.5% in 2020–21, and then dropped to 38.2% in 2021–22.

Across the state, the largest number of teacher vacancies for 2022–23 were in the certification areas of Elementary Education, Special Education, and Physical Education. Among those certification areas with lower numbers of teacher vacancies, many have higher percentages of vacancies filled with inappropriately certified teachers (DESE, 2023a).

### *Emerging Practices in the United States and in Missouri*

There is a rapid expansion of Registered Apprenticeship Programs for K–12 teachers in the United States. At the start of 2022, only two states had Registered Apprenticeship Programs for K–12 teachers, and by July 2023, that number soared to 21 states, including Missouri (U. S. Department of Education, 2023). The U. S. Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and national leading education organizations are partnering to advance these innovative programs. Registered Apprenticeship allows teacher candidates to (a) earn their credentials by completing coursework; and at the same time, (b) receive a salary for paid on-the-job learning experiences with a mentor teacher. These programs can be used to establish, scale, and build on existing teacher pathways such as Grow Your Own and Teacher Residency programs (U. S. Department of Education, 2023).

Missouri is focusing on stimulating innovative approaches for recruiting and retaining teachers. In this context, DESE is investing more than \$50 million in state reserve funds from the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund and established the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grant program (DESE, 2021a). In addition, the state is launching multiple initiatives to tackle teacher shortages including, but not limited to:

- **Retirement System.** Governor Mike Parson signed legislation which allows retired public-school staff to work full-time for a district for up to four years without losing their retirement benefits (Hanshaw, 2023).
- **The Blue Ribbon Commission.** The Missouri State Board of Education formed the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Blue Ribbon Commission. The Commission was charged with providing action steps and recommended policy changes to address teacher workforce challenges in Missouri. In its Phase 1 recommendations related to teacher pay, the Commission identified a number of immediate, short-term, and long-

term priorities (DESE, 2023d). As examples, the priorities included raising the minimum starting teacher salary to \$38,000, establishing sustainable funding for district Grow Your Own programs, amending the Constitution and the Teacher Tenure Act to allow teachers to receive salary supplements for working in subject shortage areas and high-needs schools, and providing additional pay for teachers with National Board Certification.

- **Teacher Baseline Salary Grants.** As part of the fiscal year 2024 state budget, LEAs that currently employ teachers making at least \$25,000 and less than \$38,000 per full-time equivalent are eligible to apply for the grant to boost their teacher salary to a baseline amount of \$38,000. This grant, subject to appropriation on an annual basis, supports salary increases for teaching staff to ensure they receive a baseline salary of \$38,000. The additional salary and related payroll benefits come from state grant funds (DESE, n.d.).

### *A Review of Emerging Research*

Blaushild and colleagues (2023) found a positive relationship between being close to home and retention in the teaching profession. Individuals who were assigned to a Teach For America region in their home state taught, on average, for 0.15 years longer than those who were not assigned to their home state. This effect is strongest for teachers of color and those from a low-income background. Similarly, Santelli and Grissom (2022) found teachers who spend more time commuting to work are more likely to transfer to another school or leave the district.

A study on the Accelerating Campus Excellence program in Dallas Independent School District (Morgan et al., 2023) highlighted the importance of providing and sustaining financial incentives to attract and retain effective educators in low-achievement schools. By offering salary supplements to high performing educators willing to work in disadvantaged schools, the program resulted in immediate and dramatic increases in student achievement. However, when the stipends were eliminated, many highly effective teachers left and test scores fell.

Kraft and colleagues (2022) examined the implementation of a targeted bonus program in Chicago Public Schools, designed to reduce unfilled teacher absences in largely segregated Black schools with historically low substitute coverage rates. They found the incentive pay substantially improved coverage equity and raised student achievement. They estimated the incentives would need to be 50% of daily wages to close fill-rate gaps.

Nowak and colleagues (2023) examined homeowner, teacher, and student outcomes in a metropolitan school district which switched to four-day school weeks. They found a 2 to 4 percent home price decline relative to surrounding school districts, a 5 percent decrease in teacher retention for experienced teachers, and a 0.2 to 0.3 standard deviation decrease in student test scores.

Research highlights the key role strong principal leadership plays in retaining teachers. Sartain and Estrera (2023) found teachers are most likely to leave schools with less-experienced principals and weaker leadership. The authors recommend school districts provide extra support and mentorship for principals to be equipped with the needed leadership skills.

## Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants

The Missouri Teacher Recruitment and Retention program supports the efforts of LEAs, EPPs, and CCs with three types of grants, described briefly below.

### *LEA Teacher Recruitment (Grow Your Own) Grants*

The Grow Your Own (GYO) programs in Missouri are designed to recruit and support local students and adults in their home districts to return, after college, to their communities as teachers who stay in the profession (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2023; DESE, 2023b). As Dr. Margie Vandeven, Missouri’s Commissioner of Education and CCSSO Board of Directors president-elect, introduced (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2023):

*“When we got the opportunity to invest, the very, very, very first big decision we made at the state level with the funding that we received was: Let’s invest in our teachers: \$50 million in grant products so that we would really focus on the grow your own... We’ve gone from about 15% of our districts (offering) grow your own to about 85%. So significant growth there.”*

– Dr. Margie Vandeven

The grants provide LEAs with a fixed amount of \$10,000 to establish or expand their GYO programs. The funding can be used to support activities focusing on (a) partnerships; (b) recruitment and selection; (c) preparation and support; and (d) evaluation (DESE, 2022).

### *LEA Teacher Retention Grants*

The Teacher Retention Grants support LEAs in implementing research-based, proven strategies for improving their teacher retention efforts. The maximum grant amount is the product of the LEA’s teacher count and a per teacher allocation based on an LEA’s priority level, which are determined by average percentages of students in poverty (i.e., Free and Reduced Priced Lunch) and minority students (DESE, 2022).

### *EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants*

Recognizing the key roles EPPs and CCs play in the teacher development pipeline, DESE awards grants ranging from \$10,000 to \$40,000 to eligible EPPs and CCs for recruiting teacher candidates. EPPs and CCs can use the funds for activities in the areas of (a) partnerships; (b) recruitment and selection; (c) preparation and support; and (d) evaluation (DESE, 2021a).

### *Support from the Missouri Teacher Development System*

In addition to financial resources, DESE provides the grantees with support on a regional basis through the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS). Serving as a resource to the grantees, MTDS representatives review and monitor grants, and provide technical assistance on the implementation of the grants (DESE, 2021a, 2022).

## Overview of the Report

The rest of this report is organized as follows. Chapter Two explains the methodology of the Phase III evaluation. Chapters Three through Five present the findings on, respectively, LEA Teacher Recruitment (GYO) Grants, LEA Teacher Retention Grants, and EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants. Chapter Six includes the recommendations.

## CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

CTAC used a mixed-methods approach for the Phase III evaluation. The multiple sources of data included (a) a statewide survey of all LEA, EPP, and CC lead contacts; (b) interviews with select LEA, EPP, and CC lead contacts, and LEA administrators, principals, and teacher leaders; (c) grantee provided data; and (d) a review of literature and artifacts.

### Research Questions

The following research questions (RQs) guided the Phase III evaluation:

- RQ1: What factors enhance or hinder the implementation of the teacher recruitment and retention grants?
- RQ2: What is the quality of implementation of the teacher recruitment and retention grants?
- RQ3: What is the impact of the grants on teacher recruitment and retention thus far?
- RQ4: Which strategies are improving teacher recruitment and retention efforts? Which strategies are not improving teacher recruitment and retention efforts?

At the time of the Phase III evaluation, grantees have been implementing their recruitment and retention grants and strategies for more than one year. Therefore, RQs 1 and 2 examine issues including (a) modifications made from the initial application to Year One full implementation; (b) perceived quality of grant implementation; (c) enhancing factors; (d) emerging challenges; and (e) additional support needed. RQ3 explores the perceived impacts of the grants on grantee's recruitment and retention efforts. RQ4 examines which strategies improve grantees' recruitment and retention efforts and which do not.

### Data Collection

#### *LEA, EPP, and CC Lead Contact Survey*

As a key component of grant application and a condition for receiving grant funds, all grant recipients were required to develop an evaluation plan to determine the success of their recruitment and retention strategies. In November 2022, DESE sent a communication email to all lead contacts, notifying the grantees that they would be asked to report data related to their grant implementation in the Phase III evaluation survey in early 2023.

In partnership with DESE, CTAC developed and launched a web-based survey on March 24, 2023 for all grantees. CTAC sent the survey link to DESE and DESE forwarded the link to grantees.

CTAC provided DESE with weekly updates on survey participation. To maximize the number of responses, DESE utilized a number of approaches (e.g., emails, phone calls, newsletters) and extended the survey window multiple times. The survey closed on May 23, 2023.

The survey for LEA teacher recruitment grantees had a series of Likert-scale questions and bipolar (i.e., Yes/No) questions. The questions included: (a) general knowledge and beliefs; (b) modifications from initial application to Year One full implementation; (c) quality of implementation; (d) effectiveness of the grants; (e) effectiveness of the grant-supported recruitment strategies; (f) perceived impacts of the grants; and (g) public reporting and sharing of grant progress, findings, and recommendations.

A number of open-ended questions further explored why grantees made modifications to their strategies; why they thought the strategies were effective or not; enhancing factors; impeding factors; and additional support they need.

The surveys for LEA teacher retention grantees and EPP/CC teacher recruitment grantees included a similar set of Likert-scale, bipolar, and open-ended questions.

As Table 1 shows, 96% of lead contacts responded to the survey. This included nearly all LEA lead contacts (96%), all but one EPP lead contacts (98%), and all but one CC lead contacts (92%).

Table 1. Lead Contact Survey Response Rates, 2023

	Population	# Responses	Response Rate
<b>Overall</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>96%</b>
Local Education Agencies (LEAs)*	495	476	96%
(LEA Recruitment Grantees)	(447)	(430)	(96%)
(LEA Retention Grantees)	(494)	(475)	(96%)
Educator Preparation Programs	40	39	98%
Community Colleges	13	12	92%

Note. \*LEAs that have received a recruitment grant and/or a retention grant.

Table 2 shows the LEA grantees whose lead contacts completed the survey were primarily small and medium LEAs at priority level III in towns and rural areas.

Table 2. LEA Lead Contact Survey Respondents, 2023

	Grow Your Own Grantees (N = 430)		Retention Grantees (N = 475)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
By LEA Priority Level				
Priority Level I (PL1)	27	6%	30	6%
Priority Level II (PL2)	60	14%	69	15%
Priority Level III (PL3)	343	80%	376	79%

	Grow Your Own Grantees (N = 430)		Retention Grantees (N = 475)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
By LEA Locale				
City	37	9%	40	8%
Suburb	40	9%	45	9%
Town	81	19%	83	17%
Rural	272	63%	307	65%
By LEA Size				
Small (1–1,000 students)	279	65%	314	66%
Medium (1,001–15,000 students)	140	33%	150	32%
Large (15,001 or more students)	11	3%	11	2%

Note. The LEA priority level data were retrieved from DESE (2021b). The LEA locale data were retrieved from the National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). The LEA size data were retrieved from DESE (2021b). Due to rounding, percentages may not always add up to precisely 100%.

CTAC used cross-tabulations to display survey findings. To examine the statistical significance of differences across groups, CTAC utilized Kruskal-Wallis H Tests for the Likert-scale questions, and Chi-square tests for the bipolar questions. For the written comments, CTAC conducted thematic analyses (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to identify common themes and key issues.

*Interviews*

CTAC developed two protocols, respectively, for interviews with LEA lead contacts and EPP/CC lead contacts. The protocols included two similar sets of questions related to (a) general beliefs; (b) modifications from initial application to Year One full implementation; and (c) effectiveness of the grants. The interviewees were also asked for their perceptions of (a) impacts of the grants; (b) effectiveness of grant-supported strategies; (c) enhancing/impeding factors and additional support; and (d) public reporting and sharing of grant progress, findings, and recommendations.

DESE identified and invited a total of 48 lead contacts for 44 grantees across the state to participate in the interviews. It included 36 lead contacts for 32 LEAs which have received both a teacher recruitment grant and a teacher retention grant, eight lead contacts for eight EPPs, and four lead contacts for four CCs.

As Table 3 shows, CTAC conducted interviews with 29 interviewees from 26 grantees. It included 19 LEAs, 5 EPPs, and 2 CCs. CTAC conducted thematic analyses (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to identify common themes and key issues.

Table 3. Number of Lead Contact Interviewees, 2023

	Number of Interviewees
Local Education Agency Lead Contacts	19
Local Education Agency Other Educators*	3
Educator Preparation Program Lead Contacts	5
Community College Lead Contacts	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>

Note. \*Included one principal, one instructional coach, and one teacher; they came from the 19 LEAs and were interviewed together with their LEAs' lead contacts.

In addition, DESE identified three LEAs for focused examination. These LEAs met the selection criteria, set by CTAC, which included their level of innovation and results, LEA size, location, and student demographics. The goal was to capture a diverse cross-section of the LEAs in the state.

As Table 4 shows, CTAC interviewed 15 educators from the three LEAs. The interviewees included four district-level administrators, six principals, and five teacher leaders.

Table 4. Number of Interviewees in Three LEAs, 2023

Case Study LEA	Number of Interviewees	Total
LEA 1	5 interviewees, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 LEA Administrator</li> <li>• 2 Principals</li> <li>• 2 Teacher Leaders</li> </ul>	15 interviewees, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 LEA Administrators</li> <li>• 6 Principals</li> <li>• 5 Teacher Leaders</li> </ul>
LEA 2	9 interviewees*, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 LEA Administrators</li> <li>• 4 Principals</li> <li>• 3 Teacher Leaders</li> </ul>	
LEA 3	1 LEA Administrator	

Note. \*The LEA chose to have the nine educators interviewed in a single focus group.

### *Grantee Provided Data*

CTAC examined a variety of quantitative data that grantees provided in the Phase III survey. It included data that grantees used to measure the effectiveness of their grants, teacher demographic data, and enrollment data. CTAC used paired-samples T tests to examine the changes from the baseline to the Year One full grant implementation.

### *Literature Review and Artifacts*

CTAC continued to monitor emerging research and practices in teacher recruitment and retention nationally. In addition, CTAC collected and reviewed relevant artifacts from 23 LEA grantees and three EPP grantees.

## Limitations

The Phase III evaluation utilized a single-group pre/post design to examine the changes in perceptions and outcomes from the baseline to Year One full implementation. Because such a design includes a confounding factor between time and study condition (What Works Clearinghouse, 2022), it is not possible to establish a causal relationship between the grants and the changes observed. In addition, as collecting baseline data was not required, many grantees did not report their baseline data which prevented the calculation of changes. Furthermore, administrative records on teacher recruitment and retention were not available and this study relied on grantees' self-reported data to examine the changes from 2022 to 2023.

Despite these limitations, consistent findings emerge from the many qualitative and quantitative data points across the LEA, EPP, and CC grantees. Results of the Phase III evaluation will help DESE achieve an understanding of the implementation and impacts of the recruitment and retention strategies thus far.

# CHAPTER THREE: LEA TEACHER RECRUITMENT (GROW YOUR OWN) GRANTS

This chapter examines the implementation and impacts of the LEA teacher recruitment GYO grants.

## General Knowledge and Beliefs

**LEA lead contacts continue to indicate the purpose of the teacher recruitment grant is clear and they understand support is available from MTDS. They highlight their LEA’s commitment to and the local community’s support for teacher recruitment.**

As Table 5 shows, LEA lead contacts (91–96%) agree the purpose of the grant is clear, they know where to get information, and they understand help is available from MTDS. They also believe there is a high level of commitment in their LEA to teacher recruitment (95%) and the local community supports their teacher recruitment efforts (90%). Responses from lead contacts are mostly similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 5. General Knowledge and Beliefs, 2023

Survey Prompt	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale*				By Size**		
	n	A	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
The purpose of the teacher recruitment grant is clear to me.	414	96%	100%	98%	96%	100%	95%	99%	95%	100%	98%	96%
I know where to get information about the teacher recruitment grant.	414	95%	96%	93%	95%	97%	90%	94%	96%	90%	94%	96%
I understand that help is available for the implementation of my teacher recruitment grant from members of the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS).	414	91%	92%	91%	91%	91%	87%	92%	92%	90%	92%	91%
There is a high level of commitment in my LEA to teacher recruitment.	414	95%	88%	98%	95%	97%	97%	92%	95%	100%	97%	94%
The local community supports my LEA’s teacher recruitment efforts.	414	90%	73%	93%	91%	83%	92%	90%	91%	100%	93%	88%

Note. Throughout this report, unless otherwise noted, n = Number of grantees with valid responses (i.e., grantees who did not provide the information were excluded from the analyses); \*C = City; S = Suburb; T = Town; R = Rural. \*\*L = Large (15,001 or more students); M = Medium (1,001–15,000 students); S = Small (1–1,000 students). As the percentages of grantees who disagree or strongly disagree with, or are undecided about the survey questions were very small, the table shows only the percentages of grantees who agree (A), a composite of strongly agree/agree, with the survey questions. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 6 compares the responses from lead contacts in 2022 and 2023. Across the two years, the perceptions of lead contacts are mostly similar and very positive. They agree to a greater extent in 2023 than in 2022 that there is a high level of commitment in their LEA to teacher recruitment.

Table 6. General Knowledge and Beliefs, 2022 vs. 2023

Survey Prompt	2022			2023		
	n	SA	A	n	SA	A
The purpose of the teacher recruitment grant is clear to me.	343	57%	41%	414	59%	37%
I know where to get information about the teacher recruitment grant.	343	51%	44%	414	54%	41%
I understand that help is available for the implementation of my teacher recruitment grant from members of the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS).	343	51%	41%	414	51%	41%
There is a high level of commitment in my LEA to teacher recruitment.*	343	58%	37%	414	66%	29%
The local community supports my LEA's teacher recruitment efforts.	343	49%	42%	414	56%	35%

Note. SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. \*There was a statistically significant difference among the responses from grantees between 2022 and 2023. Throughout the report, survey prompts in the tables are those used in 2022–23 (i.e., the Phase III evaluation). Liang and Slotnik (2022) includes the survey questions in 2021–22 (i.e., the Phase II evaluation).

## Modifications from Initial Application to Year One Full Implementation

**Some lead contacts indicate their LEAs have been approved to make modifications to their GYO grant strategies, particularly the fiscal support strategies and the budgetary allocations.** As Table 7 shows, lead contacts indicate they have received approval for modifying their fiscal support strategies (13%), budgetary allocations (15%), and other strategies. The responses from lead contacts are similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 7. Modifications to LEA GYO Grants, 2023

Please indicate if you have been approved to make modifications to your teacher recruitment (Grow Your Own) grant strategies.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	Yes	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Partnerships	414	6%	8%	9%	5%	3%	13%	4%	5%	10%	6%	5%
Recruitment strategies	414	8%	15%	12%	7%	3%	18%	8%	8%	10%	10%	7%
Selection strategies	414	5%	12%	7%	5%	3%	13%	5%	5%	10%	7%	4%
Preparation strategies (e.g., learning opportunities and experiences)	414	7%	15%	10%	6%	3%	18%	6%	6%	10%	8%	6%
Fiscal support strategies (e.g., scholarships, stipends)	414	13%	15%	14%	13%	6%	26%	13%	12%	20%	15%	12%
Evaluation of effectiveness of grant strategies and/or activities	414	6%	12%	9%	5%	6%	10%	4%	6%	20%	4%	6%
Budgetary allocations	414	15%	27%	22%	13%	9%	26%	18%	14%	30%	17%	14%
Public sharing of grant progress and/or outcome data	414	5%	8%	5%	4%	3%	10%	3%	5%	10%	4%	4%

Note. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

In interviews and survey comments, lead contacts elaborate on the modifications they have made and the rationale for the modifications. Some indicate they modified their strategies due to changing circumstances and reallocated the GYO funds to support the new strategies.

*We had to move funds to cover costs associated with our revised strategies. We had no support staff taking courses and no teachers mentoring students. We moved funds to support tuition assistance for a student currently working as a substitute.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*We made a hasty decision with the allocation of our GYO grant, and we revised this not long ago. There is no better way to grow our own teaching staff by helping them financially with scholarships to aid in their progress towards certification.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Some other LEAs modified funding allocations among the approved strategies.

*We budgeted money for dual enrollment coursework. However, the university paid for those courses so we were able to re-allocate those funds to other pre-approved strategies.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*We moved money from supplies to capital outlay based upon the teacher surveys.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

A couple of lead contacts elaborate on the multiple modifications they have made.

*We modified the strategies by adding an Employment Assistance Program, narrowed our partnership down, and reallocated money to other strategies such as scholarships.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

*We created a few events to grow interest in the program. We also opened up the field trip to more students to learn about education pathways. We had additional host teachers for interns and created additional stipends and scholarships.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Medium)

Lead contacts believe the modifications allowed them to strengthen their support to teacher candidates. In this context, they value the support from DESE.

*Last summer, we offered stipends to those students who worked in our summer program. Originally, we only had enough funds to support this for one summer, but with the monetary moves, we are able to support them again this summer.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*Modifications were made based on dual credit enrollment and the allocations to accompany those numbers. DESE was very supportive and easy to work with.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*The coordinator at DESE was a wonderful support in helping us to identify additional ways to support our paraprofessionals in completing their degrees.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

### Key Points on General Knowledge and Beliefs, and Modifications to Grant Strategies

- LEA lead contacts continue to indicate the purpose of the teacher recruitment grants is clear and they are aware of the availability of support from MTDS. They highlight their LEA's commitment to and the local community's support for teacher recruitment.
- Some LEA lead contacts indicate they have been approved to modify their GYO grant strategies, particularly the fiscal support strategies and the budgetary allocations.

## Quality of Implementation

**Lead contacts indicate the implementation of their teacher recruitment grant is as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.** As Table 8 shows, nearly all lead contacts (92%) believe their LEAs are implementing their grants as designed. They (86–91%) also agree their LEAs assign sufficient personnel, use research-based strategies included in DESE's guidance document, and utilize data for the grants. The responses from lead contacts are similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 8. Perceptions of Quality of Implementation, 2023

My LEA is...	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	A	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Implementing the grant as designed.	414	92%	77%	95%	93%	91%	87%	96%	92%	100%	93%	91%
Using research-based strategies included in DESE's guidance document for the grant.	414	91%	88%	93%	90%	94%	92%	91%	90%	100%	93%	89%
Utilizing data to monitor the progress of grant implementation.	414	86%	73%	88%	87%	89%	85%	90%	85%	90%	87%	86%
Using an evaluation approach that helps to understand the grant's impacts.	414	81%	77%	86%	81%	89%	79%	85%	80%	90%	81%	81%
Assigning sufficient personnel to implement the grant.	414	86%	69%	88%	87%	86%	77%	90%	87%	90%	85%	87%
Using technology to help manage the grant implementation.	414	74%	65%	72%	75%	80%	72%	83%	71%	90%	77%	72%

My LEA is...	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	A	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Collaborating with partners during the grant implementation.	414	79%	81%	81%	79%	89%	79%	87%	76%	80%	87%	75%

Note. As the percentages of grantees who disagree or strongly disagree with, or are undecided about the survey questions were very small, the table shows only the percentages of grantees who agree (A), a composite of strongly agree/agree, with the survey questions. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 9 shows the perceptions of lead contacts are similar and very positive in 2022 and 2023. They agree to a greater extent in 2023 than in 2022 that they use the research-based strategies included in DESE’s guidance document for their grants.

Table 9. Perceptions of Quality of Implementation, 2022 vs. 2023

My LEA is...	2022			2023		
	n	SA	A	n	SA	A
Implementing the grant as designed.	341	47%	47%	414	52%	40%
Using research-based strategies included in DESE’s guidance document for the grant.*	341	37%	50%	414	47%	43%
Utilizing data to monitor the progress of grant implementation.	340	34%	52%	414	39%	47%
Using an evaluation approach that helps to understand the grant’s impacts.	341	31%	48%	414	36%	45%
Assigning sufficient personnel to implement the grant.	341	36%	48%	414	38%	48%
Using technology to help manage the grant implementation.	341	28%	44%	414	33%	41%
Collaborating with partners during the grant implementation.	341	33%	46%	414	36%	43%

Note. SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. \*There was a statistically significant difference among the responses from grantees in 2022 and 2023.

### Effectiveness of the LEA GYO Grants

**Most LEA lead contacts agree that, overall, the analysis of the data they collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.** As Table 10 shows, most lead contacts (251, or 61%) agree with the survey prompt while 127 lead contacts (or 31%) are undecided. Only a small number of lead contacts disagree with the statement (12, or 3%), or indicate their LEAs are not tracking data (24, or 6%).

By LEA priority level or locale, lead contacts’ responses are similar. By LEA size, lead contacts for large, medium, and small LEAs all have positive perceptions of the effectiveness of their grants. The responses from lead contacts for large LEAs are the most positive.

Table 10. Overall Effectiveness of the LEA GYO Grants, 2023

Overall, the data our LEA has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher recruitment efforts.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size**		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Agree or Strongly Agree	251	61%	58%	57%	62%	66%	62%	64%	59%	80%	62%	59%
Undecided	127	31%	35%	31%	30%	29%	31%	27%	32%	10%	34%	30%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	12	3%	0%	9%	2%	0%	3%	0%	4%	0%	1%	4%
Not applicable*	24	6%	8%	3%	6%	6%	5%	9%	5%	10%	4%	7%

Note. \*\*"Not applicable" = "Not applicable. Our LEA is not tracking data that indicate which strategies are working best, working well, or not working at all." \*\*\*There were statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the responses from lead contacts for large LEAs and medium LEAs, and between large LEAs and small LEAs.

In interviews and survey comments, some lead contacts indicate more time is needed to fully understand the effectiveness of the grants.

*Utilizing our GYO program, we have seen greater participation. It is too early to tell if these will bear much fruit.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We are still in the early age of the grant. So it is hard to have enough concrete data to support the level of magnitude of the effect of the grant.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

For those LEAs that are not tracking data, some lead contacts indicate it is because they have not implemented their grants or utilized the grant funding.

*We are still designing the GYO program. We are in development of determining which individuals will be eligible for the scholarship that we will award later this year. The GYO program will start in the fall of 2023.*

-LEA (PL3, Suburb; Medium)

*We have not yet utilized the grant funds due to staffing shortages.*

-LEA (PL1, City; Medium)

Some lead contacts indicate they are working on data collection.

*We are in the process of surveying staff to track the effectiveness of the grant.*

-LEA (PL3, Suburb; Medium)

*We have a plan to track data, but have not started that plan yet. Data will be examined next school year.*

-LEA (PL3, Town; Medium)

**Many lead contacts indicate the survey data they have collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts** (see Table 11).

Table 11. Survey Data and Effectiveness of the LEA GYO Grants, 2023

The survey data that our LEA has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher recruitment efforts.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size**		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Strongly Agree or Agree	175	42%	46%	36%	43%	54%	31%	38%	44%	40%	40%	44%
Undecided	85	21%	12%	22%	21%	11%	13%	19%	23%	0%	22%	21%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	10	2%	0%	7%	2%	0%	5%	0%	3%	0%	1%	3%
Not applicable*	144	35%	42%	34%	34%	34%	51%	42%	30%	60%	37%	33%

Note. \*"Not applicable" = "Not Applicable. Our LEA has not collected survey data." \*\*There were statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the responses from lead contacts for large LEAs and medium LEAs, and between large LEAs and small LEAs.

Many lead contacts indicate their survey data show an increased interest of students in becoming teachers.

*One of our most significant findings is that students going into teaching have a desire to come back to the district for employment.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Student surveys were conducted with a small group of potential teacher candidates after exposure to planned activities. Survey results indicate about a 25% increase in the likelihood of them becoming a teacher.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

Some other lead contacts note their survey data show instructional staff are more willing to get certified and serve as teachers in the LEA.

*Two out of two teachers reported that the grant incentivized them to complete their certification and serve as a teacher in the district.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Through surveys of our instructional staff, we have found staff were interested in continuing their education and/or becoming a certified teacher or certified substitute.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

Some lead contacts believe the survey data suggest the grant contributes to their teacher recruitment efforts.

*All staff participated in the survey and indicated that they strongly agreed that the grant did in fact help us improve our recruitment efforts.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*According to survey data, over 70% of the participants shared the apprenticeship program had a significant impact on their choice to work at the LEA during their first year of teaching. This grant contributed to our apprenticeship program.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

**Many lead contacts also agree the interview/focus group data they have collected suggest the grants strengthen their teacher recruitment efforts** (see Table 12).

Table 12. Interview/Focus Group Data and Effectiveness of the LEA GYO Grants, 2023

The interview/focus group data that our LEA has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher recruitment efforts.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Strongly Agree or Agree	137	33%	23%	33%	34%	23%	26%	31%	36%	30%	28%	36%
Undecided	87	21%	23%	24%	20%	14%	18%	18%	23%	0%	20%	22%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	7	2%	4%	3%	1%	3%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%	2%
Not applicable*	183	44%	50%	40%	45%	60%	56%	51%	38%	70%	51%	40%

Note. \*\*"Not applicable" = "Not Applicable. Our LEA has not collected interview/focus group data." There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Many lead contacts indicate the analysis of their interview/focus group data shows an increased interest of students and staff members in becoming teachers.

*We interviewed our teacher assistants who participated in our program. All indicated they were more likely to pursue a career in education.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*Our paraprofessionals and FTA participants indicated they have grown in their desire to pursue their education degrees. All district paraprofessionals noted they would give our district the first opportunity for employment.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Lead contacts also note the interview/focus group data show participants appreciate the support from the grants.

*We are providing funding for one senior scholarship last year, one this year, and for an aide to seek certification. After interviewing all, they agree the GYO has encouraged them to enter the education field and return to our district.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Our grant funding has had an impact on a small number of teachers who are pursuing certification. Both teachers who received grant funds were positively influenced by the grant to pursue certification.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

In their grant applications, grantees indicated they would use a variety of quantitative data to measure the effectiveness of their grants. Table 13 compares the responses from grantees to the measures, identified in the Phase I evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022a), at the baseline (i.e., the point in time before the grant was implemented) and the Year One full implementation.

For example, both the baseline and the Year One data are available for 121 grantees who used the number of students who enroll in their GYO programs to measure the effectiveness of their grants. At the baseline, an average of 4.4 students enrolled in the GYO programs in the 121 LEAs, and at Year One, that number increased to 6.8 (i.e., an average increase of 2.4 students). The change from the baseline to Year One is positive and statistically significant.

As Table 13 shows, **nearly all quantitative measures are higher in 2023 of the Year One full implementation than in 2022 of the baseline.** This finding suggests the grants help LEAs to recruit teachers.

Table 13. Quantitative Data and Effectiveness of the LEA GYO Grants, 2023

Measure	Unit	Baseline			Year One			Change
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
Number or percent of students who enroll in the GYO program	By Number	121	4.4	7.2	121	6.8	8.1	2.4*
	By Percent	11	11%	0.3	11	15%	0.3	4%*
Number or percent of students who graduate from the GYO program	By Number	97	1.8	3.8	97	2.9	4.3	1.1*
	By Percent	11	41%	0.5	11	43%	0.5	2%
Number or percent of LEA graduates who enroll in education programs at Institutions of Higher Education	By Number	96	2.0	3.6	96	2.8	4.0	0.8*
	By Percent	9	31%	0.4	9	34%	0.4	3%*

Measure	Unit	Baseline			Year One			Change
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
Number or percent of teaching staff and/or candidates who get certified	By Number	102	1.1	1.7	102	1.5	2.2	0.4*
	By Percent	9	13%	0.3	9	25%	0.3	12%*
Number or percent of GYO scholarship recipients and/or LEA graduates that LEA hires	By Number	99	0.7	1.5	99	1.2	1.9	0.5*
	By Percent	5	20%	0.4	5	27%	0.4	7%

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between baseline and Year One. GYO = Grow Your Own.

Some lead contacts also indicate they have collected other data to measure the effectiveness of their grants.

*100% of the Year One participants in our apprenticeship program did teach at our school during the 2022–23 school year. Additionally, 100% of these participants have committed to return to our school in 2023–24.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*We had six paraprofessionals who utilized the GYO funds to accelerate their college coursework. Four completed their degree programs and all four of them have teaching positions secured in our district or a neighboring district for the 2023–24 school year.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

A few LEAs have collected quantitative data on teacher candidate diversity at both the baseline and the Year One full implementation. Their data also show increases over the years.

*There were zero male students in the Future Teacher program last year and this year there is one male student.*

-LEA (PL3, Rural; Small)

*At the baseline, we had one male candidate and three candidates of color. In Year One, we have five male candidates and seven candidates of color.*

-LEA (PL3, Suburb; Large)

**Key Points on Quality of Implementation, and Effectiveness of the Grants**

- Lead contacts indicate the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants is as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.
- Most lead contacts agree that, overall, the data they have collected show the grant contributes to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.

## Effectiveness of the Grant-Supported LEA GYO Strategies

Table 14 shows lead contacts' perceptions of the effectiveness of their grant-funded GYO strategies. As an example, 192 lead contacts provided an effectiveness rating (i.e., "Very effective," "Somewhat effective," or "Ineffective") of the strategy "Host events that connect students to teacher education programs and personnel including field trips to campuses and observing classrooms with college students." Of those 192 grantees, 39% chose "Very effective," 2% "Ineffective," and 59% "Somewhat effective" (i.e., by subtracting 39% and 2% from 100%).

As Table 14 shows, **nearly all lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.** In particular, 40% or more of lead contacts find the following strategies very effective: (a) provide scholarships for tuition, room, and/or board for students taking teacher education courses (43%), (b) provide stipends to teachers and other LEA staff who coordinate the activities (40%); and (c) establish dual credit, dual enrollment opportunities, and/or scholarships to support students' education about the profession (40%).

For most strategies, only a very small percentage of lead contacts (1–4%) find them ineffective. A relatively higher percentage of lead contacts (8%) indicate the strategy "Create materials that promote the teaching profession like brochures, banners, posters, etc." is ineffective.

Disaggregated data show **there are variations in the perceived effectiveness of the GYO strategies by LEA characteristics.** For example, a higher percentage of lead contacts for LEAs in suburban areas than in other areas indicate it is very effective to host events that connect students to teacher education programs and personnel.

Table 14. Effectiveness of Grant-Supported LEA GYO Strategies, 2023

Strategy	All LEAs			By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	VE	IE	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Partnerships													
Connect students to teacher education programs*	192	39%	2%	11 (27%)	23 (26%)	158 (41%)	19 (31%)	18 (77%)	45 (40%)	110 (32%)	6 (83%)	75 (45%)	111 (31%)
Connect students to community members*†	152	27%	2%	12 (16%)	16 (18%)	124 (29%)	18 (27%)	12 (41%)	33 (36%)	89 (21%)	6 (83%)	55 (29%)	91 (21%)
Provide informational trips	143	37%	3%	9 (22%)	16 (37%)	118 (38%)	14 (28%)	10 (60%)	27 (48%)	92 (32%)	4 (75%)	52 (40%)	87 (33%)
Provide stipends for coordinating these activities	178	40%	2%	14 (50%)	22 (36%)	142 (40%)	20 (45%)	16 (68%)	30 (30%)	112 (38%)	4 (75%)	63 (44%)	111 (36%)

Strategy	All LEAs			By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	VE	IE	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Recruitment and Selection													
Provide events for students or send them to existing events	247	34%	2%	13 (30%)	31 (25%)	203 (35%)	19 (42%)	20 (45%)	49 (38%)	159 (30%)	6 (66%)	90 (35%)	151 (31%)
Create materials*	154	27%	8%	10 (30%)	21 (23%)	123 (27%)	12 (50%)	14 (42%)	29 (37%)	99 (19%)	5 (80%)	55 (34%)	94 (20%)
Develop announcements*†	125	22%	4%	10 (20%)	17 (5%)	98 (24%)	14 (21%)	12 (41%)	22 (36%)	77 (14%)	3 (100%)	48 (25%)	74 (16%)
Provide guest speakers, campus visits, field trips	146	33%	1%	8 (37%)	23 (34%)	115 (32%)	13 (46%)	10 (50%)	20 (35%)	103 (29%)	2 (100%)	43 (32%)	101 (31%)
Host celebrations*†	115	29%	3%	5 (20%)	17 (29%)	93 (29%)	8 (37%)	12 (66%)	16 (31%)	79 (21%)	4 (100%)	40 (30%)	71 (23%)
Provide stipends for coordinating these activities*	168	39%	3%	12 (41%)	24 (41%)	132 (38%)	17 (41%)	17 (64%)	24 (37%)	110 (35%)	4 (100%)	59 (42%)	105 (35%)
Preparation and Support													
Invite students to participate in teaching clubs or academies**	204	38%	4%	7 (42%)	20 (45%)	177 (37%)	11 (36%)	19 (57%)	48 (43%)	126 (33%)	4 (50%)	76 (50%)	124 (30%)
Establish dual credit, dual enrollment, scholarships	204	40%	2%	12 (25%)	27 (25%)	165 (43%)	16 (25%)	24 (62%)	39 (53%)	125 (33%)	6 (50%)	74 (48%)	124 (34%)
Provide LEA employment to students*	148	34%	3%	13 (38%)	20 (25%)	115 (34%)	19 (42%)	12 (75%)	25 (44%)	92 (23%)	4 (100%)	51 (41%)	93 (26%)
Provide scholarships**	209	43%	2%	9 (33%)	28 (50%)	172 (42%)	9 (44%)	22 (59%)	33 (63%)	145 (35%)	5 (80%)	52 (59%)	152 (36%)
Provide stipends or release time for sponsoring or mentor teachers	171	35%	3%	12 (16%)	24 (37%)	135 (35%)	17 (35%)	19 (52%)	25 (20%)	110 (34%)	6 (66%)	57 (31%)	108 (34%)

Note. The answer choices were “Very effective” (VE), “Somewhat effective” (SE), “Ineffective” (IE), and “Did not use.” n = Number of grantees who chose the answer choices of VE, SE, or IE. Those who did not answer the question or chose “Did not use” were excluded from the analyses. The percentage of SE can be calculated by subtracting the sum of VE and IE from 100%. For the disaggregated data (i.e., by priority level, locale, and size), the percentages in parentheses are those who chose “Very effective.” There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by priority level. By locale, there were statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees in suburban areas and other areas on prompt 1, between suburban and rural areas on prompts 9 and 13, and between town and rural areas on prompt 14. \*There were statistically significant differences of responses between small and large LEA grantees, † between medium and large grantees, and \*\* between small and medium grantees. Appendix A has the full descriptions of the recruitment strategies in DESE’s guidance document.

For those lead contacts who indicated one or more of their strategies is "Very effective," they were asked to elaborate on why they think so. **Lead contacts believe by providing students with hands-on, engaging learning experiences in real-life situations, the GYO strategies garner student interest in teaching and elevate students' perceptions of the profession.**

*The summer school teaching experience has been effective as it gave students real-world experience of what teaching can be. Those who enjoy the experience become convinced to begin the journey to becoming a teacher.*

-LEA (PL3; City; Large)

*The majority of students who plan to go into education participated in one of our cadet teaching programs or have worked part-time for us. I have found this to be the most effective way to get students interested in the teaching field and enter the profession.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

**Lead contacts also indicate the strategies engage students with direct incentives (e.g., stipends, scholarships, dual credits), which motivate them to enter the profession.**

*Our existing welcome home student is very appreciative of the yearly stipend we provide. The student has stayed in contact and plans to teach with us in the fall.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Large)

*Our recipients of the scholarships or stipends say those funds tied them to the community to a greater extent and increased the chances they will return here to teach.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

**Lead contacts emphasize their strategies are effective because of the dedication of school educators and the support from the local community and grant partners.**

*The key to this GYO effort has been the involvement of two dedicated district teachers. Without their hard work, none of the initiatives would be very effective.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Community support for our students is vital. The relationships and knowledge the local organizations bring to our kids are important both for their educational value and in helping them make decisions about their future.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

A few lead contacts elaborate on those strategies they did not find as effective. **They indicate written recruitment materials (e.g., brochures in a paper form) are not as effective.**

*Brochures have been ineffective in the recruitment side of things. We plan to change it out and share out the success stories and celebrations in media blasts instead.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We teamed up with a marketing company to produce brochures promoting rural schools including us. This had no effect on outside individuals applying to our school.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**Some lead contacts note a lack of interest in taking advantage of the opportunities.**

*We have offered opportunities through a local vocational school that offers career pathways for the teaching profession. We have not had any students take advantage of this program to date.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*It is difficult to find high school students wanting to venture into the teaching field. Students are discouraged by the low pay.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

In addition to utilizing strategies included in DESE's guidance document, some lead contacts indicate they also support non-teaching staff (e.g., aides, paraprofessionals, substitutes) to become certified, and encourage current teachers to earn additional certifications in high-need areas.

*We provided tuition or certification cost reimbursement for our paraprofessionals and other non-certified staff who are pursuing teaching degrees. This has been effective in helping two staff members earn their teaching certification.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*We used the recruitment funds to offer tuition assistance for teachers who were willing to seek certification in areas of high need. This has helped us to internally recruit a staff member to seek the degree and certification to become a counselor in our district.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

A number of lead contacts indicate their LEAs use local funds to support their GYO strategies, and their GYO grants strengthen their recruitment efforts.

*We had an established GYO program prior to the grant and we used district funds for many of the strategies. We used all of the grant money for scholarships.*

-LEA (PL2; City; Medium)

*We were using many of the strategies prior to the grant. The grant funds have allowed us to expand our efforts.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

## Perceived Impacts of the LEA GYO Grants

As Table 15 shows, **many lead contacts indicate they are seeing indicators of success of their teacher recruitment grants.** As examples, approximately half of lead contacts believe they are seeing indicators of success in terms of increasing interest in the teacher positions (58%), collaborating with EPPs/CCs (51%), and building a larger teacher candidate pool (46%).

While the responses from lead contacts are mostly similar by LEA characteristics, the disaggregated data show notable differences in terms of recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers: **When compared to their peers in other LEAs, higher percentages of lead contacts for large LEAs at priority level I in cities indicate they are seeing indicators of success of their GYO grants in recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers.**

Table 15. Perceived Impacts of the LEA GYO Grants, 2023

Are you seeing indicators of success of your teacher recruitment (Grow Your Own) grant in terms of...?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Increasing interest in the teacher positions	413	58%	42%	59%	59%	49%	46%	67%	58%	50%	57%	58%
Building a larger teacher candidate pool	413	46%	23%	48%	47%	37%	41%	53%	45%	50%	43%	46%
Recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers PL1 > (PL2, PL3)* City > ([Suburb > Rural], Town)* Large > (Medium, Small)*	413	18%	58%	21%	14%	66%	28%	17%	10%	60%	21%	14%
Recruiting male teachers	413	25%	23%	29%	24%	31%	23%	24%	25%	40%	24%	25%
Recruiting teachers in specific content areas (e.g., special education, math, science)	413	33%	35%	38%	32%	31%	31%	37%	32%	40%	31%	33%
Recruiting teachers in schools in hard-to-staff locations (City, Rural) > Suburb* Small > Medium*	413	32%	35%	45%	30%	37%	10%	26%	37%	20%	22%	38%

Are you seeing indicators of success of your teacher recruitment (Grow Your Own) grant in terms of...?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Providing customized support to schools related to teacher recruitment	413	26%	27%	31%	25%	26%	23%	24%	27%	30%	22%	28%
Collaborating with educator preparation programs/community colleges	413	51%	42%	52%	52%	51%	69%	55%	48%	70%	57%	48%
Collaborating with community partners	413	36%	42%	38%	35%	43%	41%	46%	31%	40%	43%	32%
Improving student achievement	413	37%	38%	50%	34%	49%	36%	40%	34%	40%	35%	37%

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees. Percentages reported are those who agreed with the survey prompts. Throughout the report, the ">" sign shows that responses of the first group are greater (e.g., being more positive) than the second group. Disaggregated responses (i.e., by LEA priority level, locale, or size) of groups in parentheses are similar.

**From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher recruitment grants, and the changes are particularly salient in terms of recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers and male teachers** (see Table 16). For example, in 2022, only 7% of lead contacts indicated seeing indicators of success in recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers. One year later, that percentage soared to 18%, more than double the percentage in 2022.

Table 16. Perceived Impacts of the LEA GYO Grants, 2022 vs. 2023

Are you seeing indicators of success of your teacher recruitment (Grow Your Own) grant in terms of...?	2022		2023	
	n	%Yes	n	%Yes
Increasing interest in the teacher positions*	328	30%	413	58%
Building a larger teacher candidate pool*	328	24%	413	46%
Recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers*	328	7%	413	18%
Recruiting male teachers*	327	12%	413	25%
Recruiting teachers in specific content areas (e.g., special education, math, science)*	328	21%	413	33%
Recruiting teachers in schools in hard-to-staff locations*	326	17%	413	32%
Providing customized support to schools related to teacher recruitment*	324	19%	413	26%
Collaborating with educator preparation programs/community colleges*	326	34%	413	51%
Collaborating with community partners*	326	25%	413	36%
Improving student achievement*	323	18%	413	37%

Note. The prompt was "Are you seeing early indicators of success of your teacher recruitment (Grow Your Own) grant in terms of...?" in 2022. \*There was a statistically significant difference among the responses from grantees in 2022 and 2023.

In interviews and survey comments, lead contacts elaborate on the indicators of success they are seeing. **Many lead contacts believe the grants build a stronger interest in the profession and enhance awareness of the need for a larger and more diverse teaching force.**

*We more than doubled our cadet teaching program this year. We have more students planning to enter the teaching profession than in the past.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

*We are able to increase the awareness of the need for teachers and create an atmosphere highlighting the job.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**Many lead contacts indicate that, because of the grants, their LEAs are more effective in recruiting diverse teachers and teachers in hard-to-staff content areas.**

*Hiring for certain positions was easier this year than last, and I have two paraprofessionals finishing up degrees in SPED. It is all because of the help given with the grant.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*We have started to see our GYO students becoming eligible to hire. We have successfully hired diverse teachers from this program.*

-LEA (PL3; City; Large)

**In particular, a number of lead contacts believe their grants contribute to the development and recruitment of more high-quality teachers.**

*Our students are graduating from the GYO program as paraprofessionals and being hired within the district. They are also excelling in their practicum assignments. I believe we are not only growing teachers, but growing exceptional teachers.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*I believe that our applicant pool has gotten better in the past two years.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We are seeing a greater number of high-quality teacher candidates applying for positions in the district.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

Some lead contacts highlight stronger connections between LEAs and EPPs/CCs.

*We have seen a definite increase in our collaboration with the local university and key personnel related to teacher placement.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*Our district is more connected to teacher prep programs than we have been in years.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Medium)

## Public Reporting and Sharing

As Table 17 shows, **most lead contacts indicate they consider school leaders and teachers as key stakeholders for their GYO grants.** Many lead contacts also identify their central office leaders (76%) and school boards (68%) as key stakeholders.

Table 17. Key Stakeholders for Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

Who do you consider as key stakeholders for your LEA's teacher recruitment (Grow Your Own) grant?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
School board • Rural > Town* • Small > Medium*	430	68%	74%	75%	67%	73%	60%	52%	74%	64%	60%	73%
Central office leaders • Medium > Small*	430	76%	85%	75%	75%	76%	88%	84%	71%	82%	87%	70%
School leaders (e.g., principals, assistant principals)	430	89%	85%	88%	89%	89%	90%	84%	90%	91%	86%	90%
Teachers • PL2 > PL1*	430	84%	70%	92%	84%	76%	85%	81%	86%	91%	83%	85%
Parents	430	49%	52%	63%	47%	51%	58%	43%	50%	64%	49%	49%
Students	430	66%	63%	70%	65%	65%	78%	60%	65%	73%	72%	62%
Local community	430	41%	30%	52%	41%	32%	48%	38%	43%	45%	41%	42%
DESE/RPDC/MTDS	430	41%	33%	50%	40%	27%	45%	37%	43%	45%	39%	42%
Grant partner(s) (e.g., EPPs/CCs, other LEAs) • Suburb > (Town, Rural)*	430	24%	22%	25%	24%	27%	43%	20%	22%	36%	26%	22%

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees.

**Most lead contacts indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their GYO grants with key stakeholders once or twice a year** (see Table 18).

Table 18. Frequency of Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

How frequently has your LEA shared or reported on results to-date of your teacher recruitment grant with key stakeholders?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Once a year	183	44%	35%	48%	44%	43%	46%	41%	45%	50%	40%	46%
Twice a year	94	23%	27%	26%	22%	31%	13%	22%	23%	20%	19%	25%
Three times a year	9	2%	0%	0%	3%	0%	5%	3%	2%	0%	3%	2%
Four times a year or more frequently	26	6%	4%	7%	6%	6%	13%	8%	5%	20%	10%	4%
My LEA has not shared or reported on results to-date with key stakeholders.	101	24%	35%	19%	25%	20%	23%	27%	25%	10%	28%	23%

Note. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

For those LEAs that have not shared or reported on results with key stakeholders, some lead contacts indicate they plan to do so by the end of the school year.

*Our timeline for the reporting is at the end of each year with a reflection on current data and then we plan moving forward to inform the Board and the community.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Medium)

*We are going to report on this during the summer of 2023 when we know how many graduates plan to enroll in the education programs.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Some other lead contacts note they are collecting the data needed for reporting.

*The LEA plans to share results at the beginning of each school year. The LEA is in the process of collecting data/feedback.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We do not have all the data we would like at this point. Once we have the data we will report to the stakeholders.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

As Table 19 shows, the majority of LEAs have shared or reported on results to-date via websites/social media or reports/newsletters.

Table 19. Methods for Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

How has your LEA shared or reported on results to-date of your teacher recruitment grant?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n*	%**	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Shared via websites and/or social media	97	23%	19%	15%	24%	16%	38%	26%	20%	27%	29%	19%
Shared via reports and/or newsletters	158	37%	37%	43%	36%	43%	43%	38%	35%	36%	41%	35%
Shared via other ways (e.g., board meetings, community meetings) Large > (Medium, Small)***	109	25%	30%	22%	26%	35%	33%	21%	24%	64%	24%	24%

Note. This question allows the respondent to choose one or multiple answer choices. \*n = Number of grantees who have shared or reported on results to-date via this way. \*\*The percentages were calculated based on the number of all teacher recruitment grantees. \*\*\*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees.

### Key Points on Effectiveness of GYO Strategies, Perceived Impacts of Grants, and Public Reporting

- Nearly all lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.
- From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher recruitment grant, and the changes are particularly salient in terms of recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teachers and male teachers.
- Most lead contacts indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their GYO grants with key stakeholders once or twice a year.

In interviews and survey comments, LEA lead contacts identify a number of factors which enhance or impede the implementation of their GYO grants. They also highlight a variety of supports they need for purposes of teacher recruitment. Some of the factors and supports have been previously reported (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b).

### Enhancing Factors for LEA Teacher Recruitment (GYO) Grants

**Many lead contacts highly value the availability of financial resources to support their teacher recruitment efforts.** They indicate the funding helps them provide students with scholarships, staff with financial assistance, and mentors with stipends, all of which improve their teacher recruitment efforts.

*We are using a scholarship and we feel this is the most beneficial way to get students engaged in returning to education.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

*Being able to provide compensation to cooperating teachers who mentor students enhances our district's ability. We've been thankful for the grant money that we've been able to use to compensate them for their time and efforts.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

**Lead contacts appreciate the flexibility for how they can use the grant funding.** They indicate this allows them to customize the support of the grants to address their unique needs.

*The wide range of this grant allowed me to use it in a unique way to grow our own staff for the positions in greater need for our district.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*We have the flexibility to utilize the funds to meet our unique district needs.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

**Many lead contacts emphasize they receive effective, ongoing support from DESE.**

*The support from DESE was really great. The coordinator at DESE was very open to listening to our rationale and assisting us with budget modifications that supported our strategies.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*Support from DESE in the implementation of the grant has been an asset.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*The support from DESE for the program has been excellent. Responses to questions have always been rapid and relevant. Phenomenal communication from all involved.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

**Lead contacts underscore the importance of support from stakeholders in the LEA, and collaboration with outside partners (e.g., EPPs/CCs).**

*Everyone involved in the school understands the need to make finding teachers a high priority. We have a lot of buy-in across job roles in the district to support this priority.*

-LEA (PL3; City; Medium)

*Partnering with the educator preparation program to have an Intro to Teaching dual credit course for students enhances our implementation of the recruitment grant.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

**Some lead contacts highlight the contribution from sponsoring mentor teachers.** They believe their dedication enhances the effectiveness of their grants.

*The relationship between our mentor teachers and our FTA students is HUGE! I believe the cadet-teaching program has doubled as a result of their influence.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*The teachers our students are working with are dedicated to the field and are doing a great job of recruiting students into the profession.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We have a highly committed advisor who promotes, fosters, and nurtures the program. We also have teachers who are willing to mentor students.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

## Emerging Issues for LEA Teacher Recruitment (GYO) Grants

**Many lead contacts continue to highlight the lack of interest of students and staff members in taking advantage of the grant-supported opportunities.**

*We attempted to implement a Future Teachers of America club in our high school. There was zero interest among students. We attempted to utilize funds for paraprofessionals seeking a degree. We had zero interest this year.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Few students are interested in the teaching profession. Many participants have decided they do not want to enter the teaching profession after participating in our Teacher Cadet program. They see the stresses teachers have to deal with on a day-to-day basis.*

-LEA (PL1; Town; Medium)

*We still see a lack of student interest in seeking teaching as a career. We will continue to work hard in this area as we believe this is a HUGE crisis in Missouri.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Lead contacts indicate low salary and negative perceptions of the profession make recruiting teachers challenging.

*Many students don't want to enter education due to low pay and a lack of support for public education. They cite the political climate as a reason to avoid the profession because teachers "get all the blame" for things perceived as negative in school.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*The overall stigma of teaching and education as a whole is a huge impediment.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Large)

**Lead contacts reiterate the size of the grants is relatively small.**

*The amount of the grant is not enough to truly develop a full and robust program for GYO. We appreciate the funding, of course, but it's challenging to determine how to maximize it.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

*Our budget (\$10,000) will only allow us to work with 2-3 candidates, and it is challenging to make this initiative sustainable within our general operating budget.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

**Some lead contacts indicate it is challenging to find sponsoring teachers.** For many grantees, having a dedicated sponsoring teacher is key to the success of their grants.

*There is no one willing to take on the responsibility of helping the students create an interest in teaching.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*We lost the teacher who was in charge of our Future Teachers of America group and have not had another one willing to take it over.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

The recruitment challenges can be salient for some rural LEAs. They indicate their candidate pools are often smaller and they lack the personnel to effectively implement their grants.

*Our senior class sizes are under ten students each year. The pool of students we are speaking with about these opportunities is small.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Currently, there are a great number of grants floating through schools. I am in a district with a superintendent and a bookkeeper. It's hard to keep up with all the grants, revenue codes, etc. It is appreciated, but it is challenging.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**A few lead contacts express concerns about the grant timeline and the uncertainties regarding the sustainability of funding.**

*The fact that the scholarship funds must be spent so quickly [impedes the implementation]. I would have designed my plans much differently had I known I needed to allocate the scholarship this year.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

*Uncertainty of future funding impedes our efforts.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

**Additional Support Needed by LEA Teacher Recruitment (GYO) Grantees**

**Lead contacts continue to highlight the need for higher levels of funding for teacher recruitment over a more sustained period of time.**

*I hope there would be more funds offered to extend the grant.*

-LEA (PL2; Town; Small)

*Additional funding can help expand the reach and impact of the grant.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Medium)

**Many lead contacts want to continue to receive support and guidance from DESE related to grant implementation (e.g., information, exemplars, materials).**

*Overall, DESE should provide more explicit information on certification routes for non-traditional applicants.*

-LEA (PL2; City; Medium)

*In order for the LEA to be more effective, clearer guidance regarding the grant including more examples of how to best utilize grant funds would be beneficial.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*It would be nice for DESE to provide recruitment materials ALL school districts in Missouri could use—flyers, commercials, benefits, etc. Improvements are being made, but there is still room to grow.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

A few lead contacts would like the timeline for grant implementation to be extended.

*Being allowed to spend funds until the end of June and having an additional year to spend funds would be helpful.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Large)

*In order to evaluate recruitment data, the timeline needs to be extended four years for reporting longevity and maintenance of degree intention.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**Lead contacts reiterate the need for the state to further improve the status of the teaching profession.** One strategy many lead contacts highlight is increasing teacher salaries.

*If we really want to have a pool of quality candidates, we need to address the pay issues with teachers throughout the state. Missouri is the lowest state for teacher pay. We are slapping band-aids on a gaping wound. It is time to address the state formula.*

-LEA (PL2; Town; Small)

*We need to move the current salary minimum to a reasonable level (\$40k) with funding formula dollars.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

Another strategy is to launch public campaigns to promote the profession.

*We need a massive public campaign to make the profession of teaching sexy and compelling. It needs to be a sought after career that recruits and retains our best and brightest to a professional and rewarding career.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Medium)

*As a state, we must continue to blast media outlets with the positive things going on in public education and the many rewards it gives as a career choice!*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**LEA lead contacts hope the collaboration with EPPs/CCs becomes stronger.**

*Funding is always good, but in all honesty, that is not an issue at this time. Possibly getting the colleges and universities more involved at the high school level.*

-LEA (PL1; Town; Medium)

*We need the universities to work with us in recruiting students. Our local university has eliminated many teacher education programs which are high need areas. It will be nearly impossible to get teachers in these areas if they cannot even major in them.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

## Summary

LEA lead contacts continue to indicate they implement their teacher recruitment (GYO) grants with fidelity. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts. Most lead contacts agree that, overall, the analysis of the data they collected shows their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.

Nearly all lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective. From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher recruitment grants.

Lead contacts highlight the availability of financial resources and the flexibility for how they can use the funds as factors that enhance their recruitment efforts. They also identify challenges such as the lack of interest of students and staff members in taking advantage of the grant-supported opportunities, and low salary and negative perceptions of the profession, as barriers to their GYO program implementation.

# CHAPTER FOUR: LEA TEACHER RETENTION GRANTS

This chapter examines the implementation and impacts of the LEA teacher retention grants.

## General Knowledge and Beliefs

**LEA lead contacts continue to agree the purpose of the teacher retention grant is clear and they understand support is available from MTDS. They reiterate there is a high level of commitment in their LEA to and support from the local community for teacher retention.**

As reflected in Table 20, nearly all LEA lead contacts (92–97%) indicate the purpose of the grant is clear, they know where to get information, and they understand help is available from MTDS. They also believe there is a high level of commitment in their LEA to teacher retention and the local community supports their teacher retention efforts. Responses from lead contacts are mostly similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 20. General Knowledge and Beliefs, 2023

Survey Prompt	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	A	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
The purpose of the teacher retention grant is clear to me.	468	96%	100%	97%	95%	97%	95%	98%	95%	91%	96%	96%
I know where to get information about the teacher retention grant.	468	95%	97%	97%	94%	97%	90%	96%	95%	91%	94%	95%
I understand that help is available for the implementation of my teacher retention grant from members of the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS).	468	93%	97%	94%	92%	95%	86%	98%	92%	91%	93%	93%
There is a high level of commitment in my LEA to teacher retention.*	468	97%	100%	97%	97%	100%	95%	98%	97%	100%	98%	97%
The local community supports my LEA's teacher retention efforts.	468	92%	73%	94%	93%	79%	93%	95%	93%	100%	92%	92%

Note. C = City; S = Suburb; T = Town; R = Rural. L = Large (15,001 or more students); M = Medium (1,001–15,000 students); S = Small (1–1,000 students). As the percentages of grantees who disagree or strongly disagree with, or are undecided about the questions were very small, the table shows only the percentages of grantees who agree (A), a composite of strongly agree/agree, with the questions. \*There was a statistically significant difference among the responses from grantees in cities and in rural areas.

Table 21 compares lead contacts’ responses in 2022 and 2023. Across the two years, the perceptions of lead contacts are similar and very positive.

Table 21. General Knowledge and Beliefs, 2022 vs. 2023

Survey Prompt	2022			2023		
	n	SA	A	n	SA	A
The purpose of the teacher retention grant is clear to me.	294	59%	38%	468	59%	37%
I know where to get information about the teacher retention grant.	295	54%	43%	468	54%	41%
I understand that help is available for the implementation of my teacher retention grant from members of the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS).	295	51%	43%	468	53%	40%
There is a high level of commitment in my LEA to teacher retention.	295	62%	36%	468	64%	34%
The local community supports my LEA's teacher retention efforts.	294	55%	38%	468	53%	39%

Note. SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. \*There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees in 2022 and 2023.

### Modifications from Initial Application to Year One Full Implementation

**Some lead contacts indicate their LEAs have been approved to make modifications to their grant strategies, particularly the retention strategies and the budgetary allocations.** As Table 22 shows, lead contacts indicate they have received approval to modify their retention strategies (13%), budgetary allocations (22%), and other strategies for their grants.

Responses from lead contacts are mostly similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size. When compared to their peers in other LEAs, higher percentages of lead contacts for LEAs at priority level I, in suburban areas, and of medium size indicate they have been approved to modify their budgetary allocations.

Table 22. Modifications to Teacher Retention Grant Strategies, 2023

Please indicate if you have been approved to make modifications to your teacher retention grant strategies.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	Yes	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Partnerships	467	5%	10%	6%	5%	3%	10%	9%	4%	9%	8%	4%
Retention strategies	467	13%	14%	12%	13%	10%	19%	11%	12%	36%	12%	12%
Evaluation of effectiveness of grant strategies and/or activities	467	8%	10%	6%	8%	8%	5%	11%	7%	18%	8%	7%
Budgetary allocations*	467	22%	41%	24%	20%	23%	43%	26%	18%	36%	29%	18%
Public sharing of grant progress and/or outcome data	467	5%	7%	4%	5%	5%	0%	6%	6%	0%	4%	6%

Note. \*There were statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the responses from lead contacts for grantees (a) at priority level I and priority level III; (b) in suburbs and rural areas; and (c) of medium size and small size.

Some lead contacts indicate that due to changing circumstances, they utilize new retention strategies and, therefore, reallocate the funds to support the new strategies.

*We shifted some money budgeted for salaries and benefits to purchased services.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*We added a strategy to host a fair outside the continental U.S. to build a new robust pipeline for talent acquisition and retention.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Large)

Some other lead contacts note they shift funding allocations among the approved strategies.

*We initially allocated funds for teacher scholarships for the National Board Certification, but we had to adjust our budget to accommodate professional development that was more expensive than expected.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*One of our budget categories ended up costing more than originally anticipated.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

Lead contacts believe the approved modifications meet their emerging needs.

*Revisions of the budget allowed us to address the needs of our district by spending the grant monies in a better way for the district.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*The modifications were made to better align our needs.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

---

### **Key Points on General Knowledge and Beliefs, and Modifications to Grant Strategies**

- LEA lead contacts continue to agree the purpose of the retention grant is clear and they are aware of the availability of support from MTDS.
- They reiterate there is a high level of commitment in their LEA to and support from the local community for teacher retention.
- Some LEA lead contacts indicate they have been approved to modify their grant strategies, particularly the retention strategies and the budgetary allocations.

## Quality of Implementation

**Lead contacts continue to believe they are implementing their teacher retention grants as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.** As Table 23 shows, nearly all lead contacts (95%) agree their LEAs are implementing their grants with fidelity. They (81–89%) also indicate their LEAs assign sufficient personnel, and use data and research-based strategies included in DESE’s guidance document for the grant implementation. Responses from lead contacts are mostly similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 23. Perceptions of Quality of Implementation, 2023

My LEA is...	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	A	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Implementing the grant as designed.	467	95%	100%	96%	94%	100%	93%	100%	93%	91%	97%	94%
Using research-based strategies included in DESE's guidance document for the grant.*	467	89%	97%	88%	88%	92%	90%	98%	86%	73%	95%	86%
Utilizing data to monitor the progress of grant implementation.	467	81%	86%	88%	79%	92%	76%	81%	80%	73%	82%	81%
Using an evaluation approach that helps to understand the grant's impacts.	467	76%	69%	84%	76%	85%	62%	83%	76%	64%	77%	77%
Assigning sufficient personnel to implement the grant.**	467	86%	83%	96%	84%	90%	71%	98%	84%	64%	88%	86%
Using technology to help manage the grant implementation.	467	75%	59%	79%	75%	74%	74%	80%	74%	55%	82%	72%
Collaborating with partners during the grant implementation.	467	71%	66%	74%	71%	74%	76%	77%	68%	73%	77%	68%

Note. As the percentages of grantees who disagree or strongly disagree with the survey questions were very small, the table shows only the percentages of grantees who agree (A), a composite of strongly agree/agree, and are undecided (U) about the survey questions. There were statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees \*in towns and rural areas, and \*\*in suburban areas and in towns.

Table 24 compares the responses from lead contacts in 2022 and 2023. Across the two years, the perceptions of lead contacts are similar and very positive.

Table 24. Perceptions of Quality of Implementation, 2022 vs. 2023

My LEA is...	2022			2023		
	n	SA	A	n	SA	A
Implementing the grant as designed.	289	51%	42%	467	50%	45%
Using research-based strategies included in DESE's guidance document for the grant.	289	41%	46%	467	43%	46%
Utilizing data to monitor the progress of grant implementation.	289	39%	47%	467	36%	45%

My LEA is...	2022			2023		
	n	SA	A	n	SA	A
Using an evaluation approach that helps to understand the grant's impacts.	289	34%	48%	467	32%	44%
Assigning sufficient personnel to implement the grant.	289	39%	46%	467	37%	48%
Using technology to help manage the grant implementation.	289	31%	44%	467	31%	44%
Collaborating with partners during the grant implementation.	287	32%	41%	467	29%	42%

Note. SA = Strongly Agree. A = Agree. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees in 2022 and 2023.

### Effectiveness of the LEA Teacher Retention Grants

**Most LEA lead contacts agree that, overall, the data they have collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher retention efforts.** As Table 25 shows, most lead contacts (296, or 63%) agree with the survey prompt while 123 lead contacts (or 26%) are undecided. Only a small number of lead contacts disagree with the statement (12, or 3%), or indicate their LEAs are not tracking data (36, or 8%). Lead contacts' responses are similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 25. Overall Effectiveness of the Grants, 2023

Overall, the data our LEA has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher retention efforts.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Agree or Strongly Agree	296	63%	55%	60%	65%	69%	52%	65%	64%	45%	63%	64%
Undecided	123	26%	24%	26%	26%	21%	36%	27%	26%	36%	31%	24%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	12	3%	3%	7%	2%	0%	2%	0%	4%	0%	1%	4%
Not applicable*	36	8%	17%	6%	7%	10%	10%	7%	7%	18%	6%	8%

Note. \*\*"Not applicable" = "Not applicable. Our LEA is not tracking data that indicate which strategies are working best, working well, or not working at all." There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from lead contacts by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

For those LEAs that are not currently tracking data, a number of lead contacts indicate they plan to collect the data at the end of the school year.

*We plan to collect comparative data at the end of this school year.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*Our exit survey will be sent out at the end of the current school year.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**Many lead contacts indicate the survey data they have collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher retention efforts** (see Table 26).

Table 26. Survey Data and Effectiveness of the LEA Teacher Retention Grants, 2023

The survey data that our LEA has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher retention efforts.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Strongly Agree or Agree	221	47%	52%	41%	48%	51%	40%	47%	48%	18%	48%	48%
Undecided	111	24%	17%	28%	24%	23%	33%	23%	23%	27%	26%	23%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	9	2%	0%	6%	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%
Not applicable*	126	27%	31%	25%	27%	26%	26%	30%	27%	55%	26%	27%

Note. \*"Not applicable" = "Not Applicable. Our LEA has not collected survey data." There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from lead contacts by priority level, locale, or size.

Some lead contacts note the survey data show teachers are more satisfied with the profession.

*Teachers indicate they feel supported and valued.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*Our teaching staff provided input on the utilization of permanent building substitutes. There was overwhelming agreement that the position positively impacts teacher satisfaction and benefits the school.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

Many lead contacts indicate their survey respondents agree the grant-supported retention strategies are effective in retaining teachers.

*100% of teachers surveyed agreed our retention strategies were effective in retaining teachers/staff.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We learned from the teacher survey data that the increased collaborative time has a significant impact on their likelihood to stay for the next two years.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*According to staff survey data, providing professional development opportunities and collaboration time for our teachers has led to positive morale and a higher likelihood of teachers remaining in our district.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**Many lead contacts indicate the analysis of the interview/focus group data they have collected shows their grants strengthen their teacher retention efforts** (see Table 27).

Table 27. Interview/Focus Group Data and Effectiveness of the LEA Teacher Retention Grants, 2023

The interview/focus group data that our LEA has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher retention efforts.	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Strongly Agree or Agree	157	34%	24%	31%	35%	23%	31%	27%	37%	36%	30%	35%
Undecided	86	18%	17%	19%	18%	18%	17%	17%	19%	27%	19%	18%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	4	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Not applicable*	220	47%	59%	49%	46%	59%	52%	56%	43%	36%	51%	46%

Note. \*"Not applicable" = "Not Applicable. Our LEA has not collected interview/focus group data." There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from lead contacts by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

A couple of lead contacts explain how their LEAs collected the interview/focus group data and used the information to inform the implementation of their teacher retention grants.

*Three focus groups were created, based on length of time in the career. Groups have met four times and provided feedback on our district's recruitment and retention efforts, along with suggestions on how we can best support our staff.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Medium)

*The focus group polled the staff on what could be done to maintain and improve the school climate among staff members. The data collected was the driving force behind how the budget was allocated.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Some lead contacts indicate the interview/focus group data suggest their grants contribute to their teacher retention efforts.

*The interviews concluded that the mentors and mentees are staying because of the support they provided and received. This grant was a key variable.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Multiple interview responses indicated the strategies help teachers continue to teach and stay with our district.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

**The percentage of lead contacts who indicate it is getting easier to retain teachers is higher than that of those who believe it is getting more difficult.** As Table 28 shows, 22% of lead contacts indicate that compared to the baseline, it is easier to fill the teaching positions at their LEAs at the end of the Year One full grant implementation, twice as large as those who indicate it is more difficult (11%). Responses from lead contacts are similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 28. Level of Difficulty in Filling Teaching Positions, 2023

Compared to the Baseline, how difficult is it to fill the teaching positions at your LEA at the end of the Year One grant implementation?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Much easier	17	4%	7%	4%	3%	5%	0%	2%	4%	0%	3%	4%
Easier	85	18%	24%	19%	18%	26%	21%	20%	16%	36%	16%	19%
About the same	312	67%	48%	68%	68%	49%	69%	68%	69%	55%	70%	66%
More difficult	37	8%	7%	4%	9%	15%	5%	6%	8%	9%	8%	8%
Much more difficult	16	3%	14%	4%	2%	5%	5%	4%	3%	0%	3%	4%

Note. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from lead contacts by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

In their grant applications, grantees indicated they would use a variety of quantitative data to measure the effectiveness of their teacher retention grants. Table 29 compares the responses from grantees to the measures, identified in the Phase I evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b), at the baseline (i.e., the point in time before the grant was implemented) and the Year One full grant implementation.

For example, the baseline and the Year One data are available for 75 grantees who used the number of teachers retained to measure the effectiveness of their grants. At the baseline, an average of 58.2 teachers were retained in the 75 LEAs. At Year One, the number increased to 58.7 teachers. The change over the years is not statistically significant, yet positive.

The table suggests the teacher retention grants help to retain teachers and reduce vacant teaching positions.

Table 29. Quantitative Data and Effectiveness of the LEA Teacher Retention Grants, 2023

Measure	Unit	Baseline			Year One			Change
		n	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
Number or percent of teachers retained	By Number	75	58.2	88.3	75	58.7	87.0	0.5
	By Percent	78	83%	0.1	78	87%	0.1	4%*

Measure	Unit	Baseline			Year One			Change
		n	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
Number or percent of vacant teaching positions	By Number	143	13.5	24.0	143	11.0	20.2	-2.5*
	By Percent	33	19%	0.2	33	15%	0.2	-4%*
Number of applicants for vacant teaching positions	By Number	135	78.3	326.4	135	68.6	258.0	-9.7
	By Percent	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Number or percent of vacant positions filled	By Number	109	21.5	35.5	109	19.0	32.7	-2.5
	By Percent	43	95%	0.2	43	91%	0.2	-4%

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between baseline and Year One full implementation.

A few lead contacts describe other measures they are using in their analysis, such as the number of substitute teachers and the number of new teachers being retained.

*We had 30 substitutes in 2021–22 and 38 substitutes in 2022–23.*

-LEA (PL2; Suburb; Medium)

*All three new teachers were retained by the district and have signed contracts for the 2023–24 school year. We believe that is, in part, attributable to our Teacher Retention Grant which provided a mentor/mentee support program.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Table 30 describes the changes of teacher demographics in LEA retention grantees from 2022 to 2023. For example, 448 grantees reported in the survey the percentage of male teachers in their LEAs at both the baseline and Year One. Of these 448 grantees, the percentage of male teachers increased in 114 grantees (or 25%) and decreased in 87 grantees (or 19%).

Table 30 shows **more LEAs are reporting higher percentages of male, African American, and Hispanic teachers**. This suggests the grants help to increase the proportion of male and diverse teachers in the workforce. In addition, the increases of diverse teachers appear more notable for LEAs at priority level I in cities or in suburban areas.

Table 30. Changes of LEA Teacher Demographics, 2022 to 2023

	All LEAs			By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	IN	DE	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
% Male teachers	448	25%	19%	28 (39%)	68 (29%)	352 (24%)	39 (33%)	37 (32%)	74 (28%)	298 (23%)	8 (50%)	136 (33%)	304 (21%)
% African American teachers*	446	10%	8%	28 (50%)	68 (10%)	350 (7%)	38 (45%)	36 (25%)	74 (14%)	298 (3%)	8 (25%)	135 (20%)	303 (5%)
% Hispanic teachers**	445	6%	5%	27 (22%)	68 (3%)	350 (5%)	37 (22%)	35 (29%)	76 (5%)	297 (1%)	6 (17%)	136 (14%)	303 (2%)

	All LEAs			By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	IN	DE	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
% White teachers**	445	10%	15%	28 (46%)	68 (16%)	349 (12%)	38 (34%)	35 (34%)	74 (15%)	298 (10%)	8 (25%)	135 (24%)	302 (11%)

Note. n = Number of grantees who reported both the baseline and the Year One data. IN = Increased from the baseline to Year One; DE = Decreased from the baseline to Year One. The third group (i.e., No Changes) can be calculated by subtracting the sum of IN and DE from 100%. There were statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level \*between the responses from grantees at priority level I and other priority levels, and between grantees in cities and in towns or rural areas; \*\*between priority level I and priority level II, between suburban and other areas, and between small LEAs and medium LEAs. For the disaggregated data (i.e., by priority level, locale, and size), the percentages in parentheses are those whose data showed increases from the baseline to Year One. For % White teachers, however, the percentages in parentheses are those whose data showed decreases from the baseline to Year One.

### Key Points on Quality of Implementation, and Effectiveness of the Grants

- Lead contacts indicate their teacher retention grants are implemented with fidelity. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.
- Most lead contacts agree that, overall, the data they have collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher retention efforts.
- The percentage of lead contacts who indicate it is getting easier to retain teachers is higher than that of those who believe it is getting more difficult.

## Effectiveness of Grant-Supported LEA Teacher Retention Strategies

Table 31 shows lead contacts' perceptions of the effectiveness of their grant-funded retention strategies. For example, 274 lead contacts provided an effectiveness rating (i.e., "Very effective," "Somewhat effective," or "Ineffective") of the strategy "Strengthen the mentor program for early career teachers." Of those 274 grantees, 36% chose "Very effective," 0% "Ineffective," and 64% "Somewhat effective" (i.e., by subtracting 36% and 0% from 100%).

As Table 31 shows, **nearly all lead contacts indicate the teacher retention strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.** In particular, 40% or more of lead contacts find the following retention strategies very effective: (a) provide or increase stipends for mentors of new teachers (43%); (b) provide or increase stipends for other duties not contractually specified (40%); and (c) hire additional substitute teachers, aides, or paraprofessionals to ensure dedicated teacher planning time or to increase fill rates for time-off requests (40%).

For most strategies, only a very small percentage of lead contacts (0–5%) find them ineffective. A relatively higher percentage of lead contacts (12%) note the strategy "Create scholarships for teachers completing National Board Certification or stipends for teachers who have already earned their National Board Certification" is ineffective. Disaggregated data show the perceived effectiveness of the retention strategies are mostly similar by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

Table 31. Effectiveness of Grant-Supported LEA Teacher Retention Strategies, 2023

Strategy	All LEAs			By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	VE	IE	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Strengthening mentor program	274	36%	0%	23 (34%)	41 (43%)	210 (35%)	30 (26%)	19 (42%)	50 (36%)	175 (37%)	6 (33%)	86 (34%)	182 (37%)
Providing or increasing stipends for mentors	208	43%	1%	23 (52%)	25 (44%)	160 (41%)	26 (50%)	17 (52%)	33 (39%)	132 (41%)	5 (20%)	61 (36%)	142 (47%)
Providing or increasing stipends for other duties	241	40%	2%	24 (45%)	34 (50%)	183 (37%)	29 (41%)	16 (43%)	43 (32%)	153 (41%)	4 (50%)	72 (33%)	165 (43%)
Hiring additional substitutes, aides, or paraprofessionals	221	39%	5%	13 (53%)	32 (53%)	176 (35%)	19 (42%)	18 (33%)	37 (40%)	147 (39%)	4 (25%)	65 (43%)	152 (38%)
Planning time or fill rates for time-off requests	196	40%	3%	13 (61%)	27 (59%)	156 (34%)	16 (56%)	16 (43%)	37 (35%)	127 (38%)	4 (25%)	60 (43%)	132 (38%)
Scholarships for National Board Certification	74	31%	12%	6 (50%)	10 (50%)	58 (25%)	8 (25%)	3 (66%)	12 (16%)	51 (33%)	2 (50%)	19 (26%)	53 (32%)
Addressing working condition issues	294	35%	2%	21 (42%)	47 (46%)	226 (32%)	30 (46%)	22 (22%)	56 (33%)	186 (35%)	4 (25%)	95 (30%)	195 (37%)
Addressing students' social-emotional needs*	209	32%	2%	18 (61%)	28 (32%)	163 (28%)	27 (40%)	20 (25%)	34 (32%)	128 (30%)	5 (40%)	72 (34%)	132 (29%)
Addressing teachers' social-emotional needs*	223	30%	2%	21 (57%)	27 (37%)	175 (26%)	28 (42%)	24 (29%)	36 (25%)	135 (29%)	6 (50%)	75 (29%)	142 (30%)
Professional learning opportunities	283	35%	1%	20 (50%)	42 (35%)	221 (33%)	31 (48%)	22 (27%)	53 (30%)	177 (34%)	5 (40%)	98 (31%)	180 (36%)
Teacher voice and leadership opportunities**	268	32%	1%	22 (45%)	41 (46%)	205 (27%)	32 (43%)	20 (20%)	50 (34%)	166 (30%)	5 (40%)	89 (30%)	174 (32%)

Note. n = Number of grantees who chose the answer choices of "Very effective" (VE), "Somewhat effective" (SE), or "Ineffective" (IE). Those who did not answer the question or chose "Did not use" were excluded from the analyses. The percentage of SE can be calculated by subtracting the sum of VE and IE from 100%. For the disaggregated data (i.e., by priority level, locale, and size), the percentages in parentheses are those who chose "Very effective." There were statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees \*at priority level I and at priority level III, and \*\*at priority level II and at priority level III. Appendix B has the full descriptions of the retention strategies in DESE's guidance document.

For those lead contacts who indicated one or more of their strategies is "Very effective," they were asked to elaborate on why they think so. **Many lead contacts believe the grant-supported strategies they use are very effective because those strategies are driven by the needs that their teachers identify.** By meeting those needs, LEAs give teachers voice and choice as well as ownership of their learning.

*These strategies were effective because they were driven by the staff. We listened to their needs specifically and responded.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Incorporating teacher voice is incredibly effective when it comes to teacher retention. We need to ask them what makes them feel appreciated and what will make them want to stay. We cannot just assume what they want.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*Our teacher surveys specifically identified teacher needs and our PDC developed training opportunities directly related to the needs identified in the survey.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

Lead contacts indicate their strategies boost teacher motivation and increase satisfaction.

*We were able to show our appreciation to our teachers who always go above and beyond. Teachers are motivated by being financially supported.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*Interview data demonstrate a higher degree of satisfaction with the increased pay and hiring of additional substitutes.*

-LEA (PL2; Suburb; Medium)

**Some lead contacts believe their strategies are effective because they focus on improving school climate and culture.**

*The culture and climate surveys gave us insight into areas teachers felt could be improved. Using the teacher retention grant to address these areas has helped boost the culture, the climate, and the morale of staff.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Culture and climate were the major issues. This grant helped to improve both greatly.*

-LEA (PL2; Town; Small)

Several lead contacts highlight the strategies of providing extensive support to new teachers and their mentors, and hiring additional substitute teachers.

*Our most effective strategy was implementing a new mentor program to follow new hires through their first five years. We have had extremely positive results.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Hiring additional substitute teachers was extremely effective in boosting staff morale and retaining teachers. Additionally, being able to pay staff when they had to cover for absent teachers was very effective.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

A few lead contacts elaborate on those strategies they did not find as effective. They note a lack of interest in earning National Board Certification or participating in trainings on social-emotional learning.

*We had no teachers interested in the National Board Certification.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Our teachers were not willing to participate in social-emotional activities or utilize any of that type of support we could provide.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Some lead contacts indicate they also use other strategies to retain teachers. One is supporting teachers to earn advanced degrees or get certified in hard-to-staff areas.

*We offer tuition reimbursement for teachers seeking to attain their masters.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*I used funds to support teachers who received additional certification in high-need areas identified in our district such as science and SPED.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Some other strategies include hiring additional staff members, providing on-site childcare, and improving school facilities.

*Teachers requested additional support with student behaviors and special education so we added behavior specialist and special education teacher mentor/coach positions.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*Funds were used to remodel a teacher's lounge to increase staff well-being.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Our survey results indicated childcare was the biggest barrier for those who wished to stay. We started a daycare program with the funds to support teachers.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

## Perceived Impacts of the LEA Teacher Retention Grants

**Many lead contacts indicate they are seeing indicators of success of their teacher retention grants.** As Table 32 shows, lead contacts believe they are seeing indicators of success in terms of retaining experienced, high-quality teachers (62%), providing stronger early career professional development (46%), and improving student achievement (45%).

Disaggregated data show differences in lead contacts' responses. For example, compared to their peers in other LEAs, higher percentages of lead contacts for large LEAs at priority level I in cities indicate seeing indicators of success in retaining racially/ethnically diverse teachers.

Table 32. Perceived Impacts of the LEA Retention Grants, 2023

Are you seeing indicators of success of your retention grant in terms of...?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Retaining racially/ethnically diverse teachers PL1 > (PL2, PL3)* City > (Suburb, Town) > Rural* Large > Small*	467	14%	69%	13%	9%	72%	17%	15%	6%	36%	17%	12%
Retaining male teachers PL2 > PL3*	467	33%	45%	46%	29%	44%	24%	36%	32%	27%	28%	35%
Retaining experienced, high-quality teachers Small > Large*	467	62%	62%	72%	60%	64%	45%	64%	63%	27%	57%	65%
Retaining teachers in specific content areas (e.g., special education, math, science)	467	42%	48%	51%	40%	38%	33%	41%	44%	18%	36%	46%
Improving teacher onboarding experiences	467	44%	48%	50%	43%	46%	36%	48%	44%	18%	48%	44%
Providing stronger early career professional development	467	46%	48%	44%	46%	56%	33%	49%	46%	27%	51%	44%
Retaining teachers in schools in hard-to-staff locations City > Suburb* Small > Medium*	467	37%	52%	38%	36%	51%	21%	33%	39%	36%	29%	41%
Providing customized support to schools related to teacher retention	467	34%	41%	37%	33%	41%	29%	41%	32%	36%	37%	33%
Collaborating with community partners	467	23%	38%	18%	23%	33%	17%	28%	21%	36%	27%	21%
Improving student achievement City > (Suburb, Rural)*	467	45%	66%	49%	43%	67%	29%	47%	44%	27%	43%	47%

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees.

**From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher retention grants.** They point to successes in such areas as improving student achievement, retaining experienced and high-quality teachers, and retaining teachers in hard-to-staff schools (see Table 33). As an example, in 2022, 19% of lead contacts indicated seeing growth in student achievement. One year later, that percentage increased to 45%, more than double the percentage in 2022.

Table 33. Perceived Impacts of LEA Retention Grants, 2022 vs. 2023

Are you seeing indicators of success of your retention grant in terms of...?	2022		2023	
	n	%Yes	n	%Yes
Retaining racially/ethnically diverse teachers*	282	8%	467	14%
Retaining male teachers*	282	17%	467	33%
Retaining experienced, high-quality teachers*	283	29%	467	62%
Retaining teachers in specific content areas (e.g., special education, math, science)*	281	23%	467	42%
Improving teacher onboarding experiences	NA	NA	467	44%
Providing stronger early career professional development	NA	NA	467	46%
Retaining teachers in schools in hard-to-staff locations*	280	18%	467	37%
Providing customized support to schools related to teacher retention*	281	21%	467	34%
Collaborating with community partners*	281	16%	467	23%
Improving student achievement*	277	19%	467	45%

Note. The prompt was "Are you seeing early indicators of success of your teacher retention grant in terms of...?" in 2022. \*There was a statistically significant difference among the responses in 2022 and 2023.

In interviews and survey comments, many LEA lead contacts indicate their grants contribute to the retention of teachers.

*We have retained 100% of the teachers who participated in the grant based on the strategies provided by DESE.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*We have retained several hard-to-find teachers (math, special education, and reading interventionist) by utilizing these funds.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Lead contacts believe the grants help improve the onboarding experiences for new teachers.

*We improved our new teacher onboarding and mentoring program with this grant.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*We were able to increase onboarding for new teachers from half a day to two days.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Medium)

Many lead contacts elaborate on the multiple indicators of success of their grants.

*We were able to retain teachers, improve culture, improve student achievement, and collaborate with community partners more effectively with the support of this grant.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*Supports given through the grant have increased staff morale which directly impacts job satisfaction and indirectly impacts student achievement.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

## Public Reporting and Sharing

As reflected in Table 34, **most lead contacts indicate they consider teachers and school leaders as key stakeholders for their teacher retention grants.** In addition, many lead contacts identify their central office leaders (82%) and school boards (80%) as key stakeholders.

Table 34. Key Stakeholders for Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

Who do you consider as key stakeholders for your LEA's teacher retention grant?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
School board • Rural > (Suburb, Town)* • Small > Medium*	475	80%	77%	84%	80%	73%	69%	66%	86%	82%	72%	84%
Central office leaders • Medium > Small*	475	82%	83%	87%	81%	80%	91%	87%	80%	100%	93%	76%
School leaders (e.g., principals, assistant principals) • Small > Large*	475	93%	93%	94%	92%	98%	84%	92%	93%	73%	91%	94%
Teachers	475	94%	93%	97%	93%	93%	87%	90%	96%	82%	92%	95%
Parents • Rural > Town* • Small > Medium*	475	46%	50%	52%	44%	53%	36%	31%	50%	45%	35%	51%
Students	475	46%	50%	51%	45%	50%	38%	39%	49%	36%	41%	49%
Local community • PL2 > PL1* • Rural > City*	475	41%	23%	52%	40%	23%	31%	40%	45%	45%	38%	42%
DESE/RPDC/MTDS	475	39%	40%	45%	37%	35%	40%	34%	40%	45%	42%	37%
Other (e.g., EPPs/CCs, advocates)	475	3%	3%	0%	3%	5%	4%	2%	2%	9%	3%	2%

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between the responses from grantees.

**Most LEAs indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their retention grants with key stakeholders once or twice a year** (see Table 35).

Table 35. Frequency of Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

How frequently has your LEA shared or reported on results to-date of your teacher retention grant with key stakeholders?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n	%	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Once a year	239	51%	45%	51%	52%	49%	48%	52%	52%	55%	48%	53%
Twice a year	95	20%	17%	24%	20%	31%	14%	17%	21%	9%	20%	21%
Three times a year	14	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	2%	5%	2%	9%	3%	3%
Four times a year or more frequently	28	6%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%	9%	7%	5%
My LEA has not shared or reported on results to-date with key stakeholders.	91	19%	28%	16%	19%	10%	29%	20%	19%	18%	22%	18%

Note. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

For those LEAs that have not shared or reported on results with key stakeholders, some lead contacts indicate they plan to do so by the end of the school year.

*We will share an annual summary of the grant implementation and our plans for the next year based on those results over the summer each year.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Medium)

*We plan to share the data at the conclusion of the 2022–23 school year.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

As reflected in Table 36, the majority of LEAs have shared or reported on results to-date via websites/social media or via reports/newsletters.

Table 36. Methods for Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

How has your LEA shared or reported on results to-date of your teacher retention grant?	All LEAs		By Priority Level			By Locale				By Size		
	n*	%**	I	II	III	C	S	T	R	L	M	S
Shared via websites and/or social media	83	17%	20%	13%	18%	20%	11%	20%	17%	9%	21%	16%
Shared via reports and/or newsletters	196	41%	27%	51%	41%	43%	27%	42%	43%	45%	42%	41%
Shared via other ways (e.g., board meetings, faculty meetings)	137	29%	37%	22%	30%	38%	40%	28%	26%	45%	27%	29%

Note. This question allows the respondent to choose one or multiple answer choices. \*n = Number of grantees who have shared or reported on results to-date via this way. \*\*The percentages were calculated based on the number of all teacher recruitment grantees. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from grantees by LEA priority level, locale, or size.

### Key Points on Effectiveness of Strategies, Impacts of Grants, and Public Reporting

- Nearly all lead contacts believe the retention strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.
- From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher retention grants.
- Most LEAs indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their retention grants with key stakeholders once or twice a year.

In interviews and survey comments, LEA lead contacts identify a number of factors which enhance or impede the implementation of their teacher retention grants. They also highlight a variety of supports they need for purposes of teacher retention. Some of the factors and supports have been previously reported (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b).

### Enhancing Factors for LEA Teacher Retention Grants

**Many LEA lead contacts appreciate the availability of financial resources to support their teacher retention efforts.**

*The funding the grant has provided has allowed us to have a full-time substitute in place, a luxury we haven't had before.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Having the monies from the state was a critical piece in our ability to provide our teacher retention stipends.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

**Lead contacts highly value the flexibility in how the funds can be used.** This allows them to customize the support of their grants to address their LEA's unique needs.

*The grant allowed each district to implement changes that would directly impact their school. It was open and flexible and focused on the needs of the individual district.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*The flexibility to implement the teacher retention grant program to meet the needs of our district enhances the implementation of the grant.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

**Lead contacts value the effective, ongoing support from DESE.**

*The DESE assistance has been very effective and informative.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*Our district has traditionally had a high retention rate, but I do think this grant was beneficial to our district. It is a step in the right direction from DESE.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Easy to understand guidance and application process enhanced the implementation.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

Lead contacts also note teacher input, school community support, and opportunities to learn from other LEAs enhance the implementation of their retention grants.

*Teacher input was the most important factor in the implementation of our teacher retention grant.*

-LEA (PL2; Suburb; Medium)

*The district through the leadership of the superintendent is 100% committed to retaining effective teaching staff and has done so through an "All-Hands" approach.*

-LEA (PL1; Suburb; Medium)

*Collaboration with other districts about what they have done to create support for their staff enhanced the implementation of the grant.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

In the study of the three LEAs, several district administrators and principals indicate participation in the Missouri Leadership Development System (MLDS) supports the recruitment and retention of teachers.

*MLDS helps with retention. It provides a good support system for principals. They can take ideas from other principals, implement them, and prepare for changes. It also provides principals with resources and information.*

-LEA Administrator

*MLDS gives administrators support. Principals network with other school leaders and increase their contacts. If you are searching for an applicant, you can share the information. The networking and collaboration are essential.*

-LEA Administrator

*MLDS has made me a better instructional leader. Each time I become more effective in areas MLDS focuses on, I become more effective in retaining teachers.*

-Principal

## Emerging Issues for LEA Teacher Retention Grants

### **Lead contacts again highlight continuing challenges related to changes in LEA leadership and the lack of personnel to effectively implement their grants.**

*The change in superintendents created some challenges because there were challenges with handing off the plans for the grant.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We are a small school, and do not have an adequate number of staff members to take on every grant program handed out by the State. The influx of guidance documents and documentation requirements is too much to take on for one person.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

### **Many lead contacts reiterate the size of the grant may not be sufficient to effectively address the challenges related to teacher retention.**

*This grant is not enough to provide salary increases and sustain them. That is what is needed in order to attract teachers to the profession and keep them.*

-LEA (PL1; Town; Medium)

*It is really not a significant amount of money to make an impact on teacher retention.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

### **Another challenge many lead contacts highlight is the time-limited nature of the grants.**

*The fact that the grant ends is the biggest obstacle. We used the money for additional personnel and stipends. We don't have the ability to sustain this when the grant ends.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

*It's hard to decide in which manner to apply the resources. We ultimately decided for a one-time purchase so we didn't have sustainability issues. There are many avenues in which we could use this funding, but we had concerns about its sustainability.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**A number of lead contacts indicate the lack of substitute teachers impedes the implementation of their grants.**

*The unavailability of substitute teachers and teachers in general in a competitive marketplace for them will likely always impede our recruitment and retention efforts.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*Being located in a very rural area creates hardships related to availability of substitutes.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Substitutes are still hard to find. With these funds we could assure some jobs filled, but not all of those open. It improved the system, but did not fix it.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

**A few lead contacts believe the current conditions of the teaching profession impede the effectiveness of their teacher retention grants.**

*The lack of resources across the financial spectrum of education in Missouri continues to make teacher retention nearly impossible.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Impeding factors include: Missouri teacher pay, a growing lack of support and respect for teachers, the continual attacks on public education by some legislators and media.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

**Additional Support Needed by LEA Teacher Retention Grantees**

**Lead contacts continue to hope for sustained funding over a longer period of time.**

*Additional funding for teacher retention efforts would be very beneficial.*

-LEA (PL1; City; Small)

*We would love to see continued financial support from the state for this program.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*Additional funding to provide high-quality professional development would positively impact teacher retention as well as student learning outcomes.*

-LEA (PL3; City; Small)

Lead contacts highly value the support from the DESE team for the implementation of their grants. Within this context, **lead contacts express a desire for more guidance from DESE related to grant implementation and opportunities to learn from similar LEAs.**

*We could use more guidance from DESE. We feel like we are an island trying to figure this out on our own. We know the intentions of the grant but we are having a difficult time implementing a quality program.*

-LEA (PL3; Rural; Small)

*Shared ideas from other, similar, districts would be helpful.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*We have different challenges. It should not be a one-size-fits-all. It would be better to learn from similar districts, perhaps forming a cohort of similar districts.*

-LEA (PL1, Suburb; Medium)

**Lead contacts reiterate the need for the state to keep elevating the statewide climate and culture in support of the teaching profession.** The strategies may include more funding for higher teacher salary, adjustment to teacher retirement requirements, and positive messaging.

*Monetary support is needed to provide professional wages for a professional job.*

-LEA (PL2; Rural; Small)

*The state needs to look at requirements for teachers. There is a shortage and the retirement requirements could be adjusted to bring back highly qualified teachers.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*We need more positive messaging from state and federal leaders about the teaching profession, not so many negative press being displayed on social media and television.*

-LEA (PL3; Town; Medium)

*LEAs need long-term sustainable solutions to retaining teachers, not short-term funding with additional stipulations and multiple requirements to access the funding. Teacher retention in the long run will be about better access to affordable degrees.*

-LEA (PL3; Suburb; Medium)

## Summary

LEA lead contacts continue to indicate they implement their retention grants with fidelity. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts. Most lead contacts agree that, overall, their data suggest their grants contribute to their teacher retention efforts.

Nearly all lead contacts believe the retention strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective. From 2022 to 2023, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate seeing indicators of success of their teacher retention grants.

Lead contacts highlight the availability of financial resources and the effective, ongoing support from DESE as factors that enhance their retention efforts. They also identify challenges such as changes in LEA leadership and the lack of personnel, and the time-limited nature of the grants, as barriers to the implementation of their teacher retention grants.

# CHAPTER FIVE: EPP/CC TEACHER RECRUITMENT GRANTS

This chapter focuses on the implementation and impacts of EPP/CC teacher recruitment grants.

## General Knowledge and Beliefs

**In 2022 and 2023, EPP/CC lead contacts believe the purpose of the grant is clear and they know support is available from MTDS. They note a high level of commitment in their EPP/CC to and support from the community for their teacher recruitment efforts.**

As Table 37 shows, across the two years, all EPP lead contacts and most CC lead contacts agree the purpose of the grant is clear. They also indicate they know where to get information about the grant and that help is available from MTDS. They believe their EPPs/CCs are committed to teacher recruitment and the local community supports their efforts.

Table 37. General Knowledge and Beliefs, 2022 and 2023

Survey Prompt	Year	Educator Preparation Programs				Community Colleges			
		n	A	U	D	n	A	U	D
The purpose of the teacher recruitment grant is clear to me.	2022	42	100%	0%	0%	9	100%	0%	0%
	2023	39	100%	0%	0%	12	83%	17%	0%
I know where to get information about the teacher recruitment grant.	2022	42	90%	10%	0%	9	89%	11%	0%
	2023	39	90%	8%	3%	12	75%	8%	17%
I understand that help is available for the implementation of my teacher recruitment grant from members of the Missouri Teacher Development System (MTDS).	2022	42	79%	14%	7%	9	78%	11%	11%
	2023	39	79%	10%	10%	12	75%	8%	17%
There is a high level of commitment in my educator preparation program/community college to teacher recruitment.	2022	42	95%	5%	0%	9	78%	11%	11%
	2023	39	95%	5%	0%	12	83%	17%	0%
The local community supports my educator preparation program's/community college's teacher recruitment efforts.	2022	42	90%	7%	2%	9	89%	11%	0%
	2023	39	95%	5%	0%	12	100%	0%	0%

Note. A = Total Agree, a composite of strongly agree/agree. U = Undecided. D = Total Disagree, a composite of strongly disagree/disagree. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from EPP and CC grantees, respectively, in 2022 and 2023.

## Modifications from Initial Application to Year One Full Implementation

**Some lead contacts indicate their EPPs/CCs have been approved to make modifications to their recruitment grant strategies, particularly the fiscal support strategies and the budgetary allocations.** As Table 38 shows, higher percentages of lead contacts indicate they have received approvals to modify their fiscal support strategies (21% of EPPs and 33% of CCs), and budgetary allocations (13% of EPPs and 50% of CCs).

Table 38. Modifications to EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants, 2023

Please indicate if you have been approved to make modifications to your teacher recruitment grant strategies.	Educator Preparation Programs			Community Colleges		
	n	Yes	No	n	Yes	No
Partnerships	39	13%	87%	12	25%	75%
Recruitment strategies	39	13%	87%	12	42%	58%
Selection strategies	39	5%	95%	12	8%	92%
Preparation strategies (e.g., learning opportunities and experiences)	39	10%	90%	12	8%	92%
Fiscal support strategies (e.g., scholarships, stipends)	39	21%	79%	12	33%	67%
Evaluation of effectiveness of grant strategies and/or activities	39	5%	95%	12	8%	92%
Budgetary allocations	39	13%	87%	12	50%	50%
Public sharing of grant progress and/or outcome data	39	3%	97%	12	8%	92%

In interviews and survey comments, some EPP/CC lead contacts indicate that, due to changing circumstances, they reallocated the funds for more intensive support to teacher candidates.

*We added a K–12 partner and increased the amount of money a student could be given because we didn't have as many candidates/ schools interested as we had hoped.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We reallocated the funds to provide three additional teacher education scholarships, one additional textbook scholarship, and one additional MoGEA stipend.*

-Community College

They believe the modifications allow them to address emerging issues.

*We were approved to modify the grant to meet the discovered needs of our EPP.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*It was necessary to modify various strategies and expenditures in the initial application in order to increase and aid in successful teacher recruitment. We felt that the modifications better served our teacher recruitment goals.*

-Educator Preparation Program

### Key Points on General Knowledge and Beliefs, and Modifications to Grant Strategies

- EPP/CC lead contacts indicate the purpose of the teacher recruitment grant is clear and they understand support is available from MTDS.
- They believe there is a high level of commitment in their EPP/CC to and support from the local community for their teacher recruitment efforts.
- Some EPP/CC lead contacts indicate they have been approved to modify their grant strategies, particularly the fiscal support strategies and the budgetary allocations.

## Quality of Implementation

**EPP/CC lead contacts believe the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants is as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.** As reflected in Table 39, in both years, the majority of lead contacts for EPPs (87–88%) and CCs (78–83%) believe they implement their grants with fidelity.

Table 39. Quality of Implementation, 2022 vs. 2023

My educator preparation program/community college is...	Year	Educator Preparation Programs				Community Colleges			
		n	A	U	D	n	A	U	D
Implementing the grant as designed.	2022	41	88%	12%	0%	9	78%	11%	11%
	2023	39	87%	13%	0%	12	83%	17%	0%
Using research-based strategies included in DESE's guidance document for the grant.	2022	41	83%	17%	0%	9	78%	22%	0%
	2023	39	77%	23%	0%	12	67%	33%	0%
Utilizing data to monitor the progress of grant implementation.	2022	41	83%	17%	0%	9	100%	0%	0%
	2023	39	90%	10%	0%	12	67%	33%	0%
Using an evaluation approach that helps to understand the grant's impacts.	2022	41	78%	22%	0%	9	89%	11%	0%
	2023	39	82%	15%	3%	12	50%	42%	8%
Assigning sufficient personnel to implement the grant.	2022	41	76%	20%	5%	9	56%	22%	22%
	2023	39	82%	8%	10%	12	33%	33%	33%
Using technology to help manage the grant implementation.	2022	41	76%	22%	2%	9	67%	22%	11%
	2023	39	79%	10%	10%	12	50%	42%	8%
Collaborating with partners during the grant implementation.	2022	41	90%	7%	2%	9	89%	11%	0%
	2023	39	90%	8%	3%	12	83%	17%	0%

Note. A = Total Agree, a composite of strongly agree/agree. U = Undecided. D = Total Disagree, a composite of strongly disagree/disagree. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from EPP and CC grantees, respectively, in 2022 and 2023.

Most EPP lead contacts (76–90% in 2022 and 77–90% in 2023) also indicate their institutions assign sufficient personnel, collaborate with partners, and use research-based strategies, data, and technology to support the implementation of their grants. While CC lead contacts generally concur with these statements, they agree to a lesser extent (56% in 2022 and 33% in 2023) that their institutions assign sufficient personnel for their grants.

## Effectiveness of EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants

**Most EPP/CC lead contacts agree that, overall, the analysis of the data they collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.** As Table 40 shows, the majority of lead contacts for EPPs (24, or 62%) and CCs (6, or 50%) agree with the survey prompt, while 12 EPP lead contacts (or 31%) and 3 CC lead contacts (25%) are undecided.

Table 40. Overall Effectiveness of EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants, 2023

Overall, the data our EPP/CC has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher recruitment efforts.	Educator Preparation Programs		Community Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree or Agree	24	62%	6	50%
Undecided	12	31%	3	25%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	0	0%	0	0%
Not applicable*	3	8%	3	25%

Note. \*\*"Not applicable" = "Not applicable. Our EPP/CC is not tracking data that indicate which strategies are working best, working well, or not working at all."

**Some EPP/CC lead contacts indicate the survey data they have collected suggest their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts** (see Table 41).

Table 41. Survey Data and Effectiveness of EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants, 2023

The survey data that our EPP/CC has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher recruitment efforts.	Educator Preparation Programs		Community Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree or Agree	9	23%	5	42%
Undecided	8	21%	3	25%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	0	0%	0	0%
Not applicable*	22	56%	4	33%

Note. \*\*"Not applicable" = "Not Applicable. Our EPP/CC has not collected survey data."

EPP/CC lead contacts indicate the survey data show an increased interest of teacher candidates in becoming teachers and the grant contributes to their teacher recruitment efforts.

*The survey participants indicated the teacher recruitment grant funds encouraged them to continue their studies toward becoming a state certified teacher.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We collected survey data from 20 high school students. All of them said the dual credit course positively influenced their decision to become a teacher, mostly by helping them see themselves in classrooms through their experiences.*

-Community College

**Some lead contacts also indicate the analysis of their interview/focus group data suggests the grant strengthens their teacher recruitment efforts** (see Table 42).

Table 42. Interview/Focus Group Data and Effectiveness of EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants, 2023

The interview/focus group data that our EPP/CC has collected show the grant contributes to improvement in our teacher recruitment efforts.	Educator Preparation Programs		Community Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree or Agree	10	26%	1	8%
Undecided	3	8%	2	17%
Disagree or Strongly Disagree	0	0%	0	0%
Not applicable*	26	67%	9	75%

Note. \*"Not applicable" = "Not Applicable. Our EPP/CC has not collected interview/focus group data."

In their applications, EPP/CC grantees indicated they would use a variety of quantitative data to measure the effectiveness of their teacher recruitment grants. Table 43 compares the responses from EPP/CC grantees to the measures, identified in the Phase I evaluation (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b), at the baseline (i.e., the point in time before the grant was implemented) and Year One full grant implementation.

For example, both the baseline and the Year One data are available for 14 EPP grantees who used the number of recruitment event participants to measure the effectiveness of their grants. At the baseline, an average of 53.9 participants attended a recruitment event at the 14 EPPs, and at Year One full implementation, that number increased to 122.6 (i.e., an average increase of 68.7 participants). The change from the baseline to Year One is positive and statistically significant.

As Table 43 shows, **most of the changes from the baseline to Year One full implementation are positive.** This suggests the grants contribute to the recruitment efforts of EPPs and CCs.

Table 43. Quantitative Data and Effectiveness of EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants, 2023

Measure	Educator Preparation Programs			Community Colleges		
	N	Baseline Mean	Year One Mean	N	Baseline Mean	Year One Mean
Number of recruitment event participants	14*	53.9	122.6	1	0.0	25.0
Number of EPP/CC teacher education program applicants	13	87.4	113.3	3	88.0	94.3
Number of EPP/CC teacher education program student retention	5	36.6	37.2	0	NA	NA
Percent of EPP/CC teacher education program student retention	6	88%	89%	1	60%	55%
Number of EPP/CC teacher education program graduates	10	41.7	40.4	1	21	28
Percent of EPP/CC teacher education program graduates	1	100%	100%	0	NA	NA
Number of EPP/CC teacher education program graduates who get certified/licensed	6	46.7	49.0	1	0	0
Percent of EPP/CC teacher education program graduates who get certified/licensed	6	98%	92%	0	NA	NA

Note. \*There was a statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between baseline and Year One.

Some EPP/CC lead contacts indicate they have collected other data (e.g., inquiries, connections) to measure the effectiveness of their teacher recruitment grants.

*Applicants Admitted: 35% at baseline and 53% at Year One. Inquiries Received: 46 at baseline and 232 at Year One.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We ran social media campaigns from July 2022 to March 2023 with the following results: Reach: 103,700. Engagements: 2,000. Link clicks to website: 1,700. Inquiry forms completed: 66.*

-Community College

### Key Points on Quality of Implementation, and Effectiveness of the Grants

- EPP/CC lead contacts agree the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants is as designed. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts.
- Most EPP/CC lead contacts agree that, overall, the data they have collected show the grant contributes to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.

## Effectiveness of Grant-Supported EPP/CC Recruitment Strategies

Table 44 shows the perceived effectiveness of EPP/CC lead contacts of their recruitment strategies. For example, 20 EPP lead contacts provided an effectiveness rating (i.e., “Very effective,” “Somewhat effective,” or “Ineffective”) of the strategy “Partner with LEAs to develop learning opportunities for students.” Of those 20 EPP lead contacts, 50% chose “Very effective,” 0% “Ineffective,” and 50% “Somewhat effective” (i.e., by subtracting 50% and 0% from 100%).

**Nearly all EPP/CC lead contacts believe their recruitment strategies are very effective or somewhat effective.** Within this context, 31% of the 13 EPP lead contacts indicate it is ineffective to “Host a celebratory event to announce high school students who have decided to enter a teacher education program and invite parents, mentor teachers, and administrators.”

In addition, responses from EPP/CC lead contacts suggest the strategy to “Collaborate with state and regional teacher leaders to identify opportunities for supporting GYO program efforts” is having mixed results. Of the 18 EPP lead contacts, only 33% agree the strategy is very effective while 11% find it ineffective. Of the six CC lead contacts, 0% agree the strategy is very effective while 33% find it ineffective.

Table 44. Effectiveness of Grant-Supported EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Strategies, 2023

Strategy	Educator Preparation Programs			Community Colleges		
	n	Very Effective	Ineffective	n	Very Effective	Ineffective
Partnerships						
Partner with LEAs to develop learning opportunities for students	20	50%	0%	7	29%	14%
Network with GYO program coordinators and developers	21	43%	5%	5	40%	0%
Host events to connect high school students to teacher education programs and personnel	27	63%	0%	9	33%	0%
Host events with potential teacher education candidates and community members	21	62%	5%	6	33%	17%
Collaborate with state and regional teacher leaders	18	33%	11%	6	0%	33%

Strategy	Educator Preparation Programs			Community Colleges		
	n	Very Effective	Ineffective	n	Very Effective	Ineffective
Provide informational trips for high school/middle school students and teacher candidates	19	47%	5%	5	40%	0%
Recruitment and Selection						
Host events for students or send them to existing, external events	30	53%	3%	10	50%	0%
Create materials that promote the teaching profession (e.g., brochures, t-shirts)	29	55%	3%	9	56%	0%
Develop announcements featuring prominent individuals talking about the importance of teachers in their lives	18	44%	0%	3	0%	0%
Arrange for guest speakers, campus visits, and other field trips for secondary school students	23	48%	4%	6	67%	0%
Host a celebratory event to announce high school students who have decided to enter a teacher education program	13	46%	31%	1	0%	0%
Preparation and Support						
Connect with high school students participating in GYO teaching clubs or activities	23	48%	9%	9	56%	11%
Provide guest speakers, campus visits and other field trips for secondary students participating in GYO teaching clubs or activities	14	50%	0%	3	33%	0%
Establish dual credit, dual enrollment, or other creative learning opportunities	21	48%	0%	8	63%	0%
Establish scholarships for students based on their involvement in recruitment activities	15	67%	7%	7	57%	0%
Provide university employment opportunities for students based on their involvement in GYO recruitment programs	6	67%	0%	0	NA	NA
Provide scholarships for tuition or room and board attached to involvement in a GYO program	15	67%	7%	3	100%	0%

Note. n = Number of grantees who chose the answer choices of "Very effective" (VE), "Somewhat effective" (SE), or "Ineffective" (IE). Those who did not answer the question or chose "Did not use" were excluded from the analyses. The percentage of SE can be calculated by subtracting the sum of VE and IE from 100%. Appendix C has the full descriptions of the recruitment strategies in DESE's guidance document.

**EPP/CC lead contacts believe the strategies they use are very effective because they build student interest in their teacher education programs and the profession.**

*We hosted many campus visits. We also did several visits to high schools to share about our program and create interest for teaching. This was very effective.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Communication is key when recruiting candidates to the profession. Meeting with students at college fairs and district-sponsored events was very beneficial.*

-Community College

In addition, **EPP/CC lead contacts indicate their strategies are very effective because they focus on building strong partnerships with LEAs.**

*These strategies are effective because all involved collaborate to solve the same problem.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Our program was able to build on and expand our relationship with the teaching academy at the partner LEA. This is a relationship we have had for many years, but this grant made it possible to deepen that relationship and create a stronger pathway.*

-Community College

**EPP/CC lead contacts underscore the value of the support from GYO coordinators.**

*Our work with GYO coordinators has helped to spread the word to high school students that we have a teacher education program.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Networking with GYO coordinators helped to establish our dual enrollment program.*

-Community College

In addition to utilizing the strategies included in DESE's guidance document, some EPP/CC lead contacts indicate they also use other strategies for teacher recruitment. One strategy is working with internal offices and external organizations.

*We partnered with our Office of Diversity and Inclusion to recruit students from underrepresented groups. Given that some students were highly involved in activities in the ODI office, it was a great way for us to spread the word about our program.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We made a connection with Troops to Teachers which is a federal organization that allowed us to use email to connect with military personnel about our teacher education programs during their time of transition out of military service.*

-Educator Preparation Program

Some other grantees provide additional support to students (e.g., a second major in education, targeted scholarships).

*Efforts toward program expansion by offering more opportunities for current students to consider a second major in education have been most successful in increasing enrollment in our teacher education degree programs.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We have focused on retaining our male students of color by offering them scholarships as well as providing them with professional development opportunities.*

-Educator Preparation Program

Also, some EPP/CC lead contacts indicate they promote their programs through state conferences and social media platforms.

*We attended the MoASPA and presented about the Para to Pro Program. It was very beneficial getting the information to human resource professionals across the state.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We created a few ads in PeachJar and STL American. We also created a video promoting our program that we have added to our website.*

-Community College

## Perceived Impacts of the EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants

As Table 45 shows, **from 2022 to 2023, on many indicators, higher percentages of EPP/CC lead contacts indicate seeing signs of success of their teacher recruitment grants.** Higher percentages of EPP lead contacts note increased interest in the teacher positions (45% vs. 77%) and larger teacher candidate pools (53% vs. 77%). Most of the changes for CC lead contacts are also positive.

In interviews and survey comments, EPP/CC lead contacts indicate there is a stronger interest in their teacher education programs and the teaching profession.

*We have seen a rise in "buy-in" to the field from our students from the opportunities we have been able to give them through this grant. The students we have recruited and retained appear to be more connected to the profession through our ongoing efforts.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*The recruitment materials and financial support, through scholarships, seem to have deepened students' interest and investment in the career pathway.*

-Community College

Table 45. Perceived Impacts of the EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants, 2022 vs. 2023

Are you seeing indicators of success of your teacher recruitment grant in terms of...?	Educator Preparation Programs				Community Colleges			
	2022		2023		2022		2023	
	n	%Yes	n	%Yes	n	%Yes	n	%Yes
Increasing interest in the teacher positions*	40	45%	39	77%	9	44%	12	75%
Building a larger teacher candidate pool*	40	53%	39	77%	8	50%	12	58%
Recruiting racially/ethnically diverse teacher candidates	40	35%	39	54%	9	33%	12	25%
Recruiting male teacher candidates	40	35%	39	51%	9	22%	12	33%
Recruiting teacher candidates in specific content areas (e.g., special education, math, science)	40	20%	39	38%	9	33%	12	33%
Providing customized support to teacher candidates	40	55%	39	62%	9	44%	12	67%
Collaborating with local education agencies (LEAs)	40	63%	39	74%	9	67%	12	83%
Collaborating with community partners	38	55%	39	46%	9	56%	12	33%

Note. The prompt was “Are you seeing early indicators of success of your teacher recruitment grant in terms of...?” in 2022. \*There was a statistically significant difference among the responses from EPP grantees in 2022 and 2023. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses from CC grantees in 2022 and 2023.

EPP/CC lead contacts also indicate their enrollments are increasing.

*Our enrollment in the teacher education program is up. This grant has provided avenues to help lessen the financial burdens of extra costs our students encounter.*

-Community College

*The number of underrepresented populations who are entering our EPP program has significantly increased. The number we have in SPED has also increased.*

-Educator Preparation Program

EPP/CC lead contacts believe their grants help to build stronger partnerships.

*We have had success in collaborating with school districts and community partners to gain access to unique platforms to share our programs.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We are definitely building better relationships with LEAs through GYO and Teacher Academies.*

-Community College

## Public Reporting and Sharing

As Table 46 shows, **most EPP/CC lead contacts indicate they consider their teacher education program leaders and faculty as key stakeholders for their recruitment grants.** In addition, most EPP lead contacts (72%) consider DESE/RPDC/MTDS as their key stakeholder.

Table 46. Key Stakeholders for Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

Who do you consider as key stakeholders for your EPP's/CC's teacher recruitment grant?	Educator Preparation Programs		Community Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
DESE/RPDC/MTDS	39	72%	12	58%
Local community	39	44%	12	58%
EPP/CC teacher education program leaders	39	85%	12	75%
EPP/CC teacher education program faculty	39	72%	12	67%
EPP/CC other program, department, and/or school leaders and faculty members	39	62%	12	67%
Grant partner(s) (e.g., LEAs, other EPPs/CCs)	39	62%	12	67%
Other (e.g., teacher candidates, students)	39	5%	12	0%

**Most EPPs and some CCs indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their recruitment grant with key stakeholders once or twice a year** (see Table 47). The majority of CCs (67%) indicate they have not shared or reported on results to-date.

Table 47. Frequency of Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

How frequently has your EPP/CC shared or reported on results to-date of your teacher recruitment grant with key stakeholders?	Educator Preparation Programs		Community Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Once a year	10	26%	3	25%
Twice a year	13	33%	1	8%
Three times a year	1	3%	0	0%
Four times a year or more frequently	6	15%	0	0%
My EPP/CC has not shared or reported on results to-date with key stakeholders	9	23%	8	67%

Some grantees indicate they are collecting the data and planning to share the results.

*We are still collecting and analyzing data.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*We are planning to share with stakeholders at our first annual gala.*

-Educator Preparation Program

As Table 48 shows, the majority of EPP/CC lead contacts indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date via such ways as advisory group/board meetings, or faculty meetings.

Table 48. Methods for Public Reporting and Sharing, 2023

How has your EPP/CC shared or reported on results to-date of your teacher recruitment grant (e.g., grant progress, findings, recommendations)?	Educator Preparation Programs		Community Colleges	
	n	%	n	%
Shared via websites and/or social media	7	18%	0	0%
Shared via reports and/or newsletters	10	26%	1	8%
Shared via other ways (e.g., advisory group/board meetings, faculty meetings)	21	54%	4	33%

Note. This question allows the respondent to choose one or multiple answer choices. n = Number of grantees who have shared or reported on results to-date via this way. The percentages were calculated based on the number of all teacher recruitment grantees.

### Key Points on Effectiveness of Strategies, Impacts of Grants, and Public Reporting

- Nearly all EPP/CC lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective.
- From 2022 to 2023, on many indicators, higher percentages of EPP/CC lead contacts indicate seeing signs of success of their teacher recruitment grants.
- Most EPPs and some CCs indicate they have shared or reported on results to-date of their teacher recruitment grants with key stakeholders once or twice a year.

In interviews and survey comments, EPP/CC lead contacts identify a number of factors which they believe enhance or impede the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants. They also highlight a variety of supports they need for purposes of teacher recruitment. Some of the factors and supports have been previously reported (Liang & Slotnik, 2022b).

### Enhancing Factors for EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants

**Lead contacts continue to underscore the importance of support from EPP/CC faculty and leaders. They also highlight the importance of engaging current college students in teacher recruitment.**

*[Enhancing factors include] Motivated undergraduate teacher education students who want to attract more future teachers, and committed faculty, staff, and administrators.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Hiring student ambassadors to share information regarding our teacher education programs [enhances the implementation].*

-Educator Preparation Program

**A number of EPP/CC lead contacts believe collaboration with LEAs and community partners enhance the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants.**

*Partnering with school districts has been most effective in implementing the grant.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*The strong connection with the LEA was a boost to this program's performance.*

-Community College

**EPP/CC lead contacts appreciate the availability of financial resources to support their teacher recruitment efforts.**

*The budget has been very helpful.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Word of mouth that we are putting moneys towards future educators. It has been nice to be able to say Missouri is putting money into the education profession again.*

-Community College

Strong partnerships and funding resources together promote shared responsibilities between LEAs and higher educational institutions for addressing the teacher shortage.

*Partnerships between IHEs and P-12 partners are essential. There is not a pipeline for teachers, but a cycle: P-12 students become teachers and return to teach in P-12. Funds supporting that full cycle purposefully, from both sides, have been very effective and helped focus attention on both sides in a targeted way.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*These grants were two-fold: Both the LEA and the EPP had grants and could collaborate and share costs and goals, which helps to stretch the money.*

-Educator Preparation Program

**Lead contacts indicate the support from DESE helps with the implementation of their grants.** They appreciate the flexibility of using the grant funding.

*Open communication with DESE staff when questions about the grant arise [enhances the implementation].*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Having the freedom to use the funds as each college sees fit [enhances the implementation].*

-Community College

Two EPP lead contacts highlight factors that enhance implementation (i.e., regional GYO meetings, and the grant's alignment with best practices).

*[Participation in] The regional GYO meetings hosted by our RPDC [enhances the implementation].*

-Educator Preparation Program

*This grant is strongly aligned with national accreditation standards for best practices. It makes it easy to implement the grant.*

-Educator Preparation Program

## Emerging Issues for EPP/CC Teacher Recruitment Grants

**Many EPP/CC lead contacts are concerned about the grant timeline. They express a strong desire for more time to implement their teacher recruitment grants.**

*We needed more time to get ideas going for Grow Your Own and to create Memorandums of Understanding and to collaborate with high schools.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*The entire process of application, distribution, and design has impeded the process. Originally it was understood that it would be a three year grant, not including the application process. The timeframe and disorganization of the communication process has been very frustrating.*

-Community College

*We were originally told this grant would be carried over for three years. The first year was spent applying for the grant, then the grant deadline got moved up a year, so we've been asked to spend money within the timeframe of a year.*

-Community College

**Some EPP/CC lead contacts continue to express their concern about the current public perceptions of the teaching profession.** The low status of teachers makes it challenging to recruit students interested in teaching.

*Unfortunately, there are factors outside of the EPPs that impede implementation. This may include, but not be limited to: low teacher pay, negative publicity about the teaching profession, and the partisan politicalization of schooling.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Our program struggled to get interested students to attend the campus visits. Many students seemed either neutral or dispassionate about the career path.*

-Community College

**Some lead contacts are also concerned about challenges related to the size of the grant and the lack of sufficient personnel for effective grant implementation.**

*I appreciate there was some funding, but this was such a small amount that it is going to be difficult to make any difference.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*My CC is a very small institution. I am the one (and only) teacher education instructor, academic advisor, and co-curricular sponsor. It has been hard to find time to complete reports/implementation of the grant effectively.*

-Community College

## Additional Support Needed by EPP/CC Recruitment Grantees

**EPP/CC lead contacts hope to build, programmatically and financially, on what they have achieved thus far and expand their teacher recruitment efforts.**

*We are just now seeing payoff from our efforts. Additional funding would allow us to build on this momentum. It would allow us to partner closely with more school districts, provide uncertified teachers with the advising support they need to pursue certification, and continue to provide financial assistance to our males of color.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*This was our first attempt to conduct this kind of targeted recruitment and retention effort in our teacher education program. If another opportunity is made available, we would be interested in learning from this round to continue to develop the program.*

-Community College

**EPP/CC lead contacts also want to receive continued support and guidance from DESE.** It includes, but is not limited to, more resources (e.g., examples of successful strategies, lists of schools providing various opportunities), and an extended timeline for grant implementation.

*[We need a] List of schools that offer teaching pathways programs, GYO programs, teaching academies, and so on.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*[We need] A larger timeframe to show progress. We don't have enough data collected. We are not able to determine if our grant activities were effective.*

-Community College

*Examples of activities that have been the most successful in teacher recruitment would be beneficial. We could use resources, such as people and materials, to assist in planning events and marketing.*

-Educator Preparation Program

**EPP/CC lead contacts also hope the state can further promote the profession and strengthen the support to teacher candidates** (e.g., by conducting statewide campaigns, revising certification requirements).

*More positive marketing on why it is a good time to become an educator from the state level. The media is portraying teachers in such a negative light.*

-Educator Preparation Program

*Encouragement from DESE or elsewhere for non-participating districts to offer the dual credit and dual enrollment opportunities that have produced positive results.*

-Community College

*We should be addressing some of the policy and structure of educator certification that creates barriers for students to finish. Funding doesn't make a difference if we have unrealistic certification requirements for high-needs fields like math and science.*

-Educator Preparation Program

## Summary

EPP/CC lead contacts continue to indicate they are implementing their teacher recruitment grants with fidelity. They are generally positive about the quality of their grant efforts. Most EPP/CC lead contacts agree that, overall, the data they have collected show their grants contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment efforts.

Nearly all lead contacts believe the recruitment strategies they use are very effective or somewhat effective. From 2022 to 2023, on many indicators, higher percentages of EPP/CC lead contacts indicate seeing signs of success of their teacher recruitment grants.

Lead contacts highlight support from EPP/CC faculty and leaders, and collaboration with LEAs and community partners as factors that enhance their recruitment efforts. They also identify challenges such as the grant timeline, and the current public perceptions of the teaching profession, as barriers to the implementation of their teacher recruitment grants.

## CHAPTER SIX: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Lead contacts for LEAs, EPPs, and CCs across the state continue to indicate they are implementing their teacher recruitment and retention grants with fidelity. They believe the grants contribute to improvements in their teacher recruitment and retention efforts.

Building on the accomplishments to date, the following recommendations are intended to assist DESE in providing more targeted support to LEAs, EPPs, and CCs.

### Recommendations

*Provide additional clarification and guidance on the timeline of grant implementation.* In both years, grantees highly value the guidance from DESE related to applications and grant implementations. They believe the ongoing support from DESE contributes to the effectiveness of their recruitment and/or retention efforts to-date.

Responses from some grantees, however, indicate there has been a level of confusion related to the timeline of the grant implementation. The grantees also express desire for more time so they can maintain their momentum, build on what they have achieved so far, and further strengthen their efforts. To continue to provide grantees with the quality guidance they need, DESE should clarify the timeline for grant implementation, and resolve any existing uncertainties related to the possibility of grant extensions.

*Provide more customized sharing and learning opportunities for grantees.* Many grantees highly value the opportunities to share with and learn from other grantees of ideas and effective practices. In particular, when such opportunities are customized to accommodate local contexts and meet individual needs, grantees find these learnings more relevant and impactful. DESE should continue to convene the grantees at bi-annual forums to share (a) emerging issues in teacher recruitment and retention; and (b) innovative practices and/or successful strategies for addressing those challenges. Wherever feasible, these forums should include sessions, tailored to groups which share common concerns (e.g., by priority level, locale, size).

*Strengthen the support to EPP and CC grantees.* Educator preparation programs and community colleges play key roles in the teacher pipeline. Data show, however, that their lead contacts have concerns on the effectiveness of collaborating with state and regional teacher leaders to identify opportunities for supporting GYO program efforts. In addition, two-thirds of lead contacts for CCs indicate they have not shared or reported on results to-date of their teacher recruitment grant with key stakeholders.

To better understand how DESE can help EPP and CC grantees to strengthen the implementation of their grants, DESE should convene special meetings for EPPs and CCs, respectively, so that the grantees can share (a) the major challenges they are facing; and (b) what additional support DESE can provide to further strengthen the implementation of their grants. In addition to promoting sharing and collaboration among EPPs and CCs, the meetings can help DESE to learn of new challenges as they emerge.

*Support the professional growth of more MLDS principals on teacher recruitment and retention.* Both LEA lead contacts and research highlight the pivotal role principals play in teacher recruitment and retention. Anecdotal evidence from the study of the three LEAs also suggests that developing principals as strong leaders, through the statewide MLDS program, improved teacher recruitment and retention outcomes. To more effectively address teacher shortages, DESE should keep extending the reach of the MLDS program and facilitate the professional growth of more principals across the state with a focus on teacher recruitment and retention.

*Expand efforts to promote the teaching profession.* Numerous lead contacts for LEAs, EPPs, and CCs reiterate the state should continue to improve the status of the teaching profession. To address teacher shortages, the state has launched multiple initiatives including, but not limited to, modifying the retirement system, forming the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Blue Ribbon Commission, and issuing teacher baseline salary grants. DESE should build on these initiatives by launching a promotional campaign with the theme, *Missouri Teaches*. The purpose of the campaign should be to promote the value of teaching and enhance the statewide climate and culture for the profession.

## Conclusion

Teacher recruitment and retention grantees across the state continue to indicate they implement their grants with fidelity. They believe the grants effectively contribute to improvement in their teacher recruitment and retention efforts. The foundation for catalyzing innovation and achieving better results is now in place.

## REFERENCES

- Blaushild, N. L., Mackevicius, C., & Wigger, C. (2023). *Investigating the “draw of home” and teachers’ career decisions*. (EdWorkingPaper: 23-826). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/rcph-kq599>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Camp, A., Zamarro, G., & McGee, J. (2023). *Teacher turnover during the COVID-19 pandemic*. (EdWorkingPaper: 23-757). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/akme-z405>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2023). *Using ESSER to strengthen Missouri’s educator workforce*. <https://ccsso.org/blog/using-esser-strengthen-missouris-educator-workforce>
- Diliberti, M. K., & Schwartz, H. L. (2023). *Educator turnover has markedly increased, but districts have taken actions to boost teacher ranks*. RAND Corporation. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RRA956-14.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA956-14.html)
- Hanshaw, A. (2023). *New law tackles Missouri teacher shortage by encouraging retirees to return to classroom*. Missouri Independent. <https://missouriindependent.com/2023/07/13/new-law-tackles-missouri-teacher-shortage-by-encouraging-retirees-to-return-to-classroom/>
- Jones, C. (2022). *Teacher shortage? Depends where you look*. EdSource. <https://edsource.org/2022/teacher-shortage-depends-where-you-look/677497>
- Kraft, M. A., Conklin, M., & Falken, G. (2022). *Preferences, inequities, and incentives in the substitute teacher labor market*. (EdWorkingPaper: 22-680). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/tb06-3m94>
- Kraft, M. A., & Lyon, M. A. (2022). *The rise and fall of the teaching profession: Prestige, interest, preparation, and satisfaction over the last half century*. (EdWorkingPaper: 22-679). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/7b1a-vk92>
- Liang, G., & Slotnik, W. J. (2022a). *Evaluation of the Missouri Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants: Phase I report*. Community Training and Assistance Center. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/oeq-rr-grantevaluation2022>
- Liang, G., & Slotnik, W. J. (2022b). *Evaluation of the Missouri Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants: Phase II report*. Community Training and Assistance Center. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/evaluation-mo-teacher-rr-grants-phase-ii-508>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2021a). *Teacher education grants*. [https://www.mo-mtds.net/uploads/1/3/2/0/132027746/teachereducationgrants\\_1\\_.pdf](https://www.mo-mtds.net/uploads/1/3/2/0/132027746/teachereducationgrants_1_.pdf)
- Evaluation of the Missouri Teacher Recruitment and Retention Grants: Phase III Report

- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2021b). *Teacher recruitment and retention grants*. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/oeq-rr-eligibilityandfunding>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2022). *Teacher recruitment and retention grant*. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/oeq-teacherrecruitmentretentiongrants>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2023a). *Educator vacancy*. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/vacancy-data>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2023b). *Grow Your Own Grant (state funds): Application & guidelines*. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/gyo-guidance>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2023c). *Report on teacher workforce*. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/teacher-workforce-data-2023>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2023d). *Teacher recruitment and retention Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations*. <https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/brc-recommendations-summary>
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (n.d.). *Teacher baseline salary grants*. <https://dese.mo.gov/educator-quality/recruitment-retention>
- Morgan, A. J., Nguyen, M., Hanushek, E. A., Ost, B., & Rivkin, S. G. (2023). *Attracting and retaining highly effective educators in hard-to-staff schools*. (EdWorkingPaper: 23-772). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/svep-pd41>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *ELSI table generator*. <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/tableGenerator.aspx>
- Nguyen, T. D., Lam, C. B., & Bruno, P. (2022). *Is there a national teacher shortage? A systematic examination of reports of teacher shortages in the United States*. (EdWorking Paper: 22-631). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/76eq-hj32>
- Nowak, A. D., Perrone, F., & Smith, P. S. (2023). *How do homeowners, teachers, and students respond to a four-day school week?* (EdWorkingPaper: 23-721). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/3nyp-gk81>
- Redding C., & Nguyen, T. D. (2023). *Teacher working conditions and dissatisfaction before and during the COVID-19 pandemic*. (EdWorking Paper: 23-830). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://edworkingpapers.com/ai23-830>
- Santelli, F. A., & Grissom, J. A. (2022). *A bad commute: Does travel time to work predict teacher and leader turnover and other workplace outcomes?* (EdWorkingPaper: 22-691). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/dzsj-wg46>

- Sartain, L., & Estrera, E. (2023). *Follow the leader: Principal characteristics and teachers' labor market decisions*. (EdWorkingPaper: 23-823). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/ai23-823.pdf>
- St. George, D. (2023). *Education slipped and enrollment dropped in the pandemic, report shows*. The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2023/05/24/enrollment-scores-teacher-shortage/>
- U. S. Department of Education. (2023). *Eliminating educator shortages through increased compensation, high-quality and affordable educator preparation and teacher leadership*. <https://www.ed.gov/raisethebar/eliminating-educator-shortages-compensation-preparation-leadership>
- What Works Clearinghouse. (2022). *What Works Clearinghouse procedures and standards handbook, version 5.0*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE). <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks>

## APPENDIX A: LEA TEACHER RECRUITMENT (GROW YOUR OWN) STRATEGIES

### Partnerships

- Host events that connect students to teacher education programs and personnel, including field trips to campuses and observing classrooms with college students.
- Host events that connect students to important community members and stakeholders to demonstrate broad support.
- Provide informational trips to other regional schools to allow students to connect with teachers outside their LEA.
- Provide stipends to teachers and other LEA staff who coordinate any of these activities.

### Recruitment and Selection

- Provide events for students or send them to existing events to build their interest in the teaching profession (e.g., Opportunity Fairs, College and Career Nights, college campus visits).
- Create materials that promote the teaching profession like brochures, banners, posters, etc.
- Develop announcements featuring prominent individuals talking about the importance of teachers in their lives and the teaching profession.
- Provide guest speakers, campus visits, and other field trips to middle school students to begin their consideration of the teaching profession.
- Host a celebration to announce high school students entering a teacher education program and invite parents, mentor teachers, and administrators.
- Provide stipends to teachers and other LEA staff who coordinate any of these activities.

### Preparation and Support

- Invite students to participate in a Teacher Academy, Future Teachers of America chapter, Educators Rising chapter, and/or Teacher Cadet Opportunity.
- Establish dual credit, dual enrollment opportunities, and/or scholarships to support students' education about the teaching profession.
- Provide LEA employment to students as a before/after school care aid, tutor, substitute assistant, summer school job, etc.
- Provide scholarships for tuition, room, and/or board for students taking teacher education courses.
- Provide extra duty stipends or release time for teachers who serve as sponsors for academies, chapters, clubs, or serve as future teacher mentors.

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2022).

## APPENDIX B: LEA TEACHER RETENTION STRATEGIES

- Strengthen the mentor program for early career teachers.
- Provide or increase stipends for mentors of new teachers.
- Provide or increase stipends for other duties not contractually specified. These might include stipends to participate in intensive tutoring sessions for students; coordinate the Grow Your Own (or Future Teachers of America, Teacher Cadet, or Educators Rising) program in the LEA; facilitate after school programs or specific student clubs, etc.
- Hire additional substitute teachers, aides, or paraprofessionals to provide further support to teachers.
- Hire additional substitute teachers, aides, or paraprofessionals to ensure dedicated teacher planning time or to increase fill rates for time-off requests.
- Create scholarships for teachers completing National Board Certification or stipends for teachers who have already earned their National Board Certification.
- Utilize culture and climate surveys to determine and address working condition issues.
- Provide training to teachers on strategies for addressing the social-emotional needs of their students.
- Provide services that address the social-emotional needs of teachers.
- Provide professional learning opportunities to teachers based on needs identified by staff.
- Increase teacher voice and teacher leadership opportunities.

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2022).

## APPENDIX C: EPP/CC TEACHER RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES

### Partnerships

- Partner with LEAs to develop learning opportunities for students to promote the teaching profession.
- Network with GYO program coordinators and developers to support GYO program development and implementation.
- Host events to connect high school students to teacher education programs and personnel, including field trips to campuses and observing classrooms with college students.
- Host events with potential teacher education candidates and important community members and stakeholders who demonstrate broad support for the teaching profession.
- Collaborate with state and regional teacher leaders to identify opportunities for supporting GYO program efforts.
- Provide informational trips for high school/middle school students and teacher candidates that allow students to connect with teachers, EPP staff, MTDS resource people, and important professional organizations.

### Recruitment and Selection

- Host events for students or send them to existing, external events to build their interest in the teaching profession (e.g., Opportunity Fairs, College and Career Nights, college campus visits).
- Create materials that promote the teaching profession, such as brochures, t-shirts, window clings, pins, etc.
- Develop announcements featuring prominent individuals talking about the importance of teachers in their lives and the teaching profession.
- Arrange for guest speakers, campus visits, and other field trips for secondary school students to begin their consideration of the teaching profession.
- Host a celebratory event to announce high school students who have decided to enter a teacher education program and invite parents, mentor teachers, and administrators.

### Preparation and Support

- Connect with high school students participating in a Teacher Academy, Future Teachers of America chapter, Educators Rising chapter, and/or Teacher Cadet Opportunity.
- Provide guest speakers, campus visits, and other field trips for secondary students participating in GYO teaching clubs or activities to promote the teaching profession.
- Establish dual credit, dual enrollment, or other creative learning opportunities to support high school students' education about the teaching profession.
- Establish scholarships for students based on their involvement in recruitment activities.

- Provide university employment opportunities for students based on their involvement in GYO recruitment programs to assist in their transition from the high school to college campus.
- Provide scholarships for tuition or room and board attached to involvement in a GYO program for students taking teacher education courses or participating in an educator preparation program.

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2021a).