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What we will cover today:
• Explore the most recent data on educator diversity in Pennsylvania
• Introduce new research to learn from Black teachers about how to improve recruitment and retention.
• Discuss how RFA is using research to support PEDC.
Nationally the percentage of students of color was 2.5 times greater than the percentage of teachers of color.

In contrast, in 2022-23, the percentage of students of color in Pennsylvania was 5.8 times greater than the percentage of teachers of color.
Change in Percentage of Students and Teachers of Color in PA, 2013-14 to 2022-23

Students of Color

Teachers of Color

2013-14: 30.5%
2014-15: 31.4%
2015-16: 32.2%
2016-17: 33.1%
2017-18: 33.8%
2018-19: 34.9%
2019-20: 35.8%
2020-21: 36.6%
2021-22: 37.2%
2022-23: 38.1%
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THE LEAKY PIPELINE OF TEACHER DIVERSITY IN PENNSYLVANIA

Why these leaks?

* Based on SY 2020-21
Educational opportunity gaps drive disparities in high school graduation and college enrollment for Pennsylvania’s students of color.
THE LEAKY PIPELINE OF TEACHER DIVERSITY IN PENNSYLVANIA

*Based on SY 2020-21

36.6% total students of color
30.8% high school graduates of color
27.3% college bound graduates of color

13.7% teacher prep enrollees of color in PA
11.8% teacher certification test passers of color

? teacher prep graduates of color in PA
? teacher certification recipients of color

? prepared out-of-state and/or emergency certified applicants of color

14.1% first year teacher hires of color
lower retention rate for teachers of color

6.2% total teachers of color

RESEARCH FOR ACTION
Lower Retention (higher attrition) of PA’s Teachers of Color

Dr. Fuller, “Research consistently shows that teacher working conditions have a profound impact on teacher attrition.”

* Forthcoming project from RFA showing that race/ethnicity differences in teacher mobility are also related to differences in school funding.
New RFA PACER report found that “teachers, administrators, and other professional staff of color are concentrated in the most inadequately funded and understaffed Pennsylvania school districts that pay less and have greater student needs…” (available at https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/pennsylvania-school-funding-and-school-staffing-disparities/)

![Figure 1: PA Districts by Per Pupil Adequacy Shortfall](image1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District Category</th>
<th>Per Pupil Adequacy Shortfall Range</th>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Funding</td>
<td>$0 or less</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Shortfall</td>
<td>$1 to $1,527</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Shortfall</td>
<td>$1,528 to $2,546</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Shortfall</td>
<td>$2,547 to $3,466</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Shortfall</td>
<td>$3,467 to $9,720</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 2. Teachers per 1,000 Students in Districts by Funding Adequacy Category, 2019-20](image2)

- Adequate Funding (73 districts): 76.1 teachers
- Low Shortfall (107 districts): 69.6 teachers
- Moderate Shortfall (106 districts): 68.9 teachers
- High Shortfall (107 districts): 68.6 teachers
- Very High Shortfall (106 districts): 64.8 teachers
Figure 4. Average Professional Staff Salaries by District Funding Adequacy per Pupil, 2019-20

https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/pennsylvania-school-funding-and-school-staffing-disparities/
Figure 5. Students Characteristics by District Funding Adequacy per Pupil, 2019-20

Greatest student needs

https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/pennsylvania-school-funding-and-school-staffing-disparities/
Most staff of color

https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/pennsylvania-school-funding-and-school-staffing-disparities/
Change in Percentage of Students and Teachers of Color in PA, 2013-14 to 2022-23

What does 6.6% TOCs look like?
In 2022-23, over 1,358 Pennsylvania schools (46% of all schools) and 155 entire school districts (31% of all districts) employed zero teachers of color.

There were 596,852 students (including 103,621 students of color) enrolled in PA schools that only had white teachers.

What does 6.6% TOCs look like?

In 2022-23, over 1,358 Pennsylvania schools (46% of all schools) and 155 entire school districts (31% of all districts) employed zero teachers of color.

There were 596,852 students (including 103,621 students of color) enrolled in PA schools that only had white teachers.
Students of color are more likely to have teachers of color than white students. But most students of color still have very few teachers of color.
Teachers and Students by Race or Ethnicity in Pennsylvania, 2022-23

- Black or African American: 3.8% (Teachers), 14.3% (Students)
- Hispanic: 1.3% (Teachers), 14.3% (Students)
- Asian: 0.8% (Teachers), 4.4% (Students)
- Other: 0.7% (Teachers), 5.2% (Students)
- White: 93.4% (Teachers), 61.9% (Students)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SY</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Total of Color (%)</th>
<th>Black (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic (%)</th>
<th>Asian (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>117,973</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,769,222</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>116,944</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,741,806</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>116,450</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,754,638</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>118,273</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,750,504</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>118,244</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,745,783</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119,308</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,748,437</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119,966</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,751,691</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>120,186</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,718,405</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>121,361</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,606,205</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>122,458</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,736,886</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Men of color make up only 1.6% of Pennsylvania’s teacher workforce.

Women of color make up only 4.9%.

In all of PA, there were 1,191 Black men, 367 Hispanic men, 199 Asian men, and 228 other men of color teaching in public schools.

* State data on gender is limited to male/female and does not reflect other gender identities, such as non-binary.
Distribution of Elementary, Secondary, and Ungraded Teachers by Race/Ethnicity, PA 2022-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>All Teachers of Color</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Philadelphia: Where over half of PA’s teachers of color are employed

Teacher and Student Race/Ethnicity Philadelphia County, 2022-23

- Black: 23.2% (Teacher), 51.0% (Student)
- Hispanic: 4.6% (Teacher), 23.5% (Student)
- Asian: 2.8% (Teacher), 7.5% (Student)
- Other: 4.7% (Teacher), 4.3% (Student)
- White: 64.7% (Teacher), 13.7% (Student)
### Teachers and Students by Race or Ethnicity in Philadelphia County, 2013-14 to 2022-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SY Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total of Color</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013-14</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,270</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>191,814</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014-15</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>190,242</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015-16</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>195,139</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016-17</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,628</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>196,086</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017-18</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,015</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>196,208</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-19</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,688</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>199,242</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019-20</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11,862</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>198,733</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020-21</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12,083</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>193,255</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021-22</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12,241</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>185,867</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2022-23</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12,112</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>182,947</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers by Race/Ethnicity in the School District of Philadelphia, 2000-01 to 2022-23

White: 61.9% to 65.6%
Black: 33.7% to 21.4%
Hispanic: 6.3% to 5.2%
Asian: 0.0% to 4.9%
Other: 0.0% to 0.7%
Teachers by Race/Ethnicity in Philadelphia Charter Schools, 2007-08 to 2022-23

Data not available prior to 2007-08

- White
- Black
- Hispanic
- Asian
- Other


Percentage distribution by race/ethnicity from 2007-08 to 2022-23.
22 Year Change in **Number** of Philadelphia County Teachers by Race or Ethnicity (2000-01 to 2022-23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year and Sample</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total TOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01 (12,051 District Teachers)</td>
<td>12,051</td>
<td>7,453</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23 (7,921 District Teachers and 4,191 Charter School Teachers)</td>
<td>12,112</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>4,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Year Change</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>-1,250</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>-324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What happened to 1,250 Black teachers in Philadelphia?

“Worn & Weary” Black Teachers’ Storied Experiences and Recommendations around their Attrition and Retention in Philadelphia Schools

Leana Cabral, Lynnette Mawhinney, Jill Pierce, Carmina Hachenburg
Date: November 2022

RFA’s prior research also found a steep decline in both the number and percentage of Black teachers in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County’s public schools in recent decades.

Yet little formal research has been conducted into the reasons for that decline.

(https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/faq-allegheny-county-teachers-of-color/)
Allegheny County Black Teacher Study

We are currently conducting a research study with the goal of deepening community understanding of structural constraints to recruiting and retaining Black teachers within the region’s K-12 school systems.

• Research Questions:
  ▪ How do current and former Black teachers understand the attrition of Black teachers from the teacher workforce in Allegheny County?
  ▪ What systemic factors—from the school to district to policy level—contribute to Black teacher attrition in Allegheny County?
  ▪ What specific supports, systems, and resources are needed to support retention and curb attrition of teachers of color and Black teachers in particular?
  ▪ What promising practices and efforts are being pursued to diversify the teacher workforce in Allegheny County?
  ▪ What reported outcomes, if any, are these initiatives and efforts producing?
Qualitative Data Collection

• Conducted interviews and focus groups designed to learn directly from experiences and perspectives of Black educators on teacher attrition, as well as leaders of initiatives focused on recruiting and retaining teachers of color.

• Sample includes 44 participants:
  • 29 current teachers
  • 9 former teachers
  • 6 field leaders

• Current and former teachers who participated represent:
  • 23 different PPS schools
  • 4 other AC Districts (Mt. Lebo, Quaker Valley, South Fayette, Sto-Rox)
  • 4 charters/networks (Propel, Environmental Charter, City Charter, Penn Hills)
  • Every grade (K-12)
  • Multiple subjects (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, Specials/Electives, CTE)
Community Engagement

Research team has been advised by a Research Advisory Council (RAC)

- Formulated through connections/partnership with PEDC
- Includes members of the community who are involved with and lead educator diversity efforts, K-12 education, higher ed, and teacher education
- The RAC has now evolved into the Research Practice Learning Community, as it now includes current teachers who participated in the study in addition to the RAC members.
Research Progress and Next Steps

• Research team is currently analyzing the qualitative data we’ve collected to determine the key takeaways.

• Next steps include:
  • Determining the format of the final product through a collaborative process with the RPL
  • Finalizing and disseminating the final product, through collaboration with the RPL
  • Planning a convening for this fall
Technical Support to PEDC’s work in Allegheny County

• In addition to the AC Black Teacher Study, RFA received funding to collaborate and provide technical assistance to PEDC’s work in Allegheny County. This has included:
  • Analysis of teacher mobility data by race & ethnicity (forthcoming report summer 2023).
  • Regular updates to the network
  • Literature review and scan on the metrics that other teacher diversity initiatives are using to measure progress.
Scan of Teacher Diversity Initiatives: Background/Research Questions

At PEDC's request, RFA is conducting a national scan to identify common benchmarks and indicators of progress for teacher diversification efforts across the U.S.

1. What types of teacher diversity initiatives are being implemented?
2. Are there established categories for initiative types? If not, how might initiatives be categorized?
3. What indicators of success are initiatives using to measure progress?
4. Do different types of efforts (individual, collaborative, or collective impact) tend to focus on different goals or indicators of success?
**Key Findings:** The 47 Scanned Initiatives fit into 11 Categories

**Educator diversity initiative categories**

*Note: Total is greater than 47 because some initiatives are classified in more than one category.*

- Collaboration/Consortium
- Committee/Working Group
- Funding/Grant
- Grow-Your-Own
- Immersion Program
- Mentorship/Affinity Group
- Recruitment Network
- Scholarship Program
- Teacher Fellowship
- Teacher Preparation
- Teacher Residency

![Bar chart showing the distribution of initiatives across categories.](chart_image)
Key Findings: Geographic Focus of Initiatives

Geographic Classification

- Local (15 total) 31.9%
- State (15 total) 31.9%
- National (17 total) 36.2%
Key Findings: Indicators of Success

Approximately half of the initiatives scanned (23 total) shared the indicators used to measure progress or impact. The identified indicators of success included the following measures:

1. **Program participants**: number of participants and/or percentage participants of color.
2. **Participant outcomes**: graduation rates, percentage earning teacher credential, percentage or number hired by a school or district or broader job placement in education, and/or participant or member retention.
3. **Program reach**: number of students or sites (such as school districts or schools) served by participants/teachers, and/or number of sites or organizations participating in the initiative.
4. **Teacher recruitment and/or retention**: number of teachers recruited, number of teachers retained, and/or reduction in teacher attrition.
5. **Program effectiveness**: measured by external evaluations and/or participant feedback or testimonies.
6. **Funding**: amount of funding provided and/or number of funding, grant, or scholarship recipients.
Key Findings: Considerations

1. We did not identify any initiatives that created a collective shared measurement system across multiple educator diversity initiatives.

2. It may be worth further examination of shared measurement systems used by consortiums outside the field of educator diversity.

3. Multiple measures may provide more descriptive understanding of regional progress.
Bibliography of RFA’s Teacher Diversity Research


• The Need for More Teachers of Color https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/the-need-for-more-teachers-of-color/

• Patching the Leaky Pipeline: April 2018 brief examines the leaks in Pennsylvania’s teacher pipeline contributing to a lack of diversity and highlights promising practices found across the country that could increase teacher diversity. https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/patching-the-leaky-pipeline/


• FAQ: Allegheny County Teachers of Color: April 2021 FAQ examines the state of teacher diversity in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. https://www.researchforaction.org/research-resources/k-12/faq-allegheny-county-teachers-of-color/
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