

2016 TENNESSEE TEACHER PREPARATION REPORT CARD

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The Teacher Preparation Report Card captures the abilities of Tennessee preparation providers to train new teachers for success in Tennessee's classrooms. The report card presents data on a variety of metrics to provide an overall picture of how well each provider is able to prepare effective teachers and meet state goals.

Tennessee has produced a Teacher Preparation Report Card since 2009, although the 2016 Report Card marks a significant redesign. The 2016 Report Card contains three scored domains: Candidate Profile, Employment, and Provider Impact. Each domain is comprised of two to four metrics, and the report includes two years of provider data.

The goal of the redesigned Teacher Preparation Report Card is to create a userfriendly tool that provides focused information about providers, the effectiveness of graduates, and promotes stakeholder conversations about continuous improvement. A summary of results is provided in this state level report, and individual provider reports can be found here: <u>http://teacherprepreportcard.tn.gov/</u>.

PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES



DOMAIN SUMMARY

Candidate Profile 3 SCORED METRICS 20 POINTS AVAILABLE	The Candidate Profile domain evaluates the provider's ability to recruit a strong, diverse cohort of candidates and prepare them to teach in the content areas of greatest need.
Employment 2 SCORED METRICS 15 POINTS AVAILABLE	The Employment domain evaluates a provider's performance in preparing educators to begin and remain teaching in Tennessee public schools.
Satisfaction	Not yet available.
Provider Impact 4 SCORED METRICS 40 POINTS AVAILABLE	The Provider Impact domain reports on the effectiveness of a provider's completers in Tennessee public school classrooms.

STATE COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS

6,000 4,211 3,833 3,000 0 2013-14 2014-15

Percent of Completers by State of Residency



Number of Completers

Completers by Type of Initial Licensure



Percent of Admissions Based on*:



* Providers often consider multiple assessments in the admission process; some candidates were admitted using a former version of the Praxis assessment.

Enrollment by Ethnicity

American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0.3%
Asian		1.2%
Black	-	8.8%
Hispanic/Latino		2.1%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	I	0.1%
White		86.1%
Two more More Races	1	1.4%

Completers by Type of Clinical Practice



OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF PROVIDERS PER PERFORMANCE CATEGORY

In 2016, thirty providers received a scored report card. Seven providers achieved a score that placed them in Category 4, the top performance category. Eight providers placed in Category 3, while eleven providers achieved scores that corresponded to Category 2 performance. Four providers placed in Category 1.



OVERALL COUNT OF PROVIDERS BY PERCENT OF POINTS EARNED



Two institutions, Fisk University and LeMoyne-Owen College, have been omitted from the results because they had fewer than 10 completers when results from 2013-14 and 2014-15 were combined.

STATE SUMMARY RESULTS

PROVIDER NAME	OVERALL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY	CANDIDATE PROFILE	EMPLOYMENT	PROVIDER IMPACT
Aquinas College Number of Completers: 33	NA			
Austin Peay State University Number of Completers: 369	3	2	2	3
Belmont University Number of Completers: 110	2	2	3	1
Bethel University Number of Completers: 71	1	2	1	1
Bryan College Number of Completers: 56	NA			
Carson-Newman University Number of Completers: 167	3	2	3	3
Christian Brothers University Number of Completers: 80	3	(4)	3	3
Cumberland University Number of Completers: 74	4	2	4	4
East Tennessee State University Number of Completers: 465	2	1	2	3
Freed-Hardeman University Number of Completers: 121	3	3	3	3
Johnson University Number of Completers: 51	NA			
King University Number of Completers: 52	NA			
Lee University Number of Completers: 302	2	1	1	2

PROVIDER NAME	OVERALL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY	CANDIDATE PROFILE	EMPLOYMENT	PROVIDER IMPACT
Lincoln Memorial University Number of Completers: 174	1	1	2	2
Lipscomb University Number of Completers: 469	4	3	3	4
Martin Methodist College Number of Completers: 20	NA			
Maryville College Number of Completers: 56	2	2	1	3
Memphis College of Art Number of Completers: 21	NA			
Memphis Teacher Residency Number of Completers: 102	4	3	4	4
Middle Tennessee State University Number of Completers: 711	2	(1)	4	2
Milligan College Number of Completers: 72	1	1	3	1
South College Number of Completers: 34	NA			
Southern Adventist University Number of Completers: 66	NA			
Teach for America - Memphis Number of Completers: 321	4	4	4	4
Teach for America - Nashville Number of Completers: 205	4	4	2	4
Tennessee State University Number of Completers: 109	3	2	4	2
Tennessee Technological University Number of Completers: 756	2	1	2	2

PROVIDER NAME	OVERALL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY	CANDIDATE PROFILE	EMPLOYMENT	PROVIDER IMPACT
Tennessee Wesleyan College Number of Completers: 58	2	1	2	2
The New Teacher Project - Nashville Teaching Fellows Number of Completers: 129	4	4	2	4
Trevecca Nazarene University Number of Completers: 134	2	2	3	1
Tusculum College Number of Completers: 184	2	1	3	2
<u>Union University</u> Number of Completers: 340	4	3	3	4
University of Memphis Number of Completers: 571	3	4	4	3
University of Tennessee - Chattanooga Number of Completers: 399	2	2	3	2
University of Tennessee - Knoxville Number of Completers: 414	3	3	4	4
University of Tennessee - Martin Number of Completers: 433	2	1	4	2
Vanderbilt University Number of Completers: 230	3	4	1	4
Welch College Number of Completers: 14	NA			
Western Governors University Tennessee Number of Completers: 71	1	2	3	1



2016–17 Annual Reports for Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers

Tennessee Department of Education | April 2017

Executive Summary

Since 2008, Tennessee has produced report cards on the performance of Tennessee educator preparation providers (EPPs) that have included information related to candidate academic profile (e.g., GPA and ACT data), placement and retention data, and completer performance data (i.e., individual growth score data). In 2016, the State Board of Education led the redesign of the Report Card to provide a tool that is user-friendly, focused, informative, and accessible. The new *Teacher Preparation Report Card* identifies an overall performance category for Tennessee EPPs based on scoring metrics across three domains.¹ The Report Card is designed primarily for external stakeholders, such as prospective teacher candidates and school districts, to support their understanding of the overall performance of Tennessee's EPPs.

The department saw a need to create a set of reports that is focused on supporting EPP efforts to continuously improve. This will also provide a tool that will be used as a formal part of the accountability process outlined in the state board's Educator Preparation Policy (5.504). In 2015, the department convened a group of stakeholders, including representatives from EPP faculty and local education agencies, to define the set of metrics that would be included in the new *Annual Reports for Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers*.

These reports provide EPPs with information on five domains that each include multiple indicators. In addition to reporting at the EPP level, the Annual Reports offer data disaggregated by clusters of specialty area programs (e.g., middle grades, special populations) and for individual specialty area programs (e.g., biology, secondary mathematics). The Annual Reports also offer highly detailed information. For example, not only do the Annual Reports provide EPPs with information about overall observation ratings, the reports also offer EPPs observation data disaggregated by indicator on the most frequently used state observation rubric.

The detailed, disaggregated data will provide EPPs actionable information that can be used to identify program outcomes and impacts that are particularly strong and areas where there are opportunities for improvement. By disaggregating this data, EPPs should be able to focus efforts on specific programs or program components. Finally, the department expects that over time, not only will these reports provide individual programs with information to support continuous improvement, but also that these reports can be used collectively to identify elements of program

¹ Ultimately, the report card will provide information on four domains and additional indicators. To learn more about the *Teacher Preparation Report Card*, visit: <u>http://teacherprepreportcard.tn.gov</u>.

design that are associated with the development of effective educators. Ultimately, all of Tennessee's EPPs and their candidates, Tennessee's districts and schools, and most importantly Tennessee's students, will benefit from turning this data into information that supports the improvement of educator preparation across the state.

Annual Reports Generation

The 2016-17 *Annual Reports for Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers* (Annual Reports) were developed by the Tennessee Department of Education with support from the State Board of Education and educator preparation providers. The primary sources of data used in the Annual Reports were collected by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission or the 2015 *Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs* and the State Board of Education or the 2016 *Teacher Preparation Report Card*.

Data Included in the 2016-17 Annual Reports

The 2016-17 Annual Reports include data from two cohorts of preparation completers and candidates:

- **Cohort 1** includes individuals who completed preparation between Sept. 1, 2013 and Aug. 31, 2014. In the Annual Reports, this cohort is identified as *2014*.
- **Cohort 2** includes individuals who completed preparation and those who were candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs between Sept. 1, 2014 and Aug. 31, 2015. In the Annual Reports, this cohort is identified as *2015*.

In most cases, data points included on the Annual Reports are representative of both cohorts. Tool tips, boxes of information that appear when a user scrolls over a data point, allow the user to view each cohort separately. In future years, the department plans to include three cohorts of data.

As noted in the 2016 *Teacher Preparation Report Card*, a significant shift between the 2015 and 2016 data collection processes was the inclusion of educators who are enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs. These individuals qualify for a Tennessee teaching license and serve as teacher-of-record while completing preparation. These individuals were not consistently reported in previous years.

Metric values on Annual Reports were suppressed if fewer than six people from an EPP were identified as being included in the metric. This is often the case when data are disaggregated at a

granular level such as endorsement area or clinical type. Like the report card, instructional leader preparation program completers are not included in the Annual Reports.

Data Collection Process

Each EPP provided initial data for the Report Card to the state board. Providers submitted a roster of individuals who completed their preparation programs; in the case of cohort 2, this roster also included job-embedded enrolled candidates. In addition, EPPs provided key demographic and assessment information for all cohort members. The State Board of Education collaborated with EPPs to verify the accuracy of their data submissions. Multiple state databases were used to gather additional information on the reported completers, including license number, observation scores, individual growth scores, and employment data. These data serve as the foundation for the Annual Reports. In addition to data obtained through state databases for the construction of the Report Card, the Annual Reports include assessment data obtained from Educational Testing Services (ETS). Finally, the Annual Reports also include perception data collected through the department's spring 2016 *Tennessee Educator Survey* (candidate satisfaction data) and the fall 2016 *District Survey* (local education agency (LEA) partner satisfaction data).

General Terms and Definitions						
	Clinical practice refers to intensive field-based responsibilities, assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments. These experiences help students develop and demonstrate their preparedness to be effective educators. There are three types of clinical practice: student teaching, internship, and job-embedded.					
Clinical Practice	<i>Student Teaching</i> – Student teaching offers extended opportunity for classroom experience while the student earns course credit toward a degree or certification. Student teaching involves a planned semester of at least 15 weeks that includes full-day teaching and observation activities.					
	<i>Internship</i> – Internships require a full year of clinical practice during which the intern engages in direct teaching activities for at least 100 school days. Activities related to this experience may include classroom teaching, observation, coursework, seminars, and planning.					
	Job-Embedded – Job-embedded candidates receive a license and serve as					

Annual Reports General Terms and Definitions

	a teacher-of-record while enrolled in and completing preparation. The
	2016-17 Annual Reports include both job-embedded enrolled and job-
	embedded completed candidates. Candidates reported as completed
	finished program requirements during the reporting window for the
	Annual Reports, while enrolled have not completed, and remain in
	preparation beyond the end of the reporting period. For the purpose of
	disaggregating data by clinical type on the 2016-17 Annual Reports,
	candidates identified as enrolled and completed are combined.
	A completer is any teacher preparation program candidate who has
	completed licensure requirements and been endorsed for licensure by an
	EPP in one of the cohorts included in the Annual Reports. The 2016 Annual
Completer	Reports include completers from the 2013-14 academic year (cohort 1) and
	the 2014-15 academic year (cohort 2). Those who participated in
	instructional leader preparation programs are not considered completers
	in these reports.
Domain	Domain is used throughout the Annual Reports as a group of subdomains
Domain	that are considered together based on the related nature of their meaning.
	Educator preparation providers, also referred to as providers or EPPs, are
	the universities, colleges, and education-related organizations (EROs) that
	prepare Tennessee educators. The Annual Reports are produced for
	providers that are approved for licensure through the program approval
Educator	process outlined in the Educator Preparation Policy (5.504) adopted by the
	State Board of Education. The Annual Reports build on the reporting levels
Preparation	available in the Report Card by displaying data at the provider level, the
Provider (EPP)	licensure (endorsement) program level within each EPP, and clusters of
	licensure (endorsement) programs within each EPP. In addition, the Annual
	Reports allow providers to disaggregate cohort 2 data by clinical type and
	program type. Due to suppression rules, some providers may not be able
	to view some disaggregated metrics.
	Endorsement areas indicate the subject and/or grade level for which a
	licensed educator is prepared to provide instruction, leadership, or services
Endorsement Area	in schools or districts. When applying for licensure, each teacher candidate
	must meet requirements in at least one area of endorsement, though
	many are endorsed in multiple areas.
Motric	Metric is used throughout the Annual Reports as the calculation performed
IVIELTIC	to quantify a numeric value for a subdomain.
Program Type	Three program types are included in the Annual Reports for cohort 2:

undergraduate, post-baccalaureate non-degree, and post-baccalaureate
degree.
Subdomain is used throughout the Annual Reports as a specific measure
within a domain that is quantified to assess provider and program
performance.
The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) is the system and
rubric used to evaluate most Tennessee public school educators. TEAM is a
comprehensive, student outcomes-based evaluation system that is
designed to promote continuous improvement in the classroom. TEAM
utilizes observation data and student assessment data in order to fairly
evaluate educators and provide a broad view of educator effectiveness,
incorporating both pedagogical effectiveness and student performance
growth. More information on this model can be found on the TEAM
website at http://team-tn.org . In addition to the TEAM system, some
districts use alternative models such as TEM and Project COACH. While
rubrics may vary, these models have been approved by the state board as
acceptable models to use in the evaluation process. Note that the Annual
Reports only include domain and indicator-level observation data for
teachers who were observed using the TEAM rubric.
The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) measures the
impact that teachers have on their students' academic progress. Rather
than measuring proficiency, TVAAS specifically captures student growth to
better represent the effect that teachers and their schools can have on
students. TVAAS is scored from Levels 1-5, with Level 1 representing <i>least</i>
effective, Level 3 representing average effectiveness, and Level 5 representing
most effective.

The metrics are organized into five domains and 19 subdomains:

Domain 1: Recruitment and Selection

Subdomains: Admissions Assessment, Race and Ethnicity, Gender, and High-Needs Endorsement

Domain 2: Employment and Retention

Subdomains: Overall Employment Rate, First Year Employment Rate, Second Year Employment Rate, and Retention Rate

Domain 3: Assessment

Subdomains: Pedagogical Assessment, Literacy Assessment, and Specialty Area Assessment

Domain 4: Completer, Partner, and Employer Satisfaction

Subdomains: LEA Partner Satisfaction and Completer Satisfaction

Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness

Subdomains: Overall Evaluation Ratings, TVAAS Ratings, Observation Ratings, Average Observation Domain Scores, and Average Observation Indicator Scores

EPP Annual Reports: Data Overview



EPP Data Overview

Data Detail

Custom Analysis

User Guide

How has my EPP performed overall, and how has it performed relative to the state average?

Explore high-level data across many domains.

Choose a domain Completer Effectiveness Optional: Show fewer results
Average Observation Domain Scores
Average Observation Indicator Scores
Observation
Overall Ratings
TVAAS Ratings

Overall Ratings	Percentage of Completers with LOE of Level 3 or Higher	93.8%	0		100
TVAAS Ratings	Percentage of Completers with TVAAS of Level 3 or Higher	75%	0		100
Observation	Percentage of Completers with Observation of Level 3 or Higher	95.4%	0		100
Average	Instruction	3.6	1	•	5
Observation	Planning	3.8	1		5
Domain Scores	Environment	4.3	1		5
	Standards and Objectives	3.6	1		5
	Motivating Students	3.9	1		5
	Presenting Content	3.7	1		5
	Lesson Structure and Pacing	3.6	1	()	5
	Activities and Materials	3.7	1	•	5
	Questioning	3.3	1		5
	Academic Feedback	3.5	1		5
	Grouping Students	3.6	1		5
Average	Content Knowledge	4.1	1		5
Observation	Knowledge of Students	3.9	1		5
Indicator Scores	Thinking	3.3	1		5
	Problem Solving	3.2	1		5
	Instructional Plans	4	1	· •	5
	Student Work	4	1	Ū.	5
	Assessment	3.6	1		5
	Expectations	4.1	1		5
	Managing Student Behavior	4.2	1		5
	Environment	4.2	1	Ú	5
	Respectful Culture	4.5	1	l l	5

EPP Annual Reports: Data Detail



EPP Data Overview Data Detail

Custo

Custom Analysis Us

User Guide

How do my EPP's results vary by endorsement area, cluster, clinical type and program type? Choose a domain, and then choose a focus area to compare results across endorsement areas, clusters, clinical types and program types.

 1) Choose a domain Completer Effectiveness Optional: Click to highlight a value Core Academic - Middle and Seco Elementary Education Physical Education and Health Special Populations 	2) Choose a focus area Cluster		 3) Refine your selection Average Observation Domain Average Observation Indicator Observation Overall Ratings TVAAS Ratings 	Scores r Scores
Percentage of Completers with LOE of Level 3 or Higher		0	•• •	100
Percentage of Completers with TVAAS of Level 3 or Higher		0	•	100
Percentage of Completers with Observation of Level 3 or Higher		0		100
Instruction		1		5
Planning		1	••	5
Environment		1		5
Standards and Objectives		1	•••	5
Motivating Students		1		5
Presenting Content		1		5
Lesson Structure and Pacing		1	000	5

EPP Annual Reports: Custom Analysis



EPP Data Overview Data Detail

Custom Analysis

User Guide

How are my EPP's results related, and how do they relate to other EPPs? Select a focus area: program type and Clinical Type OR cluster and endoresment area. Then select individual domains and metrics to build a custom table. Change how the cells are highlighted using the "highlighting method" dropdown to see how your data compare to other EPPs.

Choose a filter type	Choose a Domain:	Choose a Domain:	Choose a Domain:	Choose a Domain:	Choose a Domain:
Program Type / Clinical Type	Recruitment and Sele	Employment and Ret	Employment and Rete	Completer Effectiven	Completer Effectivene
Choose a highlighting method	Choose a Metric:	Choose a Metric:	Choose a Metric:	Choose a Metric:	Choose a Metric:
Choose a highlighting method	Choose a Metric: Percentage of Compl	Choose a Metric: Percentage Employe	Choose a Metric: Percentage Employed	Choose a Metric: Percentage of Compl	Choose a Metric: Percentage of Comple

		Percentage of Completers Endorsed in High-Needs Subject Area	Percentage Employed in Year One	Percentage Employed in Year One or Year Two	Percentage of Completers with LOE of Level 3 or Higher	Percentage of Completers with Observation of Level 3 or Higher
Post-Bacc. Degree	All	63.6%	72.7%	100%	92.3%	100%
	Job-Embedded	87.5%	62.5%	100%	90%	100%
	Student teaching					
Post-Bacc. Non-Degree	All	31.3%	93.8%	100%	100%	90%
	Job-Embedded	33.3%	93.3%	100%	100%	88.9%
	Student teaching					
Undergraduate	All	25%	75%	75%		83.3%
	Job-Embedded					
	Student teaching	14.3%	71.4%	71.4%		



Human Capital Data Report Mock District

This report was compiled using 2015-16 teacher evaluation data and covers a range of human capital topics, including evaluation, growth and development, hiring, retention, and effective teaching gaps. It is intended to be used in coordination with the *Human Capital Self-Assessment Tool*, which is designed to aid in data analysis, present possible strategies for improving human capital management, and aid in prioritizing the implementation of those strategies. Note that 2015-16 TVAAS data is limited to the EOC subjects due to the suspension of the 2016 statewide assessment in grades 3-8. Individual TVAAS data reflects multi-year growth scores when available and single-year growth scores when multi-year growth was not available. Effective Teaching Gap information is calculated from one-year individual TVAAS scores.

Section A: Evaluation

Table 1. Distribution of Scores (2015-16)								
		Teachers with Data	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	
Level of Overall	District	508	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	44.2%	48.4%	
Effectiveness	State	67655	0.1%	1.9%	14.5%	41.9%	41.5%	
Observation	District	512	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	30.0%	50.0%	
Average	State	68205	0.1%	2.0%	18.1%	42.7%	37.1%	
TVAAS School-wide	District	217	20.5%	6.5%	24.0%	17.0%	32.0%	
Growth	State	37916	34.5%	7.6%	13.9%	8.0%	36.0%	
TVAAS Individual	District	58	20.7%	12.3%	29.2%	6.8%	31.0%	
Growth	State	8187	23.0%	10.5%	26.8%	10.8%	28.9%	
Portfolio Individual	District	12	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	20.0%	35.0%	
Growth	State	1845	8.2%	8.8%	21.2%	30.1%	31.7%	
Achievement	District	511	0.7%	3.2%	0.1%	10.0%	86.0%	
Measure	State	67870	7.5%	3.8%	12.5%	17.9%	58.3%	

Note. "Teachers with Data" includes all teachers with evaluation data who do not have partial year exemptions (PYE).

- How do district distributions compare to distributions at the state level? Are there any notable factors unique to the district that may affect these distributions?
- How does the distribution of scores compare across the different measures? If there are large differences, why might this be?
- Which of the available evaluation flexibility options is the district using? Has the district considered additional options to improve evaluation measures and feedback in the district?
- Given the current number of Level 1 and 2 teachers, how should district and/or school resources be allocated to support instruction?



Table 2. Misalignment Between TVAAS/Portfolio Individual Growth Scores and							
Observation Scores (2015-16)							
	Teachers Misaligned by Three or More LevelsPercent Misaligned by Three or More Levels						
District	13	22.6%					
State	1399	14.0%					

Note. Table includes educators with both individual growth and observation scores.

Guiding Questions

- Are there certain schools or observers for which misalignment is more prevalent?
- While perfect alignment between growth and observation is not expected, how can observation practices be strengthened so that observable teaching practice and feedback leads to improved effectiveness?
- How does the district ensure that observers are trained and able to identify strong (and weak) teaching practices and provide accurate, meaningful, and actionable feedback?

Table 3. Number and Percent of Observers Who Are Non-Differentiating (2015-16)						
		Observers with 90+% of Indicators in Two Levels	All Observers			
Number of Observers	District	9	57			
Number of Observers	State	632	3986			
Porcent of Observors	District	15.7%	100%			
Percent of Observers	State	15.9%	100%			
Total Number of	District	89	512			
These Observers	State	10655	68205			

Note. Non-differentiating observers are teacher evaluators whose ratings are nearly all identical across teachers on the instructional indicators of the TEAM rubric. This table includes data for TEAM districts from the 2015-16 indicator-level observation scores entered in TNCompass.

- Are there certain schools or observers for which non-differentiation is more prevalent? What strategies could be employed to address non-differentiation?
- How does the district ensure that observers are able to differentiate between varying levels of teaching practice and provide accurate, meaningful and actionable feedback?
- How can the overall observation process be improved to ensure that teachers receive high quality feedback?



Section B: Growth and Development

Table 4. Change in TVAAS/Portfolio Individual Growth Scores (2014-15 to 2015-16)						
		Individual	Individual	Individual	Individual	Individual
		Growth Score	Growth Score	Growth Score	Growth Score	Growth Score
		(2015-16)	(2015-16)	(2015-16)	(2015-16)	(2015-16)
		1	2	3	4	5
	1	66.6%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	(3 teachers)	(2)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Individual	2	33.3%	33.3%	16.6%	16.6%	0.0%
	(6 teachers)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)
Individual Growth Scores (2014-15)	3 (26 teachers)	7.6% (2)	3.8% (1)	42.3% (11)	15.3% (4)	30.7% (8)
	4 (2 teachers)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	5	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	85.7%
	(14 teachers)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(1)	(12)

Note. Table includes only teachers who had individual growth scores for both 2014-15 and 2015-16.

- Identify which group of teachers the district was most effective at growing. What type of results are these teachers producing?
- Which district-wide practices have led to more improvement of teachers' effectiveness? What other factors may have contributed to the improvements in teachers' individual growth scores?
- What professional development, training, or other supports have resulted in improved effectiveness? What specific supports does the district provide to Level 1 teachers outside the required minimum?
- Identify any regression in individual growth scores. What may have happened?
- Given the current number of Level 1 and 2 teachers, how should district and/or school resources be allocated to support instruction? What strategies are in place to support school administrators who have a high concentration of new or low-performing teachers?



Section C: Hiring

Table 5. New Hires (2015-16) based on Level of Overall Effectiveness (2014-15)								
	Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 Level 5 Newly T (2014-15) (2014-15) (2014-15) (2014-15) hired in TN					Total New Hires		
District	2	5	3	10	4	32	56	
State	34	235	439	462	294	5933	8256	

Note. The column labeled "Newly Hired in Tennessee" indicates any teacher who had not been affiliated with any Tennessee public school district in 2014-15. The column labeled "Total New Hires" may include some teachers not otherwise included in the above calculations because they were affiliated with Tennessee public schools but did not have evaluation scores in the 2014-15 school year.

Teachers were hired in Mock District in 2015-16 from:

- **Districts:** District A (15), District B (6), District C (2), District D (1)
- Educator Preparation Providers (for newly hired in TN): College A (10), University B (9), University C (8), College D (3), College E (2)

- What data does the district use to plan for recruitment?
- From which district and educator preparation provider (EPP) do most new hires come? Why? Is there an explicit strategy behind this? How can the district utilize the redesigned Teacher Preparation Program Report Card (<u>here</u>) to plan for recruitment?
- How can the partnership with EPPs be strengthened to meet the district's staffing needs and to improve the effectiveness of new teachers?
- How are new teachers (new to teaching or new to the school system) supported in the district?
- What interview and selection tools or processes are in place in the district? How are school leaders trained to identify and select effective teachers?



Section D: Retention

For the purposes of this report, "persistently high-performing" and "persistently low-performing" teachers are reported as follows:

- A persistently high-performing teacher is defined as a teacher who has individual growth scores (either through TVAAS or portfolio) of 4 or 5 for each of the last three years.
- A persistently low-performing teacher is defined as a teacher who has individual growth scores (either through TVAAS or portfolio) of 1 or 2 for each of the last three years.

Table 6. Persistently High- and Low-Performing Teachers							
	Persistently Low Performing	Total Teachers with 3 Individual Growth Scores					
District	4.2% (2)	38.2% (18)	47				
State	13.7% (700)	36.5% (1865)	5108				

Note. Table includes educators with three years of individual growth scores (2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16) available for analysis.

- How does the district prioritize retention in comparison with recruitment? Does the district's long-term plan prioritize one over the other? Why?
- Are persistently high-performing teachers identifiable by name? By school? What recognition or retention practices are in place, specifically for teachers who have demonstrated strong performance over time?
- Are persistently low-performing teachers identifiable by name? By school? Are there schools that have more lowperforming teachers than others? What district strategies are in place to support school administrators who have a high concentration of new or low-performing teachers?
- How can the district leverage persistently high-performing teachers in the continuum of support for other teachers?
- What are some ways to ensure that students who are furthest behind have access to high-performing teachers?



Table 7. District Retention Rates (2015-16) by Level of Overall Effectiveness (2014-15)								
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5			
Percent of Teachers Retained	100.0% (2)	90.0% (63)	97.8% (186)	97.8% (137)	100.0% (77)			
Percent of Teachers who Moved Districts	0.0% (0)	10.0% (7)	2.2% (4)	2.2% (3)	0.0% (0)			

Note. The row labeled "Percent of Teachers who Moved Districts" reflects those teachers who appeared in a new district for the 2015-16 school year. Teachers who do not appear in Tennessee public school data in 2015-16 were excluded from this calculation. The list of teachers below who moved from the district may include some teachers not otherwise included in the above calculations because they were affiliated with Tennessee public schools but did not have levels of overall effectiveness in the 2014-15 school year.

Teachers moved from Mock District in 2015-16 to: District A (5), District O (3), District R (3), District U (1), District W (1)

Guiding Questions

- Are effective teachers retained at higher rates than less effective teachers?
 - What percent of teachers with a level of overall effectiveness of 1 or 2 are retained?
 - What percent of teachers with a level of overall effectiveness of 3, 4, or 5 are retained?
- What current district practices or policies may be affecting retention across differing levels of effectiveness (e.g. promotion practices, recognition practices, educator support, etc.)?
- What might be the primary reasons teachers exit the district? Are exit interviews required?

Table 8. Within District Movement (2015-16) by Level of Overall Effectiveness (2014-15)								
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5			
Percent of								
Teachers who	0.0%	12.6%	8.0%	5.1%	2.5%			
Moved Schools	(0)	(8)	(15)	(7)	(2)			
within District								

Note. Table reflects the distribution of teachers who moved schools within the district by each level of effectiveness. This analysis only includes those teachers listed as teaching at one school in a given year. Teachers assigned to multiple schools in a given year were not included.

- Why might teachers seek within-district transfers (e.g., school culture, teacher-leader opportunities, other leadership opportunities, physical location, etc.)?
- Were teachers who moved concentrated in certain levels of effectiveness? In certain schools?
- To what extent do principals have the autonomy to choose teachers who best meet the needs of the school and student body?
- For students furthest behind, does the movement of high-performing teachers result in greater or at least equal access to better teaching?



Section E: Effective Teaching Gaps

The following tables include detailed information on student access to highly effective teachers in your district. Using 2015-16 student-teacher assignment data and 2014-15 TVAAS individual growth (one-year) and student performance data, these tables compare the district-level effective teaching gap (ETG) with the state-level ETG and then show gaps for schools within the district.

Key Terms

- Highly effective (HE) teachers are defined as teachers who have TVAAS individual growth (one-year) scores of level 4 or 5 on the five-point TVAAS scale.
- An Effective Teaching Gap (ETG) is calculated by subtracting the percent of below basic students who had a highly effective teacher from the percent of advanced students who had a highly effective teacher.
 - ETG = % advanced students with HE teachers % below basic students with HE teachers
 - A *positive* gap means that a greater percentage of advanced students received a highly effective teacher compared to below basic students.
 - A *negative* gap means that a greater percentage of below basic students received a highly effective teacher compared to advanced students.

District Effective Teaching Gaps

For each of the four tables in this section, only districts that had at least 4 highly effective teachers, 10 below basic students, *and* 10 advanced students in 2014-15 are included in district calculations. "N/A" means that the district did not meet one or more of these criteria. See the appendix at the end of this document for graphs of the distribution of all Tennessee districts' ETGs.

Table 9. Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in Grades 4-8 ELA							
	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG		
District	24 of 135	17.7%	38 of 247	15.3%	2.4%		
State	8610 of 29853	28.8%	6636 of 31972	20.8%	8.0%		

Table 10. Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in Grades 4-8 Math							
	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG		
District	186 of 354	52.5%	143 of 310	46.1%	6.4%		
State	25369 of 60308	42.1%	13387 of 35370	37.8%	4.3%		



Table 11. Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in EOC ELA							
	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG		
District	35 of 123	28.4%	16 of 114	14.0%	14.4%		
State	5211 of 16962	30.7%	3263 of 10644	30.7%	0.0%		

	Table 12. Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in EOC Math							
	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG			
District	112 of 334	33.5%	15 of 30	50.0%	-16.5%			
State	11099 of 22422	49.5%	3415 of 8519	40.1%	9.4%			

- If no district-level data is shown above, what conclusions can be drawn about students' access to effective teachers? Does the district have enough highly effective teachers to support students' needs? If not, what can be done to support teacher growth and development? What can be done to recruit effective teachers?
- How do district-level effective teaching gaps compare to the state-level effective teaching gap? How do district-level effective teaching gaps compare to that of other districts? See appendix for related charts.
- At the district level, what subjects or grade levels should be prioritized and what supports could be implemented to address effective teaching gaps?
- What policies and practices are in place that contribute to these gaps? What district-level human capital policies or strategies (recruitment/selection, retention, growth/development, compensation, staffing, master scheduling, etc.) should be reviewed or revised to improve students' access to highly effective teachers?
- Refer also to *Section B: Growth and Development (above) 2* for additional context on teacher growth and development. Which district-wide practices have led to more improvement in teachers' effectiveness? What professional development, training, or other supports have resulted in improved effectiveness?



School Effective Teaching Gaps

Schools within districts may have effective teaching gaps that vary greatly. The tables below display the effective teaching gaps between advanced and below basic students at each of the district's schools.

For each of the four tables in this section, only schools that had at least 4 highly effective teachers, 10 below basic students, *and* 10 advanced students in 2014-15 are included in school calculations. "N/A" means that the school did not meet one or more of these criteria for the given subject. If a school is not listed it means that the school did not meet these criteria for either subject.

Table 13. School-Level Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in Grades 4-8 ELA						
School Name	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG	
Elementary A	12 of 137	8.7%	24 of 131	18.3%	-9.6%	

Table 14. School-Level Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in Grades 4-8 Math						
School Name	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG	
Middle School C	50 of 78	64.0%	20 of 99	20.2%	43.8%	

Table 15. School-Level Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in EOC ELA						
School Name	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG	
High School A	20 of 71	28.1%	11 of 65	16.9%	11.2%	



Table 16. School-Level Effective Teaching Gaps (ETGs) in EOC Math						
School Name	# of advanced students with HE teacher	% advanced students with HE teacher	# of below basic students with HE teacher	% below basic students with HE teacher	ETG	
High School A	43 of 124	34.6%	3 of 16	18.7%	15.9%	
High School C	73 of 93	78.4%	11 of 18	61.1%	17.3%	

- If no school-level data is shown above, what conclusions can be drawn about students' access to effective teachers? Do the schools with highest numbers of below-basic students have enough highly effective teachers to support students' needs? If not, what can be done to support teacher growth and development at the school level?
- Which schools have positive effective teaching gaps? What are potential reasons for positive effective teaching gaps at these schools?
- Which schools have negative effective teaching gaps? What strategies or best practices exist at those schools that can be shared with schools with positive effective teaching gaps?
- What district-level human capital strategies (recruitment/selection, retention, compensation, growth/development, staffing, master scheduling, etc.) contribute to the gaps in certain schools? How might policies and practices be differentiated to ensure that below basic students have more access to highly effective teachers?
- Within schools, what do the effective teaching gaps look like at the grade- and/or subject-level? How would you go about finding this out?
- What are some ways to reallocate resources to ensure that below basic students have access to high-quality core instruction, highly effective teachers, and aligned intensive interventions?



Section F: Appendix

Figures 1a and 1b show the effective teaching gaps (ETGs) for 4-8 English language arts (ELA) and 4-8 math for all Tennessee districts. Note that only districts that had at least 4 highly effective teachers, 10 below basic students, *and* 10 advanced students in 2014-15 are included in these calculations.



Figure 1a. 4-8 ELA Effective Teaching Gaps in Tennessee Districts

Figure 1b. 4-8 Math Effective Teaching Gaps in Tennessee Districts





Figures 2a and 2b show the effective teaching gaps (ETGs) for EOC English language arts (ELA) and EOC math for all Tennessee districts. Note that only districts that had at least 4 highly effective teachers, 10 below basic students, *and* 10 advanced students in 2014-15 are included in these calculations.



Figure 2a. EOC ELA Effective Teaching Gaps in Tennessee Districts



Figure 2b. EOC Math Effective Teaching Gaps in Tennessee Districts