

Human Capital Data Report: Part 1

Mock District

This report was compiled using 2014-15 data and covers a range of human capital topics, including: evaluation, hiring, retention, and equity. 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.

Section 1: Evaluation

Table 1. Distribution of Scores (2014-15)							
		Teachers with Data	Level				
			1	2	3	4	5
Level of Overall Effectiveness	District	600	6.0%	4.0%	35.0%	25.0%	30.0%
	State	62,717	0.7%	10.7%	26.4%	34.0%	28.2%
Observation Average	District	595	0.0%	1.0%	4.0%	75.0%	20.0%
	State	63,718	0.1%	2.4%	19.7%	43.1%	34.6%
TVAAS Growth Score: All Teachers	District	597	7.0%	4.0%	29.0%	25.0%	35.0%
	State	63,506	24.5%	9.2%	22.4%	9.8%	34.1%
TVAAS Growth Score: Teachers w/ Individual Growth	District	200	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%
	State	24,183	21.5%	10.3%	26.1%	11.6%	30.5%
Achievement Measure	District	597	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.0%	61.0%
	State	62,691	11.2%	5.9%	19.3%	16.6%	47.0%

Note. The column labeled “Teachers with Data” includes all teachers with evaluation data who do not have partial year exemptions (PYE).

Guiding Questions:

1. How do district distributions compare to distributions at the state level? Are there any notable factors unique to the district that may impact these distributions?
2. How does the distribution of scores compare across the different measures? If there are large differences, why might this be?
3. Which of the available evaluation flexibility options is the district using (e.g., observation options, non-tested portfolio options, innovative practices such as the Principal Peer Partnership, Instructional Partnership Initiative, student surveys, level 4/5 override, etc.)?

Table 2. Misalignment between Individual Growth Scores and Observation Scores (2014-15)		
	Teachers with Data	Average Percent Misaligned by Three or More Levels
District	10	5.0%
State	1,531	6.4%

Note. Table 2 only includes educators with both individual growth and observation scores available for analysis.

Guiding Questions:

1. Has evaluator accuracy grown to more closely align teacher practice to student growth? Why? Why not? How can this accuracy be further improved?
2. Are there certain schools or observers for which misalignment is more prevalent?
3. How specifically does the district ensure fidelity in evaluation implementation?

Table 3. Number and Percent of Observers Who are Non-Differentiating (2014-15)				
		Observers with 90+% of Indicators in Two Levels	Observers with 95+% of Indicators in Two Levels	All Observers
Number of Observers	District	10	5	50
	State	640	297	4,025
Percent of Observers	District	20.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	State	15.9%	7.4%	100.0%
Total Number of Teachers Scored by These Observers	District	150	20	595
	State	10,195	3,384	99,488

Note. Non-differentiating observers are teacher evaluators whose ratings are nearly all identical both across teachers and across rubric indicators during a single observation. This table includes data taken from the 2014-15 indicator-level observation scores in CODE. This data is only available for TEAM districts. "No Data" indicates there is no data available.

Guiding Questions:

1. Observers who distinguish between levels of teaching practice and assign accurate scores are key for a teacher evaluation system that drives improvement. Are observers in your district adequately differentiating between levels of teaching practice? If not, how can to the district ensure that teachers are receiving accurate feedback? Are there certain schools or observers for which non-differentiation is more prevalent?
2. If non-differentiation is an issue in the district, what are some potential causes?
3. What strategies could be employed to address non-differentiation, if it exists?
4. How can the observation process be improved to ensure that teachers receive high quality feedback?

Section 2: Growth and Development

Table 4. Change in Individual Growth Scores from 2013-14 to 2014-15						
		Individual Growth Scores (2014-15)				
		1	2	3	4	5
Individual Growth Scores (2013-14)	1 (50 Teachers)	96.0% (48)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	2 (2 Teachers)	100.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	3 (71 Teachers)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	81.7% (58)	0.0% (0)	18.3% (13)
	4 (7 Teachers)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	71.4% (5)	0.0% (0)	28.6% (2)
	5 (70 Teachers)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (35)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (35)

Note. Table 4 includes only teachers who had individual growth scores for both 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Guiding Questions:

1. Identify which group of teachers the district was most effective at growing. What type of results are these teachers producing? Identify any regression in individual growth scores. What may have happened?
2. Which district-wide practices led to more improvement of teachers? What other factors may have contributed to the improvements in teachers' individual growth scores?
3. Given the current number of Level 1 and 2 teachers, how should district and/or school resources be allocated to support instruction?
4. What supports does the district provide to Level 1 teachers outside the required minimum?

Section 3: Hiring

Table 5. New Hires in 2014-15 based on 2013-14 Level of Overall Effectiveness							
	Level of Overall Effectiveness (2013-14)					Newly Hired in TN	Total New Hires
	1	2	3	4	5		
District	3	2	11	1	5	14	36
State	33	231	445	510	520	6,056	8,014

Note. The column labeled “Newly Hired in Tennessee” indicates any teacher who had not been affiliated with any Tennessee public school district in 2013-14. 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 2013-14 school year.

Teachers who moved to Mock District in 2014-15 came from: District A (4), District B (12), District C (6)

Guiding Questions:

1. From which district do most new hires come? Why? Is there an explicit strategy behind this?
2. From which educator preparation provider (EPP) do most new teachers come? Is there an explicit recruitment or incentive strategy involved in hiring new teachers from nearby EPPs? How can the district partner with EPPs to improve effectiveness of new teachers?
3. How are new teachers (new to teaching or new to the school system) supported in the district?
4. Does the district require teachers with prior teaching experience to share evaluation data as a part of the hiring process? If not, why?

Section 4: 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 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 of 1 or 2 for each of the last three years.

Table 6. Persistently High- and Low-Performing Teachers			
	Persistently Low Performing	Persistently High Performing	Total Teachers with 3 Individual Growth Scores
District	8.3% (2)	29.1% (7)	24
State	11.7% (1,747)	35.5% (5,308)	14,942

Note. The data above includes only those educators with three years of individual growth scores (2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15) available for analysis.

Guiding Questions:

1. Are persistently high-performing teachers identifiable by name? By school? Do persistently high-performing teachers in the district know who they are? What recognition or retention practices in place, specifically for teachers who have demonstrated strong performance over time?
2. Are persistently low-performing teachers identifiable by name? By school? Are there schools that have more low-performing teachers than other schools? What district strategies are in place to support school administrators who have a high concentration of new or low-performing teachers?
3. What are some ways to reallocate school resources to directly support instruction?
4. What are some ways to ensure that students who are furthest behind have access to high-performing teachers?

Table 7. District Retention Rates by Level of Effectiveness (2014-15)					
	Level of Overall Effectiveness				
	1	2	3	4	5
Percent of Teachers Retained	78.6%	92.9%	85.8%	71.5%	71.5%
Percent of Teachers who Moved Districts	21.4% (3)	7.1% (1)	14.2% (2)	28.5% (4)	28.5% (4)

Note. The row labeled “Percentage of Teachers who Moved Districts” reflects teachers rostered in a new district for the 2014-15 school year. Percentages will not add up to 100 because the table does not reflect those teachers who left Tennessee public schools in 2014-15. In table 7:

- “0.0%” indicates a 0 value
- “N/A” indicates a value is not applicable (e.g., the district had no level 1 teachers that year)
- “No Data” indicates there is no data available

Teachers who moved from Mock District in 2014-15 went to: District D (4), District E (2), District F (5), District E (3)

Guiding Questions:

1. Are effective teachers retained at higher rates than less effective teachers?
 - a. What percent of teachers with a level of overall effectiveness of 1 or 2 are retained?
 - b. What percent of teachers with a level of overall effectiveness of 3, 4, or 5 are retained?
2. What current district practices or policies may be impacting retention across differing levels of effectiveness?
3. What might be the primary reasons teachers exit the district? Are exit interviews required?

Table 8. Within District Movement by Each Level of Effectiveness (2014-15)

	Level of Overall Effectiveness				
	1	2	3	4	5
Percent of Teachers	30.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (5)	20.0% (2)	0.0% (0)

Note. Table 8 reflects the distribution of teachers who moved schools within the district by each level of effectiveness.

Guiding Questions:

1. Which teachers moved to another school within the district?
2. Do principals have the authority to choose teachers that best meet the school and student needs?
3. Why might teachers seek within-district transfers (e.g., school culture, teacher-leader opportunities, other leadership opportunities, physical location, etc.)?
4. For students furthest behind, does the movement of high-performing teachers result in greater access to better teaching?