



T U L S A

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## **Teacher and Leader Effectiveness**

Board of Education Update

March 2014

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

*Assure that Tulsa Public Schools has an effective teacher in every classroom, an effective principal in every building and an effective employee in every position.*

### **Strategic Objective A**

**Implement a new, innovative and fair evaluation system for all TPS staff that is based upon feedback and support and is aligned to enacted Oklahoma legislation.**

#### *Progress and Accomplishments*

- 1. Identification of performance levels that are positively correlated with student achievement growth:**
  - Teacher Evaluation: Since 2010-2011, teacher evaluations and instructional expectations have been defined by 20 performance descriptions (Indicators of the Tulsa Model). In 2009-10 there were 0 performance descriptions.
  - Correlation between Evaluation Performance Indicators and Student Growth (Validation Studies) (New): Research reveals impressive correlations, including an overall correlation of 0.34 using 2012-13 data (0.31 and 0.23 using 2011-12 and 10-11 data respectively). This validation measure meets or exceeds popular, nationally recognized qualitative instruments.
  - Principals: Principal's evaluation rankings are guided and defined by 21 performance descriptions, all of which are positively correlated with student achievement growth.
- 2. High-quality training on the effective use of the Tulsa Model:**
  - Evaluators have received multiple days of training and assessments regarding how to implement the Tulsa Model processes with fidelity and sustain accurate, consistent scoring of teacher performance using expert-rated videos and written scenarios.
  - **(NEW)** Evaluators are currently receiving supplemental, intensive professional development on how to provide teachers high-value feedback
- 3. Certification testing of Principals:**
  - All TPS principals and assistant principals passed certification tests measuring competency in both evaluation processes and calibration (rater accuracy). TPS evaluators are subject to the highest certification expectations of any district in the state, including annual calibration testing with more rigorous standards than any other district.
  - **(NEW)** Rater accuracy rates as measured on the 2013-2014 calibration tests improved 46%.
- 4. Student and Teacher Perception Survey (New):**
  - Student Surveys: Approximately half of all schools in TPS participated in a controlled rollout of student surveys this past fall and will complete a second round in the spring. For this initial year, two separate survey instruments were used (Tripod Student Survey and Colorado Legacy Foundation Survey), both survey types are research based and have been validated in large urban districts. The information gained from the surveys will allow the TLE office to make an informed decision for a single student perception survey partner in the full rollout in the 14-15 school year. In addition to the valuable feedback teachers will receive from the instrument, student surveys are one of the preferred options for Other Academic Measures (OAM).

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

- Teacher Perception Surveys: to give principals vital feedback regarding their capacity as instructional leaders, teachers at every school in the District participated in a research-based teacher perception survey developed by the Colorado Legacy Foundation regarding teachers' perception of leadership in school buildings. Principals may elect to use survey results as a portion of their leader evaluation formula in future years as an Other Academic Measure (OAM).
5. **Other Academic Measures (OAMs) (New):**
    - Pursuant to state mandates the District piloted its OAM policy in a representative sample of its schools (four buildings) for all certified teachers and with all principals and APs. A working group of teachers and leaders has been established to review OAM selections for each certified subgroup and to refine policy by determining the best evaluative options.
  6. **McREL Principal Evaluation Framework (New):** ILDs, Principals, and APs have completed their first round of Self-Assessment, Goal Setting Plans, and evaluation Rubrics. Seven ILDs evaluate individuals at the Principal level, while Principals evaluate their APs and Principal Interns.

### *Strategic Objective B*

**Continue the enhancement of human capital functions that assures the effective recruitment, development and retention of a high-performing workforce prepared to be successful in an urban setting.**

#### *Progress and Accomplishments*

1. **Tulsa-Model Aligned Support:** More support for teachers/leaders aligned to Tulsa Model framework:
  - a. **(NEW)** The District is piloting a Goal Setting Form process for teachers needing assistance to reach the effectiveness level when a Personal Development Plan (PDP) is not as appropriate; 36 teachers have participated in the process to date in 2013-2014.
  - b. Approximately 111 Personal Development Plans (PDPs) for teachers have been issued in 2013-2014 to date. 95 teachers were issued PDPs in 2012-13 (compared to 5 in '09-'10, 136 in '10-'11, 202 in 11-12).
  - c. 22 principals received PDPs in 2012-13 (2 in 2009-10, 30 in 2010-11, 15 in 2011-12).
  - d. 23 teachers have participated during 2013-2014 (to date) in the intensive mentoring program (QUEST). 18 teachers participated in Quest in 2012-13 (29 in 2010-11, 35 in 2011-12).
  - e. 92 teachers have participated during 2013-2014 (to date) in the embedded Professional Development TMA (Tulsa Model Assist). 78 teachers participated in TMA during 2012-2013. The program aligns personal supports with the Tulsa Model, targeting schools with less than average student growth measures.
2. **Induction of New Teachers:** The District partners with the New Teacher Center to provide all teachers new to the district with induction programming. In addition, the District uses New Teacher Center's mentoring program to provide coaching to its new (non-TFA) teachers of core subjects during their first year of teaching.

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

### 3. Leadership Recruitment

- a. Principal Leadership Pools: The Office of TLE is continues to partner with Teach for America (TFA) to access top leadership pools and recently participated in a recruiting day with TFA alum. TPS welcomed experienced school leaders who are TFA alumni from around the country on February 28 for the 'More than OK' event to spotlight opportunities for school leaders at the District.

### 4. Using a federal \$4.4 million School Leadership Program grant awarded in late 2013 and continuing support from the Foundation for Tulsa Public Schools, the District has enhanced its leadership development tools and resources.

- a. New Assistant Principal Professional Learning and Personal Coaching: **(NEW)** first and second year APs receive monthly training designed with the New Teacher Center and TNTP, focusing on effective instructional leadership strategies. Grant funding allows all first and second year APs to receive 2 hours of coaching once a month from leadership coaches as well as virtual coaching to support improved accuracy in teacher evaluation ratings and more effective feedback post during observation conferences.
- b. The New Principal Academy: 15 new principals receive training by New Teacher Center regarding the core goals of Data Analysis, Teacher/Leadership Effectiveness, Cultural Competence and Using PLCs. Second year principals receive bi-weekly support from a coach using blended coaching strategies. Principal supervisors (ILDs) coach first year principals.
- c. Novice Principals: 2<sup>nd</sup> year principals participate in Improving Student Achievement training by the New Teacher Center and guided learning from the University of Oklahoma Professional Development Leadership Academy (PDLA) on growth mindset research, action research projects, peer consultancy protocols and climate/culture research by the University of Oklahoma.

### 5. Teach For America Summer Institute:

- a. Faculty Advisors and Principals received approximately 24 hours of unique professional development in the summer of 2013, focusing on instructional leadership, data analysis, and mentoring and coaching teachers.
- b. Corps Members rated TPS Faculty Advisors above the national average, placing the Tulsa Institute in the top two nationally in terms of satisfaction levels. TPS credits a rigorous selection process, which incorporated the Tulsa Model rubric, and letters of recommendation in the selection of 160 highly qualified Faculty Advisors. Further, Faculty Advisors were exposed to the Tulsa Model to assist in their coaching and helping TFA Corps Members improve their effectiveness.
- c. Increased coaching/mentoring opportunities for Faculty Advisors in the summer of 2013 provided TPS teachers with substantial professional development and instructional leadership, focused on data analysis and small group instruction with approximately 4,000 students, a nearly 18% increase from 2012.

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

- d. The creation of a principal internship program provided teacher leaders with an interest in pursuing the principalship a chance to shadow a successful, experienced site administrator at the summer school site. Of the six participants, three have transitioned from the classroom to leadership roles as an Assistant Principal, Principal Intern, and Dean.
6. **Collaboration Compact:** An update to the Compact was drafted and updated in collaboration with the three TPS-sponsored charters, resulting in recognition from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and a grant award of \$100,000 in January of 2014. The Compact reaffirms and details the commitments and action steps of all signatories to making every school in Tulsa a high-performing school that provides highly effective teachers to every classroom, every year. Tulsa School for Arts and Sciences, KIPP Tulsa, and Tulsa Lighthouse Charter School are participating charter schools.

### *Strategic Objective C*

**Structure central administration and human capital systems to effectively support schools and enable campus leadership to focus on student growth and achievement.**

#### *Progress and Accomplishments*

1. **Innovative, intensive teacher supports for Tulsa Model**
  - a. A growing video library of Tulsa Model indicator exemplars from the classes of the District's master teachers is accessible to all TPS educators. The District currently has close to 60 videos created, including both shorter clips and full length classes.
  - b. Co-branded website with Teaching Channel (Tch) to disseminate exemplars and provide access to more than 600 Tch videos tagged to the Tulsa-Model indicators and facilitate online professional learning communities.
  - c. Virtual Coaching and confidential feedback from external content experts is provided to teachers by TNTP's Great Teacher/Great Feedback program using short video clips uploaded by the teacher.
2. **Human Capital Partners:** These four members of the HR team assist principals with all Human Capital questions and challenges as the designated first point-of-contact for principals regarding Tulsa Model process and technology questions. They help ensure optimum adherence to Tulsa Model mandates and accurate reporting of data.
3. **Netchemia/TalentED Support:** The District's online platform for principals to enter and store evaluation data is supported by a TLE staff member, who provides immediate assistance to the District's evaluators regarding technical and data-related issues. This staff member also identifies platform improvements and works with the vendor to resolve problems and continuously enhance the usability and value of the platform to District evaluators.

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

4. **Key TPS performance indicators** (board reporting metrics) aligned to the strategic plan core goals are collected and reported annually and are used to inform district and department plans and initiatives.
5. **All central office departments** have developed scorecards defining performance indicators for key processes which will be used as part of individual evaluations. 17 departments have completed the process to date, and reported their baseline year data to Executive staff in the Fall of 2013. The remaining 5 departments have completed scorecards and will present a final draft to Executive staff for approval.

### *Strategic Objective D*

Create a culture of high expectations for academic achievement and conduct that makes no excuses based on students' demographics and/or socioeconomic status.

#### *Progress and Accomplishments*

1. **Value-added reports** with up to 3 years of teacher-level and school-level value added data have been reported and released since 2009-2010. School-level data is available to the public.
2. **Value-Added Training:** Professional development opportunities have been provided to teachers, Principals, Assistant Principals, Staff Development Teachers and Academic Coordinators for 4 consecutive years in the interpretation of value-added data reports and how to train. **(New)** For the first time this year, principals with extensive experience with value-added were provided advanced professional development surrounding value-added, which helped them learn how and why to analyze teachers' value-added data with their observation-based scores.
3. **Extensive Student Subgroup Data** has been reported and shared with relevant stakeholders, including district leaders in special education and ELL, to identify pockets of excellence and need.
4. **NWEA-MAP (New):** This nationally recognized and normed adaptive assessment of the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) has been rolled out to the district as a whole in grades K-3. These results will allow us to generate value-added estimates for teachers in grades 1-3 (grades that are currently excluded from value-added reporting due to state testing grade levels).

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

### Data Supporting the Strategic Objectives

#### Teacher Evaluation

Teacher Evaluation Rating 2012-2013	# of Teachers	% of Teachers
INEFFECTIVE (< 1.8)	0	0.0%
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1.8-2.8)	31	1.3%
EFFECTIVE (2.8-3.8)	1697	70.6%
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (3.8-4.8)	637	26.5%
SUPERIOR (>4.8)	39	1.6%

\*Does not include other certified teacher subgroups (librarians, counselors, etc.)

#### Teacher Supports

Teacher Supports	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014 (to date)
Personal Development Plans ( <b>PDPs</b> )	136	202	95 PDPs (66 individuals)	111 PDPs (92 individuals)
# teachers using <b>QUEST</b> (Intensive Mentoring)	29	35	18	23
<b>Goal Setting Forms</b>	NA	NA	NA	42 forms (36 individuals)
# teachers using <b>Tulsa Model Assist</b> (TMA: customized, embedded PD aligned to Tulsa Model rubric)	N/A	N/A	78	92
% new (1 <sup>st</sup> year) core teachers (non-TFA) assigned a <b>New Teacher Center Mentor</b> .	N/A	100%	100% (166)	100% (151)
% beginning teachers completing comprehensive <b>new teacher induction program</b>	N/A	95.74%	100%	100%

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

### Student Perception Survey re Teacher Practice

Perception of Teachers by Students	2013-2014 (fall)
Number of sites participating	<b>48 sites (29 Legacy; 19 Tripod)</b>
Number of students participating	<b>16,887 students</b>
No. of teachers receiving reports	<b>948 Teachers</b>
Average Score on <b>Tripod</b> Instrument (% of Answers Answered Favorably)	<b>K-2: 75% (national norm 75%)</b> <b>3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>: 66% (national norm 69%)</b> <b>7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>: 49% (national norm 55%)</b> <b>9<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup>: 58% (national norm 54%)</b>
Average Score on <b>Legacy</b> Instrument (% of Answers Answered Favorably)	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>: 69% (national norm 67%)</b> <b>7<sup>th</sup>- 12<sup>th</sup>: 61% (national norm 66%)</b> <b>9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>: 62% (national norm 70%)</b>

### Teach for America Metrics

Teach for America Retention and Performance	2010 - 2011	2011 - 2012	2012 - 2013	2013 - Present
% of <b>TFA</b> teachers exiting within their two-year commitment	<b>'09 Corps: 9% (7 of 74)</b>	<b>'10 Corps: 9% (5 of 56)</b>	<b>'11 Corps: 8% (6 of 76)</b>	<b>'12 Corps: 10% (8 of 77)</b>
Average <b>Tulsa Model Scores</b> of 1 <sup>st</sup> year TFA teachers v. 1 <sup>st</sup> year Non-TFA teachers	<b>TFA= 3.43</b> <b>non-TFA=3.23</b>	<b>TFA=3.23</b> <b>non-TFA=3.15</b>	<b>TFA = 3.32</b> <b>non-TFA = 3.29</b>	<b>TFA = 3.23</b> <b>non-TFA =3.17</b>
Average <b>Tulsa Model Scores</b> in <b>Classroom Management</b> for TFA teachers vs. non- TFA teachers with commensurate experience	<b>TFA=3.41</b> <b>non-TFA=3.23</b>	<b>TFA=3.21</b> <b>non-TFA=3.14</b>	<b>TFA = 3.25</b> <b>Non-TFA = 3.11</b>	
Average <b>Tulsa Model Scores</b> in <b>Instructional Effectiveness</b> for TFA teachers vs. non- TFA teachers with commensurate experience	<b>TFA=3.41</b> <b>non-TFA=3.18</b>	<b>TFA=3.19</b> <b>non-TFA=3.11</b>	<b>TFA= 3.16</b> <b>non-TFA = 3.08</b>	
Average <b>Value Added Scores</b> of TFA teachers v. Non-TFA teachers with commensurate experience	<b>TFA = 2.98</b> <b>non-TFA = 3.32</b>	<b>TFA = 2.95</b> <b>non-TFA = 2.96</b>	<b>TFA = 3.10</b> <b>non-TFA = 2.66</b>	

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

### Teacher Evaluation Score Alignment with School Effectiveness Ratings

Teacher Evaluation & Achievement Measures	Prior Year Results (2012-2013)
<b>Avg. teacher evaluation rating – High Performing Schools as defined by Achievement</b>	
Elementary (6 highest performing – OCCT Attainment)	<b>3.64</b>
Middle/JR High (3 highest performing – OCCT Attainment)	<b>3.49</b>
High (3 highest performing – EOI Attainment)	<b>3.84</b>
<b>Avg. teacher evaluation rating – Low Performing Schools by Achievement</b>	
Elementary (6 lowest performing – OCCT Attainment)	<b>3.56</b>
Middle/JR High (3 lowest performing - OCCT Attainment)	<b>2.70</b>
High (3 lowest performing – EOI Attainment)	<b>3.24</b>

Teacher Evaluation & Value-Added	Prior Year Results (2012-2013)
<b>Avg. teacher evaluation rating – High Performing Schools as defined by Value Added</b>	
Elementary (6 highest performing – VA)	<b>3.55</b>
Middle/JR High (3 highest performing – VA)	<b>3.51</b>
High (3 highest performing – VA)	<b>3.73</b>
<b>Avg. teacher evaluation rating – Low Performing Schools as defined by Value Added</b>	
Elementary (6 lowest performing – VA)	<b>3.45</b>
Middle/JR High (3 lowest performing - VA)	<b>3.32</b>
High (3 lowest performing – VA)	<b>3.21</b>

Note: evaluating average TLE scores of schools categorized by both achievement bands and growth reflects the importance of using both measures to quantify school success and allows the District to identify evaluation patterns of observation-based scores needing further inquiry.

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

### Effectiveness and Teacher Retention

Teacher Effectiveness & Retention – years of service scoring $\geq 4$ on most recent evaluation					
Teaching Experience	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	5 Years
<b>% of Teachers Retained with Evaluation Score <math>\geq 4</math></b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>94%</b>

Retention of Teachers with Most Impact on Tested Grades & Subjects					
% teachers retained in '13-'14 who had significantly *above district average value-added results in '12-'13					
	Reading	Math	Science	Social Studies	Writing
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	89%	87%	N/A	N/A	N/A
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	67%	86%	80%	N/A	N/A
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	75%	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	100%	83%	100%	N/A	N/A

*\*Statistically significant within 95% confidence interval. Please note that in some instances in 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade, very few teachers had significantly above district average value-added results.*

*\*\* Social Studies was not included in 2012-2013 Value Added estimates as the test was in a pilot year.*

*\*\*\*Writing VA has not been calculated at the teacher level as the results were received late from the state.*

### Principals and Assistant Principal Evaluation

Principal Evaluation Rating 2012-2013	# of Principals/APs	% of Principals/APs
INEFFECTIVE (< 1.8)	0	0.0%
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1.8-2.8)	3	2.7%
EFFECTIVE (2.8-3.8)	85	75.9%
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (3.8-4.8)	23	20.5%
SUPERIOR (>4.8)	1	0.9%

**\*Please note that some APs did not receive evaluation scores.**

Principal Supports	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013 – 2014 (to date)
# principals on development plans	<b>31</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>
% 2 <sup>nd</sup> year principals and 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> year APs assigned a coach trained by New Teacher Center.	N/A	N/A	<b>100%</b> <b>(13 principals)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(45 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year APs and 7 principals)</b>

## Core Goal: Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

### Teacher Perception Survey re School Leadership

Perception of Principal by Teachers	2013-2014 (fall)
% of teachers participating	<b>52%</b> <b>(1,382 of 2,657 Teachers)</b>
% of principals receiving survey report	<b>97%</b> <b>(74 of 76 Principals)</b>
Average Score (% of Answers Answered Favorably)	<b>82%</b>
Range of Scores	<b>50 points (50% to 100%)</b>

### Education Service Center Scorecards

Development Metrics	Current Year Results (2013-2014)
% central services departments with Key Performance Indicators	100%
% central services departments with completed scorecards with targets	100% (22/22)
% of central services departments with baseline metrics and targets	77% (17/22)