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Teacher Effectiveness Ratings for School Year 2014-15
Teacher Effectiveness Ratings Increased

Almost 3.8 percentage points more teachers were rated Highly Effective in SY’15; 0.2 points fewer teachers were rated Ineffective in SY’15.
The 5 largest School Systems represent 67.3% of the Teacher Ratings

n = 43,818
Teacher Effectiveness Ratings vary across the 24 School Systems

This graph includes teacher data for Frederick (n=2,390) and Montgomery (n=10,557). The additional 12,947 records are not reflected in the STATE average based on 43,818.
Teacher Effectiveness and Poverty

Students in low poverty schools are more than two times more likely to have a Highly Effective Teacher than are students in high poverty schools. Students in high poverty schools are four times more likely to have an ineffective teacher.

Poverty is defined using the method for the Annual APR report: n FARMS/Enrollment sorted into statewide quartiles.
Teacher Effectiveness and Minority

Students in low minority schools are four times more likely to have a Highly Effective Teacher than are students in high poverty schools. Students in high poverty schools are five times more likely to have an ineffective teacher.

Minority is defined using the method for the Annual APR report: n non-White/Enrollment sorted into statewide quartiles.
...and the Combined Impact of Poverty and Minority

Students in Low Poverty/Low Minority schools are almost four times more likely to have a highly effective teacher than are students in high poverty/high minority schools. Students in high poverty/high minority schools are nine times more likely to have an ineffective teacher.
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**Low Minority/Low Poverty**
- Highly Effective (HE): 58.0%
- Effective (E): 41.4%
- Ineffective (I): 0.6%

**High Minority/High Poverty**
- Highly Effective (HE): 15.1%
- Effective (E): 79.5%
- Ineffective (I): 5.4%
Teacher Effectiveness and School Performance

As Strand Performance declines, the percent of Highly Effective teachers decreases (delta -15.1 points) and the percent of Ineffective teachers increases (delta +2.3 points).

Strands derive from SY’14 SPI data for 22% of schools. For “Field Testing” schools, Strands were carried forward from SY’13. Strand 1 schools met or exceeded all targets. Strand 5 schools failed to meet any targets.
Nearly half (47%) of teachers who completed one full year, but not yet two full years, of teaching have left the field by the beginning of the third full year of teaching.
Teacher Effectiveness and Tenure

Tenured teachers are more likely to be rated High Effective and less likely to be rated Ineffective than are untenured teachers.

373 records did not have a disposition for tenure.
Teacher Effectiveness and Years of Service

Effectiveness plateaus by the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-5\textsuperscript{th} year once tenure has been granted.

158 staff without years of service information are spread across 17 School Systems.
Inexperienced teachers in low poverty/minority schools are four times more likely to be rated highly effective than are inexperienced teachers in high poverty/minority schools.
Comparison of Professional Practice to Student Growth by Rating

Highly Effective and Effective teachers earn most of their rating points from Student Growth, HE teachers being particularly skilled at achieving their SLOs and meeting other growth measures.
Some School Systems have three or more SLOs. The first SLO was required to be informed by the State Assessments or other objective State Measure such as the SPI.
Teacher Effectiveness and Average Professional Practice Domain Scores

Instructional delivery is the dominant contributor to differentiating Highly Effective Professional Practice. Planning and Professional Responsibility are the two Domains contributing most to low scores in Ineffective Ratings.
Simulation: Changing the State 50-50 Model
Increasing the percentage value of Student Growth benefits Highly Effective Teachers, has negligible impact on Effective Teachers, and does not reward Ineffective Teachers.
Principal Effectiveness Ratings for School Year 2014-15
While the percent of highly effective principals increased by only 0.5 points, the proportion of ineffective principals doubled.
Principal Effectiveness Ratings also varied across the School Systems

Systems with more principals rated highly effective are between 16.4 and 45.9 points higher than the State average.
High school and combined school principals are less likely to be rated highly effective and are almost 4 to 12 times, respectively, more likely to be rated ineffective.
Students in low poverty schools are nearly three times more likely to have a Highly Effective Principal. Students in high poverty schools are nearly nine times more likely to have an Ineffective Principal.

Poverty is defined using the method for the Annual APR report: \( n \) FARMS/Enrollment sorted into statewide quartiles.
Principal Effectiveness and Minority

Students in low minority schools are more than twice as likely to have a Highly Effective Principal than are students in high poverty schools. Students in high poverty schools are nearly 13 times more likely to have an Ineffective Principal.

Minority is defined using the method for the Annual APR report: n non-White/Enrollment sorted into statewide quartiles.
...and the combined Impact of Poverty and Minority

Students in Low Poverty/Low Minority schools are almost four times more likely to have a Highly Effective Principal than are students in high poverty/high minority schools. Students in high poverty/high minority schools have a 7%+ likelihood of having an Ineffective Principal.
Principal Effectiveness and School Performance

Unlike Teacher Effectiveness, Principal Effectiveness vacillates across measures of school performance.

Strands derive from SY'14 SPI data for 22% of schools. For “Field Testing” schools, Strands were carried forward from SY’13. Strand 1 schools met or exceeded all targets. Strand 5 schools failed to meet any targets.
Prevailing questions...

? How will information from two years’ data inform and determine changes to the State Evaluation Frameworks and local models

? Who will conduct the analysis of the TPE date and how will it occur

? What will be the change process and who will make the decisions

? What role will tests or school accountability measures have in evaluation

? How will performance deficits inform improvements in teacher and principal preparation programs and LEA professional development

? Can we further define the profile of highly effective and ineffective educators

? How might the State facilitate the alignment of professional development for teachers and principals in response to evaluation

? How will new nationally developed standards for Principals and Principal Supervisors be incorporated into this body of work

? How do we progress from processes of evaluation to systems of continuous improvement

? When will we know that this work has benefited students
From Evaluation to Continuous Improvement

Drivers
- WestEd Annual Progress Report
- 2015 Educator Effectiveness Ratings Report
- New State Accountability Measure
- PARCC Assessments
- ESEA Waiver
- Equity Plan
- Professional Standards

Charges
- **Research Team**
  To provide analysis of data to answer critical questions generated by LEAs and the Visionary Committee
- **LEA TPE Teams**
  To provide local perspective and input into the analysis and change process
- **Visionary Committee**
  To determine the processes whereby information gleaned from Research Team and LEAs result in changes and redefining of next generation TPE

Process
- Analysis work to begin in December 2015 and continue through March 2016
- Monthly reconvening of TPE Teams to react to ongoing work of the research team
- Periodic meetings to construct thinking in response to Research findings and LEA reactions

Outcome
- Generate data driven revelations to the LEAs & the Visionary Committee
- Identify statewide recommendation for the Visionary Committee and determine local changes
- Make changes to the state evaluation frameworks, endorse local changes, and affect policy changes.
Contacts:
Dave Volrath, Teacher and Principal Evaluation Planning Development Officer
David.Volrath@maryland.gov
410 767 0504

Ben Feldman, TPE Data Lead
Ben.Feldman@maryland.gov
410 767 3676