The Teacher Excellence Initiative (TEI) began its first year of implementation of the evaluation and associated support systems during the 2014-15 school year. In the summer of 2014, administrators and other central office staff members within TEI began certifying evaluators on the TEI system. Beginning in 2015-16, teacher evaluation results from the 2014-15 school year were used to determine compensation levels.

The initiative was established with one primary objective, to improve student learning by improving teacher effectiveness. The TEI system defines, supports, and rewards excellence. Defining Excellence involves conducting annual evaluations of teachers that contain a combination of teacher performance indicators, student achievement indicators, and student survey results. Supporting Excellence involves developing teachers through self-facilitated learning opportunities, one-on-one coaching supports, whole-group training opportunities, district content workshops, differentiated professional development academies, and a new teacher mentor program. Rewarding Excellence is providing teachers opportunities to significantly increase their salaries based on performance rather than tenure with the district. TEI is a continuous improvement model and is designed to account for the differing teaching environments of Dallas ISD teachers. The model is designed to be fair, accurate, and rigorous.

The following are the major findings of the TEI evaluation:

- Spot observation scores increased over time suggesting TEI evaluator feedback could be leading to improved performance.
- Spot observation scores and summative performance evaluation scores were correlated, indicating that TEI evaluators were consistent throughout the year.
- Within student achievement, relationships were not as strong between teacher-level student achievement, School STAAR, and SLO measures.
- Between TEI components (teacher performance, student achievement, and student experience) the strength of relationships were mixed.
- The TEI teacher and administrator perceptions surveys indicated that while the individual elements of TEI, particularly the TEI evaluator feedback and professional development opportunities offered through the Teaching and Learning department, were favorably rated, feedback about the student experience survey, teacher compensation, communication about TEI, and TEI in general was less favorable.

In most cases, the findings of the quantitative aspect of this evaluation were aligned with teacher and administrator feedback about TEI. To date, the district has not outlined expectations regarding the strength of correlations, or relationships, between or among components and measures of TEI. Further professional development and calibration of the TEI tools may lead to stronger relationships over time. Because TEI is a continuous improvement model, future evaluations should continue to monitor the TEI elements and how they relate to one another in order to determine what relationships should exist and to what degree. The following sections of the summary give an overview of the major findings for each section of this report.

**TEI Quantitative Analysis**

**Teacher Performance**

The three components of the TEI (teacher performance, student achievement, and student experience) were analyzed. Under teacher performance, the average spot observation score was 1.75 out of 3 possible points. Spot scores increased over time, suggesting that the process of observation and feedback may have led to improved performance. The mean summative score was 66.4 and the median was 67. A score of 67 can be reached by receiving a 2 (Proficient) on all items across the summative performance evaluation rubric. Of the 596 teachers who received an overall score of 67 on the summative performance evaluation, 380 teachers (64%) received a 2 on all 19 indicators. Additional calibration among TEI evaluators may resolve this issue. The data show that middle school teachers were receiving lower summative scores than elementary or high school teachers. School leadership should explore the potential causes of these differences. There was a strong correlation between spot observations and the final summative performance evaluation ratings providing evidence that TEI evaluators summative evaluation scores were consistent with what they observed throughout the school year (Table 1).
Table 1: Correlations between Average Spot Observation Scores and Summative Evaluation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>( r^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Establishes clear, aligned standards-based lesson objective(s)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Measures student mastery through a demonstration of learning (DOL)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Clearly presents instructional content</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Engages students at all learning levels in rigorous work</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Maximizes instructional time</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Observation Score</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( *: 0 = \text{small effect size}, 3 = \text{medium effect size}, 5 = \text{large effect size} \)

Student Achievement
There was a moderately strong correlation between teacher-level student achievement and School STAAR for teachers in Category A, while the correlation was relatively weak for Category B teachers. The difference in strength of the correlation between Category A and B teachers is most likely attributable to the fact that many Category A teachers had a measure based on STAAR scores of students in their classroom, rather than the campus as a whole. Category B teachers did not have this measure. The teacher-level student achievement and SLO measures had a relatively weak correlation for Categories A and B. The quality of the SLO component could be improved or assessed to determine if it makes a meaningful contribution to TEI. Over eight percent of teachers were missing their SLO score. The distribution was highly skewed to the left – over fifty percent of teachers received the maximum number of points. The correlation of SLO and teacher-level student achievement may increase as the measure is improved.

Comparing TEI Components
When comparing TEI components, teacher performance had a moderate correlation with student achievement scores for Categories A and B, but a weak correlation for Categories C and D. Categories C and D included SLO measures. Improving the SLO measure may increase the correlation between these two components. The percentage of favorable responses was used to analyze the relationship between student experience and teacher performance. The percentage of favorable responses on the student survey had a weak correlation with teacher performance and student achievement scores. Further professional development for teachers and principals may increase the strength of correlations in the future. In addition, it is hoped that adjustments to the measures and improvements in rater calibration would further increase the strength of the correlations.

Subpopulation Performance
TEI evaluation scores varied by teacher subpopulation. Teachers at magnet and majority white schools had the highest scores in all facets of TEI. The one exception was student experience scores for teachers at majority white schools. These teachers received lower student experience scores than any other subpopulation. This indicates that student subgroups may differ in their leniency/severity when evaluating their teachers. It could also potentially explain why student experience scores had low correlations with other TEI components. This may be an area worth further exploration. First-year teachers received the lowest summative scores and evaluation ratings. Their student achievement scores were the lowest with the exception of teachers at IR schools and campuses that were to become ACE campuses. Post-baccalaureate degrees did not have an impact on TEI performance. When scores were compared across high school feeder patterns, there was significant variation. Feeder patterns had similar rank orderings among most of the TEI measures with the exception of student experience. Some of the lowest performing feeder patterns in other areas received the highest student experience points. Finally, Dallas ISD retained more effective teachers at higher rates than less effective teachers.

Compensation
The majority (72%) of teachers received a salary increase during the 2015-16 school year. The median increase was $3,618. On average, teachers in each effectiveness level saw a pay increase with the exception of teachers in the unsatisfactory level. Teachers in higher effectiveness levels received larger salary increases than those in lower levels. Figure 1 compares teachers’ average 2014-15 salary to their average 2015-16 estimated salary by effectiveness level.

Figure 1: Average 2014-15 Salary versus Average Estimated 2015-16 Salary by Effectiveness Level

Salary increases were related to CYS, with salary increases being greatest for teachers with two through six years of service. Salary increases declined as CYS increased beyond six years of experience. Teachers with 20 or more creditable years of service had an average raise of $170.
TEI Teacher and Administrator Survey Results

Dallas ISD teachers and administrators participating in the first year of the new Teacher Excellence Initiative (TEI) evaluation system received a 40-item survey soliciting information about participants’ experiences with TEI during the 2014-15 school year. The survey covered the TEI process of defining excellence, supporting excellence, and rewarding excellence. The responses provided a baseline measure of how the TEI system functioned during its first year and identified any potential adjustments that could be made. There were 8,397 teachers and 579 administrators who received the survey. Of those, 4,185 teachers and 287 administrators completed the survey, resulting in a 49.8 percent and 49.6 percent response rate, respectively. Principals made up 37 percent of respondents to the administrator survey. The majority of respondents were assistant principals (63%).

The teacher and administrator TEI survey results showed that perceptions of the TEI system overall were relatively negative; however, there were individual elements of the system that respondents rated favorably. While TEI evaluator feedback, professional development, the Distinguished Teacher Review process and resources to assist in understanding TEI were aspects of the system that were rated positively, the feedback from the student experience survey, the compensation system, communication about TEI, and TEI in general were rated less favorably.

Classroom Observation and Feedback
A majority of respondents from both groups indicated that administrators were able to evaluate teachers effectively. In general, administrators were able to identify areas for improvement, set high standards for teachers, be objective and fair, understand class content, and knew classroom goals for students. Both teachers and administrators indicated that observation feedback was helpful, but administrators rated the helpfulness of their feedback more positively than did teachers (Figure 2). Over half of administrators and teachers reported that too many spot observations were conducted throughout the 2014-15 school year. Teachers and administrators did not agree that the length of spot observations were sufficient to accurately assess performance (34% of teachers said yes, compared with 52% of administrators). While administrators indicated that summative performance evaluation scores aligned with spot observation feedback (92% of administrators reported that the two were aligned), less than half of teachers agreed that the two measures were aligned (45%). It is important to note that the E&A evaluators’ analysis of spot and summative performance data indicated that there was a strong correlation between spot observation scores and summative performance evaluation scores. This may be a difference between what the data reflect and the perceptions of those experiencing the system first hand. Furthermore, half of teachers reported that summative performance evaluations were not an accurate measure of their effectiveness as a teacher.

Student Survey
About half of teachers and administrators reported that the student experience survey feedback was helpful to improving instructional practices; however, just over a quarter of teachers (28%) and less than half of administrators (41%) reported that the survey results accurately reflected strengths and weaknesses of teachers. The results of the TEI quantitative analysis component of this evaluation support this finding (the correlation between student survey results and teacher performance was weak to very weak).

Professional Development
Teachers and administrators reported that professional development sessions, especially those sessions held in person, were helpful in improving overall teacher performance. Teachers were less likely to attend extended year professional development sessions. Teachers rated the quality of
professional development overall, instructors, and materials/resources positively.

**Distinguished Teacher Review**
The TEI office conducted a survey of DTR teachers in May of 2015. The results of that survey indicated that teachers who submitted a Distinguished Teacher Review application and received an observation were satisfied with the DTR process. Over half of administrators surveyed conducted observations as part of the DTR process. Of those, just over half (52%) reported that the number of observations was “just right.” About half of administrators also reported that the process was fair (51%) and awarded DTR status to the best teachers (48%). Just over 50 percent of administrators reported that the DTR process was too cumbersome for teachers.

**Compensation**
When it came to ratings of the new compensation system, results were less favorable. Administrators’ perceptions of the new system were more positive than those of teachers. A majority of teachers disagreed with statements such as, “The new TEI system should be continued in its current form” and “The new TEI system will entice more effective teachers to work at lower performing schools.” Administrators also disagreed with these items at a higher rate, though it was not a majority. Administrators were more likely to give neutral ratings about the compensation than were teachers.

**TEI Knowledge**
When asked about their knowledge of the TEI system, over half of teachers and about three-quarters of administrators reported their knowledge to be intermediate or advanced with one exception, 49 percent of teachers rated their knowledge at this level when asked about the DTR process. Both groups indicated that they had the most knowledge about the observation rubric used to rate teacher performance and TEI in general. They were less knowledgeable about how overall evaluation ratings were calculated and how effectiveness levels were calculated. Teachers were less likely to report that they had the resources they needed to understand 2014-15 TEI results – about 55 percent of teachers said “yes”, while 76 percent of administrators reported having the resources they needed to help teachers understand their results. Teachers were also less likely than administrators to report specific TEI resources as being helpful, but about half of teachers rated most of the items in the section as helpful. About 32 percent of teachers indicated that they did not attend in-person professional development on TEI held somewhere other than their campus. Teachers found professional development held on their campus to be most helpful (59% of teachers indicated this resource was helpful or very helpful). While teachers rated their knowledge of TEI and the resources related to TEI relatively positively, they were less positive about the district’s communication about TEI. Between 42 and 45 percent of teachers reported the district’s communication regarding different aspects of TEI was moderately or very effective. Between 67 and 79 percent of administrators indicated communication around these same aspects to be moderately or very effective. The items included knowing where to find general information about TEI, specific information about ratings and compensation, information about the Distinguished Teacher Review process, and how to interpret and understand TEI scorecards.

**Satisfaction with TEI**
About 77 percent of teachers and 62 percent of administrators reported that the TEI system increased their levels of stress and anxiety. While 58 percent and 50 percent of teachers reported that TEI took more effort than results were worth and relied too heavily on student growth, respectively, 41 percent and 26 percent of administrators agreed with these same items. While 61 percent of administrators reported that they were satisfied with teacher evaluation process at their school, 31 percent of teachers indicated that they were satisfied. The results of the survey indicate that there was a disconnect between teachers and administrators when it came to their experiences, knowledge, and perceptions of the TEI system.

**Recommendations**
The recommendations resulting from the evaluation related to exploring quantitative findings related to TEI components; addressing discrepancies between teacher and administrator feedback about experiences; examining spot observation and summative performance evaluation protocols; providing additional opportunities for teachers to learn about calculations of overall evaluation ratings, effectiveness levels, and compensation levels; and increasing campus-based professional development for teachers. Recommendations also included administering the teacher and administrator perception surveys again at a later date and applying methods that could potentially increase the response rate above 50 percent in order to gain a more representative picture of the attitudes and experiences of Dallas ISD teachers and administrators. A complete list of recommendations can be found in the full report. Future evaluations will include an examination of teacher professional development participation and continued monitoring of the strength of correlations among the three TEI components.

Additional information may be obtained by consulting the TEI Evaluation Report, EA15-539-2, at: http://www.dallasisd.org/Page/888.