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TEACHER EXCELLENCE INITIATIVE (TEI) TRAINING END-OF-YEAR REPORT

Project Evaluator: Nora E. Douglas, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

The Teacher Excellence Initiative (TEI), a new system for evaluating and supporting teachers, began during the 2014-15 school year. The initiative had three components – defining, supporting, and rewarding excellence – and included conducting annual evaluations of teachers, developing teachers through coaching and training opportunities, and providing opportunities for teachers to receive pay increases as a result of merit rather than tenure. Administrators were required to participate in a certification training to learn and calibrate on the new rubric. Other Dallas ISD staff could participate in the training. The 2014-15 evaluation of TEI focused specifically on this training. The TEI certification training was made up of three components: system knowledge, rater accuracy, and an observation and coaching field experience. Training participants attended training sessions for system knowledge and rater accuracy and were tested in these two areas. Trainees worked with a supervising administrator to conduct spot observations during the field experience. Results of a training satisfaction survey from fall 2014 indicated that training participants were highly satisfied with the quality of the TEI training they received. The strongest components were that the training provided a deeper understanding of the TEI process and how to coach teachers towards excellence in the classroom. Suggestions for improvement included follow-up training, more time and opportunities for practice, and more timely distribution of training materials. When analyzing training data for fall and spring 2014-15, results of a comparison of the average number of attempts to pass the certification exam indicated that there were some differences in passing rates by trainer as well as over time. An analysis of spot observation scores showed that scores increased slightly over time and that average spot observation scores were relatively similar between divisions and feeder patterns, though division 4 had the highest average scores for both semesters and division 2 had the lowest. Recommendations as a result of the evaluation focused on increased training and calibration opportunities for administrators, improved tracking of training participants, and changes to scoring of spot observations in the Schoolnet system.
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PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Background Information

The Teacher Excellence Initiative (TEI) began its first year of implementation of the evaluation and associated support systems during the 2014-15 school year. Beginning in 2015-16, teacher evaluation results from the 2014-15 school year will be used to determine compensation levels. In the summer of 2014, administrators and other central office staff members within TEI began certifying evaluators on the TEI system. TEI was funded in part through the Texas Education Agency Educator Excellence Innovation Program. The first-year budget of $700,000 came from General Operating funds. The second-year budget was $1 million, of which half funded Dallas ISD TEI staff member salaries. The remaining funds were used towards other TEI-related expenditures.

Purpose and Goal

The initiative was established with one primary objective, to improve student learning by improving teacher effectiveness. There are three components to the TEI system: Defining, Supporting, and Rewarding Excellence. Defining Excellence involves conducting annual evaluations of teachers that contain 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.

The evaluator certification is made up of three stages: TEI system knowledge, rater accuracy, and an observation and coaching field experience. Dallas ISD staff members responsible for completing teacher evaluations for the 2014-15 school year, including employees who transferred into an administrator position, were required to complete the certification within 30 instructional days from the hire date. Returning administrators will receive annual update training before the 30th day of instruction during each school year. Any classroom observations conducted prior to the evaluator receiving their certification do not count as part of the teacher’s evaluation.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation will focus specifically on the training component of TEI and will:

1. Determine the source and amount of funding for the program.
2. Describe the design of the TEI training program.
3. Summarize TEI trainee experiences during training.
4. Summarize the passing rates in the TEI training course and analyze any class differences in passing rates.
5. Review passing rates over time and analyze factors associated with any changes in passing rates.
6. Determine to what extent trainees have been calibrated on their TEI scoring and whether this calibration holds over time.
7. Deliver the evaluator’s recommendations with respect to program improvement or continuance.

MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

What was the design of the TEI certification training program?

Methodology

The evaluator reviewed program documentation in order to determine the purpose and scope of the TEI program.

Results

TEI Certification Trainers

Teaching and Learning Solutions (TLS) were selected through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to be the vendor responsible for providing summer TEI certification training. TLS created the training curriculum with feedback from the TEI leadership team. TEI then hired in-house trainers to conduct training throughout the year. These trainers needed to have past teaching experience and were required to complete a skills test, a phone screening, and an in-person interview as part of the hiring process. Once hired, Dallas ISD trainers went through the TEI certification training with TLS and then completed a train-the-trainer model with TLS in order to learn the curriculum and how to administer the training.

Training Participants

Dallas ISD staff who would be conducting spot observations that would count towards a teacher’s evaluation were required to complete the certification (i.e., principals and assistant principals). Executive directors were also required to complete the training. Other district staff such as instructional coaches and school leadership staff (coordinators and academic facilitators) were encouraged to complete the training but were not required to complete it. Dallas Leadership Development/Fellows Academy fellows completed the training as part of their training. Under the Teaching and Learning department, staff who were going to support the Distinguished Teacher Review process were required to become certified. There was some confusion about which staff members should attend the TEI certification training. The TEI department is working to clarify who is expected to complete training for the 2015-16 school year.
Training Components

The TEI evaluator training had three components: system knowledge, rater accuracy, and field experience. Staff attended training sessions for system knowledge and rater accuracy and then were tested on these two components before they began their field experience. The three components are described below:

- **TEI System Knowledge** – This section of training included a multiple-choice assessment to demonstrate proficiency. The assessment covered certification training materials, DNA policy and regulations (Board Policy), Student Learning Objective (SLO) training, and the TEI Teacher Guidebook. Training topics included teacher categories within TEI, TEI performance, student achievement, student surveys, Distinguished Teacher Review (DTR), supporting excellence, and rewarding excellence.

- **Rater Accuracy** – evaluators viewed and rated a video of classroom instruction. In order to pass this component of the training, they needed to demonstrate accuracy on the five focus indicators for the spot observations and the 11 observable indicators. The TEI System Knowledge exam and Rater Accuracy exam took place on the same day.

- **Observation and Coaching Field Experience** – returning Dallas ISD administrators could meet this requirement by conducting at least 15 spot observations and coaching conversations during the previous school year. New Dallas ISD administrators were required to complete a field experience with a supervisor (an Executive Director or other “certified” administrator) during the 2014-15 school year. That experience included 15 spot observations, 3 joint spot observations, and 1 joint feedback conference. The supervisor then completed an online assessment of the evaluator.

Administrators were required to pass all three components of the training before they received their certification. If an administrator did not pass the calibration assessment the first time, they received a group coaching session and could retake the assessment. If they did not pass a second time, they received an intervention plan with individualized coaching support and could retake the assessment. Not passing a third time led to other actions which could have included termination; however, no staff were actually fired as a result of failing the assessment. Instead, staff who took more than three times to pass were provided an in-person opportunity which included conducting two live spot observation along with an executive director and two principals followed by a debriefing session and then conducting one final spot observation which, if calibrated with the executive director and principals, counted as a passing assessment.

**Spot Observation Forms**

Summative evaluations represent between 50 and 80 percent of the new Teacher Excellence Initiative evaluation rubric scoring system depending on the teacher category. Administrators use evidence collected during spot observations and extended observations throughout the year to inform their summative evaluation scoring, but an average of spot observation scores is not used to calculate the
summative evaluation score. The student achievement results represent 20 to 35 percent of the total score depending on category and the student survey results represent up to 15 percent.

Spot observations are made up of five indicators: 1) establishes clear and rigorous lesson objectives, 2) measures student mastery through a Demonstration of Learning, 3) clearly presents instructional content, 4) engages students at all learning levels in rigorous work, and 5) maximizes instructional time. Evaluators rate teachers on each indicator on a scale of 0 to 3 (with half-point increments as options). Evaluators then provide comments on praise, questions, and polish.

Administrators (primary evaluators) must conduct at least 10 spot observations per teacher per year and at least one extended observation. Spot observations are conducted between September and May each school year.

On December 5, 2015, the Superintendent of Schools released a memo indicating that administrators could conduct four spot observations for each teacher in the fall and the remaining six observations in the spring. Distinguished Teacher Review (DTR) eligible teachers had to have six spot observations total, with four spot observations conducted before December 2015. Teachers who were hired later in the year had their number of required spot observations calculated based on their hire date. The memo also announced that administrators were no longer required to score spot observations. This change in scoring did not affect how summative evaluation scores were calculated; however, if there were no spot observation scores for a given teacher, principals no longer had quantitative data to draw from when determining the summative evaluation score. They only had the qualitative comments to use a guide to the teacher’s progress throughout the year. The text of the memo is below:

Effective second semester the scoring of spot observations will be left to principal discretion. If a principal decides not to score the spot observations and provides only written feedback, select “N/A” for each indicator and enter comments into the corresponding text field in SchooNet. Note this is a building-level decision that principals should make with their leadership team based on what feedback they feel would be most advantageous for supporting and developing their teachers.

What were TEI trainee experiences during the certification training course?

Methods

TEI certification training participants completed a 9-item survey at the end of training. There were 903 trainees who responded to the survey. There were five closed-ended items and four open-ended items. Respondents were asked to rate the quality of training on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being “poor” and 5 being “outstanding.” The middle values were not defined. The results shown here are from surveys administered during the fall 2014 training sessions.

Results

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of four aspects of the training (content, presentation, materials, and participation) along with the overall quality of the training. A large majority of respondents
were highly satisfied with the training. Figure 1 shows the percentage of respondents who chose each rating. Only the lowest and highest categories were defined by text (i.e., 1=Poor and 5=Outstanding.) The middle categories (i.e., 2, 3, 4) were not defined. The lowest rated item related to training materials. A review of open-ended comments suggested that the materials and resources were a strength of the training, but that they may not have not been distributed in a timely manner.

![Figure 1: Respondent ratings of training quality](image)

The survey solicited information about the most valuable aspects of the training. The most common areas identified as strengths were: trainers, explanations, and feedback; practice with the rubric; calibrating, interacting with peers, and collaboration; informative group discussions; videos; and handouts, articles, and resources. Survey participants also reported that as a result of training, they had a better understanding of TEI and a clarification of the TEI process (including the pay scale, compensation, and how to train faculty on TEI).

Respondents then reported what aspects of training would most influence their practice. They reported that they would be:

- Better at coaching teachers.
- More confident with the rubric including implementing with fidelity, remaining objective, becoming a better evaluator, use for curriculum planning, and use for training staff.
- More knowledgeable about what to focus on and how to use the rubric for scoring.
- More knowledgeable about TEI and be better able to answer questions.
- Better able to work on their weaknesses, more aware of their performance, and able to identify areas for personal improvement.

Respondents provided suggestions for improving the training program. During the initial training sessions, respondents recommended that in the future they be presented at a slower pace with more time for processing and more clarification of training topics. Respondents also recommended there be more time
for practice within the training sessions, handouts be provided at the beginning of the sessions, the training environment be more comfortable and conducive to learning, and that time during training be better managed. Providing more time for practice was also a common response from survey participants as well as providing more videos for practice, including more videos of Dallas ISD teachers (rather than teachers from other districts), and aligning videos with Dallas ISD initiatives. Respondents requested follow-up trainings and additional calibration throughout the school year.

What were the passing rates in the TEI training courses and were there any trainer differences in passing rates?

Methodology

The evaluator analyzed training data provided by TEI program staff. The evaluator had access to an Excel spreadsheet that included data for all trainees for the 2014-15 school year. The data included the dates and number of times it took each participant to pass the certification exam as well as the trainer for each session. An outside vendor was contracted to run the summer TEI training sessions. Because the vendor was not a Dallas ISD employee and program management was specifically interested in passing rates for Dallas ISD trainers, the data from that group were not used in the analyses for this section. There were 10 training participants who did not pass the certification exam. They were not included in the analyses when comparing the number of times it took participants to pass the exam.

Limitations

No training date was provided in the data file; thus, date of first certification exam attempt was used as a proxy for training date. The program kept certification exam information in a separate file from the list of trainers for each session. There was not trainer information available for all trainees.

Results

There were 1,256 Dallas ISD staff members certified during the summer of 2014 and the 2014-15 school year. There were 36 staff members who participated in training but did not receive a certification. Only principals and assistant principals were required to complete TEI certification.

Tables 1 and 2 show the number and percentage of participants by position, trainer, and semester. The majority of principals and assistant principals were trained in the summer of 2014. An outside vendor was hired to conduct this training. There were seven Dallas ISD trainers hired to conduct training in the fall and spring semester. Trainers also conducted sessions in teams. The trainers are not identified by name in this report; however, the TEI program manager received specific trainer information to aid in program planning for the 2015-16 school year.
A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tested for differences in mean number of attempts to pass by trainer (participants who did not pass the certification exam and participants trained by the outside vendor were not included in the analyses.) There was a statistically significant difference between groups (F=5.791; df=7, 475; p=.000). Participants trained by Trainer E and A were less likely to pass the exam on the first attempt than participants trained by Trainers F, G, and the Team-Led Training. Figure 2 shows the mean number of attempts to pass by trainer. Trainers for each session were selected based on availability and trainers were asked to volunteer for sessions they wanted to conduct. In October 2014, the program switched to a rotation-based system to ensure that all trainers were carrying an even workload.
Table 3 shows the number and percentage of participants for each trainer by the number of attempts to pass. For comparison purposes, participants who did not pass are also included in this table, as well as figures for the participants trained by the outside vendor in the summer.

### Table 3: Number of Attempts to Pass by Trainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>1 Attempt</th>
<th>2 Attempts</th>
<th>3 Attempts</th>
<th>5 Attempts</th>
<th>Did Not Pass</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainer A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer B</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer D</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer E</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer G</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Led Training</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>434</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>492</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vendor           | 599       | 97         | 55         | 2          | 0           | 753   |

### Figure 2: Average Number of Attempts to Pass by Trainer

**What were the exam passing rates over time?**

**Methodology**

The evaluator analyzed training data provided by TEI program staff. The evaluator had access to an Excel spreadsheet that included data for all trainees for the 2014-15 school year. The data included the dates and number of times it took each participant to pass the certification exam as well as the trainer for each session. There were 10 training participants who did not pass the certification exam. They were not included in the analyses when comparing the number of times it took participants to pass the exam.
Because change over time is examined in this section, data from the vendor hired to conduct training sessions over the summer of 2014 were included in the analyses.

**Results**

**Test of Significance**

A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tested for differences in mean number of attempts to pass by semester (participants who did not pass the certification exam were not included in the analyses.) There was a statistically significant difference between groups (F=15.505; df=2, 1,279; p=.000). Training participants were more likely to pass the certification exam on the first attempt as the year progressed. Table 4 shows the number and percentage of participants each semester by the number of attempts to pass. Over time, the number of times it took participants to pass the certification exam decreased. In spring 2015, 100 percent of participants passed the exam on the first attempt (there were fewer training participants in the spring than in other semesters.) For comparison purposes, participants who did not pass are also included in this table. The outside vendor conducted the summer training sessions. Dallas ISD trainers conducted the sessions in the fall and spring.

The ANOVA results indicate that there were differences in average number of attempts to pass the certification exam as the year progressed; however; it does not explain why these differences exist. Trainers could have had additional support or clarification on training topics throughout the year, which could have improved their ability to communicate the information. In addition, the vendor who conducted summer training (TLS) was less familiar with the TEI rubric and the Dallas ISD trainers became more familiar with the rubric as the year progressed. Class sizes were smaller as the year progressed which could have provided participants with additional individualized attention.

**Table 4:** Number and Percentage of Participants by Number of Attempts to Pass and Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>1 Attempt</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2 Attempts</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>3 Attempts</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>5 Attempts</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Did Not Pass</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent have trainees been calibrated on their TEI scoring and does this calibration hold over time?

Methodology
The evaluator analyzed Spot Observation data from Schoolnet. The data were retrieved on June 5, 2015 and included all spot observation data for the 2014-15 school year.

Limitations
In spring 2015, administrators could score “N/A” on spot observations rather than give a score. This change created a limitation when analyzing spot observation data. Teachers were scored on spots from 0 to 3. When administrators gave an “N/A”, that rating was translated as a 0 in the spot observation data; thus, it was impossible to determine whether a teacher scored a true “0”.

An analysis of calibration over time could not be conducted because only one administrator evaluated a teacher at a time; thus, no comparison data existed in order to conduct an inter-rater reliability test (a test of the degree of agreement among raters.)

The analysis includes a review of Distinguished Teacher Review-Eligible (DTR-Eligible) teacher spot observation scores. In order to become DTR eligible teachers must have met the following criteria for the 2014-15 school year:

- Teachers must be in at least their third year of service in the 2014-15 school year.
- Teachers must score at least 65 points on the performance rubric (summative performance evaluation) by midnight on December 7, 2014.

For teachers eligible for DTR, the summative performance evaluation score may be determined, and the summative conference may be held after a minimum of four spot observations and the extended observation are conducted in order to allow time to go through the DTR process. The TEI department notified teachers if they were eligible and invited them to participate in the application process.

Results
There were 96,516 spot observations conducted for 10,587 teachers during the 2014-15 school year; thus, teachers received an average of about 9 spots throughout the year.

Comparing Scores by Month
Figures 3 and 4 show the average spot observation scores for each semester by month. Figure 3 shows average scores for all teachers, DTR-Eligible teachers and non DTR-eligible teachers. Scores increased slightly throughout the first semester, with DTR-Eligible teachers receiving higher scores throughout the semester. Figure 4 shows average scores including the zeros (see limitations discussion above) and without the zeros. When zeros were included, average scores drop noticeably in June 2015. It is reasonable to assume that this drop is because of an increase in “N/A” ratings for that month. When the zeros were removed, scores increased slightly throughout the second semester. Data for DTR-Eligible and non DTR-Eligible teachers is also shown. As in the fall, DTR-Eligible teachers received higher scores
throughout the second semester. Additional calibration data would be needed to determine whether scores changed due to an increase in performance as a result of increased instructional leadership and coaching or due to less rigorous evaluations or inflated scores.

Figure 3: Fall 2014 – Average Spot Observation Scores by Teacher Category

![Figure 3: Fall 2014 – Average Spot Observation Scores by Teacher Category](image)

Figure 4: Spring 2015 – Average Spot Observation Scores by Teacher Category

![Figure 4: Spring 2015 – Average Spot Observation Scores by Teacher Category](image)
Comparing Scores by Feeder and Division

Average scores across divisions were relatively stable (Figure 5). Division 2 had the lowest average scores for both fall and spring. Division 4 had the highest average scores for both semesters. A comparison of fall and spring could not be made because scores of zero were removed from the spring semester data.

Figure 5: Average Spot Observation Scores by Semester and Division

Figures 6 and 7 show the average spot observation scores for fall and spring by feeder pattern. A comparison of fall and spring could not be made because scores of zero were removed from the spring semester data. In fall 2014, the average score difference was about half a point between the Woodrow Wilson feeder pattern (the highest average score) to the Kimball feeder pattern (the lowest average score.) There was a little less than a half point difference in average scores for the lowest and highest scoring feeder patterns in the spring.
Figure 6: Fall 2014 - Average Spot Observation Scores by Feeder Pattern

Figure 7: Spring 2015 – Average Spot Observation Scores by Feeder Pattern
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The TEI certification training was made up of three components: system knowledge, rater accuracy, and an observation and coaching field experience. There were training sessions on system knowledge and rater accuracy, with an exam for each. Trainees began their field experience after completing the first two certification exams. Principals and assistant principals were required to complete their certification – all other district staff could participate in training, but were not required to complete the certification. Conducting spot observations was one of the covered subjects. Summative evaluations represent 50 percent of the new Teacher Excellence Initiative evaluation rubric scoring system. Evidence from spot observations throughout the year are reflected in the summative evaluation scores, though actual spot observations scores are not used in the summative evaluation score calculations. Student achievement and student surveys results made up the remaining 50 percent.

Respondents to TEI training survey were highly satisfied with the training they received. They rated all five closed-ended items in the survey highly and comments suggested the training provided a deeper understanding of the TEI process and how to coach teachers towards excellence in the classroom. Suggestions for improvement included follow-up training, more time and opportunities for practice, and more timely distribution of training materials.

There were 1,292 Dallas ISD staff members trained on the TEI system between summer of 2014 and June 2015. Of those, 1,256 received certifications. The majority of principals and assistant principals were trained in the summer, while other staff such as instructional coaches and central staff were trained throughout the year. There were seven trainers hired to conduct TEI training during the 2014-15 school year. They trained individually and in teams. A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated that there were some trainer differences when it came to the number of times it took participants to pass the certification exam. Participants who were trained by Trainers E and A were less likely than participants trained by Trainers F, G, and the Team-Led Training to pass the certification exam on the first attempt. Trainees attempted the certification exam between one and five times in order to pass. The percentage of trainees who passed on the first attempt was 74.6 percent and 79.2 percent, respectively for trainers E and A. The percentage of trainees who passed on the first attempt for Trainer’s F, G, and the Team-Led Training were 100 percent, 97.7 percent, and 100 percent, respectively.

Passing rates over time increased slightly over the course of the school year. An ANOVA indicated there were some statistically significant differences between groups. Over time, it took participants fewer attempts on average to pass the certification exam. From summer, fall, to spring, the percentage of trainees who passed the exam on the first attempt increased from 79.5 percent, to 85.7 percent, to 100 percent, respectively.

There were 96,516 spot observations conducted during the 2014-15 school year for 10,587 teachers. A lack of comparison data prevented the use of inter-rater reliability (a test of the degree of agreement among raters) for 2014-15 spot observation data to determine calibration levels over time.
Instead, the evaluator conducted a descriptive analysis to look at average spot observation scores over time. In spring 2015, administrators were no longer required to score spot observations. They were able to give an “N/A” and then provide qualitative feedback to teachers. These “N/A” scores were translated into zeros in the Schoolnet data. The spot observation scoring system ranged from 0 to 3 with half-point increments. Because “N/A” was also coded as a zero, comparing fall and spring scores was difficult. An analysis of fall and spring data showed that scores did improve over time, with DTR-eligible teachers performing at a higher level. Average scores by feeder pattern were relatively similar with Division 4 having the highest average scores for fall and spring and Division 2 having the lowest average scores for fall and spring.

**Recommendations**

The following are recommendations based on the results of the 2014-15 TEI program evaluation:

1. Results of the fall trainee survey and spot observation data suggest that conducting follow-up training and calibration with administrators throughout the year would be beneficial.
   a. This training should include additional time for practice and calibration (as suggested by training participants).
   b. The program should investigate methods to track calibration results so that evaluators can run inter-rater reliability tests to determine whether raters are maintaining the expected levels of rigor throughout the year.

2. Results of the trainee survey suggested that providing training materials to training participants at the beginning of each training would benefit training participants. This would allow for better time management and greater processing of information.

3. Results of the training data analyses indicated that a review of trainer characteristics to determine if additional training on the TEI system would be beneficial for them was in order. Trainers showed some differences in participant outcomes; this could be due to the way materials were covered in different training sessions.

4. In order for training data to be better analyzed, more detailed tracking of training information is needed. This includes who trained each participant and what dates each participant attended training. Tracking information about the supervising administrator for the observation and coaching field experience would allow for evaluation of that process.

5. Based on the analyses of Schoolnet data it is recommended that Schoolnet data be adjusted so that scores of “N/A” are not coded as zero. This will allow for valid comparisons of data over time.
6. The TEI department should investigate the rationale for the spot observation rule change and determine if it is appropriate (this could include gathering data from teachers and administrators.)