**Completer Teacher Effectiveness Data**

The state of Kansas requires each district to have a teacher evaluation system. Districts may choose to use the state’s tool, the Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP), choose another valid and reliable tool or construct their own. Any tool outside the KEEP used by a district must be approved by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE). This analysis used the McRel Teacher Evaluation System. This system has been approved for use by KSDE. “McREL’s Teacher Evaluation System is designed to (1) assess a teacher’s performance as it relates to the Professional Teaching Standards, and (2) serve as the basis for developing a professional growth plan. The principal/evaluator conducts the evaluation process, in which the teacher actively participates, through the use of self-assessment, reflection, presentation of artifacts, and classroom demonstrations(s) (Source: <http://www.lakeviewschools.net/uploads/McREL/McREL_TeacherRubricSystem%20FINAL%2007_10.pdf>, page 9).”

**McRel Rating Scale:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Rating** | **Definition** |
| **Developing (1)** | The teacher demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving proficiency on the standard(s) or element(s). |
| **Proficient (2)** | The teacher demonstrated basic competence on the standard(s) or element(s). |
| **Accomplished (3)** | The teacher exceeded basic competence on the standard(s) or element(s). |
| **Distinguished (4)** | The teacher consistently and significantly exceeded basic competence on the standard(s) or element(s). |
| **No Demonstrated (0)** | The teacher did not demonstrate competence on nor demonstrate adequate growth toward achieving a minimum rating of developing on the standard(s) or element(s). |

McRel Teacher Evaluation data for new teachers beginning 2014, 2015 and 2016 were shared by a participating district. Data were shared in aggregate form to protect teacher identity and maintain confidentiality as required by the state of Kansas. Data were provided disaggregated by completer year and level by the district. Table 1 provides data for the 2014, 2015 and 2016 completers. The table provides a longitudinal view of for those completers employed by the district for more than one year. Since data for multiple years were provided, the EPP could determine approximate mean growth for completers from one year to the next. While there are a few negative growth areas for 2014 EPP completers from the second year to the third year, these data must be used with caution. In the first and second years, teachers have at least two evaluations per year, while teachers only have one evaluation in the third year. Thus, the *N* drops significantly in the third year. From the first year to the third year, 2014 EPP completers do demonstrate positive growth. Additionally, both 2014 and 2015 EPP completers demonstrated positive growth in all categories from year one to year two. For year one for 2014, 2015, and 2016 completers, mean data indicated EPP completers were well above developing and near proficient for each category on the McRel Teaching Evaluation rubric, and for some categories, completers had demonstrated proficiency as a first year teacher.

**Results of Extended Data Analysis for Teacher Effectiveness Data:**

* An independent samples *t-*test indicated there was a significant difference in elementary versus secondary 2014 completers’ first year evaluations for Standard 3B (*t*=-2.412, *p*<.05; elementary mean=2.06; secondary mean=2.50). Standard 2B: *Teachers embrace diversity in the school community and in the world*. Table 5.0 provides the descriptive statistics.
* An independent samples *t*-test indicated there was a significant difference in elementary versus secondary 2015 completers’ first year evaluations for Standard 1D (*t*=2.046, *p*<.05, elementary mean=2.09, secondary mean=1.90), Standard 1E (*t*=3.477, *p*<.05; elementary mean=3.35, secondary mean=2.75), Standard 2B (*t*=-2.546, *p*<.05, elementary mean=1.78, secondary mean=2.30), Standard 3B (*t*=-2.207, *p*<.05, elementary mean=2.00, secondary mean=2.35), Standard 3C (*t*=-3.555, *p*<.05, elementary mean=1.65, secondary mean=2.20), Standard 3D (*t*=-2.315, *p*<.05, elementary mean=1.65, secondary mean=2.10), Standard 3 Total Score (*t*=-2.423, *p*<.05, elementary mean=1.70, secondary mean=2.15), Standard 4C (*t*=-2.757, *p*<.05; elementary mean=1.70, secondary mean=2.30), Standard 4H (*t*=-2.274, *p*<.05, elementary mean=1.65, secondary mean=2.10), Standard 4 Total Score (*t*=-2.150, *p*<.05, elementary mean=1.83, secondary mean=2.25), Standard 5B (*t*=3.529, *p*<.05, elementary mean=2.96, secondary mean=2.20). Table 6.0 provides the descriptive statistics.
* An independent samples *t*-test indicated there was a significant difference in elementary versus secondary 2016 completers’ first year evaluations for Standard 2C (*t*=2.307, p<.05; elementary mean=2.62, secondary mean=2.14). Table 7.0 provides the descriptive statistics.
* Based on an independent samples *t*-test, 2014 mean completer scores improved significantly in a number of areas, including the total score for standards 1, 2 and 5. Growth was not statistically significant for standards 3 and 4. Table 1.0 compares evaluation data between cycles.
* Based on an independent samples *t*-test, 2015 mean completer scores improved significantly in a number of areas, including the total score for standards 1, 2 and 5. Growth was not statistically significant for standards 3 and 4. Table 1.0 compares evaluation data between cycles.
* A one-way analysis of variance indicated there were no significant differences in cohort completer means between 2014, 2015 and 2016 first-year performance on the McRel evaluation items.

Note: In the tables below, *N* represents the number of evaluations occurring during that year. During year one and two in the district, teaches are evaluated two times each year. Beginning in year three, teachers are evaluated only once each year.

**Table 1 Mean McRel Rating Scores—EPP Completer Comparisons (N=number of evaluations)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard/Element** | **2016 ESU Completers**  **2016-2017 Eval**  **(N=43)** | | **2015 ESU Completers**  **2015-2016 Eval**  **(N=42)** | **2015 ESU Completers**  **2016-2017 Eval**  **(N=32)** | **2015**  **Completer Growth from 15-16 to 16-17** | **2014 ESU Completers**  **2014-2015 Eval**  **(N=34)** | **2014 ESU Completers**  **2015-2016 Eval**  **(N=31)** | **2014 Completer Growth from 14-15 to 15-16** | **2014 ESU Completers**  **2016-2017 Eval**  **(N=13)**  **3rd year; only one evaluation** | **2014 Completer Growth from 15-16 to 16-17 and**  **14-15 to 16-17** |
| **Standard 1: Teachers Demonstrate Leadership** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Teachers lead in their classroom. | 1.95 | | 2.12 | 2.56 | 0.44 | 1.88 | 2.52 | 0.64 | 2.46 | -0.06/  0.58 |
| B. Teachers demonstrate leadership in the school. | 1.93 | | 2.00 | 2.41 | 0.41 | 1.79 | 2.26 | 0.47 | 2.31 | 0.05/  0.52 |
| C. Teachers lead the teaching profession. | 2.16 | | 2.24 | 2.66 | 0.42 | 2.12 | 2.58 | 0.45 | 2.77 | 0.19/  0.65 |
| D. Teachers advocate for schools and student. | 1.93 | | 2.00 | 2.38 | 0.38 | 1.85 | 2.19 | 0.34 | 2.38 | 0.19/  0.53 |
| E. Teachers demonstrate high ethical standards. | 2.70 | | 3.07 | 3.16 | 0.09 | 2.82 | 2.94 | 0.12 | 3.15 | 0.21/  0.33 |
| Overall rating for Teachers Demonstrate Leadership | 2.09 | | 2.12 | 2.56 | 0.44 | 1.91 | 2.48 | 0.57 | 2.54 | 0.06/  0.63 |
| **Standard 2: Teachers establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Teachers provide an environment in which each child has a positive, nurturing relationship with caring adults. | 2.67 | | 2.79 | 2.97 | 0.18 | 2.62 | 2.97 | 0.35 | 3.00 | 0.03/  0.38 |
| B. Teachers embrace diversity in the school community and in the world. | 1.74 | | 2.00 | 2.25 | 0.25 | 1.88 | 2.42 | 0.54 | 2.46 | 0.04/  0.58 |
| C. Teachers treat students as individuals. | 2.44 | | 2.43 | 3.00 | 0.57 | 2.65 | 2.84 | 0.19 | 3.08 | 0.24/  0.43 |
| D. Teachers adapt their teaching for the benefit of students with special needs. | 2.09 | | 2.10 | 2.25 | 0.15 | 2.18 | 2.48 | 0.30 | 2.62 | 0.14/  0.44 |
| E. Teachers work collaboratively with the families and significant adults in the lives of their students. | 2.02 | | 2.19 | 2.34 | 0.15 | 2.21 | 2.71 | 0.50 | 2.54 | -0.17/  0.33 |
| Overall rating for Teachers Establish Respectful Environment | 2.19 | | 2.17 | 2.50 | 0.33 | 2.24 | 2.68 | 0.44 | 2.77 | 0.09/  0.53 |
| **Standard 3: Teachers know the content they teach** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Teachers align their instruction with the state standards and district approved curriculum. | | 2.02 | 1.93 | 2.44 | 0.51 | 2.06 | 2.48 | 0.42 | 2.46 | -0.02/  0.40 |
| B. Teachers know the content appropriate to their teaching specialty. | | 2.09 | 2.14 | 2.47 | 0.33 | 2.26 | 2.48 | 0.22 | 2.62 | 0.14/  0.36 |
| C. Teachers recognize the interconnectedness of content areas/disciplines. | | 1.86 | 1.88 | 2.28 | 0.40 | 1.97 | 2.39 | 0.42 | 2.31 | -0.08/  0.34 |
| D. Teachers make instruction relevant to students. | | 1.84 | 1.83 | 2.28 | 0.45 | 2.06 | 2.52 | 0.46 | 2.62 | 0.10/  0.56 |
| Overall rating for Know the Content They Teach | | 1.91 | 1.88 | 2.25 | 0.37 | 2.06 | 2.35 | 0.29 | 2.38 | 0.03/  0.32 |
| **Standard 4: Teachers facilitate learning for their students** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Teachers know the ways in which learning takes place, and they know the appropriate levels of intellectual, physical, social, and emotional development of their students. | | 1.84 | 1.93 | 2.19 | 0.26 | 2.06 | 2.35 | 0.29 | 2.38 | 0.03/  0.32 |
| B. Teachers plan instruction appropriate for their students. | | 2.09 | 2.26 | 2.47 | 0.21 | 2.15 | 2.55 | 0.40 | 2.69 | 0.14/  0.45 |
| C. Teachers use a variety of instructional methods. | | 2.02 | 1.95 | 2.31 | 0.36 | 2.18 | 2.52 | 0.07 | 2.46 | -0.06/  0.28 |
| D. Teachers integrate and utilize technology in their instruction. | | 2.16 | 2.24 | 2.22 | -0.02 | 1.97 | 2.55 | 0.58 | 2.31 | -0.24/  0.34 |
| E. Teachers help students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills. | | 2.05 | 2.14 | 2.31 | 0.17 | 2.00 | 2.35 | 0.35 | 2.54 | 0.19/  0.54 |
| F. Teachers help students work in teams and develop leadership qualities. | | 1.91 | 2.05 | 2.25 | 0.10 | 1.91 | 2.45 | 0.54 | 2.00 | -0.45/  0.09 |
| G. Teachers communicate effectively. | | 2.16 | 2.07 | 2.47 | 0.40 | 2.00 | 2.58 | 0.58 | 2.38 | -0.20/  0.38 |
| H. Teachers use a variety of methods to assess what each student has learned. | | 1.72 | 1.83 | 2.06 | 0.23 | 1.91 | 2.23 | 0.32 | 2.15 | -0.08/  0.24 |
| Overall rating for Teachers Facilitate Learning for Their Students | | 1.93 | 2.00 | 2.31 | 0.31 | 2.09 | 2.42 | 0.33 | 2.31 | -0.11/  0.22 |
| **Standard 5: Teachers reflect on their practice** | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. Teachers analyze student learning. | | 1.93 | 2.14 | 2.50 | 0.36 | 2.18 | 2.61 | 0.43 | 2.85 | 0.24/  0.67 |
| B. Teachers link professional growth to their professional goals. | | 2.30 | 2.60 | 2.97 | 0.37 | 2.32 | 2.81 | 0.49 | 3.08 | 0.27/  0.76 |
| C. Teachers function effectively in a complex, dynamic environment. | | 1.81 | 1.98 | 2.56 | 0.58 | 1.94 | 2.39 | 0.45 | 2.54 | 0.15/  0.60 |
| Overall rating for Teachers Reflect on Their Practice | | 1.91 | 2.12 | 2.63 | 0.51 | 2.21 | 2.58 | 0.37 | 2.85 | 0.27/  0.64 |