

Achieving Equity in Teacher and Principal Distribution

Summary

To enable State officials, parents, the Department of Education, local educators and other key stakeholders to measure States' progress towards improving teacher effectiveness and achieving equity in the distribution of teachers and principals, States will need to collect, publish, and analyze basic information about how districts evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness and distribute their highly qualified and effective teachers among schools. The objective is to highlight inequities that result in low-income and minority students being taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field or ineffective teachers at higher rates than other students. Similarly, because principals play a critical role in teaching and learning, it is important to highlight inequities that result in low-income and minority students being taught in schools overseen by ineffective principals at higher rates than other students.

General Instructions:

In this section, as appropriate, please update the information that was submitted as part of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) supplement to the Bridge to Excellence Master Plan Guidance. in December 2009. You should use the December 2009 report as a starting point and update as needed.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local education agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	Teacher evaluation systems should reflect a comprehensive review of the established criteria and are an important information source for assessing the distribution of effective teachers.

Directions

Include the following information on the local school system's designated website reporting the evaluation systems of teachers. The description of the teacher evaluation system must explain how evaluation results are used in decisions regarding each of the following: teacher professional development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal. If this information has already been included and updated on your school system's website, please indicate so below and provide the link.

1. Please provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:

<http://www.aacps.org/html/teach/teachereval.asp>

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.

Directions:

1. Do your evaluation systems include achievement outcomes or student growth? (Mark "Yes" or "No")
 - a. _____ Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.
 - b. If Yes, please respond (check one):

_____ Student achievement outcomes are included as an evaluation criterion.

_____ Student growth is included as an evaluation criterion.
 - c. x No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers do not include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.	Ratings from teacher evaluation systems further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those systems and provide valuable information on the distribution of effective teachers across districts.

Directions:

1. Complete the table below by listing each of the rating or performance levels in the LEA's performance evaluation systems, and the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Performance Rating or Level	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers
Outstanding/Excellent	2,565	44.40%

Highly Effective/Highly Proficient/Very Good	2,293	39.70%
Satisfactory/Effective	827	14.30%
Needs Improvement/Marginal	82	1.40%
Unsatisfactory	9	0.20%
Total: 5,776		

2. If the LEA does not currently publicly report this data, please list the major action steps that you will take to make this information publicly available by 6/30/11. Update the Action Steps Table (below) as appropriate to reflect progress to date.

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date
Develop appropriate content and establish links to include this information on our current system website.	Public Information, Technology, Human Resources	June - 2011

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.	To the extent information on the distribution of teacher performance ratings is readily accessible by school, State officials, parents and other key stakeholders can identify and address inequities in the distribution of effective teachers on an ongoing basis.

Directions:

1. Is the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level publicly reported for each school in the LEA? Mark "Yes" or "No".
 - a. ____ Yes, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.
 - b. Please provide the link to this information on the LSS's designated website below:

- c. No, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are not publicly reported for each school in the LEA.
2. If the LEA does not currently publicly report these data, please list the major action steps that you will take to publicly report this information by 6/30/11. Update the Action Steps Table (below) as appropriate to reflect progress to date.

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date
Develop appropriate content and establish links to include this information on our current system website.	Public Information, Technology, Human Resources	June - 2011

Citation	Description	Rationale
Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	Principal evaluation systems should reflect a comprehensive review of the established criteria and are an important information source for assessing the distribution of effective principals.

Directions:

Include the following information on the local school system's designated website reporting the evaluation systems of principals. The description of the principal evaluation system must explain how evaluation results are used in decisions regarding each of the following: principal professional development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal. If this information has already been included and updated on your school system's website, please indicate so below and provide the link.

1. Provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:
<http://www.aacps.org/html/teach/teachereval.asp>

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.

Directions:

1. Do the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion? (Mark "Yes" or "No")
 - a. Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.
 - b. If Yes, please respond (check one):

 Student achievement outcomes are included as an evaluation criterion.

 Student growth is included as an evaluation criterion.
 - c. No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals do not include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.	Ratings from principal evaluation systems further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those systems and provide valuable information on the distribution of effective principals across districts.

Directions:

1. Complete the table below by listing each of the rating or performance levels in the LEA's performance evaluation systems, and the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Performance Rating or Level	Number of Principals	Percentage of Principals
Outstanding/Excellent	148	46.90%
Highly Effective/Highly Proficient/Very Good	122	38.60%
Satisfactory/Effective	44	13.90%
Needs Improvement/Marginal	1	0.30%
Unsatisfactory	1	0.30%
	Total: 316	

2. If the LEA does not currently publicly report this data, please list the major action steps that you will take to make this information publicly available by 6/30/11. Update the Action Steps Table (below) as appropriate to reflect progress to date.

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date
Develop appropriate content and establish links to include this information on our current system website.	Public Information, Technology, Human Resources	June - 2011