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Measuring Teacher Effectiveness

- New state and district evaluation systems encouraged by Race to the Top (RTT)
- DCPS IMPACT teacher evaluation system preceded RTT
- Features shared by RTT evaluation systems
  - Multiple measures of effectiveness
  - Consequences for teachers
- Opportunity to learn from DC implementation
Computing IMPACT Scores

**IMPACT COMPONENTS FOR GROUP 1**

- **SVA** 5%
- **CSC** 10%
- **TLF** 35%
- **IVA** 50%

- Individual Value-Added Student Achievement Data (IVA)*
- Teaching and Learning Framework (TLF)
- Commitment to the School Community (CSC)
- School Value-Added Student Achievement Data (SVA)**

*In the event that Individual Value-Added Student Achievement Data (IVA) cannot be generated for your class, you will be moved to Group 2.

**In the event that School Value-Added Student Achievement Data (SVA) cannot be generated for your school, the Commitment to the School Community (CSC) component will expand to replace the SVA portion of the pie.
Four Performance Categories

- **Ineffective**: Subject to separation
- **Minimally Effective**: Subject to separation (in category for two consecutive years)
- **Effective**: No change
- **Highly Effective**: Eligible for performance pay
Evaluation of DC School Reform

- Conducted by the DC Education Consortium on Research and Evaluation (DC-EdCORE)

- School reform legislation required evaluation
  - Human resources operations and human capital strategies
  - Business practices and strategies
  - Academic plans
  - Student achievement

- Annual snapshots
  - 2010–2011 and 2011–2012 completed
  - Other years in progress

- Analysis of trends (in progress)
Research Questions

- Retention and experience of effective teachers
  - Did DCPS retain its most effective teachers?
  - How effective are teachers who are new to DCPS?

- Distribution of effective teachers
  - Are students in high-poverty schools more or less likely to be taught by effective teachers?
  - Is retention related to school poverty?
## Retention of Effective Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT Rating</th>
<th>Number of Teachers 2009–2010</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Number of Teachers 2010–2011</th>
<th>Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimally Effective</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All IMPACT ratings</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- DCPS retained most teachers classified as effective or highly effective
- DCPS retained fewer than half of 2010–2011 teachers rated minimally effective
- No ineffective teachers were retained
- 1.8% of 2009–2010 teachers dismissed
- 5.5% of 2010–2011 teachers dismissed
Experience and Teacher Effectiveness

Experience and Teacher Effectiveness

Average IMPACT Score

Highly Effective

Effective

Minimally Effective

Ineffective

2010–2011 Teachers

2011–2012 Teachers

N = 620
N = 941
N = 1,920

N = 744
N = 482
N = 2,227

New teachers

Second-year teachers

All other returning teachers

283 291 303

289 313 317

N = 620
N = 941
N = 1,920

N = 744
N = 482
N = 2,227

289 313 317

N = 744
N = 482
N = 2,227

New teachers

Second-year teachers

All other returning teachers
Teacher Effectiveness by School Poverty

2010–2011 Teachers

- Highly Effective: 320
- Effective: 289, 287
- Minimally Effective
- Ineffective

2011–2012 Teachers

- Highly Effective: 329
- Effective: 308, 298
- Minimally Effective
- Ineffective

0-59% free and reduced price lunch - Low-poverty schools
60-80% free and reduced price lunch - Medium-poverty schools
81-100% free and reduced price lunch - High-poverty schools
Retention by School Poverty

Proportion Retained in Same School

2009–2010 Teachers
- Low-poverty schools: 83
- Medium-poverty schools: 83
- High-poverty schools: 62

2010–2011 Teachers
- Low-poverty schools: 78
- Medium-poverty schools: 70
- High-poverty schools: 67

Low-poverty schools
Medium-poverty schools
High-poverty schools
Effectiveness of “Leavers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Low-poverty</th>
<th>Medium-poverty</th>
<th>High-poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Highly Effective**
- **Effective**
- **Minimally Effective**
- **Ineffective**

Low-poverty schools: 304, 286
Medium-poverty schools: 278, 265
High-poverty schools: 260, 253
Effectiveness of “Stayers”

2009–2010 Teachers

- Highly Effective: 327
- Effective: 299
- Minimally Effective: 294
- Ineffective: 297

2010–2011 Teachers

- Highly Effective: 326
- Effective: 302
- Minimally Effective: 297
- Ineffective: 297

- Low-poverty schools
- Medium-poverty schools
- High-poverty schools
Summary

- DCPS retained most teachers classified as effective or highly effective
- More experienced DCPS teachers received higher IMPACT scores
- Teachers in high-poverty schools:
  - Received lower IMPACT scores
  - Were less likely to remain in DCPS
- Teachers who stayed in their schools were more effective than those who left
For More Information

- Please contact:
  - Elias Walsh
    - ewalsh@mathematica-mpr.com

- Full DC-EdCORE reports
  - Available from the Office of the DC Auditor
    - [http://dcauditor.org/reports/2013](http://dcauditor.org/reports/2013)