






Garland Independent School District

## ACE Internal Teacher Candidate Identification District Process

Spring 2018

Data Source	Content Areas	Grade Level(s)	Administrations	Description
	Reading Mathematics  Writing Science Social Studies	Grades 3-8 EOC	2013-2014* *baseline year 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017	<p>Teacher performance measured through calculation of a percent gain score based on changes in raw score above/below expected value. Annual gain scores (2015, 2016, 2017) and multi-year total gain score.</p> <p>Internal teacher candidates were identified based on their gain scores. Tier 1 teachers had gain scores greater than 3.0% indicating above expected student gains. Tier 2 teachers had gain scores within the range of -3.0% to 3.0% indicating expected student gains.</p> <p>Growth in less than annual assessments was calculated by the connecting a) writing/social studies to reading performance, and b) science to math performance.</p> <p><i>Generated by Educational Resource Group (ERG)</i></p>
	Reading Mathematics	Grades K-8	2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017	<p>Teacher performance measured through the determination of the percent of students meeting growth projections within an academic year (BOY to EOY) by content area.</p> <p>A weighted index score was created that included weights for the growth performance of all students (40%) and targeted student groups (60%), which included African American students, economically disadvantaged students, and English Language Learners. Student group performance was calculated independently, then combined to determine the weighted contribution.</p> <p>A total MAP index score was calculated based on the average of the available annual MAP index scores.</p> <p>MAP growth index scores (annual &amp; total) were then compared across the district using quintiles. Internal teacher candidates were identified based on total index performance, with emphasis on potential candidates in Quintiles 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p><i>Generated by GISD's Research, Assessment &amp; Accountability Department</i></p>
	Reading	Grades K-5	2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017	<p>Teacher performance measured through the determination of the amount of change in scores (BOY to EOY), translated to a z-score by grade level and language version.</p>

Data Source	Content Areas	Grade Level(s)	Administrations	Description
				<p>A weighted index score was created that included weights for the average z-score performance of all students (40%) and targeted student groups (60%), which included African American students, economically disadvantaged students, and English Language Learners. Student group performance was calculated independently, then combined to determine the weighted contribution.</p> <p>A total Istation index score was calculated based on the average of the available annual Istation index scores.</p> <p>Istation index scores (annual &amp; total) were then compared across the district using quintiles. Internal teacher candidates were identified based on total index performance, with emphasis on potential candidates in Quintiles 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p><i>Generated by GISD's Research, Assessment &amp; Accountability Department</i></p>

**Quantitative data was not used in Isolation.**

Potential teacher candidates identified through qualitative analysis were targeted based on a ranking of data across multiple data sets. For example, a teacher identified across multiple data sources received a higher ranking on the potential teacher candidate recruitment list than a teacher identified through a single data source.

In addition, district-level qualitative considerations were given to the targeted teacher lists based on quantitative review:

- Notation of principal recommendations provided to the Organizational Learning Department identifying campus teacher leaders, i.e., “stars,” to serve as peer mentors and/or model classrooms for observations received at the end of the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years;
- Review of the potential teacher candidate list by Area Directors to ensure that the qualitative performance identification matched what district leaders knew of teacher professional practice and other narrative measures and focusing on selecting teachers that would be a “best fit” for ACE campuses; and
- Observations of potential teacher candidate list by small district-level instructional staff teams with a common set of look-fors – e.g., classroom environment, teacher-student interaction, instructional practices, etc.