**Section 1: Analyzing and Prioritizing Equity Gaps**

The purpose of Section 1 is to identify the data available, determine the most relevant data points, and set meaningful goals. When this important step is skipped, local education agencies (LEAs) run the risk of utilizing strategies that do not yield intended results because they have not accurately dissected the data.

To conduct a meaningful and thorough data analysis (and overall LEA Equity Plan), best practice is to engage a variety of stakeholders throughout the process, such as teachers and teacher leaders, principals and principal supervisors, parents, district leaders, students, board members, local business leaders, and community members.[1](#_bookmark0)

The steps presented on the following pages will allow a LEA to complete “Section 1: Equity Gaps” of the *2018 LEA Equity Plan Template,* which includes the following components:

* Of the gaps identified by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), which are the most meaningful for your LEA?
* Identify the LEA’s goals for closing gaps for each identified school, specifying target years and desired progress.
* Optional: All LEAs may elect to use their data to conduct additional teacher equity analyses of their choosing and may include any additional identified teacher equity gaps in this section.

1 If you are interested in learning more about stakeholder engagement, such as how to design stakeholder engagement groups of different sizes or how to design and implement stakeholder engagement meetings, please see the [Moving Toward Equity Stakeholder Engagement Guide](https://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/GTL_Moving_Toward_Equity.pdf) from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

# Step 1: Gather Data

The goal of Step 1 is for LEAs to bring together all data relevant for understanding and addressing teacher equity gaps. LEAs should use the worksheet below to identify the data to be gathered.

## Step 1 Worksheet

* Teacher equity gap data[2](#_bookmark1)
* Teacher equity gap data spreadsheet. Applies to LEAs in the DC Staffing Data Collaborative.[3](#_bookmark2)
* Teacher effectiveness data
* Insight Survey data: Applies to LEAs in the District of Columbia (DC) Staffing Data Collaborative[4](#_bookmark3)
* TNTP (formerly known as The New Teacher Project) Collaborative reports: Applies to LEAs in the DC Staffing Data Collaborative[5](#_bookmark4)
* Within-building data
* Additional data source:
* Additional data source:

**Within-Building Data**

Recent research shows that even within a single campus, there may be inequitable student access to effective teachers.2 Beyond the equity gap calculations shared by OSSE, districts also may choose to examine equitable access by teacher level, grade level, or subject area. These analyses allow districts to examine whether populations within a school (e.g. minority students, low income students, students with disabilities, English Language Learners) are systematically served by ineffective, out-of-field, and/or novice teachers. This additional effort is worthwhile if districts want to examine equity within a campus. Calculations of equity gaps at the teacher level require district staff to link individual student data to individual teacher data.

2 These data were shared with schools with identified teacher equity gaps in OSSE’s Dear LEA Leader letter dated May 9, 2018.

3 To request a spreadsheet, LEAs in the DC Staffing Data Collaborative should contact TNTP.

4 The Insight Survey provides valuable data on teacher perceptions and school climate.

5 The TNTP LEA Collaborative Report provides summary analysis and recommendations based on LEA climate and teacher effectiveness data and considers citywide trends.

# Step 2: Predicting the Data

The goal of Step 2 is for LEAs to (1) make predictions and (2) ask questions that bring to the surface past experiences, preconceived ideas, and assumptions.

LEAs should use the following prompts to fill out the Step 2 Worksheet template.

* What predictions can be made about our data review?
* What questions do we hope to explore during the data review?

## Step 2 Worksheet

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Source** | **Predictions and Questions** |
| Teacher equity gap data | I predict that we’ll see more gaps in our high schools than our elementary schools. |
| Other data sources (e.g., Insight Survey, DC Staffing Data Collaborative reports) |  |

**Step 3: Observing the Data**

*Please note: large LEAs should skip to the expanded version of Step 3 on the next page.*

The goal of Step 3 is to identify patterns and trends in the data. LEAs should review the data and note data points that are important or unexpected, raise questions, and/or point to patterns. At this stage, LEAs should avoid taking the next step of interpreting the cause of the patterns (the “why”) or drawing conclusions.

* For this step, LEAs should include leaders who have an LEA-wide strategic and programmatic understanding of equity planning, as well as data managers or analysts who understand the structure of LEA-wide data.
* LEAs may complete this exercise on paper or online, using highlighters or the “comments” feature to make notes.
* This can be done in a whole-group or small-group discussion, with a notetaker recording key discussion points in the Step 3 Worksheet.
* LEAs that are part of the DC Staffing Data Collaborative may wish to contact TNTP and request that they receive their equity data in spreadsheet form, to supplement the PDF file sent by OSSE on May 9, 2018.

## Step 3 Worksheet

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Source** | **Data Points That “Jump off the Page,” Patterns, or Trends** |
| Teacher equity gap data | Victory PCS has high rates of out-of-field teachers in schools serving students from low-income and minority families and in low-performing schools. |
| Teacher effectiveness data | Victory PCS has a high rate of ineffective teachers in low-income and high- minority schools. |
| Other data (e.g., Insight Survey, TNTP collaborative report) |  |

**Step 3 *Expanded for Large LEAs*: Observing the Data**

*This expanded version of Step 3 provides instructions for large LEAs.*

The goal of Step 3 is to identify patterns and trends in the data, noting data points that are important, unexpected, raise questions, and/or point to patters. At this stage, LEAs should avoid taking the next step of interpreting the cause of the patterns (the “why”) or drawing conclusions

* LEAs that are part of the DC Staffing Data Collaborative should contact TNTP and request that they receive their equity data in spreadsheet form, to supplement the PDF file sent by OSSE on May 9, 2018.
* For this step, LEAs should include leaders who have an LEA-wide strategic and programmatic understanding of equity planning, as well as data managers or data analysts.
* LEAs should plan to designate at least one data “point person” to organize and analyze the data, via the approaches the group decides. It is recommended that the LEAs choose individuals(s) with the appropriate data skillset, and who understand the structure of LEA-wide data.

First, LEAs should convene as a group to brainstorm ways to sort or disaggregate the data gathered in Step 1. This may include analyses *within* the teacher equity data, as well as analyses that *combine* teacher equity data with other data sets. It is recommended that LEAs first examine and summarize the teacher equity data, before considering additional data sets. LEAs may use the worksheet below to brainstorm options for sorting and analyzing teacher equity data.

## Step 3 Worksheet: Approaches for Sorting and Summarizing Equity Data

Examples:

* Arrange school-level rates (of ineffective, out-of-field, and/or novice teachers) in order from highest to lowest by campus.
* Note LEA “outliers,” or campuses with large teacher equity gaps, as compared with the rest of the LEA.
* Compare the set of schools with teacher equity gaps to those without them.
* Identify schools that serve large percentages of specific subgroups of students (e.g. minority students, low-income students, students with disabilities, English language learners). Compare teacher equity data for these schools to teacher equity data for the rest of the LEA.

Second, LEAs with robust data analysis capacity may also wish to consider using unique identifiers to merge separate datasets into one large data set for analysis. This allows LEAs to conduct additional cross-data set analyses.

## Step 3 Worksheet: Working with Additional Data Sets

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Sources Gathered in Step One** | **Approaches for Sorting or Disaggregating Data**[**6**](#_bookmark5) |
| *Examples:*   * *Teacher equity gap data* * *Teacher effectiveness data* * *Insight Survey data* * *Other data sources* | *Examples:*   * *By campus* * *By grade range* * *By ward or geographic area* * *By school effectiveness designation* * *By feeder pattern* * *By type of school (e.g., elementary vs middle vs high; alternative school vs non alternative school; arts or science focused school vs general education model)* * *By leadership characteristics (e.g., schools with first year principals vs others)* * *Other data cuts* |

Third, LEAs should review the list of disaggregation approaches and decide which ones to try, considering which will provide the most useful information, which are highest priority to complete, and which are feasible, given the structure of the data available. The designated staff member(s) should complete the data sorting and analysis. The work may be done in a group setting, or LEAs may wish to “divide and conquer” and reconvene after initial data organization and analysis is complete.

Fourth, the group should review the results, considering each approach. LEAs should make observations about patterns, trends, and data points that “jump off the page.” The exercise may reveal additional approaches to disaggregating the data, and if so, LEAs may wish to iterate and repeat the steps above.

6 This includes analysis of the distribution of ineffective, out-of-field, and novice teachers *within* the school-based teacher analysis provided by OSSE, as well as analysis that combines the teacher equity data with other LEA data.

Last, LEAs should summarize observations. An example format is shown below.

## Step 3 Worksheet

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Points That “Jump off the Page,” Patterns, or Trends** | |
| Teacher equity gap data |  |
| Other data (e.g., Teacher Effectiveness, Insight Survey, TNTP Collaborative Report) |  |
| Cross data-set analyses |  |
|  |  |

**Step 4: Interpreting the Data**

The purpose of Step 4 is for LEAs to look deeper at the patterns in the data related to teacher effectiveness and teacher equity gaps. In the Step 4 Worksheet, LEAs should discuss the following focus questions, while a notetaker records key discussion points.

1. What does this data exercise reveal about our teacher equity gaps?
   1. Across different campuses?
   2. Across elementary, middle, and high schools?
   3. Across different Wards?
   4. Across other “cuts” of the data?
2. Do trends point to common themes, or do trends seem to contradict one another?
   1. For example: Does a common group of schools have strong (or weak) results across all metrics? Or, do some schools have a mix of stronger and weaker results?
   2. If contradictions are found, how can they be explained? Consider, for example, changes in demographic trends, policies, or school programs.
3. How does the LEA’s data set as a whole inform or deepen its understanding of teacher equity and teacher effectiveness?



## Step 4 Worksheet

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Focus Question** | **Notes** |
| Q1. What does this data exercise reveal about our teacher equity gaps (consider comparing campuses; elementary, middle, and high schools; different wards; other data “cuts”)? |  |
| Q2. Are emerging trends aligned with one another? Or are contradictions found? (If so, how can they be explained?) |  |
| Q3. How does the LEA’s data set as a whole inform or deepen the understanding of teacher equity, teacher effectiveness, and student learning? |  |



# Step 5: Determining Priorities and Goal Setting

The purpose of Step 5 is to identify the most meaningful equity gaps to prioritize and then set goals for increasing equitable student access to effective, in-field, and experienced teachers, considering the insights revealed by Steps 1-4. For sample meaningful goals, please see the Sample LEA plan.

To prioritize the gaps, LEAs should consider the following questions:

* *Feasibility:* Which gaps are the most feasible to address in the short term for early wins? Which gaps are more feasible for long-term planning?
* *Momentum:* What momentum already exists that could be leveraged?
* *Impact:* Are any gaps “high leverage,” such that if they were addressed, they would cause a “ripple effect” of positive effects?
* *Autonomy:* Is there autonomy to make changes?
* *Alignment:* Is it possible to align these goals with ongoing initiatives or existing goals?
* *Champions:* Are there champions who push specific goals?
* *Resources:* Does the LEA have the resources and support needed to address this gap?

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION — DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE



## Step 5 Prioritization Worksheet

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gap to Address** | **Feasibility** | **Momentum** | **Impact** | **Autonomy** | **Alignment** | **Champions** | **Resources** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



When writing LEA goals, LEAs should consider:

* Is each goal specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant?
* Is each goal aspirational or realistic? Will it be most useful to use the goal setting exercise to set high expectations, or for feasibility?
* Do the goals align with the LEA’s long-term plan, priorities, achievement goals and/or logic model?

## Step 5 Goal Setting Worksheet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Equity Gap** | **Date by Which Differences in Rates Will Be Eliminated** | **Interim Targets** |
| *“Ineffective” gap in schools defined as low income and/or high minority* | *2024-25 school year* | *The gaps of ineffective teachers across high-minority and/or low- income schools and their non- high-minority and non-low- income school counterparts will be reduced by at least half by the 2021-22 school year.* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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