## DATA SUBMISSION OF PRIOR EXCELLENCE

We want to know about your prior successes as an excellent teacher and colleague! If you want to extend your reach to more students and collaborate with peers, we are interested in learning more about your positive impact on students and schools.

As a required component of your application, you will need to provide data evidence of high-progress student outcomes. If data are not available for all years requested, please explain and provide alternative evidence of impact on students where possible (e.g., facilitators, non-assessed grade or subject).

Applicants who can show evidence of consistent positive impact on student learning progress and peer teacher success are favored in our application process.

## We encourage you to SHOW US YOUR STUFF!

Please submit the number of years of data required for the most advanced role for which you are applying:

* Multi-Classroom Leader:
- 3 years is ideal for Level I and 4+ years for Level II and must be submitted if you have data
- If you have been a teacher-leader with responsibility for the teaching success of other teachers, please report on their results as well
* Extended-Reach Teacher (blended-learning, expanded impact, elementary specialization):
- 3 years is ideal for Level I and 4+ years for Level II and must be submitted if you have data
- New and less-experienced teachers, please indicate your status and submit any data that you have
* Social Emotional Support Teacher
- 3 years of data
- New and less-experienced teachers, please indicate your status and submit any data that you have

The submission must be no more than three pages total, and must include a narrative of no more than 750 words and a visual display of data with clear labels of what the data is. Please do not include any individual identifiers or names of students or colleagues other than yourself. If needed, you can refer to them as Colleague1, Colleague2, Student1, Student2, etc.

To ensure that the context of your data is easily understandable, your submission must include the following in either the narrative or the visual display of data:

* Your name
* School or department where you worked for each set of data you include
* Timeframe for the data (e.g., 2016-17 school year)
* Subjects and grades (e.g., $3^{\text {rd }}$-grade mathematics) for the data
* The number of students taught or served
* The number of other teachers led, if applicable
* Data source (e.g., MAP, end of grade or end-of-course tests, state proficiency exams, teachercreated assessments, EVAAS growth scores, discipline or attendance data source, etc.)
* Baseline to which you are comparing your students (state, district, county) to demonstrate how you are measuring your success
* Proficiency and growth improvement rates
* A description of your specific contribution to the data outcomes (versus other teachers), who taught with you, if applicable, and the significance of the impact relative to similar students.


## Examples of Data Submissions

For Multi-Classroom Leader, Expanded Impact Teacher, and Social Emotional Support Teacher

- Example 1
- Example 2
- Instructions

Additional Data Submission for Social Emotional Support Teacher

- Example 1


## INSTRUCTIONS

## *Must be pulled by an employee with CAMPUS data rights to access teacher data from previous years.*

1. Login to Eduphoria
2. Go to Aware

3. Click on " Quick views"
4. Click on " STAAR TEST
5. Click on what year you taught that you want data from (ex: 2013)
6. Click on what grade you taught then (ex: fourth grade)
7. Click on what subject you want data on (ex: Math)

Eduphoria is going to pull up where that class is currently in the system- you will see middle school's listed.
8. Click on circle with red arrow coming off of it (Where They Were).

This will take you back to 2013 Grade 4 in our example.
9. Click on Teacher icon next to the school one


This gives you teacher overview of how they did with each of their subpops
10. Double click on bolded Teacher's name on the left of the screen- this will pull up the 2013 class roster so that teachers can show evidence of growth from year to year.
11. To track growth, a teacher can pull up who the kids were with in 2012, 2013 and where they went in 2014

## Data Evidence \# 1



2015-2016 School Year
Number of students served: $\mathrm{\eta}$ Ştudents

## STAAR Growth Improvements for Prior Year Students

Source: STAAR Subject Results comparing previous grade Subject ('15) vs current grade Subject ('16) Improved Satisfactory Rate by 8\% (from 55\% to 63\%)

| 2015 Data Summarized |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Passed | 16 |
| Total Students | 29 |
| $\%$ Passed | $55 \%$ |


| Grade Level | Satisfactory |
| :---: | :---: |
| 30\% | No |
| 85\% | Yes |
| 89\% | Yes |
| 59\% | Yes |
| 78\% | Yes |
| 59\% | Yes |
| 41\% | No |
| 24\% | No |
| 89\% | Yes |
| 78\% | Yes |
| 48\% | Yes |
| 61\% | Yes |
| 41\% | No |
| 39\% | No |
| 74\% | Yes |
| 33\% | No |
| 39\% | No |
| 43\% | No |
| 37\% | No |
| 61\% | Yes |
| 61\% | Yes |
| 28\% | No |
| 22\% | No |
| 91\% | Yes |
| 76\% | Yes |
| 33\% | No |
| 67\% | Yes |
| 24\% | No |
| 65\% | Yes |


| Grade Level | Satisfactory |
| :---: | :---: |
| 38\% | No |
| 71\% | Yes |
| 44\% | No |
| 46\% | No |
| 77\% | Yes |
| 54\% | Yes |
| 56\% | Yes |
| 50\% | Yes |
| 56\% | Yes |
| 42\% | No |
| 44\% | No |
| 79\% | Yes |
| 81\% | Yes |
| 69\% | Yes |
| 67\% | Yes |
| 67\% | Yes |
| 56\% | Yes |
| 56\% | Yes |
| 69\% | Yes |
| 23\% | No |
| 44\% | No |
| 52\% | Yes |
| 54\% | Yes |
| 33\% | No |
| 75\% | Yes |
| 56\% | Yes |
| 25\% | No |
| 17\% | No |
| 81\% | Yes |
| 75\% | Yes |
| 38\% | No |
| 29\% | No |
| 71\% | Yes |
| 31\% | No |
| 60\% | Yes |

- STAAR passing rates increase year to year to a higher standard, these scores encompass that increased rate. I was able to build upon their instruction in grade 纸 Ğiand increase the passing rates.


## 

School EAÂNĞ
2016-2017 school year
Number of students served: $\eta$ Students

## Benchmark Data for Current Year Students

Source: SBISD Benchmark Tests comparing previous grade Subject ('15) vs current grade Subject ('16) 33 out of 45 improved
10\% Growth Rate improvement

| Previous Gr | Current Gr | Improvement | Growth Rate \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35\% | 62\% | Yes | 27\% |
| 74\% | 90\% | Yes | 16\% |
| 70\% | 86\% | Yes | 16\% |
| 65\% | 76\% | Yes | 11\% |
| 78\% | 86\% | Yes | 8\% |
| 83\% | 86\% | Yes | 3\% |
| 43\% | 81\% | Yes | 38\% |
| 35\% | 52\% | Yes | 17\% |
| 17\% | 52\% | Yes | 35\% |
| 35\% | 48\% | Yes | 13\% |
| 17\% | 19\% | Yes | 2\% |
| 48\% | 76\% | Yes | 28\% |
| 30\% | 38\% | Yes | 8\% |
| 48\% | 57\% | Yes | 9\% |
| 39\% | 57\% | Yes | 18\% |
| 61\% | 90\% | Yes | 29\% |
| 35\% | 71\% | Yes | 36\% |
| 43\% | 57\% | Yes | 14\% |
| 74\% | 86\% | Yes | 12\% |
| 35\% | 43\% | Yes | 8\% |
| 30\% | 81\% | Yes | 51\% |
| 74\% | 81\% | Yes | 7\% |
| 43\% | 52\% | Yes | 9\% |
| 61\% | 76\% | Yes | 15\% |
| 48\% | 71\% | Yes | 23\% |
| 39\% | 67\% | Yes | 28\% |
| 70\% | 71\% | Yes | 1\% |
| 57\% | 81\% | Yes | 24\% |
| 61\% | 71\% | Yes | 10\% |
| 48\% | 71\% | Yes | 23\% |
| 43\% | 76\% | Yes | 33\% |
| 35\% | 62\% | Yes | 27\% |
| 70\% | 86\% | Yes | 16\% |
| 43\% | 24\% | No | -19\% |
| 39\% | 19\% | No | -20\% |
| 57\% | 33\% | No | -24\% |
| 30\% | 19\% | No | -11\% |
| 22\% | 14\% | No | -8\% |
| 74\% | 71\% | No | -3\% |
| 83\% | 71\% | No | -12\% |
| 30\% | 14\% | No | -16\% |
| 96\% | 95\% | No | -1\% |
| 83\% | 71\% | No | -12\% |
| 39\% | 38\% | No | -1\% |
| 61\% | 29\% | No | -32\% |

I was able to build upon their instruction in $\eta$ grade and show growth in 33 out of 45 students by the first District Benchmark assessment.

## dĞĂ®Śc̆a

School EĂÂĞG
2012-2013 School Year
Number of students served: $\eta$ Students

## STAAR Growth Improvements for Prior Year Students

Source: STAAR Subject results comparing practice test and actual test, \# grade ('13) Improved Satisfactory Rate by 10\% (from 53\% to 63\%)


|  | April 2013 STAAR, Grade \# |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Total Students | Raw <br> Score | Percent Score | Satisfactory | Advanced | Date Taken | Testing Instructor |
|  | 57 | 27.7 | $62.95 \%$ | $63.16 \%$ | $8.77 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Teacher Name | 42 | 26.38 | $59.98 \%$ | $57.14 \%$ | $2.38 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 1 | 2 | 37 | $84 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 2 | 5 | 33.6 | $76.40 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 3 | 43 | 26.42 | $60.05 \%$ | $53.49 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 4 | 1 | 26 | $59 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 5 | 6 | 29.17 | $66.17 \%$ | $83.33 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 6 | 31 | 25.16 | $57.19 \%$ | $51.61 \%$ | $6.45 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Suppop 7 | 26 | 30.73 | $69.81 \%$ | $76.92 \%$ | $11.54 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 8 | 2 | 25.5 | $58 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 9 | 6 | 21.67 | $49.33 \%$ | $16.67 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 10 | 1 | 18 | $41 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop 11 | 2 | 23.5 | $53 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $04 / 01 / 13$ | Teacher Name |
| Subpop |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |

- This data is broken down by sub -populations for the ngrade SZd proud of student performance on this assessment. This was the first year of STAAR, the rigor and assessments were different from TAKS.

Teacher Name<br>School Name

## District Expectations for Grade Level

Per district expectations, the students entering this grade level should come in reading a level \#. By the middle of the year, the students are expected to progress to a level \#. The end of year expectation is a level \# which also includes a written summary and answering some comprehension questions. As a school, we use the DRA/EDL to assess our students' reading. We use this method of assessment in the beginning, middle and end of year. The outcomes provide the information needed for us to begin our guided reading instruction.

## 2014-2015 (\# graders now)

## Reading using EDL

During this specific school year, I had a total of 21 students, 11 girls and nine boys. $52 \%$ of my students began the year below grade level, $33 \%$ began the year on level and $14 \%$ began the year above grade level. As I formed my guided reading groups, I made sure to not only focus on their reading level but what comprehension strategies they needed to be more successful readers. My guided reading groups were constantly changing. By the middle of the year, $47 \%$ were below grade level, $28 \%$ were on level, and $24 \%$ were above grade level. As I analyzed my data, I was glad my students were progressing but I still worried that some were below grade level. I began to closely monitor those students. I began to pull them for guided reading more frequently and would talk to other colleagues and our instructional coach for ideas. When the end of year EDL was given, $52 \%$ left this grade level below grade level and the ranges were from level\#t t. 14\% left this grade level on level 28 and 29\% left this grade level above grade level.


## 2015-2016 (\# graders now)

## Reading using EDL

During this school year I had 18 students, 10 boys and eight girls. $61 \%$ of my students came into this grade level below grade level, $22 \%$ on grade level and $17 \%$ above grade level. The high percentage of below grade level was rather worrisome but with consistent small group instruction and close monitoring, I knew my students would become better readers and writers. By January, $56 \%$ of my students were below grade level, $28 \%$ on level and $17 \%$ above grade level. I continued to have really thought-out guided reading plans and to closely monitor my students. I began to use Edmodo book clubs during my guided reading groups as a way to integrate technology. This was highly successful in my classroom. When May rolled around, 67\% of my students left my classroom below grade level. This was very upsetting. As I analyzed their assessments, I saw how their reading was phenomenal but their writing did not improve. These students, three in particular, were unable to fully reproduce a summary about a nonfiction text. These students wrote better when they were retelling a fiction story. $17 \%$ of my students left my room on level and the other $17 \%$ left above grade level.


## 2017-2017 (Current grade class)

## Reading using EDL

This year I have a total of 17 students, seven boys and 10 girls. $76 \%$ of my students tested below grade level in the beginning of this year. 18\% of them were on level and $6 \%$ of my students were above grade level. Because of the personalized learning movement in our district, the school was able to get an online reading site that helped monitor students progress and they were able to pace themselves. I also analyzed my data more closely so that my guided reading groups could be more focused and effective. I stopped using Edmodo and introduced my students to Google docs and Google slides. They have been using them to create book presentations. Even though reading is a big part of our day, so is writing. I make sure that we are constantly writing about both fiction and nonfiction texts. By January, $47 \%$ of my class was below grade level and $53 \%$ on grade level. I was overjoyed by their growth. At this moment, I am continuing to closely monitor all my students and have formal and informal assessments. As of February 17th, $24 \%$ of my students are below grade level, $41 \%$ are on grade level and $35 \%$ are above grade level.


## Additional Data Evidence for Social Emotional Support Teacher - SAMPLE

Teacher Name $\qquad$
School $\qquad$

1. Student Data

Source of Information $\qquad$

| School Year | Number of Students <br> in Class | Total Number of <br> Classroom Office <br> Referrals for Year | Number of Student <br> Days Missed by All <br> Students |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2016-2017$ | 22 | 2 | 19 |
| $2015-2016$ | 21 | 3 | 15 |
| $2014-2015$ | 23 | 4 | 23 |

## 2. School Committee Participation and Role

| 2016-2017 <br> School Year | 2015-2016 <br> School Year | 2014-2015 <br> School Year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.District Improvement <br> Team Member | 1.Campus Improvement <br> Team Member | 1. Campus Improvement <br> Team Member |
| 2.Campus Improvement <br> Team Member | 2.Campus Discipline <br> Committee Member | 2. Campus Discipline <br> Committee Member |
| 3.Campus Discipline <br> Committee Chairperson | 3. School Awards Day <br> Committee Member | 3.School Carnival <br> Committee Member |

## 3. Behavioral Program and Campus Climate Program Implementation

In this section you will provide an explanation of behavioral programs that you have designed and implemented in your classroom and, if applicable, campuswide. Also provide information about community or team building projects that you have worked on that have impacted campus climate. For each, provide an explanation of how you evaluated the program; include program goals, measurement or criteria for success, and results.

