

**Measure 1:** Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) Assessment (Measure 1)

**What:** Oklahoma public schools are required to use the Teacher Leader Effectiveness (TLE) assessment for the evaluation of teachers. There are two forms of the TLE: The Tulsa Model and the Marzano model. The data from the TLE assessment of completers of the EPP in their first year of teaching are provided to the EPP by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (OEQA). That state agency receives the data from the Oklahoma State Department of Education as all assessment data from the TLE for each public school teacher are submitted to the state department.

**When:** First year teachers are evaluated in the fall semester and the spring semester. The data from the evaluation are provided to the EPP in late summer to fall term. The data reported on this document are summary data from the two semesters.

**Data Reporting:** Data are reported via aggregate scores by levels of effectiveness, i.e. levels of performance per the evaluation instrument. The “N” for each level of effectiveness for the EPP completers are provided. Data are also reported based upon InTASC clusters (see table below) and the average of the EPP completers by those clusters. The TLE data are not presented to the EPP by program. The TLE data for completers in their first year of teaching are reviewed annually by the Teacher Education Assessment and Management System (TEAMS) Committee, the body responsible for an annual review of EPP data. The committee makes recommendations to the governing body of the EPP, the Teacher Education Committee, for programmatic changes based upon its analysis of the data (Report found at <https://www.nwsu.edu/school-of-education/education>). The data show that completers of the EPP are assessed at the “Effective”, “Highly Effective”, or “Superior” level. No completers were in the “Improvement Needed” or below level. For the three previous reporting years, completers were at the “Effective” or higher range for the InTASC clusters. The data for InTASC clusters for 2020-2021 will be provided to the EPP at a later time.

**Aggregate scores from the TLE instrument\* broken down by levels of effectiveness:**

TLE Evaluation Year	Number of Completers Evaluated	Average of Scores	Range of Averages	Ineffective	Improvement Needed	Effective	Highly Effective	Superior
2020-2021	30	3.55	2.83-4.67	0	0	11	17	2

\*Data provided by the Oklahoma State Department of Education also included a fraction of completers evaluated by using the Marzano instrument. However, Marzano data sets were incomplete and inconsistent per completer across items reported. Therefore, completers evaluated using the Marzano instrument have not been included in the analysis above. Five completers reported in the data set evaluated by the TLE instrument had no data associated. Those completers were not included in the analysis above.

In this table, the ratings correspond to ranges that are evenly spread across the five possible scores: Ineffective, Improvement Needed, Effective, Highly Effective, and Superior. This flat, linear spreading yields ranges of 0.80 for each category.

**TLE items clustered per InTASC standard:**

InTASC 1	InTASC 2	InTASC 3	InTASC 4	InTASC 5	InTASC 6	InTASC 7	InTASC 8	InTASC 9	InTASC 10
TLE Dimensions 4, 5, 13, 19	TLE Dimensions 16	TLE Dimensions 6, 9, 10	TLE Dimensions 5, 10, 12, 13, 15	TLE Dimensions 7, 10, 12, 15	TLE Dimensions 5, 13, 14	TLE Dimensions 1, 2, 3, 4	TLE Dimensions 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15	TLE Dimensions 17, 18	TLE Dimensions 20

TLE item clusters were assembled using the Oklahoma State Department of Education InTASC Crosswalk document dated 4/12/13:

[https://sde.ok.gov/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/InTASC\\_Crosswalk.pdf](https://sde.ok.gov/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/InTASC_Crosswalk.pdf)

**Completer performance averages and ranges per InTASC standards:**

Evaluation Year	InTASC 1 TLE Cluster	InTASC 2 TLE Cluster	InTASC 3 TLE Cluster	InTASC 4 TLE Cluster	InTASC 5 TLE Cluster	InTASC 6 TLE Cluster	InTASC 7 TLE Cluster	InTASC 8 TLE Cluster	InTASC 9 TLE Cluster	InTASC 10 TLE Cluster
<b>2015-16</b> N=6 <average> range	<3.5> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.6> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.5> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.5> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.4> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.7> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0
<b>2016-17</b> N=15 <average> range	<3.2> 3.0 – 4.7	<3.2> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.4> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.2> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.2> 2.0 – 4.7	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.5> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.1> 3.0 – 4.0
<b>2017-18</b> N=23 <average> range	<3.4> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.5	<3.5> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.0	<3.3> 3.0 – 4.5	<3.4> 2.0 – 5.0	<3.4> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.5> 3.0 – 5.0	<3.4> 3.0 – 4.0

Decimal values in ranges are due to completers being evaluated multiple times in a single year. In these cases, evaluation scores were averaged to report a single score per completer for equal weighting in the final analysis.