

Aligning school and district resources with your equity goals is foundational to ensuring that all students have

educational opportunities and supports that match their needs. This tool is designed to help you:

* Examine distribution of resources (stafﬁng, funding, course offerings, instructional materials, and engagement with families);
* Compare school, district, and state data to see where your school and district stand relative to others;
* Ask some key questions to ﬁnd patterns in the data; and
* Consider action steps to better align your resources with your goals.

Examining resources is very complex. Adjusting resources is both a technical and adaptive challenge. As such, while this tool helps meet a requirement for schools identiﬁed under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and begins a discussion about resource inequities, teams need to cautiously consider the unintended consequences of making, or not making changes.

Remember that it is within your sphere of inﬂuence to address assumptions, beliefs, practices, and behavior of adults working in your school and district. It is *not* within your sphere of inﬂuence to change parents, families, or the background histories that students carry with them. Frame the next steps in your school’s continuous improvement process as actions that educators will take.

Following the contextual enrollment data on the next page, this data tool contains ﬁve sections, providing an opportunity to examine resource distribution in the following key areas:

1. Access to high-quality and appropriately licensed educators
2. Access to a full range of courses
3. High-quality instructional materials
4. Distribution of funding
5. Family engagement

Each section contains a data table, followed by data inquiry questions to inform your school’s planning. You can learn more about research that supports a focus on these areas on the DPI Continuous Improvement [website](https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/continuous-improvement/pdf/Supporting_Research_on_Resource_Inequity.pdf).

*Note: This Resource Inequity Data Tool is designed as a resource for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Additional Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools developing improvement plans in collaboration with stakeholders under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Reviewing the data in the tool may beneﬁt all schools, whether identiﬁed under ESSA or not. Use of this Resource Inequity Data Tool is not required for any schools, but identifying and addressing resource inequities generally is required for CSI and ATSI schools. The data within this tool is not intended to represent a complete list of possible resource inequities.*

District: - School:

# Context: Enrollment Demographics

Awareness of these basic demographics will help you examine the data in other sections and identify disparities.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ENROLLMENT  (2017-18 Third Friday of September) | School | | District | | State | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 860,543 | 100.0% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  | 9,624 | 1.1% |
| Asian |  |  |  |  | 34,187 | 4.0% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  | 78,661 | 9.1% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  | 103,396 | 12.0% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Paciﬁc Islander |  |  |  |  | 667 | 0.1% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  | 32,509 | 3.8% |
| White |  |  |  |  | 601,499 | 69.9% |
| **Student Groups** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |  | 119,087 | 13.8% |
| Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  | 331,871 | 38.6% |
| English Learners |  |  |  |  | 50,915 | 5.9% |

1 Numbers in this table are based on the WISEdata snapshot for Third Friday of September, with School Report Card corrections applied.

## Part A: The Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TEACHERS (2017-18) | School | | District | | State | |
|  | FTE | Percent | FTE | Percent | FTE | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 56,952.4 | 100.0% |
| **Qualiﬁcations\*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fully licensed |  |  |  |  | 54,965.8 | 96.5% |
| Out-of-ﬁeld or licensed with stipulations |  |  |  |  | 1,337.8 | 2.3% |
| No license |  |  |  |  | 586.7 | 1.0% |
| **Tenure** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3+ yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  |  | 42,928.4 | 75.4% |
| <3 yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  |  | 14,024.0 | 24.6% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  | 174.5 | 0.3% |
| Asian |  |  |  |  | 425.3 | 0.7% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  | 874.5 | 1.5% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  | 1,047.1 | 1.8% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Paciﬁc Islander |  |  |  |  | 26.6 | 0.0% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  | 181.7 | 0.3% |
| White |  |  |  |  | 54,222.8 | 95.2% |

1 Teacher and principal data come from the WISEstaff data collection (formerly the PI-1202 Fall Staff reports) and the annual license audit performed by the Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing team.

2 Qualiﬁcations values may not sum to the value in the Total row. This occurs when the quality of data submitted

by a school or district is insufﬁcient to determine teacher license status.

## Part A: The Data (Continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PRINCIPALS (2017-18) | School | District | | State | |
|  | FTE | FTE | Percent | FTE | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  | 2,415.0 | 100.0% |
| **Tenure** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3+ yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  | 1,929.4 | 79.9% |
| <3 yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  | 485.6 | 20.1% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  | 4.8 | 0.2% |
| Asian |  |  |  | 15.0 | 0.6% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  | 201.1 | 8.3% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  | 64.5 | 2.7% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Paciﬁc Islander |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  | 8.4 | 0.3% |
| White |  |  |  | 2,121.3 | 87.8% |

1 Teacher and principal data come from the WISEstaff data collection (formerly the PI-1202 Fall Staff reports) and the annual license audit performed by the Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing team.

## Part B: Data Inquiry Questions

With your district or school’s leadership team, compare school, district, and state data and identify signiﬁcant differences. Your team may have additional questions.

* Does the school have a higher percentage of teachers who are out-of-ﬁeld or licensed with stipulations than the district or state? If so, what are some practices that may be contributing to this?
* Does the school have a higher percentage of uncertiﬁed teachers than the district or state? If so, what are some practices that may be contributing to this?
* Does the school have a higher percentage of teachers with less than three years of experience than the district or state? If so, what are some practices that may be contributing to this?
* Are the teacher demographics proportionately aligned to the student demographics? If not, what are some practices that may be contributing to this?

## Part A: The Data

*Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction statewide data related to courses is not yet available. We encourage examination of your local data.*

### Please refer to WISEdata [guidance](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zNOdO2LDmqNjoEsNpvJZKmdDSk61oDf7/view?ts=5b226375) when deciding which courses to categorize as advanced.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ADVANCED COURSES | School | | District | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| **Advanced Courses Offered** |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Subject area: |  |  |  |  |
| Subject area: |  |  |  |  |
| Subject area: |  |  |  |  |
| Subject area: |  |  |  |  |
| **Participation in Advanced Courses** |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| **By Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |  |  |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Paciﬁc Islander |  |  |  |  |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |
| **By Student Groups** |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |
| English Learners |  |  |  |  |

**Part B: Data Inquiry Questions**

* Does the course participation proportionally reﬂect the student groups in the school? If not, which groups are not proportionally reﬂected? If not, what are some practices that may be contributing to this disparity?

## Part A: The Data

*The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction doesnotcurrentlycollectstatewidedatarelatedtoinstructionalmaterials. The data needed for this section may take some time to collect and may require surveying staff. The following tools can be used to assess standards-alignment:*

* Ed Reports <https://www.edreports.org/> (close attention should be paid to the edition and year of publication since in some cases, different editions have different ratings)
* Achieve the Core [Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET)](https://achievethecore.org/page/1946/instructional-materials-evaluation-tool)
* EQuiP (Educators Evaluating the Quality of Instructional Products) [Rubrics](https://www.achieve.org/our-initiatives/equip/all-equip-resources)
* NCSM [Materials Analysis Tool](https://www.mathedleadership.org/ccss/materials.html) (Mathematics only)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS | Last updated | Level of standards- alignment | Level of cultural responsiveness | Used for Title I and/or Special Ed |
| **Literacy Instructional Materials** |  |  |  |  |
| 1) |  |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |  |
| 4) |  |  |  |  |
| **Mathematics Instructional Materials** |  |  |  |  |
| 1) |  |  |  |  |
| 2) |  |  |  |  |
| 3) |  |  |  |  |
| 4) |  |  |  |  |

## Part B: Data Inquiry Questions

* What is the overall level of alignment of your district or school’s instructional materials to academic standards in literacy and mathematics? Which practices may be contributing to any lack of alignment?
* Do all students, including those receiving Title I or Special Education services, have access to grade-level, standards-based instructional materials? If not, what are some practices that may be contributing to this lack of access?
* Do all students have access to culturally responsive instructional materials? If not, what are some practices that may be contributing to this lack?
* In the past two years, how often were materials-focused professional development opportunities made available to support teachers in implementing your district or school’s instructional materials in literacy and/or math?

## Part A: The Data

*Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction statewide data related to per-pupil expenditures is not yet available. We encourage examination of your local data.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | School | District |
|  |  |  |
| Per-Pupil Expenditure |  |  |

## Part B: Data Inquiry Questions

* Based on the per pupil expenditure, are schools with high percentage of economically disadvantaged receiving ﬁnancial support at an equitable level? If not, what practices may be contributing to this disparity?
* Based on the per pupil expenditure, are schools with higher representation of race or ethnic groups receiving ﬁnancial support at an equitable level? If not, what practices may be contributing to this disparity?

## Part A: The Data

*The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not currently collect statewide data related to family engagement. We encourage examination of your local data.*

### In the below table, please use the following deﬁnitions.

**Families engaged:** family members attended two or more school events this year that were linked to learning; and/or family members communicated on multiple occasions with school staff.

**Families who participated in shared decision making:** parents and family members served on school advisory councils; helped devise school mission and vision; helped plan and conduct school activities; and results of family surveys were shared with staff and families.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FAMILY ENGAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP | School | | District | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total Families |  |  |  |  |
| **\.** |  |  |  |  |
| Families engaged |  |  |  |  |
| Families who participated in shared decision making |  |  |  |  |

## Part B: Data Inquiry Questions

* Are families meaningfully engaged as partners and decision makers in the school/district?
  + If so, what practices are being used to successfully engage families?
  + If not, which school/district practices may be contributing to a lack of family engagement?
  + What barriers of time, understanding, or access do families face?
* Are families representative of all student groups meaningfully engaged as partners and decision makers?
  + What families have NOT participated in shared decision making? Why not?
  + What barriers of time, understanding, or access do families face?
* How do we collect data from or about families to assess their engagement?
  + How do we know if they feel welcome at school, if they understand how to help their child succeed in school, or if they know how the school system works?
  + How do we know if school communications reach families, if families understand our communications, and if they know how to communicate with school staff or feel comfortable enough to communicate with school staff?

# Clarify

### Pause, reﬂect, and document data ﬁndings

1. Based on our team’s analysis of data and discussion, utilizing the inquiry questions, what rises to the top that needs action?

*Example response: A team has identiﬁed some speciﬁc resource inequities in Section 2: Access to High-Quality and Appropriately Licensed Educators. The team discusses that the school experiences a high turnover rate of teaching staff.*

1. Based on our team’s identiﬁed area of need what practices have we identiﬁed to be the possible cause (root cause tools are available in WISELearn)?

*Example response: After a root cause analysis, the team identiﬁes the high turnover rate is a result of new educators to the building not being mentored and supported to implement the instructional materials.*

# Planning for Action Steps

### How might you address the root cause revealed?

*Example response: The team considers mentoring might be used to support inexperienced, new, and out of ﬁeld educators, and considers changes in practices around assignment, recruitment, and retention. From there, the team creates an action plan to systematically take steps that will support access to high quality and appropriately licensed teachers.*

*Within WISEDash for Districts, part three of the Data Inquiry Journal includes a template for action planning that may be used.*
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