

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 an 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 the following 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 Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI/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 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  (2018-19 Third Friday of September) | School | | District | | State | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 858,833 | 100.0% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  | 9,516 | 1.1% |
| Asian |  |  |  |  | 34,711 | 4.0% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  | 77,839 | 9.1% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  | 105,863 | 12.3% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  | 651 | 0.1% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  | 35,229 | 4.1% |
| White |  |  |  |  | 595,020 | 69.3% |
| **Student Groups** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |  | 120,825 | 14.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  | 351,198 | 40.9% |
| English Learners |  |  |  |  | 51,829 | 6.0% |

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

## Part A: The Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TEACHERS (2018-19) | School | | District | | State | |
|  | FTE | Percent | FTE | Percent | FTE | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 60,360 | 100.0% |
| **Qualifications** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fully licensed |  |  |  |  | 56,858 | 94.2% |
| Out-of-field or licensed with stipulations |  |  |  |  | 1,682 | 2.8% |
| No license |  |  |  |  | 1,047 | 1.7% |
| **Tenure** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3+ yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  |  | 45,381 | 75.2% |
| <3 yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  |  | 14,979 | 24.8% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  | 180 | 0.3% |
| Asian |  |  |  |  | 514 | 0.9% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  | 1,127 | 1.9% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  | 1,183 | 2.0% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  | 28 | 0.0% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  | 220 | 0.4% |
| White |  |  |  |  | 57,108 | 94.6% |

1 Teacher FTE numbers include the positions of Teacher (position code 53) and Teacher-in-charge (po- sition code 19). In addition, this year teacher FTE numbers newly include the following positions: Speech/Language Pathologist (position code 84), Librarian (position code 86), Library Media Special- ist (position code 87), and Instructional Technology Integrator (position code 88). This change has been

implemented both in this tool and in the Inequitable Distribution of Teachers (IDT) report, based on con- versations with the Teacher Education, Professional Development, and Licensing team.

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

3 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  (2018-19) | School | District | | State | |
|  | FTE | FTE | Percent | FTE | Percent |
| Total |  |  |  | 2,496 | 100.0% |
| **Tenure** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3+ yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  | 1,976 | 79.2% |
| <3 yrs experience in assignment area code |  |  |  | 520 | 20.8% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  | 6 | 0.2% |
| Asian |  |  |  | 16 | 0.6% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  | 202 | 8.1% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  | 67 | 2.7% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  | 10 | 0.4% |
| White |  |  |  | 2,193 | 87.9% |

1 Principal FTE numbers include the positions of Principal (position code 51) and Assistant Principal (position code 52).

2 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, Profes- sional 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 our 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 our 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 our 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 teacher demographics proportionately aligned to the student demographics? If not, what are some practices that may be contributing to this?

## Part A: The Data

*Advanced Placement (AP) & International Baccalaureate (IB) programs both offer rigorous college preparatory curricula with the potential for college credit with a qualifying test score. Student Participation is defined as enrollment in 1 or more courses, regardless of grade earned.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AP/IB COURSES  (2018-19, grades 9-12) | School | | District | | State | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| **Participation in AP/IB Courses** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 59,241 | 100.0% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  | 249 | 0.4% |
| Asian |  |  |  |  | 3,128 | 5.3% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  | 3,227 | 5.4% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  | 5,674 | 9.6% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  | 34 | 0.1% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  | 1,683 | 2.8% |
| White |  |  |  |  | 45,246 | 76.4% |
| **Student Groups** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |  | 1,122 | 1.9% |
| Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  | 12,700 | 21.4% |
| English Learners |  |  |  |  | 805 | 1.4% |

1 Numbers in this table are based on the WISEdata student snapshot for Year End Attendance, Discipline, Completion, Roster, and Career Education.

## Part A: The Data (Continued)

*Dual Enrollment courses offer the opportunity to earn college credit while still in high school. Student level participation is defined as enrollment in 1 or more dual enrollment program courses, regardless of grade earned.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DUAL ENROLLMENT COURSES  (2018-19, grades 9-12) | School | | District | | State | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| **Participation in Dual Enrollment Courses** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 50,661 | 100.0% |
| **Race/Ethnicity** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native |  |  |  |  | 416 | 0.8% |
| Asian |  |  |  |  | 1,935 | 3.8% |
| Black or African American |  |  |  |  | 2,986 | 5.9% |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |  |  |  | 5,006 | 9.9% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  | 32 | 0.1% |
| Two or More Races |  |  |  |  | 1,251 | 2.5% |
| White |  |  |  |  | 39,035 | 77.1% |
| **Student Groups** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with Disabilities |  |  |  |  | 4,127 | 8.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  | 15,126 | 29.9% |
| English Learners |  |  |  |  | 1,460 | 2.9% |

1 Numbers in this table are based on the WISEdata student snapshot for Year End Attendance, Discipline, Completion, Roster, and Career Education.

## Part B: Data Inquiry Questions

* Does participation in AP/IB and Dual Enrollment courses proportionally reflect the student groups in our 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

*Research shows that engaging students with high-quality, grade-level, standards-aligned instructional materials while engaging educators with on-going, job-embedded professional learning on those materials can result in student achievement gains. The following tools can be used to assess alignment with standards:*

* 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 our district or school’s instructional materials to academic standards in literacy and mathematics? What are some practices may be contributing to any lack of alignment?
* Do all students – including those receiving Title I, Special Education, or English language instruction 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?
* How often do we provide professional development to teachers that supports their use of our district’s or school’s instructional materials for literacy and/or mathematics? What is the impact of the professional development? How do we measure that impact?

## 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 per-pupil expenditure and the student demographics in our school and district:

* Are economically disadvantaged students receiving financial support at an equitable level? If not, what are some practices that may be contributing to this disparity?
* Are students of color receiving financial support at an equitable level? If not, what are some practices that 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:** this year, family members attended two or more school events that were linked to learning; and/or family members communicated on multiple occasions with school staff.

**Families who participated in shared decision making:** this year, family members served on school advisory councils; helped devise school mission and vision; or helped plan and conduct school activities.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FAMILY ENGAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP | School | | District | |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total Families |  |  |  |  |
| **Engagement & Leadership** |  |  |  |  |
| Families engaged |  |  |  |  |
| Families who participated in shared decision making |  |  |  |  |
| **Survey Activity** |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Were families surveyed this year? |  |  |  |  |
| If yes, were results of surveys shared with staff and families? |  |  |  |  |

## Part B: Data Inquiry Questions

* Are we meaningfully engaging families as partners and decision makers in our school?
  + If so, which practices are we using to successfully engage families?
  + If not, which practices may be contributing to a lack of family engagement?
  + What barriers of time, understanding, or access do families face?
* Are families we engage as partners and decision makers representative of all student groups?
  + Which families are *not* participating in shared decision making? Why not?
  + What barriers of time, understanding, or access do families face?
* Are we engaging families in decision making using multiple forms of data?
  + Which data do we share with families as decision makers on our school team?
  + How do we help families understand our school’s student outcome and survey data?
  + How do we ensure that families’ voices are valued during continuous improvement planning?

# Clarify

### Pause, reflect, and document data findings

1. Based on our team’s analysis of data and discussion, utilizing the inquiry questions, what issues rise to the top, requiring 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(s) of need, which practices are possible root causes (root cause analysis tools are available in [WISELearn](https://wlresources.dpi.wi.gov/groups/wisconsin-continuous-improvement/4/8/3/))?

*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 we address the root cause(s) 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*](https://dpi.wi.gov/wisedash/districts)*, part three of the Data Inquiry Journal includes a template for action planning that may be used.*
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