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Educator Effectiveness priorities include:

- Differentiating teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance
- Compensating and promoting teachers based on effectiveness
- Providing effective support to teachers and principals
- Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals
Ensure that great teachers and leaders are in every school.

- Elevate profession through systemic reforms across the educator career continuum.
- Increase teacher and leader effectiveness in improving student outcomes.
- Provide support for states and districts to increase the number of effective educators where they are most needed.
- Strengthen educator pathways into high-need schools.
Trends in State Legislation: Teacher Evaluation

During late 2010 and early 2011, 15 states passed legislation related to teacher evaluation.

• Student Achievement
  ➢ 7 States specify use of student test scores and/or student growth measures as a part of the evaluation system

• Multiple Measures
  ➢ 5 states specify the use of multiple measures to evaluation teacher performance
Teacher Evaluation Trends cont.

• Role of the LEA
  ➢ 3 states specify that the LEA is responsible for developing a system of teacher evaluation that aligns with state standards

• Teacher Tenure
  ➢ 3 states link results from new teacher evaluation systems to granting teacher tenure.
Assessing Teaching: Seeing the Full Context

U.S. DOE Priorities

• Increasing effective and highly effective teachers
  ▪ Number and/or percentage
  ▪ Retention and equitable distribution

• Method for determining and identifying effective and highly effective teachers
  ▪ Must include multiple measures
  ▪ Effectiveness evaluated, in significant part, on the basis of student growth
  ▪ Supplemental measures may include, e.g. multiple observation based instruments
Why Multiple Measures?

• Creates a more accurate and complete representation of teacher performance
• Takes into account a full range of what teachers do
• Increases confidence in teacher evaluation results
• Increases ability to make informed human capacity decisions (e.g. recruitment, retention, tenure, compensation)
Selecting Measures

• Necessary steps prior to measurement selection
  - Determine State Role
    - Balance between state and local control
      - Dictate evaluation model and/or allow local flexibility
    - Encourage collective responsibility and accountability
  - Determine Evaluation System Goals/Purpose
    - Goal selection focuses and guides all decisions in the design process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Level Evaluation System</td>
<td>• Measurements and dimensions are the same statewide&lt;br&gt;• Data collection can be standardized&lt;br&gt;• Districts can be directly compared&lt;br&gt;• Evaluating the system and results will be easier&lt;br&gt;• System is seen as fair because all districts are held to same standards&lt;br&gt;• Increased system reliability since changes from year to year impact all districts</td>
<td>• Local flexibility and ownership is diminished&lt;br&gt;• Fails to take into consideration local context&lt;br&gt;• Difficult to obtain statewide support&lt;br&gt;• Variance in district resources&lt;br&gt;• May be subject to local bargaining agreements&lt;br&gt;• May be seen as unfair by low capacity districts forced to implement the same model as districts with greater capacity&lt;br&gt;• Local variations in school year, testing times, etc. may result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective State Level Evaluation System</td>
<td>• Allows for some local flexibility&lt;br&gt;• Data collection can still be standardized for certain components&lt;br&gt;• Districts can be directly compared in certain areas&lt;br&gt;• Reliability strong in required components&lt;br&gt;• Allows for continuance of locally developed models</td>
<td>• Local flexibility in certain areas is diminished&lt;br&gt;• Presents more challenges for state oversight&lt;br&gt;• Data aggregation of teacher results may be more difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Evaluation System with Required Parameters</td>
<td>• Local ownership and buy-in is increased&lt;br&gt;• Permits districts to address local priorities within the model&lt;br&gt;• Allows for continuance of locally developed models</td>
<td>• Difficult to compare progress/results&lt;br&gt;• Data aggregation may present considerable challenges&lt;br&gt;• Reliability is vulnerable across districts&lt;br&gt;• Training to ensure fidelity would likely be done at the district level, meaning more district resources are required&lt;br&gt;• Resources may be limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model 1: State Level Evaluation Systems

- State provides strict interpretation of state and federal legislation
- Prescribe the requirements of the model
- State is instrumental in the design, implementation, and evaluation of model
- Example: Delaware
  - With significant contribution from practitioners, state led effort
  - Once finalized, all districts will be required to implement the system with little flexibility

Model 2: Elective State Level System

- State provides strict interpretation of state and federal legislation
- Dictate certain aspects but allow flexibility in others
- Continues the tradition of local control over teacher evaluation
- Example: New York’s Evaluation System
  - 60% based on locally negotiated processes
  - 40% based on state standardized and local assessments

Model 3: District Evaluation System with Required Parameters

- States play a smaller role in design and implementation
- Guidance provided
  - General Example – State requires multiple measures including student achievement and observations
  - Restrictive Example - State provides screening/approval process to ensure district compliance
    - Example: Ohio
Evaluation System’s Purpose/Goals

- Tendency to oversimplify this step
- Purpose should drive all decisions regarding:
  - Measurement selection and weight
  - Evaluation format (e.g. frequency of observations, pre-post observation conferences)
  - Data collection needs
- Higher stakes point to measures that are technically defensible (e.g. valid & reliable)
- Improved teacher capacity point to measures that identify effective teaching practices

### Aligning Purpose(s) and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness</th>
<th>Growth Models</th>
<th>Classroom Observation</th>
<th>Analysis of Artifacts</th>
<th>Portfolios</th>
<th>Teacher Self-Reports</th>
<th>Student/Parent Ratings</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine whether a teacher's students are meeting achievement growth expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather evidence for making contract renewal and tenure decisions.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine the types of assistance and support a struggling teacher may need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine whether a teacher's performance qualifies him or her for additional compensation or incentive pay (rewards).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information on a teacher's ability to work collaboratively with colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine how students and parents perceive a teacher's instructional efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guide to Teacher Evaluation Products

Types of Evaluation Products

1. Classroom Observations
2. Instructional Artifacts
3. Portfolios
4. Teacher Self-Report Measures
5. Student Surveys
6. Value-Added Models
7. Student Performance Measures
8. Combination Models

The Challenge

Accurately measuring a teacher's effectiveness is a complex and difficult task.

Like building a puzzle, developing a teacher evaluation system requires multiple pieces that must be placed.
Trends in State Legislation: Teacher Compensation

• During late 2010 and early 2011, 4 states passed legislation related to teacher compensation.
• All of the bills focus on the link between new or revised measures of teacher performance and performance-based compensation for teachers.
Research-Based Lessons: Compensation Reform

Implementing Pay for Performance Systems
- Develop clear measures of teacher performance
- Identify and communicate additional compensation options
- Consistently describe intended outcomes, impacts, and effects

Gaining Support
- Establish teacher buy-in early and often

Sustaining the System
- Identify and secure long-term funding streams
- Demonstrate effectiveness and return on investment
# Define Program Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is being rewarded (i.e., definition of performance)?</th>
<th>At what level is the input or outcome measured?</th>
<th>Who is being rewarded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching performance</strong> (e.g., classroom observations, principal evaluation, peer evaluation, lesson plan review)</td>
<td>Teacher or school</td>
<td>Teacher or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student outcomes</strong> Student learning gains (e.g., value-added measures)</td>
<td>Teacher, grade level, subject area, or school</td>
<td>Teacher, grade level, subject area, or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement levels subject area or school performance levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other student outcomes (e.g., graduation, curriculum-specific goals, social/emotional outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School outcomes</strong> (e.g., adequate yearly progress, graduation resource development)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Teacher or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge/skills</strong> (e.g., portfolio, National Board Certification, professional development)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional responsibilities</strong> (e.g., mentor/master teacher, afterschool teacher, tutoring)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard-to-fill positions</strong> Subject area (e.g., English) or grade level</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type (e.g., high poverty, low performing)</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s New:

Arizona Career Ladder Program 1.2 KB PDF
Describes the long-standing Arizona Career Ladder Program. The case summary highlights three districts and explores how those districts capitalize on the district-based autonomy granted by the Career Ladder Program to develop programs that best suit their needs.

June 2011 Newsletter 312 KB PDF
Introduces the new CECR Case Summary about the Arizona Career Ladder Program. Highlights the Colorado Springs School District 11 performance-based compensation system.
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