

National **Charter School**
Resource Center

**Using Performance-Based Assessment
and Value-Added Models to Identify
and Support High-Quality Teachers
in Charter School Contexts**

NOVEMBER 2011



Tips & Tools

Using Performance-Based Assessment and Value-Added Models to Identify and Support High-Quality Teachers in Charter School Contexts

November 2011



NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER
FOR TEACHER QUALITY

www.tqsource.org

This Tips & Tools was written by Jane Coggshall, Ph.D., Jeffrey Max, and Katherine Bassett.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality as *Key Issue: Using Performance-Based Assessment to Identify and Support High-Quality Teachers* with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B050051.

The content has been updated specifically for the National Charter School Resource Center by Jenni Fetters and adapted with permission from the original source.

CONTENTS

Key Definitions	1
Scenario	3
Benefits	5
Tips and Cautions	8
Strategies	12
Strategy 1: When Developing or Revising Your Charter School Teaching Standards, Get to Know Your State’s Teaching Standards and Use National Models for Guidance	13
Strategy 2: Use Teacher Performance-Based Assessments to Measure New Teachers’ Adherence to Teaching Standards	19
Substrategy 2.1: Use Portfolios and Structured Observation to Assess Teachers’ Adherence to Teaching Standards.	22
Strategy 3: Use (Formative) Teacher Performance-Based Assessment and Value-Added Models to Support Teachers and Improve Programs	26
Substrategy 3.1 Use Value-Added Models to Improve Professional Development	31
Strategy 4: Use (Summative) Teacher Performance-Based Assessment and Value-Added Models to Make Local Staffing Decisions	32
Substrategy 4.1: Use Performance-Based Assessment as Part of a Peer Review Process for Local Staffing Decisions	35
Substrategy 4.2: Use Value-Added Models to Understand Staffing Distributions	37
Strategy 5: Use Teacher Performance-Based Assessment With Value-Added Models for Diversified Compensation	40
Strategy 6: Use Video Evaluation for Research and Program Improvement Purposes	46
Strategy 7: Use Teacher Logs or the <i>Surveys of Enacted Curriculum</i> to Measure Instructional Practices for Research or Program Evaluation Purposes	47
Strategy 8: Use Value-Added Models to Determine the Impact of Teacher Characteristics and Teaching Practices on Student Outcomes.	49
Real-Life Example: Achievement First.	50
References	52

KEY DEFINITIONS

What Is Performance-Based Assessment of Teachers?

Performance-based assessment of teachers includes a class of measurement methods designed to assess the quality of teacher performance on one or more important aspects of teaching. It may include portfolios, structured observations, video records of practice, and teacher work samples.

Performance-based assessment can be contrasted with assessments that consider knowledge of particular concepts without examining the application of that knowledge to teaching tasks. Scoring of performance-based assessment requires the application of professional judgment to evaluate the quality of performance because there is no single correct answer as with traditional multiple-choice tests. Performance-based assessment methods are scored by trained and calibrated assessors who use rubrics—written scales that define levels of performance quality based on standards of practice—to make judgments of performance quality.

Performance-based assessment methods can measure many constructs at a time by relying on multiple sources of evidence, preferably collected over time, and can provide formative and summative judgments. Performance-based assessment for teaching can be based on teaching evidence obtained from assessment tasks such as the following:

- Structured classroom observation protocols
- Teacher-developed portfolios (which may include an analysis of student work samples)
- Detailed preparation of instructional plans
- Teacher-developed student assessments
- Mock individualized education programs for different student learners
- Teachers' written responses to real-world teaching scenarios that deal with behavior and classroom management
- Video records of real-time instructional practice

What Are Value-Added Measures?

A value-added measure is the “contribution of various factors toward growth in student achievement” (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003, p. 38). According to leading researchers in the field, value-added models can be thought of as “a collection of complex statistical techniques that use multiple years of students’ test score data to estimate the effects of individual schools or teachers” (McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz, & Hamilton, 2003, p. xi). There are two primary ways that value-added models are used in practice to evaluate schools for accountability purposes and to evaluate teachers in terms of their effectiveness relative to other teachers. For a helpful discussion of these two applications of value-added models, see *Evaluating Value-Added: Findings and Recommendations From the NASBE Study Group of Value-Added Assessments* (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2005).

In its most simple form, the value-added measure as it is used for evaluating teachers is calculated as follows: Students' previous test scores are used to create *predicted* test scores for a given year. The difference between the predicted and actual test scores are growth scores. Teachers' contribution to student learning is determined by considering the average of all of their students' growth scores. The teachers are then ranked against other teachers within a district (or other unit of interest) according to how much they contributed to students' growth, and this ranking is their value-added score. In some value-added models, only students' prior achievement scores are used in the calculation; other models include students' gender, race, and socioeconomic background; still others include information about teachers' experience. Within a value-added model, teachers whose students performed about as well as predicted are considered "average" teachers, those whose students performed much better than predicted are considered "above average" or "highly effective," and those whose students performed worse than expected are considered "below average."

SCENARIO

Marlene Davis is a seasoned principal with 30 years of experience. She has spent the last 15 years at several successful charter schools in what has become the Early Success charter school network. The network formed through the joint collaboration of several previously independent charter schools. The success of the network's charter schools led to expansion by seeding new charter schools in additional districts and regions across the state.

As one of the most experienced principals in the Early Success network, Davis has been asked by the central administration to participate in a task force to overhaul and standardize the performance management system for hiring, developing, evaluating, and maintaining high-quality teachers. Davis is well known and respected among her colleagues for guiding and mentoring young teachers and providing them with strong instructional feedback to improve their practice. For this reason, Davis has been tasked with leading the development of a performance-based teacher evaluation model that could include value-added measures and will be used by all the charter schools in the Early Success network.

Davis is excited about the opportunity to institutionalize performance-based assessment. She knows that high-quality assessments of teacher performance have the potential to be more meaningful measures of the quality of the network's teacher workforce and to develop the younger and less experienced teachers who tend to predominate in many of the network's schools.

Moreover, Davis knows that although all Early Success charter schools use some form of performance-based evaluation with extensive feedback and coaching, the network has not provided a systemwide set of performance-based teaching and instruction standards, nor does it have a consistent plan for the mentoring and induction of new teachers. Although Early Success is extremely rigorous in screening and hiring teaching candidates who are good fits with the network's focus on a collaborative school culture, Davis believes the network could benefit from a more coherent, cohesive process that uses performance-based teaching and instructional standards to guide mentoring, induction, evaluation, and professional development.

Davis also is a bit daunted. There are many options—several charter school networks in the state have performance-based assessment models in place, but they vary greatly. Some networks use portfolio collections of evidence, and others rely on teams of trained observers who conduct in-person observations. In some instances, observation is conducted by viewing video recordings. In still others, the charter schools combined observations, portfolios, and measures of student growth into a composite score with weights for different elements.

Davis is particularly concerned about incorporating the use of value-added measures of student growth—using statistical models with longitudinal student test-score information to determine what contributions specific teachers are making to their students' learning. She knows that value-added models are very complex but understands that they are basically the difference between students' actual test scores and their predicted test scores.

Using value-added measures for evaluating teachers is a thorny and contentious issue in the education community. Although federal and state policy initiatives emphasize the use of student achievement and student growth outcomes in teacher evaluation, many teachers question the fairness of such calculations and the logic of isolating a teacher's influence on an individual student's learning through statistical calculations. Davis understands these concerns and wants to know whether combining performance-based assessment and value-added measures in the evaluation system can provide the network and its teachers with actionable feedback on the quality of instruction and teaching and its effect on student outcomes.

As part of a larger task force on performance management, Davis knows she will need to develop a system that combines performance-based assessments and value-added measures in a manner that is useful for restructuring teacher compensation, developing a teacher career ladder, making staffing decisions, and developing a system of rewards for high-performing teachers.

Davis is left wondering: What are the best ways to use performance-based assessment and value-added models to identify and support high-quality teachers for various purposes?

BENEFITS

Performance-Based Assessment

The following list describes the importance of using teacher performance-based assessment in identifying and supporting high-quality teachers:

- **Teacher performance-based assessment goes beyond traditional teacher evaluation methods to capture the complexity of teaching in context.** Effective performance-based assessment is embedded in teacher candidates' or teachers' classroom practice, so it measures their actual work with real students. It differs from other approaches to measuring teachers' knowledge and skill (e.g., "paper-and-pencil" certification examinations, traditional classroom observation behavioral checklists). Unlike these other methods, performance-based assessment can measure teachers' knowledge and skills as *they are used* in practice and, therefore, has the potential to be a more meaningful and valid measure of what teachers know and can do in their classrooms to be effective (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000; Toch & Rothman, 2008).
- **High-quality teacher performance-based assessment is based on meaningful professional standards of teaching performance.** In high-quality performance assessment, the criteria used to determine the quality of a teacher's performance are based on rigorous professional standards (e.g., Dwyer, 1998; Linn et al., 1989). Such standards are developed via a consensus of experts from both within and outside the profession and, therefore, represent a credible and meaningful yardstick on which to judge teaching quality (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 2011).
- **Teacher performance-based assessment supports teacher learning.** Many teachers report that completing the tasks required in a performance-based assessment has helped them understand their teaching and their students better (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Sato, 2000). Moreover, those who are asked to conduct and score the assessments find the experience to be enormously valuable in refining their own practice (Jackson & Suckow, 2004). Also, because performance-based assessment often entails individual, supported reflection and the analysis of one's own teaching, it provides for a deepened learning experience (Pechione, Pigg, Chung, & Souviney, 2005). Teacher performance-based assessment helps both teachers and assessors understand the underpinnings of standards-based practice. In this sense, teacher performance-based assessment allows for both summative and formative evaluation of teachers.
- **Teacher performance-based assessment provides a firsthand evaluation experience that teachers can then modify and apply to their assessment of students.** For many teachers, this type of performance-based assessment—one that starts with standards, ties specific tasks and measures to those standards, and requires a body of evidence that is collected across time and judged against rubrics (descriptions of practice)—is new. After going through the experience, teachers can better understand how to use this type of assessment with students, thereby expanding the range of tools they have to gauge what their students know and are able to do (See Danielson, 2007a, for discussion of how the assessment of teacher learning can inform student learning).

- **Teacher performance-based assessment is composed of multiple measures and can be used for multiple purposes.** High-quality performance-based assessment entails multiple measures and sources of evidence as well as multiple opportunities to test. As such, it captures the complexity of teachers' work through rich sets of data on which grounded decisions can be made. In addition, performance-based assessment can incorporate teachers' contributions to student achievement as measured using test scores (See Goe, 2008) as well as teachers' scores on "paper-and-pencil" tests of teacher knowledge validated for this specific purpose. If designed thoughtfully, with particular purposes in mind, such a performance-based assessment can be used not only to make summative decisions for individual teachers (e.g., certification, tenure, or differentiated pay decisions) and programs (e.g., accreditation of teacher preparation programs or adoption of professional development programs) but also for individual and program improvement purposes. To use these tests for specific purposes, the test instrument needs to be validated for each use.
- **Teacher performance-based assessment can be used to assess the quality of any teacher—not only teachers of core academic subjects.** After standards are developed for the different categories of teachers, teacher performance-based assessment can be used to measure teacher performance in different subjects and grade levels and across the career continuum. For example, Gelfer, Xu, and Perkins (2004) outline how portfolio assessment is being used to evaluate early childhood teachers. Teacher performance-based assessment also can be used at various points in a teacher's career.
- **Teacher performance-based assessment can be a powerful component of an aligned performance management system.** Teacher performance-based assessment (and the standards that underlie it) can be used to align important aspects of the human resources (or human capital) management system—for example, selection, induction, mentoring, professional development, evaluation, leadership, and compensation (See, e.g., Heneman & Milanowski, 2004).

Value-Added Measures

The following list describes the importance of using value-added measures in identifying and supporting high-quality teachers:

- **Value-added measures are relatively objective because they attempt to consider only teachers' contributions to student learning.** Unlike classroom observations (which may be influenced by the observers' own beliefs about effective teaching, the appearance of the classroom, the students' behavior, and other factors), value-added scores are free from the subjective judgments and impressions of evaluators. With proper training, observer bias can be minimized but not eliminated; with value-added models, there is no observer—only scores.
 - **Value-added measures provide a useful way to look for evidence about which teacher qualifications and characteristics influence student learning.** Reviewing value-added test scores for teachers and linking those scores to other information—such as a teacher's highly qualified status, past experience, and degrees—can reveal interesting information. For example, in several research studies, teachers
-

with either certification in mathematics or a strong mathematics background contributed significantly more to their students' achievement test scores than did teachers without a strong mathematics background or a mathematics certification—although there was no strong, consistent evidence of the impact of certification, experience, or educational background on student achievement in other subjects such as language arts, social studies, and science (Goe, 2007; Rice, 2003; Wayne & Youngs, 2003).

- **Analyzing value-added data is relatively inexpensive compared with other means of assessing teachers.** Creating the necessary infrastructure (e.g., unique identifiers for teacher and students and data systems that link students with teachers over time) to collect and analyze data may be expensive initially, but the cost of analyzing the data is relatively low compared to the cost of collecting and analyzing classroom observation data or developing and evaluating teacher portfolios. Currently, states are working to collect more data at the student and teacher levels, so some of the work already may be accomplished. Sorting, linking, and warehousing data for reporting purposes as well as for use in value-added teacher evaluation is difficult and initially costly, but linked student-teacher data can be profoundly useful for making evidence-based decisions and thus worth the investment.
- **Value-added measures focus exclusively on student learning—not on teaching practices that may or may not be linked to positive outcomes for students.** It is possible for teachers to be given a high score when evaluated with a teacher observation instrument but still have average or below-average impact on their students' learning. Observation instruments can rate teachers on their use of teaching practices that fit with experts' beliefs about effective teaching, but empirical evidence that specific teaching practices improve student learning is lacking (See Goe, 2007, for a review of the literature on teacher quality and teacher practices). This lack of evidence may be a result of the difficulty of measuring differences in teaching practices as they relate to standardized achievement outcomes (See Valli et al., 2004, for a discussion of these difficulties). Because value-added measures focus only on actual student progress, the extent to which teachers' practices reflect an instructional ideal is not part of the equation. In this view, teacher effectiveness is based on confidence that student test scores are valid and reliable indicators of student learning.
- **Value-added measures identify highly successful classrooms and teachers, creating opportunities to learn from those teachers.** There are considerable differences among teachers, even within the same school, in terms of how much their students learn (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004). It can be extremely helpful to new or struggling teachers to observe how highly effective teachers teach, but identification of outstanding teachers is often based on their reputation or the extent to which their practices reflect experts' conceptions of accomplished teaching. Value-added measures offer a way to identify those highly effective teachers whose practices actually contribute the most to student learning gains, thus creating a "learning lab" for colleagues and researchers. It would be particularly valuable to identify and examine the classrooms of teachers who are highly effective—as measured by value-added scores—with students who are at-risk for poor educational outcomes. Providing preservice teachers an opportunity to learn from these effective teachers or giving new or struggling teachers opportunities to observe in these classrooms could provide valuable professional development.



TIPS AND CAUTIONS

Performance-Based Assessment

Before implementing performance-based assessment, the following questions should be addressed:

- **When should assessment be conducted?** There are many points along a teacher's career continuum during which assessment can take place: preservice, initial licensure, hiring, induction, second-tier licensure, accomplished teaching, and teacher leadership. States must determine when to assess performance. The teacher pool will possess specific knowledge and abilities depending on the point in time along the continuum at which teachers are assessed. For example, a preservice teacher candidate's knowledge and abilities will be very different from those of a second-year teacher.
- **What are the goals of assessment?** What vision of quality teaching performance does the education agency want to uphold? What decisions will be made based on whether or not a teacher can achieve this vision? What claims does the agency hope to make about a teacher who "passes" the assessment, versus one who does not?

In answering these questions and designing or adopting appropriate performance-based assessments, the following notes of caution should be heeded:

- Teacher performance-based assessment is expensive. Each step of teacher performance-based assessment costs money: developing standards, developing the assessment, providing *ongoing* training of assessors and assessment leaders, conducting assessments, holding scoring sessions, and designing and implementing information management systems. The primary source of these costs is labor.
- Teacher performance-based assessment requires a great deal of learning for both assessors and those taking the assessment, given the complexity and richness of the evidence. Intensive and ongoing training of assessors and teachers taking the assessment is critical.
- There must be a clearly defined link between the standards that serve as the assessment foundation, the tasks used to collect evidence, the rubric, and training materials (Dwyer, 1998).
- Teaching standards must be revisited and revised as the field evolves and as a more fine-grained understanding of effective teaching practices is developed.
- There may be threats to the validity and reliability of teacher performance-based assessment—from rater bias to difficulty in achieving acceptable interreliability to inequitable access to support for completing the assessment. Such threats must be considered and thoughtfully addressed.
- The training of assessors is a critical component in developing a performance-based assessment program. Assessors must be trained in numerous areas, including awareness of bias, knowledge measured, and understanding and applying the rubric. In addition, they must be monitored during scoring by highly trained staff who are experts in the prompt and the rubric and who know how to look for scoring drift, how to apply seed cases, and when to apply a third-read rule.

- There is an uncertain link between teacher performance as assessed using performance-based assessment and teacher effectiveness as measured by student achievement test scores (Goe, 2007). Nevertheless, some research shows that teachers' performance as measured by certain performance assessment systems is significantly related to student achievement outcomes as measured by particular test scores (e.g., Harris & Sass, 2007; Milanowski, Kimball, & Odden, 2005; Milanowski, Kimball, & White, 2004).
- To achieve the formative objectives of teacher performance-based assessment, there must be a culture of support for evaluation. To learn from performance-based assessment, teachers need to recognize that they continually learn and grow in their practice and should be open to learning how to strengthen their own teaching skills. This effort requires a high degree of trust between the teacher being assessed and those doing the evaluation. As McLaughlin (1990) writes:

Teacher evaluation will be no more effective than the extent to which teachers support it. An effective teacher evaluation system assumes candor on the part of teachers,... [it] demands teachers' willingness and ability to act on the outcomes of the evaluation,... [and it] insists on trust between teachers and "evaluators." (p. 404)

This effort takes high levels of commitment from both charter school networks and organizations and charter school leaders.

Value-Added Models

Even though value-added models are useful in tracking student progress over time, there are limitations and complexities involving these methods and the resultant data, particularly when used as the sole measure of teacher effectiveness. Educators and policymakers should give careful consideration to these concerns before committing to using value-added methods in ways that may not be warranted, given the current state of understanding about the methodology and theory. The bottom line is that value-added data are limited in their implications about teacher quality and effectiveness; these data are more useful when supplemented by other measures and sources of evidence.

Following are several limitations to the use of value-added measures of teacher effectiveness. Officials should use extreme caution when making high-stakes decisions about teachers using these measures.

- **Difficulty in Determining Impact.** Value-added measures alone are insufficient to determine the impact of specific teaching practices on student progress and to guide instructional improvement. There is little that teachers (or administrators) can learn simply from seeing teachers' value-added scores because these numbers give no indication of what the teacher might be doing right or wrong that affects student learning. Value-added scores can provide some direction for teacher learning, however. For example, knowing that a teacher's students are demonstrating slower growth in understanding fractions but faster growth in understanding multidigit multiplication, helps the teacher know that his or her instruction of fractions needs to improve, but the measures provide no information on *how* to improve in that area. For beginning teachers, in particular, it is important to ensure that they are given detailed and specific information about the strengths and weaknesses of their instructional practices and targeted suggestions for improvement. Observations or other forms of performance-based assessments conducted by experts, followed by discussion of the results, are most likely to be helpful to new or struggling teachers who need guidance.

- **Difficulty in Isolating the Contributions of an Individual Teacher.** Many researchers have expressed concerns that it is difficult, if not impossible, to isolate an individual teacher's contributions to student achievement from a number of other factors that can affect it: classroom and school characteristics, students' peers, student mobility, curriculum quality, access to materials and resources, other teachers (e.g., Braun, 2005; Glass, 2004; Kupermintz, 2003; McCaffrey, Koretz, Lockwood, & Hamilton, 2004). Even the specific grade level can be a factor. Teachers who teach students in the first year of middle school or high school may have lower value-added scores because there is a "building change effect" that tends to lower achievement gains dramatically for some students (Sanders & Horn, 1998). Thus, comparing teachers across grades may be problematic. Moreover, comparing teachers across grades assumes that tests have sound "vertical scales" (i.e., that what is being measured is essentially the same across grade levels).
 - **Methodological Issues.** Methodological issues in generating value-added scores can compromise teachers' value-added scores and thus their classification as effective or ineffective (for discussions of these issues, see Amrein-Beardsley, 2008; Glass, 2004; McCaffrey et al., 2004). Some research suggests that students who have a series of effective teachers will have higher levels of achievement in subsequent years (Sanders & Horn, 1998), so some of the gains that students experience in a given year may be the effects of prior years of effective teachers and thus not attributable to the current teacher. The effects of bad teaching also may be cumulative, and a low score for a teacher in a low-performing school may in part reflect poor teaching by others in previous years. Although some value-added models attempt to control for students' prior teachers' contributions, it is not clear how well the models succeed in isolating the current teacher effects.
 - **Incomplete Student Data and Small Sample Sizes.** Incomplete student data as well as small sample sizes may skew a teacher's value-added score. Given that the most challenging schools often have highly mobile student populations, it is likely that value-added estimates are affected. The more students' scores are available, the more likely it is that the score will accurately reflect a teacher's contribution. A teacher's score is likely to be more accurate when calculated with 20 students' achievement growth information than with only 10 students' growth information. Teachers with fewer students' growth information used in calculations of value-added scores may be disadvantaged because their scores may appear to be too high or too low depending on random fluctuation.
 - **Relativity.** Teachers' value-added scores are not absolute or based on independent criteria but are relative—that is, dependent upon the teacher comparison group and the particular value-added method employed. This situation complicates efforts to use value-added measures as the basis for *statewide* evaluation or compensation systems. Teachers' value-added scores reflect a ranking based on the mean score of the comparison group, which is almost always limited to the teachers in a particular district (Kupermintz, 2003). The result is that an "average" teacher in a district with a high mean value-added score (a district where students have made notable achievement gains) may be as effective as, or even better than, a "highly effective" teacher in a district with a low mean score (a district where students have failed to make substantial achievement gains). In addition, value-added models used by different states or districts may be built on very different assumptions. For example, models often differ on the length of time students must be in a school for their examination scores to count in a teacher's value-added calculation. This means that the value-added score received by the teacher of a particular class in one district could be higher or lower if the teacher taught the very same class in another district solely because the districts use different value-added models.
-

- **Parameters of Effective Teaching.** The success of teachers based on value-added data does not necessarily reflect accomplished teaching. For example, a teacher whose class shows excellent gains in a given year and who thus has a high value-added score may be either (1) effective in helping students explore and learn a range of worthwhile knowledge within a broad curriculum or (2) effective in preparing students for the standardized test on which the value-added score is based. Thus, a teacher who focuses on a narrow curriculum that is closely aligned with a standardized test may score higher than a gifted and inspiring teacher whose students receive a broader, richer curriculum that includes material that is not tested. In addition, many worry that teacher appraisal systems based solely on value-added models may provide incentives for “teaching-to-the-test” or even cheating.
 - **Inability to Use Value-Added Methods.** Many teachers cannot be evaluated using value-added methods. Assessment and instructional policies in states or districts can result in limitations in the scope and legitimate application of value-added data. Although effective early elementary teachers are critical, those whose students are not tested cannot be assessed using value-added scores because the scores rely on students’ previous testing records. School subjects that are not tested cannot be used to generate value-added scores, so teachers of art, music, physical education, and so on will not receive value-added scores. Teachers with less traditional assignments (e.g., those who work in pull-out programs) may not spend enough time with students to include the students in their value-added score. Team teaching and other arrangements in which instruction is shared among teachers also make it difficult to identify the specific contributions—and thus the value-added scores—of individual teachers. In addition, value-added models used in some states and districts explicitly exclude first-year teachers. These factors pose a challenge to the evenhandedness of statewide or districtwide programs that evaluate or compensate teachers on the basis of value-added data. They also make it difficult to use value-added data fairly and accurately in making school-level decisions, such as the awarding of whole-school performance bonuses.
 - **Privacy Issues.** Unique teacher and student identifiers are essential to create links between teachers and students for calculating value-added scores. A growing number of states have linked student-teacher data that can be used for value-added methods, but many states struggle with privacy issues related to using these identifiers. Some states, such as California, have only recently begun to establish policies and procedures to assign unique identifiers and use them for administrative and research purposes. The Data Quality Campaign (<http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org>) has worked diligently to advocate for the development of statewide longitudinal data systems. It offers many useful ideas about how to design and develop such systems and also provides advocacy materials for the support and adoption of unique identifiers.
 - **Inadequacy of Standardized Tests.** Finally, standardized tests are incomplete measures of student learning. Some examinations have better psychometric properties than others; some are more rigorous than others; and some require higher-order thinking, and some do not. Tests will inevitably be limited in their coverage of any subject matter domain. Moreover, teachers contribute to other valued student outcomes that are more difficult to measure—for example, socioemotional wellness, civic engagement, moral character, open-mindedness, and motivation for continued learning. A teacher appraisal system based solely on value-added models would exclude these other important contributions.
-

STRATEGIES

1. When developing or revising your charter school teaching standards, get to know your state's teaching standards and use national models for guidance.
2. Use teacher performance-based assessments to measure new teachers' adherence to teaching standards.
 - a. Use portfolios and structured observation to assess teachers' adherence to teaching standards.
3. Use (formative) teacher performance-based assessment and value-added models to support teachers and improve programs.
 - a. Use value-added models to improve professional development.
4. Use (summative) teacher performance-based assessment and value-added models to make local staffing decisions.
 - a. Use performance-based assessment as part of a peer review process for local staffing decisions.
 - b. Use value-added models to understand staffing distributions.
5. Use teacher performance-based assessment with value-added models for diversified compensation.
6. Use video evaluation for research and program improvement purposes.
7. Use teacher logs or the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* to measure instructional practices for research or program evaluation purposes.
8. Use value-added models to determine the impact of teacher characteristics and teaching practices on student outcomes.

The following sections describe these strategies in more detail and provide resources with helpful information about implementing the strategies. Some resources highlight the rationale for a strategy or the research base that supports it; others provide examples of how a strategy has been implemented elsewhere or practical toolkits that can assist charter school leaders in adopting the strategy.

STRATEGY 1:

When Developing or Revising Your Charter School Teaching Standards, Get to Know Your State’s Teaching Standards and Use National Models for Guidance

For any school (private, public, charter, or otherwise), teaching standards provide the basic framework for evaluating the performance of teachers. The standards define the knowledge, skills, and practices of effective teachers and create a common understanding of what teachers are expected to know and be able to do. The adoption of teaching standards offers a charter school network or management organization consistency in how it hires, evaluates, and develops teachers.

Charter schools have expectations or standards on teacher performance rooted in the school’s unique mission, vision, and instructional approach. Indeed, one of the advantages for charter schools is the ability to create standards and performance systems that are tightly aligned to their schools’ cultures and contexts; however, as states move forward in revising or creating new teacher evaluation systems and their accompanying state teaching standards, charter schools should stay abreast of major changes in these areas. The recent adoption of the Common Core State Standards by many states also may prompt updates or revisions to teaching standards to reflect new instructional strategies and student assessments. As states increasingly use state-mandated teaching standards to align teacher preparation, certification, and evaluation requirements, charter schools need to be involved in conversations about the creation of state standards and assessing how well their pre-existing standards align with or reflect the priorities of state and national teacher standards. Get to know your state’s teaching standards and check for gaps or misalignments with your charter school’s standards.

In addition, the development of model standards at the national level provides a useful starting point for charter schools to reassess their existing teaching standards or design new standards. For example, several states have adopted teaching standards based on a national model known as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, or INTASC. First developed in 1992, the standards were recently revised in 2011 to reflect the most current teacher practices and to address content and pedagogy changes associated with the Common Core State Standards.

Resource 1: Achievement First Network’s “Cycle of Highly Effective Teaching”

Curtis, R. (2011). *Achievement First: Developing a teacher performance system that recognizes excellence*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute Education & Society Program. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/education%20and%20society%20program/AI_Achievement%20First_performance%20mangmt.pdf

Achievement First (AF), a charter school network expanding in the Northeast, began developing instructional and teaching standards for its charter schools in 2008. In a profile of AF’s performance management system, Curtis (2011) describes AF’s standards, known as the “Cycle of Highly Effective Teaching” as follows:

A network-wide set of expectations for how teachers do their jobs. It is a four-step model of instruction that includes planning, instruction, assessment, and planning again. The Cycle... defines the broad set of responsibilities that teachers must pursue before, during, and after classroom instruction. (p. 6)

The core of the cycle is a separate set of standards focused explicitly on pedagogy: the “Essentials of Effective Instruction.” The Essentials of Effective Instruction are organized into ten categories:

- Great AIMS
- Exit Ticket/Assessment of Mastery
- Most Effective and Efficient Strategies
- Modeling/Guided Practice
- Sustained, Successful, Independent Practice
- Classroom Culture
- Student Engagement
- Academic Rigor
- Cumulative Review
- Differentiation

The Cycle of Highly Effective Teaching forms the foundation and basis for AF’s broader performance management system that includes both performance-based assessment and value-added models. AF’s system is profiled in the Real-Life Example section at the end of this document.

Resource 2: Pacoima Elementary Charter School: Teacher Evaluation

USC Rossier School of Education. (n.d.). *Promising practices compendium—Pacoima Elementary Charter School: Teacher evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Center on Educational Governance. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/cegov/products/compendium-of-promising/pacoima_elementary_charter_school.html

California-based Pacoima Elementary Charter School relies on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession to provide formative feedback to its teachers on instruction and practice. Beginning teachers (those with less than three years of experience) are evaluated annually, and tenured teachers are evaluated every three years. Teachers and evaluators engage in an initial planning conference, a midyear conference, and a final evaluation conference at the end of the year. All observations are unannounced and followed up with nonevaluative visits from a mentor or coach. At the end of the evaluation cycle, teachers are provided with a score on a scale of one to three based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Teachers use the score for self-reflection and to identify areas for improvement and growth. The *Promising Practice Compendium* profile of this program provides a helpful overview of the system, its costs, strengths, and weaknesses.

Resource 3: Aspire Public Schools Pilot Teacher Assessment Standards and Rubric

Aspire Public Schools. (2010). *Pilot college ready teaching framework*. Oakland, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/assets/tools/ASPIRE_Pilot_College_Ready_Teaching_Framework_TSLT_0311.pdf

As part of the College Ready Promise Partnership (<http://www.thecollegereadypromise.org>), Aspire Public Schools, a California-based charter school network, developed a pilot Teaching Framework that includes teaching standards, indicators, and a performance-level rubric. A version of this framework is currently being piloted in charter schools within Los Angeles, California, as part of a Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Intensive Partnership and a Teacher Incentive Fund grant. The rubric was developed using Charlotte Danielson's (2007b) *Framework for Teaching* as well as other national teaching standards.

Resource 4: Friendship Public Charter School: Teacher Performance Behavior Standards and Rubric

Friendship Public Charter School. (2010). *Engage! guide 2010–2011: Performance management plan* (Teacher edition). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/assets/tools/FPCS_ENGAGE_Latest+Revised+Teacher+Guide_TSLT_0311.pdf

Friendship Public Charter School, located in Washington, D.C., developed a set of teacher performance standards organized into four key areas: Excellent Teaching and Learning, Outstanding Leadership, Environment Conducive to Learning, and Organizational Strength and Viability. The resource listed above is the full guide for the teacher evaluation system; however, the teaching standards and performance-level rubric can be located on pages 100–111.

Resource 5: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Model Standards

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2011). *Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/INTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf

The Council of Chief State School Officers organized a consortium of state education agencies, institutions of higher education, and national education organizations to develop model standards for beginning teachers that could be adapted and used by states. The consortium, known as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), first created the standards in 1992. The INTASC standards are designed to be compatible with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and are organized in three main areas: knowledge, dispositions, and performance. INTASC also developed content-specific standards for mathematics, arts education, foreign languages, science, and special education. The most recently revised standards (2011) were updated to reflect changes in the current teaching and learning context. They are designed to align with the Common Core State Standards and include an emphasis on 21st century knowledge and skills, literacy assessment, personalized learning for diverse learners, and collaborative professional culture.

Resource 6: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2007). *Every child deserves a great teacher*. Arlington, VA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.nbpts.org/index.cfm?t=downloader.cfm&id=1269>

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2011). *The five core propositions*. Arlington, VA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_propositio

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was created in 1987 after the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession released *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. After this release, NBPTS issued its first policy statement: *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do*, which set forth the NBPTS vision for accomplished teaching. The Five Core Propositions "form the foundation and frame the rich amalgam of knowledge, skills, dispositions and beliefs that characterize National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs)." These propositions, with an emphasis on modeling, collaboration, learning communities, leadership, instructional policy, curriculum development, staff development, and evaluation of school progress, describe not only accomplished teachers but also effective teacher leaders.

Resource 7: Teacher Leader Model Standards

Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium. (2011). *Teacher Leader Model Standards*. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.teacherleaderstandards.org/downloads/TLS_Brochure.pdf

The Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium includes a wide variety of education organizations, state education agencies, teacher leaders, principal leaders, and institutions of higher education. The Consortium recently drafted the Teacher Leader Model Standards to create a dialogue among education leaders about the knowledge, skills, and competencies that teachers require to become leaders at multiple levels. The standards have a format similar to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLSC) State Standards for School Leaders in that they incorporate domains and performance indicators. Charter schools are known for offering teachers a wider variety of leadership roles and responsibilities than their conventional school counterparts and thus, it may be particularly relevant for charter schools to consider incorporating specific teacher leadership standards into their teacher evaluation models.

Resource 8: Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2010). *2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational skills*. Hartford, CT: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/educatorstandards/Board_Approved_CCT_2-3-2010.pdf

Connecticut's state teaching standards, known as the Common Core of Teaching, define the skills and competencies of an accomplished teacher. The state designed the standards to guide the preparation, induction, and ongoing development of teachers. The standards are used for teacher preparation, formative and evaluative assessment using the Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) program, teacher evaluation, and the selection of professional development.

Resource 9: New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders

State of New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.). *National professional standards for teachers and school leaders*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/profdev/profstand/>

The New Jersey Professional Teaching Standards Board worked with INTASC to develop and adopt new teaching standards in 2003. The standards define the knowledge, dispositions, and performance expected of teachers. They are used as the basis for accrediting teacher preparation programs, certifying new teachers, and planning professional development. In addition, teacher induction activities are aligned with the standards. The state expects teachers to improve their mastery of the professional standards over time.

Resource 10: Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers

Colorado Department of Education. (2011). *Colorado Teacher Quality Standards*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/downloads/Colorado_Quality_Standards_for_Teachers.pdf

The Colorado Teacher Quality Standards identify what all Colorado teachers should know and be able to do and forms the foundation for Colorado's Educator Effectiveness program and the state's current efforts in piloting a teacher evaluation model for adoption by schools in Colorado.

Resource 11: Core Standards for Teachers in North Carolina

North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission. (2007). *North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards*. Raleigh, NC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/profdev/standards/teachingstandards.pdf>

North Carolina revised its teaching standards in 2006 to align them with its new goal of ensuring that graduates are competitive for work and postsecondary education and prepared for life in the 21st century. The standards are used as the basis for teacher preparation, teacher evaluation, and professional development in the state. As a result, the change in standards has led to further changes in teacher preparation programs, the state's teacher evaluation instrument, and professional development offerings.

Resource 12: Framework for Teaching

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

This book lays out the design and use of Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*. Many school districts have used the framework as the basis for their teacher evaluation systems. The framework consists of 22 components organized in the following four domains: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.



Resource 13: Searching for Consensus While Acknowledging Alternative Perspectives on Teaching Standards

Moss, P. A., & Schutz, A. (2001). Educational standards, assessment, and the search for consensus. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 37–70.

The authors of this article critically examine the process used to develop teaching standards, pointing out that the “consensus” reached may “underrepresent, misrepresent, or exclude groups of voices within the community” (p. 68). They argue that assessment decisions based on such standards may limit the diversity of those selected into the profession as well as those who are allowed to remain. They do not argue against standards-based assessment but remind future standards developers to work persistently to nurture a civic culture that is inclusive of dissenting voices to construct standards that are ultimately legitimate and fair.

Resource 14: Standards for Personnel Evaluation

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2007). *The personnel evaluation standards: How to assess personnel evaluations and personnel evaluation systems* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, the 27 standards presented in this book guide users to research and expert consensus about the best way to implement sound personnel evaluations and personnel evaluation systems (which may or may not include performance-based assessments). The standards require that personnel evaluations be ethical, fair, useful, feasible, and accurate.



STRATEGY 2:

Use Teacher Performance-Based Assessments to Measure New Teachers' Adherence to Teaching Standards

Performance-based assessment often is linked to states' licensure and induction and mentoring programs for new teachers. Several states have incorporated performance-based assessment into their teacher licensing systems. The performance-based assessment serves as an additional requirement for initial licensure or as the primary requirement for moving from an initial to a full teaching license. The latter approach creates a tiered system in which teachers typically must pass a state licensing examination to receive initial licensure and then pass a performance-based assessment to obtain professional licensure.

Charter school networks and organizations face similar dilemmas regarding the induction and mentoring of new teachers. Whether hiring an experienced teacher who is new to the specific charter school model or hiring a beginning teacher with little teaching experience overall, charter schools must develop a system for induction. Performance-based assessment is an important method for monitoring a new teacher's progress in mastering the standards, culture, and practices of the school. Moreover, in states where performance-based assessment is required for licensure and certification, charter school networks and organizations are uniquely situated to collaborate with teacher preparation programs in developing residency and induction programs that are designed to meet their specific needs. Alternatively, charter schools have the option of developing their own (state-approved) credentialing programs.

The Teacher Residency Program at Aspire Public Schools, a California-based charter school organization, provides an interesting example of partnership between a charter school organization and a public university within a state that requires the use of teacher performance-based assessment for initial licensure. Going a step further, High Tech High, a San Diego-based charter school network, has developed its own state-approved credentialing process and teacher induction program. High Tech High formed a partnership with the New Teacher Center at the University of California–Santa Cruz to use performance-based assessment as part of its induction process.

The following resources provide details on the Aspire residency program, High Tech High's credentialing and induction program, and additional state-approved performance-based assessment approaches to teacher preparation and licensure.

Resource 15: Aspire Public Schools Teacher Residency Program

Aspire Public Schools. (2011). *Aspire Teacher Residency: Program overview*. Oakland, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.aspirepublicschools.org/?q=atr>

Aspire Public Schools, a California-based charter school network, recently developed an innovative, four-year teacher residency program in partnership with the University of the Pacific. Modeled on medical school residencies, Aspire residents receive a master of arts in education and California Preliminary Teaching Credential in their first year while working alongside an Aspire mentor teacher four days per week. In the second and third years, the residents work with instructional coaches and complete an induction program while in charge of their own classes. The third year culminates

in completion of the next tier of state certification. In the fourth year, residents have the chance to pursue other career paths with Aspire schools, including lead teacher, mentor teacher, and administrator. Residents receive discounted tuition and an annual stipend during the first year and additional tuition reimbursements depending on length of employment with Aspire Public Schools. Although each Aspire charter school has a performance-based assessment process in place, the organization is currently revising and developing a performance-based assessment process that will include student growth scores (See http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/assets/tools/ASPIRE%20TCRP_Feb2011%20TSLT_0311.pdf).

Resource 16: High Tech High—Teacher Credentialing Program

High Tech High. (n.d.). *Educator training: Teacher credentialing at High Tech High*. San Diego, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.hightechhigh.org/about/educator_training.php

High Tech High. (n.d.). *HTH teacher induction*. San Diego, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.hightechhigh.org/about/induction.php>

High Tech High is a network of charter schools based in San Diego, California. In addition to operating 11 schools (two elementary schools, four middle schools, and five high schools), the network has established its own Graduate School of Education. The Graduate School of Education grants master's degrees in school leadership and teacher leadership, includes its own state-approved credentialing process and induction programs, and provides professional development for all High Tech High teachers. The credentialing program has two stages: intern and induction. The intern program involves two years of coursework and teaching and includes 120 hours of preservice program work and 600 hours of training and practice. Interns earn a full salary with benefits while completing their training at High Tech High. The induction program focuses on an inductee and mentor relationship rooted in mutual, periodic observation. In addition, High Tech High has partnered with the New Teacher Center (NTC) at the University of California–Santa Cruz to implement the NTC's Formative Assessment System as part of the induction program. Together, the intern and induction programs provide High Tech High teachers with preliminary and professional teaching credentials.

Resource 17: California Teaching Performance Assessment

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (n.d.). *Teaching performance assessment*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TPA.html>

Teacher preparation programs in California are required to include a standardized performance-based assessment as part of the credentialing process for new teachers. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing worked with Educational Testing Service to develop a state-approved performance assessment known as the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA). The assessment is incorporated into the teacher education coursework and is designed to measure candidates' achievement of the California teaching standards. The CalTPA consists of four performance tasks in which candidates: (1) use subject-specific pedagogy to develop, adapt, and analyze lesson plans based on four case studies of particular classes and learners; (2) plan and adapt instruction for an actual classroom and two focus students; (3) develop and adapt student assessments for an actual class and for two focus students; and (4) integrate the activities from the previous tasks in a culminating teaching experience.

Resource 18: Performance Assessment for California Teachers

Performance Assessment for California Teachers. (n.d.). *What is PACT?* Stanford, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.pacttpa.org/>

To provide an alternative to the California Teaching Performance Assessment, a consortium of universities and colleges in California created another state-approved assessment called the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). PACT is organized around four aspects of teaching—planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection—and consists of two primary components: (1) embedded signature assessments and (2) the teaching event. The signature assessments are assignments administered during the normal teacher preparation courses that beginning teachers take. The assessments include case studies, lesson plans, analyses of student work, and observations of student teaching. The teaching event occurs during the student teaching experience and is designed to measure learning from throughout the teacher preparation program. A candidate plans and teaches three to five hours of instruction, analyzes instruction, collects and analyzes student work, and reflects on practices. The final product is a portfolio that includes lesson plans, student assessments, and video segments of teaching.

Resource 19: Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality: Teacher Work Samples

Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality. (n.d.). *Renaissance teacher work samples (RTWS)*. Bowling Green, KY: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.uni.edu/itq/RTWS/index.htm>

The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality is a five-year collaboration of 11 teacher preparation programs across 10 states to improve the quality of their graduates. As part of this initiative, the universities designed a performance-based assessment referred to as a teacher work sample. This model includes a rubric for scoring teachers' performance and a set of teaching tasks or prompts that measure seven performance standards for teachers. Teaching candidates submit a 20-page narrative in addition to exhibits that provide evidence of their ability to design and implement instruction, assess student learning, and reflect on the learning process.

Resource 20: State Induction Programs and Mentoring for New and Beginning Teachers

Kaufmann, J. (2007). *State induction programs and mentoring for new and beginning teachers. ECS State Notes: Teaching quality/induction programs and mentoring—Defining the terms and identifying state policies*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/76/63/7663.pdf>

This *ECS State Notes* describes the various ways that states have legislated new teacher support programs, many of which have an assessment component. It provides links to more information for each state program.

SUBSTRATEGY 2.1: *Use Portfolios and Structured Observation to Assess Teachers' Adherence to Teaching Standards*

Structured classroom observations provide a formal way to assess new teachers in the context of their own classroom. Older observation tools that relied on a checklist of teacher behaviors have been replaced by more comprehensive tools that cover a broader range of teaching competencies. A number of states have adopted standardized observation tools based on clear frameworks for effective teaching. In some cases, the observation tool is used as an extension of the state licensing system—teachers must be assessed using the structured observation (in some cases, as part of a larger teacher evaluation process) to transition from initial to full licensure.

In addition to structured observations, portfolios offer a more in-depth and holistic view of a teacher's overall performance. The design of the portfolios is similar to other performance-based assessments in that teachers typically submit a collection of evidence gathered during the design and implementation of a teaching unit. In some cases, teachers submit a video lesson with their portfolio instead of receiving an in-person classroom observation. One or more trained assessors score the portfolios, with established procedures for resolving discrepancies between assessors.

Portfolios often contain the following elements:

- Teacher's written description of a lesson or unit plan with the teachers' rationale for his or her choices concerning the goals and content of the lesson, the instructional materials, student grouping strategies, assessment activities, and so on
- Teacher's written description of the classroom or school context
- A video of the teacher's implementation of the lesson
- Examples of student work
- Teacher's written analysis of how the lesson went

The following resources provide examples of structured observations and portfolios used for assessing the performance of beginning teachers in a school, district, or state. In addition, several resources provide general guidance on developing and using structured observations and portfolios.

Resource 21: Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessments

ETS: The Praxis Series. (n.d.). *Overview of the Praxis III assessments*. Princeton, NJ: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ets.org/praxis/institutions/praxisiii/>

ETS (formerly Educational Testing Service) designed this classroom observation tool to assess the skills of beginning teachers in a classroom setting for the purpose of state licensure. The Praxis III consists of three parts: a direct observation of classroom practice, a review of documentation prepared by the teacher, and semistructured interviews. The assessment is based on a framework of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers that includes 19 criteria organized under four domains.

Resource 22: How Praxis III Supports Beginning Teachers

Danielson, C., & Dwyer, C. (1995). How Praxis III supports beginning teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 52(6), 66–67.

This article describes the development of the Praxis III assessment, the role of performance-based assessment in supporting new teachers, and the unexpected benefits of relying on a performance-based assessment for teacher licensure.

Resource 23: Praxis III in Arkansas

Arkansas Department of Education. (2010). *Educator licensure–Teacher licensure–Praxis series*. Little Rock, AR: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://arkansased.org/educators/licensure/praxis.html>

Arkansas has adapted the Praxis III for use as part of its state licensure system. New teachers must complete the performance-based assessment in their second semester to move from a provisional teaching license to a standard license. The design and structure of the assessment follows the original design by ETS. The state trained mentors in a new mentoring model to build teacher capacity before the assessment.

Resource 24: Kentucky Teacher Internship Program

Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board. (2009). *The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program: Teacher performance assessment handbook*. Frankfort, KY: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://kyepsb.net/documents/KTIP_KP/IP/KTIP%20Training%20Materials/KTIP%20TPA%20Handbook.doc

The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program provides support and guidance for new teachers and culminates in a performance-based assessment required for state licensure. The assessment is based on the state teaching standards and requires the teacher to complete 10 teaching tasks, which are assessed by a committee that includes the principal, a resource teacher, and a teacher educator. New teachers develop a lesson plan, analyze their own teaching, and address special learning needs. The main portion of the assessment requires that teachers design and implement an instructional unit and analyze their own teaching. Teachers submit a variety of materials, including their plans for the instructional unit, student assessments, examples of student work, analysis of student learning, a video-recorded lesson, and a reflection on their teaching. The committee uses these materials to evaluate the teacher's performance.

Resource 25: South Carolina's Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching System

South Carolina State Department of Education. (2011). *ADEPT*. Columbia, SC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.scteacheers.org/adept/index.cfm>

Teachers in South Carolina must pass a performance-based assessment to move from an initial to a professional teaching certificate. The assessment is part of the state's Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT) system that provides support and assistance to new teachers and encourages professional development.

Districts can design their own performance-based assessment, although the system must be aligned with state teaching standards and include (1) a long-range plan; (2) a unit work sample that documents the development, implementation, and analysis of an instructional unit; (3) four unannounced classroom observations; (4) a written reflection of student learning for a lesson; (5) a principal review; and (6) a self-assessment. A team of at least three evaluators, including a school or district supervisor and someone knowledgeable in the content area, uses a scoring rubric to evaluate a teacher's performance.

Resource 26: Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program

Louisiana Department of Education. (n.d.). *Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program*. Baton Rouge, LA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/Lde/uploads/8048.pdf>

The Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program is a comprehensive induction and professional development program for new teachers in Louisiana that includes a performance-based assessment in the third semester of teaching. The performance-based assessment is based on the state teaching standards and is required for a new teacher to receive full certification. A new teacher is assigned an assessment team consisting of the principal or principal designee and an assessor from outside the building (external assessor or an experienced teacher from another school). The assessment of teacher performance is based on a portfolio that includes information on planning, instruction, professional development, and school improvement, as well as a classroom observation conducted by a trained assessor on the assessment team.

Resource 27: Performance-Based Assessment, Mentoring, and Support for Beginning Teachers in North Carolina

North Carolina State Board of Education. (2010). Policies on the Beginning Teacher Support Program. In *Policy Manual*. Raleigh, NC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/recruitment/beginning/policysupportprogram.pdf>

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.). *Educator recruitment and development: Beginning teacher support resources*. Raleigh, NC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/recruitment/beginning/>

North Carolina requires a performance-based assessment as part of a three-year induction and mentoring program for new teachers. The assessment is tied to state licensure, with new teachers required to pass it to receive a continuing teaching license. Beginning teachers are provided orientation and a mentor by their local education agency. In addition, beginning teachers develop and update a professional development plan and are evaluated annually through a performance assessment process (See <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/profdev/training/teacher/teacher-eval.pdf>). Beginning teachers are observed four times annually, with one of the observations completed by a peer. Beginning teachers must receive a rating of "proficient" on all five North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards to be eligible for the Standard Professional 2 License. Probationary teachers must receive a rating of "proficient" on all five North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards to be recommended for career status.

Resource 28: The Value of Teacher Portfolios

Attinello, J. R., Lare, D. W., & Waters, F. (2006). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional growth. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(2), 132–152.

This article examines teacher and administrator perceptions of a district-based teacher portfolio assessment. The authors are optimistic about the use of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development and report that teachers and administrators in the district viewed portfolios as more accurate and comprehensive than a traditional classroom observation.

Resource 29: The Efficacy of Portfolios for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., Gareis, C. R., & Beers, C. S. (2003). The efficacy of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development: Do they make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(5), 572–602.

This article describes the study of a portfolio evaluation system in a small school district to assess the use of portfolios for teacher accountability and professional development. Portfolios were useful in making more detailed distinctions about teacher performance compared with classroom observations, especially in the areas of assessment and professionalism. Although teachers and administrators viewed portfolios as a fair assessment of teacher performance, there were concerns about the time demands of creating the portfolio.

Resource 30: Handbook on Teacher Portfolios for Evaluation and Professional Development

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., & Gareis, C. R. (2002). *Handbook on teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional development*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

The authors of this book define the purpose and role of portfolios, explore the development of a portfolio system, and describe the use of portfolios for evaluation and professional development. The book promotes the use of portfolios for both formative and summative purposes and emphasizes the role of portfolios as a new approach to assessing teachers.



STRATEGY 3:

Use (Formative) Teacher Performance-Based Assessment and Value-Added Models to Support Teachers and Improve Programs

A formative evaluation is an assessment of teacher performance for the purpose of informing and improving practice. When used for formative purposes, a performance-based assessment can be a useful tool for identifying the aspects of a teacher's knowledge or practice that need to be improved and targeting professional development to those areas. In addition to performance-based assessment, a number of states, districts, and charter school networks use value-added or student growth data as an important part of a more comprehensive teacher performance assessment system.

Value-added scores should never be the only measure of teachers' effectiveness, quality, or performance. For example, teachers contribute to students' learning, growth, social skills, self-esteem, and citizenship, but these important contributions are not measured by standardized achievement tests. Moreover, teachers contribute to overall school climate and effectiveness by collaborating with their colleagues, conducting action research, and providing other professional services. Many performance-based assessment systems have been designed to capture evidence of teachers' contributions to their students' development as well as to their school and profession.

Current research on charter schools' use of performance-based assessment and value-added models for teacher evaluation in charter schools is lacking; however, a recent exploratory study by Donaldson and Peske (2010) examined five charter schools in three charter school networks. The authors note that value-added models were not currently in use at any of the schools included in the study; however, each school did use performance-based assessment, including frequent observation with coaching and formative feedback.

The following resources include performance-based tools and methods that are useful for formative purposes and describe several performance-based assessment systems and some systems that have a value-added (or similar student growth) component.

Resource 31: East Palo Alto Charter School (Aspire Public Schools)

Center on Educational Governance, USC Rossier School of Education. (n.d.). *Promising practices compendium—East Palo Alto Charter School: Teacher evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/cegov/products/compendium-of-promising/east_palo_alto_charter_high_school.html

Aspire Public Schools. (n.d.). *Aspire educator performance criteria*. Oakland, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.aspirepublicschools.org/sites/aspirepublicschools.org/files/Educator%20performance%20rubric.pdf>

East Palo Alto Charter School uses a combination of monthly formal classroom observations and daily informal “walkthrough” observations by principals, coaches, and lead teachers to provide teachers with consistent formative feedback. Combined written feedback is provided to the teacher on a weekly basis with follow-up questions. The teacher is expected to respond to the questions within 24 hours. At the end of the year, the teacher and principal collaborate to complete the Aspire Educator Performance Rubric, and the principal provides a final summative rating that determines whether the teacher is retained. The resource provides additional information on the costs, strengths, and weaknesses of this system.

Resource 32: The College-Ready Promise—Gates Foundation Partnership

The College-Ready Promise Website: <http://www.thecollegereadypromise.org>

The College-Ready Promise. (2011). *The College-Ready Promise—Presentation to Ed Trust West’s “Innovations in Teaching Evaluation: A Forum on Promoting Teacher Effectiveness”* [PowerPoint presentation]. Los Angeles, CA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.thecollegereadypromise.org/sites/default/files/Ed%20Trust%20West%205-19.pptx>

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2010). *Intensive partnership factsheet: The College-Ready Promise*. Seattle, WA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/united-states/Pages/the-college-ready-promise-fact-sheet.aspx>

Based in Los Angeles, the College-Ready Promise represents a partnership between the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and a coalition of five public charter school management organizations in California (Alliance College-Ready Public Schools, Aspire Public Schools, Green Dot Public Schools, ICEF Public Schools, and Partnerships to Uplift Communities). In an effort to improve teacher effectiveness in their respective schools and boost student achievement and college-ready graduation rates, the coalition identified four broad areas of focus. One key area of focus is listed as: “Improving the evaluation of teacher effectiveness, including student achievement data as part of a set of measures that can inform how teachers are supported and rewarded.”

The coalition is partnering with Teaching and Learning Solutions to design an appropriate teacher observation rubric that is based on national standards and the College-Ready Teaching Framework. The Framework includes teaching standards grouped into six domains (planning and preparation, the classroom learning environment, instruction, assessment and data-driven instruction, relationships, and professional responsibilities).

In addition to observation, the coalition is proposing peer, student, and family feedback as potential measures of teacher effectiveness. The coalition also will include measures of student achievement using student growth percentiles (without control variables) calculated for individual teachers, teaching teams, and schools. The coalition is currently proposing to weigh the performance-based assessment as 60 percent of a teacher’s final evaluation and the student achievement component as 40 percent. The system will be piloted in 2011–12 in selected Los Angeles charter schools that are affiliated with the five participating charter school networks.



Resource 33: The New Teacher Project: School Leader's Toolbox

The New Teacher Project. (2011). *School Leader's Toolbox: Teacher evaluation*. Brooklyn, NY: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/assets/tools/TNTP_Toolkit_2_-_Evaluation_TSLT_0311.pdf

The New Teacher Project. (2011). *Evaluation*. Brooklyn, NY: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/toolkit/evaluation>

The New Teacher Project's School Leader's Toolbox provides school leaders with a wealth of information and exemplars for developing and managing a high-quality teaching team. One section of the toolbox focuses on teacher evaluation in charter schools. The teacher evaluation toolbox provides exemplars of various self-evaluation, goal-setting, observation, walkthrough, and feedback forms from some of the nation's top charter school networks. In addition, the New Teacher Project integrated these exemplars into a presentation outlining information about teacher evaluation systems in each of the charter school networks they examined and highlighted research-based effective and innovative practices in teacher evaluation to help guide school leaders' potential use of the documents.

Resource 34: Tennessee and TAP: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement

Tennessee Department of Education. (n.d.). *Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)*. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.team-tn.org/>

Tennessee Department of Education. (n.d.). *TEAM educator rubric*. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.team-tn.org/assets/educator-resources/TEAM_Educator_Rubric.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education. (2011). *Teacher model*. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.team-tn.org/educator-resources>

The Tennessee Department of Education has contracted with the TAP program (<http://www.tapsystem.org/action/action.taf?page=ifa>) to develop its teacher evaluation system. The TAP program's Instructionally Focused Accountability framework includes four to six teacher observations (announced and unannounced) per year and considers student growth as part of a teacher's overall evaluation. In Tennessee's model, teachers have pre- and post-conference meetings for all announced observations and are provided feedback through a collaborative process reviewing the observation data and using the TEAM Educator Rubric. Teachers will be supported by identifying professional development opportunities relevant to their individual needs for improvement. The student growth component will be calculated using a value-added model and will account for 35 percent of the teacher's overall evaluation. An additional 15 percent of a teacher's evaluation will be based on student achievement.

Resource 35: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2010). *Guide to teacher evaluation products*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://resource.tqsource.org/GEP/>

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2010). *Teacher evaluation models in practice*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://resource.tqsource.org/evalmodel/>

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality provides a number of resources for identifying relevant types of performance-based assessment and value-added models for use in charter school contexts. The following are two particularly helpful online resources:

- *Guide to Teacher Evaluation Products*. Designed as a searchable, interactive website, this resource provides a comprehensive look at a wide variety of performance-based assessment instruments including classroom observation, instructional artifacts, student surveys, portfolios, and student performance measures.
- *Teacher Evaluation Models in Practice*. This online resource provides an overview of teacher evaluation systems in Austin Public Schools, Chicago Public Schools, Montgomery County Public Schools, and St. Francis Independent School District 15.

Resource 36: Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)

The Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia. (n.d.). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System™*. Charlottesville, VA: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://curry.virginia.edu/research/centers/castl/class>

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) is a classroom observation tool developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia that is used for program development, evaluation, research, or professional development. CLASS measures classroom and teacher quality based on 10 dimensions in three broad areas: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. The observation tool is based on research showing that interactions between students and adults are important for student development and learning. Validation studies find that high ratings on CLASS dimensions predict higher academic performance and better social adjustment in the early grades.

Resource 37: Linking Classroom Observation and Professional Development—CLASS

Pianta, R. (2005). Classroom observation, professional development, and teacher quality. *The Evaluation Exchange*, XI(4), 8. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.hfrp.org/var/hfrp/storage/original/application/1ef9f773781dd0b1e2d237f6c8af939e.pdf>

The Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning has linked its standardized classroom observation tool, known as the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), to a new online professional development resource called MyTeachingPartner (MTP). CLASS is used to provide individualized feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of each teacher and target professional development in the areas that need improvement. The online resources provided through MTP are directly linked to the dimensions assessed by CLASS and include examples of classroom practices and tools for teachers to analyze their own practice. Teachers also can submit video recordings of their teaching and receive feedback and support from MTP consultants who have expertise in CLASS.

Resource 38: Instructional Quality Assessment

Junker, B., Weisberg, Y., Matsumura, L. C., Crosson, A., Wolf, M. K., Levison, A., et al. (2006). *Overview of the Instructional Quality Assessment* (CSE Technical Report 671). Los Angeles: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing & University of California. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.cse.ucla.edu/products/reports/r671.pdf>

The Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA) is a toolkit for rating instructional quality using classroom observation and student assignments. Developed by researchers at the Center for the Study of Evaluation and The National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, known as CRESST, the IQA was designed to monitor the effects on classrooms of curriculum, professional learning opportunities, and leadership development programs. They have found evidence of a positive relationship between teachers' scores on the IQA and their students' achievement. An overview of the rationale, development, design, and validation of the IQA can be found in Junker et al. (2006).

Resource 39: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence Professional Development Portfolio

Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. (n.d.). *What is the CREDE portfolio?* Berkeley, CA: University of California. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://gse.berkeley.edu/research/credearchive/tools/teaching/pdp/generic_portfolio_manual.shtml

The Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence offers a template for schools or districts to develop a customized portfolio system. The portfolio assessment is based on five standards of effective pedagogy and is designed to encourage continuous improvement and facilitate planning, teaching, and reflecting among teachers. Teachers gather artifacts for the portfolio and have the option of presenting their portfolio to a committee.

Resource 40: The Classroom Walk-Through

The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2007, February). *Using the classroom walk-through as an instructional leadership strategy* [Newsletter]. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/TheCenter_NL_Feb07.pdf

This newsletter describes the role of the classroom walk-through as a strategy for principals to assess and discuss a teacher's classroom practices. The walk-through is described as "a brief, structured, nonevaluative classroom observation by the principal that is followed by a conversation between the principal and the teacher about what was observed" (p. 1).

Resource 41: Houston's ASPIRE Program

Website: <http://portal.battelleforkids.org/ASPIRE/Home.html?sflang=en>

The Houston Independent School District ASPIRE Program is a comprehensive continuous improvement effort to align teaching practice, evaluation, professional development, career advancement, and recognition. The ASPIRE (Accelerating Student Progress. Increasing Results and Expectations) initiative uses value-added data as a core indicator of teachers' strengths and weaknesses and also of the effectiveness of the various programs and practices that the district may use in efforts to improve the quality of instruction.

SUBSTRATEGY 3.1:

Use Value-Added Models to Improve Professional Development

Effective professional development should improve teachers' instruction and, in turn, improve student learning and student achievement test scores. Tracking teachers who have participated in specific professional development opportunities or who have gone through specific trainings can be useful in efforts to determine the contribution of these experiences to improved instruction. Classroom observations, journals, portfolios, samples of teachers' assignments, and other evidence can be used to determine whether teachers' practices changed as a result of their professional development, but these changes may or may not translate into improved student learning. Value-added data may be able to reveal whether these professional development experiences truly have a positive impact on student achievement.

Resource 42: Analysis of Professional Development in Dallas

Babu, S., & Smith, G. (1995). *Can staff make a difference in school effectiveness?* Dallas, TX: Dallas Public Schools.

Not long after Dallas implemented its value-added system in the early 1990s, the district undertook a series of studies to determine whether the system could be used to identify the practices of schools and their faculty that value-added methods identified as effective. One of the subjects of study was professional development practices, and researchers looked for differences in staff development between high-performing and low-performing schools. The study of professional development was inconclusive, but the methodology used in the study is instructive and points to what might be possible using more powerful statistical tools.

Resource 43: REL Southwest's Issues and Answers Report on Effective Professional Development

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 33). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf

REL Southwest's 2007 review of 1,300 studies that examine the impact of professional development on teacher effectiveness found only nine that meet the What Works Clearinghouse's rigorous standards of evidence. The nine studies, nevertheless, showed that high-quality professional development can have an impact on teacher effectiveness. The report provides recommendations for more effectively evaluating the link between professional development and student achievement.

STRATEGY 4: Use (Summative) Teacher Performance-Based Assessment and Value-Added Models to Make Local Staffing Decisions

When used for summative purposes, teacher evaluations form the basis for staffing decisions such as hiring, promoting, or dismissing a teacher. Many charter schools evaluate teachers to monitor their performance and provide formative and summative feedback for teacher growth and improvement; however, current research on charter schools' use of performance-based assessment and value-added models for evaluation and making local staffing decisions is lacking.

In Donaldson and Peske's (2010) exploratory study of five charter schools in three charter school networks, principals reported using summative findings from performance-based assessments to make staffing decisions about hiring and renewal of teachers' contracts. In contrast to traditional schools, charter school principals viewed the hiring process as the first step in the performance evaluation process. All three charter school networks "pre-screen and select individuals who they believe already bring a propensity for, and interest in, constructive feedback" to ensure a strong fit with school culture (p. 16; see also, Gross & DeArmond, 2011).

In this sense, the assessment of teachers begins with the hiring process itself. Exactly how principals use summative performance-based assessment in teacher contract renewal decisions is less clear. In fact, several principals in the study indicated that their dismissal decisions had less to do with assessments of teachers' instructional performance and more to do with their assessment of a teacher's willingness to (1) work hard to improve, (2) be a team player, and (3) support the culture of the school (Donaldson & Peske, 2010, pp. 24–25).

Attempts to use a summative evaluation for formative purposes can present both opportunities and challenges. Teachers may be more likely to use the results of their evaluation if they know that later evaluations are tied to high-stakes decisions. However, teachers may be less willing to take risks or less invested in a system if their formative evaluation also is used for summative purposes. Teacher induction programs often combine formative assessments of beginning teachers during the school year with a summative evaluation at the end of the year.

A charter school's flexibility to use or not use summative information from performance-based assessment and value-added models to make local staffing decisions also can be constrained by the federal and state policy context. Recent federal policy initiatives like School Improvement Grants, the Race to the Top initiative, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 have created a groundswell of legislative and policy change at the state and district levels across the country. Numerous states have passed legislation mandating changes to state requirements regarding teacher evaluation systems. Although states and districts vary widely in whether they include or exempt charter schools, new state guidelines often include requirements to use student growth scores as a portion of teachers' summative evaluations and to base tenure, compensation, and contract renewal decisions on summative evaluation results. States provide varying amounts of guidance on the content and design of these systems. Some states allow

districts and charter schools the flexibility to design their own evaluation systems within broad guidelines outlined by the state (e.g., Florida, Iowa, Ohio); other states mandate specific and detailed requirements on all aspects of teacher evaluation while providing a state-endorsed evaluation model that most districts and schools are expected to adopt (e.g., Rhode Island, Delaware). The resources that follow highlight the use of performance-based assessment and value-added models in charter schools, states, and districts.

Resource 44: The New Teacher Project: School Leader’s Toolbox

The New Teacher Project. (2011). *School leader’s toolbox: Performance accountability*. Brooklyn, NY: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/toolkit/performance-accountability>

The New Teacher Project. (2011). *Performance accountability*. Brooklyn, NY: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://schoolleaderstoolbox.org/toolkit/view/performance-accountability>

As previously noted, the New Teacher Project has created a set of resources for school leaders on developing high-quality teaching teams. In addition to resources on teacher evaluation, the School Leader’s Toolbox also contains useful information on connecting performance-based assessment with accountability decisions. As with the evaluation toolbox, the performance accountability page provides exemplars from some of the top charter school networks and includes performance management guides, exit interview questions, information on professional growth plans, and advice on having “courageous conversations.” The New Teacher Project has also provided a synthesized presentation that frames each of these exemplars within a larger conversation about research-based best practices regarding performance accountability.

Resource 45: Delaware Performance Appraisal System II (DPAS II–Revised)

Delaware Department of Education. (2011). *DPAS II guide for teachers*. Dover, DE: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/ti/DPASII TeachFullGuide.pdf>

Delaware recently revised its performance-based assessment system that evaluates teachers yearly or every other year depending on years of experience and evaluation status. The performance-based assessment is based on Charlotte Danielson’s (2007b) *Framework for Teaching* and includes an additional domain focused on student improvement. The performance appraisal cycle includes a goal-setting conference, pre- and post-observation conferences, at least one classroom observation, and a summative evaluation conference. The results of DPAS II are used to inform decisions about continued employment and dismissal. Improvement plans are developed for teachers who receive an unsatisfactory rating on any part of the evaluation.



Resource 46: North Carolina Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (2009). *North Carolina teacher evaluation process*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/profdev/training/teacher/teacher-eval.pdf>

North Carolina requires that all certified teachers receive an annual evaluation based on the state teaching standards that includes measures of student growth and teacher skills and knowledge. The evaluation measures minimal competence levels, and low-performing teachers can be recommended for an improvement action plan or dismissal. School systems can adopt the state's evaluation instrument or use their own instruments. The state-developed instrument includes self-assessment, pre- and post-observation conferences, classroom observations, and an individual professional development plan. Probationary teachers receive three formal observations annually, and one observation is conducted by a peer.

Resource 47: Newport News Teacher Performance Assessment System: A Case Study

Kimball, S. M. (2002). *Newport News Teacher Performance Assessment System: A case study*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://cpre.wceruw.org/papers/Newport%20News%20TE%204-02.pdf>

In 1998, Newport News School District was one of the first districts to redesign its performance evaluation system based on Charlotte Danielson's (2007b) *Framework for Teaching*. This case study by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education describes the development, design, and implementation of the performance-based assessment system in Newport News. The performance-based assessment system is used for both formative and summative purposes.

Resource 48: Washoe County Teacher Performance Evaluation System: A Case Study

Kimball, S. M. (2002). *Washoe County Teacher Performance Evaluation System: A case study*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://cpre.wceruw.org/papers/Washoe%20TE%204-02.pdf>

Similar to Newport News, the Washoe County School District revised its evaluation system in the late 1990s based on Charlotte Danielson's (2007b) *Framework for Teaching*. This case study by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education describes the development, design, and implementation of the performance-based assessment system in Washoe County. The performance-based assessment system is used for both formative and summative purposes.

SUBSTRATEGY 4.1:

Use Performance-Based Assessment as Part of a Peer Review Process for Local Staffing Decisions

Peer assistance and review has gained renewed attention as a method for supporting and evaluating new teachers and struggling teachers. Peer assistance involves peer teachers—experienced or accomplished teachers in the district—providing mentoring and support for beginning teachers or experienced teachers who need assistance. The peer teacher may have a role in identifying and referring low-performing teachers to the program. The peer review process involves a performance-based assessment; often one or more classroom observations by the peer teacher; and a recommendation for additional support, continued employment, or dismissal. A panel consisting of teachers and administrators makes the final determination about the teacher’s employment status. The following resources highlight the use of performance-based assessment for peer review and staffing decisions.

Resource 49: The Toledo Plan

Toledo Federation of Teachers. (n.d.). *The Toledo Plan*. Toledo, OH: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.tft250.org/the_toledo_plan.htm

Toledo Public Schools implemented the first peer assistance and review program beginning in 1981. The peer assistance and review program relies on experienced teachers to mentor, support, and evaluate new teachers and experienced teachers referred by a principal or union committee member. Experienced teachers are mentored until their performance improves or they are terminated for poor performance. During a 16-year period, 52 experienced teachers received an intervention, and 40 left teaching. New teachers are evaluated six or seven times per semester by an experienced teacher who writes a narrative describing their strengths and areas for improvement. A recommendation is made to an internal review board for a rehire of the new teacher or a release from his or her contract.

Resource 50: Columbus Peer Assistance and Review Program

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Exemplary practices. D-2: Toward a seamless transition—Columbus Peer Assistance and Review Program*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ed.gov/inits/teachers/exemplarypractices/d-2.html>

The Columbus Public School District collaborated with Ohio State University to develop a peer assistance and review program. Consulting teachers support and evaluate new teachers and experienced teachers in need of assistance. The consulting teachers are required to conduct more than 20 observations of a teacher in a year and hold conferences with the teacher to provide ongoing feedback, support, and resources. The university trains consulting teachers for the program, and consulting teachers collaborate with university faculty to provide workshops and courses for new teachers in the district. A seven-member panel of teachers and administrators oversees the program.

Resource 51: Cincinnati Public Schools' Teacher Evaluation System

Cincinnati Public Schools. (n.d.). *Teacher evaluation*. Cincinnati, OH: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from www.cps-k12.org/employment/tchreval/tchreval.htm

Teachers in Cincinnati receive a comprehensive evaluation in their first and fourth years of teaching, and then every five years afterward, and a classroom observation in all other years. The comprehensive evaluation is based on an adaptation of Charlotte Danielson's (2007b) *Framework for Teaching* and consists of an initial conference to discuss the teaching assignment and at least four classroom observations. A rubric is used to score a teacher's performance on each of the 16 teaching standards. New teachers and teachers with "instructional deficiencies" receive assistance through the Peer Assistance and Evaluation Program. Consulting teachers orient new teachers to the district and improve the teaching skills of low-performing experienced teachers. Experienced teachers who do not improve their performance may not have their contracts renewed.

Resource 52: Peer Assistance and Review Overview

Bloom, G., & Goldstein, J. (n.d.). *Peer assistance and review [overview]*. Santa Cruz, CA: The New Teacher Center. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://newteachercenter.org/content/peer-assistance-and-review-par-reader>

The New Teacher Center at the University of California–Santa Cruz developed this overview in response to a legislative mandate for a statewide peer assistance and review program in California. Although the literature on peer assistance and review programs is somewhat limited, the overview explains the challenges of implementing these programs, defines the perspectives of various stakeholders in the program, and describes the experience of several existing programs.

Resource 53: Exploring Teacher Peer Review

Escamilla, P., Clarke, T., & Linn, D. (2000). *Exploring teacher peer review*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices.

This policy paper defines peer review and summarizes the policy issues affecting its implementation. The authors provide a short summary of existing peer review programs.

Resource 54: Peer Assistance & Peer Review: An AFT/NEA Handbook

American Federation of Teachers & the National Education Association. (1998). *Peer assistance & peer review: An AFT/NEA handbook*. Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/teachers/paprhandbook0998.pdf>

The two largest national teachers unions developed this manual on peer assistance and review programs to inform local affiliates engaged in developing these programs. The manual describes the context for their implementation, the case for creating such programs, the details of their implementation, and labor negotiation issues.

SUBSTRATEGY 4.2: Use Value-Added Models to Understand Staffing Distributions

With value-added methods, teachers can be placed on a continuum based on how much more or less their students gained on their achievement scores than the students' prior achievement results would have predicted. Where to draw the "cut points" in that distribution for designating "effective" and "ineffective" teachers, however, is a matter that requires a decision involving many stakeholders, including representatives of teacher organizations. There has been a history of resistance among teachers to using value-added scores as a measure of teacher effectiveness because of the limitations and methodological complexities of value-added assessment. As an example, Tennessee introduced value-added assessment in the 1980s; however, until recent changes to federal and state policy, these scores were simply given to teachers and their principals without any expectations of further action or any stakes, such as compensation decisions, attached to them. Currently, they may be considered as one component in the overall evaluation of a teacher and are being incorporated into teacher's summative evaluations through weighting.

Although little research exists on the extent of its use in charter schools, the use of value-added scores by charter schools raises a number of issues. First, because value-added models require access to longitudinal data, charter schools will need to work with district and state data agencies to obtain longitudinal state testing data for all the students enrolled in a given year. The relative ease of this process and the quality of the data will vary depending on the state policy context and data infrastructure; however, to the extent that charter schools are developing their own rigorous, in-house assessments aligned to their own curriculum and instruction, charter schools are good contexts for increasing the reliability and validity of value-added models, and for exploring the connection between changes in instructional practice and student growth outcomes (See the Real-Life Example section for information about Achievement First, an emblematic charter school network in this area).

Resource 55: Evaluating Value-Added

National Association of State Boards of Education. (2005). *Evaluating value-added: Findings and recommendations from the NASBE Study Group on value-added assessments*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

This summary provides a useful description of the different ways that value-added measures can be used, including school accountability, teacher accountability and evaluation, school improvement, teacher training, and adequate yearly progress calculations. The summary also provides the group's findings and recommendations on both the uses of and limitations of value-added measures.



Resource 56: Using Student Progress to Evaluate Teachers: A Primer on Value-Added Models

Braun, H. I. (2005). *Using student progress to evaluate teachers: A primer on value-added models*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICVAM.pdf>

Although Braun is a well-known statistician, he approaches the topic of using value-added models to evaluate teachers from a policy-oriented point of view. The result is a very accessible and easy-to-read report that should help clarify some of the limitations of this method. Of note, Braun contends that value-added models actually measure “classroom effects” rather than “teacher effects.”

Resource 57: The Promise and Peril of Using Value-Added Modeling to Measure Teacher Effectiveness

McCaffrey, D. F., Koretz, D., Lockwood, J. R., & Hamilton, L. S. (2004). *The promise and peril of using value-added modeling to measure teacher effectiveness* (Research Brief No. RB-9050-EDU). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/2005/RAND_RB9050.pdf

The RAND researchers have conducted a great deal of research in this area and are considered among the leading experts in the country. This research brief describes and summarizes both technical and practical issues involved in using value-added measures, including how various statistical strategies yield different results, problems related to inadequate data, issues related to using achievement test scores as outcomes, and sampling error. It also cautions against using value-added measures for high-stakes decisions regarding teachers.

Resource 58: A Review of Value-Added Models

Hibpshman, T. L. (2004). *A review of value-added models*. Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.kyepsb.net/documents/Stats/Journals/Heterogeneity%20of%20regression.pdf>

This review summarizes the important information about the basic types of models used for value-added measures as well as what researchers have concluded about the differences among the different models. The author also asks, and answers, the question “What is the best model, and how should we use it in Kentucky?” For states asking themselves similar questions, this review may be very helpful. The only drawback is that in spite of the author’s attempts at making the statistical discussions “friendly,” it is still somewhat technical.

Resource 59: Sizing Up Test Scores

Ballou, D. (2002). Sizing up test scores. *Education Next*, 2(2). Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://educationnext.org/files/ednext20022_10.pdf

This “opinion” piece by Dale Ballou published by *Education Next* in 2002 is still highly relevant when considering using value-added measures for teacher accountability. Ballou describes three considerations that make value-added assessments problematic for high-stakes teacher evaluation, although he does suggest that value-added results can be useful to inform policy discussions. The three considerations are: (1) methods of testing that are not completely accurate for measuring student gains; (2) other factors besides teacher or school quality that may influence student gains; and (3) different student ability levels, which make results difficult to interpret.

Resource 60: Identifying Effective Teachers in Tennessee

Tennessee Department of Education. (2007). *Tennessee's most effective teachers: Are they assigned to the schools that need them most?* (Research Brief). Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://tennessee.gov/education/nclb/doc/TeacherEffectiveness2007_03.pdf

The state of Tennessee has used its Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) to investigate whether there are disparities in the effectiveness of teachers between the state’s high-poverty and more affluent schools. This summary of the study shows how the state conducted this analysis and provides insight into how TVAAS works. This study overview should be particularly helpful to states that are considering using value-added measures for research purposes and want to know what research questions other states have attempted to answer.

Resource 61: Benwood Initiative, Chattanooga, Tennessee

The Achievement Alliance. (2006). *It's being done: The Benwood Initiative*, Chattanooga, Tennessee. Washington, DC: Author.

The Hamilton County School District in Tennessee, which includes the city of Chattanooga, took advantage of the state’s Value-Added Assessment System to develop a major school reform initiative in the district’s poorest performing schools, called the Benwood schools. Using value-added data, officials identify those teachers in the districts who are the most effective and offer opportunities to earn salary bonuses if they will take positions in the Benwood schools.



STRATEGY 5: Use Teacher Performance-Based Assessment With Value-Added Models for Diversified Compensation

As states and districts experiment with compensation systems that reward teachers based on their performance, there is a strong interest in standardized assessment tools that measure teacher performance. Several compensation reform efforts combine analysis of student learning gains with a structured performance-based assessment. This approach allows a state or district to reward teachers for student outcomes and the quality of their teaching knowledge or practices. District-level performance pay systems often develop a performance-based assessment using a framework or model for teaching standards, such as Charlotte Danielson's (2007b) *Framework for Teaching*, and link the assessment results to pay incentives.

Using value-added scores as a basis for teacher compensation systems poses significant challenges, particularly when such compensation is teacher based rather than school based. Although few schools use value-added scores alone to determine salary bonuses, some districts have reached agreements with teachers and teachers' representatives to use value-added scores in combination with other measures to differentiate teacher pay. One thing most of these approved pay plans have in common is some way to include teachers who do not receive value-added scores. In some states and districts, bonuses are awarded on a whole-school basis to those schools in which the student population's average growth exceeds value-added projections. Many teachers prefer these schoolwide awards because this approach eliminates any sense that teachers within a school are competing with or comparing themselves to one another. Schoolwide awards raise other issues of fairness, however, because the basis of the awards is the performance of teachers in the core subjects that are tested, rather than the performance of all teachers.

Resource 62: Achievement First: Teacher Career Pathway

Curtis, R. (2011). *Achievement First: Developing a teacher performance system that recognizes excellence*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute Education & Society Program. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/education%20and%20society%20program/AI_Achievement%20First_performance%20mangmt.pdf

As noted previously, Achievement First (AF) has developed a charter school network teacher evaluation system grounded in a detailed set of instructional and teacher standards, which also includes both an individual teacher and schoolwide value-added score in the teacher's summative evaluation. In addition, AF developed the Teacher Career Pathway to link teacher evaluation results to staffing decisions by recognizing and rewarding excellent teaching. The Pathway is currently being piloted and includes five distinct stages beginning with an internship stage and culminating in a master teacher stage, with a minimum of two years required at each stage (except intern) to allow value-added data to be included in decisions about a teacher's advancement. As a result, teachers who perform the highest on AF's broader evaluation framework could advance from a stage 2 (beginning teachers) to stage 5 (master teacher) in seven years. As teachers progress along the career pathway, they receive additional professional growth opportunities, opportunities to visit excellent teachers in other parts of the nation,

school-based and network-based appreciations, additional leadership opportunities, reduced or consistent course/grade loads. In addition, teachers will receive consistent salary increases with each step up the career pathway. Teachers start at \$50,000–\$55,000 at stage 2 and top out at more than \$100,000 by stage 5.

Resource 63: Standards-Based Teacher Evaluation as a Foundation for Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay

Heneman, H. G., III, Milanowski, A., Kimball, S. M., & Odden, A. (2006, May). *Standards-based teacher evaluation as a foundation for knowledge- and skill-based pay* (CPRE Policy Brief, RB-45). Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/RB45.pdf

This policy brief discusses the use of standards-based teacher evaluation systems for teacher compensation systems. The paper summarizes research findings from past efforts to use standards-based evaluations to award additional pay and offers several guidelines for using these evaluation systems.

Resource 64: Observations of Teachers' Classroom Performance

Milanowski, A. T., Prince, C. D., & Koppich, J. (2007). *Observations of teachers' classroom performance*. Washington, DC: Center for Educator Compensation Reform. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.cecr.ed.gov/guides/CECRTeacherObservationModel.pdf>

This report by the Center for Educator Compensation Reform describes the advantages of using classroom observations as a method for measuring performance in a teacher compensation system. The report highlights key implementation issues in developing an evaluation system for compensation reform.

Resource 65: Teacher Evaluation in Diversified Teacher Compensation Systems

Baber, A. (2007). *Teacher evaluation in diversified teacher compensation systems. Introduction to the project*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://eprints.ecs.org/clearinghouse/74/78/7478.pdf>

This issue paper provides an overview of how teacher evaluation has been used in teacher compensation systems and describes several proven and promising examples of compensation reform efforts that relied on teacher evaluation systems.



Resource 66: Teacher Excellence Through Compensation

Teacher Excellence Through Compensation. (n.d.). *Introducing Teacher Excellence Through Compensation (TEC)*. Lake Bluff, IL: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.teachercomp.com/TEC_publications.html

Teacher Excellence Through Compensation is a consulting firm that works with states and districts on the development and design of teacher compensation systems. The firm has developed a performance-based assessment system for use in teacher compensation systems. This website provides access to a handbook on measuring teacher performance for compensation systems and a manual that discusses major issues in the design of teacher compensation systems.

Allan Odden and Marc Wallace describe the full Teacher Excellence Through Compensation evaluation approach and an overview of how to use it in a differentiated compensation system in the book titled *How to Create World Class Teacher Compensation*. The book can be downloaded for a minimal fee from Freeload Press at <http://www.textbookmedia.com/Products/ViewProduct.aspx?id=3304>.

Resource 67: Case Studies of Knowledge- and Skill-Based Pay Systems

Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. (2007). *Knowledge- and skill-based pay studies*. Madison, WI: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://cpre.wceruw.org/tcomp/research/ksbp/studies.php>

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education offers 12 case studies describing knowledge and skill-based compensation systems in Arizona, Iowa, Colorado, Ohio, Minnesota, and California. These systems rely on performance-based assessments to evaluate teacher performance and award financial incentives. The case studies describe each site's experience with designing, developing, and implementing their compensation systems.

Resource 68: Denver's ProComp and Teacher Compensation Reform in Colorado

DeGrow, B. (2007). *Denver's ProComp and teacher compensation reform in Colorado*. Golden, CO: Independence Institute. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.i2i.org/articles/IP_5_2007.pdf

ProComp is a teacher compensation system implemented by Denver Public Schools that replaces the traditional salary schedule with additional pay for building teacher knowledge and skills, receiving satisfactory evaluations, fostering student growth, and teaching in hard-to-staff positions. Under ProComp, teachers earn a 3 percent salary increase every three years if they receive a satisfactory rating on their performance evaluation. Teachers, administrators, and other educators collaborated on the design of the teacher evaluation tool used for ProComp.

Resource 69: Teacher Advancement Program, National Institute for Excellence in Teaching

Teacher Advancement Program. (2011). *TAP in action*. Santa Monica, CA: National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.tapsystem.org/action/action.taf?page=elements>

The Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) is a national model for alternative compensation that consists of four main components: (1) multiple career paths, (2) applied professional development, (3) standards-based accountability, and (4) pay for student performance. As part of the focus on standards-based accountability, TAP promotes classroom evaluation of teachers at multiple points in time, based on multiple measures, and by more than one trained evaluator. The National Institute for Excellence in Teaching developed a teacher evaluation tool that is based on a set of standards known as the TAP Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Responsibility Standards. These standards are modeled after a variety of existing national and state teaching standards. States and districts implementing TAP often use or adapt this evaluation tool as part of their compensation plan. In TAP, the value-added gains of a teacher's pupils are one of the factors included in the evaluation of both individual teachers and the school as a whole; these gains also are a factor in the determination of the teacher's total compensation package. Professional development is a key part of the TAP strategy. TAP has been implemented in more than 60 districts and 180 schools throughout the United States.

Resource 70: Minnesota's Q-Comp Program

Minnesota Department of Education. (2011). *Quality compensation for teachers (Q-COMP)*. Roseville, MN: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Teacher_Support/QComp/index.html

Minnesota's statewide alternative compensation system—known as Q-COMP—is based on the main components outlined by the Teacher Advancement Program model. School districts apply for state funding to collaborate with teachers in creating a pay plan that includes these components. Participating districts must use multiple measures and trained evaluators. The state recommends that districts use a standards-based assessment to evaluate teachers each year.

Resource 71: Education Commission of the States Diversified Teacher Compensation Database

Education Commission of the States. (n.d.). *Welcome to the ECS redesigned teacher compensation database*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/educationissues/teachingquality/NCLB-HQTP/T_Comp.asp

ECS provides an interactive online database of state- and district-level alternative compensation systems. The database targets programs that provide a bonus or salary increase to teachers and that reward teachers for student performance or teaching in high-need schools. A detailed summary of the selected alternative compensation plans is included in the database. As part of the summary, ECS defines the method used to evaluate teachers for the compensation plan.

Resource 72: Improving Teaching Through Pay for Contribution

NGA Center for Best Practices. (2007). *Improving teaching through pay for contribution*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/07111IMPROVINGTEACHING.PDF;jsessionid=25EC090BBAB5DF3E22D26B9FCB25AEF9>

This NGA Center for Best Practices policy paper promotes pay plans that reward teachers and teaching roles that contribute to student learning. The paper outlines this “pay for contribution” approach and describes several different forms that it can take. The authors offer guidelines for ensuring that alternative pay plans are effective and propose several state initiatives that support these pay plans.

Resource 73: Teacher Incentive Fund Grants

Center for Educator Compensation Reform. (n.d.). *Grantee profiles*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.cecr.ed.gov/TIFgrantees/granteeProfiles/>

The U.S. Department of Education has awarded 34 Teacher Incentive Fund grants to states and districts that are experimenting with alternative pay plans for teachers and administrators. The grants support compensation plans that reward teachers for student achievement gains and expand the number of high-quality teachers in high-need schools and subject areas. Although the structure and design of each compensation plan differs, the grants provide a perspective on different approaches to evaluating teachers for compensation. This link provides access to a description of each grant that includes how the grantee plans to evaluate and reward teachers.

Resource 74: Houston’s ASPIRE Program

Website: <http://portal.battelleforkids.org/ASPIRE/Home.html?sflang=en>

The Houston Independent School District has launched a new, comprehensive, continuous improvement effort to align teaching practice, evaluation, professional development, career advancement, and recognition. The ASPIRE (“Accelerating Student Progress. Increasing Results and Expectations”) initiative uses value-added data as a core indicator of teachers’ strengths and weaknesses and also as an indicator of the effectiveness of the various programs and practices the district uses to improve the quality of instruction. Teachers who are identified as successful on the basis of their value-added scores will receive monetary rewards as part of Houston’s differentiated pay plan, and they also will be considered for career advancement opportunities.

Resource 75: Center for Educator Compensation Reform

Website: <http://cecr.ed.gov/>

The Center for Educator Compensation Reform is a partnership of five organizations funded by the U.S. Department of Education to raise awareness of alternative and effective strategies for educator compensation reform. The website has information, tools, and resources to support federal Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grantees and other educators, stakeholders, and policymakers considering compensation reform. Several of the profiled TIF grantees use models that promote differentiated staffing opportunities in which teachers are recognized and rewarded for serving as lead teacher, mentor, and other positions.

Resource 76: National Center on Performance Incentives

Website: <http://www.performanceincentives.org/index.asp>

The National Center on Performance Incentives, housed at Vanderbilt University, seeks to find answers to the question “Do financial incentives for teachers, administrators, and schools affect the quality of teaching and learning?” Through research initiatives and evaluations of existing pay-for-performance plans, the center seeks to inform education policymakers and ultimately contribute to better teaching and learning. In addition to policy briefs and publications, it provides useful definitions of various pay-for-performance initiatives at its webpage on national incentive pay initiatives (http://www.performanceincentives.org/news__events/detail.asp?pageaction=ViewSinglePublic&LinkID=46&ModuleID=28&NEWSPID=1).

Resource 77: Florida’s STAR Plan

Florida Department of Education. (2007). *Florida performance pay guidance: 2007–2008 and beyond*. Tallahassee, FL: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.fldoe.org/PerformancePay/pdfs/MeritAwardProgram.pdf>

Special Teachers Are Rewarded (STAR) is a Florida statewide plan that enables districts opting in to reward outstanding teachers based on their documented classroom performance. One of the principal factors considered in teachers’ eligibility for the bonus is the value-added gains of their students on statewide assessments. Florida is one of the few states whose statewide longitudinal data system is sufficiently advanced to conduct value-added comparisons anywhere in the state.

Resource 78: North Carolina’s ABCs of Public Education

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (n.d.). *The ABCs of Public Education*. Raleigh, NC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://abcs.ncpublicschools.org/abcs/>

North Carolina has implemented a school accountability system that uses students’ value-added achievement gains, aggregated by school, to identify schools that are effective or ineffective. If a school either meets or exceeds state-determined expectations for student achievement growth, its entire instructional staff, including teacher assistants, is awarded a performance bonus.



STRATEGY 6: Use Video Evaluation for Research and Program Improvement Purposes

Measuring how well teachers know their subject matter and the effectiveness of the way they teach it is a difficult endeavor. Observations of teachers may provide clues for how deeply a teacher knows the content. For example, the teacher could make an error that the observer notices, or the teacher could lecture the students on a particular topic with great accuracy and depth of detail. However, the observer must be quite knowledgeable about the subject to discern these things as well as be mindful that such observations are samples of what teachers know. Promising research in this area is developing, and the analysis of video records of practice may provide a tool for researchers and others to assess teachers' knowledge for teaching.

46

Resource 79: Learning Mathematics for Teaching Project

Website: <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/lmt/home>

This website describes a research study currently being conducted that examines the types of mathematics knowledge that teachers need to teach mathematics effectively and has developed video codes that can be used in analyzing video recordings of mathematics instruction. The project does not offer measures that can be used for hiring, promotion, pay, or tenure because they are not accurate assessments of the knowledge of an individual teacher. Instead, the measures can be used to compare mathematical knowledge of groups of teachers or examine how knowledge in a group of teachers develops over time. This site contains research that may inform the development of teacher performance-based assessment in the content areas.

STRATEGY 7:

Use Teacher Logs or the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* to Measure Instructional Practices for Research or Program Evaluation Purposes

Many researchers concerned with teacher learning and the improvement of teaching advocate measuring instruction rather than (or in addition to) teacher performance. The differences between these two concepts are slight but important. Much of teacher performance-based assessment assumes a high degree of teacher decision-making autonomy, and teachers are judged based on the choices (about factors such as learning activities, goals, materials, sequencing, pacing, and delivery) that they make and their ability to analyze those choices in light of evidence of student learning. However, many efforts to improve instruction seek to centralize these choices—not to make them “teacher proof,” per se, but to prevent each teacher from having to “reinvent the wheel” each time they write a lesson plan or make a choice of assessment activity.

To determine whether teachers are adequately implementing a curriculum or whether the choices they make have an impact on student learning, some researchers have developed teacher logs (which are essentially daily tallies of what teachers did in their classrooms that day) as well as the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum*. These tools have the potential to increase understanding of the impact that particular teaching practices have on student learning.

Resource 80: The Study of Instructional Improvement Papers and Publications

Study of Instructional Improvement. (2010). *Papers & publications*. Ann Arbor, MI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.sii.soe.umich.edu/about/pubs.html>

This series of papers describes the development and use of teacher logs for research on instruction. The logs were specifically designed for a large-scale longitudinal study focusing on school improvement in high-poverty schools, but elements of them may be useful in the development of such tools to track instruction.

Resource 81: The Study of Instructional Improvement Project Instruments

Study of Instructional Improvement. (2010). *Study sample & components*. Ann Arbor, MI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.sii.soe.umich.edu/about/sample.html>

Teachers fill out these logs on a daily basis, and data from these daily reports are then aggregated to create portraits of content emphasis and pedagogy over time. Examples are provided.

Resource 82: The Surveys of Enacted Curriculum

Council of Chief State School Officers. (n.d.). *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from [http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Surveys_of_Enacted_Curriculum_\(SEC\).html](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Surveys_of_Enacted_Curriculum_(SEC).html)

The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)* are a set of data collection tools being used with teachers of core content areas to record data on current instructional practices and content being taught in classrooms. These data then are used to analyze the degree of alignment between current instruction and state standards and assessments. Teachers complete the survey questions through an online, Web-based system. The SEC data analysis and reporting tools are intended to assist teachers, administrators, and policymakers with planning for instructional improvement in several ways: (1) aligning classroom instruction with state standards and assessments; (2) evaluating effects of initiatives, such as professional development, in changing instructional content or practice (or both); (3) analyzing instructional practices and teacher preparation to develop a needs assessment in low-performance areas; and (4) measuring indicators of instruction and their relationship to student achievement.

STRATEGY 8:

Use Value-Added Models to Determine the Impact of Teacher Characteristics and Teaching Practices on Student Outcomes

Researchers are interested in finding strong, clear evidence about which teacher characteristics have the greatest positive effect on student achievement. A number of studies have investigated the impact of characteristics, such as race and gender, and of qualifications, such as credentials, degrees, course taking, college selectivity, SAT or ACT scores, licensure or certification status, and teaching experience. A number of other studies, usually involving observations of teaching, have tried to determine the link between specific teaching practices and student learning gains. With the exception of teaching experience and knowledge of mathematics, neither the studies on teacher qualifications and characteristics nor those on teaching practices have been able to demonstrate a consistent relationship between these factors and student achievement (Goe, 2007; Goe et al., 2008).

With more districts beginning to collect value-added scores, however, it will become increasingly possible to tie those scores to teacher practices and characteristics and to identify stronger connections to student achievement. States, districts, and charter schools that want to conduct this type of research need to maintain longitudinal data files with unique identifiers for every student and every teacher. Because the various teacher factors are all likely to have different degrees of impact depending upon the grade level and subjects taught, student demographics, school characteristics, and geographic location, gathering information from many locations and across many contexts will help identify which factors matter the most.

It also is important to note that student outcomes other than achievement gains can be an important source of data about students' academic success, particularly for at-risk students. Teachers who are effective at helping at-risk students to stay in school, pass to the next grade, attend classes regularly, and stay out of trouble are contributing in ways that may be even more important than small gains on standardized tests. Unlike value-added measures, these types of measures are more likely to be used at the school level.

Resource 83: The Link Between Teacher Quality and Student Outcomes: A Research Synthesis

Goe, L. (2007). *The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/LinkBetweenTQandStudentOutcomes.pdf>

This research synthesis is a comprehensive summary and analysis of the research on teacher quality, as determined by considering how teacher qualifications, characteristics, and practices are linked with student achievement in recent research. Only a small number of the studies included use value-added models; most use less sophisticated measures.

Resource 84: Data Quality Campaign

Data Quality Campaign. (n.d.). *About DQC*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/about>

The Data Quality Campaign is a partnership between a number of nationally prominent organizations and associations that seek “to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the collection, availability and use of high-quality education data and to implement state longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement.” Its website has a great deal of information about data, assessment, and accountability as well as helpful resources.

REAL-LIFE EXAMPLE: ACHIEVEMENT FIRST

Using Performance-Based Assessment and Value-Added Models in a Charter School Context

Achievement First (AF) is a network of charter schools in the Northeast that grew out of Amistad Academy, founded in New Haven, Connecticut, in 1999. As the network expanded, AF recognized the need to create a performance management system that would continue the first charter school's success by perpetuating and growing those instructional practices and school culture across the newer AF charter schools.

To accomplish this goal, AF spent two years working with its current teachers and principals to develop a set of teaching standards and instructional practices known as the "Cycle of Highly Effective Teaching" and the "Essentials of Effective Instruction" (See Resource 1 for more details). AF uses these standards to communicate clear, concrete expectations to each new cohort of teachers that joins AF schools each year.

With a standards-based framework guiding the system, AF established a new teacher training and support program to "bring them to life" (Curtis, 2011, p. 10). The program includes a two-week summer institute, network-wide professional development, and coaching. In her profile of AF, Curtis (2011) notes that coaching is a network-wide practice for all staff regardless of level or years of experience. For less experienced teachers, coaches visit the classroom weekly for observation using the Essentials of Effective Instruction as a guide for assessing and providing feedback. Together, the teacher and the coach select elements of the Essentials of Effective Instruction to focus on in developing a Learning Plan. The Learning Plan's focus, length of duration, and complexity vary by school and by teacher and coaching pair.

As part of a teacher's annual assessment, AF teachers and coaches develop a professional growth plan (PGP) with goal-setting that aligns with the Cycle of Highly Effective Teaching and provides a framework for assessing teachers on a 1–4 scale across seven elements. The PGP forms the basis of a beginning, mid-year, and end-year conference between the teachers and their coaches. Data from weekly classroom observation and learning plans inform this summative assessment.

In addition to performance-based evaluation based on classroom observation and coaching, AF includes information from student, peer, and parent surveys; principal assessments; and value-added data as part of each teacher's annual evaluation. AF piloted a number of pre-existing survey instruments in the spring of 2010 and concluded that developing a set of in-house surveys would provide the most reliable data and enable the creation of a manageable process.

For its incorporation of value-added data, AF relied on "Athena," a set of in-house developed interim assessments that are Web-based and aligned to AF curriculum. The tests are given to all students across all grades in reading, mathematics, and writing at five points during the school year. Science and social studies are assessed in selected grades on a less frequent basis. The results of student's performance on Athena assessments are predictive of students' scores on state and national standardized tests. Teachers use information from value-added measures to show evidence of student growth as part of their PGP assessment.



In addition, the network incorporates value-added measures into teachers' evaluations by weighting different components. For tested subjects, student achievement counts for 40 percent, and in untested subjects, student achievement counts for 20 percent. Furthermore, the network includes the principal's professional judgment in the process by including a principal's assessment of data accuracy and consistency with previous results in the final determination of a teacher's value-added score.

AF is currently in the process of implementing a Teacher Career Pathway (See Resource 62) that will link performance-based assessment results and value-added scores with staffing decisions to reward high-quality teachers with promotions and pay increases over their career in the AF network.



REFERENCES

- Amrein-Beardsley, A. (2008). Methodological concerns about the education value-added assessment system. *Educational Researcher*, 37(2), 65–75.
- Braun, H. I. (2005). Value-added modeling: What does due diligence require? In R. W. Lissitz (Ed.), *Value added models in education: Theory and applications* (pp. 19–39). Maple Grove: JAM Press.
- Curtis, R. (2011). *Achievement First: Developing a teacher performance management system that recognizes excellence*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute Education & Society Program. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/education%20and%20society%20program/AI_Achievement%20First_performance%20mangmt.pdf
- Danielson, C. (2007a). Assessment for learning—For teachers as well as students. In C. A. Dwyer (Ed.), *The future of assessment: Shaping teaching and learning* (pp. 191–214). New York: Erlbaum.
- Danielson, C. (2007b). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (2000). Authentic assessment of teaching in context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(5–6), 523–545.
- Donaldson, M., & Peske, H. (2010). *Supporting effective teaching through teacher evaluation: A study of teacher evaluation in five charter schools*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/pdf/teacher_evaluation.pdf
- Dwyer, C. A. (1998). The evaluation of teachers. In B. Alvarez H. & M. Ruiz-Casares (Eds.), *Evaluation and educational reform: Policy options* (pp. 182–214). The Advancing Basic Education and Literacy (ABEL) Project. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnacd054.pdf#page=182
- Gelfer, J. I., Xu, Y., & Perkins, P. G. (2004). Developing portfolios to evaluate teacher performance in early childhood education. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(2), 127–132.
- Glass, G. V. (2004). *Teacher evaluation* (Policy Brief). Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://eps.l.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPsl-0401-112-EPRU.doc>
- Goe, L. (2007). *The link between teacher quality and student outcomes: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/LinkBetweenTQandStudentOutcomes.pdf>
- Goe, L. (2008). *Using value-added models to identify and support highly effective teachers* (Key Issue). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from <http://www2.tqsource.org/strategies/het/UsingValueAddedModels.pdf>
- Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Value-added models and other approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2003). *Teacher quality and student achievement* (Urban Diversity Series No. 115). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.
- Gross, B., & DeArmond, M. (2011). *How do charter schools get the teachers they want?* (Issue Brief). Washington, DC: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.publiccharters.org/data/files/Publication_docs/NAPCS_TeacherBrief_March2011_20110330T164201.pdf

- Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (2007). *The effects of NBPTS-certified teachers on student achievement*. Arlington, VA: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/Harris_Sass_Final_2007.pdf
- Heneman, H. G., & Milanowski, A. T. (2004). Alignment of human resource practices and teacher performance competency. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 108–125.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2011). *Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf
- Jackson, A., & Suckow, M. (2004). *California Teaching Performance Assessment: Initial calibration analysis 2003–04*. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Kupermintz, H. (2003). Teacher effects and teacher effectiveness: A validity investigation of the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(3), 287–298.
- Linn, R. L., Buchmann, M., Gould, B., Kellaghan, T., Lawrence, D., Robinson, P., et al. (1989). The development, validation, and applicability of The Personnel Evaluation Standards. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 2(3), 199–214.
- McCaffrey, D. F., Koretz, D., Lockwood, J. R., & Hamilton, L. S. (2004). *The promise and peril of using value-added modeling to measure teacher effectiveness* (Research Brief No. RB-9050-EDU). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/2005/RAND_RB9050.pdf
- McCaffrey, D. F., Lockwood, J. R., Koretz, D. M., & Hamilton, L. S. (2003). *Evaluating value-added models for teacher accountability*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG158.pdf
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). Embracing contraries: Implementing and sustaining teacher evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 403–415). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Milanowski, A. T., Kimball, S. M., & Odden, A. R. (2005). Teacher accountability measures and links to learning. In L. Stiefel, A. E. Schwartz, R. Rubenstein, & J. Zabel (Eds.), *Measuring school performance and efficiency: Implications for practice and research. 2005 Yearbook of the American Education Finance Association* (pp. 137–159). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Milanowski, A. T., Kimball, S. M., & White, B. (2004). *The relationship between standards-based teacher evaluation scores and student achievement: Replication and extensions at three sites*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (2005). *Evaluating value-added: Findings and recommendations from the NASBE Study Group on value-added assessments*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
- Pecheone, R., Pigg, M. J., Chung, R. R., & Souviney, R. J. (2005). Performance assessment and electronic portfolios: Their effect on teacher learning and education. *The Clearing House*, 78(4), 164–176.
- Rice, J. K. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes* (Report). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458.
- Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Economic Review*, 94(2), 247–252.
- Sanders, W. L., & Horn, S. P. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), 247–256.
- Sato, M. (2000, April). *The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: Teacher learning through the assessment process*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Washington, DC: Education Sector. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/RushToJudgment_ES_Jan08.pdf
- Valli, L., Croninger, R., Alexander, P., Chambliss, M., Graeber, A., & Price, J. (2004, April 15). *A study of high quality teaching: Mathematics and reading*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(1), 89–122.
-

ABOUT THE NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOL RESOURCE CENTER

The U.S. Department of Education is committed to promoting effective practices, providing technical assistance, and disseminating the resources critical to ensuring the success of charter schools across the country. To that end, the U.S. Department of Education, under a contract with Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research, has developed the National Charter School Resource Center. The Resource Center provides on-demand resources, information, and technical assistance to support successful planning, authorizing, implementation, and sustainability of high-quality charter schools; to share evaluations on the effects of charter schools; and to disseminate information about successful practices in charter schools.

National Charter School Resource Center

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
877.277.2744 | 202.403.6222

charterschoolcenter.org

The National Charter School Resource Center is administered by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research, under contract number ED-04-CO-0109/0004 with the Office of Innovation and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

1170_11/11



LEARNING POINT Associates®
An Affiliate of American Institutes for Research®