

This response was prepared for the Nevada Interim Committee on Education

In addition to providing information about education policy and practice in the 50 states, ECS staff is available to review bill drafts, testify at legislative hearings and consult on Pre-K to postsecondary issues.

Your Request:

The committee requested notes regarding comments on teacher and administrator evaluation systems delivered before the Interim Committee on Education on February 25, 2014.

Our Response:

Issues for Nevada to consider on best practices for Educator Evaluations:

1. Adequate time to do well on evaluations

TIMELINE

Activity	Estimated Time
Pre-Observation	20-30 minutes in conference
Formal Observation	30-60 minutes
Assembling Evidence	3hrs
Post-Obs Conference	30-45 minutes
Informal Observation (2 Sessions)	10-20 minutes (2x)
Summative Conference	30-45 minutes
Total Time	5- 6.75 hrs/per Teacher

- Each Evaluator has about 25 Evaluatees
- = 125 – 169 hrs not including goal setting, training, etc.

• Considerations to address the time demands:

- Digital supports
- Rubrics
- New formats and tailored flexibility, particularly for evaluating top performers
- Distributing the responsibility for observations beyond principals

Key Takeaways for Educator Evaluation:

- Adequate time
- Observation tools and professional development for observations
- Accuracy and reliability of evaluations
- Cost of system
- Skills for effective post-observation evaluations

- Inclusion (or exclusion) of examination of student work
- Strategic approach
- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Tennessee** Educator Acceleration Model – video capture technology. Encouraging districts to allow teachers to film and submit videos to be utilized as announced observations.

2. Rubrics – simple; easy to use system and not superficial checklists

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Rhode Island:** revised rubrics to reduce elements
 - **Massachusetts:** Multiple rubrics – for admins, teachers, specialized staff like art, music, etc.; easy to use; could have on handheld device?

administrator rubric: http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/model/PartIII_AppxB.pdf

teacher rubric: http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/model/PartIII_AppxC.pdf

specialized: http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/model/PartIII_AppxD.pdf

- **Illinois:** New formats and tailored flexibility, particularly for evaluating top performers. Tenured teacher who receive “excellent” or “proficient” w/be evaluated every other year. More frequent observations (3X during year following) for tenured teachers receiving “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” in last evaluation
- **Delaware:** Fewer observations for “highly effective” experienced teachers - 1 announced, 1 unannounced observation at least once every 2 years, with summative evaluation at least once every 2 years.
- **Ohio:** Observes “accomplished” teachers every two years rather than annually.
- **Tennessee:** Minimum required number of observations will be based on licensure status and evaluation scores from the previous year. Teachers in Tennessee undergo one, two, three, or four full-length observations depending on their prior performance (a composite score of value-added measures and observation scores) and licensure status.

3. Distributing the responsibility for observations beyond principals

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Ohio:** ORC 3319.111 states that an evaluator may be a person who is employed by an entity contracted by the board to conduct evaluations and who holds a license designated for being a superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, vocational director, administrative specialist or supervisor in any educational area issued under section 3319.22 of the Revised Code or is

qualified to conduct evaluations. The words “3rd party evaluator” no longer appears in legislative language.

4. Examining student work.

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**

- **Colorado, Illinois and Florida** all specify that classroom observations include an examination of student work by the evaluator. (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/evaluations-teacher-effectiveness.pdf>)

5. Screening

- Evaluating more strategically

- : http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/CF_evaluating_teachers_strategically.pdf

- Key considerations:

- Simplicity
- Fairness
- Cost

- A value-added score will lead to collection of additional information – but shouldn't be the sole screener
- “When high stakes are attached to measures, Campbell’s law says measures will be corrupted.”
- Weighted average and matrix approaches make more sense than screening where measures capture different elements of effect (i.e, parent engagement)
- With screening, all information from prior year is used as part of the first stage. If fail on a measure, collect more information.

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue: none identified at this time**

6. Concerns about accuracy, reliability

- **Evaluations should employ four to five rating levels** to describe differences in teacher effectiveness. (The New Teacher Project - <http://tntp.org/assets/documents/Teacher-Evaluation-Oct10F.pdf?files/Teacher-Evaluation-Oct10F.pdf>)
- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Missouri:** Five levels in the Professional Continuum of the Missouri teacher- 1) candidate; 2) emerging teacher; 3) developing teacher; 4) proficient teacher; 5) distinguished teacher.
 - **Minnesota:** 1) Unsatisfactory; 2) Development Needed; 3) Effective; 4) Exemplary

7. Use multiple measures

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**

- Most states are doing this
- Kentucky's are a bit different from other states: 1) principal observation; 2) peer observation; 3) reflection/self-examination; 4) professional growth planning; 5) student growth; 6) student voice through survey.

8. Rolling years of student growth data

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**

- **North Carolina:** An overall status for a teacher (on standard 6 – student growth value) is determined once a teacher has a three-year rolling average of student growth values

9. Reliability of evaluators (training, etc.)

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**

- **Illinois**—web-based resources, FAQs, etc.
 - ☐ Prequalification training and assessments
 - ☐ Train-the-trainer program to build capacity
 - ☐ Technical Assistance
 - ☐ Retraining program
 - ☐ Interactive website with video library and other resources to support evaluators, districts and trainers (see below)
 - ☐ Online resources for districts in developing teacher and principal evaluation systems
 - ☐ Facilitate communication among stakeholders
 - ☐ Quarterly networking to identify and replicate effective practices for implementing teacher and principal evaluation systems
 - ☐ Provide database of state-qualified trainers

Source: http://www.isbe.state.il.us/peac/pdf/prin_tchr_eval_trng_pres022412.pdf

- **Massachusetts:** Amended law to provide for training: <https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2012/Chapter131/>
- **Tennessee:** <http://team-tn.org/training/training-materials/>

10. Costs

- see Carnegie cost calculator: https://carnegiefoundation.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8oylGoEjGCQotsF

11. Skills and training needed for effective post-observations

- Guide for principals: Strategies for post-observation: http://commons.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/BRIEF_Feedback-for-Teachers.pdf (Jan. 2014)

12. Concerns about teachers in non-tested grades or subjects

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Delaware** – state ordered vendor-created modules – to help teachers develop assessments. They now have 43 assessment packages with growth goals – assembled by educators.
 - **Tennessee** is testing portfolio approach – starting with art; portfolios are evaluated via “blind peer review” by high quality teachers
 - **Ohio** – Can use vendor-provided assessments as long as approved (<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Approved-List-of-Assessments>) Required by law, the Ohio Department of Education created a list of assessments that can measure student growth on subjects that do not have the OAA Value-Added growth measure. Districts may choose to use an assessment on the ODE approved list of assessments as an option to determine student growth for those teachers who do not have Value-Added data.

13. Keeping the end in mind: Design Principles

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Connecticut's** SEED is based on five principles:

Teacher Evaluation- Design Principles

The SEED model for teacher evaluation, developed in partnership with Education First, adheres to the following design principles:

- ❑ Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance
- ❑ Promote both professional judgment and consistency
- ❑ Foster dialogue about student learning
- ❑ Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth
- ❑ Ensure feasibility of implementation

Administrator Evaluation- Design Principles

The SEED model for administrator evaluation, developed in partnership with New Leaders, adheres to the following design principles:

- ❑ Focus on what matters most
- ❑ Emphasize growth over time
- ❑ Leave room for judgment
- ❑ Consider implementation at least as much as design

14. Timing

ECS strives to respond to information requests within 24 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Visit our website at www.ecs.org.

- Evaluations should be completed and reviewed prior to contract renewal timelines (usually in March or mid-April)

15. Evaluating the system of evaluation

- **Examples of states who are leading in this issue:**
 - **Massachusetts:** Amended law as follows:

SECTION 2. Section 11 of chapter 69 of the General Laws, as appearing in the 2010 Official Edition, is hereby amended by inserting after the fifth paragraph the following paragraph:-
 The board shall establish and maintain a data system to collect information from school districts for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of district evaluation systems in assuring effective teaching and administrative leadership in the public schools. Such information shall be made available in the aggregate to the public; provided, however, that any data or information that school districts, the department or both create, send or receive in connection with educator evaluation that is evaluative in nature and which may be linked to an individual educator, including information concerning an educator's formative assessment or evaluation or summative evaluation or performance rating or the student learning, growth and achievement data that may be used as part of an individual educator's evaluation, shall be considered **personnel information** within the meaning of subclause (c) of clause Twenty-sixth of section 7 of chapter 4 and shall not be subject to disclosure under said clause Twenty-sixth of said section 7 of said chapter 4 or under section 10 of chapter 66.

16. Recommendations from academic research

- Use scoring bands (levels) that contribute to teacher evaluations (especially with implementation of CCSS)
- Use multiple years of student growth
- Judge teacher performance measures based on the degree to which they accurately estimate future teacher performance from past years of teaching, i.e., Brown Center on Education Policy model: (Brown Center on Education Policy - Brookings, 2011 - http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/2011/4/26%20evaluating%20teachers/0426_evaluating_teachers.pdf)
- (Douglas N. Harris, Carnegie Foundation for Teaching - http://www.carnegieknowledgenetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/CKN_2013_10_Harris.pdf)

17. Social Emotional Learning

- Create tools that help administrators quickly and easily see how the practices that support SEL can be supported and reinforced through existing teacher evaluation systems.
- Provide districts and schools with a sample student social-emotional competencies assessment to use for teachers' self-assessment or professional growth plan.

- Incorporate teaching practices that explicitly teach students’ social and emotional competencies into teachers’ self-assessment or professional growth plan (e.g., what did the teacher do to teach students to regulate their academic behavior?).
- Connect teacher efforts that contribute to student social-emotional competency development to other dimensions in professional teaching frameworks (e.g., school-family connections, leading SEL initiatives, etc.).
- Embed a focus on SEL in other education initiatives (e.g., school climate, anti-bullying, teacher preparation, principal accountability).
- Promote collaboration across districts and schools by encouraging administrators to share successful strategies around creating a school culture that supports SEL, such as incorporating SEL development activities into staff meetings, professional learning communities, and regular school events.

Source: Teaching the Whole Child Instructional Practices that support social-Emotional Learning in three teacher Evaluation Frameworks

<http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/TeachingtheWholeChild.pdf> (American Institutes for Research)

18. Academic Research findings on value-added measurement or evaluations

- “The main lesson of this study is that value-added models that control for a student’s prior-year test scores provide accurate forecasts of teachers’ mean impacts on student achievement. This result shows that existing test score data can help identify teachers who substantially improve student achievement. Teachers’ impacts are substantial and improving teacher quality could raise the performance of low-scoring students significantly.” – “Measuring the Impacts of Teachers I: Evaluating Bias in Teacher Value-Added Estimates,” NBER Sept. 2013
- “Second, one should compare the long-term impacts of evaluating teachers on the basis of VA to other metrics, such as principal evaluations or classroom observation. One can adapt the methods developed in this paper to evaluate these other measures of teacher quality. When a teacher who is rated highly by principals enters a school, do subsequent cohorts of students have higher college attendance rates and earnings?” – “Measuring the Impacts of Teachers II: Teacher Value-Added and Student Outcomes in Adulthood.” – NBER September 2013
- “Using matched student-teacher data from North Carolina, we show that the optimal use of math and reading scores improves the fit of prediction models of overall future teacher value-added by up to a third for reading and a tenth for a composite measure (math and reading combined). Efficiency gains are greatest when value-added must be calculated on only 1 or 2 years of data...better use of existing data would be simple, low cost place to start.” – “Using Subject Test Scores Efficiently to Predict Teacher Value-Added,” Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, AERA Feb. 21, 2012 version
- “This study finds that **incorporating confidence intervals** into teacher performance classifications reduces the likelihood that teachers classified as higher performing based on one test will be classified as lower performing based on another. Other research has shown that averaging estimates of teacher value-added over multiple years will increase precisions and provide more reliable information on teacher performance.” “Comparing Estimates of Teacher Value-Added Based on Criterion- and Norm-Referenced Tests,” IES/REL Midwest January 2014
- “Our study shows that value-added measures can differ according to the model and connects these differences to assumptions about student learning. The limitation is that it does not provide



information about what model specification is likely to be the most accurate reflection of true teacher effectiveness.” – “Teacher Value-Added at the High-School Level: Different Models, Different Answers??” Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, January 2013

- “Our analysis demonstrates empirically **the hazard of using a common metric—80% interrater agreement—as a sole measure of the reliability** of a classroom observation system...although reaching high rater agreement levels for such items is clearly preferable, it may not be feasible for some complex performance arenas within teaching, nor should it be used as the sole criterion for determining score reliability, as our findings clearly show.” “We argue for focusing national efforts on developing a set of carefully tested classroom observation systems. By doing so, we could have confidence that the scores and instructional feedback derived from observational systems will become trusted inputs in teacher development and teacher evaluation systems.” “When Rater Reliability is Not Enough: Teacher Observation Systems and a Case for the Generalizability Study,” Educational Researcher Mar. 5, 2012 (might not be final version)

19. States further along with implementation

- Tennessee
 - <http://team-tn.org/teacher-model>
 - http://team-tn.cloudapp.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/TVAAS_FAQs.pdf
- Massachusetts
- Wisconsin
 - <http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/FPtraining/EETeacherEvaluationProcessManual-version1.pdf>

20. Carnegie resources

- http://www.carnegieknowledgenetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/CKN_2013_10_Harris.pdf
- Evaluating more strategically: http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/CF_evaluating_teachers_strategically.pdf
-  Carnegie cost calculator: https://carnegiefoundation.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8oylGoEjGCQotsF
-  Strategies for post-observation: http://commons.carnegiefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/BRIEF_Feedback-for-Teachers.pdf (Jan. 2014)

21. Other frameworks:

- Danielson: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/article.aspx?page=FAQonlineresources>

ECS strives to respond to information requests within 24 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Visit our website at www.ecs.org.

ECS strives to respond to information requests within 24 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Visit our website at www.ecs.org.