



NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER
FOR **TEACHER QUALITY**

Evaluating All Teachers: Measuring Student Growth in Nontested Subjects and for Teachers of At-Risk Students

Laura Goe, ETS

&

Lynn Holdheide, Vanderbilt University

May 10, 2011 ♦ Joint Webinar

Why include student achievement growth as a component of teacher evaluation?

- Evidence of teachers' contribution to student learning growth is increasingly important for performance management
 - Teacher effectiveness is the **most** influential school-based factor in student achievement (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2002; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Sanders & Rivers, 1996)
- Other measures may provide information about teachers' practice but not the outcomes that result from it

Federal funding often demands student achievement results

- Race to the Top States must include systems in which effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, on the basis of student growth
- States are expected to provide support to SIG and TIF districts which also must measure teacher effectiveness with student learning growth

Race to the Top definition of student achievement

Student achievement means—

- (a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student's score on the State's assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning, such as those described in paragraph (b) of this definition, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
- (b) **For non-tested grades and subjects:** alternative measures of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

The Challenge: Measuring Contributions to Student Learning Growth for...

- Teachers of non-tested subjects (e.g. social studies, K-2, art, drama, band) and grades (most states test only grades 4-8 reading and language arts)
 - Teachers of certain student populations and/or situations in which standardized test scores are not available or utilized
 - Teachers of students assessed on alternate assessments
 - Smaller teacher caseloads for some student groups (e.g. students with disabilities, English language learners).
-

Factors to Consider in Measuring Student Learning Growth

Is there a consensus on the competencies students should achieve in this content area?



- Focus on proficiency: experts and practitioners define the knowledge, concepts, and skills students should acquire for each subject and grade level based on content **standards**
- Content standards form the basis on which measures can be either identified or developed

Factors to Consider

What assessments/measures can be used to reliably measure these competencies with validity?



- Existing measures
- Rigorous new measures
- Portfolios/products/performance/projects
- School-wide or team-based value-added
- Pro-rated scores in co-teaching
- Multiple measures (classroom observations...)
- Student learning objectives



Measures must be rigorous, between two points in time and comparable across classrooms.

Factors to Consider

- Can these measurements be applied to all grades and student populations?



- Vertically equated scales makes the achievement measure applicable to a broader range of grades and ability levels.
- Students with disabilities and English language learners instructed on the general education curriculum assessed w/ same measures (with potential need for accommodations)
- Different measures for students on alternate standards
- IEPs as basis for student growth presents legal and other potentially contentious issues.

Factors to Consider

- What resource and human capacity limitations and strengths need to be factored into the decision on measurements?



- Does the district have the human capacity to implement these assessments with fidelity?
- What are the training needs?
- What type of resources are required to ensure implementation fidelity?

Measuring teachers' contributions to student learning growth: Models

Model	Description
Student learning objectives	Teachers assess students at beginning of year and set objectives then assesses again at end of year; principal or designee works with teacher, determines success
Subject & Grade alike team models	Teachers meet in grade-specific and/or subject-specific teams to consider and agree on appropriate measures that they will all use to determine their individual contributions to student learning growth
Pre-and Post-tests model	Identify or create pre- and post-tests for every grade and subject
School-wide value-added	Teachers in tested subjects & grades receive their own value-added score; all other teachers get the school-wide average
Tested subjects only	Teachers' contributions to student learning growth is determined with value-added; other teachers are not evaluated with student outcomes

State role in evaluation (Goe, Holdheide, & Miller 2011)

- **State Level Evaluation System:** State interprets legislation, prescribes the requirements, and determines measures, weights, etc.; little flexibility
- **Elective State Level System:** State interprets legislation and prescribes some requirements but allows local flexibility over others
- **District Evaluation System with Required Parameters:** States provide guidance but permits local interpretation and considerable flexibility; mandates some general parameters of the model

Considerations

- Partner with national and regional comprehensive centers
- Engage stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, school board members, union representatives, business leaders, etc.) in decision-making processes early and often
- If lacking grade-level and subject standards, adopt such standards
- Conserve resources by encouraging districts to join forces with other districts or regional groups

Considerations

- Consider whether human resources and capacity are sufficient to ensure fidelity of implementation.
- Develop a communication strategy to increase awareness and buy-in (FAQs on website, public meetings, news “blasts” to email subscribers).
- Establish a plan to evaluate measures to determine if they can effectively differentiate among teacher performance
- Examine correlations among measures.
- Evaluate processes and data each year and make needed adjustments.

Evaluation System Models

Austin (Student learning objectives with pay-for-performance, group and individual SLOs assess with comprehensive rubric)

<http://archive.austinisd.org/inside/initiatives/compensation/slos.phtml>

Delaware Model (Teacher participation in identifying grade/subject measures which then must be approved by state)

http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/student_growth/default.shtml

Georgia CLASS Keys (Comprehensive rubric, includes student achievement —see last few pages)

System: http://www.gadoe.org/tss_teacher.aspx

Rubric:

<http://www.gadoe.org/DMGetDocument.aspx/CK%20Standards%2010-18-2010.pdf?>

[p=6CC6799F8C1371F6B59CF81E4ECD54E63F615CF1D9441A92E28BFA2A0AB27E3E&Type=D](http://www.gadoe.org/DMGetDocument.aspx/CK%20Standards%2010-18-2010.pdf?p=6CC6799F8C1371F6B59CF81E4ECD54E63F615CF1D9441A92E28BFA2A0AB27E3E&Type=D)

Hillsborough, Florida (Creating assessments/tests for all subjects)

<http://communication.sdhc.k12.fl.us/empoweringteachers/>

Evaluation System Models (cont'd)

New Haven, CT (SLO model with strong teacher development component and matrix scoring; see Teacher Evaluation & Development System)

<http://www.nhps.net/scc/index>

Rhode Island DOE Model (Student learning objectives combined with teacher observations and professionalism)

http://www.ride.ri.gov/assessment/DOCS/Asst.Sups_CurriculumDir.Network/Asnt_Sup_August_24_rev.ppt

Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) (Value-added for tested grades only, no info on other subjects/grades, multiple observations for all teachers)

<http://www.tapsystem.org/>

Washington DC IMPACT Guidebooks (Variation in how groups of teachers are measured—50% standardized tests for some groups, 10% other assessments for non-tested subjects and grades)

[http://www.dc.gov/DCPS/In+the+Classroom/Ensuring+Teacher+Success/IMPACT+\(Performance+Assessment\)/IMPACT+Guidebooks](http://www.dc.gov/DCPS/In+the+Classroom/Ensuring+Teacher+Success/IMPACT+(Performance+Assessment)/IMPACT+Guidebooks)



Laura Goe, Ph.D.

P: 609-734-1076

E-Mail: lgoe@ets.org

Lynn Holdheide, Vanderbilt University

P: 615-322-8150

E-Mail: lynn.holdheide@vanderbilt.edu