

Guidance Concerning the Design and Implementation of Teacher and Leader Evaluation Systems



Strategies That Support the Academic and Social Growth of Students With Disabilities

Lynn Holdheide

Deputy Director

June 2013

Center on
GREAT TEACHERS & LEADERS

at American Institutes for Research ■

 **AIR**[®]
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH[®]

Mission

The mission of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center) is to foster the capacity of vibrant networks of practitioners, researchers, innovators, and experts to build and sustain a seamless system of support for great teachers and leaders for every school in every state in the nation.

Trends in Teacher Evaluation

- Policy is ahead of the research on educator evaluation measures and models.
- Inclusion of student achievement growth data represents a huge “culture shift” in evaluation.
- States are under increased pressure to meet deadlines and requirements within:
 - State Fiscal Stabilization Funds
 - Race to the Top
 - Teacher Incentive Funds/State Improvement Grants
 - Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waivers

Considerations for Inclusion in Evaluation Models

- Regulatory requirements
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria
- Suitability and need for differentiation within:
 - Measures of instructional/teacher practice based upon national association standards and district responsibilities
 - Measures of professional practice based upon national association standards and district responsibilities
 - Measures of student growth based upon role and function
 - Weighting of measures
- Considerations in targeted professional learning opportunities



Guiding Principles

Educator evaluator models based on:

1. The student learner
2. What educators and administrators need to know and do to support the academic and social growth of students with disabilities
3. Demonstrated student growth
4. Roles and responsibilities
5. The type of feedback and support needed to improve educator practice across the career continuum

General Guidance

- Utilize existing evaluation frameworks for all teachers and administrators.
- Strengthen existing frameworks to include explicit guidance pertaining to students with disabilities, special educators, and specialized instructional support personnel.

Considerations, Examples, and Next Steps

- **Eight considerations:**
 - All are based upon national issues, practice, and guidance.
- **State and district examples (appendixes):**
 - Consider augmenting with **district initiatives**. Many district and special education stakeholders have already begun this work—much could be learned from their efforts.
- **Potential next steps:**
 - Consider utilizing district-level special education stakeholders to move this work forward.

Consideration 1

- Rubric remains constant for all instructional providers (e.g., teachers).
- Explicit examples provided of standards and indicators across student populations and context (e.g., Pennsylvania and Massachusetts).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Establish a subgroup of special educators to work collaboratively to develop:
 - Explicit examples
 - Guidance and training for evaluators
 - Use of peer observers

Consideration 2

- Modify rubric standards and performance indicators specific to roles and responsibilities of specialized instructional support personnel (e.g., speech pathologist, school psychologist) (e.g., Pennsylvania and Massachusetts).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Establish a subgroup of specialist personnel to modify the rubric to reflect specific roles and responsibilities:
 - Work with state and national associations.
 - Use professional association standards to establish face and content validity.

Consideration 3

- Use the preobservation conference as an opportunity for the educator to review students' needs and the evidence-based instructional practice used prior to the observation (e.g., Nevada and Pennsylvania).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Require the use of a preobservation and a postobservation conference.
 - Provide guidance and professional learning opportunities preparing teachers to guide and facilitate discussions concerning instructional strategies based on students' needs.

Consideration 4

- Include students with disabilities within the multiple measures of growth like that of all students (e.g., Delaware).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Provide training and guidance on how to select or develop assessments that are accessible.
 - Provide training and guidance for teachers to ensure that students with disabilities can be appropriately accommodated.

Consideration 5

- Consider students with disabilities within the student learning objective (SLO) development process (e.g., Rhode Island, Ohio, and Delaware).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Require that all teachers are held accountable for the growth of students with disabilities under the SLO process.
 - Provide guidance and examples concerning SLO development, implementation, and accountability across the various service delivery models.
 - Provide guidance in how to differentiate learning targets established through the SLO process that take into account past learning trajectories and present levels of performance.

Rhode Island Student Learning Objectives

- Teachers are encouraged to set tiered goals so that targets are differentiated according to students' present levels of performance and needs.
- General education and special education teachers are encouraged to work collaboratively to construct objectives that are in alignment with those of the general education class but accommodate for the specific learning needs and levels of performance for students with disabilities.

Rhode Island Student Learning Objectives

- Partnered with special education teachers in early adopter districts and local institutions of higher education to draft sample SLOs.
- Example SLOs for students with disabilities are located at <http://www.ride.ri.gov/EducatorQuality/EducatorEvaluation/SLO.aspx>.

Rhode Island Student Learning Objectives

- Guidance document that provides recommendations on SLO development across context:
<http://ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorEvaluation/RIModelFAQsandGuidance.aspx>
 - The special education teacher who coteaches as part of a grade level or content team
 - The special education teacher who does not fully coteach with a general education teacher but who works with students with disabilities across several classrooms
 - The special education teacher who works with students with disabilities across several grade levels who are not also assigned to a general education teacher

Consideration 6

- Capitalize on response to intervention (RTI) framework as an important lever for implementing SLOs.
 - Potential next steps:
 - Utilize established data collection teams used as part of the RTI process to structure the SLO process.

Consideration 7

- Establish differentiated growth targets that take into account past learning trajectories and present levels of performance (e.g., Rhode Island, Ohio, and Delaware).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Provide guidance in how to differentiate learning targets.

Consideration 8

- Make a statement that the individualized education program (IEP) should not be used to measure student growth for the purpose of teacher and leader evaluation; however, it could be used as a source of evidence to develop SLOs (e.g., Delaware and Illinois).
 - Potential next steps:
 - Provide guidance in how the IEP is distinct from SLOs as IEPs.

Lynn Holdheide
615-308-2525
lholdheide@air.org

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
877-322-8700
www.gtlcenter.org
gtlcenter@air.org

▶ *Advancing state efforts to grow, respect, and retain great teachers and leaders for all students*

Center on
GREAT TEACHERS & LEADERS

at American Institutes for Research ■

 **AIR**[®]
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH[®]