The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the Race to the Top grant program have pushed states and districts to invest in the development of high-quality teacher evaluation systems that focus on student growth data as a measure of teacher effectiveness and use multiple measures to inform critical decisions relating to opportunities for teacher improvement and career advancement.
THE CHANGING POLICY LANDSCAPE

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 funneled an unprecedented amount of federal funding to education initiatives through a variety of funding streams. By now, most education stakeholders are aware of the four primary assurances outlined in ARRA and made available to states through the Race to the Top competitive grant:1

- “Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace to compete in the global economy.”
- “Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction.”
- “Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most.”

Since the passage of ARRA, these assurances have driven changes in state legislation, especially as states prepared to participate in the Race to the Top competitive grant program. In a review of the 41 applications submitted for Phase I of Race to the Top, Learning Point Associates (2010b), an affiliate of American Institutes for Research, found that 29 (71 percent) of the 41 applications submitted by states and the District of Columbia included descriptions of recently passed legislation or intentions to introduce legislation in support of Race to the Top program priorities. Specific to teacher evaluation, a total of 11 states passed, or expressed an intention to pass, legislation related to teacher evaluation in the following key areas: prescribing measures to evaluate teachers (7 states), prescribing the use of evaluation data (2 states), and prescribing both measures to evaluate teachers and the use of evaluation data (2 states).

Although most new state laws focused on the use of student achievement data to assess teacher performance, another common theme in the legislation was the redesign of educator evaluation systems at the state and district levels, including the stated use of observation rubrics and other measures of teacher performance (Learning Point Associates, 2010b).

In addition to ARRA, the Common Core State Standards movement, spearheaded by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), provides states with an additional incentive to agree on definitions for the essential knowledge and skills necessary to the future success of K–12 students. NGA and CCSSO worked collaboratively with states, educators, content experts, researchers, national organizations, and community groups to ensure that stakeholders had a significant role in the development process. Forty-one states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have adopted the Common Core State Standards.2 Currently, state standards are available in mathematics and English language arts, which also include literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. NGA and CCSSO also consider the application of the standards to English learners and students with disabilities.

This Policy-to-Practice Brief introduces five current examples of measures of teacher performance. The goal is to assist regional comprehensive centers and state education agencies in building local capacity to incorporate the use of alternative measures of teacher performance into the overhaul of state evaluation systems—especially in states with looming legislative deadlines.

1 For a complete listing of education programs under ARRA as well as links to regulations, guidance, and resources provided by the U.S. Department of Education, visit http://www.ed.gov/recovery.
2 For more information on the states and territories that have adopted the Common Core State Standards as well as links to the detailed standards, guidance, and other resources, visit http://www.corestandards.org.
THE IMPORTANCE OF ALTERNATIVE MEASURES OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE

ARRA and the Race to the Top grant program have pushed states and districts to invest in the development of high-quality teacher evaluation systems. Such systems have two specific elements:

- A focus on student growth data as a measure of teacher effectiveness
- Multiple measures to inform critical decisions relating to opportunities for teacher improvement and career advancement (e.g., promotion, tenure, equitable distribution, compensation).

Historically, most states and districts have used classroom observations as the primary tool to assess teacher performance (Brandt, Thomas, & Burke, 2008; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009). Although classroom observations—in combination with student growth measures—provide multiple data points on teacher performance, additional alternative measures also should be considered to ensure a robust teacher evaluation system that captures the many facets of effective teaching.

Alternative measures can take many forms, from student engagement surveys to teacher portfolios. It is beyond the scope of this brief to cover every alternative measure to assess teacher effectiveness; however, the brief highlights five measures that are included in the online Guide to Teacher Evaluation Products (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2010) as examples of alternative measures that have potential for use in teacher evaluation.

In a review of teacher evaluation reforms proposed in state Phase 1 Race to the Top applications, Learning Point Associates (2010a) found that in addition to student growth measures, states also discussed plans to develop multiple measures of teacher performance beyond student learning. Although most state applications included references to observation rubrics, some states also described other measures of teacher performance in their applications, including the following (Learning Point Associates, 2010a):

- A review of classroom artifacts or portfolios submitted by the teacher
- Teacher planning, instructional, and assessment artifacts (6 states)
- Teacher self-reflection portfolios (5 states)
- Examples of student work (3 states)
- Provisions for peer review and feedback (6 states)
- Student reflections and feedback (5 states)
- Teacher participation in professional development (1 state)
- Follow-up work on teacher adaptation of classroom practices in response to feedback from formal and informal observations (1 state).

Defining Effectiveness

Understanding that student growth measures on their own have limitations for determining “effective” and “highly effective” designations for teachers and leaders, the U.S. Department of Education (2009) has reinforced the need to include multiple measures of teacher performance as the most robust approach to fully capturing classroom practice (See “Definitions of Effective and Highly Effective Teachers”).
In its 2008 review of existing research on evaluating teacher effectiveness, the TQ Center introduced a five-point definition of teacher effectiveness that was intended to initiate state and regional conversations on the types of measures that might be needed to determine effective classroom teaching (Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008). The TQ Center’s definition recognizes the primacy of student growth data, but it also highlights additional important aspects of teaching, many of which are not currently measured through teacher observations or student learning growth measures. This definition highlights a specific need for alternative measures of teacher performance to determine effectiveness.

Given the significant policy focus on reforming state and local teacher evaluation systems that include multiple measures of teacher performance, there is a clear need for the following:

- The development of products and services that provide alternative measures of teacher performance
- Widespread dissemination of the products and services for states to respond to legislative initiatives implemented since the passage of ARRA

“...effective teacher effectiveness consists of the following:

- Effective teachers have high expectations for all students and help students learn, as measured by value-added or other test-based growth measures, or by alternative measures.
- Effective teachers contribute to positive academic, attitudinal, and social outcomes for students such as regular attendance, on-time promotion to the next grade, on-time graduation, self-efficacy, and cooperative behavior.
- Effective teachers use diverse resources to plan and structure engaging learning opportunities; monitor student progress formatively, adapting instruction as needed; and evaluate learning using multiple sources of evidence.
- Effective teachers contribute to the development of classrooms and schools that value diversity and civic-mindedness.
- Effective teachers collaborate with other teachers, administrators, parents, and education professionals to ensure student success, particularly the success of students with special needs and those at high risk for failure.” (Goe et al., 2008, p. 8)
EXAMPLES OF ALTERNATIVE MEASURES

States and districts recently have begun to implement teacher evaluation reforms. Table 1 provides information on five alternative measures of teacher performance that might be used to supplement growth measures and observation rubrics. (For additional information about these measures, refer to Appendixes A–E.)

Table 1. Five Alternative Measures of Teacher Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Measure Product or Service</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Type of Information Gathered</th>
<th>Cost of Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallup Student Poll</td>
<td>Gallup Inc. America’s Promise Alliance American Association of School Administrators</td>
<td>The poll is administered to students in Grades 5–12. The poll measures three variables identified as key factors that drive students’ grades: hope, engagement, and well-being.</td>
<td>Registered public schools and districts can use this measure at no cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop Notebook</td>
<td>National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) at the Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) RAND Corporation Stanford University</td>
<td>This measure uses artifacts and related materials to represent classroom practice. Artifacts and other materials can include the following: lesson handouts; student classwork; homework; photos of classroom layout, equipment, and board work; teacher reflections on each lesson.</td>
<td>States may use publically available research and resources to implement this measure in their schools at no cost. To receive expert assistance to use the tool, states may negotiate pricing with the developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER)</td>
<td>Teachers report information on subject coverage, length of time spent on topics, and cognitive depth covered in their classroom instruction through an online survey. Teachers as well as school, district, and state leaders can use this information to inform professional development and assess the extent to which teacher instruction aligns with state standards and assessments.</td>
<td>Cost for tools and services varies and is determined by CCSSO and WCER on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Portfolios</td>
<td>Varies, based on specific example (See Appendix D.)</td>
<td>Teachers pull together portfolios that can include the following: • Video clips • Lesson plans • Teacher self-assessments or evaluations • Examples of student work</td>
<td>Costs vary, depending on whether portfolios are developed in-house or with consultant. (See Appendix D for more details.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The products and services included in Table 1 align with the types of alternative measures specified in some of the state Race to the Top applications, such as review of classroom artifacts or portfolios; teacher planning, instructional, and assessment artifacts; teacher self-reflection portfolios; examples of student work; provisions for peer review and feedback; and student reflections and feedback (Learning Point Associates, 2010a). The products and services were selected from the range of products available in more detail in the TQ Center’s online Guide to Teacher Evaluation Products (2010).
RESEARCH ON ALTERNATIVE MEASURES

Although further evaluation and research is needed to fully understand the best way to fit these measures into teacher evaluation practices, Table 2 provides a short synopsis of the advantages and challenges identified by currently available research.

**Table 2. Advantages and Challenges of Alternative Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Teacher Performance</th>
<th>Research Cited*</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gallup Student Poll | America’s Promise Alliance (2010)  
Gallup Consulting Education Practice (2009)  
Lopez (2010)  
Lopez, Agrawal, and Calderon (2010) | The poll is available through a secure, online administration website.  
Students can complete the poll in less than 10 minutes.  
For a fee, Gallup provides analysis of the data that correlate survey results with grade-level or classroom-level gains. | The poll is not an alternative measure for all students, as it is not available before Grade 5.  
The poll requires Internet access. |
| Scoop Notebook | Borko, Stecher, Alonzo, Moncure, and McClam (2005)  
Borko, Stecher, and Kuffner (2007)  
Stecher et al. (2005) | This measure can increase teacher commitment to the evaluation process.  
Schools and districts may be able to better address the professional development needs of teachers with the critical information gleaned from this measure.  
This measure may assist teachers in analyzing student work in professional learning communities. | Only mathematical and science rating guides are currently available.  
It might be difficult to develop as a rigorous and comparable measure of teacher effectiveness as part of a high-stakes evaluation system.  
It may not be useful as a measure in classrooms that produce minimal artifacts (e.g., physical education).  
This approach takes time and effort to complete. |
Blank, Porter, and Smithson (2001)  
The SEC report on instructional practice across a school year, which can be difficult information to obtain through other types of evaluation measures. | This measure relies on teacher self-reporting, which may not be accurate.  
This measure requires training for teachers and administrators to view and understand the data to be used most effectively. |
As evidenced in Table 2, each measure has distinct advantages and implementation challenges. In some cases, such as the Gallup Student Poll and the Tripod Surveys, the relatively small cost of implementation is advantageous. However, it is also important to take into account the state’s or district’s specific teacher evaluation needs.
CONCLUSION

As state and district efforts continue to focus on teacher evaluation system reform, it is necessary to explore options for the gradual inclusion of multiple measures of performance to accurately evaluate teacher effectiveness. As state and district staff consider the five alternative measures presented in this brief, they should reflect on the following questions:

- What teaching standards is the system trying to measure?
- What kind of support can the state provide to LEAs for implementation?
- How will the evaluation system be used?
  - Guiding professional development
  - Certification or tenure decisions
  - Teacher career ladders
  - Alternative compensation programs
  - Addressing the inequitable distribution of teachers

For a more in-depth look at making decisions regarding state and district teacher evaluation systems, see the Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems (http://www.tqsource.org/publications/practicalGuideEvalSystems). This guide walks states and districts through questions that are essential to the development and implementation of a high-quality, comprehensive teacher evaluation system.

The advantages and implementation challenges of the alternative measures presented in this brief directly relate to the type of outcomes affected by the evaluation system. States and districts should carefully review examples of each measure in practice and determine the appropriate measures in the context of their school systems.
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APPENDIX A. GALLUP STUDENT POLL

Developer of Product and Services

The Gallup Student Poll was designed by Gallup Inc., in partnership with America’s Promise Alliance and the American Association of School Administrators.

Description of Product and Services Available

In 2009, Gallup Inc. launched the Gallup Student Poll, a school-based online survey for students in Grades 5–12 that measures three variables: hope, engagement, and well-being. Gallup Inc. defines hope as “the ideas and energy students have for the future,” engagement as a student’s “level of involvement in and enthusiasm for school,” and well-being as “how students think about and experience their lives” (see America’s Promise Alliance, 2010, listed in the Research and Resources section at the end of this appendix). Through extensive research, these three variables were identified as key factors that drive students’ grades, achievement scores, retention, and future employment. Furthermore, research has revealed that the variables are linked to teacher talent and teacher engagement; staff and student engagement have been shown to drive positive outcomes and explain variance in school performance (see Gallup Consulting Education Practice, 2009, listed in the Research and Resources section).

The survey is administered once during each school year. Students can access the survey on a secure website using a registered account. The survey takes, on average, less than 10 minutes to complete. In addition to several demographic questions (e.g., age, grade, gender), students are asked 20 core questions about their perspectives related to their home, school, and community lives. Survey questions were first developed in 2006 and have since been reviewed and refined based on additional research, focus group feedback, and psychometric studies conducted from 2008 to 2010. Studies include a 2008 expert review of items, pilot studies in 2008 and 2009, representative panel studies in 2009 and 2010, and a 2009 validation study.

In 2009 and 2010, more than 450,000 students from across the country took the survey. Data from the survey have been used by schools and districts to build student and staff engagement and to provide information on how to select strategic initiatives, trainings, and interventions.

Training for Use of Product and Services

Gallup Inc. has developed a webinar series to communicate information about the Gallup Student Poll to educators and community leaders. The webinars are free and are offered throughout the year. For a schedule of upcoming webinars, please visit the Online Learning & Webinars webpage (www.gallupstudentpoll.com/121688/Online-Learning-Webinars.aspx).

Cost of Product and Services

The survey is free for registered public schools and districts.
Advantages and Implementation Challenges

Advantages
- Free of charge.
- Available online through a secure website.
- Takes less than 10 minutes to complete.

Implementation Challenges
- Not available for students prior to Grade 5.
- Requires computers with Internet access.

How States Can Get More Information

States can get more information at the Gallup Student Poll website (www.gallupstudentpoll.com). Technical support, provided by Gallup Inc., is available by phone (866-346-4408) Monday through Thursday from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. and Friday from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. (Central Time).

Research and Resources


APPENDIX B. SCOOP NOTEBOOK: EXAMINING CLASSROOM ARTIFACTS

Developer of Product and Services

The Scoop Notebook was developed by the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) at the Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE); RAND Corporation; and Stanford University.

Description of the Product and Services Available

The Scoop Notebook is a protocol for gathering and rating the quality of middle school mathematics and science classroom artifacts. It was developed through a five-year project funded through CRESST. The goal of the project was to use artifacts and related materials to represent classroom practice well enough that a person unfamiliar with a teacher or lessons can make valid judgments about selected features of practice solely on the basis of those materials. Moreover, there are two potential uses of the Scoop Notebook: as part of a system of multiple measures to characterize teacher effectiveness or as a formative tool for teacher professional development.

During the course of one week, teachers collect artifacts and other materials (e.g., lesson handouts; student classwork; homework; photos of classroom layout, equipment, and board work; teacher reflections on each lesson) and put them in a binder called the “Scoop Notebook.” (Articles and studies listed in the Research and Resources section at the end of this appendix provide detailed instructions on creating the binders and using rubrics to analyze artifacts.) Rating guides for the notebook are based on previous research, the National Science Education Standards, and Principles and Standards for School Mathematics. Although the tool was developed and field-tested in middle school classrooms, the developers believe it is appropriate for other grade levels as well.

During the five-year project, developers have conducted numerous studies to develop, refine, and test the reliability and validity of the product (see the Research and Resources section at the end of this appendix). Between 2003 and 2007, the Scoop Notebook was tested and used successfully in 36 middle schools in Los Angeles and Denver. Because the tool is publicly available, it may be used in multiple schools and districts beyond the developers’ knowledge.

Training for Use of Product and Services

The Scoop Notebook can be used without training. All materials and guidebooks are available online at no cost to the user. Questions concerning the specific use of the notebook can be addressed to the developers listed in the How States Can Get More Information section.

Cost of Product and Services

States may use publically available research and resources (see the Research and Resources section) to implement the Scoop Notebook in their schools, free of cost. To receive expert assistance to use the tool, states may negotiate pricing with the developers (see the How States Can Get More Information section).
Advantages and Implementation Challenges

**Advantages**
- Free online; additional expert assistance available for a fee.
- May increase teacher commitment to the evaluation process.
- May provide schools and districts critical information to better address professional development needs of teachers.
- May assist teachers in analyzing student work in professional learning committees.

**Implementation Challenges**
- Currently, only mathematics and science ratings guides available.
- May be difficult to develop as a rigorous and comparable measure of teacher effectiveness.
- May not be useful for a measurement of classrooms that produce minimal artifacts (e.g., physical education).
- Takes time and effort to complete.

How States Can Get More Information

States can get more information from the developers of the product:
- Dr. Hilda Borko (650-723-7640, hildab@stanford.edu)
- Dr. Brian Stecher (310-393-0411, brian_stecher@rand.org)

Research and Resources


APPENDIX C. SURVEYS OF ENACTED CURRICULUM

Developer of Product and Services

The Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC) were developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER).

Description of Product and Services Available

The SEC are online surveys that ask teachers to report information on subject coverage, length of time spent on topics, and cognitive depth covered in their classroom instruction. Teacher results can be compared with the content included in state standards and state assessments.

Using aggregated information from several teachers, administrators at the school, district, and state levels can identify the extent to which teacher instruction aligns with state standards and state assessments and use this information to inform professional development and school improvement. By tracking this information over time, the SEC can provide feedback to schools, districts, and states on program implementation.

Individual teachers also can review their practice and compare it with standards and the results of other teachers in their school or district. Consequently, it is possible for SEC data to be part of the information that teachers consider when self-evaluating their performance.

This tool was designed for Grades K–12 mathematics, science, and language arts teachers. Mathematics and science surveys were written and field-tested from 1994 to 1998, with English language arts surveys and reports developed from 2002 to 2003. Eleven states are part of the SEC State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards: Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

The final report of the SEC, a study of the mathematics and science measures across 11 states, was funded through a grant by the National Science Foundation and published in 2001. It includes information on measure validity and ways to mitigate issues related to teacher self-reporting on practice (see Blank, Porter, & Smithson, 2001, listed in the Research and Resources section at the end of this appendix).

The Common Core State Standards recently were analyzed for their content, and the results are publicly available (see Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010, listed in the Research and Resources section). Several states are currently using the SEC to consider the alignment between instruction and the Common Core State Standards. Currently, SEC instruments are being adapted and expanded to facilitate a deeper examination of the instruction that students with disabilities receive. In addition, there are plans to develop a teacher-log format as well as a tool that would allow teachers to study the intended curriculum as compared with the enacted and assessed curriculum.
Training for Use of Product and Services

Training can be scheduled by contacting CCSSO or WCER. Resources related to training can be found at the SEC Resources webpage (seconline.wceruw.org/resources.asp).

Cost of Product and Services

Costs of tools and services vary and can be determined by contacting CCSSO or WCER.

Advantages and Implementation Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Implementation Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collects a large amount of information on teacher practice.</td>
<td>Relies on teacher self-reporting, which may not be accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on instructional practice across a school year—information that is difficult to obtain through other types of evaluation measures.</td>
<td>Requires training for teachers and administrators to view and understand the data so they may be used most effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How States Can Get More Information

States can find more information at the CCSSO SEC webpage (www.secsurvey.org) and the WCER SEC webpage (seconline.wceruw.org/secWebHome.htm) or by contacting the following:

- Rolf K. Blank (202-336-7044; rolfb@ccsso.org)
- John Smithson (608-263-4354; johns@education.wisc.edu)

Research and Resources


APPENDIX D. TEACHER PORTFOLIOS

Developer of the Product and Services

Teacher portfolios have been developed by various state education agencies, local education agencies, and education organizations.

Description of the Product and Services Available

Following are some examples of teaching portfolios.

Washington ProTeach Portfolio

The ProTeach portfolio collects the following student-based evidence to measure teacher effectiveness:

- Professional growth and contributions. Includes analysis and reflection on professional growth and its impact on student learning.
- Building a learning community. Includes a description and analysis of the learning environment established in the single class or classroom.
- Curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Includes analysis and reflection of the curriculum, instruction, and assessment and their impact on three focus students.

Artifacts collected for the portfolio include teacher and student work, written commentary, and samples in student voice (e.g., evidence of student learning from the students’ perspective).

Alexandria (Virginia) City Public Schools—Performance Evaluation Program

The Performance Evaluation Program has four components: formal observations, informal observations, teacher portfolios, and academic goal-setting. The teacher portfolios are made up of artifacts that provide documents for 17 performance responsibilities, determined by Alexandria City Public Schools.

Performance Assessment for California Teachers—Teaching Event

Teaching Event is a teacher portfolio modeled after the teacher portfolio assessments of the Connecticut Department of Education, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. It documents work that meets criteria for six components: context, planning, instruction, assessment, reflection, and academic language. The goal is to have teacher candidates make connections between the different tasks and to provide evidence from a brief learning segment in depth. The directions for constructing the Teaching Event portfolio are designed to direct teacher candidates to plan, teach, and reflect on their teaching within the specific context of their students and their learning. Teaching Event portfolios include video clips, scorers with subject-specific expertise, and subject-specific benchmarks. Training is provided on its use.
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards—National Board Certification

National Board Certification is a standards-based assessment of teacher effectiveness. A score reflects the degree to which assessors were able to locate clear, consistent, and convincing evidence that the candidate has met the standards specific to his or her certificate field. The National Board Certification process consists of a teacher portfolio as well as other components. The portfolios are required to contain four entries. Three of these entries are classroom based; the fourth requires working with families and the larger community and with colleagues and the larger profession. At least two of the classroom-based entries must use video recording. In addition, teachers must provide a collection of student work as well as commentary describing, analyzing, and reflecting on the evidence.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has conducted analyses every year to determine the level of assessor reliability. These analyses indicate that assessors are making reliable, accurate, and fair evaluations of candidates’ responses. The standards committees recommend to the National Board the specific standards for each certificate area and advise those involved in developing the corresponding assessment. The standards and the certificates are structured along two dimensions: the developmental level of students and the subject area.

Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio

The Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) requires teachers to provide information about the unit’s lesson plans and assessments. Specific information about how the instruction is modified for two individual students within the classroom also is required. In addition, the teacher candidate reflects on the implementation of the unit for the whole class and the two focus students. The portfolios must address six focus areas:

- Analysis of contextual information
- Analysis of learning environment factors
- Instructional implementation
- Analysis of classroom learning environment
- Analysis of assessment procedures
- Reflection and self-evaluation

KPTP measures the teacher candidate’s ability to design, deliver, and reflect on an entire unit of study through four distinct sources of evidence:

- Contextual information and learning environment factors
- Designing instruction
- Teaching and learning
- Reflection and professionalism

Training for Use of Product and Services

The available training for use of these products and services varies, depending on whether the state developed the rubrics in-house or used outside consulting services. The TQ Center’s Guide to Teacher Evaluation Products (www3.learningpt.org/tqsource/GEP/) provides additional information for each example.
Cost of Product and Services

The costs of these products and services vary, depending on whether the state developed the rubrics in-house or used outside consulting services. The TQ Center’s Guide to Teacher Evaluation Products (www3.learningpt.org/tqsource/GEP/) provides additional information for each example.

Advantages and Implementation Challenges

Advantages

• Evidence across various activities collected and considered by teachers, which encourages a perspective on teaching beyond the classroom.
• Potential for a more cohesive teaching team if the approach is applied collaboratively.
• May promote professional growth through provision of support to colleagues.

Implementation Challenges

• Time-sensitive feedback.
• Best when applied over the course of a year but difficult to regulate.
• Tension between using evidence as part of an evaluation and for professional growth.

How States Can Get More Information

• Washington ProTeach Portfolio: www.waproteach.org
• PACT Assessment—Teaching Event: www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Home
• National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: www.nbpts.org
• Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio: www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=3769

Research and Resources


APPENDIX E. TRIPOD SURVEYS: STUDENT, TEACHER, AND PARENT SURVEYS

Developer of Product and Services

The Tripod Surveys were developed by Ron Ferguson, Ph.D., at Harvard University, and Cambridge Education.

Description of Product and Services Available

Tripod surveys are one component of the Tripod Project, which aims to improve school capacity to address content, pedagogy, and relationships (the “tripod” of quality teaching) while closing achievement gaps. The surveys are available for students, teachers, and parents. Tripod surveys identify attitudes, perceptions, experiences, and practices in classrooms as they relate to the content knowledge of teachers, the pedagogical knowledge of teachers, and the relationships between teachers and students.

Tripod surveys examine the Seven C’s of quality teaching: care about students, control of student behavior, captivating students, clarifying lessons, challenging students academically, conferring with students, and consolidating knowledge. Tripod surveys are now in their 11th version. Previous research indicates that classrooms with high student ratings on the Seven C’s also produced higher average gains in student achievement. Currently, a modified version of the Tripod student survey is being used as part of the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which is researching the classroom practice of more than 3,000 teachers.

The Tripod student, teacher, and parent surveys were developed for use with teachers in any subject or grade level. The Tripod Project is now offering value-added analysis, using results from Tripod surveys to predict student achievement on state tests.

Training for Use of Product and Services

Resources and research on the Tripod Project can be found at the Materials Archive webpage (www.tripodproject.org/index.php/materials/materials_overview/).

Cost of Product and Services

The Tripod Project offers consulting and support for student, teacher, and parent surveys; analysis and reporting; strategic school improvement planning; and professional development. Consultation services are customized based on client needs. For more information, see the Services and Offerings webpage (www.tripodproject.org/index.php/services/services_overview/).
Advantages and Implementation Challenges

Advantages

- Can be used to report otherwise unobservable factors that may affect teaching, such as knowledge, intentions, expectations, and beliefs.
- Provides the unique perspective of the teacher.
- Provides the perspective of students, who have the greatest amount of experience with teachers.
- Can provide formative information to help teachers improve practice in a way that will connect with students.
- Makes use of the perspectives of students, who may be as capable as adult raters at providing accurate ratings.

Implementation Challenges

- Relies on teacher self-reporting, which may not be accurate.
- Should not be used as the sole or primary measure of teacher evaluation because student ratings have not been validated for use in summative assessment.
- Information on aspects of teaching (e.g., a teacher’s content knowledge, curriculum fulfillment, or professional activities) not available from students.

How States Can Get More Information

States can find more information at the Tripod Project website (www.tripodproject.org) or by contacting Rob Ramsdell (rob.ramsdell@camb-ed-us.com).

Research and Resources


ABOUT THE NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER FOR TEACHER QUALITY

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center) was created to serve as the national resource to which the regional comprehensive centers, states, and other education stakeholders turn for strengthening the quality of teaching—especially in high-poverty, low-performing, and hard-to-staff schools—and for finding guidance in addressing specific needs, thereby ensuring that highly qualified teachers are serving students with special needs.

The TQ Center is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and is a collaborative effort of ETS, Learning Point Associates, and Vanderbilt University. Integral to the TQ Center’s charge is the provision of timely and relevant resources to build the capacity of regional comprehensive centers and states to effectively implement state policy and practice by ensuring that all teachers meet the federal teacher requirements of the current provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act.

The TQ Center is part of the U.S. Department of Education’s Comprehensive Centers program, which includes 16 regional comprehensive centers that provide technical assistance to states within a specified boundary and five content centers that provide expert assistance to benefit states and districts nationwide on key issues related to current provisions of ESEA.