




Developing Teacher/Principal Model Evaluation Systems

Administrator Days, 2012

July 25, 2012



Copyright 2005 by Randy Glasbergen. www.glasbergen.com



“In an increasingly complex world, sometimes old questions require new answers.”

Educator effectiveness reforms

In recent years, national, state, and local educational leaders have come to realize that improving teacher and principal effectiveness is the key to increasing student achievement and developing better school systems.

Put another way--

"...more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor." --Wright, Sanders, and Horn.

How important are effective teachers in generating greater student achievement?

Robert Marzano (2005): *Nearly 60 percent of a school's impact on achievement is attributable to principal and teacher effectiveness. About 35 percent can be credited to teacher effectiveness alone.*

Eric Hanushek (2010): *"The magnitude of the differences is truly large, with some teachers producing 1½ years of gain in achievement in an academic year while others with equivalent students produce only ½ year of gain."*

Meanwhile, effective principals...

- Shape a vision of academic success...
- Create a learning climate...
- Cultivate leadership...
- Focus on instruction...
- Manage people, data, and processes...

"Education research shows that most school variables, considered separately, have at most small effects on learning. The real payoff comes when individual variables combine to reach critical mass. Creating the conditions under which that can occur is the job of the Principal." --Wallace Foundation (2012) .

How important is educator effectiveness to our economic well-being?


- Hanushek (2010): An above average teacher can add more than \$400,000 across a class of 20 students in combined future lifetime earnings each year; ineffective teachers decrease future lifetime earnings across their classes.
- Columbia Business School Study (2011): Students assigned to high “value added” teachers are more likely to go to college and earn higher incomes. On average, having such a teacher for one year raises a child’s total lifetime income by \$9,000.

What does low student achievement cost us?

- OECD Study (2010): Estimates that low student performance as measured by international assessments cost the U.S. between \$500 billion and \$1.3 trillion annually in lower Gross Domestic Product (GDP).
- McKinsey & Company Study (2009): Estimates that the impact on GDP of achievement gaps among American students may exceed \$2 trillion, “...the economic equivalent of a permanent national recession.”

What can be done to enhance educator effectiveness

- ✓ Statewide **performance standards**.
- ✓ Standards-based accountability for **educator preparation** and **initial certification**.
- ✓ Strong **induction** and **mentoring**.
- ✓ Targeted **professional development**.
- ✓ Standards-based **evaluation**.
- ✓ **Compensation** and **incentives**.
- ✓ Improved **Working conditions**.



Nebraska's Performance Framework

- State Board of Education authorized the drafting of teacher and principal performance standards in January, 2011.
- Drafting and Editing Committees developed drafts which were refined by the Board's Accountability Subcommittee.
- Board adopted in November, 2011, as the **Nebraska Teacher and Principal Performance Framework**.

Teacher topics

- *Foundational Knowledge*
- *Planning and Preparation*
- *The Learning Environment*
- *Instructional Strategies*
- *Assessment*
- *Professionalism*
- *Vision and Collaboration*

Principal topics

- *Vision for Learning*
- *Continuous School Improvement*
- *Instructional Leadership*
- *Culture for Learning*
- *Systems Management*
- *Staff Leadership*
- *Developing Relationships*
- *Professional Ethics and Advocacy*

Integrated themes in the Framework

- ✓ *High expectations for student learning.*
- ✓ *A commitment to teacher and principal accountability for results.*
- ✓ *Awareness of the individual circumstances of each student in light of the increasing diversity of our state's population.*
- ✓ *The integration of technology.*

What's next?

Now that the Performance Framework has been adopted, what's next for educator effectiveness policies in Nebraska?

In February, NDE staff presented options to the State Board for developing model teacher and principal evaluation systems for Nebraska districts.

Problems with current evaluation practices

New Teacher Project studied 15,000 teachers across the U.S. and found what they termed “the widget effect”:

- *Nearly all teachers received high ratings.*
- *Districts failed to recognize and reward excellence.*
- *Professional development was not tied to evaluation.*
- *New teachers routinely were rated above satisfactory and seldom denied tenure.*
- *Poor performance rarely led to dismissal.*

“School districts fail to acknowledge or act on differences in teacher performance almost entirely. ...a culture of indifference about the quality of instruction in each classroom dominates.” -- The Widget Effect (2009)

Problems with current evaluation practices

Follow-up report, “Teacher Evaluation 2.0” (2010) noted:

- **Infrequent...**
- **Unfocused...**
- **Undifferentiated...**
- **Unhelpful...**
- **Inconsequential...**

“...our system of teacher evaluation...frustrates teachers who feel that their good work goes unrecognized and ignores other teachers who would benefit from additional support.” --Education Secretary Arne Duncan (2010)

What should good evaluation look like?

New Teacher Project’s “design standards” for teacher evaluation systems:

- *All teachers evaluated annually.*
- *Clear instructional standards that prioritize student learning.*
- *Multiple ratings to differentiate performance levels.*
- *Frequent observation and constructive, critical feedback.*
- *Should be a major factor in employment decisions.*

“...school districts must begin to distinguish great from good, good from fair, and fair from poor. Effective teaching must be recognized; ineffective teaching must be addressed.” –Widget Effect (2009)

Improving evaluation: the federal view

NCLB waiver requirements (Fall, 2011):

- *Teacher and principal evaluations designed for instructional improvement.*
- *Differentiation of performance, not just “Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory”.*
- *Multiple measures of performance including significant use of student growth data.*
- *Evaluation of teachers and principals on a regular basis.*
- *Clear, timely and useful feedback.*
- *Use of evaluation to inform personnel decisions.*

(Proposed House ESEA requirements very similar.)

Gates Foundation MET Study

Gates Foundation’s Measures of Teacher Effectiveness Study (MET) found a combination of **three evaluation components** that are key to predicting teacher effectiveness:

- *Multiple observations by trained observers based on an instructional framework with clear expectations.*
- *Student perceptions of teacher effectiveness (surveys).*
- *Multiple measures of student achievement.*

“The best way to ensure that the evaluation system is providing valid and reliable feedback is to verify that – on average – those who shine in their evaluations are producing larger student achievement gains.”
–MET Study Report (2010)

State evaluation initiatives

- **Thirty-two states** have significantly changed teacher evaluation policies in last three years.
- **Twenty-three states** enacted 42 new laws regarding school leadership in the 2010 legislative sessions alone.
- **Twenty-four states** now require annual evaluation of all teachers.
- **Twenty-three states** require teacher evaluations to include objective measures of student learning in the form of growth or value-added data.
- **Seventeen states** require student achievement or growth data to be a significant factor or the preponderant factor in teacher evaluation.

State approaches to evaluation

- **State-mandated evaluation systems.** All districts must adopt. Ex. Delaware, South Carolina.
- **Elective State-level systems.** Very detailed state requirements, but local districts may create equivalent system. Ex. New York, Colorado.
- **State models for district systems.** Responsibility for designing evaluation is local, but state provides a model that can be adopted. Ex. Massachusetts, Minnesota.
- **State guidelines for district systems:** Local districts required to develop system within State guidelines. Ex. Iowa, Washington State.

Nebraska's current evaluation requirements

- **Sec. 79-828** requires probationary certificated employees to be evaluated each semester based on a full period observation. No requirement for tenured employees.
- **NDE's Rule 10** requires school districts to develop a Board policy for evaluating certificated staff on instructional performance, classroom organization and management, and personal and professional conduct. Rules includes some procedural requirements.
- **Nebraska Teacher and Principal Performance Framework** provides effective practices as voluntary guidelines for districts.

What Nebraska doesn't require

- *Frequent evaluations of tenured staff.*
- *Clear, rigorous expectations for teachers and principals.*
- *Multiple measures of teacher/principal performance.*
- *Differentiation in performance ratings.*
- *Regular feedback other than to probationary teachers and principals.*
- *Use of evaluation data in employment decisions other than dismissal.*

Commissioner's survey of Superintendents

- Would you support the development of a model teacher evaluation system based on the Teacher Performance Framework?

Yes: 70.7% (145 responses)

No: 29.3% (60 responses)

- Would you support the development of a model principal evaluation system based on the Principal Performance Framework?

Yes: 72.9% (148 responses)

No: 27.1% (55 responses)

Stakeholder Committee views

If State evaluation models are developed, what components should be included?

- *Clear statement that teachers and principals are responsible for student achievement.*
- *Multiple measures of student growth.*
- *Should be responsive to educator performance at different career stages.*
- *Professional development component.*
- *Mixed views on use of student/parents surveys (some favored; some concerned about bias.)*

Survey of NSEA local association leaders

- Would you favor or oppose the development of a **model teacher evaluation system** based on the Teacher Performance Framework that local districts could choose to adopt or adapt?

• Favor: 57.4% (54 responses)

• Oppose: 24.5% (23 responses)

Typical Comment: *"I believe this ... would be a good compromise, giving districts a well-developed model, but still allowing them to choose those pieces that work best for their situation."*

Survey of NSEA local association Leaders

➤ If a model teacher evaluation system were developed, would you favor/oppose including these **components**:

(1) **Observation rubrics** based on the Nebraska Teacher Performance Framework.

Favor: 66.7% (62 responses)
Oppose: 21.4% (20 responses)

(2) **Student achievement measures:**

Favor: 14.0% (13 responses)
Oppose: 77.4% (72 responses)

(3) **Student perception surveys:**

Favor: 24.7% (23 responses)
Oppose: 64.5% (60 responses)

State Board's February decision

Authorized NDE to develop teacher and principal evaluation models for voluntary use by local districts.

- *Stressed purpose of evaluation is instructional improvement.*
- *Include student learning component, multiple measures of student growth, multiple observations, student/staff/parent perceptions.*
- *Build on what schools already have in place.*
- *Bring in local and outside expertise (vendors)*

Target and purposes

- **Target Educators:** *Like Performance Framework, models designed for classroom teacher and principals -- those working directly with students in the classroom.*
- **Purposes:** *Models should serve both formative and summative purposes and provide for multiple measures of evaluating professional practice.*

Possible model evaluation components

- *Definition of teacher/principal effectiveness (Nebraska Performance Framework)*
- *Summative evaluation documents – rubrics based on Framework.*
- *Instructional/leadership practices framework/Observation protocols.*
- *Student learning measures.*
- *Student/staff feedback measures.*
- *Collections of supporting evidence/artifacts.*
- *Self-Assessment/goal-setting procedures.*
- *Professional development plans.*
- *Support/Remediation plans.*

Evaluation process elements

- *Frequency of observation and evaluation.*
- *Levels of performance/ratings.*
- *Weighting of components.*
- *Professional growth linked to performance.*
- *Levels of remediation/support.*
- *Conferencing protocols.*
- *Use of technology for observation and professional development.*

Initial planning timeline

- **Phase I – Leadership/Steering Committee: Spring, Summer, Fall, 2012.**
- **Phase II – Design/training process: 2012-13.**
- **Phase III -- Pilot school implementation in 2013-14.**
- **Phase IV – Full availability to districts: 2014-15.**

Model development participants

- **Leadership Committee**— *Develop recommendations for State Board on structure/components of evaluation models. Serve as Steering Committee for the project.*
- **Rubric-Writing Committee**— *Develop broad, summative rubrics for the Nebraska Performance Framework; refine the Effective Practices by describing critical attributes and performance levels.*
- **Pilot/Design Teams.** *Take the recommendations of the Leadership Committee and translate into specific instruments and processes. Teams include ESU staff developers and technology coordinators.*


Implementation plans

- **Pilot implementation**— *Piloting phase beginning in 2013-14. Twenty-two volunteer pilot districts have been identified; more may be added.*
- **Training of evaluators** — *Assistance from ESU staff developers.*
- **Training for teacher/principals** — *Must understand requirements of the models. ESU's to play major role.*
- **Technology**— *Working with ESU technology coordinators on making the models user friendly.*
- **Costs** — *Anticipated that districts will have to cover most of costs, but costs should not be great.*

Current committee work

- **April 18-19**— *Dr. Laura Goe on evaluation models and measures.*
- **May 31-June 1** — *Leadership Committee on models from other states; Nebraska districts.*
- **June 25-26** -- *Framework Committee: rubric-writing.*
- **July 16-17**— *Leadership Committee on instructional frameworks, Nebraska Framework. Charlotte Danielson/Michael Toth presentations.*
- **August 27-28** — *Leadership Committee on student learning measures, feedback measures.*
- **September 13**— *Leadership Committee on Principal evaluation.*
- **October 2 or 3**— *Leadership Committee develops recommendations for State Board.*
- **October-November** — *State Board considers recommendations.*

© Randy Glasbergen, www.glasbergen.com



"You're certainly entitled to your opinion."

What do you think?

What would you like to see come out of this effort?

What would be most helpful to your district?

What concerns do you have?

THANKS for joining us today.

Please offer your comments to us at:

Donlynn Rice: donlynn.rice@nebraska.gov

Jim Havelka: jhavelka@gpcom.net

And have a safe trip home.
