

# Making Meaningful Use of Teacher Effectiveness Data

## Measuring Teacher Effectiveness\*

### Observation-based measures of teaching performance

#### BENEFITS AS AN EVALUATION MEASURE

Standards-based instructional rubrics:

- + Give teachers and principals common language about clear expectations of good teaching
- + Directly assess teachers' classroom and other work behaviors
- + Can yield constructive feedback
- + Tend to be perceived as credible measures by teachers and principal

#### CONCERNS AS AN EVALUATION MEASURE

- Most reliable with multiple observers and more than four observations
- Observations and post-conferences are very time- and labor-intensive, and different observers (with different content backgrounds) may have different perceptions
- Often little variation in the scores awarded by principals, who may be overly lenient

### Measures of teacher contributions to student learning

#### BENEFITS AS AN EVALUATION MEASURE

- + Teacher-level value-added/growth (VA/G) and student learning objective (SLO) scores are based on the academic growth of students
- + SLO processes seek to promote best teaching practices (e.g., goal setting, formative assessment, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction)
- + Production of VA/G scores doesn't require additional work from teachers or principals

#### CONCERNS AS AN EVALUATION MEASURE

VA/G scores:

- Prioritize standardized test scores and tested subjects
- Are dependent on the timing of test score release
- Don't necessarily indicate if student results are due to school, peers, teacher, or other factors
- May be sensitive to the nonrandom assignment of students to teachers
- Vary year to year and by test instrument
- Have limited value in identifying next steps for teacher

SLOs:

- Aren't standardized or comparable across contexts
- Quality/rigor of implementation varies



## Collecting and Accessing Teacher Effectiveness Data

#### DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS

- + Districts and schools collect and manage new data from their teacher effectiveness measures/processes
- + Principals have ongoing access to multiple years of teacher results in a centralized, integrated data system, enabling them to systematically track performance, analyze scores across teachers and across time, and identify areas of greatest need
- + Knowledgeable, trained principals ultimately access the right amount of the right type of data at the right time, and know which data to use to inform the various decisions they need to make

#### KEY CONCERNS

- Overwhelming demands on principals' time, particularly if tasks aren't distributed to other capable members of the school community or if results from different teacher measures must be stored/accessed separately. (Many principals design their own spreadsheets, often by cutting/pasting from multiple reports.)
- The annual timing of teacher-level results can be a problem; although observations are conducted/scored throughout the year, they often aren't compiled/summarized until end of school year, at the same time that standardized and end-of-course tests and student/parent perception surveys are administered, thus delaying final teacher scores until the summer/fall.



## Using Teacher Effectiveness Data

### More targeted professional development

#### DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS

- + Principals, aware of the full range of available supports for teachers, use recent results from teacher measures to recommend specific learning opportunities in teachers' specific areas of need (with supports aligned with the indicators on the district/school's instructional framework or rubric)
- + Multiple learning opportunities are available, such as coaching/mentoring and/or the modeling of best practices, or online videos, suggested readings, or workshops offered by the district
- + School/district leaders track teachers' PD participation over time

#### KEY CONCERNS

- Principals may be impeded by a lack of time or financial resources or inadequate training around how to align support with teachers' needs, and/or the district may lack the systems to facilitate such connection

### More strategic assignment

#### DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS

- + Principals use recent results from teacher effectiveness measures to strategically place their teachers in the subjects and grades where they can be most effective (with the students who need them most)
- + District and school leaders use results to identify potential teacher leaders

#### KEY CONCERNS

- Relevant effectiveness data may not be available when decisions must be made, or principals may lack the capacity to assign teachers to subjects, grades, and students and/or grant teacher leadership responsibilities

### More selective retention

#### DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS

- + Principals have honest (sometimes difficult) performance conversations with teachers (supported by evidence that's well documented over time), and do not renew contracts for those who consistently fail to show improvement

#### KEY CONCERNS

- Relevant effectiveness data may not be available when retention decisions must be made, or principals may lack the capacity to document the appropriate level of evidence to support dismissal

STUDENTS  
BENEFIT

\* Results from these different measures tend to have low positive correlations, suggesting that although related, each may capture some distinct, unique dimension of effective teaching.

## Measuring Teacher Effectiveness

American Statistical Association. (2014). *ASA statement on using value-added models for educational assessment*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Available online at [https://www.amstat.org/policy/pdfs/ASA\\_VAM\\_Statement.pdf](https://www.amstat.org/policy/pdfs/ASA_VAM_Statement.pdf).

Balch, R. (2012). *The validation of a student survey on teacher practice*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. Available online at <http://mystudentsurvey.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Balch-Student-Surveys-2012.pdf>.

Bell, C. A., Gitomer, D. H., McCaffrey, D. F., Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., & Qi, Y. (2012). An argument approach to observation protocol validity. *Educational Assessment*, 17(2–3), 62–87.

Cantrell, S., & Kane, T. J. (2013). *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET project's three-year study*. Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Available online at [http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET\\_Ensuring\\_Fair\\_and\\_Reliable\\_Measures\\_Practitioner\\_Brief.pdf](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf).

Gill, B., Bruch, J., & Booker, K. (2013). *Using alternative student growth measures for evaluating teacher performance: What the literature says* (REL 2013–002). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, REL Mid-Atlantic. Available online at <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544205.pdf>.

Gill, B., English, B., Furgeson, J., & McCullough, M. (2014). *Alternative student growth measures for teacher evaluation: Profiles of early-adopting districts* (REL 2014–016). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, REL Mid-Atlantic. Available online at <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544797.pdf>.

Ho, A. D., & Kane, T. J. (2013). *The reliability of classroom observations by school personnel*. Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Available online at [http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET\\_Reliability\\_of\\_Classroom\\_Observations\\_Research\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Reliability_of_Classroom_Observations_Research_Paper.pdf).

Lacireno-Paquet, N., Morgan, C., & Mello, D. (2014). *How states use student learning objectives in teacher evaluation systems: A review of state websites* (REL 2014–013). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, REL Northeast & Islands. Available online at [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL\\_2014013.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2014013.pdf).

Lazarev, V., Newman, D., & Sharp, A. (2014). *Properties of the multiple measures in Arizona's teacher evaluation model* (REL 2015–050). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, REL West. Available online at [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/west/pdf/REL\\_2014050.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/west/pdf/REL_2014050.pdf).

Riordan, J., Lacireno-Paquet, N., Shakman, K., Bocala, C., & Chang, Q. (2015). *Redesigning teacher evaluation: Lessons from a pilot implementation* (REL 2015–030). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, REL Northeast & Islands. Available online at [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL\\_2015030.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northeast/pdf/REL_2015030.pdf).

Ruffini, S., Makkonen, R., Tejwani, J., & Diaz, M. (2014). *Principal and teacher perceptions of implementation of multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems in Arizona* (REL 2015–062). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, REL West. Available online at [http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/west/pdf/REL\\_2015062.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/west/pdf/REL_2015062.pdf).

## Collecting and Accessing Teacher Effectiveness Data

Grissom, J. A., Rubin, M., Goldring, E. B., Cannata, M., Drake, T., Neumerski, C., & Schuermann, P. (2014). *Central office supports for data-driven talent management decisions: Evidence from the implementation of new systems for measuring teacher effectiveness*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. Available online at <http://principaldatase.org/assets/files/additional/District-Supports.pdf>.

Pickens-Jewell, C., Makowsky, L., Hallgren, K., & Hartog, J. (2014). *Changing education agencies from the inside out: Year 2 report on the Strategic Data Project and Education Pioneers*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research. Available online at [http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/~media/publications/pdfs/education/sdp\\_ep\\_year2.pdf](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/~media/publications/pdfs/education/sdp_ep_year2.pdf).

Supovitz, J., & Klein, V. (2003). *Mapping a course for improved student learning: How innovative schools systematically use student performance data to guide improvement*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Available online at <http://www.cpre.org/mapping-course-improved-student-learning-how-innovative-schools-systematically-use-student-performan>.

## Using Teacher Effectiveness Data

Coburn, C. E., & Turner, E. O. (2011). Research on data use: A framework and analysis. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 9(4), 173–206.

Cohen-Vogel, L. (2011). Staffing to the test: Are today's school personnel practices evidence based? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 33(4), 483–505.

Goldring, E. B., Neumerski, C. M., Cannata, M., Drake, T. A., Grissom, J. A., Rubin, M., & Schuermann, P. (2014). *Principals' use of teacher effectiveness data for talent management decisions*. Nashville, TN: Peabody College of Education and Human Development at Vanderbilt University. Available online at <http://principaldatase.org/assets/files/reports/Summary-Report-201405.pdf>.

Marsh, J. A. (2012). Interventions promoting educators' use of data: Research insights and gaps. *Teachers College Record*, 114(11), 1–48.

Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628–3651. Alternate version available online at [http://educationnext.org/files/ednext\\_20124\\_taylor Tyler.pdf](http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_20124_taylor Tyler.pdf).