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ABSTRACT

TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AND EXPERIENCE

COMPARING EVALUATION RATINGS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Janice Marie Garnett, Ed.D.
University of Nebraska, 2013
Advisor: Dr. Kay A. Keiser, Ed.D.

There is a growing body of research that suggests that teachers’ on the job performance has an impact on improving student learning. A teacher’s effectiveness is the most important factor that impacts student learning greater than any other attribute in the school system (Goldhaber, Anthony, & Urban Inst, 2005; Marzano, 2000; Mathers & Olivia, 2008; Sanders, Wright, & Horn, 1997).

The purpose of this quantitative study was to discover and describe the relationship of teacher experience and evaluation ratings aligned with student achievement results in a public school setting. The research question guiding this study: Is there a significant relationship between teacher effect data in elementary school mathematics and reading and a teacher’s years of experience and performance ratings?

The documents gathered for this study included teacher summary evaluation reports that reflected the overall score on the Framework for Effective Teaching, teacher demographic data was used to determine years of experience of each teacher selected for the study, and disaggregated test results for students who have completed fourth grade
assessments in reading and mathematics for one school year were analyzed. Descriptive statistics were generated on each of the research questions.

Implications of the research worth further examination: 1) school districts should utilize comprehensive and robust teaching frameworks, 2) districts will need to ensure that specific expectations through standards are stated through specific communication and feedback with teachers and the evaluators, and 3) a supervision process that empowers teachers to develop expertise through a differentiated approach could lead to increase student success.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Teacher contribution to student achievement is widely researched and recognized in the education community. A teacher’s effectiveness is the most important factor that impacts student learning greater than any other attribute in the school system (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2005; Marzano, 2000; Mathers & Olivia, 2008; Sanders, Wright, & Horn, 1997). Student achievement is much less related to demographic characteristics than it is to student access to appropriate, quality instruction (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Therefore, schools should focus on developing teachers to enhance their effectiveness in order to increase student achievement. According to Donaldson (2009), a potential exists to develop teachers through an effective supervision and evaluation process.

Teaching evaluation is a necessary process in any educational setting. There are a number of tools or instruments available that can be used to assess the level of effectiveness of teachers. Evaluations can be used for formative and summative purposes. Popham (2013) defines formative teacher evaluation as “evaluation activities directed toward the improvement of the teacher’s ongoing instruction” (p. 17). Formative evaluation focuses on helping teachers grow instructionally effective. On the other hand summative evaluation refers to the appraisal of a teacher aimed at making a decision such as (1) reward for performance, (2) continued employment, and/or (3) develop a plan of assistance (Popham, 2013). It appears as though the ultimate goal of both evaluation types is to provide high quality teachers in every classroom. Several studies show that the difference for students between having a very effective or very ineffective teacher can
represent more than a year’s worth of learning growth. But evidence on which specific teacher characteristics predict classroom effectiveness remains, to a large extent, unanswered or validated. While there seems to be consensus in the literature that teacher effectiveness is the most important factor in the classroom that impacts student achievement, there is little consensus on how to effectively impact teacher effectiveness through teacher evaluation. Marzano (2010) believes that schools need to maximize the effects teachers have on student learning by focusing teacher efforts on not only learning high probability strategies but how and when to deliver them as well. In essence, to some degree, everything that teachers carry out in their classrooms happens as expected (Hattie, 2009) still a key to improving student achievement is implementing practices that have the best chance for success.

A quandary facing teacher evaluation reform is to design a process that not only ensures the quality of teaching but also influences teacher growth and improves student achievement. The design of the instrument should merge opportunities for teachers to grow professionally while, at the same time, completing the required components that will allow evaluators to make judgments regarding the quality of teaching and future employment status. Clear and coherent definitions of exemplary practice such as those developed in Enhancing Professional Practices: A Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 1996) and how they will be assessed are central to the idea of teacher quality assurance. Professional growth must allow a teacher the opportunity to reflect on their practice, work collaboratively with others in the profession and to use self-assessment and self-directed inquiry (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).
Research (Brandt, 1996; Egelson, 1994) suggests that without appropriate professional development opportunities, instructional support and guidance, and proactive teacher evaluation and supervision, any educational restructuring effort is doomed to failure. Donaldson (2009) conveys that, “Historically, teacher evaluation has not substantially improved instruction or expanded student learning” (p. 1), however, Mathers and Olivia (2008) believe that "the role of teacher evaluation has surfaced only recently as an underutilized resource that might hold promise as a tool to promote teacher professional growth and measure teacher effectiveness in the classroom" (p. 1). As supervision and evaluation models have evolved, researchers have tussled with the creation of a systematic process that generates practical feedback that addresses the uniqueness and complexities of teaching. Schmoker (1992) states that, “research has finally told us what many of us suspected all along: that conventional evaluation, the kind of overwhelming majority of American teachers undergo, does not have any measurable impact on the quality of student learning. Schmoker (1992) also states that “in most cases, it is a waste of time” (p. 24). Only a few models have been identified that are proven to be manageable for supervisors and that lead to teacher development. Marshall (2005) believes that current supervision and evaluation processes do not “prod teacher's to emerge from their isolation and reflect with their colleagues on what they need to change in order for more students to succeed” (p. 730). According to Marzano, Frontier, and Livingston (2011), there is a need to implement teacher supervision and evaluation process that;

- Includes a well-articulated knowledge base for teaching,
• Has focused feedback and practice,
• Offers opportunities to observe and discuss expertise,
• Provides clear criteria and a plan for success, and
• Presents recognition of expertise.

This study addressed how teacher evaluation is conducted through a sample of teacher and student data and the analysis of an urban school district’s teacher evaluation policies and methods. The teachers chosen for the study were fourth grade teachers who administer the Nebraska state reading and mathematics tests. These teachers have been teaching for at least one year or more in the district.

A National Context

Teacher quality is also the focus of significant national efforts and investments. Federal programs like Race to the Top and the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) represent ambitious attempts to recognize, reward, and encourage effective teaching. The federal investment, totaling approximately $100 billion, is mirrored by similar philanthropic efforts. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation invested hundreds of millions of dollars in an attempt to jump start teacher policy reforms in a number of “deep dive” school districts (districts in which Gates is working closely to implement changes to teacher policy and to assess the implications of those changes), and its Measures of Effective Teaching study focused on assessing the relationship between various methods of evaluating teachers and student achievement. A growing body of quantitative research supports the focus on teacher effectiveness. This research shows teaching to be the most important school-based factor influencing student performance (Aaronson, Barrow, &
Sanders, 2007; Rivkin et al., 2005). The means to improve the effectiveness of the
teacher workforce, however, is not straightforward; experience, degrees, and
credentials—factors that typically determine teacher employment eligibility and
compensation—do not adequately explain effectiveness. In addition, teacher evaluation
systems typically do not recognize the significant variation we know exists amongst
teachers (Goldhaber, 2010). However, consensus has not been reached on how to
measure an individual teacher's effectiveness. Recently, teacher supervision and
evaluation has become a topic of debate in the media on how to improve the American
education system. Newsweek (March 15, 2010) portrayed a blackboard with the words
written across it “We must fire bad teachers …“The Key to Saving American Education.”

In recent years, research (Darling-Hammond, Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein,
2012) cited that evidence of teacher contributions to student learning should be a
component of teacher evaluation systems. Thus, valued-added models (VAMs) were
designed as tools to promote the notion to evaluate student test score gains over one year
span to determine the teacher’s effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). VAMs
were used to measure changes in student scores over time however; consideration was
given to student characteristics and other factor which may influence achievement
(Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). Ongoing research in this area reveals that growth in
student learning is measured by more than the teacher solely. Darling-Hammond, et al.
(2012), pg. 8 identified other factors which include:
School factors such as class sizes, curriculum materials, instructional time, availability of specialists and tutors, and resources for learning (books, computers, science labs, and more);

- Home and community supports or challenges;
- Individual student needs and abilities, health, and attendance;
- Peer culture and achievement;
- Prior teachers and schooling, as well as other current teachers;
- Differential summer learning loss, which especially affects low-income children.

- The specific tests used, which emphasize some kinds of learning and not others and which rarely measure achievement that is well above or below grade level.

Conversely, value added models are not designed to measure the majority of these factors presented in the findings. Therefore, the federal government, state education departments and local school districts are searching for the best method to move teachers from being highly qualified to highly effective.

A State Context

Extensive progress has been made in the past decade in creating meaningful teacher evaluation systems in K-12 education to improve teacher performance. There is a wide variety among states as to the types of teacher standards that have been adopted and the uses for those standards. States are either unique or illustrative in terms of their standards’ content or the use of those standards. States such as Florida, Virginia, and
Massachusetts demonstrate the different ways in which standards are developed or organized. Florida uses generic standards based on the 1992 INTASC standards. These standards target three benchmark career levels: (1) pre-professional, (2) professional, and (3) accomplished. Each standard is defined by a list of sample key indicators appropriate to the benchmark level. Virginia combines both general and specific standards for use in teacher preparation. General standards have been adopted and supporting standards for specific disciplines and specialized areas are organized under the general standards. Massachusetts has a limited set of standards for teacher preparation and initial licensure. However, local school committees are required to develop performance standards for their schools collaboratively with the collective bargaining units.

Several states have developed or adopted national standards for use in teacher evaluation systems. The Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson is the foundation for evaluation systems in Delaware and Idaho. The four domains are used with the addition of a fifth domain, Student Improvement. In Idaho, legislation requires each school district to adopt a teacher evaluation system aligned to the state’s performance standards based on the Danielson Framework. Nebraska, Wisconsin and Iowa provide examples of comprehensive standards based approaches to review as the state began the process of adopting teacher and principal standards. Wisconsin’s standards are the basis for licensure and for professional development related to relicensure. Iowa’s system is a comprehensive approach that includes state supported mentoring and induction; standards based evaluation, and ongoing professional development.
In 2010, Nebraska Department of Education began the process of developing standards for both teachers and principals. Nebraska State Statute, Section 79-808 states” The fundamental power of the State Board of Education to set standards for professional educators comes from its duty to issue professional certificates”. Rule 10 outlines various standards for teaching or specialist assignment and Rules 20, 21, 23, and 24 dealt with training teachers and administrators and issuing certificates and endorsements in Nebraska. However, the criteria outlined in Rule 10 are not further defined or referenced to the competency requirements in Rule 27. Therefore, Nebraska Department of Education made a recommendation to the State Board to adopt one or more sets of professional standards that could be used for purposes of i.e. (1) initial certification, (2) teacher and administrator evaluation, (3) professional development, and (4) recertification. During December 2010, approximately 25 representatives from various educational groups participated in the Educator Effectiveness Stakeholder Committee. The purpose of the committee was to identify purposes and structure for statewide teacher and principal performance standards and to make recommendations to the Nebraska State Board of Education (NSBE) and Nebraska Department of Education (NDE). A Standards Drafting Committee was formed in 2011 which created standards for statewide teacher and principal performance. The following standards were adopted by the NSBE (November 9, 2011) (see Appendix A).

With standards established, NDE selected school districts to participate in the piloting of evaluation models. Danielson’s and Marzano’s instructional frameworks were
recommended to the State Board to use in the Nebraska model. Both instructional frameworks align well with the Nebraska framework.

**A Local Context**

Danielson (2007) underscores the need for a standards based framework, “Without a framework, the structure is reduced to whatever the mentor, coach or supervisor has in her head, and it thus reflects the personal beliefs that individual holds about teaching, regardless of whether these have ever been made explicit” (p. 12). For that reason, it is important that teacher supervision and evaluation models incorporate a standards based framework that delivers relevant feedback to teachers with the goal of teacher improvement. Danielson (1996) states that recently standards based teacher evaluation practices have emerged to be a primary source of teacher evaluation and feedback. Teacher evaluation is a vehicle for providing the feedback, direction, and supervision needed to assist teachers in successfully changing how they teach. To accomplish this, teacher evaluation must stay in step with the educational reform movement.

This Midwestern urban public school district in the study had a strong foundation for the qualitative measures of teacher effectiveness. Teacher evaluation is a key factor in teacher preparation and professional development. The research-based evaluation system was developed in collaboration with the teacher union, based on Charlotte Danielson’s framework. The school district is a nationally-recognized leader in the area of teacher evaluation. In 2009, the school district participated as part of a panel that testified during a Congressional briefing in Washington, D.C., on measuring teacher effectiveness due to
its work with teacher evaluation. The district’s previous teacher appraisal system was in existence for 15 years. It reflected educators’ beliefs about successful teaching at that time. This traditional approach to teacher evaluation was no longer adequate as it did not reflect teachers’ need to actively contribute in the appraisal process. The evaluation process should serve as a tool to support teacher improvement and continual growth. Clearly, the goals for student achievement, including closing the existing learning gap, have evolved and, as a result, have impacted the standards defining teacher effectiveness. Consequently, the description of successful teaching performance and its evaluation required revisions to reflect current expectations. Approximately nine years ago, the school district implemented the Framework for Effective Teaching. The framework is grounded in the wisdom of experienced classroom teachers and based on extensive research, 22 critical components of teaching are identified. As a way of organizing the complexity of teaching, the 22 components are sorted into four major domains, each devoted to a distinct aspect of teaching (Danielson, 1996). The framework rates teachers against 57 criteria that are grouped into 4 domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. For each criterion, the teacher is rated across one of four levels: Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, and Unsatisfactory. Accompanying each criterion is a detailed description of required performance to achieve the level of performance. Utilizing this framework, evaluators (primarily principals and assistant principals) currently evaluate pre-tenure teachers annually and tenured teachers every three years. The framework provided common language for teachers to receive feedback to aid them in improving specific components
within each Domain. The framework is specifically designed to meet the needs of an urban school district. The school district’s framework identified 23 critical components of teaching; sorted into four major domains, and 76 criteria which are categorized into the 4 domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction and Professional and Leadership Responsibilities. The process is designed to measure teacher performance across five levels: Exemplary, Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, and Unsatisfactory. The district’s Framework for Effective Teaching was piloted in spring of 2003, implemented in fall of 2003 and revised in 2010: The revised Framework for Effective Teaching included five levels of performance (see Appendix B).

The process required teachers to conduct a self-evaluation. The role of the evaluators was to conduct two to three classroom observations throughout the year. Classroom observations were followed by post observation conferences to discuss ways for teachers to improve on specific areas identified through one of the 76 elements. Evaluators also relied on classroom artifacts to gain additional information for those areas which are not visible in a classroom setting. The school district’s appraisal system depended on qualitative inputs (classroom observations, walk-throughs, and artifacts) to measure teacher effectiveness. Student test scores or value-added metrics were not included as quantitative measures for the evaluation of teachers. In the future, defining a process and tools that meet both criteria (qualitative and quantitative) may be the key to developing effective teachers in the District.

While the foundation for the appraisal system is strong, application of the evaluation framework can at times be inconsistent. Currently ratings on teacher
evaluations appear correlated with teacher experience and education level. Preliminary data indicated that the more experience teachers have and the higher degree level, it is likely that the teacher is rated higher on his/her evaluations. It called for more exploration to be determined if indeed experience correlated with higher student achievement gains.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher evaluation ratings of fourth grade teachers and the correlations with the ratings and years of experience with student achievement results in mathematics and reading in the public school district. The research conducted through a quantitative study of the NeSA-Mathematics and NeSA-Reading scores of fourth grade students in classrooms of teachers with one or more years of experience. This study was designed to determine if teacher evaluation and teacher experience lead to teacher effectiveness in increasing student test scores.

One of the initial driving forces behind this study was to find a process that aided teacher evaluation beyond the qualitative measures that were currently in place. As detailed in the literature review, many current practices of teacher evaluation are ineffective and inefficient. Thus, this study attempted to review the correlation that would not replace formal teacher evaluations but would help teachers and administrators incorporate quantitative measures to enhance the current evaluation process and improve teacher effectiveness to increase student achievement. Most available literature focused on teacher evaluation processes. Some recent literature described new developments in teacher effectiveness. This study described the impact of a potential teacher’s ratings and
years of experience influence on student learning to further investigate strategies to close the achievement gap.

**Research Questions**

**Research Question 1.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

**Research Question 2.** Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and student scores on the state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

**Research Question 3.** Was there a correlation between teachers’ years of experience and their instructional observation ratings?

**Definition of Terms**

The researcher chose to define some of the following terms to clarify them during the study. Some terms were defined in the literature review, and in that occurrences, sources were cited. For consistency of interpretation, the following terms were defined:

**Classroom Observations.** Classroom observations measure the strategies that teachers use in their classroom and can be used for formative purposes such as providing direction for teachers to strengthen their practice in targeted areas. Research indicated that observation is important to teacher evaluation because teachers must demonstrate that they can perform certain pre-established competencies, such as lesson presentation and classroom management (Clark, 1993).

**Formative evaluation.** This feedback is part of an evaluative process that is designed to assist professionals to perform to higher levels of mastery across the continuum of growth.
**Framework for Teaching.** The Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility:

1. Planning and Preparation
2. Classroom Environment
3. Instruction
4. Professional Responsibilities

Each component defines a distinct aspect of a domain; two to five elements describe a specific feature of a component. Levels of teaching performance (rubrics) describe each component and provide a roadmap for improvement of teaching (see Appendix B).

**NeSA-Mathematics.** The *Nebraska State Accountability-Mathematics* (NeSA-M) is a statewide, mandated testing program. The tests are given in grades 3 through 8 and 11. They consist of multiple-choice tests in the core subject of mathematics. The NeSA-M measures student achievement based on Nebraska’s content standards. All questions are written and reviewed by Nebraska educators for content and sensitivity (Report Alignment Analysis of Nebraska Content Standards and Indicators and The Nebraska State Accountability- Mathematics (NeSA-M) Grades 3- 8 and 11, October, 2010).

**NeSA-Reading.** The new Nebraska State reading test, known as NeSA-R, was piloted in several Nebraska school districts prior to implementation. Starting in the 2009-10 school year, the NeSA-R test will fully replace the Nebraska STARS reading test. NeSA-
Reading will be given statewide to 3rd through 8th grades, and high school. NeSA-R will measure progress in new Nebraska reading standards that focus on integrating technology and building critical thinking skills. Student performance on this new online reading test will be reported by a total reading score, reading comprehension, and vocabulary (NDE website).

**Non-tenured teacher.** According to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 79-828 (2004) defined a probationary certificated employee as a teacher who has served under a contract with a school district for less than three consecutive schools years in any district and is employed one-half time or more by a school district.

**Performance rubric.** Levels of teaching performance (rubrics) describe each component and provide a roadmap for improvement of teaching (Danielson, 2011).

**Summative evaluation.** This feedback is in the form of an evaluation that is provided to a teacher from an administrator for the purpose of judging levels of performance as measured at the end of an appraisal cycle.

**Teacher effectiveness.** Teacher effectiveness is defined in broad statements which may be the reason multiple methods for evaluating teachers exist today. The different measures are: (1) principal evaluations; (2) analyses of classroom artifacts (i.e., ratings of teacher assignments and student work); (3) teaching portfolios; (4) teacher self-reports of practice, including surveys, teaching logs, and interviews; and (5) student ratings of teacher performance (National Comprehensive Center For Teacher Quality, 2009).

**Teacher evaluation.** Popham (2013, p.1) defines formative teacher evaluation as “evaluation activities directed toward the improvement of the teacher’s ongoing
instruction”. Formative evaluation focuses on helping teachers grow instructionally effective. On the other hand summative evaluation refers to the appraisal of a teacher aimed at making a decision such as to (1) reward for performance, (2) continued employment, and/or (3) develop a plan of assistance (Popham, 2013).

**Tenured Teacher.** Permanent certificated employees are those teachers who have gained tenure by serving the probationary period as defined in statute (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 79-828, 2004).

**Value-added.** Value-added measures can be defined as “a collection of complex statistical techniques that use multiple years of students’ test score data to estimate the effects of individual schools or teachers” (McCaffrey, Lockwood, and Koretz, & Hamilton, 2004, p.xi).

**Assumptions**

The researcher made the following assumptions: The teacher evaluation instrument is an accurate measure of teachers’ skills and content knowledge. It is possible to become a better teacher through focused effort and improved awareness on specific skills through experience and feedback from evaluations. The data received from the Research Division are an accurate representation of teacher skills related to the ratings of the Framework for Teaching as a part of this correlation study.

**Limitations of the Study**

This research was a quantitative study of public school teachers from elementary schools teaching fourth grade. This study was specifically limited to the evaluation results, years of experience of fourth grade teachers and is not necessarily representative
of other districts or teachers. Data were collected from NeSA- Reading and NeSA-
Mathematics assessments results of fourth grade students in the public schools. The only
variables studied dealt with the context, process and content of teacher evaluation,
teaching experience and student achievement data.

The primary goal of this quantitative study was to investigate the validity of the teacher
evaluation tool as a means to determining the correlation of the teacher’s skill set with
that of increased student achievement based on standardized mathematics and reading
test results. Thus, gaining more knowledge about a teachers’ ability to influence student
achievement will be further examined as an outcome of this study. However, caution
must be exercised when making generalizations based on finding of this study, as
delimitations and limitations apply. This researcher also noted the following limitations
of the study.

1. The Danielson Framework for Teaching measures only qualitative inputs.

   However, there have been studies to show its effectiveness.

2. There may be several other factors that have an effect on student learning,

   other than the method of evaluation being used.

3. Danielson’s Professional Framework for Teaching is the current evaluation

   model used in the school district where the study took place and does not

   measure the effect of experience correlated to student achievement.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The researcher imposed the following delimitations: The study involved only one
school district that was limited to a total of 33 teachers. The research site was a public
school district in the Midwest. The participants were teachers from the elementary level. The bias of the interpretation of the data may produce potential limitations. The research was solely quantitative.

**Significance of the Study**

This study was significant because the data and findings will add to the limited quantitative data existing on the relationship between teachers’ years of experience, teacher evaluation ratings and student achievement results. The results of this study may identify and be able to recommend teacher evaluation processes and content appropriate findings on the importance of teacher effectiveness for students’ elementary level mathematics and reading achievement in an urban school district. The study will be of value to the school district as it continues to explore factors or variables to increase teacher effectiveness to improve student achievement.

**Outline of the Study**

As education continues to be a focus, nationally, regionally and locally, reform efforts continue to be introduced regarding teacher evaluation. Evaluation instruments, while not a new concept in education, teacher effectiveness is a recent phenomenon due to the focus on student learning. Chapter One presented the background for this study, specified the problem, described the significance of that problem, and presented a brief overview of the methodology used. The first chapter concluded by stating some specific limitations contained within the study. A review of the related literature was shared in Chapter Two. Chapter Two included related theory and historical perspective on national, state and local reform efforts focused on teacher effectiveness. The chapter also
considered aspects of student achievement factors in order to address the manner in which teachers contribute to new reform efforts. Chapter Three presented a description of the research design, including an annotation of the participants, the district studied, teacher evaluation processes, the methodology for data collection, the manner in which that data was analyzed, and the instrumentation used in this study. The results of the investigation outlined in Chapter Three were presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Four included a detailed statistical analysis of the data and an interpretation of the findings that linked to the research questions. A summary of the research, its limitations, and implication for further research were discussed in Chapter Five. This research study was intended to offer districts insight into the implementation of measures of teacher effectiveness within districts, schools and classrooms, with the hopes of providing a framework of practice and feedback allowing other schools or districts to explore similar measures.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature and related research in the area of teacher effectiveness and the impact on student achievement will be presented. The review was directed to an examination of the influence of the effectiveness of a teacher as a contributing factor resulting in the achievement of students specifically students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. The following questions will be addressed in the literature review: (1) How should a school district approach designing a measurement of student achievement that is robust, fair, and research-based? (2) What kind of evaluation systems is available to measure the effectiveness of teachers? (3) Is there a correlation between teacher experience and student achievement?

Historical Background

The history of teacher evaluation and the emerging trends in evaluation of teachers is an ongoing debate. In 1966, the release of the Equality of Education Opportunity (the “Coleman Report”) showed that student performance is only slightly related to school quality. Among the various factors influences that schools and policy makers can control, teacher quality was found to account for a large portion of the variation in student test scores than all other characteristics of a school, excluding the composition of the student body. A great deal of the research published since the Coleman Report has confirmed the finding that high quality teaching increases student performance (A Nation at Risk, 1984; Race to the Top, 2009; and Equity and Excellence
Commission Report, 2013). Furthermore, discussions continue to focus on what constitutes effective teaching. Initially, the purpose of evaluation was to determine continuation of employment and salary increases. With the onset of the industrial revolution, the evaluation process in schools became larger as union influence was present (Clark, 1993). The teacher unions began to establish specific criteria for teacher evaluation and rules for dismissal of teachers. During the 1950’s, more men entered into the teaching profession which sparked more union activity and membership. The Cold War and Sputnik brought attention on education with concerns that Soviet students were better educated than American students. These concerns elicited more public demands which brought on a desire to find better teachers in order to compete with the Soviet education system. During this period, Americans wanted their children to compete and surpass the Soviets in academic excellence. This sentiment led to even more men entering the teaching profession and unions increasing their influence. Clark (1993, p.7) said, “Their influence and role in evaluation of teachers offered the profession the respect long overdue.” At this time of history, Americans prospered and students went to college in larger numbers than ever before.

Research offered a superfluity of definitions of an effective teacher. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2002 legislation enacted by the Bush Administration placed new demands on teachers. The modern classrooms witnessed dramatic demographic changes in an increase of diverse student populations and homogeneity of classroom teachers (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). States would need to determine teacher quality criteria independent of teacher certification requirements. School districts had to monitor
the criteria for high quality teachers. The political reform efforts made the first attempt on measuring teacher quality linked to student achievement. However, NCLB Act failed short of appropriate measures to determine teacher effectiveness. Now that nearly all teachers are meeting the criteria to be considered “highly qualified,” policy conversations are turning to issues of teacher effectiveness (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, March 2009). Under the new administration, President Obama and Secretary Duncan have issued a “call to action” and the nation awaits reinforcing voices on systems to measure teaching effectiveness and student learning.

In the absence of a strong, robust, and deep body of research, the debate in this field has been largely ideological. One must explore the plethora of definitions currently used to describe teacher effectiveness. Clark (1993, p.10) wrote that, “Obviously, the definition involves someone who can increase student knowledge but it goes beyond this in defining an effective teacher.” Vogt (1984) related effective teaching to the ability to provide instruction to different students of different abilities while incorporating instructional objectives and assessing the effective learning mode of the students. Collins (1990), while working with the Teacher Assessment Project established five criteria for an effective teacher: (a) is committed to students and learning, (b) knows the subject matter, (c) is responsible for managing students, (d) can think systematically about their own practice, and (e) is a member of the learning community. Another model of effectiveness was based upon teacher actions (Swank, Taylor, Brady, & Frieberg, 1989). Effective meant increasing academic questions and decreasing lecture and ineffective practices, such as negative feedback and low-level questions. The authors of this study
felt that these factors became easily identifiable in the assessment of performance. Papanastasiou (1999) states “that no single teacher attribute or characteristic is adequate to define an effective teacher” (p.6). In research by Wenglinksy (2000), found that what happens in the classroom is critical and that how a teacher teaches is important. Such practices that promote higher order thinking and active participation are most successful. The challenge was to translate this knowledge into an acceptable evaluation procedure (Wenglinksy, 2000). The majority of the research to this point did not take into consideration student achievement. It was believed that effective teaching techniques would automatically produce positive student achievement results. Recently, research has begun to review achievement data correlated to student achievement. Tucker and Stronge (2001) declared that teachers were responsible for not only teaching but also, to some extent, learning outcomes. The research of Sanders and others at the University of Tennessee offered that teacher effectiveness can be measured and may be critical to student success (Sanders, 1996; Sanders, Wright, & Horn, 1997). Their work asserted that teacher effectiveness is the single biggest contributor to student success. The effectiveness of the teacher outweighs all other factors including class size, socioeconomic status, and gender.

**Methods of Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness**

Great teaching is multi-dimensional and should be viewed through multiple lenses (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2009). No one single measure is sufficient to stand alone to measure teaching effectiveness (NCCTQ, 2009). Multiple measures of student performance should be considered (Tucker & Stronge, 2001). Teachers should know what
the expectations are for good teaching and what they can do to improve. Principals should have a broad set of measures when they are making internal staffing decisions. District administrators should be able to compare the effectiveness of teachers entering the professions through differentiated routes to weigh the outcome of professional development, and benchmark their teaching force against that of other districts.

Teacher effectiveness is defined in broad statements which may be the reason multiple methods for evaluating teachers exist today. The different measures are: (1) principal evaluations; (2) analyses of classroom artifacts (i.e., ratings of teacher assignments and student work); (3) teaching portfolios; (4) teacher self-reports of practice, including surveys, teaching logs, and interviews; and (5) student ratings of teacher performance (NCCTQ, 2009). Two of the most widely used measures of teacher effectiveness are: value-added models and classroom observations. Value-added models and classroom observations both focus on how teachers contribute to student learning through different lenses. Value-added measures can be defined as “a collection of complex statistical techniques that use multiple years of students’ test score data to estimate the effects of individual schools or teachers” (McCaffrey, Lockwood, & Koretz, & Hamilton, 2004, p.xi). William Sanders, professor at the University of Tennessee is recognized with developing the valued-added model for evaluating teachers. His research determined that students in some teachers’ classrooms were scoring higher than their previous test scores would have predicted (Sanders & Rivers, 1996).

Classroom observations measure the strategies that teachers employ in their classroom and can be used for formative purposes such as providing direction for teachers
to strengthen their practice in targeted areas. Research indicated that observation is important to teacher evaluation because teachers must demonstrate that they can perform certain pre-established competencies, such as lesson presentation and classroom management (Clark, 1993). The National Center for Educational Statistics (1999) noted several criticisms of observations: (a) limited competence of the principal; (b) teacher resistance and apathy; (c) role conflict for the principal; and (d) lack of expertise in specialized areas, especially at the secondary level. Teacher evaluation systems were found to be inconsistent in determining teacher effectiveness. A report by the Center for American Progress (2011) found that “in most places, teacher evaluations are infrequent; are based on scant evidence; rely on crude instruments; include few reliable quality controls; fail to use adequately trained evaluators; provide almost no useful feedback to teachers; and yield vastly inflated performance ratings” (Jerald & Van Hook, 2011, p.7). New teacher evaluation systems are being developed aimed at improving instruction and student learning (Stecher, Garet, Holtzman & Hamilton, 2012).

A deep dive into the research behind value added measures reveals the complexity of the model. The intent of the value-added measures is that teachers are accurately ranked within a district by their contributions to student learning. Supporters of value added measures contend that measures indicate the following (NCCTQ, 2009):

- Those students of a particular teacher performed better than their previous achievement would have predicted.
- Whether certain teachers’ students consistently perform above or below predicted levels on standardized achievement tests.
Teacher effectiveness rankings are calculated based on whether students meet, exceed, or fail to reach their predicted scores on the test. Within the district, teachers are compared with other teachers. Only teachers who have students with standardized test scores can be ranked. If students perform better than predicted on standardized achievement tests, the teacher is credited with being effective. However, if the majority of his/her students fail to make predicted gains, the teacher may be deemed less effective (NCCTQ, 2009).

As stated earlier in this review, value-added modeling is complex, and many experts urge caution in using the results for evaluating teacher effectiveness (Bracey, 2004; Braun, 2005; Kupermintz, 2003; McCaffrey, Koretz, Lockwood, & Hamilton, 2004; Thum, 2003). According to the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (2009) because teachers are not randomly assigned to schools, and students are not randomly assigned to teachers, it is difficult to sort out how much student achievement growth is attributable solely to teachers’ efforts and how much is attributable to other factors not included in the statistical model.

Classroom observations are the most common form of teacher evaluation. Evaluation systems can be created by the district or purchased through a company. As well as the observations may be conducted by the principal or an external evaluator. The observation varies from measuring general teaching practices to subject specific techniques; formally scheduled or unannounced and can occur once or several times per year. Nevertheless, classroom observations provide a useful measure of teachers’ practice but little evidence about whether students are actually learning. The degree to which observations can or should be used for specific purposes depends on the
instrument, how that instrument was developed, the level of training and monitoring
raters receive and the psychometric properties of the instrument (NCCTQ, 2009).

Appendix C provides a brief comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of value
added and classroom observation measures (NCCTQ, 2009):

Both these measures, classroom observations and value-added measures have
different strengths and weaknesses as illustrated by the table in Appendix C. States and
districts will need to determine the purpose for the use of the metrics. If the goal is to
improve teacher practice, classroom observations may be a more practical method to
accomplish this end result.

Teaching Experience

The majority of studies concluded that teacher education and experience are not
strong predictors of teacher effectiveness, as measured by student achievement gains. In
one study of Chicago Public School teachers, for example, Aaronson, Barrow, and
Sander (2007) found that 90% of the variance in teacher effects on student learning was
not explained by teacher characteristics such as highest level of education, experience,
credentials, and selectivity of the college that the teacher attended.

Research does show that teachers become more skilled with experience
(Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006, 2007a; Ferguson, 1991; Ferguson & Ladd, 1996;
Gordon, Kane, & Staiger, 2006; Greenwald, Hedges, & Laine, 1996; Grissmer,
Flanagan, Kawata, & Williamson, 2000; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 1998; Hanushek &
Rivkin, 2004; Hanushek, Kain, O’Brien, & Rivkin, 2005; Harris & Sass, 2007: Kane,
Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006; Murnane, 1975; 1981; Rice, 2003; Rivers & Sanders, 2002;
Rowan, Correnti, & Miller, 2002; Wayne & Youngs, 2003). The preponderance of evidence suggests, however, that teacher experience matters most during the first several years of a teacher’s career.

Gordon, Kane, and Staiger (2006) found large gains in teacher effectiveness between the first and second year of teaching, much smaller gains between the second and third year, and no substantial improvement after the third year in the classroom. Murnane (1975) found that teacher effectiveness improves rapidly over the first three years of teaching and reaches its highest point between the third and fifth year but found no substantial improvement after year five. Ferguson (1991) and Ferguson and Ladd (1996) also found no experience effects for elementary teachers beyond the first five years in the classroom. A number of other studies also conclude that teacher experience effects are largely concentrated in the early years (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2007, Rockoff, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Boyd et al., 2005). The research is quite clear that there is a relationship between teacher experience and student achievement, but the preponderance of evidence suggests that the biggest improvements in teacher effectiveness occur during the first few years in the classroom. Moreover, only a portion of the large gains in average teacher effectiveness after Year 1 may be due to on-the-job learning (Hanushek, Kain, O’Brien, & Rivkin, 2005). Average teacher effectiveness also increases, in part, because beginning teachers who are not successful often leave the profession after their first year. Some evidence suggests that at the high school level there may be sustained experience effects that last longer.
Experience matters, but more is not always better. The impact of experience is strongest during the first few years of teaching; after that, marginal returns diminish. A number of CALDER studies confirm findings from existing research that, on average, brand new teachers are less effective than those with some experience under their belts (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor 2007a, 2007b; Harris & Sass, 2007; Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006; Ladd, 2008; Sass, 2008). Early-career experience has a clear payoff in teacher effectiveness, and the impact is stronger than the effect of most other observable teacher-related variables including advanced degrees, teacher licensure tests scores, National Board certification at the elementary level, and class size (Clotfelter et al. 2007a; Ladd 2008; Sass 2007).

**New Educational Reforms**

Under the Obama Administration, the Race to the Top (RTT) strategy spurred competition in which many states have either recently passed new legislation or pointed to existing legislation concerning teacher evaluation. Most of this existing legislation is directly related to the four (4) American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) reform goals or assurances: The quality of standards and assessments, improving the collection and use of data, increasing teacher effectiveness and equitable distribution, and supporting struggling schools (Learning Point Associates, 2010)

A trend across states, districts and schools is the development or implementation of teacher evaluation systems which reflect the components of RTT. A variety of reports and initiatives are the results of reports which highlight that (1) teacher evaluation systems have not accurately measured teacher quality because they have failed to do a
good job of discriminating between effective and ineffective teachers, and (2) teacher evaluation systems have not assisted in developing a highly skilled teacher workforce (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2011; Toch & Rothman, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern & Keeling, 2009). There’s also a growing consensus that evidence of teacher contributions to student learning should be part of teacher evaluation systems, along with evidence about the quality of teacher practices (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). “Value-added models” (VAMs), designed to evaluate student test score gains from one year to the next, are often promoted as tools to accomplish this goal. Teachers’ value-added scores also differ significantly when different tests are used, even when these are within the same content area (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2011; Lockwood et al., 2007). Student test scores should serve as one element and as part of multiple measures for teacher evaluation because research points to a variety of influences on standardized test scores other than teacher performance (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Nebraska is one of the states joining the trend of developing teacher and principal evaluation models incorporating a student learning component. The Nebraska State Board of Education has adopted the Teacher and Principal Performance Standards in November 2011. As stated by James Havelka, Education Consultant for the Nebraska Department of Education, at the January 4, 2012, Stakeholder meeting, “The Standards are not a regulatory mandate. Rather, the State Board views them as a resource for schools which outlines a framework of effective practice for teachers and principals. We hope the Standards will help to inform teacher and principal preparation, professional
development, evaluation, and other educator effectiveness policies”. Nebraska school
districts are in discussion and piloting various models of teacher and principal evaluations
systems. This Nebraska Public School District is using the Danielson model and has
developed multiple measures of teaching practice tied to student learning. These reforms
efforts will be discussed in more

**Public School District Measures of Teacher Effectiveness**

In 2009, the public school district developed a set of comprehensive strategies to
dramatically increase teacher effectiveness and thus improve student outcomes. The
teacher evaluation system was clearly established as a qualitative measure of teacher
effectiveness. The district’s appraisal system was based on a rigorous and constructive
framework; however, implementation of the approach required further refinement. The
current *Framework for Effective Teaching* will remain at the core of the evaluation and
measurement system as the district continues to review measures of teacher effectiveness
aligned to student outcomes.

The vision for the district is to implement an innovative and comprehensive set of
strategies that touch every aspect of the teacher lifecycle. The five prong strategy is
highlighted in Appendix D.

The measure must be multifaceted, bringing together a collection of both
quantitative and qualitative measures. Through the research-based evaluation system
developed in close collaboration with the local union based on Charlotte Danielson’s
framework, the foundation has been set for defining teacher effectiveness. The District
has been nationally-recognized regarding the teacher appraisal system. In 2009, a
representative from the district was invited to participate as part of a panel to testify at a Congressional briefing in Washington, D.C. regarding measuring teacher effectiveness. Therefore, the district had affirmation that the evaluation system was a strong qualitative instrument for defining effective teaching. In order to build a strong qualitative measure of teaching, the following changes will occur over a period of 3 - 5 years to enhance the teacher evaluation system.

(1) **Increase the range of performance levels.** The four performance levels did not provide opportunities for incremental growth of a tenure teacher. If the system is based on a professional growth continuum, the four categories need to be expanded from four categories to five, adding another level for teachers to attain.

(2) **Develop synthesized rating for each of the domains.** During the 2011 -2012 school year, the District implemented an electronic calculation of an overall rating for each Domain. Previously, the ratings were only provided at the “criterion” level; not synthesized at “Domain” level. Moving forward, each domain will have an average rating. This will allow evaluators and the Department of Human Resources to identify the Domain in which a teacher may need more support.

(3) **Collect information electronically.** The next step in the process is to collect the information electronically which will allow the evaluator to complete necessary forms online. The data can be uploaded into the automated system through PeopleSoft. Human Resource will be able to quickly review the data for inter-rater consistency and determine if the process is being accurately implemented. If the District moves to a growth model,
the automation of the appraisal process will permit the Research Office to tie appraisal data to other data sources (e.g. student performance).

(4) **Tie appraisals to individualized Professional Development (PD) plan.** The professional development provided for teachers is often fragmented, not aligned or focused on teacher evaluation standards. To ensure teachers receive professional development that is relevant for their own individual growth needs and aligned with district priorities, the summative evaluation report will become the basis for discussion and planning for professional development.

A set of possible quantitative measures have been developed but not yet implemented. Depending on grade level, teachers could have different weightings applied to the components of overall rating for the teacher effectiveness score displayed in Appendix E.

With the new Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) Teacher and Principal Framework and incorporating a student learning component, the district felt that it was positioned to meet this goal with further exploration of the best, fair and equitable measures for determining teacher effectiveness.

**Summary**

Despite the apparent limitation of research focused on measures of teacher effectiveness, the findings establish a definite relationship between the effectiveness of a teacher and student achievement. There is a preponderance of evidence that suggests that an effective teacher has a significant impact on improving student outcomes especially in the areas of reading and mathematics. Drawing from the research findings, a variety of
approaches can and should be used to determine teacher effectiveness to increase student achievement. However, there is a need for a clearer picture of the strengths and limitations of the various approaches. Consequently further examination is needed to illustrate the effectiveness of these measures paralleled with the teachers’ ability to improve student achievement; therefore, a research base that aligns measures of teaching approaches with student performance must be strengthened.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

As described in Chapter One, the purpose of this study was to discover and describe the correlation of teacher evaluation ratings and teacher years of experience of fourth grade teachers and the relationship on student achievement results on state mathematics and reading tests. Utilizing the theoretical constructs of the reviewed literature, as well as the data available to the researcher, this study researched teachers’ effect on achievement of fourth grade students on two standardized tests (1) NeSA-Mathematics and (2) NeSA-Reading. This chapter described the methods and procedures used, including research design, research questions, and sample population. In addition, the conceptual framework, instrumentation, and data collection were presented. Finally, the chapter discussed the data analysis of this study.

A quantitative research approach was utilized to investigate the relationship of teacher experience and evaluation ratings aligned with student achievement results in a public school setting. The organization of this study, the writer’s role as the researcher, and the procedures used in data collection and data analysis were presented. Also, the appropriate steps taken to validate the findings collected were outlined. The final section of the chapter presented the organization of the study.

Research Design

This quantitative study was designed to ascertain whether there was a significant relationship between teacher effect data in elementary school mathematics and reading and a teacher’s years of experience. In addition, further exploration of whether there was
a significant relationship between an effective teacher as measured by the total score on the Danielson’s Framework instrument and teacher effect scores as measured by NeSA-R and NeSA-M standardized tests as noted by the results at the end of fourth grade. The research design included two components. Teachers were grouped by their total years of teaching experience. Teachers also were grouped by their total scores on the Danielson Framework. End of Grade test scores in 2012-2013 for children in grade four in the school district was used to match with specific teachers to determine the relationship between test scores, evaluation ratings and years of teaching experience. This data was obtained from the Research Division of the school district. A few descriptive analyses were conducted to demonstrate the relationship between Danielson’s Framework Scores and teachers’ years of teaching experience with the growth students made with that particular teacher. The hypotheses are:

H1: Experience impacts student NeSA-M & R scale scores such that as teacher experience increases so too do students NeSA-R & M scale scores.

Experience impacts student NeSA-Mathematics scale scores such that as a teacher experience increases so too do students NeSA-Mathematics scale scores.

Experience impacts student NeSA-Reading scale scores such that as a teacher experience increase so too do students NeSA-Reading scale scores.

H2: Teacher instructional observation scores impact student NeSA-M & R scale scores such that as teacher’s instructional capabilities increase so too do students NeSA-R & M scale scores.
Teacher instructional observation scores impacts student NeSA-Mathematics scale scores such that as a teacher’s instructional capability increases so too do students NeSA-Mathematics scale scores.

Teacher instructional observation scores impacts student NeSA-Reading scale scores such that as a teacher’s instructional capabilities increase so too do students NeSA-Reading scale scores.

H3: The impact of experience on students’ scale scores will be fully mediated by teachers’ instructional observation scores such that as teachers experience increases so too does their instructional capabilities which results in increased NeSA-R & M scale scores.

**Research Questions**

The research questions guiding this study were:

**Research Question#1.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of a teacher and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

- **Research sub-Question 1a.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA mathematics tests?
- **Research sub-Question 1b.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of a teacher and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading tests?
- **Research sub-Question 1c.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA total score?

Questions 1a, b, and c were analyzed using a Pearson correlation and alpha level .05 was utilized to avoid type one error.
Research Question #2. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and student scores on the state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

Research sub-Question 2a. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA mathematics tests?

Research sub-Question 2b. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading tests?

Research sub-Question 2c. Was there a correlation between teachers’ Instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA total score?

Questions 2a, b, and c were analyzed using a Pearson correlation and alpha level .05 was utilized to avoid type one error.

Research Question #3. Was there a correlation between teachers’ years of experience and their instructional observation ratings?

Question #3 was analyzed using a Pearson correlation and alpha level .05 was utilized to avoid type one error.

This research sought to explore potential measures of teacher effectiveness incorporating current research about teacher evaluation and teacher experience.

Subjects

The public school system currently employs 2,517 classroom teachers, 1,537 other instructional staff, and 2,850 non-instructional staff. The number of teachers (not
just classroom teachers) has grown from 3,182 to 3,408 over a four year span, or 1.7% per year. Over the same period of time, student enrollment has grown at the rate of 0.8% per year, resulting in a decline in the student to teacher ratio from 14.6 to 14.1. Over 85% of the teacher population is Caucasian compared with 60% of the student population which is culturally diverse. The percentage of teachers with only MA degrees has increased steadily over time (from 49% of all teachers to 58% in approximately five years). The district has a slightly younger teacher workforce than the national average (average age of 39.6 versus a national average age of 43.3). The district also has a significantly less experienced teacher workforce compared to the state average (10.8 average years of experience in the district versus 15.3 years of experience in the state).

The teacher attrition patterns are consistent with those in other urban school districts. As in other urban districts, there is a strong relationship between years of experience and attrition level, with least experienced teachers leaving in higher numbers. In 2011-2012, in which the study was conducted, 17% of new teachers in the district and 10% of teachers with one to two years of experience left the district. In addition, large variations exist in teacher attrition by individual school. Including retirements, transfers to administrative roles and departures from the district, annual teacher attrition ranges from a low of 0% to a high of 20% by school.

For this study, 33 out of 189 fourth grade teachers and fourth grade students’ achievement results were selected. Non-tenured teachers who are in their first three years of teaching in the District were selected. These teachers are evaluated during their first three years of teaching. Therefore teacher evaluation ratings were available for the
year of the study. Tenured teachers who are evaluated on a three year cycle were identified only if they were on an evaluation cycle for the year of this study. Approximately a total of 33 teachers were selected based on the established criteria.

**Data Collection Strategies**

For the purposes of this quantitative study, data contained within this study were collected through teacher appraisal ratings, teacher experience data, and fourth grade state assessment results. The student data represented test scores for mathematics and reading correlated with a specific fourth grade teacher.

**Instruments**

The documents gathered for this study included teacher summary evaluation reports that reflected the overall score the Framework for Effective Teaching. Teacher demographic data was used to determine years of experience of each teacher selected for the study. Additionally, disaggregated test results for students who have completed fourth grade assessments in reading and mathematics for school year of 2012 – 2013 were analyzed. For the purposes of the data analysis, the documents were copied and any identifiable information was extracted. The original documents were returned to the Research Division and Human Resources Department.

**Data Analysis**

The results of the data were analyzed to determine if there was a correlation between the effects of a teacher in regard to increasing student achievement. Descriptive statistics were generated on each of the research questions. These descriptive statistics included the mean scores for each data point, as well as the frequency distributions for
each response. These means were then analyzed using Pearson product moment correlation to determine the significance of the variables. In a correlational research design, the researcher used the correlation statistical test to describe and measure the degree of the relationship between two or more variables (Creswell, 2012). It is a good test to express the relationships between the product-moment correlation coefficient (Creswell, 2012).

The researcher recognized that using Pearson product moment correlation presented the assumption that the variances of the dependent variable are the same across the groups being studied. The data used within this study attempted to address this assumption through the stabilization of the sample size utilizing the whole collection of teachers as the base as opposed to disaggregating individual school results, which may skew the results due to the differences in the mean.

**Role of the Researcher**

Quantitative research methods attempt to maximize objectivity, replicate and generalize findings and are typically interested in prediction. Integral to this approach is the expectation that a researcher will set aside his or her experiences, perceptions, and biases to ensure objectivity in the conduct of the study and the conclusions that are drawn (Harwell, 2011).

In a quantitative research study, the researcher attempts to remain detached from the study. They strive to maintain objectivity. It is important that the researcher does not influence the sample with her own personal values, feelings, and experiences.
Essentially, the researcher must not sway the study towards the perceptions and values of the researcher, rather than allowing the hard scientific facts to have influence.

As an administrator in an urban public school district setting, the researcher has extensive experience in education, specifically in an urban public school district. With various roles ranging from teacher to administrator, the study reflects the work of this research over a decade. Currently, the researcher is enrolled in a doctoral program. Numerous responsibilities were achieved in this research undertaking. The expectations outlined by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) have been met. The researcher had the responsibility of working with an urban school district to collect data based on district policies, procedures and guidelines. In addition, the researcher was responsible for creating questions and conducting the analysis. The writer is knowledgeable with regards to teacher evaluation and teacher effectiveness. Furthermore, this researcher is aware of the education reforms in the area of teacher evaluation and measures of effectiveness. The writer initiated this research with great anticipation and the expectation that the data collection from various instruments involved in the study would reveal significant correlations that will positively affect the exploration of measuring teacher effectiveness to moving closer to reducing the student achievement gap in an urban public school district. The research further believes that a careful and in-depth review of the literature, suggestions and recommendations beyond the current local practices will set the course for effective strategies to support improving student learning.
Summary

This chapter described the methods and procedures employed to provide insight into the validity of teachers’ evaluation scores, teachers’ years of experience and its impact on student achievement. The problem, research design, research questions, sample population, conceptual framework, and instrumentation were presented. Additionally, this chapter discussed the data collection process, as well as the data analysis of the information attained. The presentation of this data in Chapter Four addressed the research questions, as well as the general demographic information collected. A summary and discussion of the findings, along with conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research from the content were included in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this analysis of data collected of the 2012-2013 Ne-SA mathematics and reading scores were to examine whether the presence of teacher experience and evaluation ratings serve as influencing factors in identifying teacher effectiveness metrics to increase student achievement. This chapter reported the results of the statistical analysis completed to answer the three research questions. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings.

Overview of Results

The study sample included only test scores for fourth grade students with complete data for the variables of interest resulting in a sample size of 33 teachers. A Pearson correlation was utilized to determine the significance of the relationship between the variables. The design of the study was quantitative employing teacher evaluation ratings, teachers’ years of experience and student test scores. The research questions guiding this study were:

Research Question#1. Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

Research sub-Question 1a. Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA mathematics tests?
As seen in Table 1, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between teachers years of experience and fourth grade NeSA math scores, $r = +0.22$, $n = 33$, $p = .22$, two tails.

**Research sub-Question 1b.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading tests?

As seen in Table 1, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between teachers years of experience and fourth grade state NeSA reading scores, $r = +0.33$, $n = 33$, $p = .73$, two tails.

**Research sub-Question 1c.** Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA total score?

As seen in Table 1, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between teachers years of experience and 4th grade NeSA total scores, $r = +0.29$, $n = 33$, $p = .10$, two tails.

**Research Question #2.** Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and student scores on the state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

**Research sub-Question 2a.** Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA mathematics tests?

As seen in Table 2, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade NeSA math scores, $r = +0.28$, $n = 33$, $p = .12$, two tails.
Research sub-Question 2b. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading tests?

As seen in Table 2, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade NeSA reading scores, $r = +0.33$, $n = 33$, $p = .06$, two tails.

Research sub-Question 2c. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA total score?

As seen in Table 2, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and 4th grade NeSA total scores, $r = +0.32$, $n = 33$, $p = .07$, two tails.

Research Question #3. Was there a correlation between teachers’ years of experience and their instructional observation ratings?

As seen in Table 3, a correlation for the data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between years of experience of teachers’ and their instructional observation ratings, $r = +0.13$, $n = 33$, $p = .48$, two tails.
Table 1

Findings from Research Questions 1 (a, b, and c). Correlation between NeSA Mathematics and Reading Scores and Teachers Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NeSA</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p(two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NeSA Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeSA Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeSA Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

Findings from Research Questions 2 (a, b, and c).  Correlation between NeSA Mathematics and Reading Scores and Teacher Instructional Observation Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NeSA</th>
<th>Observation Ratings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p(two-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeSA Mathematics</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeSA Reading</td>
<td>+0.33</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeSA Total</td>
<td>+.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

Findings from Research Question Three. Correlation between Teacher Years of Experience and Teacher Instructional Observation ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Observation Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five presents a summary of the findings related to the research purpose and reviewed literature. This chapter also offers conclusions and implications of the study for practice, policy and further research.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This study is an analysis of data collected to examine teacher evaluation ratings of fourth grade teachers and the correlations with the ratings and years of experience with student achievement results in mathematics and reading in a public urban school district. The research conducted through a quantitative study of the NeSA-Mathematics and NeSA-Reading scores of fourth grade students in classrooms of teachers with one or more years of experience. This study was designed to determine if there was a relationship between teacher evaluation ratings and teacher experience leading to teacher effectiveness based on increased student test scores.

As reviewed in Chapter Two, there was a significant need for expanded review regarding teacher evaluation. Reform efforts are underway, however there has only been a ubiquitous tie to student achievement. Therefore further research is needed in this arena.

The purpose of this study was to discover and describe the relationship of potential teacher evaluation ratings and years of teaching experience that correlate with student growth on state standardize tests in reading and mathematics. The research question guiding this study was: How does a teacher’s evaluation rating combined with years of teaching experience correlate with student achievement results? Related questions that guided this study were:

1. Was there a correlation between years of experience of a teacher and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?
a. Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA mathematics tests?

b. Was there a correlation between years of experience of a teacher and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading tests?

c. Was there a correlation between years of experience of teachers and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA total score?

2. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and student scores on the state NeSA reading and mathematics tests?

   a. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA mathematics tests?

   b. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading tests?

   c. Was there a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA total score?

3. Was there a correlation between teachers’ years of experience and their instructional observation ratings?

   The first question asked if there was a correlation between years of experience of a teacher and fourth grade student scores on state NeSA reading and mathematics tests. The data analysis led to the conclusion that as seen in Table 1, a correlation for the data revealed that there was a positive effect but not a statistically significant relationship between teachers years of experience and fourth grade state NeSA reading scores, 

   \[ r = +0.33, \ n = 33, \ p = .73, \ \text{two tails.} \] Specifically, teaching experience had a positive
finding; however it suggests that teacher years of experience do not appear correlated with student test scores.

The total sample size averaged 3.2 years of teaching experience. The sample size of 33 teachers ranged from 1 – 30 years of teaching experience. A large percentage of the teachers in the study had less than five years of teaching experience. The majority of studies conclude that teacher education and experience are not strong predictors of teacher effectiveness, as measured by student achievement gains. In one study of Chicago Public School teachers, for example, Aaronson, Barrow, and Sander (2007) found that 90% of the variance in teacher effects on student learning was not explained by teacher characteristics such as highest level of education, experience, credentials, and selectivity of the college that the teacher attended.


The preponderance of evidence suggests, however, that teacher experience matters most during first several years of a teacher’s career.

The second question asked if there was a correlation between teachers’ instructional observation ratings and student scores on the state NeSA reading and
mathematics tests. The study revealed that as seen in Table 2, teacher evaluation scores appear uncorrelated with student assessments (4th grade NeSA total scores), $r = +0.32$, $n = 33$, $p = .07$, two tails.

The current District’s appraisal system in this study depends on qualitative observations to measure teacher effectiveness. It does not take into account student test scores or value-added metrics. The qualitative inputs (classroom observations, walk-throughs, artifacts) constitute 100% of the overall effectiveness measure. Teaching evaluation is a necessary process in any educational setting. There are a number of tools or instruments available that can be used to assess the level of effectiveness of teachers. Evaluations can be used for formative and summative purposes. Popham (2013) defines formative teacher evaluation as “evaluation activities directed toward the improvement of the teacher’s ongoing instruction” (p. 17). Formative evaluation focuses on helping teachers grow instructionally effective. On the other hand summative evaluation refers to the appraisal of a teacher aimed at making a decision such as (1) reward for performance, (2) continued employment, and/or (3) develop a plan of assistance (Popham, 2013). It appears as though the ultimate goal of both evaluation types is to provide high quality teachers in every classroom. Donaldson (2009) conveys that, “Historically, teacher evaluation has not substantially improved instruction or expanded student learning” (p. 1), however, Mathers and Olivia (2008) believe that "the role of teacher evaluation has surfaced only recently as an underutilized resource that might hold promise as a tool to promote teacher professional growth and measure teacher effectiveness in the classroom” (p. 1).
The third question asked if there was a correlation between teachers’ years of experience and their instructional observation ratings. The study revealed that as seen in Table 3, a correlation for the data revealed that there was a positive effect however, it was not a statistically significant relationship between years of experience of teachers’ and their instructional observation ratings, $r = +0.13$, $n = 33$, $p = .48$, two tails. Teacher contribution to student achievement is widely researched and recognized in the education community. A teacher’s effectiveness is the most important factor that impacts student learning greater than any other attribute in the school system (Goldhaber, Anthony, & Urban Inst, 2005; Marzano, 2000; Mathers & Olivia, 2008; Sanders, Wright, & Horn, S. (1997). While there seems to be consensus in the literature that teacher effectiveness is the most important factor in the classroom that impacts student achievement, there is little consensus on how to effectively measure the effect of a thorough teacher evaluation. Based on a review of literature, a limited relationship between teacher evaluation ratings and years of experience was expected. The findings established a slight relationship between both the evaluation ratings and experience level of a teacher and student achievement; specifically in the area of reading.

**Conclusions Compared to Related Literature**

The major findings / themes that were described in the literature review in this study were as follows:

1. Teaching evaluation is a necessary process in any educational setting. There are a number of tools or instruments available that can be used to assess the level of effectiveness of teachers. Teacher evaluation has gained increased attention in the
United States over the past decade, partially in response to federal and state legislation and most recently because of the philanthropic interest in measuring teacher effectiveness. The research of Sanders and others at the University of Tennessee offered that teacher effectiveness can be measured and may be critical to student success (Sanders, 1996; Sanders, et al, 1997).

2. Teacher contribution to student achievement is widely researched and recognized in the education community. A teacher’s effectiveness is the most important factor that impacts student learning greater than any other attribute in the school system (Goldhaber, Anthony, & Urban Inst, 2005; Marzano, 2000; Mathers & Olivia, 2008; Sanders, et al., (1997).

3. Teacher quality is also the focus of significant national efforts and investments. Federal programs like Race to the Top (RTT) and the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) represent ambitious attempts to recognize, reward, and encourage effective teaching. A trend across states, districts and schools is the development or implementation of teacher evaluation systems which reflect the components of RTT. A variety of reports and initiatives are the results of reports which highlight that (1) teacher evaluation systems have not accurately measured teacher quality because they have failed to do a good job of discriminating between effective and ineffective teachers, and (2) teacher evaluation systems have not assisted in developing a highly skilled teacher workforce (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2011; Toch & Rothman, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2009; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009).
4. Great teaching is multi-dimensional and should be viewed through multiple lenses (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2009). Multiple measures of student performance should be considered (Stronge & Tucker, 2001). Papanastasiou (1999) states “that no single teacher attribute or characteristic is adequate to define an effective teacher” (p. 6). Student test scores should serve as one element and as part of multiple measures for teacher evaluation because research points to a variety of influences on standardized test scores other than teacher performance (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

5. Ferguson (1991) and Ferguson and Ladd (1996) also found no experience effects for elementary teachers beyond the first five years in the classroom. A number of other studies also conclude that teacher experience effects are largely concentrated in the early years (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2007, Rockoff, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Boyd et al., 2005). Experience matters, but more is not always better. The impact of experience is strongest during the first few years of teaching; after that, marginal returns diminish.

Discussion

The findings of this study further inform fields of study associated with teacher supervision and evaluation processes that focus on teacher growth to influence student achievement. Study findings have particular implications for practice and policy, as well as related research.

The current research and literature has revealed repeatedly that teachers are the most critical factor in determining student success and that current traditional teacher
evaluation practices, used in isolation cannot improve teaching and learning. Recent political educational reform efforts such as the federal government’s Race to the Top (RTT) initiative have caused states to develop teacher evaluation systems that may be viewed as high stakes efforts and risky. The underlying belief suggests that creating a high stakes evaluation system which includes student test scores in combination with traditional teacher evaluation practices will help to improve teacher effectiveness. If current teacher evaluation practices are not effective and inconsistently implemented, combining it with student achievement scores coupled with possible dismissal; it is unlikely to improve the effectiveness of a teachers and ultimately student performance.

In terms of student achievement, NCLB did not substantiate that high stakes testing improved student test scores. However, it provided a nationwide view of the achievement gap. Therefore, the movement to improve teaching with emphasis on student growth leading to increased student achievement became the major focus. Potentially the same reform efforts are in progress pertaining to teacher evaluation. Creating an evaluation system based on high stakes may lead to increase teacher isolation and competitiveness among the teaching staff which may limit necessary collaboration focused on student learning. When additional measures are added to an ineffective system, it will not create a steady state to improve teaching and learning. States and school districts will need to make a dramatic shift in the philosophy and approach of measuring teacher effectiveness.

The Danielson model is a research-based evaluation system and has a strong foundation for the qualitative measures of teacher effectiveness. An effective teacher
evaluation system is far more complex than the forms and must contain three essential elements (Danielson, 1996):

A coherent definition of the domain of teaching (the “What?”), including decisions concerning the standard for acceptable performance (“How good is good enough?”), and techniques and procedures for assessing all aspects of teaching (the “How?”).

Trained evaluators who can make consistent judgments about performance, based on evidence of the teaching as manifested in the procedures.

In order to begin with the process of developing a transformational evaluation system, a definition of effective teaching must be created. The following is the school district in the study definition of effective teaching.

*Effective teachers:*

1. Build strong relationships with students, colleagues and parents; *pay attention to the feelings of others; show students they care about them and make learning in the classroom exciting*

2. Have *consistently high expectations for all students; engage and challenge students to learn; and breed hopefulness in classrooms, demonstrating persistence in working with students*

3. Contribute to positive academic, attitudinal, and social outcomes for students; *able to see and work with the needs and interests of individual students; and take responsibility for student learning*

4. Collaborate with teachers, administrators, parents, and education professionals, contributing as part of a professional learning community, including participating
in ongoing learning that prioritizes diversity, civic-mindedness and cultural responsiveness

5. Use diverse resources to plan and structure learning opportunities; demonstrate proficiency in content pedagogy; monitor student progress formatively, adapting instruction as needed; and evaluate using multiple sources of evidence and data tools

To ensure teaching quality, schools and districts must base the evaluative criteria on recent research on teaching and learning. This ensures the validity of the criteria. In addition, the criteria should include all the important aspects of teaching and not be limited to only a part of what teachers do. For instance, an evaluation system that defines teaching solely in terms of what teachers do in their classroom interactions with students may not take account of all the important aspects of the teaching role that occur outside that setting. However, this study did not address other measures that were directly aligned with teacher’s effectiveness since the Danielson Framework for Teaching is the district’s current evaluation model and only is a qualitative tool. As seen in Appendix F, the following qualitative metrics for each domain as identified by the district to measure teacher performance.

In education, the trend leads to doing similar activities, programs or tasks over and over again and expecting different results. This definitely applies to teacher supervision and evaluation. Improving student achievement can no longer be expected to get different results from having the same practices and approaches to improving the effectiveness of teachers. The results of this study imply that the following implications and
recommendations should be considered to implement effective measures of teaching aligned with teacher and student growth.

1. Fair and Transparent Measurement and Evaluation are important. Districts should utilize comprehensive and robust teaching frameworks. Additionally, the more comprehensive the framework the more likely it is to improve teachers’ ability to grow and develop skills to improve student learning.

2. Strengthen implementation of current qualitative evaluation system. Districts will need to ensure that specific expectations through standards are stated through specific communication and feedback with teachers and the evaluators. The feedback should assist teachers to gain expertise to influence student achievement.

3. Tailored professional development programs to teacher needs aligned through the evaluation process. In current education practice, differentiation for students to meet their needs and improve learning is emphasized. Arguably, the same philosophy should apply to teacher development. A supervision process that allows teachers to develop adeptness through differentiated approaches could lead to increase student success.

Each of these implications is described in detail in the following section.

**Implication One: Fair and Transparent Measurement and Evaluation is Important**

According to this study, districts that are attempting to improve student achievement should implement fair and transparent measures of evaluating teachers. One measure of determining teachers’ influence on student achievement is flawed. It takes multiple lenses in which to look at the complexity of teaching. Educational psychologist
Lee Shulman (2004) illustrated the complexity of teaching by comparing the fields of teaching and medicine. He compared teachers with managing classrooms of 25 students, whereas doctors treat only a single patient at a time. Even when working with a small group of students, the teacher must continue to supervise the other 15-20 students remotely while performing a number of tasks connected to the grade or subject level content standards. Shulman (2004) pointed out, "The only time a physician could possibly encounter a situation of comparable complexity, would be in the emergency room of a hospital during or after a natural disaster" (p. 258). His conclusion about classroom teaching "is perhaps the most complex, most challenging, and most demanding, subtle, nuanced, and frightening activity that our species has ever invented" (p. 504). Therefore, the importance of implementing a comprehensive teaching framework must be a priority. A research based comprehensive teaching framework that honors the complexity of teaching helps to create a common language for teachers and supervisors while defining the expectations for teaching. Evaluation frameworks must clearly describe and better define what the expectations are for everyone involved in the process. A performance rubric also aids teachers and supervisors with understanding and identifying the components of expert teaching. The rubric facilitates learning focused conversations following classroom observations more objective than subjective of what is expected. Traditionally, school districts utilize various measures to determine teacher effectiveness frequently tied to the salary schedule. In the Midwest urban public school district in this study, teacher placements are based on a staff profile which includes: 1) experience, 2) diversity, 3) gender, and 4) specialized competence.
The underlying assumptions are that experience and degree level promotes effectiveness.

School districts also need to find ways to determine measures to define effectiveness every teacher in the district will understand. These measures could be the foundation for all other initiatives, emphasizing how teachers are promoted, supported and compensated. The measures must be multifaceted, bringing together a collection of both quantitative and qualitative metrics. For example; balance of qualitative and quantitative inputs incorporating PK-12 teachers in areas with growth model assessments may consider the following weightings applied in their ratings: 50% qualitative and 50% quantitative. PK-5 teachers without growth model assessments may consider the following weightings applied in their ratings: 60% qualitative and 40% quantitative. Grades 6-12 teachers without growth model assessments may consider the following weightings applied in their ratings: 50% qualitative and 50% quantitative. Qualitative inputs based on the Danielson model or any other framework should be the core of the evaluation and measurement system. Quantitative inputs should depend upon grade levels in which teachers may have different weightings applied to components of overall rating i.e. student engagement “snapshots,” student attendance; student surveys/parent surveys, standards-based student grades, student graduation rates, and teacher attendance.

Incorporating quantitative measures into the current evaluation system should consider an appropriate mix of measures for early grades versus older grades and appropriate mix of measures for teachers in tested versus non-tested subjects. For those with growth model assessments, there should also be a growth measure based on appropriate tests. Appendix
G depicts weights of individual components within growth areas and percent of total score.

The purpose of evaluation is to capture teacher skills; as a result it is very apparent that evaluators did not take into consideration any alignment with student tests since teacher evaluation ratings were consistently higher in regards to teachers in the sample size with more years of experience. The trend may simply reflect a tendency on the part of the evaluator to assume that more experienced or more educated teachers are more effective. With refinement of the evaluation framework and additional research in coming years, more specific information pertaining to evaluating and measuring teachers’ ability to influence student growth will be more accurate. Alignment of teacher supervision and evaluation with the school’s or district’s professional development plan will be a natural fit.

**Implication Two: Strengthen implementation of current qualitative evaluation system**

According to this study, teacher evaluation and years of teaching matter somewhat in the equation in regard to student achievement results. In order to begin a process of determining measures of a teacher’s impact on significantly increasing students’ success, the core foundation of the strategy must be reliable. Consequently, the comprehensiveness of the framework can enhance the benefits of the supervision and evaluation process. In this study, the use of the Danielson model, although comprehensive and research based, there appears to be inconsistency in the ratings which may be due to implementation shortcomings. Current scores on teacher evaluations
appear correlated with teacher experience and education level. The more experience teachers have and the more highly educated they are, the more highly they are rated on their evaluations. However, there is no apparent correlation between teacher evaluation and student performance. Thus, districts utilizing the strong Danielson-based evaluation system to its fullest potential, could contemplate the following actions:

- Increase the range of performance levels to provide for more differentiation among teachers. Currently, the system is designed with four categories to measure performance/expertise. Adding a fifth level for which teachers can strive may possibly improve practice over time without the pressure of reaching a specific level within the first three years of teaching.

- Raise the bar for each rating including the highest distinction rating:
  Communicate clearly to teachers and administrators what it means to reach each performance level. It will be crucial to train not only the evaluators but also the teachers in understanding each level of performance. The rubric is a tool to guide self-assessment against the performance standards. Teachers and evaluators should use the rubric to help select specific goals that are aligned to the standards, indicators, and elements, and build a professional development plan around the attainment of these goals. The rubric is a critical tool for tracking progress and collecting evidence of practice, while also serving as a guide for the evaluator to provide feedback to the educator. At the formative evaluation phase, the rubric is the primary tool evaluators should use to assess progress toward goals and to provide learning focus feedback to the teacher. Lastly, the rubric should provide
the foundation for the summative conversation—what performance level has the teacher achieved on each standard based on the evidence of their practice and artifacts presented, and what is their overall rating?

- Set threshold for performance levels for novice teachers: Acknowledge that brand new teachers are likely to have slightly lower overall levels of performance as they grow and develop. With this recognition, it is recommended to set threshold performance levels for end of year 1, 2 and 3. Nevertheless, communicate that it is expected to observe progression of novice teachers over the first three years toward mastery and tenure status.

- Increase frequency of observations and walk-throughs for all teachers: Currently, based on research, evaluating teachers is an infrequent and inconsistent process. To correct the infrequency and inconsistency, more frequent interactions may allow evaluators more robust data upon which to draw, increase the amount of feedback provided to teachers, and presumably increase trust between teachers and evaluators. It is the intent to change the culture of rating teachers’ performance on experience and educational attainment. Scores should be based on multiple observations. Meaningful feedback should be delivered in a timely manner. The key objectives are to: (1) change culture and perceptions that observation is punitive; (2) develop a culture of support; and (3) increase frequency and range of relevant perspectives.
• Increase frequency of summative evaluations at the tenured teacher level:

  Currently, summative evaluations are conducted on a three year cycle. In order to institutionalize change in practice and move to increasing student achievement, it is recommended that summative evaluations for every teacher occur annually. The goal would be to focus each evaluation on growth areas identified in prior evaluations in order to create an effective and efficient process for teachers and evaluators to improve practice, focus on student achievement goals and align with both district and school goals.

  Thus, strengthening the implementation of current qualitative evaluation system, schools may encourage the structured feedback for teachers on specific goals aligned with student achievement, promote collaboration and continuous learning.

  **Implication Three: Tailored Professional Development Programs to Teacher Needs Aligned Through the Evaluation**

  According to this study, the comprehensive teaching framework is only one way to promote teacher and student growth. It is of the belief that teachers want to improve and seek ways to improve. Moreover, principals and evaluators desire to assist teachers in areas that need improvement. School districts should consider a process to promote teacher growth and should reflect on the following components:

  1. Self Assessment. This component provides the opportunity for teachers’ to reflect on their practice to determine what they do well and what areas need improvement.
2. **Goal Setting and Plan Development.** Goal setting occurs after the self reflection. This component assists teachers in selecting specific goals that are aligned to the standard.

3. **Evaluation Activities.** The evaluator and teacher engage in a series of activities to collect analyze and discuss evidence and artifacts. The activities may include pre-observation and post observation conferences and observations.

4. **Summative Evaluation.** In this component, the evaluator and teacher participate in a collaborative process to review evidence of teaching practice aligned with performance levels.

5. **Program of Assistance.** Structured and layered supports must be available to help any teacher regain competence. An intervention process should be considered as part of the comprehensive approach.

Appendix H illustrates the continuous cycle in an evaluation process.

In Chapter Two, the literature review states that clear and coherent definitions of exemplary practice such as those developed in Enhancing Professional Practices: A Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 1996) and how they will be assessed are central to the idea of teacher quality assurance. Professional growth must allow a teacher the opportunity to reflect on their practice, work collaboratively with others in the profession and to use self-assessment and self-directed inquiry (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Research (Brandt, 1996; and Egelson, 1994) suggests that without appropriate professional development opportunities, instructional support and guidance, and
proactive teacher evaluation and supervision, any educational restructuring effort is doomed to failure.

As a result, a trained evaluator knows and recognizes that a teacher does not reach the pinnacle of expertise and halt the process. A skillful evaluator will focus on continuous improved expertise with the teacher in a collaborative approach that may cultivate student growth as an outcome of this process. Recommendations for districts to ponder are:

- Implement a program of professional development that is aligned with district priorities while also allowing for differentiated support for teachers, based on their evaluations and needs. In order to achieve this vision, districts will need to reduce and prioritize current professional development activities, ensure that professional development is an integral part of teacher evaluations and develop specific professional development based on teachers’ individual needs (as described in Appendix I).

- Redesign the evaluation process to ensure that real dialog and feedback occur between the evaluator and the teacher, not just at the end of the year, but throughout the year. Principals and evaluators should receive additional training on how to translate teacher performance on the various evaluation standard and criteria into specific professional development recommendations.

- Improve communication that allows teachers to provide the district with data on the effectiveness of the professional development programs. Following professional development (PD) activities, teachers could participate in surveys, immediately after and the next six months following the program. Also,
qualitative evaluation criteria scores could be tracked over time to assess whether teachers improve in their developmental areas after participating in targeted PD.

As described at the conclusion of Chapter Two, a comprehensive set of teacher effectiveness strategies can be reviewed. The next section will discuss implications for policy reform.

**Implication for Policy**

State policymakers across the nation are embracing comprehensive educator effectiveness reforms based on Teacher and Principal Performance standards as the key to improving student achievement. Several policy implications should be considered as states and school districts move forward with this reform efforts.

1. Federal government, state education departments and local school districts are searching for the best method to move teachers from being highly qualified to highly effective. It is critical to create policies that ensure accurate and reliable measures of teacher effectiveness. Ongoing research in this area reveals that growth in student learning is measured by more than solely the teacher. Darling-Hammond, et al. (2012) identified other factors which include:

   - School factors such as class sizes, curriculum materials, instructional time, availability of specialists and tutors, and resources for learning (books, computers, science labs, and more);
   - Home and community supports or challenges;
   - Individual student needs and abilities, health, and attendance;
   - Peer culture and achievement;
• Prior teachers and schooling, as well as other current teachers;

• Differential summer learning loss, which especially affects low-income children.

• The specific tests used, which emphasize some kinds of learning and not others and which rarely measure achievement that is well above or below grade level.

Policy makers should explore, review and pilot measures to determine which strategies will yield the best return on investing in the success of young people.

2. Extensive progress has been made in the past decade in creating meaningful teacher evaluation systems in K-12 education to improve teacher performance. Therefore, State Departments of Education should adopt one or more sets of professional standards that could be used for many purposes including (1) initial certification, (2) teacher and administrator evaluation, (3) professional development, and (4) recertification (NDE, 2011). Current state laws governing teacher evaluation should be revised to reflect current reform efforts. However, revamping policies should not be done in isolation and must engage all stakeholders in the process.

3. Local school districts must consider the risks when developing bold plans that may prove to be significant challenges and risks across a number of areas i.e. human capital capacity, teacher/union support, external resistance and financial sustainability. An effective communication plan should be implemented to ensure those teachers, union leadership, the board of education, and other interested persons have a stake in the plan. District policies and negotiated agreements may need
revisions based on the teacher measures adopted and changes to teacher evaluation processes.

Accordingly, the core of evaluation reform efforts should be human capacity building at all levels so that states, districts, and schools can identify and learn from top-performing teachers, support discouraged and less successful teachers, and continue to develop all teachers toward their full potential (Goe, Holdheide, & Miller, 2011).

Implication for Research

Based on a review of literature, a limited relationship between teacher evaluation ratings and years of experience was expected. Previous research concluded that despite the apparent limitation of research focused on measures of teacher effectiveness, the findings established a slight relationship between the effectiveness of a teacher and student achievement. There is a preponderance of evidence that suggests that an effective teacher has a slight impact on improving student outcomes especially in the areas of reading. Therefore it was expected that a limited relationship would be evident in this study as well.

Student test scores should serve as one element and as part of multiple measures for teacher evaluation because research points to a variety of influences on standardized test scores other than teacher performance (Darling-Hammond, 1984). Despite the apparent limitation of research focused on measures of teacher effectiveness, the findings from the literature review established a definite relationship between the effectiveness of a teacher and student achievement.
Drawing from the research findings, a variety of approaches can and should be used to determine teacher effectiveness to increase student achievement. Further studies could include:

1. Collect data over a longer period of time (3 years) to confirm or contrast these initial findings.

2. Investigate or compare these results to a larger population sample including additional grade levels.

3. Incorporate a case study approach to investigate or compare these findings to data gathered also from students, teacher, parents and teachers to gain a wider or deeper perspective of the perceived effects when teacher experience and evaluation ratings are substantial on student achievement.

4. Explore the differences in demographics, school background, grade level, or subject taught by the teachers and the relationship between student achievement results on standardized tests over time.

Additionally, there is a need for more research studies to help districts and states answer the following questions:

1. Are there evaluation frameworks that could serve as the core foundation of the qualitative measure of teacher effectiveness?

2. What measures could be implemented that are differentiated, reliable, fair and transparent for all teachers?

3. What professional development programs are recognized for advancing the growth of teacher practice?
Consequently further examination is needed to illustrate the effectiveness of these measures paralleled with the teachers’ ability to improve student achievement; therefore, a research base that aligns measures of teaching approaches with student performance must be strengthened.
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Appendix A

NEBRASKA’S PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHERS

The Effective Practices:

(1) Foundational Knowledge
The teacher demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge of content, pedagogy, students, and standards needed to provide each student with effective opportunities for learning, development, and achievement.

Example Indicators

The Teacher:

a) Possesses a strong command of the content and related instructional strategies in the discipline(s) he or she teaches.
b) Understands research-based instructional approaches, strategies, assessments, and interventions.
c) Understands the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of students, how they learn, and how they differ.
d) Understands the effect of cultural and societal influences on learning for each student.
e) Understands how national, state, and local standards impact teaching.
f) Understands the components of an effective curriculum.
g) Accepts responsibility for the growth of student learning, development, and achievement.

(2) Planning and Preparation
The teacher integrates knowledge of content, pedagogy, students, and standards with the established curriculum to set high expectations and develop rigorous instruction for each student that supports the growth of student learning, development, and achievement.

Example Indicators

The Teacher:

a) Develops coherent units, lessons, and activities that reflect high expectations and enable each student to achieve standards, learning goals, and instructional objectives.
b) Designs and adapts lessons based on student progress, assessment results, and interests.
c) Uses a variety of appropriate, research-based teaching strategies.
d) Considers students’ prior knowledge, abilities, and individual circumstances to ensure that instruction is differentiated, relevant to students, and rigorous.
e) Integrates a variety of resources, including technology, to provide challenging, motivating, and engaging learning experiences.

(3) The Learning Environment

The teacher creates and maintains a learning environment that fosters positive relationships and promotes active student engagement in learning, development, and achievement.

Example Indicators

The Teacher:

a) Establishes relationships that result in a positive learning climate of openness, mutual respect, support, and inquiry, and interacts with students in ways that demonstrate and promote recognition of diversity.
b) Ensures a safe and accessible environment.
c) Establishes, communicates, and maintains effective routines, procedures, and clear standards of conduct.
d) Establishes a collaborative learning community built on trust and teamwork that is consistent with and supportive of the full development of students as individuals.
e) Establishes high expectations that cultivate each learner’s self-motivation and encourage pride in his/her genuine accomplishments.
f) Values individual students, their families, neighborhoods, and communities; acknowledges their experiences and builds upon those experiences to increase academic success.

(4) Instructional Strategies

The teacher uses effective instructional strategies to ensure growth in student achievement.

Example Indicators
The Teacher:

a) Uses a range of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and resources that are targeted to meet learning goals.
b) Modifies, adapts, and differentiates instruction and accommodations based on data analysis, observation, and student needs.
c) Communicates effectively with students to promote and support high expectations for achievement.
d) Assumes various roles in the instructional process appropriate to the content, purposes of instruction and the needs of students.
e) Engages students by using varied activities, assignments, groupings, structure, pacing, and a variety of instructional techniques such as direct instruction, inquiry, questioning, and discussion as appropriate for individual student achievement.
f) Uses strategies that enable students to develop skills in critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving.
g) Uses existing and emerging technologies as needed to support and promote student learning.
h) Implements engaging learning experiences that draw upon family and community resources.

(5) Assessment

The teacher systematically uses multiple methods of formative and summative assessment to measure student progress and to inform ongoing planning, instruction, and reporting.

Example Indicators

The Teacher:

a) Develops and uses varied and appropriate assessments and accommodations based on instructional objectives and student needs.
b) Uses both formative and summative assessments and the resulting data to inform instruction, monitor student progress over time, and provide meaningful feedback to each student.
c) Seeks to assure that classroom-based assessment instruments and procedures are effective, free of bias, and appropriate to the developmental and linguistic capabilities of students.

d) Develops or selects appropriate assessments and interprets the resulting data, both individually and with colleagues.

e) Uses strategies that enable students to set high expectations for personal achievement, and to assess, monitor, and reflect on their own work.

f) Compiles and reports assessment data to accurately document student progress over time.

(6) Professionalism
The teacher acts as an ethical and responsible member of the professional community.

Example Indicators

The Teacher:

a) Systematically reflects on his/her own professional practice in order to bring about continuous improvement.

b) Actively pursues meaningful professional development.

c) Contributes to and advocates for the profession.

d) Protects the established rights and confidentiality of students and families.

e) Adheres to school policies, procedures, and regulations.

f) Models ethical behavior in accordance with established standards.

g) Maintains accurate records, documentation, and data.

(7) Vision and Collaboration
The teacher contributes to and promotes the vision of the school and collaborates with students, families, colleagues, and the larger community to share responsibility for the growth of student learning, development, and achievement.

Example Indicators

The Teacher:

a) Actively participates in the development and implementation of the school’s vision, mission, and goals for teaching and learning.

b) Contributes to the continuous school improvement process.

c) Establishes and maintains collaborative professional relationships.

d) Uses effective communication strategies and technological resources when
appropriate, and takes into account various factors that impact communication with individual students, their families, and the community.

e) Collaborates with students, parents, families, and the community to create meaningful relationships that enhance the learning process.
Appendix B

Framework for Effective Teaching Model

## Domain I: Planning and Preparation

### Component I A: Demonstrating Knowledge of Subject Matter, Pedagogy and Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows Depth of Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Teacher makes content errors or does not correct content errors students make.</td>
<td>Teacher displays basic content knowledge and use of standards but cannot articulate connections with other parts of the discipline or with other disciplines.</td>
<td>Teacher displays solid content knowledge and use of standards. Makes a connection between content and other parts of the discipline and other disciplines.</td>
<td>Teacher displays extensive content knowledge and use of standards. There is evidence of continuing pursuits of such knowledge.</td>
<td>Teacher shares depth of content knowledge with colleagues to assist them with pedagogy and best instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse student populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects Knowledge Effectively to Relevant Disciplines</td>
<td>Teacher displays little understanding of content knowledge and standards connected to other disciplines.</td>
<td>Teacher indicates some awareness of cross-curricular learning and standards, although such knowledge may be incomplete or inaccurate.</td>
<td>Teacher's plans and practices reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among and between topics and concepts.</td>
<td>Teacher actively builds on prerequisite relationships and standards when seeking causes for student misunderstanding.</td>
<td>Teacher is keenly aware of students' backgrounds and experiences in which he/she applies this knowledge to develop relevant lessons for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches for Best Practices in Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Teacher displays little understanding of best practices involved in student learning of the content.</td>
<td>Teacher displays basic knowledge of best practices but does not anticipate student misconceptions.</td>
<td>Teacher’s pedagogical practices reflect current research on best pedagogical practices within the discipline but without anticipating student misconceptions.</td>
<td>Teacher displays continuing search for best pedagogical practices and adapts practices effectively to meet students’ needs. Teacher is keen in anticipating student misconceptions.</td>
<td>Teacher implements best pedagogical practices and routinely demonstrate exceptional skills in anticipating and in mediating students’ misconceptions that impact learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component I B: Understanding and Using District Content Standards</th>
<th><strong>Element</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unsatisfactory</strong></th>
<th><strong>Basic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient</strong></th>
<th><strong>Distinguished</strong></th>
<th><strong>Exemplary</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knows Grade Level or Subject Area Content Standards</td>
<td>Teacher shows a limited understanding of grade level or subject area content standards. Standards are not always reflected in learning activities.</td>
<td>Teacher has a moderate understanding of grade level or subject area content standards with little instructional connections.</td>
<td>Teacher understands the continuum of grade level or subject area content standards and makes instructional connections. Instruction is congruent with standards.</td>
<td>Teacher has a thorough understanding of grade level or subject area content standards, articulates high expectations and relates curricula to standards through long-term planning.</td>
<td>Teacher lesson plans reflect knowledge of grade level and subject area content standards as well as ways to engage students in relevant and comprehensive learning at all times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops and Follows Lesson Plans Reflective of Content Standards and the Varying Needs of Students</td>
<td>Teacher does not develop appropriate lessons.</td>
<td>Teacher usually develops appropriate lesson plans and varies activities based on student needs.</td>
<td>Teacher develops and implements clearly defined lesson plans written in the form of student learning objectives tied to content standards. Plans show evidence of varied independent activities to reinforce or enrich student learning.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently develops, reviews, and refines plans designed around clear learning objectives. Plans show evidence of variations based on student needs. Follow through is noted through student products.</td>
<td>Teacher plans tiered lessons to meet varying student’s needs. Students’ products are designed to reflect the variety of strategies and plans used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Component I C: Designing Coherent Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans for a Variety of Learning Activities which Reflect Professional Research</td>
<td>Learning activities are not suitable to students or instructional goals. They do not follow an organized progression and do not reflect recent professional research.</td>
<td>Only some learning activities are suitable to students or instructional goals. Progression of activities in the unit is uneven, and only some activities reflect recent professional research.</td>
<td>Most of the learning activities are suitable to students and instructional goals. Progression of activities in the unit is fairly even, and most activities reflect recent professional research.</td>
<td>Learning activities are highly relevant to students and instructional goals. They progress coherently, producing a unified whole and reflect recent professional research.</td>
<td>Learning activities are relevant, engaging, and focused on instructional goals that have been proven to increase student academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes for Differentiated Instructional Groups that Engage Students in Meaningful Learning</td>
<td>Instructional groups do not support the instructional goals or offer variety.</td>
<td>Instructional groups are inconsistent in suitability to the instructional goals and offer minimal variety.</td>
<td>Instructional groups are varied, and are appropriate to the different instructional goals.</td>
<td>Instructional groups are varied and are appropriate to the different instructional goals. There is evidence of student choice in selecting different patterns of instructional groups.</td>
<td>Instructional groups are ever changing with variety and differentiated based on the instructional goals. Through differentiated lessons, the students are provided choice in learning concepts and reaching academic success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component I C: Designing Coherent Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Plans
Lessons and Unit Structure within Reasonable Timeframe | The lesson or unit has no clearly defined structure or the structure is chaotic. Time allocations are unrealistic. | The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure, although the structure is not uniformly maintained throughout. Most time allocations are reasonable. | The lesson or unit has a clearly defined structure that activities are organized around. Time allocations are reasonable. | The lesson or unit structure is clear and well-defined. Different pathways and timelines for learning are available, allowing student choice to meet individual needs. | The lesson or unit structure is constantly evolving based on teacher's informal assessment and anecdotal notes regarding students' progress. |

### Component I D: Assessing Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses a Variety of Classroom Assessments Aligned with Teaching and Learning Processes that Reflect the Goals and Formats of National, State and Local Assessments</td>
<td>Classroom assessments are not aligned with instructional goals and formats.</td>
<td>Limited use of classroom assessment aligned with instructional goals and formats.</td>
<td>Consistent use of classroom assessments aligned with instructional goals and formats.</td>
<td>Consistent use of a variety of classroom assessments aligned with instructional goals and formats. Students are exposed to varied formats of assessments in a planned manner. Teacher analyzes the assessment data results for future planning.</td>
<td>Aware of different purposes of collecting data as a part of the day to day functions of the classroom. Ongoing analysis of current assessment results to determine gaps in instructional practice to plan accordingly to increase student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communicates Assessment Criteria, Standards and Results to Students and Parents/Guardians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposed approach does not contain clear criteria or standards.</th>
<th>Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are either not clear or have not been clearly communicated to students and parents/guardians.</th>
<th>Assessments have clear criteria and appropriate standards for performance; expectations for performance have been communicated clearly to students and to parents/guardians.</th>
<th>Assessment criteria are appropriate and high standards for performance have been set and communicated clearly to all stakeholders. Teacher follows up with specific information to parents/guardians to assist students in mastery of each standard.</th>
<th>Following dissemination of assessment results, the teacher interprets results and plans strategies for parental engagement in increasing student mastery of specific standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Interprets Both Formal and Informal Assessments to Modify Instructional Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The formal and informal assessment results have minimal impact on planning for students.</th>
<th>Teacher uses informal and formal assessment results to plan for the class as a whole.</th>
<th>Teacher uses formal and informal assessment results to plan for individuals and groups of students.</th>
<th>Students and teachers are aware of how they are meeting the established standards and participate in planning the next steps.</th>
<th>Teacher analyzes and charts assessments data, draw action conclusions and uses the information to fine-tune instruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Component I E: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands Developmental Characteristics of Age Group</td>
<td>Teacher displays minimal knowledge of developmental characteristics of age group.</td>
<td>Teacher generally displays accurate knowledge of developmental characteristics of age group.</td>
<td>Teacher displays thorough understanding of typical developmental characteristics of age group as well as exceptions to general patterns.</td>
<td>Teacher displays extensive knowledge of typical developmental characteristics of age group, exceptions to the patterns, and the extent to which each student follows patterns.</td>
<td>Teacher is an expert in the subject area and has a cutting-edge grasp of child development and how students learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component I E: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory</strong></td>
<td><strong>Basic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong></td>
<td><strong>Distinguished</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exemplary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Students’ Skills and Interests Including those with Special Needs</td>
<td>Teacher displays little knowledge of students’ skills and interests and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes the value of understanding the students’ skills and interests but only displays this knowledge for the class only as a whole.</td>
<td>Teacher displays knowledge of students’ skills and for groups of students. This information is generally applied to small groups of students.</td>
<td>Teacher uses, where appropriate, knowledge of students’ varied approaches to learning in instructional planning.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates knowledge of students’ skills and interest through relevant lessons that will motivate all students and sweep them up in active learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Students’ Interests and Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Teacher displays little knowledge of students’ interests or cultural heritage and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students’ interests or cultural heritage but displays this knowledge for the class as a whole.</td>
<td>Teacher displays specific knowledge of the interests or cultural heritage of groups of students.</td>
<td>Teacher displays considerable knowledge of the interests or cultural heritage of each student and recognizes the value of this knowledge. This diversity among cultures is celebrated in appropriate ways.</td>
<td>Teacher designs and implements lessons which respond to students’ interests and cultural heritage with an appropriate mix of top notch cultural responsive learning materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component I F: Demonstrating Knowledge of and Utilizing Instructional Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accesses Available Teacher Resources through the School, District and Community</td>
<td>Teacher is unaware of resources available through the school or district.</td>
<td>Teacher displays limited awareness of resources available through the school or district.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates an awareness of school and district resources and knows how to access these resources.</td>
<td>In addition to being aware of school and district resources, teacher actively seeks other materials to enhance instruction, from professional organizations or through the community.</td>
<td>Teacher successfully enlists extra resources from home and the community to enhance lessons or build prior knowledge for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a Variety of Effective Resources that Support Student Learning</td>
<td>Teacher is unaware of resources to support student learning.</td>
<td>Teacher displays limited awareness of resources available to support student learning.</td>
<td>Teacher is fully aware of all resources available to support student learning.</td>
<td>Consistently, teacher utilizes additional resources available to support, enhance and extend student learning.</td>
<td>Teacher uses additional supportive resources imbedded within all students learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Technology to Enhance Student Learning and Achievement</td>
<td>Teacher does not use technology as a resource to enhance student learning.</td>
<td>Teacher uses limited technology as a resource to enhance student learning.</td>
<td>Teacher uses technology on a regular basis as a resource to enhance student learning and to improve student achievement.</td>
<td>Teacher frequently integrates multimedia activities to enhance student learning and to increase student achievement.</td>
<td>A variety of electronic devices used by both students and teacher are an integral part of the learning environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain II: The Classroom Environment

#### Component II A: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrates Equity, Respect and Fairness Toward All Students</strong></td>
<td>Teacher interaction with at least some students is negative, demeaning, sarcastic, or insensitive to the age or culture of the students.</td>
<td>Teacher-student interactions are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students’ culture.</td>
<td>Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general warmth, caring and respect.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates genuine caring and respect for individual students. Teacher honors student’s culture and unique qualities.</td>
<td>Teacher wins all students’ respect and creates a climate in which disruption of learning is unthinkable. Shows warmth, caring, respect, and fairness for all students and builds strong relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helps Students to Develop Positive Self-concepts and Interpersonal Skills</strong></td>
<td>Teacher seldom provides opportunities for positive student interactions and self-concept development.</td>
<td>Teacher occasionally provides opportunities for positive student interactions and self-concept development.</td>
<td>Teacher usually provides opportunities for positive student interactions and self-concept development.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently provides varied opportunities for positive student interactions and self-concept development and acknowledges student progress.</td>
<td>Teacher implements a program that successfully develops positive interactions and social emotional skills for all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Component II B: Managing Classroom Procedures and Practices Consistent with Building and District Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicates Behavioral Expectations to All Students</td>
<td>Teacher seldom communicates expected standards of behavior to all students.</td>
<td>Teacher occasionally communicates expected standards of behavior to all students.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently communicates expected standards of behavior to all students and encourages student involvement.</td>
<td>Teacher is direct, specific, consistent, and tenacious in communicating and enforcing very high expectations daily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches, Reviews and Revises Expectations and Procedures Throughout the Year to Ensure a Safe, Secure and Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>There is little evidence of established expectations and procedures.</td>
<td>There is some evidence of established expectations and procedures, although results are inconsistent.</td>
<td>There is evidence that expectation and procedures are established, practiced and consistently reinforced. Students demonstrate self-management skills.</td>
<td>Teacher is highly successful inculcating class routines and procedures so that students maintain them throughout the year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes Procedures for Transitions to Facilitate an Organized Classroom</td>
<td>Much time is lost during transitions.</td>
<td>Transitions are sporadically efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.</td>
<td>Transitions occur smoothly with little loss of instructional time.</td>
<td>Transitions are seamless, with students assuming some responsibility for efficient operation.</td>
<td>Teacher uses coherence, lesson momentum, and smooth transitions to get the most out of every minute of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component II C: Managing Student Behavior</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sets High Behavioral Expectations for All Students</strong></td>
<td>No behavior expectations appear to have been established, or students are confused as to what the expectations are.</td>
<td>Behavior appears to have been established for most situations, and most students seem to understand them.</td>
<td>Behavioral expectations are developed with student participation, clearly communicated, and support a safe learning environment for all students.</td>
<td>Positive behavior is reinforced and there is evidence of student self-management in a respectful classroom.</td>
<td>Teacher successfully develops students’ self-discipline, self-confidence, and a sense of responsibility in the classroom reflective on the positive interactions between one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reinforces Positive Student Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Student behavior is not monitored, and teacher is unaware of what students are doing.</td>
<td>Teacher is generally aware of student behavior but may miss the activities of some students.</td>
<td>Teacher is alert to student behavior at all times, reinforcing positive behavior.</td>
<td>Monitoring by teacher is subtle and preventive. Students monitor their own and their peers’ behavior, correcting one another respectfully.</td>
<td>Student behavior is entirely appropriate. Students take an active role in monitoring their own behavior and that of other students against student code of conduct. Teacher monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive. Teacher’s response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and receives a positive reaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrates the Ability to Respond and Intervene to Inappropriate Student Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Teacher does not respond to misbehavior, or the response is inconsistent, overly repressive, or does not respect the student’s dignity.</td>
<td>Teacher attempts to respond to student misbehavior, but with inconsistent results, or no serious disruptive behavior occurs</td>
<td>Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and successful and respects the student’s dignity, or student behavior is generally appropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher response to misbehavior is highly effective and sensitive to students’ individual needs, or student behavior is entirely appropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher has a highly effective discipline repertoire and can capture and hold students’ attention at any time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component II D: Establishing a Culture for Learning through Support of the Mission and Aims of the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishes Relevancy of Learning and Connecting Lessons to Life</td>
<td>Teacher conveys a negative attitude toward the content suggesting that the content is not important or relevant.</td>
<td>Teacher communicates the importance of the work but with few real life connections.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates genuine enthusiasm for the subject and conveys real life connections.</td>
<td>Teacher encourages a curiosity for learning and active participation in real life situations.</td>
<td>Students routinely direct their own learning, going beyond classroom assignments using supplementary materials to enhance learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes and Encourages All Students’ Progress in Learning</td>
<td>Teacher seldom recognizes or encourages students’ progress in learning.</td>
<td>Teacher occasionally recognizes or encourages students’ progress in learning.</td>
<td>Teacher usually recognizes or encourages students’ progress in learning.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently recognizes or honors students’ progress in learning.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently recognizes or honors students’ progress in learning and students demonstrate support of one another’s achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys High Expectations for Quality of Work and Achievement</td>
<td>Instructional goals, activities, interactions, and the classroom environment convey only modest expectations for student achievement.</td>
<td>Instructional goals, activities, interactions, and the classroom environment convey inconsistent expectations for student achievement.</td>
<td>Instructional goals, activities, interactions, and the classroom environment convey high expectations for student achievement.</td>
<td>Through planning of learning activities, both teacher and students establish and maintain interaction within the classroom environment that conveys high learning expectations for all.</td>
<td>The classroom culture is characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning, instructional outcomes, activities, and assignments convey high expectations for all students. Classroom interaction may extend learning. Students assume responsibility for high quality work by initiating improvements, making revisions, adding details and/or helping peers. High expectations are internalized by students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component II E: Organizing Physical Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assures that the Classroom and Other Physical Resources are Safe, Accessible, and Conducive to Learning</td>
<td>The classroom is unsafe and learning is not accessible to some students.</td>
<td>The classroom is safe, physical resources are used adequately and are accessible to all.</td>
<td>Teacher uses physical resources safely and skillfully, and all learning is equally accessible to all students.</td>
<td>Both teachers and students safely use physical resources optimally and learning is equally accessible to all students.</td>
<td>Students demonstrate knowledge and practice of safe classroom procedures and practices. The classroom is safe and easily accessible to students with special needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain III: Instruction

### Component III A: Communicating Clearly and Accurately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents Content Driven Lessons and Directions that are Clear to Students and Contain an Appropriate Level of Detail</td>
<td>Teacher’s lessons and directions are often confusing to students.</td>
<td>Teacher’s lessons and directions are clarified after initial student confusion or are excessively detailed.</td>
<td>Teacher’s lessons and directions are clear and contain an appropriate level of detail.</td>
<td>Teacher’s lessons and directions are clear and anticipate possible misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Students readily understand teacher direction as demonstrated by ability to immediately translate direction to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken and Written Language is Clear and Correct</td>
<td>Spoken or written language may contain many grammar and syntax errors. Vocabulary may be inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.</td>
<td>Teacher’s spoken and written language is acceptable. Both are used correctly, but may not always be developmentally appropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher’s spoken and written language is clear, correct and developmentally appropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher’s spoken and written language is clear and correct, with language that enhances the lesson.</td>
<td>Teacher always presents materials clearly and explicitly, with well-chosen examples and vivid and appropriate language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Component III B: Engaging Students in Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages Students by Using a Variety of Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>Teaching strategies and assignments are developmentally inappropriate and lack variety.</td>
<td>Teacher uses a limited variety of developmentally appropriate strategies.</td>
<td>Many teaching strategies are developmentally appropriate with good variety.</td>
<td>Most teaching strategies are developmentally appropriate and encourage high levels of student engagement.</td>
<td>Teacher gets all students highly involved in focused work in which they are active learners and problem solvers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Differentiated Instruction Based on Students' Needs</td>
<td>Teacher does not recognize or use differentiated learning to meet student needs.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes the need for differentiated learning and provides limited variations.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes the need for and uses differentiated learning on a regular basis.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently provides varied learning activities to address and enhance the needs of all students.</td>
<td>Teacher skillfully meets the learning needs and styles of all students by differentiating and scaffolding instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes Students for Instruction Using Various Techniques (i.e. individualized, performance groups, cooperative groups, small group)</td>
<td>Teacher does not recognize the need for or utilize grouping techniques for instruction.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes the need for and uses limited grouping techniques for instruction.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently uses a variety of grouping techniques.</td>
<td>Teacher uses a variety of grouping techniques and encourages students to initiate grouping.</td>
<td>Teacher orchestrates highly effective strategies, materials, and groupings to involve and motivate all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component III B: Engaging Students in Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Students to Initiate Learning and Achieve Goals on an Ongoing Basis</td>
<td>Teacher does not encourage students to initiate learning.</td>
<td>Teacher sometimes encourages students to initiate learning, but does not provide support in setting and achieving goals.</td>
<td>Teacher usually encourages students to initiate learning and offers support in setting and achieving goals.</td>
<td>Teacher engages students cognitively in exploration of content. Students initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance understanding.</td>
<td>Teacher uses a variety of effective methods to check for understanding, immediately unscrambles confusion and clarified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Component III C: Providing Feedback to Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides Feedback that is Substantive, Constructive and Specific to Each Student</td>
<td>Feedback is either not provided or is of uniformly poor quality.</td>
<td>Feedback is inconsistent in quality: Some elements of high quality are present; others are not.</td>
<td>Feedback is consistently of high quality.</td>
<td>Feedback is consistently high quality. Provision is made for students to use feedback in their learning.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently has students summarize what they learn and apply it to real-life situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Feedback in a Timely Manner</td>
<td>Feedback is not provided in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Timeliness of feedback is inconsistent.</td>
<td>Feedback is consistently provided in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Feedback is consistently provided in a timely manner. Students make prompt use of the feedback in their learning.</td>
<td>Teacher anticipates student queries and proves feedback relevant to entire class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component III D: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses a Variety of High Quality, Clearly Stated Questions</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are virtually all of poor quality.</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are of inconsistent quality or may not be clearly stated.</td>
<td>Teacher generally uses a variety of high quality, clearly stated questions.</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are of uniformly high quality and are formulated to generate further discussion.</td>
<td>Teacher incorporates the higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy of synthesis and evaluation to elicit more profound student thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages All Students in Discussions and Encourages Students to Formulate Questions for Higher Level Thinking</td>
<td>Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with teacher mediating all questions and answers.</td>
<td>Teacher makes some attempt to engage students in a true discussion, with uneven results.</td>
<td>Classroom interaction represents true discussion among all students, with teacher stepping to the side, when appropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher creates an atmosphere where all students assume considerable responsibility for the success of the discussion, initiating topics and making unsolicited contributions.</td>
<td>Teacher acts as a facilitator to assist students with routinely directing discussion topics for future exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicits Responses Equitably from All Students and Allows Adequate Response Time</td>
<td>Teacher does not elicit responses equitably from all students and does not allow adequate response time.</td>
<td>Teacher inconsistently elicits responses equitably, and may not allow adequate response time.</td>
<td>Teacher usually elicits responses equitably from all students and generally allows adequate response times.</td>
<td>Teacher has established a system for eliciting responses equitably and recognizes that individual students need varying response time.</td>
<td>Teacher’s question/prompts are of uniform high quality and fully support the lesson outcomes, with adequate time for students to respond. Varieties of question/prompts are used to challenge students cognitively, and advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition. Students formulate many questions, initiate topics and make unsolicited contributions. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Component III E: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapts Instructional Lessons Based on Student Responsiveness and Engagement</td>
<td>Teacher adheres rigidly to an instructional plan, even when a change will clearly improve responsiveness and engagement.</td>
<td>Teacher attempts to adapt lessons, with inconsistent results.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently adapts instructional plans and the adjustments occur smoothly.</td>
<td>Teacher continually assesses and adapts instructional plans based on student Responsiveness and engagement.</td>
<td>Students are engaged in helping direct instructional strategies to meet their learning needs (self-directed learners).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches to a Variety of Cognitive Levels: Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation</td>
<td>Teacher does not recognize differences in the cognitive complexity of tasks and teaches only to knowledge/recall level.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes cognitive levels, and demonstrates use of knowledge and comprehensive teaching techniques.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates flexibility and teaches to a variety of cognitive levels.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently uses a variety of cognitive levels and encourages students to engage in higher level thinking.</td>
<td>Students routinely risk volunteering responses, ideas, thoughts, and applications about discussions topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persists in Seeking Strategies that May Help Students Who Have Difficulty Learning</td>
<td>Teacher does not provide strategies or solutions to remedy the students’ lack of success.</td>
<td>Teacher recognizes students’ lack of success, but has only a limited repertoire of instructional strategies to use.</td>
<td>Teacher persists in seeking new approaches and strategies for students who have difficulty learning.</td>
<td>Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of strategies and utilizes additional resources.</td>
<td>Active participation in learning activities by academically challenged students demonstrate the teacher’s ability to find and implement teaching/learning techniques meeting the needs of all levels of learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Domain IV: Professional and Leadership Responsibilities**

### Component IV A: Maintaining Accurate Records and Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains Appropriate Progress Records of Student Tasks and Assignments, I.E.P.s, etc.</td>
<td>Teacher has no system for maintaining accurate information on student academic progress in learning, or the system is in disarray</td>
<td>Teacher’s system for maintaining accurate information on student academic progress in learning is rudimentary and only partially effective.</td>
<td>Teacher’s system for maintaining accurate information on student academic progress in learning is fully effective. Students may access progress information to improve performance.</td>
<td>Teacher maintains up to date web-based student academic information that is accessible to both student and family. Information includes academic status reports, all assignments/projects (past, current, make-up) and attendance information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains Records for Non Instructional Activities (i.e. attendance, field trip information)</td>
<td>Teacher’s records for non-instructional activities are in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.</td>
<td>Teacher’s records for non-instructional activities are adequate, but they require frequent monitoring to avoid error.</td>
<td>Teacher’s system for maintaining information on non-instructional activities is fully effective.</td>
<td>Teacher’s system for maintaining information on non-instructional activities is highly effective and students may contribute to its maintenance.</td>
<td>Teacher maintains up to date web-based student activity information that is accessible to both student and family on a daily basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Component IV B: Communicating and Developing Positive Relationships with Students, Parents/Guardians, Staff and Community Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers Various Points of View to Develop Positive</td>
<td>Teacher seldom considers various points of view.</td>
<td>Teacher inconsistently considers various points of view.</td>
<td>Teacher usually considers various points of view to develop positive relationships.</td>
<td>Through various ways, the teacher gathers input from students, colleagues, and parents/guardians to enhance his/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>view to develop positive relationships.</td>
<td>view to develop positive relationships.</td>
<td>relationships and further develop professionally. The teacher models the value of diverse viewpoints in his/her conversations, emails, written communication, and day-to-day activities with all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated Courtesy Integrity and Reliability in Professional Relationships.</td>
<td>Teacher seldom shows courtesy, integrity and reliability in professional relationships.</td>
<td>Teacher most often shows courtesy, integrity and reliability in professional relationships.</td>
<td>Teacher consistently shows courtesy, integrity and reliability in working with internal and external customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher makes little attempt to engage families and community partners in the instructional process or such attempts are inappropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher usually makes modest attempts to engage families and community partners in the instructional process, with inconsistent results.</td>
<td>Teacher’s efforts to engage families and community partners in the instructional process are frequent and successful.</td>
<td>In stressful interpersonal situations, both with colleagues and parents/guardians, the teacher remains alert, poised, dynamic, self-assured, and maintains a professional demeanor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports and Encourages the Role of the Family and Community in the Education of a Child</td>
<td>Teacher makes little attempt to engage families and community partners in the instructional process or such attempts are inappropriate.</td>
<td>Teacher usually makes modest attempts to engage families and community partners in the instructional process.</td>
<td>Families and community support partners seek out the teacher for ways to participate in the instructional process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

A Comparison of Value-Added Measures and Classroom Observations for Teacher Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value-Added Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Costly to build necessary data system; generally requires hiring experts to set it up and conduct the analyses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively inexpensive (after initial infrastructure costs)</td>
<td>• No information about what effective teachers do in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focuses solely and directly on student learning</td>
<td>• No information to help “bad” teachers improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively objective</td>
<td>• No information for some teachers (e.g., special education, art, music, early elementary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparable across schools, districts, and even states (if they are using the same statistical methods and achievement tests)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Observation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Costly due to personnel costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High face-validity and teacher buy-in</td>
<td>• May not take student achievement into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows teachers to understand and participate in the evaluation process</td>
<td>• Scores determined by evaluators with different levels of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Useful for formative evaluation, particularly for novice teachers</td>
<td>• May be affected by whether measures are used for high-stakes or low-stakes evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Based on “best practices”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Teacher Effectiveness Strategy

“From Hire – to- Retire”


## Appendix E

### Qualitative and Quantitative Inputs into Teacher Effectiveness Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Measures</th>
<th>Quantitative Measures of Student Engagement and Achievement</th>
<th>Quantitative Value-Added Measures of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>• Student surveys</td>
<td>• Student assessment scores (growth compared to baseline) for those subject areas which have assessments (or for which we can develop new assessments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom observations (Danielson)</td>
<td>• Parent surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walk-throughs</td>
<td>• Student engagement snapshots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers’ goals/self-reflection</td>
<td>• Teacher attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student work (portfolios)</td>
<td>• Standards-based grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher artifacts (e.g., lesson plans)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single Teacher Effectiveness Score is calculated based on all the inputs above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-wide Incentives</th>
<th>Student attendance</th>
<th>Student drop-out rates</th>
<th>Teacher attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Quantitative Inputs by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Input</th>
<th>Target Grades</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement Snapshots</td>
<td>PK-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attendance</td>
<td>PK-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Surveys</td>
<td>PK-3</td>
<td>Focus on grades in which student surveys would not be reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>Based on national research, grade 4 appears to be first grade in which student surveys provide reliable information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards-based Student Grades</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Need to be based on standards and on common definitions of what constitutes an “A”, “B,” “C,” etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assessment Scores</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>Need appropriate, credible tests (tied to the curriculum) Need growth model (pre- and post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attendance</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>Need a growth model or differentiated approach to account for schools with chronic attendance problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Drop-out Rates</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Domains and Evidence

**Domain 1**
- Teaching artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, unit plans, gradebook)
- Teacher performance goals
- Unit plans and gradebooks

**Domain 2**
- Announced formal classroom observations
- Unannounced formal classroom observations
- Walk-through observations

**Domain 3**
- Announced formal classroom observations
- Unannounced formal classroom observations
- Walk-through observations

**Domain 4**
- Parent-teacher conference notes*
- Teacher performance goals
- Logs of professional development activities
- Teacher self-assessment
## Appendix G

Weights of Individual Components within Growth areas (*only with growth assessments*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>K-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Appraisal Framework</td>
<td>Domain I</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain II</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain III</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain IV</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Measures: Student Engagement and Achievement</td>
<td>Student Engagement Snapshots</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Attendance</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Surveys</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards-Based Student Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Measures: Value-Added Models</td>
<td>Acuity, AP tests, Achieve, End-of-Course Tests</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Components as Percent of Total “Score”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>K-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Appraisal Framework</td>
<td>Domain I</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain II</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain III</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain IV</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Measures: Student Engagement and Achievement</td>
<td>Student Engagement Snapshots</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Attendance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Surveys</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards-Based Student Grades</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Measures: Value-Added Models</td>
<td>Acuity, AP tests, Achieve, End-of-Course Tests</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### METRICS

- **K-2**: 7
- **3**: 8
- **4**: 8
- **5**: 8
- **6**: 8
- **7-8**: 9
- **9-12**: 8
Appendix H

Evaluation Components

- Self-assessment
- Program of Assistance
- Goal setting/professional development plan
- Summative evaluation
- Evaluation Activities—conferencing, Observations, Walk-throughs
Appendix I

Using Data to Focus and Align Professional Development

* Bernhardt, Victoria
  Data Analysis
Appendix I, continued

**PRE-PREP: Planning for Implementation**

1. Unpack the standards and curriculum indicators and identify prerequisite skills needed for success.
2. Consider Skills and Concepts, Depth of Knowledge, and Table of Specifications.
3. Use the intervention indicator report to identify students with greatest need.

**Administration**

- September: Acuity Pre-Screen
- 1/2 previous grade, 1/3 on grade level items
- November-January: Diagnostic Tests
- February: Mid Year Acuity Tests, on grade level

**ACT: Collaborative Meetings for Strategy Revision**

1. Set a working, what is not?
2. Unpack the curricular indicator(s) for gaps in student understanding?
3. What progress has been made?
4. What remains to be mastered?
5. How can I teach the content/skill differently?
6. Utilize Acuity Instructional Resources specific to student needs

**PLAN: Interpretation of Results/Data Analysis**

1. Collaborative meetings with staff, such as:
   - Elementary Grade Level Meetings
   - Middle School Team Meetings/Department Meetings
   - High School Department Meetings

2. Analysis of test results focused on curricular indicators:
   - Acuity School Item Analysis Report
   - Identify teachers needing assistance
   - Acuity Class Item Analysis Report
   - Identify classroom needs
   - Note misconceptions/score distributions
   - Identify Instructional Goals
   - Set short term goal(s) at the class level
   - Set short term goal(s) for skill groups
   - Set short term goals for individual students (involve students)

**STUDY: Progress Monitoring/Progress Checks**

1. Monitor progress by using:
   - Informal Classroom Checks
   - Classroom Based Assessments
   - Acuity Instructional Resources
   - Acuity Diagnostic Tests
   - Acuity Custom Tests

   Students are engaged in monitoring their own learning to keep them focused on the target.
   Communicate progress to parents.

**DO: Standards Based, Strategic Teaching**

1. Organize instruction, using the graduated release of instruction (modelled, shared, guided, independent) based on identified curricular indicators:
   - Implement targeted instructional strategies
   - Provide regular descriptive feedback
   - Form/adjust skills groups using classroom evidence
   - Utilize Acuity Instructional Resources specific to student needs