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Teacher leaders today are faced with hard choices: to teach, or to lead.
93% of expert teachers in a national survey said that opportunities for growth and leadership were “somewhat” or “very” important to their decisions to remain in teaching.
Problems of a flat profession:

• Fewer opportunities for promotion, leadership, growth make teaching less attractive in comparison with other 21st century careers.

• Lack of differentiated roles makes it harder to pay for expertise rather than years of service.

• Attrition is expensive: $455m for California, up to $4.9b for the nation each year.
Many Ways Out
No Way Up

TEACHER ATTRITION
1 out of 5 will leave by Year 3
3 out of 5 will leave by Year 5

CURRENT
State of the Teaching Profession

Pre-Service Teacher
Temporary Probationary Teacher
Permanent Teacher
Teacher on Special Assignment
Department Head or Lead Teacher
Leave Field of Education Entirely
Consultant, Coach, or Researcher
Administrative Track
Many Ways Up No Reason to Move Out

State of the Teaching Profession

Master Teacher
Professional Teacher
Apprentice Teacher

Hybrid Teacher Leader Track
Specialization Track
Mentor Teacher Track
What we can do:

• Make funding for teachers’ positions flexible so districts can construct hybrid roles that meet local needs.
• Encourage partnerships between districts and the programs that prepare their teachers to lead.
• Follow best practices around professional development that is continuous, teacher driven, and results oriented.
• Share your stories of what is already being done: @nmiteachers, #nmibayarea, teachingquality.org
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Creating a Teacher Evaluation System that Works for California

National Board Resource Center, Stanford University
Our mission:

amplify teacher voice, support teacher leaders

Our members:

Teacher leaders from most regions of California

Traditional, charter, alternative schools

Early-career to veteran

National Board Certified, Teachers of the Year, other recognition
Our ways of thinking about evaluation must change.

The goals should be
continual improvement,
for every teacher,
focused on meeting the needs of the whole child.
Guiding principles for teacher evaluation reform

1. Professional Standards
   - California Standards for the Teaching Profession
   - National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
   - Certificate standards; and, “Getting It Right” (2011)
   - Need greater cohesiveness to address full continuum
   - Other models: Danielson; Marzano

2. Include authentic teaching performance assessments

3. Engage teachers in decision-making
More guiding principles for teacher evaluation reform

4. Include an array of authentic evidence of student learning

5. Regular evaluation by trained peer and administrative evaluators

6. More intensive evaluation before permanent status is granted; part of an improved professional induction

7. Provide useful feedback and relevant professional development opportunities
“Value added?”
Professional Consensus

- “VAM estimates of teacher effectiveness ... should not be used to make operational decisions because such estimates are far too unstable to be considered fair or reliable.”
  – 2009 Letter Report from the Board on Testing and Assessment, National Research Council

- Assessments validated to measure student learning require separate validation as measure of teaching.
  APA/NCME/AERA
Many teachers indicated as effective or ineffective in one year are not for others

- 27% of “A” teachers one year get D or F next year. 45% get C or lower.
- 30% of “F” teachers one year get A or B next year. 51% get C or better.

The *Unintended Effects* of VA Teacher Evaluation in Houston: Three Cases in Point

- In spring of 2011, a number of HISD teachers’ contracts were not renewed, largely due to:
  - “a significant lack of student progress attributable to the educator,” and
  - “insufficient student academic growth reflected by [EVAAS] value-added scores.”
- These teachers filed wrongful termination appeals.
Teacher A’s EVAAS Scores (2007-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-0.96*</td>
<td>+2.03</td>
<td>+1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>+0.68*</td>
<td>+0.16*</td>
<td>+3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>+1.12</td>
<td>-0.49*</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>+2.37</td>
<td>-3.45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>+0.91*</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teacher A had been an elementary teacher in HISD for more than 10 years.

- Positive VA scores 50% of the time (8/16 of EVAAS observations). During Teacher A’s most recent years of activity, her VA scores were positive 2/3 of the time.

- Until 2010-11, she “exceeded expectations” across every domain in her supervisor evaluations. She was given a “Teacher of the Month” award in 2010 and a “Teacher of the Year” award in 2008.
- Teacher B, a career-changer with a bachelor’s and master’s degree in mathematics, was certified as a math teacher via HISD’s Alternative Teaching Certificate (ATC) program. She taught middle- and high-school math in HISD since 2007.

- Teacher B’s relative value-added scores were negative for math for two years, and positive for the most recent year for which she had EVAAS data.

- Note that she taught alongside another math teacher who taught nearly half of her students math an equal amount of time per week all year long.

- Until 2010-11, she scored a “proficient” across every domain in terms of her supervisor evaluations.
Teacher C’s EVAAS Scores (2007-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>+0.36*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>-3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>+1.28</td>
<td>+0.39*</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teacher C certified as a teacher for grades 4-8 via HISD’s Alternative Teaching Certificate (ATC) program. She took a full-time position in HISD in 2006.

- Teacher C flip-flopped across subject areas, with 50% positive VA (3/6 EVAAS observations) and 50% negative (3/6 EVAAS observations) up until 2009-2010.

- In 2009-2010 Teacher C was assigned to teach a large number of English Language Learners who were transitioned into her classroom.

- Until 2010-11, she was rated as “exceeded expectations” or “proficient” across every domain in terms of her supervisor evaluations.
Benefits we would anticipate from adopting these principles

- Sharper focus on better teaching for all teachers
- Distributed leadership; support principals
- More effective professional development practices
- Focus on student learning that matters

Cost/benefit consideration

- Expense of turnover and attrition
- Expense of an underperforming public education system
Making Connections, Spreading the Word

• Media: Education Week, California newspapers, KQED-FM
• Government: CDE website; AB-5 (Fuentes); SB-257 (Liu); visits to legislators
• Research, advocacy: EdSource; Educate Our State; Educacy; League of Women Voters (S. San Mateo Co.); The Carlston Family Foundation
• Districts: LAUSD, OUSD, Palo Alto, Escondido

Final thoughts: teacher evaluation must become tool for grooming, improving and retaining teachers, not weeding them out. We face massive problems in the near future with our teacher pipeline. We must develop and improve the teachers we have, and attract and retain talent (not either/or). Expanding capacity is vital.
web: acteachers.org
blog: InterACT (blog)
twitter: @AcmpCA_Teachers

plus YouTube and Facebook
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Peer Review:
Getting Serious About Teacher Support and Evaluation
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The Study

• Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) in Poway and San Juan

• Context: Teacher evaluation

• Foci: 1) Consulting Teachers, 2) Governance Board, 3) labor-management relations
The Findings

Finding #1:
PAR provides rigorous teacher support and evaluation.

Example from an Evaluation File:
“Since October 2, our work has included 12 conferences to discuss expectations, one formal classroom observation, 15 informal classroom observations, and 1 full day and 1 half-day of lesson modeling by the Consulting Teacher. Total time together, including observations, discussion, and modeling lessons in the classroom, has been approximately 30.5 hours over 6 weeks.”
Principal Evaluations and Consulting Teacher Evaluations

Principals’ Evaluations:
- Formal Observations: Average 1 (0 to 3)
- Informal Observations: Average 2 (0 to 7)
- Evaluation Page Count: Average 7 (2 to 27)

Consulting Teachers’ Evaluations:
- Formal Observations: Average 5 (2 to 6)
- Informal Observations: Average 38 (12 to 71)
- Evaluation Page Count: Average 190 (52 to 49)
Finding #2: The Governance Board leads to high stakes labor-management collaboration.

- Union and District representatives serve on the Governance Board.
- The Governance Board makes high stakes recommendations regarding teachers continued employment.
- The Governance Board serves as a problem solving arena.
Next Steps

• BTSA Dilemma

• “Right Start” Study

• Teacher early career policies
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Moderator: John Fensterwald, Thoughts on Public Education
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