

Teacher Evaluation, Compensation & Student Outcomes



*How can we link all of these components together
in a fair, reliable system that will change
public education for the better?*

Presented by Ellen Bernstein, Ed.D.

President of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation

Background

- ▶ Race to the Top has replaced the NCLB emphasis on “Highly Qualified” teachers with “Highly Effective” teachers.
- ▶ Race to the Top also required that evaluation of teachers and principals “take into account data on student growth” .
- ▶ Some have assumed that teacher effectiveness can be measured by linking student test scores to teachers’ evaluations.

Race to the Top Application (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:

- ▶ The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—
- ▶ (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; *(5 points)*
- ▶ **(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; *(15 points)***
- ▶ (iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; *(10 points)* and
- ▶ (iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— *(28 points)*
 - (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;
 - (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;
 - (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and
 - (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

With us, not to us...

- ▶ Teachers and their union leaders know the current evaluation system is broken, ineffective and needs to change.
- ▶ As teachers, we embrace our professional accountability. Our evaluation system should take into account the outcomes of our work.
- ▶ Teachers are interested in an assessment system that measures growth, in part, because of the flawed AYP system in No Child Left Behind.



With us, not to us (cont'd)...

- ▶ Contrary to popular belief, teacher unions are not protecting the *status quo*.
- ▶ Union leaders, teachers and other education professionals know that an effective evaluation system that accounts for student growth must be co-developed with us.
- ▶ As unionized professionals, of everything within our control, nothing matters more than the knowledge, skills and effectiveness of our members.



Value-Added Methods: The New Bandwagon

- ▶ Good teaching is much more than a student test score, yet teacher evaluation cannot ignore the importance of student learning.
- ▶ Some school districts and states have embraced a Value-Added Method (VAM) for measuring growth.
- ▶ The research community strongly cautions against reliance on test scores – even when superficially sophisticated VAM methods are used.

Reasons to be Concerned About Value-Added Methods

- ▶ No strong evidence that the teachers who are identified using VAM, and subsequently dismissed, are less effective than those teachers retained or those newly-hired to replace them.
- ▶ Evaluating schools and teachers mainly on standardized test scores has led to excessive test preparation and a narrow curriculum.
- ▶ It's also led to an arbitrary and inordinate focus on students who are on the cusp of “proficiency” as measured by standardized tests, a focus that undercuts the right of all students.



A test's *instructional sensitivity* represents the degree to which students' performances on that test accurately reflect the quality of the instruction that was provided specifically to promote students' mastery of whatever is being assessed. In other words, an instructionally *sensitive* test would be capable of distinguishing between strong and weak instruction by allowing us to validly conclude that a set of students' *high* test scores are meaningfully, but not exclusively, attributable to effective instruction.

Similarly, such a test would allow us to accurately infer that a set of students' *low* test scores are meaningfully, but not exclusively, attributable to ineffective instruction. In contrast, an instructionally *insensitive* test would not allow us to distinguish accurately between strong and weak instruction.

Students' performances on most of the accountability tests currently used are more heavily influenced by the students' socioeconomic status (SES) than by the quality of teachers' instructional efforts. That is, such instructionally insensitive accountability tests tend to measure the SES composition of a school's student body rather than the effectiveness with which the school's students have been taught.

Instructional Insensitivity of Tests: Accountability's Dire Drawback

By W. James Popham
*W. JAMES POPHAM is an emeritus professor at the
University of California, Los Angeles, and founder
of IOX Assessment Associates.*



Purposes of an Evaluation System

- ▶ In a deficit-based model, evaluation has only one purpose. In an asset-based model, evaluation serves multiple purposes, such as:
 - Improving the overall quality of the teacher workforce by identifying and building upon individual and collective teacher strengths, and by improving instruction and other teacher practices to improve student learning.
 - Identifying exemplary teachers.
 - Identifying ineffective teachers and develop a system of support to remediate their skills.
 - Ensuring fair and valid employment decisions, including decisions about rehiring, dismissal, career paths and tenure.



ATF Believes an Evaluation System Should:

- ▶ Focus on providing continuous professional development and growth for teachers by addressing the skills, knowledge and needs of teachers depending on where they are on a career continuum (e.g., novice, mid-career, veteran).
- ▶ Promote teacher leadership.
- ▶ Be both formative and summative.
- ▶ Be based on a set of standards of practice that takes into account the complexities of teaching.



ATF Believes an Evaluation System Should Also:

- ▶ Include evidence of teaching and student learning from multiple sources.
- ▶ Address how to build the capacity of districts and schools to implement high-quality teacher development and evaluation systems.
- ▶ Consider the context in which teaching and learning takes place.
- ▶ Be subject to continuous updating of instruments and processes as research on practice leading to valued student outcomes becomes available.



To a music lover watching a concert from the audience, it would be easy to believe that a conductor has one of the easiest jobs in the world. There he stands, waving his arms in time with the music, and the orchestra produces glorious sounds, to all appearances quite spontaneously. Hidden from the audience—especially from the musical novice—are the conductor’s abilities to read and interpret all of the parts at once, to play several instruments and understand the capacities of many more, to organize and coordinate the disparate parts, to motivate and communicate with all of the orchestra members. In the same way that conducting looks like hand-waving to the uninitiated, teaching looks simple from the perspective of students who see a person talking and listening, handing out papers, and giving assignments. Invisible in both of these performances are the many kinds of knowledge, unseen plans, and backstage moves—the skunkworks, if you will—that allow a teacher to purposefully move a group of students from one set of understandings and skills to quite another over the space of many months.

Preparing Teachers for a Changing World:

What Teachers Should Know and Be Able To Do

Linda Darling-Hammond and

John Bransford, editors



Student Learning & Teacher Evaluation

- ▶ Student learning should include evidence of growth in knowledge and skills based on multiple measures.
- ▶ One measure of student learning, currently used in the Pro-Comp System in Denver and Austin's REACH program, is called Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).



Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

as a tool to measure student learning

- ▶ SLOs are annual targets for growth that a teacher sets at the beginning of the year and strives to attain by the end of the year (or at the end of a semester if appropriate).
- ▶ SLOs are based on a student needs assessment and aligned to the school's standards and curricula.
- ▶ SLOs must be (1) based on outcomes, (2) rigorous, and (3) measurable.



Student Learning Objectives (cont'd)

- ▶ SLOs are a way to incorporate an individual teacher's contribution to student learning into an evaluation system, and are:
 - Teacher-created
 - Student-specific
 - Instructionally-sensitive
 - Valid
 - Reliable
- ▶ We should measure what we value, not the other way around. All too often in education, we value what is easy to measure, but overlook elements that are essential for effective practice. If we value the ability to work in groups, think critically, solve problems, etc., we must measure those abilities.

Evaluation & Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness

- ▶ Teaching is multifaceted.
- ▶ Evaluation measures must include teacher knowledge—of students, of how children learn, of subject matter and of instructional techniques.
- ▶ An evaluation system must also take into account outcomes—of student learning, student behavior and student engagement.
- ▶ To evaluate teacher effectiveness, we must gather data on all these matters and make a judgment based on all the evidence.
- ▶ We must avoid creating incentives to focus on some outcomes or practices at the expense of other equally-valued outcomes or practices.



Evaluation & Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness (cont'd)

- ▶ In teacher evaluation, each characteristic of importance to us (for example, quality of instruction; outcomes for students; contributions to the profession) can be measured in several different ways. For example:
 - Student Learning Objectives–SLOs
 - Instructional quality – classroom observations, analysis of teacher artifacts including lesson plans and student assignments and examination of grading practices and feedback to students.



Evaluations Must Also Consider *Weighting*

- ▶ For example, are all evaluation criteria equally important?
- ▶ How much consideration should be given to classroom observation data? To parent and student surveys? To student work samples and/or test data?
- ▶ Decisions must be made about what type of evidence best fulfills the criteria of an evaluation system, including:
 - Principal observations
 - Student learning
 - Teacher artifacts

Peer Assistance and Review

- ▶ Allowing ineffective teachers to stay in the classroom is detrimental to students, teachers, their unions and the profession. Teacher unions have a responsibility to teachers, the teaching profession and students to ensure that all teachers meet high professional standards of practice.
- ▶ The PAR Program is an intervention program designed to help improve the performance of experienced teachers who are having serious difficulties in the performance of their professional responsibilities.
- ▶ This help is provided through peer assistance from a Consulting Teacher (CT). The CT works directly with the struggling teacher to provide constructive and intensive intervention. The goal of the PAR Program is to develop and maintain the highest caliber teaching staff.

ATF's Position on Compensation

- ▶ Teachers should be paid well for teaching and evaluation must have as its primary goal strengthening the individual and collective practices of teachers and schools to improve student learning.
- ▶ Teaching is broad in its scope of responsibilities, all of which must be taken into account within a compensation system.



ATF Believes a Compensation System Should:

- ▶ Reward both expertise and extra time.
- ▶ Value teachers for their expertise and not just for quasi-administrative work.
- ▶ Be tied directly to a legitimate evaluation system. All movement must be contingent upon satisfactory evaluations.



Tying it All Together: Building on the 3-Tiered Licensure System

- ▶ It is important to note that New Mexico's 3-Tiered system:
 - Is unique
 - Is a high-stakes system
 - Currently includes both student learning and teacher evaluations
- ▶ As teachers, we want to be recognized for experience and education, but the current Training & Experience (T&E) Index is not adequate.
- ▶ We need a funding formula that ensures that the minimum salaries in the 3-Tiered system do not also become maximum salaries.
- ▶ We support adapting the T&E Index so that it's similar to the way we fund students by assigning them weight according to a formula.

In a Teacher-Weighted Formula:

- ▶ Each Level II and Level III teacher is weighted by a formula based on:
 - Experience
 - Education
 - Credentials
 - Added responsibilities
 - Evaluations
 - Student growth
- ▶ Incorporating the EPSS recognizes that in a comprehensive system, teacher development and evaluation must foster collective responsibility and accountability.

Example: Level 1 compensation using teacher-weighted formula

Level 1 Example Base pay \$30,000				
Years within Level	BA+30	MA	MA+30	Credential Differential (National Board Certification, ESL, Bilingual, etc.)
0-3	.05 / \$31,500	.15 / \$34,500	.20 / \$36,000	.10 in addition to current base
4-5	.10 / \$33,000	.20 / \$36,000	.25 / \$37,500	.10 in addition to current base

In Level 1, the focus is on learning how to teach, mentoring, learning how to create and measure SLOs.



Example: Level 2 compendensation using teacher-weighted formula

Level 2 Example							
Base Pay \$40,000							
Years within Level	Education			Credential Differentials	Added Responsibilities	Evaluation/ Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	School EPSS Goals
	BA	BA+30	BA+45 or MA				
1-5	\$40,000	.15 \$46,000	.20 \$48,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000
6-10	.10 \$44,000	.20 \$48,000	.25 \$50,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000
11+	.15 \$46,000	.25 \$50,000	.30 \$52,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000



Example: Level 3 compensation using teacher-weighted formula

Level 3 Example
Base Pay \$50,000

Years within Level	Education			Credential Differentials	Added Responsibilities (Mentoring)	Evaluation/ Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	School EPSS Goals
	MA or NBC	MA+30	Doctorate				
1-5	.10 \$50,000	.15 \$57,500	.20 \$60,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000
6-10	.10 \$55,000	.20 \$60,000	.25 \$62,500	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000
11+	.15 \$57,500	.25 \$62,500	.30 \$65,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000



Benefits of a Teacher-Weighted Formula

- ▶ School districts will truly have a career ladder of opportunity within the licensure levels. This system will continue to honor education and experience for all teachers by adding a weighted formula for each Level I and III teacher.
- ▶ It will also provide incentives and pay growth potential if a teacher wants to stay at Level II for an entire career.
- ▶ In addition, it will allow pay increments for extra work or assignments for Level III teachers if they choose to take on additional responsibilities.



In Conclusion:

- ▶ Revamping teacher evaluation and compensation systems is necessary.
- ▶ The Albuquerque Teachers Federation is looking at ways to accurately measure student learning in ALL content areas, so that it can be appropriately factored into teacher evaluation and compensation systems.

In Conclusion (cont'd):

- ▶ In order to overhaul these systems, we need:
 - State lawmakers to have the political will to raise revenue to fund public education appropriately.
 - A truly collaborative relationship among all stakeholders in our public education system.
 - To ensure that teachers work within a highly functional *system* — one that, at a minimum, provides meaningful performance evaluations, high-quality professional development, reasonable class sizes, reliable and stable leadership, and time for planning and collaboration.



We can have a perfect evaluation system, but if nothing else in our system changes, then changing the teacher evaluation system will change nothing.

Albuquerque Teachers Federation

Teacher Evaluation, Compensation and Student Outcomes

How can we link all of these components together in a fair, reliable system that will change public education for the better?



ALBUQUERQUE
TEACHERS
FEDERATION

Ellen Bernstein, Ed.D., President of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation
October 28, 2010

Teacher Evaluation, Compensation and Student Outcomes

How can we link all of these components together in a fair, reliable system that will change public education for the better?

Background & Context

- Race to the Top has replaced the NCLB emphasis on “Highly Qualified” teachers with “Highly Effective” teachers.
- Race to the Top also required that evaluation of teachers and principals “take into account data on student growth”.
- Some have assumed that teacher effectiveness can be measured by linking student test scores to teachers’ evaluations.

Race to the Top Application (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; *(5 points)*

(ii) **Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth** (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; *(15 points)*

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; *(10 points)* and

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— *(28 points)*

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

With Us Not To Us

- Teachers and their union leaders know the current evaluation system is broken, ineffective and needs to change.
- As teachers, we embrace our professional accountability. Our evaluation system should take into account the outcomes of our work.
- Teachers are interested in an assessment system that measures growth, in part, because of the flawed AYP system in No Child Left Behind.
- Contrary to popular belief, teachers and their unions are not protecting the *status quo*.
- Union leaders, teachers and other education professionals know that an effective evaluation system that accounts for student growth must be co-developed with us.
- As unionized professionals, of everything within our control, nothing matters more than the knowledge, skills and effectiveness of our members.

Value-Added Methods

- Good teaching is much more than a student test score, yet teacher evaluation cannot ignore the importance of student learning.
- Some school districts and states have embraced a Value-Added Method (VAM) for measuring growth.
- Unfortunately, this method relies on narrow and flawed standardized tests with standardized test scores used as the sole or predominant measure.
- Some advocates of VAM think it will make it easier to dismiss teachers. There is no short cut.
- The research community strongly cautions against reliance on test scores – even when superficially sophisticated VAM methods are used.
- Standardized test scores are not sufficiently reliable and valid indicators of teacher effectiveness.
- Standardized tests are not instructionally-sensitive.

- There are good reasons to be concerned about current VAM:
 - No strong evidence that the teachers who are identified using VAM, and subsequently dismissed, are less effective than those teachers retained or those newly-hired to replace them.
 - No evidence that teachers are motivated to “improve” if evaluated or compensated using test scores.
 - Unintended consequences such as:
 - Evaluating schools and teachers mainly on standardized test scores has led to excessive test preparation and a narrow curriculum.
 - It’s also led to an arbitrary and inordinate focus on students who are on the cusp of “proficiency” as measured by standardized tests, a focus that undercuts the right of all students to a well-rounded, content-rich curriculum that encourages them to develop critical thinking skills.

A test’s *instructional sensitivity* represents the degree to which students’ performances on that test accurately reflect the quality of the instruction that was provided specifically to promote students’ mastery of whatever is being assessed. In other words, an instructionally *sensitive* test would be capable of distinguishing between strong and weak instruction by allowing us to validly conclude that a set of students’ *high* test scores are meaningfully, but not exclusively, attributable to effective instruction.

Similarly, such a test would allow us to accurately infer that a set of students’ *low* test scores are meaningfully, but not exclusively, attributable to ineffective instruction. In contrast, an instructionally *insensitive* test would not allow us to distinguish accurately between strong and weak instruction.

Students’ performances on most of the accountability tests currently used are more heavily influenced by the students’ socioeconomic status (SES) than by the quality of teachers’ instructional efforts. That is, such instructionally insensitive accountability tests tend to measure the SES composition of a school’s student body rather than the effectiveness with which the school’s students have been taught.

Instructional Insensitivity of Tests: Accountability’s Dire Drawback

By W. James Popham

W. JAMES POPHAM is an emeritus professor at the University of California, Los Angeles, and founder of IOX Assessment Associates.

Purposes of an Evaluation System

In a deficit-based model, evaluation has only one purpose. In an asset-based model, evaluation serves multiple purposes, such as:

- Improving the overall quality of the teacher workforce by identifying and building upon individual and collective teacher strengths, and by improving instruction and other teacher practices to improve student learning.
- Identifying exemplary teachers.
- Identifying ineffective teachers and developing a system of support to remediate their skills.
- Ensuring fair and valid employment decisions, including decisions about rehiring, dismissal, career paths and tenure.
- Confirmation of what teachers are doing well.

ATF Believes an Evaluation System Should:

- Focus on providing continuous professional development and growth for teachers by addressing the skills, knowledge and needs of teachers depending on where they are on a career continuum (e.g., novice, mid-career, veteran).
- Promote teacher leadership.
- Be both formative and summative.
- Be based on a set of standards of practice that takes into account the complexities of teaching.
- Include evidence of teaching and student learning from multiple sources.
- Address how to build the capacity of districts and schools to implement high-quality teacher development and evaluation systems.
- Be subject to continuous updating of instruments and processes as research on practice leading to valued student outcomes becomes available.

To a music lover watching a concert from the audience, it would be easy to believe that a conductor has one of the easiest jobs in the world. There he stands, waving his arms in time with the music, and the orchestra produces glorious sounds, to all appearances quite spontaneously. Hidden from the audience—especially from the musical novice—are the conductor’s abilities to read and interpret all of the parts at once, to play several instruments and understand the capacities of many more, to organize and coordinate the disparate parts, to motivate and communicate with all of the orchestra members. In the same way that conducting looks like hand-waving to the uninitiated, teaching looks simple from the perspective of students who see a person talking and listening, handing out papers, and giving assignments. Invisible in both of these performances are the many kinds of knowledge, unseen plans, and backstage moves— the skunkworks, if you will—that allow a teacher to purposefully move a group of students from one set of understandings and skills to quite another over the space of many months.

*Preparing Teachers for a Changing World:
What Teachers Should Know and Be Able To Do*
Linda Darling-Hammond and John Bransford, editors

How Could Student Learning be Measured within a Teacher Evaluation System?

- Student learning should include evidence of growth in knowledge and skills, based on multiple measures.
- One measure of student learning, currently used in the Pro-Comp System in Denver and Austin’s REACH program, is called Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).
- SLOs are annual targets for growth that a teacher sets at the beginning of the year and strives to attain by the end of the year (or at the end of a semester, if appropriate).
- SLOs are based on a student needs assessment and aligned to the school’s standards and curricula.
- SLOs must be (1) based on outcomes, not activities, (2) rigorous, and (3) measurable.
- SLOs are a way to incorporate an individual teacher’s contribution to student learning into an evaluation system, and are:
 - Teacher-created
 - Student-specific
 - Instructionally-sensitive
 - Valid
 - Reliable
- We should measure what we value, not the other way around. All too often in education, we value what is easy to measure, but overlook elements that are essential for effective practice. If we value the ability to work in groups, think critically, solve problems, etc., we must measure those abilities.

Evaluations Systems Must Have Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness

- Teaching is multifaceted.
- Evaluation measures must include teacher knowledge—of students, of how children learn, of subject matter and of instructional techniques.
- An evaluation system must also take into account outcomes—of student learning, student behavior and student engagement.
- To evaluate teacher effectiveness, we must gather data on all these matters and make a judgment based on all the evidence.
- One important reason for incorporating multiple measures in teacher evaluation systems is to avoid creating incentives to focus on some outcomes or practices at the expense of other equally-valued outcomes or practices.
- In teacher evaluation, each characteristic of importance to us (for example, quality of instruction; outcomes for students; contributions to the profession) can be measured in several different ways. For example:
 - Student Learning Objectives-SLOs
 - Instructional quality - classroom observations, analysis of teacher artifacts including lesson plans and student assignments and examination of grading practices and feedback to students.

Evaluation Systems Must Consider *Weighting*

- For example, are all evaluation criteria equally important?
- How much consideration should be given to classroom observation data? To parent and student surveys? To student work samples and/or test data?
- Decisions must be made about what type of evidence best fulfills the criteria of an evaluation system, including:
 - Principal evaluations
 - Student learning
 - Teacher artifacts

Peer Assistance and Review

- Allowing ineffective teachers to stay in the classroom is detrimental to students, teachers, their unions and the profession. Teacher unions have a responsibility to teachers, the teaching profession and students to ensure that all teachers meet high professional standards of practice.
- ATF, and many other teacher unions, have negotiated a system known as Peer Assistance and Review (PAR).
- The PAR Program is an intervention program designed to help improve the performance of experienced teachers who are having serious difficulties in the performance of their professional responsibilities. This help is provided through peer assistance from a Consulting Teacher (CT). The CT works directly with the struggling teacher to provide constructive and intensive intervention. The goal of the PAR Program is to develop and maintain the highest caliber teaching staff.
- A Consulting Teacher (CT) is an experienced Mentor Teacher released part-time from the classroom. The CT is a professional colleague who provides non-evaluative support for teachers who are on an intensive evaluation plan or an improvement plan.
- Unions that have negotiated PAR programs have universally reported that teachers hold their peers to higher standards than the traditional evaluation system did.

ATF's Position on Compensation

- Teachers should be paid well for teaching and evaluation must have as its primary goal strengthening the individual and collective practices of teachers and schools to improve student learning.
- Teaching is broad in its scope of responsibilities, all of which must be taken into account within a compensation system.
- Reward both expertise and extra time.
- Value teachers for their expertise and not just for quasi-administrative work.
- Be tied directly to a legitimate evaluation system. All movement must be contingent upon satisfactory evaluations.

Tying it All Together: Building on the 3-Tiered Licensure System

- It is important to note that New Mexico's 3-Tiered system:
 - Is unique
 - Is a high-stakes system
 - Currently includes both student learning and teacher evaluations
- As teachers, we want to be recognized for experience and education, but the current Training & Experience (T&E) Index is not adequate.
- We need a funding formula that ensures that the minimum salaries in the 3-Tiered system do not also become maximum salaries.
- We support adapting the T&E Index so that it's similar to the way we fund students by assigning them weight according to a formula.

A Teacher-Weighted Formula

Each Level II and Level III teacher is weighted by a formula based on:

- Experience
- Education
- Credentials
- Added responsibilities
- Evaluations
- Student growth

This system would differentiate between new Level II and III teachers and experienced Level II and III teachers as exemplified by the charts on the following page.

Examples of how factors can be associated with education and experience to augment the minimum pay levels and create a Teacher Weighted Formula are shown within each chart.

Level 1 Example Base pay \$30,000				
Years within Level	BA+30	MA	MA+30	Credential Differential (National Board Certification, ESL, Bilingual, etc.)
0-3	.05 / \$31,500	.15 / \$34,500	.20 / \$36,000	.10 in addition to current base
4-5	.10 / \$33,000	.20 / \$36,000	.25 / \$37,500	.10 in addition to current base

Level 2 Example Base Pay \$40,000							
Years within Level	Education			Credential Differentials	Added Responsibilities	Evaluation/ Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	School EPSS Goals
	BA	BA+30	BA+45 or MA				
1-5	\$40,000	.15 \$46,000	.20 \$48,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000
6-10	.10 \$44,000	.20 \$48,000	.25 \$50,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000
11+	.15 \$46,000	.25 \$50,000	.30 \$52,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000

Level 3 Example Base Pay \$50,000							
Years within Level	Education			Credential Differentials	Added Responsibilities (Mentoring)	Evaluation/ Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	School EPSS Goals
	MA or NBC	MA+30	Doctorate				
1-5	\$50,000	.15 \$57,500	.20 \$60,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 5,000
6-10	.10 \$55,000	.20 \$60,000	.25 \$62,500	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000
11+	.15 \$57,500	.25 \$62,500	.30 \$65,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000

- In Level 1, the focus is on learning how to teach, mentoring, learning how to create and measure SLOs.
- Incorporating the EPSS recognizes that in a comprehensive system, teacher development and evaluation must foster collective responsibility and accountability.

Benefits of a Teacher-Weighted Formula

- School districts will truly have a career ladder of opportunity within the licensure levels. This system will continue to honor education and experience for all teachers by adding a weighted formula for each Level II and III teacher.
- It will also provide incentives and pay growth potential if a teacher wants to stay at Level II for an entire career.
- In addition, it will allow pay increments for extra work or assignments for Level III teachers if they choose to take on additional responsibilities.

In Conclusion

- Revamping teacher evaluation and compensation systems is necessary.
- The Albuquerque Teachers Federation is looking at ways to accurately measure student learning in ALL content areas, so that it can be appropriately factored into teacher evaluation and compensation systems.
- In order to overhaul these systems, we need:
 - State lawmakers to have the political will to raise revenue to fund public education appropriately.
 - A truly collaborative relationship among all stakeholders in our public education system.
 - To ensure that teachers work within a highly functional *system* — one that, at a minimum, provides meaningful performance evaluations, high-quality professional development, reasonable class sizes, reliable and stable leadership, and time for planning and collaboration.

We can have a perfect evaluation system, but if nothing else in our system changes, then changing the teacher evaluation system will change nothing.

“Under the notion of *reciprocal accountability*, people with greater authority wouldn’t just monitor performance and impose sanctions when it’s lacking, they would be responsible for ensuring that those being monitored have what they need to succeed.”

Incompetent Teachers or Dysfunctional Systems?
Ken Futernick
Director of WestEd’s School Turnaround Center
Sacramento, Calif.



**Initial Recommendations of the New Mexico Business Roundtable
Regarding
Teacher Evaluation, Compensation, and Student Outcomes**

Legislative Education Study Committee

November 10, 2010

**Mr. Larry Langley
President/Chief Executive Officer
New Mexico Business Roundtable**

STATEMENT

This document is an initial summation of what we hope will be extensive and partnered work in the area of Teacher Evaluations, Compensation, and Student Outcomes. We would like to especially thank Dr. Ellen Bernstein and the Albuquerque Teachers Federation for their preliminary work on this extremely important education reform. We would also like to thank Dr. Bernstein, President of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation, Ms. Christine Trujillo, President of the American Teachers Federation of New Mexico, and Ms. Sharon Morgan, President of the National Education Association of New Mexico for their assistance and collaboration with the New Mexico Business Roundtable Public Policy Committee on this issue.

The base of this document is the creation and work of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation with highlights, additions, deletions, and strikethroughs made by the Public Policy Committee of the New Mexico Business Roundtable. We would like to reiterate that this is a fluid working document and our commitment to this work and process will be strong continued partnership and discussion in crafting reforms that will best support multiple evaluations of New Mexico's Public Education Teachers which are fair, rigorous, and effective, tied to student outcomes and offer reward, remediation, and removal based on those decided evaluations.

As a matter of protocol, this document has been reviewed as an initial summation based on the Albuquerque Teachers Federation document with input from the New Mexico Business Roundtable Public Policy Committee which will be a primary recommendation from that Committee to the New Mexico Business Roundtable Board of Directors on November 11, 2010.

1. Teacher evaluation, compensation and student outcomes

How can we link all of these components together in a fair, reliable system that will change public education for the better?

Background & Context

- Race to the Top **and possible ESEA reauthorization** has replaced the NCLB emphasis on “Highly Qualified” teachers with “Highly Effective” teachers.
- Race to the Top also required that evaluation of teachers and principals “take into account data on student growth”.
- Some have assumed that teacher effectiveness can be measured by linking student test scores to teachers’ evaluations.

Race to the Top Application (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; *(5 points)*

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; *(15 points)*

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; *(10 points)* and

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— *(28 points)*

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

With Us Not To Us ATF

- Teachers and their union leaders know the current evaluation system is broken, ineffective and needs to change.
- As teachers, we embrace our professional accountability. Our evaluation system should take into account the outcomes of our work.
- Teachers are interested in an assessment system that measures growth, in part, because of the flawed AYP system in No Child Left Behind.
- Contrary to popular belief, teachers and their unions are not protecting the *status quo*.
- Union leaders, teachers and other education professionals know that an effective evaluation system that accounts for student growth must be co-developed with us.
- As unionized professionals, of everything within our control, nothing matters more than the knowledge, skills and effectiveness of our members.

Value-Added Methods

- Good teaching is much more than a student test score, yet teacher evaluation cannot ignore the importance of student learning.
- Some school districts and states have embraced a Value-Added Method (VAM) for measuring growth.
- Unfortunately, this method relies on narrow and flawed standardized tests with standardized test scores used as the sole or predominant measure.
- Some advocates of VAM think it will make it easier to dismiss teachers. There is no short cut.
- The research community strongly cautions against reliance on test scores – even when superficially sophisticated VAM methods are used.
- Standardized test scores are not sufficiently reliable and valid indicators of teacher effectiveness.
- Standardized tests are not instructionally-sensitive.
- There are good reasons to be concerned about current VAM:

- No strong evidence that the teachers who are identified using VAM, and subsequently dismissed, are less effective than those teachers retained or those newly-hired to replace them.
- No evidence that teachers are motivated to “improve” if evaluated or compensated using test scores.
- Unintended consequences such as:
 - ***→ Evaluating schools and teachers mainly on standardized test scores has led to excessive test preparation and a narrow curriculum.
 - ***→ It’s also led to an arbitrary and inordinate focus on students who are on the cusp of “proficiency” as measured by standardized tests, a focus that undercuts the right of all students to a well-rounded, content-rich curriculum that encourages them to develop critical thinking skills.

Purposes of an Evaluation System

In a deficit-based model, evaluation has only one purpose. In an asset-based model, evaluation serves multiple purposes, such as:

- Improving the overall quality of the teacher workforce by identifying and building upon individual and collective teacher strengths, and by improving instruction and other teacher practices to improve student learning.
- Identifying exemplary teachers.
- Identifying ineffective teachers and developing a system of support to remediate their skills.
- Ensuring fair and valid employment decisions, including decisions about rehiring, dismissal, career paths and tenure.
- Confirmation of what teachers are doing well.

ATF Believes an Evaluation System Should:

- Focus on providing continuous professional development and growth for teachers by addressing the skills, knowledge and needs of teachers depending on where they are on a career continuum (e.g., novice, mid-career, veteran). **This must not be a substitute for short term remediation of ineffective teachers.**
- Promote teacher leadership
- Be both formative and summative.
- Be based on a set of standards of practice that takes into account the complexities of teaching.

- Include evidence of teaching and student learning from multiple sources.
- Address how to build the capacity of districts and schools to implement high-quality teacher development and evaluation systems.
- Be subject to continuous updating of instruments and processes as research on practice leading to valued student outcomes becomes available.

How Could Student Learning be Measured within a Teacher Evaluation System?

- Student learning should include evidence of growth in knowledge and skills, based on multiple measures.
- One measure of student learning, currently used in the Pro-Comp System in Denver and Austin's REACH program, is called Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).
- SLOs are annual targets for growth that a teacher sets at the beginning of the year and strives to attain by the end of the year (or at the end of a semester, if appropriate).
- SLOs are based on a student needs assessment and aligned to the school's standards and curricula.
- SLOs must be (1) based on outcomes, not activities, (2) rigorous, and (3) measurable.
- SLOs are a way to incorporate an individual teacher's contribution to student learning into an evaluation system, and are:
 - Teacher-created
 - Student-specific
 - Instructionally-sensitive
 - Valid
 - Reliable
- We should measure what we value, not the other way around. All too often in education, we value what is easy to measure, but overlook elements that are essential for effective practice. If we value the ability to work in groups, think critically, solve problems, etc., we must measure those abilities.

Evaluations Systems Must Have Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness

- Teaching is multifaceted.
- Evaluation measures must include teacher knowledge—of students, of how children learn, of subject matter and of instructional techniques.
- An evaluation system must also take into account outcomes—of student learning, student behavior and student engagement.
- To evaluate teacher effectiveness, we must gather data on all these matters and make a judgment based on all the evidence.
- One important reason for incorporating multiple measures in teacher evaluation systems is to avoid creating incentives to focus on some outcomes or practices at the expense of other equally-valued outcomes or practices.
- In teacher evaluation, each characteristic of importance to us (for example, quality of instruction; outcomes for students; contributions to the profession) can be measured in several different ways. For example:
 - Student Learning Objectives-SLOs
 - Instructional quality - classroom observations, analysis of teacher artifacts including lesson plans and student assignments and examination of grading practices and feedback to students.

Evaluation Systems Must Consider *Weighting*

- For example, are all evaluation criteria equally important?
- How much consideration should be given to classroom observation data? To parent and student surveys? To student work samples and/or test data?
- Decisions must be made about what type of evidence best fulfills the criteria of an evaluation system, including:
 - Principal evaluations
 - Student learning
 - Teacher artifacts
 - Parent evaluation
 - Student evaluation

Peer Assistance and Review

- Allowing ineffective teachers to stay in the classroom is detrimental to students, teachers, their unions and the profession. Teacher unions have a responsibility to teachers, the teaching profession and students to ensure that all teachers meet high professional standards of practice.

- ATF, and many other teacher unions, have negotiated a system known as Peer Assistance and Review (PAR).
- The PAR Program is an intervention program designed to help improve the performance of experienced teachers who are having serious difficulties in the performance of their professional responsibilities. This help is provided through peer assistance from a Consulting Teacher (CT). The CT works directly with the struggling teacher to provide constructive and intensive intervention. The goal of the PAR Program is to develop and maintain the highest caliber teaching staff.
- A Consulting Teacher (CT) is an experienced Mentor Teacher released part-time from the classroom. The CT is a professional colleague who provides non-evaluative support for teachers who are on an intensive evaluation plan or an improvement plan.
- Unions that have negotiated PAR programs have universally reported that teachers hold their peers to higher standards than the traditional evaluation system did.
- If remediation is deemed necessary, the indicated teacher should be required to participate in the partnered remediation program until such time as the teacher has resolved the issues triggering their remediation, a definitive time period. If the teacher participating in remediation fails, after a definitive time period, to positively resolve those issues, then the teacher should be removed.

ATF's Position on Compensation

- Teachers should be paid well for teaching and evaluation must have as its primary goal strengthening the individual and collective practices of teachers and schools to improve student learning.
- Teaching is broad in its scope of responsibilities, all of which must be taken into account within a compensation system.
- Reward both expertise and extra time.
- Value teachers for their expertise and not just for quasi-administrative work.
- Be tied directly to a legitimate evaluation system. All movement must be contingent upon satisfactory evaluations.

Tying it All Together: Building on the 3-Tiered Licensure System

- It is important to note that New Mexico's 3-Tiered system:
 - Is unique
 - Is a high-stakes system
 - Currently includes both student learning and teacher evaluations
- As teachers, we want to be recognized for experience and education, but the current Training & Experience (T&E) Index is not adequate.

- We need a funding formula that ensures that the minimum salaries in the 3-Tiered system do not also become maximum salaries.
- We support adapting the T&E Index so that it's similar to the way we fund students by assigning them weight according to a formula.

A Teacher-Weighted Formula

Each Level II and Level III teacher is weighted by a formula based on:

Not all of the following should or can be weighted the same

- Experience
- Education
- Credentials
- Added responsibilities
- Evaluations
- Student growth

This system would differentiate between new Level II and III teachers and experienced Level II and III teachers as exemplified by the charts on the following page.

Examples of how factors can be associated with education and experience to augment the minimum pay levels and create a Teacher Weighted Formula are shown within each chart.

Determining specific weights and dollar amounts at this time other than example is inappropriate. However multiple evaluations and weights are imperative.

Level 1 Example Base pay \$30,000				
Years within Level	BA+30	MA	MA+30	Credential Differential (National Board Certification, ESL, Bilingual, etc.)
0-3	.05 / \$31,500	.15 / \$34,500	.20 / \$36,000	.10 in addition to current base
4-5	.10 / \$33,000	.20 / \$36,000	.25 / \$37,500	.10 in addition to current base

Level 2 Example Base Pay \$40,000							
Years within Level	Education			Credential Differentials	Added Responsibilities	Evaluation/ Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	School EPSS Goals
	BA	BA+30	BA+45 or MA				
1-5	.10 \$40,000	.15 \$46,000	.20 \$48,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000
6-10	.10 \$44,000	.20 \$48,000	.25 \$50,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000
11+	.15 \$46,000	.25 \$50,000	.30 \$52,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000	.10 \$4,000

Level 3 Example Base Pay \$50,000							
Years within Level	Education			Credential Differentials	Added Responsibilities (Mentoring)	Evaluation/ Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	School EPSS Goals
	MA or NBC	MA+30	Doctorate				
1-5	.10 \$50,000	.15 \$57,500	.20 \$60,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000
6-10	.10 \$55,000	.20 \$60,000	.25 \$62,500	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000
11+	.15 \$57,500	.25 \$62,500	.30 \$65,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000	.10 \$5,000

- In Level 1, the focus is on learning how to teach, mentoring, learning how to create and measure SLOs.
- Incorporating the EPSS recognizes that in a comprehensive system, teacher development and evaluation must foster collective responsibility and accountability.

Benefits of a Teacher-Weighted Formula [This again is cause to rethink the new funding formula]

- School districts will truly have a career ladder of opportunity within the licensure levels. This system will continue to honor education and experience for all teachers by adding a weighted formula for each Level II and III teacher.
- It will also provide incentives and pay growth potential if a teacher wants to stay at Level II for an entire career.
- In addition, it will allow pay increments for extra work or assignments for Level III teachers if they choose to take on additional responsibilities.

In Conclusion

- Revamping teacher evaluation and compensation systems is necessary.
- The Albuquerque Teachers Federation is looking at ways to accurately measure student learning in ALL content areas, so that it can be appropriately factored into teacher evaluation and compensation systems.
- In order to overhaul these systems, we need:
 - State lawmakers to have the political will to raise revenue to fund public education appropriately. Continue to look at efficiencies within the public education system.
 - A truly collaborative relationship among all stakeholders in our public education system.
 - To ensure that teachers work within a highly functional *system* — one that, at a minimum, provides meaningful performance evaluations, high-quality professional development, reasonable class sizes, reliable and stable leadership, and time for planning and collaboration.

We can have a perfect evaluation system, but if nothing else in our system changes, then changing the teacher evaluation system will change nothing.