Across the Los Angeles area and the nation, much of the current education debate focuses on teachers— their effectiveness, tenure, and pay. Ensuring quality teaching is paramount, but developing good systems for evaluating and improving teacher quality is far from straightforward. Using educational research, the experiences of one Los Angeles area school, and teacher evaluation policies from around the nation, this Research, Practice, and Policy Brief is designed to provide background, resources, and steps to develop a school-based multiple measures system of teacher evaluation. The goal of this brief is to be an introductory resource to help autonomous school communities (see box) craft an effective system of evaluation that includes multiple ways to measure good teaching. Secondary beneficiaries include educators and policymakers working in Los Angeles and the nation who are also engaged in this debate.

AUDIENCE - Autonomous Schools

In the Los Angeles area, autonomous schools are those that have decision-making power and responsibility for school components such as staffing, budgets, curriculum and systems of teacher evaluation. These include charter schools, pilot schools, and other reform models that have more autonomy from district regulation. Charter schools are publicly funded and granted a charter by the local school district but operate outside of its governance. Pilot schools are in-district schools created to investigate new ways to develop more effective schools. There are 183 charter schools and 19 pilot schools operating in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) in 2010-11.
The complexity of teaching requires gathering multiple measures to evaluate the effectiveness of that teaching. The table below provides a brief overview of potential components of a teacher evaluation system including accompanying resources with direct links to freely accessible* examples of each tool and research citations. Decisions about tools, however, need to come after a staff has developed or decided upon a model of what quality instruction and teacher effectiveness looks like in their school. Having these models, whether they be general or specific, is a prerequisite to using any of these tools because the models should guide tool choice, development and adaptation to meet the needs of the school (See page 6 for examples of standards of good teaching).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLE MEASURE COMPONENTS</th>
<th>TOOLS USED TO MEASURE</th>
<th>RESEARCH SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OBSERVATIONS                | Rubrics, checklists, notes | - Considered the “gold-standard” for understanding teacher practice  
- Time intensive  
- Requires standardized protocols and trained observers |
| STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH    | Value-Added Model (VAM), California Standards Tests (CSTs), grades, reading levels, student portfolios | - Consensus on the importance of measuring student growth but controversy about the measurement tools and academic growth variation being attributed to teacher “effects” |
| STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON QUALITY OF TEACHING | Student surveys | - Consensus of the value of student voices  
- Initial evidence shows link between student survey results on a teacher’s effectiveness and students’ academic growth in that teacher’s class, but there are also concerns about reliability and bias |
| CLASSROOM ARTIFACTS         | Rubrics | - Considered a grounded view into classroom practice without direct observation  
- Evidence shows a link between classroom artifacts and observations |
| REFLECTIONS ON PRACTICE     | Rubrics | - Seen as beneficial for teacher practice  
- Purpose of reflection can differ and bring different results  
- Concerns exist that it can reinforce current beliefs |
| TEACHER PORTFOLIOS          | Rubrics, checklists | - Comprehensive, can capture many aspects of teacher practice  
- Requires detailed rubrics and trained scorers |
| ACTION RESEARCH             | Project rubrics, also could include any tools listed above | - Systematic inquiry by a teacher into his or her own instructional practice  
- Research into own practice has greater utility in theory to bring about lasting impact |

* Tools and procedures used to evaluate teachers, such as observation rubrics, are often owned or considered proprietary by a company or a non-profit organization and are not readily available. Use of the links in this brief does not represent our advocacy of these tools or sources; they are only to provide examples.
## FOR FURTHER READING: SOURCES THAT PROVIDE OVERVIEWS OF TEACHER EVALUATION


## EXAMPLES OF TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Public Schools</td>
<td>Click on standards and rubrics on the right side to download their rubric.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cps-k12.org/employment/tchreval/tchreval.htm">http://www.cps-k12.org/employment/tchreval/tchreval.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified academic growth over time resources</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://agt.lausd.net">http://agt.lausd.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA) rubrics</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cse.ucla.edu/products/reports/r671.pdf">http://www.cse.ucla.edu/products/reports/r671.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) contains rubrics on reflections for each subject matter area</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Rubrics">http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Rubrics</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available action research rubrics</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.smar2t.missouri.edu/doc/rubric.pdf">http://www.smar2t.missouri.edu/doc/rubric.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RESEARCH RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In 2009-10, the school’s first year, the principal used the common district teacher evaluation form. Yet, the teachers also wanted a more formative assessment tool that focused on growth and improving their instructional practice. Toward that end, they piloted peer evaluation, which included grade level span teams observing each other and giving feedback. This became a core element of their second year evaluation system.

The summer before the school’s second year, the staff met to develop a framework to guide their evaluation system. This framework, based on their similar goals for students, spells out the development of four core competencies for teachers: 1) Become a self-directed, passionate learner, 2) Demonstrate mastery of academic content and skills, 3) Become bi-literate, bi-lingual, and multicultural, 4) Show active and critical participation in society.

Later that summer, the staff began to develop a plan for teachers to document their professional growth and evaluate their teaching which they called the Professional Learning Plan (PLP). The discussion focused on how they could support the school’s framework, grow as professionals (i.e. meet the California Standards for the Teaching Profession), and measure that growth.

They asked themselves: What would we expect to see if someone is meeting the four core competencies? Wanting this investigation into practice to be teacher-driven, the teachers decided that an action research project was the best method to use to answer this question. A committee of teachers, called the Professional Learning Action Team, developed these steps for each teacher’s action research project, known as the PLP: 1) Set goals, 2) Develop an action plan, 3) Implement the plan, 4) Analyze data and reflect, and 5) Share results. Knowing they wanted multiple sources to capture the complexity of their teaching they designed the PLP to include an artifact section, containing observation feedback from peers, lesson plans and products, student work, reflections, and other documentation from the action research project. Currently, the action team is in the process of creating rubrics for these items so that there is a systematic evaluation tool for their PLP.

In 2010-11 all teachers are creating and completing a PLP. Also, a subset of teachers is piloting other measures to include in their portfolio of teacher practice.
The science teachers are using a measure of student assignment quality called the Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA) developed by the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing (CRESST). Next year teachers from several different grade levels will pilot the use of student surveys developed by The Tripod Project, a firm founded by Harvard professor Ron Ferguson.

The PLP is still a work in progress. As the school’s system of multiple measures develops over time, teachers and administrators will continue to grapple with deciding which tools work best for evaluation purposes and in the future, how to use this system of multiple measures to inform staffing decisions.

THE TIME IT TAKES - DEVELOPING THE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING PLAN

Allowing sufficient time for teachers to develop this Professional Learning Plan (PLP) was vital to its creation and gaining full-staff support. In August and September 2010, teachers met to discuss the teacher evaluation system and other systems that needed developing in the newly created and expanding school. In October the teachers divided into five action teams to continue this work, with one action team, called the Professional Learning Action Team, charged to work on the teacher evaluation system as well as plan staff professional development. All action teams met two Wednesdays (from 2:30 pm during banked time) per month to work and the other Wednesdays were designed for a variety of things including sharing and getting feedback on the action team’s work from the rest of the staff. This structure allowed for the teacher action teams to know what each other was doing, and sufficient time for teachers to give feedback to any committee.

When the Professional Learning Action Team convened in October their primary goal was to create the PLP. In December they brought the full PLP proposal to the entire staff for feedback. In order for teachers to begin their action research plan in the spring semester, the teachers attended a day-long meeting over winter break to begin the work on the revised PLP. The work of the action team will continue through 2011, as they develop evaluation rubrics for the Professional Learning Plan and decide how they will document and use student growth data.
QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN CREATING YOUR OWN SCHOOL-BASED SYSTEM OF EVALUATION PLAN

Below are some key questions to be answered by a school community when creating a school-based system of evaluation.

- What is your school’s mission or what are the guiding principles?
- What do you consider to be good teaching?
- How do you want to document, demonstrate or share good teaching?
- How can that be captured? What tools or methods can be used to document it?
- How do your tool or method choices capture the complexity of teaching?
- How will you put all the measures together?
- How can the results be used to encourage and support teaching, learning, and growth?
- How will you evaluate new teachers before they reach permanent status?
- What are your criteria and systems for hiring teachers?
- How will this system inform your hiring and tenure systems?

Schools that wish to develop a system of evaluation using multiple measures may want to consider adapting the tools in this brief and others they find to meet their own specific needs and circumstances. Below are a few organizations that have developed standards for good teaching:

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION
http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-standards.html

COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS
http://www.essentialschools.org/items/11

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS
http://www.nbpts.org/

TEACH FOR AMERICA - TEACHING AS LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK
http://www.teachingasleadership.org/

EVALUATION SYSTEM EXAMPLES

To date, observations are still the primary component of teacher evaluation for virtually all school districts nationwide. Some states, districts, and schools are now beginning to design systems of multiple measures for teacher evaluation. Below are links to resources that describe systems of evaluation being used and in development around the country as well as a snapshot of the current efforts in Los Angeles to develop these systems.

SYSTEMS WITH OBSERVATIONAL FOCUS

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
http://www.cps-k12.org/employment/tchreval/tchreval.htm

NORTH CAROLINA TEACHER EVALUATION RUBRIC
http://www.ncpublicschools.org/profdev/training/teacher/
Although there is now consensus that there should be multiple measures in teacher evaluation systems, there is very little guidance about how to put them all together. Some policy makers advocate aggregating the measures – adding them all up to get a composite score, others argue they should be compiled – compared side-by-side, in order to allow a holistic analysis. Either way a school community must make tough decisions about the value of each measure when designing a teacher evaluation system. This is only in part a technical issue. It also involves consideration of a variety of conceptual and practical issues related to a school community such as local context, school goals and priorities.

Like everything in education, this is a challenging human endeavor. We hope the resources in this brief will help those working to develop a multiple measures system of teacher evaluation.
High school students from the UCLA Community School painted these images of their teachers as part of a lesson in monochromatic painting led by the school’s art teacher, Grace Maddox. They include (from the top left): high school English and lead teacher Beth Trinchero, portrayed by Alessa; 6th grade math and science teacher Janet Lee, portrayed by Sergio; Kindergarten and Grade 1 teacher JoAnn Carvajal, portrayed by Alex; middle school math teacher Andre Feng, portrayed by Adrian; high school English teacher Jason Torres-Rangel, portrayed by Soo, and high school chemistry teacher, Pedro DeLeon portrayed by Juan.

This brief was supported in part by a five-year teacher quality partnership grant from the U.S. Department of Education to establish an urban residency program in partnership with UCLA, LAUSD and the Los Angeles Small Schools Center. This brief is part of a larger effort to support teacher development in the context of data-driven small autonomous schools.