

## Summative Teacher Evaluation

<b>Date</b>	January 18, 2008
<b>Number</b>	00052
<b>Request</b>	What research is available on summative teacher evaluation, specifically how long an observation should be conducted and how many are required for validity? What exists in other states?
<b>Summary</b>	In response to this request, the Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC) queried state departments of education (SDEs) and other organizations throughout the U.S. by e-mail and telephone. The SECC also searched numerous Web sites that focus on teacher quality, teacher evaluation, and professional development. This report contains a synopsis of the findings on summative evaluation, a table of the information obtained from contacts and Web sites, and descriptions of resources and references that provide additional information on teacher evaluation processes, tools, and programs.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) has several provisions that relate to teacher quality. As a result, states are challenged to examine their teacher certification and evaluation processes to ensure that teachers are competent and qualified to perform their jobs successfully. Teacher evaluation is a key tool used by school districts and schools to measure performance, determine competency, and identify areas for improvement.

Although this report focuses on summative evaluation, the contacts for most of the 21 states for which we were able to obtain information indicate that their school districts use both formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation is conducted for the purpose of improving a teacher's performance by identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. Summative evaluation is conducted for the purpose of making personnel decisions about the teacher, such as merit pay, reassignment, promotion, dismissal, and tenure.

Information obtained for this request indicates that the following factors are of considerable importance regarding teacher evaluation:

- Novice teachers versus experienced teachers
- State-approved evaluation instruments versus district discretion on the selection or development of instruments and guidelines
- Statutes governing the evaluation process
- State-mandated systems versus district discretion on creating or selecting systems

In addition to statutes governing the evaluation process and state-approved instruments and systems, some states have school reform initiatives (Louisiana) or performance evaluation programs (Hawaii, Missouri, and North Carolina). Refer to Table 1, State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation, on the next page, for a summary of the information obtained from state contacts and various Web sites.

With regard to the number of observations performed during an evaluation period, the state contacts' responses indicate a range from 0 (Washington State) to 6 (Oregon). The duration of observations ranges from 30 minutes to a full class period. Also, the frequency of observations varies, depending on the teacher's status as described below:

- Novice (1–3 years' teaching experience) and non-tenured teachers
- Veteran (more than 3 years' teaching experience) and tenured teachers
- Teachers with licensure issues or documented performance deficiencies

For beginning and non-tenured teachers, the observation frequency ranges from four times a year to annually for the first 3 years. For veteran and tenured teachers, the observation frequency ranges from annually to once within a 5-year cycle. For teachers with licensure issues or documented performance deficiencies, the observation frequency is usually annually but may be more frequent depending on the circumstances.

The state contacts were unable to provide any information on research concerning how long observations should be conducted or how many are required for validity. Most indicated that they are not aware of any research relating to observation criteria to ensure validity. However, they did stress that critical elements to consider include the quality of the evaluation instruments, the professional learning that accompanies the instruments, and the proficiency of the evaluators (Iowa). In addition, Howard (2005) recommends that summative evaluation should not rely solely on observations but should include a review of other items that may demonstrate a teacher's capabilities, such as lesson plans, assessment instruments and grade books, student work samples, student achievement data, documentation of parent contacts, and feedback from parents and students.

*Continued on next page >*

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
<b>Alabama</b>	The Alabama Department of Education collects selected data related to teacher evaluations through its Professional Education Personnel Evaluation (PEPE) system. PEPE assessments include teacher observation, among others. The following link provides information about PEPE: <a href="http://www.alabamapepe.com">http://www.alabamapepe.com</a>	Ann M. Jones, PhD Teacher Education Administrator Alabama Dept. of Education PO Box 302101 Montgomery, AL 36130- 2101 Phone: 334-242-9943
<b>Arizona</b>	In Arizona (AZ), summative evaluations vary from district to district. These evaluations are conducted for all teachers each year with the scripting time frame from 30 to 60 minutes. Beginning teachers (1–3 years' teaching experience), have one formative and one summative evaluation each year. Additional formative evaluations are conducted according to the teacher's needs. Veteran teachers are evaluated one time each year. The evaluations contain areas that address the implementation of the AZ Professional Teaching Standards, Student Academic Standards, teacher dispositions, and parent/community relationships that help increase student achievement.  Links for more information: <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/certification/downloads/Teacherstandards.pdf">http://www.ade.az.gov/certification/downloads/Teacherstandards.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/standards/contentstandards.asp">http://www.ade.az.gov/standards/contentstandards.asp</a>	Arizona Dept. of Education <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov">http://www.ade.az.gov</a>
<b>Connecticut</b>	While Connecticut's general statutes do not address the length of an observation or the number of observations required for a summative teacher evaluation, Sections 10-220a and 10-151b do address professional development plans required by each public school district. Generally, CT leaves it up to the districts, in conjunction with advice and assistance of the teachers and administrators, as well as representatives of the exclusive bargaining units, to address these questions. Other districts have indicated that non-tenured teachers are observed at least three times each year (two announced and one unannounced) before an evaluation is completed, while tenured teachers may be observed once every 2 or 3 years. Again, each district determines the guidelines to be followed.	Patricia Wilson Connecticut Dept. of Education <a href="mailto:Patricia.M.Wilson@ct.gov">Patricia.M.Wilson@ct.gov</a>  Lee Marcoux Connecticut Dept. of Education <a href="mailto:Lee.Marcoux@po.state.ct.us">Lee.Marcoux@po.state.ct.us</a>
<b>Florida</b>	In Florida, Statute 1012.34 specifies the annual evaluation and minimum areas that must be considered. Details regarding the number of evaluations or classroom visits are determined locally by each school district when they adopt their appraisal systems.  Link to the statute: <a href="http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&amp;Search_String=&amp;URL=C_h1012/SEC34.HTM&amp;Title=&gt;2007-&gt;Ch1012-&gt;Section%2034#1012.34">http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&amp;Search_String=&amp;URL=C_h1012/SEC34.HTM&amp;Title=&gt;2007-&gt;Ch1012-&gt;Section%2034#1012.34</a>	Crystal Spikes Director Excellent Teaching Program Florida Dept. of Education 325 W. Gaines St., #124 Tallahassee, FL 32399 Phone: 850-245-0555 Fax: 850-245-0543

Continued on next page &gt;

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
Hawaii	<p>Hawaii's Teacher Standards Board licenses teachers but does not employ them. The Hawaii (HI) Department of Education employs and evaluates teachers. Specific information on teacher evaluation is provided in the department's manual entitled, <i>Professional Evaluation Program for Teachers (PEP-T)</i>. All teachers are continuously evaluated for the five duties of a teacher, as described in the manual. Probationary teachers and teachers with less than satisfactory ratings are evaluated annually. Tenured teachers who have satisfactory ratings are evaluated once in a 5-year cycle. Tenured teachers with documented performance deficiencies are evaluated annually.</p> <p>Link to the HI PEP-T manual:  <a href="http://sp.k12.hi.us/pdf/atrch5602manual.pdf">http://sp.k12.hi.us/pdf/atrch5602manual.pdf</a></p>	<p>Sharon Mahoe  Executive Director  Hawaii Teacher Standards Board  Iwilei Road, Suite 201  Honolulu, HI 96817  Phone: 808-586-2605  Fax: 808-586-2606  <a href="http://www.htsb.org">www.htsb.org</a></p> <p>Leighton Hirai  Hawaii Dept. of Education  Phone: 808-586-3276</p>
Idaho	<p>In Idaho, two evaluations are conducted for individuals on a first-year contract, but it has never been validated. For additional information on accreditation, contact Clair Gates at the Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center (NWRCC).</p>	<p>Cina Oravez  Coordinator  Certification/Professional Standards Commission  Idaho Dept. of Education  PO Box 83720  Boise, ID 83720-0027  Phone: 208-332-6936  Fax: 208-334-2228</p> <p>Clair Gates  Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory  NWRCC  Senior Program Advisor  Idaho State Coordinator  Phone: 503-275-9173  <a href="mailto:gatesc@nwrel.org">gatesc@nwrel.org</a></p>
Iowa	<p>The Iowa Department of Education contact indicates that he is not aware of any research that suggests how long or how many observations produce validity. He stresses that it is the effectiveness of the "system" in which evaluation actually takes place. He also emphasizes that the quality of the instrument, the professional learning that accompanies the instrument, how proficient the evaluator is on reflecting on effective teaching, and many more elements impact the teacher evaluation process.</p> <p>Link to documents on the IA SDE Web site (Note: Charlotte Danielson's work should be reviewed):  <a href="http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/538/1195/">http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/538/1195/</a></p> <p>Another helpful link:  <a href="http://www.sai-iowa.org/teachereval.html">http://www.sai-iowa.org/teachereval.html</a></p>	<p>Chris Day  Iowa Dept. of Education  <a href="mailto:Chris.Day@iowa.gov">Chris.Day@iowa.gov</a></p>

Continued on next page &gt;

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
<b>Kentucky</b>	<p>The Resource Guide for the Kentucky Teacher Internship provides information on teacher evaluation. See the link to this document and other resources below.</p> <p>Link to resource guide:  <a href="http://www.kyepsb.net/documents/Intern/Resource-Guide.pdf">http://www.kyepsb.net/documents/Intern/Resource-Guide.pdf</a></p> <p>Link to 704 KAR 3:345. Evaluation guidelines:  <a href="http://education.ky.gov/KDE/Administrative+Resources/School+Improvement/Leadership+and+Evaluation/Certified+Personnel+Evaluation+/">http://education.ky.gov/KDE/Administrative+Resources/School+Improvement/Leadership+and+Evaluation/Certified+Personnel+Evaluation+/</a></p> <p>Link to district evaluation guidelines:  <a href="http://education.ky.gov/users/spalmer/CPE%20-%20KRS%20156.557%20-%20.pdf">http://education.ky.gov/users/spalmer/CPE%20-%20KRS%20156.557%20-%20.pdf</a></p>	<p>Kentucky Dept. of Education  <a href="http://education.ky.gov/KDE/">http://education.ky.gov/KDE/</a></p>
<b>Louisiana</b>	<p>The Louisiana Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) is a school reform initiative that has four key elements of focus: multiple career paths, job-embedded professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance-based compensation. There are currently 36 schools participating. It is a school reform initiative that offers teachers the opportunity to step into a leadership role in their buildings by becoming a master/mentor teacher. It also offers real job-embedded professional growth for teachers during the school day, lead by master/mentor teachers and focused on needs specific to students in that school. Teachers are held accountable through evaluations with the TAP Instructional Rubric. The last element offers teachers the opportunity to earn incentive (bonus pay) based on a combination of evaluation scores and the value added growth that students make. In this program, teachers are evaluated four times during the school year (one announced and three unannounced). These evaluations and observations cover an entire class period (30–90 minutes depending on grade level and subject) and are conducted by administrators and trained master/mentor teachers. The LA SDE uses the TAP instructional rubric with 12 instructional indicators (standards and objectives, motivating students, presenting instructional content, grouping, teacher content knowledge, teacher knowledge of students, activities and materials, questioning, academic feedback, critical thinking, lesson structure and pacing, and problem solving). Then, teachers are guided to reflect on an area of reinforcement and an area of refinement, referencing specific evidence from the observation. More information on the TAP can be viewed at the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) Web site at <a href="http://www.talentedteachers.org">www.talentedteachers.org</a> (see references for TAP). The Professional Accountability Section in the LA SDE administers the Local Personnel Evaluation Program (LPEP) for school districts. Each district establishes a Local Personnel Evaluation Program that is based on state guidelines, <i>Bulletin 1525</i>. This bulletin is designed to assist local school districts in the development and implementation of effective professional employee evaluation programs. This document also reflects local</p>	<p>Shelia P. Chavis  Office of Educator Support  Louisiana Dept. of Education  Phone: 225-342-3524  Fax: 225-219-4508  <a href="mailto:shelia.chavis@la.gov">shelia.chavis@la.gov</a></p>

Continued on next page &gt;

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
	<p>personnel evaluation legislation as well as the state-approved guidelines for its implementation. Visit the LA SDE's Web site at <a href="http://www.louisianaschools.net">www.louisianaschools.net</a> for information on the LPEP. Once on the Web site, look under the Professional Development tab at the top of the page and then the Division of Professional Development link for information on the LPEP and <i>Bulletin 1525</i>. Each local district is responsible for establishing the LPEP based on <i>Bulletin 1525</i> requirements; therefore, the length of the observations will vary based on local district requirements. The state contact was unable to provide information about the validity of observations in Louisiana.</p>	
<b>*Massachusetts</b>	<p>In Massachusetts, Statute 603 CMR 35.00 governs the evaluation of teachers and administrators. The statute states the following in the procedures for evaluation:</p> <p>The school committee is responsible for ensuring that adequate resources are available to evaluate all administrators and teachers without professional teacher status at least annually and to evaluate teachers with professional teacher status at least once every two years and to assist teachers and administrators to improve their performance.</p> <p>Link to the MA statute:  <a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=all">http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=all</a></p>	<p>Massachusetts Dept. of Education  <a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu">http://www.doe.mass.edu</a></p>
<b>*Mississippi</b>	<p>The Mississippi Department of Education's <i>Sourcebook for Effective Supervision of Instruction</i> provides information on teacher evaluation.</p> <p>Link to sourcebook on teacher evaluation:  <a href="http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/Sourcebook.html">http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/Sourcebook.html</a></p>	<p>Mississippi Dept. of Education  <a href="http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/">http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/</a></p>
<b>Missouri</b>	<p>Missouri's <i>Guidelines for Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE)</i> provide detailed information on the process. The document states the following:</p> <p>During each of the first three years of the evaluation cycle, non-tenured teachers will have a minimum of one scheduled and two unscheduled observations. During the remaining non-tenured years, a minimum of one scheduled and one unscheduled observation will be conducted annually.</p> <p>Link to the evaluation guidelines:  <a href="http://www.dese.missouri.gov/divteachqual/leadership/profdev/PBTE.pdf">http://www.dese.missouri.gov/divteachqual/leadership/profdev/PBTE.pdf</a></p>	<p>Linda Dooling  Missouri Dept. of Education  <a href="mailto:Linda.Dooling@dese.mo.gov">Linda.Dooling@dese.mo.gov</a></p>

Continued on next page &gt;

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
<b>Nebraska</b>	Nebraska requires by statute that a teacher be evaluated once each semester for a full class period. The state contact was not aware of any research that supports or refutes this.	Jay Sears Director Instructional Advocacy Nebraska State Education Association <a href="mailto:Jay.Sears@nsea.org">Jay.Sears@nsea.org</a>
<b>New Jersey</b>	In New Jersey, the minimum number of summative evaluations required for tenured teachers is one per year. The state requires two formative and one summative evaluation to be submitted by the principal for each teacher in his first year under their provisional. Satisfactory completion of that process allows the provisional teacher to get his standard in the second year of teaching. This requirement is in addition to the three summative evaluations done on all non-tenured teachers in districts.	Vicki Duff Teacher Quality Coordinator Office of Academic and Professional Standards 100 River View Plaza PO Box 500 Trenton, NJ 08625-0500 Phone: 609-292-0189 <a href="mailto:victoria.duff@doe.state.nj.us">victoria.duff@doe.state.nj.us</a>
<b>*North Carolina</b>	<p>According to information on North Carolina's state board of education Web site, NC utilizes a statewide program for performance evaluation. During 2006–07, the board adopted standards for evaluation of teachers and school administrators. School districts may adopt evaluation instruments developed by the state or may choose to use instruments developed by the school system. Evaluation standards for teachers are provided in the <i>North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards</i>.</p> <p>Link to personnel evaluation information on the NC Public Schools State Board of Education Web Site: <a href="http://www.ncpublicschools.org/fbs/personnel/evaluation/">http://www.ncpublicschools.org/fbs/personnel/evaluation/</a></p> <p>Link to evaluation standards for teachers: <a href="http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/fbs/personnel/evaluation/standardsteacher.pdf">http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/fbs/personnel/evaluation/standardsteacher.pdf</a></p>	<p>Danny Holloman North Carolina Dept. of Public Instruction</p> <p>Mailing Address: 6330 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-6330</p> <p>Physical Address: North Wilmington Street Raleigh, NC 27601</p> <p>Phone: 919-807-3375 Fax: 919-807-3362  <a href="mailto:dholloman@dpi.state.nc.us">dholloman@dpi.state.nc.us</a></p> <p>Joe Parry Hill <a href="mailto:jparry@dpi.state.nc.us">jparry@dpi.state.nc.us</a></p>
<b>North Dakota</b>	North Dakota does not have a state level evaluation system. Local districts are responsible for the faculty evaluation.	Janet Placek Welk Executive Director Education Standards and Practices Board 2718 Gateway Avenue Suite 303 Bismarck, ND 58503 Phone: 701-328-9641 <a href="mailto:jwelk@nd.gov">jwelk@nd.gov</a>

Continued on next page &gt;

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
<b>Ohio</b>	According to the Ohio Revised Code 3319.111, for teachers on limited contracts (basically new to the district), the observation must be a minimum of 30 minutes with a minimum of two observations per evaluation. For teachers on continuing contracts, there is no specific length of time for the observation.	Ohio Dept. of Education <a href="http://www.ode.state.oh.us/">http://www.ode.state.oh.us/</a>
<b>Oregon</b>	In Oregon, observation guidelines may vary from program to program. Oregon requires six observations over a 15-week period. Some use these observations as formative while other programs may use the last one or two of them as summative (depends on the design of the field experiences). Oregon also requires two work samples. Some programs use both samples as summative if two different placements occur. Some programs use both work samples as formative, still others use one as formative and one as summative.	Oregon Dept. of Education <a href="http://www.ode.state.or.us/">http://www.ode.state.or.us/</a>
<b>South Dakota</b>	South Dakota has no requirements in its laws for teacher evaluation. It is done at the local level.	Melody Schopp South Dakota Dept. of Education Phone: 605-773-5232 <a href="mailto:melody.schopp@state.sd.us">melody.schopp@state.sd.us</a>  Lanette Johnston <a href="mailto:Lanette.Johnston@state.sd.us">Lanette.Johnston@state.sd.us</a>

Continued on next page >



**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
Texas	<p>Texas uses the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) as the state's approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas that would benefit from staff development. PDAS Cornerstones of the process include a minimum of one 45-minute observation and completion of the Teacher Self-Report form. PDAS includes 51 criteria within eight domains reflecting the Proficiencies for Learner-centered Instruction adopted in 1967 by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC).</p> <p>The domains are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Active, successful student participation in the learning process</li> <li>2. Learner-centered instruction</li> <li>3. Evaluation and feedback on student progress</li> <li>4. Management of student discipline, instructional strategies, time/materials</li> <li>5. Professional communication</li> <li>6. Professional development</li> <li>7. Compliance with policies, operating procedures, and requirements</li> <li>8. Improvement of all students' academic performance</li> </ol> <p>Below is a link to Texas' PDAS:  <a href="http://www.tea.state.tx.us/eddev/PDAS/">http://www.tea.state.tx.us/eddev/PDAS/</a></p>	<p>Texas Education Agency  <a href="http://www.tea.state.tx.us/">http://www.tea.state.tx.us/</a></p>

Continued on next page >

**Table 1. State Information on Summative Teacher Evaluation**

State	Information	Contacts and Web Sites
Washington	<p>The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) does not use observation as part of its certification process; it uses a portfolio of evidence combined with a six-question written content test. Washington's second-tier licensure program does not use an observation, rather like the NBPTS, WA teachers submit a portfolio of evidence demonstrating their positive impact on student learning. In WA, observations are used for the purpose of employee (teacher) evaluation by the principal. There is an observation instrument that is used in WA during student teaching called the Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment (PPA) that must be conducted a minimum of twice. There are other states that use an observation instrument for purposes of second-tier licensure. One model is the Praxis III/Pathwise developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), which is used by a few states. Refer to the ETS Web site for the research and specifics about training and inter-rater reliability and validity that relate to Praxis III. The state contact was not sure about the actual research base.</p> <p>Link to the ETS Web site:  <a href="http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.3a88fea28f42ada7c6ce5a10c3921509/?vgnextoid=85b65784623f4010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD">http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.3a88fea28f42ada7c6ce5a10c3921509/?vgnextoid=85b65784623f4010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD</a> </p>	<p>Mary Jo Larsen  Program Specialist for Professional Certification  Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction  PO Box 47200  Olympia, WA 98504-7200  <a href="http://www.k12.wa.us/certification/ProfEd/profcertprograms.aspx">http://www.k12.wa.us/certification/ProfEd/profcertprograms.aspx</a> </p> <p>Michaela Miller  National Board Certification Coordinator  OSPI  Phone: 360-725-6119  <a href="mailto:Michaela.Miller@k12.wa.us">Michaela.Miller@k12.wa.us</a> </p> <p>Roy J. Einreinhofer  National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)  <a href="mailto:rje@nasdtec.com">rje@nasdtec.com</a> </p>
<p><i>Note:</i> This table contains information only for the states for which the SECC was able to obtain information. Information for those states that are marked with asterisks was gathered from state departments of education and other organizational Web sites.</p>		

Continued on next page &gt;

## RESOURCES

**1)** Barrett, J. (1986). *The evaluation of teachers*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (ERIC Identifier ED278657). Retrieved January 14, 2008, from <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-925/evaluation.htm>

This digest provides information on the teacher evaluation process, including types of evaluation, the criteria issue, evaluation methods, the evaluation procedure, and the elements required for a successful evaluation program.

**2)** Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Oliva, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007). *Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest Region* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 030). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Services (IES), National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Midwest. Retrieved January 2, 2008, from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>

This report provides a summary of teacher evaluation policies in a sample of districts located in the Midwest Region. It provides information on how often evaluations are conducted, the evaluation tools used, and what methods are to be used. It also includes sample forms for summative and formative evaluations.

**3)** Coggshall, J.G. (2007). *Communication framework for measuring teacher quality and effectiveness: Bringing coherence to the conversation*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ). Retrieved January 2, 2008, from <http://www.ncctq.com/communicationFramework.php>

Abstract: This communication framework was developed to promote effective dialogue about the measurement of teacher quality and effectiveness. It facilitates communication about policies regarding teacher effectiveness by helping to build a shared understanding of the terminology used in the discussion. Through a brief overview of teacher quality and the various instruments that can be used to collect evidence of its many facets, the framework illuminates both the possibilities and the limitations of focusing on teacher effectiveness (as opposed to other dimensions of teacher quality) in education policy and practice. The framework consists of the following four components: communication planning, goals clarification, teacher quality terms, and measurement tools and resources. Also included are definitions of key measurement terms, three communication tools, resources that provide information on standards for teaching quality, and additional resources.

**4)** Hawaii State Department of Education. (2001). *Professional evaluation program for teachers (PEP-T), Manual for evaluators and participants*. Retrieved January 2, 2008, from <http://sp.k12.hi.us/pdf/atch5602manual.pdf>

This manual provides a description of the procedures for the teacher evaluation process for the Hawaii State Department of Education. It includes a flow chart of the evaluation program as well as forms for implementation.

**5)** Howard, B.B. (2005). *Teacher growth and assessment process: Procedural handbook*. Greensboro, NC: SERVE Center for Continuous Improvement at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Retrieved January 2, 2008, from [http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content\\_storage\\_01/0000019b/80/1b/a8/c7.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1b/a8/c7.pdf)

Abstract: Teacher Growth and Assessment (TGA) is a comprehensive teacher evaluation system that includes structures for both accountability and professional growth, taking teacher evaluation to a new level. TGA provides the opportunity to use teacher evaluation data to plan professional development, involve teachers

in self-assessment, and structure activities around expectations of performance. This is accomplished through two complementary phases: (a) summative and (b) formative. The summative phase establishes the process for accountability that ensures overall competency of the classroom teacher while also acknowledging those who meet or exceed state teaching standards within specific areas. Why engage in teacher evaluation? An effective system of teacher evaluation properly implemented can be a principal's most powerful tool in fulfilling the role of instructional leader. The intent of this system of teacher evaluation is to provide principals with a tool to increase their own instructional leadership skills while guiding teachers in improving their practice.

**6)** Millman, J. (Ed.). (1984). *Handbook of teacher evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

343 pages. ISBN 0803915977.

**Abstract:** Millman's tightly edited volume answers the questions: who should evaluate teachers? For what purpose? And using what methods and techniques? The strengths and weaknesses of students, other teachers, or administrators as evaluators are discussed and the use of evaluation as a tool for self-improvement or for making decisions about promotion and salary is explored. Finally, all commonly employed methods are summarized.

**7)** Millman, J. & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.). (1990). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

441 pages. ISBN 080394523X.

**Abstract:** The 25 chapters in this handbook examine evaluation purposes, processes, and methods, and discuss how they shape the implementation and outcomes of evaluation. Following an introduction in chapter 1, the nine chapters in Part I consider the purposes of evaluation. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 are concerned with the evaluation processes that determine selection into teaching: preservice evaluation, licensure, and certification. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 focus on how evaluation may support the development of greater teaching competencies for beginning and veteran teachers. Chapters 9 and 10 consider school accountability and school improvement. Part II examines the various methods used to evaluate teachers, along with their strengths and limitations as applied to the many purposes of evaluation. Chapters 11 and 12 deal with two methods for evaluating in-service teachers: classroom observations and ratings of classroom performance, while chapter 13 deals with teacher self-assessment. Chapters 14 and 15 deal with less widely used methods, the use of student test scores and the use of teacher portfolios. Chapters 16 through 18 address the use of formal tests to evaluate teachers for licensure or certification, and chapter 19 discusses combining evaluation data from multiple sources for decision-making. In Part III, some of the system-wide concerns that developers and users of evaluation plans must confront are discussed. Chapters explore legal, ethical, administrative, and economic aspects of teacher evaluation, and ways to improve and support teacher evaluation. The use of personnel standards to improve teacher evaluation is also discussed. Each chapter contains references.

**8)** Mississippi Department of Education Office of Leadership Development & Enhancement. (2000). *Sourcebook for effective supervision of instruction*. Retrieved January 2, 2008, from [www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/Sourcebook.html](http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/Sourcebook.html)

This handbook provides a description of the department's summative evaluation process and includes feedback forms for conducting observations and conferences.

*Continued on next page >*

**9)** Peterson, K.D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices, 2nd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

440 pages. ISBN-10: 0803968833; ISBN-13: 978-0803968837.

**Abstract:** The original edition, published in August 1995, challenges current teacher evaluation and school practice. The book discusses stages of teacher choice, teacher responsibilities for evaluation, and suggests ways for teachers to become more involved and in control of their own evaluation. Combining information and techniques from his academic studies and evaluation experiences, Peterson presents a coherent, field-tested set of new practices for teacher evaluation. The revised edition adds new chapters on the role of the principal in changed teacher evaluation, how districts can transition from current practice to improved practices, the use of national standards, developments in using pupil achievement data, and puts a new emphasis on developing sociologically. The Internet as a resource for local development is encouraged (67 Web sites are recommended as starting points). New resources for local development have been added from extensive field-testing and analysis; forms have been improved, and district-level principles have been assembled. Substantial material has been added on the topic of responding to deficient teacher practice. Finally, the research literature has been augmented.

**10)** Peterson, K.D., & Peterson, C.A. (2006). *Effective teacher evaluation: A guide for principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

114 pages. ISBN 1412914833.

**Abstract:** Enrich the quality of teaching and learning in your school with meaningful teacher evaluations! Effective teacher evaluation is at the core of improving the quality and value of education, and principals bear the responsibility of implementing a teacher evaluation program that helps develop highly qualified teachers and promotes high academic standards. In their easy-to-use handbook, evaluation experts Kenneth D. Peterson and Catherine A. Peterson offer a fresh, innovative look into teacher evaluation methods, focusing on three central areas: 1) increasing the amount of objective data, 2) increasing teacher involvement, and 3) increasing the technical and sociological quality of the evaluation process. This excellent resource provides specific “how-to” methods to help principals: use the best objective evidence available, put the teacher at the center of the process, use multiple data sources, use data sources which vary by individual teacher, incorporate student achievement data, inspire ongoing teacher reflection and analysis, as well as use the specific strategies and best practices in this practical guide to help inspire quality teaching and high academic achievement!

**11)** Peterson, K. (2004). Research on schoolteacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(639), 60–79.

**Abstract:** Research literature highlights the principal as central to teacher evaluation. However, principal reports do not provide adequate information to document teacher quality. Good teacher evaluation adds multiple data sources such as client surveys, peer reviews of materials, and pupil achievement data, which vary by teacher and setting. Principals should become knowledgeable about pupil gain data, costs of evaluation, sociology of teacher evaluation, and the problem of the bad teacher. Teacher evaluation can reassure external audiences that schools are doing a good job.

**12)** Shinkfield, A.J., & Stufflebeam, D.L. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to effective practice*. Boston: Kluwer.

395 pages. ISBN 079239674X.

**Abstract:** Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice is organized around four dominant, interrelated core issues: professional standards; a guide for applying the Joint Committee’s Standards; 10 alternative models for the evaluation of teacher performance; and an analysis of these selected models. The book draws heavily upon

the research and development conducted by the federally funded national Center for Research on Educational Accountability and the Teacher Evaluation (CREATE). This guide allows the reader to grasp the essence of the experience of sound teacher evaluation and apply its principles, facts, ideas, processes, and procedures. Finally, the book invites and assists school professionals and other readers to examine the latest developments in teacher evaluation.

**13)** Stronge, J.H. (Ed.). (1997). *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

316 pages. ISBN 0-8039-6356-4 (soft cover).

**Abstract:** This guide presents current research and thinking about teacher evaluation and combines that research with practice. Chapters contain illustrations and examples to make a research-practice connection and present a comprehensive approach to designing, implementing, and monitoring quality teacher-evaluation systems. Chapters include: (1) "Improving Schools through Teacher Education" (James H. Stronge); (2) "Building the Foundation: Teacher Roles and Responsibilities" (Patricia H. Wheeler and Michael Scriven); (3) "Legal Considerations in Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems" (Pamela D. Tucker and Kay P. Kindred); (4) "Applying the Personnel Evaluation Standards to Teacher Evaluation" (James R. Sanders); (5) "Classroom-Based Assessments of Teaching and Learning" (Chad D. Ellett); (6) "Client Surveys in Teacher Evaluation" (James H. Stronge and Laura P. Ostrander); (7) "Indicators of Student Learning in Teacher Evaluation" (Andrew A. McConney, Mark D. Schalock, and H. Del Schalock); (8) "Portfolios in Teacher Evaluation" (Kenneth Wolf, Gary Lichtenstein, and Cynthia Stevenson); (9) "Teacher Self-Evaluation" (Peter W. Airasian and Arlen Gullickson); (10) "Conducting a Successful Evaluation Conference" (Virginia M. Helm); (11) "Dealing Positively with the Nonproductive Teacher" (Mary Jo McGrath); and (12) "Linking Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development" (Joyce Annunziata). Chapters contain references.

**14)** Stronge, J.H. & Tucker, P.D. (2003). *Handbook on teacher evaluation: Assessing and improving performance*. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education, Inc.

253 pages. ISBN 1930556586.

**Abstract:** Easy-to-use, authoritative, and flexible, the tools in this book and CD-ROM have been developed over the last 15 years and have been field tested in over 500 schools. These tools will empower you to do your evaluations based on current thinking and best practices.

Among the tools included are the following:

- Performance appraisal rubrics
- Teacher evaluation records
- Portfolio guidelines and forms
- Student and parent surveys
- Improvement assistance plan
- Teacher performance feedback form.

Also included are annotated lists of teacher job responsibilities, organized around domains, standards, and performance indicators. Distinct sets of teacher job responsibilities are devoted to the following:

- Classroom teachers
- English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers
- Reading specialists, and
- Special education resource teachers.

*Continued on next page >*

## REFERENCES

- Bartz, D.E., et. al., (1995). Improving the summative evaluation conference. *Principal*, 74, 24–6.
- Goldstein, J. (2007). Easy to dance to: Solving the problems of teacher evaluation with peer assistance and review. *American Journal of Education*, 113(3), 479–508.
- Goldstein, J. (2006). Debunking the fear of peer review: Combining supervision and evaluation and living to tell about it. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 18, 235–252.
- Goldstein, J. (2004). Making sense of distributed leadership: The case of peer assistance and review. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(2), 173–197.
- Gullatt, D.E., & Ballard, L.M. (1998). Choosing the right process for teacher evaluation. *American Secondary Education*, 26(3), 13–17.
- Haefele, D.L. (1993). Evaluating teachers: A call for change. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7(1), 21–31.
- Jun, M.K.; Anthony, R.; Achrazoglou, J.; Coghill-Behrends, W. (2007). Using ePortfolio for the assessment and professional development of newly hired teachers. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 51(4), 45–50.
- Piggot-Irvine, E. (2003). Appraisal training focused on what really matters. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(6).
- Wise, A.E., Darling-Hammond, L., Tyson-Bernstein, H., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1984). *Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices* (RAND Series Report NIE# R-3139-NIE). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp. Retrieved January 15, 2008, from <http://www.rand.org/pubs/notes/N2133/>

**Rapid Responses** are customized reports that are prepared to fulfill requests for information by the departments of education of the states served by the Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL. The responses address topics on current education issues related to the requirements and implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. For additional information, visit the SECC Web site at <http://secc.sedl.org>.

Wesley Hoover, PhD, SEDL President and CEO  
Robin Jarvis, PhD, SECC Program Manager  
Chris Times, MBA, SECC Communications Associate and Publication Editor

Rapid Response Team: Shirley Beckwith, Communications Associate; Leslie Blair, Project Director; Danny Martinez, Program Associate; Chris Times, Communications Associate; and Maria Torres, Program Associate.

Alabama State Liaison: Lou Meadows ([lmeadows@sedl.org](mailto:lmeadows@sedl.org))  
Georgia State Liaison: Glenda Copeland ([gcopeland@sedl.org](mailto:gcopeland@sedl.org))  
Louisiana State Liaison: Jill Slack ([jslack@sedl.org](mailto:jslack@sedl.org))  
Mississippi State Liaison: Debra Meibaum ([dmeibaum@sedl.org](mailto:dmeibaum@sedl.org))  
South Carolina State Liaison: Sandra Lindsay ([slindsay@sedl.org](mailto:slindsay@sedl.org))

The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from the US Department of Education. The contents do not, however, necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education, and one should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.