2101(c)(4)(B)(ii): Evidence-based support and evaluation systems

Background

Research shows that teaching can be improved, and those improvements can result in better student outcomes. As states seek to improve the quality of their evaluation systems with the hope of improving instruction, they have an opportunity to invest in responsive, targeted, and sustainable evaluation strategies that provide clear instructional guidance and timely feedback so that teachers can work steadily to improve their craft. According to a series of white papers from 100Kin10, effective evaluation systems should be tied to professional development and support, including opportunities to develop a culture of teamwork and to benefit from coaching and mentoring.

We believe that observation tools offer a strategic focal point for SEAs who are working to improve instruction, and we support the use of protocols that leverage the effective teaching practices identified in NCTM's *Principles to Actions: Ensuring Mathematical Success for All* (2014). The following, some of which are described by the Gates Foundation's Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, are just a few of the many tools that states and districts might consider utilizing:

- **Teaching for Robust Understanding** (TRU; Schoenfeld and colleagues, UC Berkeley)
- **Using the Formative Assessment Rubrics, Reflection and Observation Tools to Support Professional Reflection on Practice** (Wylie and Lyon, FAST-SCASS)
- **Framework for Teaching** (FFT; Danielson, Danielson Group and the Mathematics Clusters)
- **Classroom Assessment Scoring System** (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, and Hamre, University of Virginia)
- **Mathematical Quality of Instruction** (MQI; Hill and colleagues, Harvard University)
- **UTeach Observation Protocol** (UTOP; Marder and Walkington, The University of Texas at Austin)

Look Fors

State plans should address evaluation and support systems designed to improve mathematics educator and leader effectiveness, thereby increasing student achievement, by describing ways in which SEAs will–

1. guide the selection of observation tools and rubrics that are shown to be valid and reliable;
2. develop clear linkages between the instruments and effective mathematics teaching practices and/or the five dimensions of powerful classrooms in order to promote coherence across LEAs;
3. regularly sample teacher observation scores to verify their relationship with student achievement scores;
4. ensure that funds are, at least in part, serving teachers whose observations indicate an opportunity for growth and a need for support;
5. direct and support LEAs to create opportunities for teacher leaders (other than principals) to perform observations and provide meaningful and timely feedback (see Allowable Activity v); and
6. provide support structures to ensure the accurate and fair application of observation instruments.

States with Promising Features

The following states were identified as a result of the Promising Features Survey in which 13 state plans were reviewed by mathematics leaders across the country. Related text from the full state plans mentioned below can be found in Tool #12 at http://nctm.org/essatoolkit.

- **Connecticut** will support ongoing statewide professional development focused on using observational tools to support educator growth.
- **Delaware** will provide LEAs with resources, including an Excellent Educator Dashboard and an Educator Equity LEA Planning Toolkit.
- **Massachusetts** proposes developing resources that, together with professional learning networks, will support teachers in implementing state standards.
- **Maryland** will support personalized learning for teachers, principals, and principal supervisors.
- **Oklahoma** will emphasize teacher professional growth and ownership as part of the state's evaluation system.

http://nctm.org/essatoolkit