

Evaluating Teaching
16:300:650:01
Mondays, 4:50pm-7:30pm
Rutgers Academic Building, Room 2200
3 Credits

Instructor: Drew Gitomer	drew.gitomer@gse.rutgers.edu
Phone Number: 848-932-0642	10 Seminary Pl Rm 9
Office Hours: by appointment	Prerequisites or other limitations: none
Mode of Instruction: <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seminar <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid <input type="checkbox"/> Online <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Permission required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Directions about where to get permission numbers: from the instructor

Rutgers University welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, a student with a disability must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentations: <https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/documentation-guidelines>. If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus's disability services office will provide you with a Letter of Accommodations. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible. To begin this process, please complete the Registration form on the ODS web site at:

<https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/registration-form>

Course Description

Learning goals:

1. To understand the policy issues related to the evaluation of teaching
2. To learn about and gain experience in the use of different methods for measuring teaching quality
3. To understand the different measurement approaches that are used to evaluate teaching quality, including the limitations of various methods
4. To understand and be able to analyze and critique teaching evaluation systems

Course catalog description:

Evaluating teaching quality is a cornerstone of current educational reform efforts. There are multiple motivations for improved evaluation practices, ranging from professional development to making decisions about employment and compensation. Over the last two decades, new models of evaluation that include value-added modeling based on student test

scores, classroom observations, student perception surveys, teacher portfolios, classroom assignments, and new measures of teacher knowledge have been introduced.

This course will explore the policy context, methods, and research around the evaluation of teaching quality. We will study the assumptions, values, promises, and challenges of using different methods to make inferences about the quality of teaching and the effectiveness of particular teachers. The course will also examine current policy initiatives (e.g., Race to the Top) and implementations at state and district levels that are designed to improve teacher evaluation systems.

The course will also provide direct experience with a number of evaluation tools in order to better understand the nature of these tools, the insights about teaching that they can provide, and the challenges to using them effectively.

Required texts:

Students are asked to purchase the following books:

Harris, D. (2011). *Value-added methods in education: What every educator needs to know*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

In addition, students will be asked to read a set of papers that will be posted on Sakai and/or are available through web links provided in the citation.

Grading policy:

Students will be evaluated on their participation in class (including weekly assignments; 30%) and three assignments.

Assignment 1 (20%) – Students will be asked to provide a synthetic and critical summary of a set of papers provided by the instructor that addresses, from different perspectives, a key issue focused on the evaluation of teaching.

Assignment 2 (20%) – Students will be asked to select a particular instrument that is used in teaching evaluation and provide an analysis that considers its conceptual basis, core values and assumptions, and validity evidence.

Assignment 3 (30%) – Students (in small groups) will examine a current statewide or district-wide evaluation system and provide a critical analysis of the characteristics, theory of action, strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and potential risks associated with the evaluation system. Analysis will be submitted in written format and each group will present their findings to the class.

Academic Integrity Policy:

Any violation of academic honesty is a serious offense and is therefore subject to an appropriate penalty. Refer to <http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/academic-integrity-policy/> for a full explanation of policies.

Course Requirements

This is a seminar, and all students, including any auditing the class, are expected to participate fully and contribute to the class. Each week you will be expected to read the assigned readings and provide a brief answer to a question (based on the readings) posted on the Sakai site.

As a doctoral seminar it is really important to participate in classroom discussions. For some of you it will come more easily than others. One thing you can do is to prepare for the discussion—as you read the papers, think about the questions that come to mind, any important takeaways, and the connections among papers and ideas discussed in the class. Each week, you should come out of the class feeling like you’ve made at least one important contribution.

You will also be asked to write three papers for the class over the semester. All papers should represent your best thinking and critical analysis and should also follow American Psychological Association (APA) format. As a graduate student, you should own and refer to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.; see <http://apastyle.org/>).

Contacting Me

I encourage you to contact me to ask questions, discuss issues, consult on your papers, etc. While I don’t have standing office hours, please contact me through email and we’ll set up a meeting, either in person or virtually.

My assistant is Colleen McDermott, and she can help with scheduling meetings, logistical issues, etc. Please contact her (colleen.mcdermott@gse.rutgers.edu) if you are having trouble getting in touch with me.

Course Schedule by Week

Week	Topics to be Covered	Assignments & Readings
1: Sept. 12, 2016	<p><i>Why the push for better teacher evaluation?</i></p> <p>This week we will encounter some of the drivers that have led to a focus on teacher evaluation as a mechanism for educational improvement. We will review traditional</p>	<p>Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). <i>Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education</i>. Washington, DC: Education Sector.</p> <p>Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 73(1), 89–122. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3516044.pdf</p> <p>Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). <i>The widget effect: Our national failure to</i></p>

	<p>approaches to teacher evaluation. We will also begin to consider the theories of action that guide the current focus on teacher evaluation.</p>	<p><i>acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness</i>. New York, NY: The New Teacher Project. Retrieved from http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect.pdf</p> <p>Wright, S., Horn, S., & Sanders, W. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. <i>Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education</i>, 11, 57–67. Retrieved from http://www.sas.com/govedu/edu/teacher_eval.pdf</p>
<p>2: Sept. 19, 2016</p>	<p><i>Conceptions of teacher quality</i></p> <p>We will explore various conceptions of teacher quality and draw a distinction between teacher quality and teaching quality. We will examine the connections and disjunctions between these various conceptions and their implications for measuring teaching practice.</p>	<p>Ball, D. L., & Hill, H. C. (2009). Measuring teaching quality in practice. In D. H. Gitomer (Ed.), <i>Measurement issues and the assessment for teacher quality</i> (pp. 80–98). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.</p> <p>Cohen, D. (2010). Teacher quality: An American educational dilemma. In M. M. Kennedy (Ed.), <i>Teacher assessment and the quest for teacher quality: A handbook</i> (pp. 375–402). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.</p> <p>Hanushek, E. A. (2002). Teacher quality. In L. T. Izumi & W. M. Evers (Eds.), <i>Teacher quality</i> (pp. 1–13). Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press. Retrieved from http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Hanushek%202002%20Teacher%20Quality.pdf</p> <p>Kennedy, M. M. (2010). Attribution error and the quest for teacher quality. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 39(8), 591–598. Retrieved from http://edr.sagepub.com/content/39/8/591.full.pdf</p>
<p>3: Sept. 26, 2016</p>	<p><i>Value-added methods – what are they?</i></p> <p>This week we will examine the fundamental assumptions and techniques of value-added models for</p>	<p>Braun, H. I. (2005). <i>Using student progress to evaluate teachers: A primer on value-added models</i>. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved from http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICVAM.pdf</p> <p>Briggs, D. (2008, November). <i>The goals and uses of value-added models</i>. Paper presented at the</p>

	<p>evaluating teachers. While we will not go into all of the finer technical details, we will learn the basic approaches, nomenclature, and assumptions that underlie models so that students can become literate readers of studies using these techniques.</p>	<p>workshop of the Committee on Value-Added Methodology for Instructional Improvement, Program Evaluation, and Educational Accountability, National Research Council, Washington, DC.</p> <p>Harris, D. (2011). <i>Value-added methods in education: What every educator needs to know</i>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.</p> <p>Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 22(2), 129–145. Retrieved from http://epa.sagepub.com/content/22/2/129.full.pdf</p>
<p>4: Oct. 3, 2016</p>	<p><i>Evaluating value-added methods</i></p> <p>Researchers have widely disparate views about the merits of using value-added methods to evaluate teachers. We will examine the rationales for different positions as well as some of the technical literature that helps us understand the nature of support for the underlying assumptions of value-added methods. How reasonable is it to make claims that a particular teacher “caused” student learning?</p> <p>*Assignment 1 assigned</p>	<p>Baker, E. L., Barton, P. E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H. F., Linn, R. L., . . . Shepard, L. A. (2010). <i>Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers</i> (EPI Briefing Paper 278). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/page/-/pdf/bp278.pdf</p> <p>Glazerman, S., Loeb, S., Goldhaber, D., Staiger, D., Raudenbush, S., & Whitehurst, G. (2010). <i>Evaluating teachers: The important role of value-added</i>. Washington, DC: Brown Center on Education. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/research/evaluating-teachers-the-important-role-of-value-added/</p> <p>Hill, H. C., Kapitula, L., & Umland, K. (2011). A validity argument approach to evaluating teacher value-added scores. <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, 48(3), 794–831. Retrieved from http://aer.sagepub.com/content/48/3/794.full.pdf</p> <p>Reardon, S. F., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2009). Assumptions of value-added models for estimating school effects. <i>Education Finance and Policy</i>, 4(4), 492–519. Retrieved from http://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/reardon%20raudenbush%20EFP%20VAM%20paper%20resubmission.pdf</p>

<p>5: Oct. 10, 2016</p>	<p><i>Classroom observation: introducing systems</i></p> <p>Note: During the next three weeks, the class will gain experience in using observation protocols to score video samples of actual classroom practice. This week we will begin to observe teaching practice through video and understand how observation protocols are developed and how they differ from each other.</p>	<p>Danielson, C. (2007). <i>Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching</i>. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.</p> <p>Grossman, P. <i>Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observation (PLATO)</i>. (current version with permission)</p> <p>Hill, H. <i>Mathematical Quality of Instruction (MQI)</i>. (current version with permission)</p> <p>Pianta et al. <i>Classroom Assessment Scoring System</i>. (pilot version with permission)</p> <p>Stodolsky, S. S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 13(9), 11–18.</p> <p>Walberg, H. J. (1991). Productive teaching and instruction: Assessing the knowledge base. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), <i>Effective teaching: Current research</i> (pp. 33–62). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.</p>
<p>Oct. 17, 2016: NO CLASS</p>		
<p>6: Oct. 24, 2016</p>	<p><i>Classroom observation</i></p> <p>My colleagues and I have been involved in a number of studies of classroom observation. We will be reading these to understand issues associated with measuring teaching quality through observation, including implications for evaluation and professional development.</p> <p>We will continue to use different protocols to</p>	<p>Bell, C. A., Gitomer, D. H., McCaffrey, D. F., Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., & Qi, Y. (2012). An argument approach to classroom observation protocol validity. <i>Educational Assessment</i>, 17(2–3), 62–87.</p> <p>Casabianca, J. M., McCaffrey, D. F., Gitomer, D. H., Bell, C. A., & Hamre, B. K. (2013). Effect of observation mode on measures of secondary mathematics teaching. <i>Educational and Psychological Measurement</i>, 73(5), 757–783. doi: 10.1177/0013164413486987</p> <p>Gitomer, D. H., & Bell, C. A. (2013). Evaluating teaching and teachers. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed.), <i>APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology</i> (Vol. 3, pp. 415–444). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.</p> <p>Gitomer, D. H., Bell, C. A., Qi, Y., McCaffrey, D. F.,</p>

	<p>better understand the challenges and potential of using classroom observation to understand teaching.</p> <p>*Assignment 1 due</p>	<p>Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2014). The instructional challenge in improving teaching quality: Lessons from a classroom observation protocol. <i>Teachers College Record</i>, 116(6). Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=17460</p>
<p>7: Oct. 31, 2016</p>	<p><i>The validity of observation scores</i></p> <p>How does one establish the validity of using observations to make inferences about teacher quality? During this week we will first discuss what validity means in this context and then examine a number of recent studies that attempt to develop validity evidence for different observation approaches. We will learn about both the methods and the validity evidence for classroom observations.</p> <p>We will continue to have experiences in using observation protocols.</p> <p>*Assignment 2 assigned</p>	<p>Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2011). <i>Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching project</i>. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED528382</p> <p>Grossman, P., Loeb, S., Cohen, J., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). Measure for measure: The relationship between measures of instructional practice in middle school English language arts and teachers' value-added scores. <i>American Journal of Education</i>, 119(3), 445–470. doi: 10.1086/669901</p> <p>Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Mashburn, A. J., & Downer, J. T. (2007). <i>Building a science of classrooms: Application of the CLASS framework in over 4,000 U. S. early childhood and elementary classrooms</i>. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Retrieved from http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/BuildingAScienceOfClassroomsPiantaHamre.pdf</p> <p>Stodolsky, S. S. (1990). Classroom observation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), <i>The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers</i> (pp. 175–190). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.</p>
<p>8: Nov. 7, 2016</p>	<p><i>Classroom artifacts</i></p> <p>Another aspect of classroom practice that we can look at to understand teacher quality is the nature of assignments and</p>	<p>Borko, H., Stecher, B., & Kuffner, K. (2007). <i>Using artifacts to characterize reform-oriented instruction: The Scoop Notebook and rating guide</i> (CSE Technical Report 707). Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)/UCLA. Retrieved from</p>

	<p>assessments that teachers ask students to do. This week we will learn about how researchers have used artifacts to study classroom practice, how practice is sampled, and what studies have been found about the quality of teaching using such instruments.</p> <p>We will also gain experience in using an assignment protocol to score classroom assignments and student work.</p>	<p>http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED495853.pdf</p> <p>Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H., Slater, S. C., & Boston, M. (2008). Toward measuring instructional interactions at-scale. <i>Educational Assessment</i>, 13(4), 267–300.</p> <p>Newmann, F. M., Bryk, A. S., & Nagaoka, J. K. (2001). <i>Authentic intellectual work and standardized tests: Conflict or coexistence?</i> Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research. Retrieved from http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/p0a02.pdf</p> <p>Wenzel, S., Nagaoka, J. K., Morris, L., Billings, S., & Fendt, C. (2002). <i>Documentation of the 1996–2002 Chicago Annenberg Research Project strand on authentic intellectual demand exhibited in assignments and student work: A technical process manual</i>. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research. Retrieved from http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/p67.pdf</p>
<p>9 & 10: Nov. 14 & 21, 2016</p>	<p><i>Content knowledge for teaching</i></p> <p>What is the nature of knowledge that teachers need to have in order to help students learn? Measures of subject-matter knowledge have long been used for the initial certification of teachers using tests like <i>Praxis</i>. For these two weeks we will examine these traditional measures and contrast them with new models of knowledge assessments that pay much greater attention to an idea broadly</p>	<p>Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. <i>Educational Researcher</i>, 15(2), 4–14. doi: 10.3102/0013189X015002004</p> <p>Gitomer, D. H., & Zisk, R. C. (2015). Knowing what teachers know. <i>Review of Research in Education</i>, 39(1), 1–53. doi: 10.3102/0091732X14557001</p> <p>Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i>, 59(5), 389–407. Retrieved from http://jte.sagepub.com/content/59/5/389.full.pdf</p> <p>Hill, H. C., Blunk, M. L., Charalambous, C. Y., Lewis, J. M., Phelps, G. C., Sleep, L., & Ball, D. L. (2008). Mathematical knowledge for teaching and the mathematical quality of instruction: An exploratory study. <i>Cognition & Instruction</i>, 26(4), 430–511. Retrieved from</p>

	<p>defined as pedagogical content knowledge. We will examine studies of content knowledge for teaching and also experience some of these assessments.</p>	<p>http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/07370000802177235</p> <p>Gitomer, D. H., Phelps, G., Weren, B., Howell, H. & Croft, A. J. (2014). Evidence on the validity of content knowledge for teaching assessments. In T. J. Kane, K. A. Kerr, & R. C. Pianta (Eds.), <i>Designing teacher evaluation systems: New guidance from the Measures of Effective Teaching project</i> (pp. 493–528). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.</p>
<p>11: Nov. 28, 2016</p>	<p><i>Emerging teacher evaluation systems</i></p> <p>States and districts across the country are now developing teacher evaluation systems that use a combination of measures we have explored thus far. This week we will explore several models that are being implemented and how scores from different measures are being combined to make judgments about teachers. We will also examine findings related to developing compensation systems based on measures of teaching quality.</p> <p>*Assignment 2 due</p>	<p>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2012). <i>Gathering feedback for teaching: Combining high-quality observations with student surveys and achievement gains</i> (MET Project Research Paper). Seattle, WA: Author. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED540960</p> <p>Chait, R., & Miller, R. (2009). <i>Paying teachers for results: A summary of research to inform the design of pay-for-performance programs for high-poverty schools</i>. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2009/05/18/6127/paying-teachers-for-results/</p> <p>Headden, S. (2011). <i>Inside IMPACT: D.C.'s model teacher evaluation system</i> (Education Sector Reports). Washington, DC: Education Sector. Retrieved from http://www.educationsector.org/sites/default/files/publications/IMPACT_Report_RELEASE.pdf</p> <p>Springer, M. G., Ballou, D., Hamilton, L., Le, V., Lockwood, J. R., McCaffrey, D., . . . Stecher, B. (2010). <i>Teacher pay for performance: Experimental evidence from the Project on Incentives in Teaching</i>. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reprints/2010/RAND_RP1416.pdf</p>
<p>12: Dec. 5, 2016</p>	<p><i>Teacher evaluation within a broader context of performance</i></p>	<p>Rowan, B., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2016). Teacher evaluation in American schools. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), <i>Handbook of research on</i></p>

	<p><i>management</i></p> <p>This week we will look closely at a chapter by Rowan and Raudenbush (2016) that considers evaluation within a social context, examining performance management approaches more in teaching and also more generally.</p>	<p><i>teaching</i> (5th ed.; pp. 1159–1216). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.</p>
<p>13: Dec. 12, 2016</p>	<p><i>Teacher portfolio systems</i></p> <p>This week we will review readings about the National Board for Professional Standards, the EdTPA, and other systems that ask teachers to demonstrate their practice through the development of a teaching portfolio.</p>	<p>The following are documents from the NBPTS system:</p> <p>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2003). <i>NBPTS adolescence and young adulthood English language arts standards, 2nd edition</i>. Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/sites/default/files/document/s/certificates/nbpts-certificate-aya-ela-standards.pdf</p> <p>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2010). <i>Mathematics standards</i>. Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/sites/default/files/document/s/certificates/nbpts-certificate-ea-math-standards.pdf</p> <p>National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2012). <i>Middle childhood generalist standards, 3rd edition</i>. Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/sites/default/files/document/s/certificates/nbpts-certificate-mc-gen-standards.pdf</p>
<p>14: Dec. 19, 2016</p>	<p><i>Final presentations</i></p>	