

# The Voter

A Publication of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County

MARCH 2012

VOL. 53, No.8

## FOSTERING EFFECTIVE TEACHING: NO EASY ANSWERS

By Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Education Chair

After 30 years of doing such work, I have concluded that classroom teaching... is perhaps the most complex, most challenging, and most demanding, subtle, nuanced, and frightening activity that our species ever invented....The only time a physician could possibly encounter a situation of comparable complexity would be in the emergency room of a hospital during or after a natural disaster.”

Lee Shulman, *The Wisdom of Practice*  
Stanford University

The above quote exemplifies why it has been so difficult to figure out how to develop, support, and reward teachers. In the past few years, teachers have been the focus of efforts to improve and “reform” our educational system. This local and national discussion of teaching was the impetus for the Seattle-King County League to look more closely at teachers and, specifically, to study how teachers are trained and what impact district policies have on their ability to affect student learning.

Many League members are or have been teachers or have family members or friends who are teachers. Yet few of us understand the training now required of teachers and the district policies that affect a teacher’s ability to do his or her job. The education committee hopes that this study will provide some understanding of the issues that surround teachers. It seems like almost every day there is a new research project that proclaims the “true way” to improve teaching

and thus improve student performance. However, the title of the study, “Fostering Effective Teaching: No Easy Answers,” should give readers a clue that the research is all over the map as regards results. There are a variety of ongoing projects nationally and within our state that hope to provide more definitive results over the next few years. In the meantime, League members should recognize the demands society puts on teachers and the complexity of their jobs. Teachers have a critical role in developing the next generation, and it is in society’s interest to figure out how best to support them in their goal of improving student achievement.

### **CORPORATIONS ARE NOT PEOPLE!**

Monday, March 5  
7:00 p.m

Hear from author  
Jeff Clements about the effects  
of Citizens United v. FEC  
on the political process.

Seattle University’s  
Pigott Auditorium

**FOSTERING EFFECTIVE TEACHING:  
NO EASY ANSWERS**

**LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SEATTLE-KING COUNTY**

STUDY COMMITTEE

Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Chair

Karen Adair

Nancy Bagley

Shira Brewer

Zita Cook

Joanna Cullen

Jan O'Connor

Kelly Powers

Phyllis Runyon

READING COMMITTEE

Pat McCann

Kati Ortiz

Janet Winans

## INTRODUCTION

### Background

Over the last 50 years, the American educational system has come to the attention of most presidents. Each has tried to put his imprint on what should be done to improve the system. In 1983, under President Reagan, the National Commission of Excellence in Education produced a controversial report, *A Nation at Risk*. The purpose of the commission was to evaluate the quality of education in the United States. One of its more startling comments was, "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre education performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war."<sup>1</sup> The report was very critical of many aspects of the system: the content or curriculum, the expectations and academic requirements for students, the time spent in school and on homework, and the level of competence of the teachers.

Since that time, many reforms have been proposed, most of which involved aspects outside of the classrooms. There have been efforts to provide parents more choice through vouchers; to increase competition with the establishment of charter schools; and to impose greater accountability through rigorous testing. While each of these reforms has its supporters and detractors, there still has been no consensus on the "silver bullet" that would produce a higher quality educational system that could compete in today's world.

In the last few years, educational research and commentary has focused on defining and promoting "effective teaching." Academic researchers, national education organizations, educational practitioners, and politicians have written extensively on the benefits of high quality instruction in advancing student learning.<sup>2</sup> There is widespread recognition that important factors outside the school, primarily the family's financial status and home environment, have an impact on student achievement. There is also acknowledgement that the context in which teachers work affects their performance, in

addition to the skills they possess: knowledge of the subject matter, planning and preparation, and classroom management.<sup>3</sup> However, many advocates for education see the quality of the teacher as the critical factor in improving student performance.<sup>4</sup> In spite of this general agreement on the importance of a teacher's effectiveness, there is little consensus on how to define and evaluate effective teaching.

Much of the recent research and legislation focuses on teacher evaluations as the key to improving teacher effectiveness. Some participants in the debate advocate measuring teacher effectiveness by rating their students' performance. Although there are still significant national and local discussions on the validity of this approach, some districts around the country are including student performance as a measure of teacher effectiveness in making decisions about pay and layoffs. In 2006, Denver fully implemented their ProComp compensation system which includes a teacher's evaluation as one of the options for determining salary increases and bonuses.<sup>5</sup> The Seattle School District's most recent contract with its teacher union includes student performance as one measure of a teacher's evaluation. In 2010, Colorado passed legislation allowing districts to consider teacher effectiveness in making layoff decisions. Other states as well as Washington D.C. have similar requirements for including teacher effectiveness in these decisions.<sup>6</sup> In the 2011 Washington State legislative session, a bill was introduced but not passed that would have required districts to use other factors, including evaluations, along with or in place of, seniority in determining layoffs.

### State and Federal Efforts at Education Reform

For more than a decade, both Washington State and the federal government have passed legislation to improve the quality of the education system. In Washington State, Governor Chris Gregoire oversaw the Washington Learns project beginning in 2005. The report containing all the recommendations was finished in November 2006. The goal was to redesign and more fully

fund the state's education system from pre-kindergarten through college. For K-12, the emphasis was on building expertise in math and science teaching, providing more personalized learning for specific student populations, increasing quality and accountability throughout the system, and creating a compensation system that rewards teachers based on their performance. In 2007, as a follow up to Washington Learns, state legislation created a Task Force on Basic Education Finance which was to develop a new definition of basic education and create a new funding structure. Their recommendations were included in ESHB 2661 passed in 2009. In 2010, another bill, SHB2776, gave the state until 2018 to complete full implementation of a new basic education definition with full funding. With implementation six years away, any impacts from this reform effort will not happen in the near future.

Another pressure on the state to fully fund education came from the courts. Washington State plays a major role in the funding and regulation of our educational system. The Washington Constitution declares that education is the paramount duty of the state, but the state pays only about 60% of local school districts' costs. In 2010, King County Superior Court ruled in favor of plaintiffs in their lawsuit against the state for lack of education funding. This decision upheld a 30 year old decision that came to the same conclusion, that is, that the state was not carrying out its constitutional duty to fully fund education. It appeared that the judge in 2010 would give the state until 2018 to meet the court's demands. However, the state appealed to the Washington State Supreme Court. The court finally issued a ruling on January 5, 2012 which upheld the lower court decision. The court agreed to give the state until 2018 but will "retain jurisdiction over the case to ensure progress in the State's plan to fully implement education reforms by 2018."<sup>7</sup> The League of Women Voters of Washington was one of the plaintiffs in the suit.

Since 2001, the federal government has moved aggressively to hold states more accountable for improving student performance. President George

W. Bush proposed and Congress passed an update to the existing Elementary and Secondary Education Act, commonly known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The thrust of the act is to require all students to meet academic standards by 2014 with punishments for low-performing schools where few students meet the standards. Schools that don't have 100% of their students meeting standards after a specific time period could be closed and reopened with new staff and principal. A key problem for many states and local school districts is that there was no additional funding provided to carry out the act's mandates. Additionally, there is no recognition for student growth for those students who still didn't meet standards but made substantial improvements in their performance. A number of states have applied for waivers from enforcing the law. NCLB has created much controversy about its goals and impacts, and it is up for renewal. However, any action is most likely to be delayed until after the 2012 election since there is significant disagreement among members of Congress about what needs to be done. As a result, the Obama Administration has encouraged states to request waivers from NCLB although there are criteria that each state must meet before any waiver is granted.

In 2009, President Obama and his Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, chose a different approach to push educational reforms across the country. The Race to the Top Program (RTT) is a \$4 billion grant program that asked states to advance reforms in four specific areas:

- Adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace;
- Build data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
- Recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed the most; and
- Turn around lowest achieving schools.<sup>8</sup>

Washington State did not apply in the first

round. In 2010, the legislature passed legislation (Senate Bill 6696) to make Washington more competitive in the granting process, although the state still was unsuccessful in getting any funds. The legislation included new requirements aimed at developing and retaining the best teachers. One major change was the development of a new teacher and principal evaluation system requiring a four-tier system replacing the previous two-tier satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Additionally, teacher preparation programs are required to improve their evaluation of students' skills before the students receive state certification to teach. Underlying all these efforts is the assumption that teachers are central to improvements in student achievement and overall school improvement.

### Study Focus

In 2010, members of the League of Women Voters of Seattle decided to study public school teachers. The resulting study looks at the major components of the educational system that affect teachers: state legislation and regulation, teacher preparation programs, and school district policies. The focus is on the requirements, programs, and policies that develop, support, or reward effective teaching.

In reviewing the research on teacher effectiveness and school improvement, one finds two approaches: one approach focuses on raising the quality of an individual teacher; the other focuses on improving the school as an organization. Both approaches reflect a common sense notion: to improve student learning over time, you need good teachers and a school culture that encourages collaboration and improvement for all teachers. If the focus is on raising student achievement, one good teacher is not enough. Our study will look at both aspects: the factors that affect a teacher and the factors that affect a school as a whole.

The study begins with a look at three teacher preparation programs in the greater Seattle area to understand how teachers are trained: Seattle University, Seattle Pacific University, and the University of Washington. The process for state certification of teachers is also explained. The

bulk of the study will look at the major elements within a local school district that play a role in teacher performance: mentoring and professional development; evaluation; the school environment, including the role of the principal and family integration into the school; union agreements; and teacher compensation. The school districts included in the study are Seattle, Mercer Island, and Bellevue. The study also reviews the impact of the recent changes at the state and federal level on these local school districts and local teacher preparation programs.

## TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

### Overview

Teacher preparation programs are an important component in the development of a public school teacher. Research indicates that these programs are vital to teacher effectiveness, offering prospective teachers the knowledge and skills they will need in the classroom. In addition, well-prepared teachers produce higher student achievement and are more likely to remain in teaching.<sup>9</sup>

The Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB) establishes policies and requirements for the preparation and certification of teachers and other educational professionals.<sup>10</sup> It is also responsible for approving and monitoring all Washington State teacher education programs. According to its Executive Director, Jennifer Wallace, the PESB is committed to high standards for preparing educators and ensuring uniformity of programs offered.<sup>11</sup> To receive state accreditation, programs must meet five approved standards: have a Professional Educators Advisory Board (PEAB) to provide guidance; show how the program uses data to assess and improve their program; demonstrate through their business practices that they have the fiscal capacity to enroll students, fund programs, and hire well-trained faculty; allow enough time for students in the field; and, finally, organize their program around knowledge and skills educators are expected to know.<sup>12</sup>

Although it is not required, many Washington State teacher education programs seek national accreditation as well. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a non-profit, non-governmental alliance of professional education and public organizations that promotes quality teaching preparation.<sup>13</sup>

Teacher education programs are now entering a new era, according to PESB's Wallace. Washington State has new regulations aimed at training teachers and new ways of evaluating teacher preparation programs. Previously, twenty-one Washington programs (seven public) were accredited by the state. New legislation has opened up accreditation to "non higher education" groups such as community colleges, and charter management companies. However, Wallace said, the same standards for preparing educators are required of these new programs to ensure uniformity.<sup>14</sup>

The PESB is now required to develop a new assessment of teacher effectiveness to evaluate the quality of a teacher preparation program in order to improve the rigor of all programs. Washington is one of twenty states that participate in the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC).<sup>15</sup> The Consortium is conducting a national pilot project of Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), an emerging assessment of candidates who are in teacher preparation programs. The assessment reflects the new emphasis on evidence-based standards rather than accumulation of courses and credits; candidates must demonstrate that they can assess student learning and know what to do when students are or aren't learning the concepts. The TPA requires that teaching candidates submit three to five lesson segments with detailed plans, a 15-minute video clip and analysis of their lesson, a list of materials used, samples of student work, and reflection on the lesson outcomes. The TPA includes a focus on teaching English Language Learners.<sup>16</sup> The model timeline is to test the system in the field in the 2011-12 school year and then have it required for all candidates in the 2012-13 school year.

Finally, teacher education programs across the state

are now mandated to provide an Alternate Route program in addition to their more "traditional" teacher education programs. The programs emphasize field experience and practice, full-time internship, and less formal course work.<sup>17</sup>

### Local Teacher Preparation Programs

Local teacher preparation programs offer many options for aspiring teachers. We chose to look at three local institutions--Seattle Pacific University (SPU), Seattle University (SU), and University of Washington (UW)--to provide a sampling of different programs. Here are features that all three of these teacher education programs share:

- All prospective teachers in Washington State must pass the WEST-B (The Washington Educator Skills Test-Basic which assesses basic skills in reading, mathematics, and writing) as a requirement for teacher preparation program admission and the WEST-E (Washington Educator Skills Test-Endorsements) which measures content knowledge required for candidates' teaching assignments.
- The field experience is an important part of becoming certified to teach; all three of the programs use a co-teaching model during the field experience. This means that the student teacher and mentor teacher are involved in organizing, planning, and assessing instruction, and they share instruction. As student teachers gain experience, they assume more and more of the instruction. This may differ from what some people think of when they picture student teaching. The classic image of an inexperienced teacher being thrown into a classroom to sink or swim is no longer the case.
- SPU, SU, and UW all piloted the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) in 2010-11. Now this assessment, part of the process of evaluating teacher candidates, will be required for all teacher education programs in Washington.
- Students at all three schools are evaluated

using a three-pronged approach--the TPA, an evaluation of their teaching in their school placements, and their university course work.

- After a candidate has successfully completed a teacher preparation program, the school awards a degree and recommends that the state grant the candidate a teaching certificate.
- Teacher preparation programs are accredited by different bodies. All three programs are accredited by the PESB. SU and SPU are also accredited by the NCATE which is an optional accreditation and requires additional resources.

Here are some unique features of the teacher preparation programs at each institution reviewed in this study:

Seattle Pacific University offers several teacher education programs. Undergraduates may choose to earn a bachelor's degree and their teacher certification. Candidates with bachelor's degrees in other fields, who want to continue working during the day, are able to earn a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) by taking most of their courses in the evening. A third program, known as Alternate Routes to Certification (ARC), allows candidates working in schools as paraprofessionals, instructional assistants, or conditionally-certified teachers to earn a degree and certification in an intensive one-year program. SPU makes a special effort to recruit and offer scholarships to teaching candidates of color. The school has an articulation agreement with Seattle Central Community College so that these students can finish their academic program at SCCC and "walk right into SPU." The recruiting effort also includes a focus on social connections to ease these students into what is a very different campus environment.<sup>18</sup> Another special effort at recruitment is aimed at those with majors in math or science. The School of Education makes scholarships available, has built a strong relationship with the math and physics departments, and has developed a Master in Teaching Math and Sciences degree especially for candidates who want to teach at the secondary level. All course work is integrated with math and

science. Applicants tend to be career changers who are older, very committed, and described as the brightest of candidates.<sup>19</sup>

Seattle University offers a full-time Master in Teaching (MIT) program in which candidates are able to earn a master's degree and a Residency Teaching Certificate in four academic quarters. There is no undergraduate teacher education program at SU. Candidates selected for the MIT program tend to be older students returning to school or changing careers. The average age of an MIT student is 28 years when entering the program.<sup>20</sup> About half of the program involves field experiences, observing, participating, and teaching in an actual classroom beginning with the second week of the program. Interns initially observe and evaluate each other, then gradually take on full-time teaching responsibilities using a co-teaching model with the cooperating teacher.

The SU program partners with several schools in the area. One school, Echo Lake Elementary in Shoreline, provides a classroom for instructors from SU and Echo Lake teachers to use for demonstrating teaching strategies for MIT students, who in turn can go out to other classrooms in the school to apply what they have learned. In selecting partner schools, SU looks for a diverse student population, master teachers, and a three-year commitment to place at least two interns per year.<sup>21</sup> Dr. Margit McGuire, director of the MIT program, points out that it is a very cohesive and integrated program that can be changed easily to keep the program dynamic. For example, they recently integrated a service-learning course into another course in order to include a focus on English Language Learners earlier in the program. She also believes that the co-teaching model for internships has great impact, fostering collaboration and building community among the interns.<sup>22</sup>

The University of Washington also offers a four-quarter Master in Teaching program. The program focuses on inspiring commitment to and preparing teachers for teaching in poverty-impacted schools because there is a higher teacher retention rate in such schools among teachers

who are *prepared* to teach in them. Among the admissions requirements for the program is at least 40 hours observing, volunteering, or teaching in a poverty-impacted school. Admissions officers look for strong knowledge in a content area, experience with children from diverse communities, and commitment to equity, social justice, and improving the educational opportunities and outcomes for all students.<sup>23</sup>

The UW partners with the Ackerley Partner Schools Network, funded by the Ackerley Foundation. Its mission is to create and support the collaboration of K-12 and university educators to improve teaching and learning in public schools and universities in ways that respond to the needs of students who face the greatest challenges.<sup>24</sup> For their field experiences, UW students are placed in Ackerley partner schools identified as high needs schools with large minority and poverty-impacted populations.<sup>25</sup> Clinical experience (including student teaching) is an important part of the UW program. Students observe and teach in schools from the beginning of the program. Graduates who have received their teaching certificate are encouraged to complete a second endorsement in teaching English learners, special education, or reading. Course work and field experiences are provided to support this opportunity for graduates in the summer and academic year.<sup>26</sup>

The UW has recently entered into a partnership with Teach for America (TFA) to offer the certification portion of the program for TFA teachers working in the Puget Sound area. The University is working with the Alliance for Education, a local non-profit working on education issues, and with the Seattle Public Schools to plan an urban teacher residency program.<sup>27</sup>

## TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Once a teaching candidate has completed a teacher education program, he or she must apply for a teaching certificate to teach in our state's public schools. The PESB is responsible for the certification of teachers and other educators. The candidates must demonstrate the two requirements

for certification: the basic knowledge and skills required for teaching, and the knowledge of the subject matter. Both components are tested before certification is granted. The standards for basic knowledge and skills are constantly updated. For example, cultural competency is now a required skill. Some skills previously limited to the fields of Special Education or English Language Learning are now required of all teachers. Once the new student teaching assessment is implemented, it will be used to assess a candidate's actual teaching skills.

**Residency Certificate:** The first level of certification requires a bachelor's degree, completion of a preparation program, and subject endorsements. Assessment is done through the basic skills test done on entry into the program (WEST-B) and then the subject area (WEST- E) test.

**Professional Level Certificate:** After two years of teaching, a teacher begins working toward the next level of certification. Generally, a teacher has five years to complete the requirements. As of 2007, teachers are required to complete a ProTeach portfolio that is used to evaluate the candidate's ability to have an impact on student learning as stated in the three standards — effective teaching, professional development, and professional contributions to the improvement of the school and community.<sup>28</sup> It is an online assessment that is scored under a point system with a required score to pass. Each teacher is provided an online platform where the information is collected. The website offers lots of guidance on what is required.

The PESB has contracted with Professor Dan Goldhaber of the Center for Education Data and Research at the University of Washington to evaluate the validity of the ProTeach portfolio assessment. The study looks at whether those teachers who scored higher on the ProTeach portfolio actually achieve higher student learning gains than those teachers who scored lower.<sup>29</sup> The research will be completed in 2014, assuming there is a sufficient sample of teachers to proceed.

In addition to earning certification to teach in Washington State, many local teachers pursue an optional advanced teaching credential, National

Board (NB) certification. Teachers earn this by going through a rigorous process that takes one to three years; about half of all candidates who attempt the process actually achieve the certification. Certification must be renewed every ten years. The incentives for achieving NB certification are annual salary bonuses and professional development. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which oversees this process, states on its website that the certification and standards “give teachers and schools the tools to define and measure teaching excellence.”<sup>30</sup> As of 2011, the Seattle School District had 289 NB certified teachers or 15 percent of the staff, the Bellevue School District had 266 NB teachers for a total of 27% of the district’s teachers, and Mercer Island School District reported a total of 45 teachers, or 18% of district teachers. The number of teachers who are working toward national certification is increasing. Teachers say that the process made them better teachers.<sup>31</sup>

## OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL DISTRICT POLICIES

### Introduction to Four Areas of District Policies

The study focuses on local district policies that develop, support, or reward teachers. The four policy areas are: 1) mentoring and professional development; 2) evaluation of teachers; 3) the school environment (including the role of the principal and families); 4) compensation. Mentoring includes both help for new teachers (induction) and for teachers who need improvement. Professional development policies are important for the instructional needs of an individual teacher, the school, or the district as a whole. The state has established a new four-tier evaluation system for both teachers and principals, and all three districts are working on implementing a system that meets the state’s requirements. The state also has a major role in compensation as it sets the minimum base pay of teachers based on years of teaching and academic degree plus additional coursework credits. Each

district can supplement the base pay by offering additional pay for Time, Responsibilities, and Incentive (TRI) work.

Many of these policies are included in collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) along with working conditions, hours of work, etc. Seattle School District completed a new contract in the fall of 2010, and Bellevue and Mercer Island School Districts both have teacher agreements that were renegotiated in 2011. There are also CBAs for Seattle school principals while Bellevue principals have a less formal agreement. Because union agreements generally cover a three year period, the study looks at current policies that are in effect now although they might change in the future.

### Overview of Three Local Districts

Bellevue, Seattle, and Mercer Island School Districts were chosen for the study based on their diverse characteristics. All three are also in the Seattle League’s area of involvement and membership. Seattle School District is the largest with 95 schools and a total student population of 47,808. Forty-five percent of the students are white with 55% students of color. Asian and African American students make up the majority of students of color. Mercer Island School District has five schools and 4,740 students. Its student population is less diverse with 74% white. The majority of students of color are Asian. Bellevue School District has 29 schools with 18,088 students. Its student population is more evenly split between white (49.9%) and students of color. The largest segment of students of color is Asian at 28.6%. Both Seattle (12%) and Bellevue (9.4%) have significant numbers of students for whom English is not their native language. Roughly 43% of Seattle’s students qualify for free and reduced price lunch with Bellevue at 22% and Mercer Island around 3.5%. These numbers are based on data from the 2010-11 school year.<sup>32</sup>

The information on specific policies at each district is based on interviews with district staff and a review of pertinent agreements. It is important to remember that some districts have multiple

schools at each level: elementary, middle, and high school. The examples given to demonstrate how a policy or program is implemented provide a snapshot, not the full picture of how policies are implemented in each school. The needs of specific student populations at each school play a role in how the school operates.

## MENTORING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### Overview

Many commentators, foundations, and educational organizations have focused on the importance of professional development. Professional development is a broad term that can be defined as: 1) help for new teachers (induction); 2) a plan for improvement for struggling teachers; and 3) a process for all teachers individually or collectively to encourage professional growth by learning new teaching techniques or devising new plans for updated curriculum. The orientation or induction programs for new teachers appear to be universally accepted as important to the development and retention of highly qualified teachers. Induction is best defined as a comprehensive, coherent, and sustained professional development process organized by a school district to train, support, and retain new teachers. It should seamlessly lead teachers into a lifelong learning program.<sup>33</sup> Building strong professional learning communities with a culture of collaboration was recognized as essential to this model.

Research from the US Department of Education sees professional development for new teachers as a way to reduce their high rate of attrition, especially those who are serving the neediest students in high poverty schools. "Although shown to be valuable, induction programs that include sustained feedback in collaborative environments remain a rare experience for most beginning teachers."<sup>34</sup> Another problem is the retention of teachers in their first five years of teaching. Research of a national think tank presented evidence of the high cost of teacher

turnover to districts and communities.<sup>35</sup> The report concludes that low salaries are not the only reason for high rates of turnover in schools with high rates of poverty. Often teachers are stymied by inadequate administrative support or training, too many intrusions on classroom time, and an inability to affect decision making.

### Local School District Programs

The three districts and their teachers realize the importance of strong professional development and mentoring programs for teachers. The districts report that professional development is often driven by state and federal mandates for the districts, teacher certification and endorsement requirements, or new curriculum, technology, or reporting initiatives by the districts. Mercer Island School District (MISD) reported that the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) direct professional development. SIPs are developed with input from teachers, principals, and parents. In Seattle School District (SSD) the SIPs also determine the professional development needs of the school. A Bellevue School District (BSD) principal<sup>36</sup> stated that establishing a culture where everyone welcomes and supports a new employee is important to the smooth functioning of a school. Supportive, collaborative working environments are critical to attracting and retaining strong, committed teachers. Collaboration at all levels is accepted as a key to a successful professional development process and is reflected in the current efforts in the districts to build professional learning communities and in the school improvement plans.

School district staff interviewed for this study used the terms mentor, coach, master teacher, and specialist to some degree interchangeably. Both MISD and BSD include building level one-on-one trained mentors who receive a stipend for their work. In MISD, each teacher new to the district is assigned a mentor. Mentors are chosen because of their experience in the area the new teacher is teaching and because of their willingness to have the new teacher observe them in their own classroom. Each mentor has only one new teacher

to mentor, and they are both assigned to the same school. The principals in BSD recommend the match of the mentor and teacher. The President of the Bellevue Education Association (BEA) has final approval and usually agrees to the proposed match.<sup>37</sup> While SSD emphasizes support for new teachers during their first year of teaching, it does not include the building level one-on-one mentoring. Both BSD and SSD employ district specialists or star teachers whose full time job is to guide the work and evaluate the needs of 15 to 35 new teachers. BSD is the only district that reported both building and district level mentoring support. It also is the only one with collaboration between the district and teacher union in identifying mentors.

Both MISD and BSD have early release days during the week for the schools to use for professional development and school planning. In MISD, Monday afternoons are available, and in BSD Wednesday afternoons are set aside for this work. In MISD, one Monday a month can be district directed activities. On the first Wednesday of a month, BSD cannot require a district event for teachers. In BSD, it is usually up to the teachers to participate although the Superintendent would like to change this to have more specific requirements for the time.

The collection, analysis, and definition of relevant data for implementation and evaluation of professional development programs for teachers remain problematic. In BSD, both the BEA and Superintendent agreed that the resources available for mentoring fall short of the ideal and that resources are scarce for new initiatives. In 2010, BEA reported losing a planning day which is the day before school starts. MISD reported that they were affected by the cuts to curriculum resources. With state funding being reduced each year, financing professional development programs is a critical issue and impairs the ability of the districts to fully train their teachers.

## EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

### Overview

There is general agreement on the positive effect of high quality teaching on student achievement. Disagreements arise over how to define effective, excellent instruction and--once it is defined--how to evaluate teachers on their performance. Traditionally, the main purpose of an evaluation process has been to decide whether or not to extend a contract to a teacher for the ensuing academic year. Principals conducted classroom observations once or twice a year and then met with the teacher to discuss their observations. Teachers were given an evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

As momentum for education reform has grown over the past several years, there have been efforts to find new and better ways to evaluate instruction and teachers. Other goals for a meaningful evaluation system include improving student achievement and providing support and mentoring to help teachers become more effective. Evaluations can provide opportunities to recognize teachers' work as well as to help teachers and schools identify priorities for further training.

Many reformers believe that student achievement should be an important factor in evaluating teachers and principals. Some suggest that an evaluation system can be used to determine differential pay for teachers based on their effectiveness. Using teacher effectiveness, instead of seniority, also as a criterion for layoffs would require an evaluation system that is accurate and fair, a task that may prove difficult.

Efforts are underway nationally and in Washington State to create and test comprehensive evaluation systems. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation began a Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project in 2009 to develop and test several measures of teacher effectiveness. The project has enlisted over 3,000 teacher volunteers in six mostly urban school districts across the country (none in Washington). These teachers have

agreed to have data collected and analyzed on these measures: 1) student achievement gains on assessments; 2) videotaped classroom observations; 3) teachers' pedagogical content knowledge; 4) student perceptions of the classroom instructional environment; 5) teachers' perceptions of working conditions and instructional support at their schools. Final findings and report are to be released the fall of 2012.<sup>38</sup> A preliminary progress report in January 2012 emphasized the need for multiple classroom observations done by well trained observers. The observations need to be combined with student feedback and data on improvement in student test scores.<sup>39</sup>

In Colorado, state legislation was passed in 2010 establishing new requirements for evaluating teachers and principals. The law mandates that at least half of a teacher's evaluation be determined by the academic growth of the teacher's students and that at least half of a principal's evaluation is determined by the academic growth of the students in the principal's school. The Colorado Growth Model has been developed to see how individual students and groups of students progress from year to year toward state standards, based on where each individual student begins. The new evaluation system will be implemented statewide in 2013-14.<sup>40</sup>

### **National Teacher Unions Grapple with Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness**

At the annual meeting of the National Education Association (NEA), the national union for educators adopted a policy statement in July 2011 that lays out criteria "for the types of teacher evaluation and accountability systems necessary to ensure a high quality public education for every student." The policy statement affords the association's members the opportunity to take responsibility for ensuring the development, implementation, and enforcement of these high quality systems. The policy further states "high quality teacher evaluation systems must provide the tools teachers need to continuously tailor instruction, enhance practice, and advance student learning."<sup>41</sup>

The criteria used in evaluations should include indicators of 1) a teacher's practice such as knowledge of the subject matter material, classroom management, lesson plans; 2) a teacher's contribution to the school and professional growth; 3) and a teacher's contribution to student learning and growth. The evaluation system should be fair and conducted by highly trained supervisors and must be adequately funded. The full statement can be found at the NEA website.

### **Race to the Top Fuels Race to Change Evaluation in Washington State**

Race to the Top contenders were graded on several criteria including that of measuring student achievement. In an effort to be a contender for future Race to the Top funding, the Washington State Legislature passed a broad education reform bill (E2SSB 6696) in 2010 that includes significant changes to state requirements for school districts' evaluation of teachers and principals.<sup>42</sup> The legislation requires that each school district establish revised evaluative criteria and a four-tier rating system for all teachers and principals, a departure from the previous satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating. Minimum criteria specified in the legislation for evaluating classroom teachers include:

- centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement;
- demonstrating effective teaching practices;
- recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs;
- providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum;
- fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment;
- using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning;
- communicating and collaborating with parents and school community;

- exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning.

When student growth data (student growth meaning the change in student achievement between two points in time) is referred to in the evaluation process, it must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools.

Another change was extending the period of provisional status for new teachers from two years to three. During the provisional period, a teacher is subject to nonrenewal of the employment contract without due process. After successfully completing the provisional period, teachers receive a continuing contract requiring a more substantial argument for dismissal.

A Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot project is the first phase in the implementation of the new state evaluation requirements by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Eight school districts and one consortium of districts were selected to begin in 2010-11 to develop evaluation systems aligned to the new state criteria. They will pilot these systems in 2011-12. (None of the districts are in the Greater Seattle area.) OSPI will review information from the pilot projects and make recommendations to the legislature regarding adopting one or more of the evaluation systems for use by all districts in the state. All districts must adopt evaluation systems that conform to the requirements of the E2SSB 6696 legislation for use in the 2013-14 school year.<sup>43</sup>

### **Current Evaluation Practices in Local School Districts**

#### Bellevue School District: Traditional Evaluation System

In the Bellevue School District, evaluations are carried out by principals with some assistance from district administrators, who observe teachers in classrooms at least twice a year. The annual evaluation summary is essentially a blank form on which the principal writes the evaluation.

Student performance is not part of the evaluation, but student or parent concerns can be considered. After three years of teaching in the district a teacher receives a continuing contract which doesn't bring a higher salary but does entitle the teacher to due process. The district and the Bellevue Education Association have a joint committee working on a new evaluation system to comply with the 2010 state legislation.<sup>44</sup>

#### Mercer Island School District: Three Years In

The Mercer Island School Board adopted a new evaluation system in 2008 after the district and the Mercer Island Education Association (MIEA) worked together to review the previous system and recommend a change that would better support teachers in the classroom and foster a culture of professional development. This evaluation process is spelled out in the collective bargaining agreement and is based on Charlotte Danielson's work *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*.<sup>45</sup> The Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of components of instruction. "In this framework, the complex activity of teaching is divided into 22 components (and 76 smaller elements) clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities."<sup>46</sup> Teachers are evaluated for their level of performance in each domain or category and receive a rating of unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, or distinguished. The goal for each teacher is to receive an evaluation of proficient or distinguished in each domain.

The procedure for evaluation observations by the principal and follow-up meetings is spelled out in the agreement. The principal asks for three observations, a mixture of announced and unannounced. The teacher must be observed for a total of 60 minutes, 30 of which must be continuous. The 30-minute continuous observation must be scheduled in advance. New teachers must have one observation in the first 90 days.

The teacher union (MIEA) is proud of the evaluation system, which resulted from the collaboration of union members and the

district. They believe that the system elevates professionalism by providing a structured way to reflect on one's teaching practice, take stock, get input from the principal and other teachers, and think of ways to improve. It is useful for every teacher because it helps identify specific areas for improvement for underperformers, as well as areas for good teachers to stretch. The evaluator must identify specifically where there are deficiencies and then help construct a plan for improvement. The union gets involved when an evaluator has concerns and lets the union know. It makes sure that due process is followed and wants to see that milestones are set up for improving practices. It also tries to ensure that the employee is hearing what the evaluator says. If milestones aren't met and teaching does not improve, MIEA helps to counsel that teacher to leave the profession.<sup>47</sup> The process for struggling teachers involves a great deal of the principal's time, especially if a teacher is placed on probation. A major concern of many teachers and principals is that all the evaluators be properly trained to use the evaluation system. This requires funds that may or may not be provided by the state.

#### Seattle School District: Transitioning

Seattle School District began the development of a new four-tiered system for evaluating teachers in 2010 based on its collective bargaining agreement with Seattle Education Association. In the past teachers were observed as they taught and then given feedback. They were rated as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. It has been estimated that less two percent of all SPS teachers were rated unsatisfactory. In addition to creating four levels of evaluation, the system will require student growth measures to be included in determining the evaluation of teachers.

In 2010-11, Level One schools,<sup>48</sup> for teachers in their first three years of teaching as well as teachers new to the district, began using a new system called the Professional Growth and Evaluation (PG&E) measure. Teachers receive evaluations of unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, or innovative in four domains based on Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. Like Mercer Island

School District, teachers are evaluated by their principal or a designated evaluator. In 2011-12, Level Two schools are being phased into the new system. In 2012-13, all teachers will be evaluated in the same way.

As part of their evaluation, teachers along with their evaluator will assess their own teaching practice and develop future goals for their students. These goals should be in line with the specific School Improvement Plan of their school. Early in the school year they will discuss and agree upon ways to measure how they will know if these goals have been met. One principal in the middle of her first year of this new method commented that she is impressed with the rich conversations she was having with teachers about their practice, but that the process is incredibly time-consuming.

Once proficient in all four domains, the certified teacher moves to the shorter general annual evaluation. Provisional teachers and those who have not been found proficient in all areas or have failed to meet the student growth standard stay on the more comprehensive evaluation, the Professional Growth and Evaluation Measure, referred to previously.

A teacher whose performance is rated unsatisfactory shall be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and receive support from a mentor or the teacher may be placed on probation. Teachers who receive a basic rating must develop a support plan with their supervisor. After three months of the support plan, the administrator will observe the progress of the teacher and either discontinue the support plan, keep the support plan, or put the teacher on a PIP.

#### **Role of Evaluation in Decisions on Reductions in Force (RIF)**

When school districts must lay off teachers because of inadequate funding (reduction in force or RIF), most make decisions about which teachers to lay off on the basis of seniority (often described as last hired, first fired). Concerns have been raised by a variety of stakeholders that less senior but highly effective teachers are let go

while sometimes ineffective teachers with more seniority keep their jobs. Another concern is that often inexperienced teachers are assigned to schools that include significant numbers of at risk students. As a result, those schools and students who most need stability and extra help must cope with higher rates of teacher turnover in times of reduced funding.

Teacher unions argue that using seniority is the fairest, most transparent way to handle layoffs. The Mercer Island teachers union makes the case that a fair, consistent, and well-implemented evaluation system, and not budget driven layoffs, is the best way to address the problem of underperforming teachers. The teachers will be identified throughout the year, given help to improve, and placed on probation if necessary. If there is still no improvement, they will leave the system. When a good evaluation system is working well, seniority is the fairest and most transparent criterion for making layoff decisions.

Other observers make the case that teachers' evaluations should be factored into layoff decisions in addition to, or in place of, seniority.<sup>49</sup> However, that would require a well-developed evaluation system trusted by all parties. Implementation of new state approved evaluation systems included in ESHB 2661 will be required in 2013-14. While criteria for layoffs is currently a hot topic among politicians and educators, a resolution will depend on agreements with teacher unions or state mandates, neither of which will happen in the near future.

## SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

### Teaching as a Collective Act

The spring 2010 issue of the *Voices in Urban Education* (VUE) published by the Annenberg Institute of School Reform is devoted to the importance of teaching as a collective act. This concept comes from a belief that a teacher's effectiveness is affected by the school environment and how well teachers and principals work together. Recent research has demonstrated that

schools become more effective when teachers coordinate their work and contribute to school wide improvements.<sup>50</sup> Collaboration leads to higher teacher effectiveness and student achievement gains.<sup>51</sup> According to the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession, Washington State teachers report that having a collaborative work environment is a great source of support as well as one reason for them to remain at their schools and in their jobs.<sup>52</sup>

One often discussed form of collaboration is the development of a professional learning community (PLC). Characteristics of a PLC include: shared values and vision, a shared leadership structure with shared decision making, a collaborative culture, and a focus on instructional improvement that leads to gains in student performance. Schools become learning environments for both teachers and students.<sup>53</sup> PLCs can take the form of grade level teams in elementary schools, cross-discipline teams working with the same students in a high school, or a school wide instructional leadership team.<sup>54</sup>

One critical issue is how to find the time for collaboration. Some schools provide common planning periods for teachers in a team, others have early release days or provide substitutes for teachers so they can observe another teacher or meet with their team.<sup>55</sup>

All three school districts have established a structure for encouraging collaboration among the teachers and the principals at each school. It generally takes the form of a leadership team which includes teachers and principals. In the Bellevue School District, Superintendent Cudeiro instituted instructional leadership teams (ILT) when she became superintendent. She specifically called out the need to develop professional learning communities in each school to improve instruction.<sup>56</sup> While teachers collaborated on a more informal basis, the ILT further supports the idea of teachers taking ownership of any changes.<sup>57</sup>

At Mercer Island School District, the high school has a Building Leadership Team (BLT), and the

elementary and middle schools have a cabinet that includes the principal and teachers. Teachers' views on whether they have enough say in the decision making process depends on the school.<sup>58</sup>

In the Seattle School District, each school is to have a Building Leadership Team (BLT) composed of staff representatives and the principal. The BLT may also include parents, students, and community members where appropriate. The purpose of the BLT is to "promote and facilitate the collaborative decision-making process which affects academic achievement and to indentify how to support the needs of the students and staff in the buildings."<sup>59</sup> There are also instructional councils that focus on instruction. In the 2010 agreement between the SEA and the Seattle School District, several items address the need for more collaboration: there is one additional paid hour per week for collaborative time in elementary and K-8 schools and general support for an increase in planning and collaborative time for all staff. The Seattle School District is also in the process of developing PLCs both within a school and cross-district with educators who teach the same subject such as physical education, special education, and English language learners.

### **The Role of the Principal**

The principal has the most influence in determining the school culture and environment. Principals have many roles: operational manager of the school, instructional leader who works with teachers to improve instruction, evaluator of the teachers, and the face of the school to the students, parents, and community. According to interviews with district staff and principals, the degree of autonomy that a principal has to hire the staff and organize the school fluctuates based on district policies and the principal. With so many roles, principals complain about the lack of time and resources to fulfill all of their responsibilities.<sup>60</sup>

Representatives of Mercer Island School District administration, teachers, and principals are in complete agreement on the importance of the principal as the instructional leader who

establishes a school environment that nurtures learning, innovation, and creativity for educators and students. In the Bellevue School District, principals have some autonomy to organize their schools based on the needs of their students. A key responsibility for any principal is the hiring of staff for the school. In Mercer Island and Bellevue School Districts, principals have the authority to hire staff based on the pool of candidates available. In the Seattle School District, the hiring process is more complex because of the three phase hiring process. However, the principal and staff at the school are responsible for the final decision on hiring in most situations.

The area where principals do not have much autonomy is in budgeting. While they may be able to establish their own staffing pattern, it is within the context of a certain level of funds based on district funding formulas. With the reduction in overall funding these last few years, principals have less money to work with. Districts and individual schools are turning to grants to provide more resources for teachers and students. Sammamish High School in the Bellevue School District received a grant for problem based learning which the principal believes will help provide for more teacher collaboration and innovation at the school.<sup>61</sup> In 2010, West Seattle Elementary was one of three schools in Seattle that received federal funds to turn around low performing schools. The district hired a new principal and 12 new teachers. The grant pays for a longer school day, more after-school activities, more training for teachers, and outreach to parents.<sup>62</sup> The grant is for three years with significant evaluation after the first two years.

### **Family Participation in the School**

The families and guardians of the students are another important influence on student learning. Research has shown that the more parents are involved in their children's schooling, the better it is for their academic achievement.<sup>63</sup> Schools consider a student's family a critical partner in the student's success, and they strive to create

opportunities for families to become engaged in the schools. The three school districts have an assortment of community and family engagement policies, and many schools have Parent, Teacher, Student Associations (PTSA's) that work to keep parents informed and participating in their children's education. However, families that face language and cultural barriers have a more difficult time engaging with the schools. The National PTA created a set of national standards for parent or family involvement programs. The standards are based on John Hopkins University scholar Joyce L. Epstein's six types of parent involvement.<sup>64</sup> The six standards are: 1) communication between home and school is regular, two-way, and meaningful; 2) parenting skills are promoted and supported; 3) parents play an integral role in assisting student learning; 4) parents are welcome in the school and their support and assistance are sought; 5) parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families; and 6) community resources are used to strengthen schools, families, and student learning.

For teachers, parents are critical to ensuring that their students are in school and ready to learn. Attendance is an important factor in a student's performance. Home visits, parent-teacher conferences, and opportunities for parents to become involved at the school are some of the important ways that teachers and schools try to connect with parents.

## TEACHER COMPENSATION

### Overview

Washington State sets the basic salary schedule based on education credentials (B.A., M.A., Ph.D., extra credits) and years of experience. It provides funds to each district to cover the salaries of its teachers based on the schedule. The goal of this policy is to provide adequately for public schools throughout the state, in spite of wide variations among local communities in income, resources, and property values. The three school districts included in this study add on to the basic schedule

based on time, responsibilities, and incentives (TRI). Since pay is a negotiated item in union agreements, districts vary in the amount and requirements for extra pay.

Restructuring teacher pay is a national area of reform. Some advocates want to link pay more closely with teacher effectiveness and to raise some salaries for specific work in order to encourage and retain a higher quality teacher workforce.<sup>65</sup> There are also efforts to induce teachers to accept placement or remain in high need schools and to provide differential pay by subject matter so as to compete with the private sector in areas like math and science.<sup>66</sup> Both Denver and Washington D.C. have instituted new systems where teachers can earn significant pay increases as rewards or bonuses for good performance. In Washington's Impact Plus, a teacher who is rated "highly effective" two years in a row can earn large pay increases ranging from \$2,400 to \$25,000.<sup>67</sup> Providing those bonuses to teachers early in their careers was considered important in keeping teachers from leaving the profession. With close to 20 percent of teachers in urban districts leaving every year, the cost of teacher turnover is also an important aspect of pay reform. Teachers make 14 percent less than professionals in other occupations with similar educational backgrounds.<sup>68</sup>

In 2006, Denver Public Schools collaborated with its teachers' association to develop an alternative compensation system called ProComp.<sup>69</sup> A teacher who participates in this salary system is assigned an initial salary based on a traditional schedule. Then the teacher is eligible to earn monetary awards and bonuses based on four major components: knowledge and skills, comprehensive evaluation, hard to serve school or assignment, and student growth indicators. There are nine elements in the four components, and each one has an assigned monetary reward.<sup>70</sup> The evaluation report done in 2011 found mixed results, some due to lack of understanding of the system and need for more complete implementation. However, the district made significant gains during the period of review, although it was not clear that the gains were due solely to the ProComp system. The report

provides suggestions for other districts that might be interested in establishing a similar system.

Another issue under discussion is the basis for determining a teacher's salary and step increases. The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) argues that more funds should be allocated based on a district's primary needs: improving student achievement and placing the best teachers where they are needed the most.<sup>71</sup> Their report looked at research on the two basic determinants of teacher pay: education credentials and years of experience. Their conclusion was that there is not a significant relationship between advanced degrees and student achievement. Additionally, the report questions the link between higher pay and longevity.<sup>72</sup> However, other recent studies using student testing data showed a more positive impact of teacher experience on student achievement. While the research is not conclusive either way, there does seem to be general agreement that any correlation between experience and student performance is most evident in the first five to seven years of teaching.<sup>73</sup>

The NCTQ report recommends that states remove the requirements for advanced degrees and use the funds to boost salaries earlier in teachers' careers and provide bonuses for highly effective teachers and for teachers working in high needs schools.<sup>74</sup> A caveat on these recommendations comes from Dan Goldhaber, Director of the Center for Educational Data and Research, who states that more work needs to be done on the methodology for using student achievement tests as a gauge of teacher effectiveness.<sup>75</sup> Before connecting pay to teacher effectiveness, districts need a valid evaluation system that generates trust among teachers and principals.

Washington State's efforts at using pay as a means to improve teaching include providing bonuses to teachers who received National Board certification, a more rigorous certification process than that of the state. The state also pays bonuses to teachers who work in high needs schools. Because of funding problems, the state reduced the size of the bonus in its 2011-13 budget. All three local school districts provide bonuses to teachers with national

certification, at least for now. At the federal level, the new Teacher Incentive Fund provides grants to state and local districts to implement new pay structures. The extra funds would go to teachers who increase student achievement and to teachers who work in "hard to staff" positions working with high need students.<sup>76</sup>

### **Review of Local School Districts Compensation**

While the state determines the basic salary schedule, local school districts have some options in responding to local needs and choices. Such options include access to funds through federally funded programs such as Title One, local levy funds authorized by local voters, other levies established for purposes which support activities related to education, and grants for specific purposes from other sources. School districts in this area have salary schedules that are quite similar. An inexperienced teacher with a bachelor's degree and a teaching certification will probably earn about \$45,000. As the teacher gets more experience and higher degrees, he or she will move up the salary schedule. The top salary after 16 years of experience and a master's degree or Ph.D. can reach \$80,000.

In the Seattle School District, the latest contract provided a small increase in pay for TRI responsibilities and additional compensation for special and supplemental assignments including leadership and extra duties. The contract also established career ladder positions such as mentor teachers, curriculum specialists, or mentor principals.<sup>77</sup> The increases were linked to the passage of additional levy capacity authorized by the state which was approved by Seattle voters in November 2010. The school district also received funds from the federal Teacher Incentive Fund to help pay for the additional pay and salary increases. The Mercer Island and Bellevue School Districts also include TRI pay incentives and pay for extra work such as being a mentor teacher or participating on a leadership team. Additional funds from grants may pay for extra professional development such as those received by Bellevue's Sammamish High School.

In this time of significant budget cuts from the state to local school districts, it will be difficult for districts to increase base salaries. In 2011, the state reduced teacher salaries by 1.9 percent. Districts had to negotiate with their teachers as to how this reduction was implemented.

## LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

This study has described some of the critical issues relating to teacher effectiveness; however, there are no grand conclusions. As stated earlier, the issues of teacher evaluation (both before and during their teaching careers), teacher compensation, and professional development are all in flux, especially because of the state's funding situation. The last few years have seen significant experiments across the country to improve teaching quality; however, there is no one easy answer. The conclusions from research studies are varied and not definitive. Given the variety of student populations and district sizes, solutions will ultimately have to be determined at the local level.

The amount of funds a district receives from the state has a major impact on what it can do. Budget reductions over the last few years have already reduced teacher salaries, reduced funds for professional development, reduced the bonus for national certifications, and forced districts to lay off teachers, a process that can lead to disruptions in the schools and larger class sizes.

Since the passage of ESHB 2661 in 2009, the state has worked at creating a new system of funding basic education (including expansion of what is defined as basic education). A variety of work groups were established to: create a new model for allocating funds to school districts; create a new teacher and principal evaluation system; develop a new teacher compensation model; provide new investments in early learning including full day kindergarten; and increase graduation requirements and standards. In its January 2011 report to the Legislature,<sup>78</sup> The Quality Education

Council, the agency responsible for overseeing the implementation of education reform, estimated the costs of implementing its recommendations at over \$221 million in the first year. Final implementation of basic education reforms will not be completed in the near future given the lack of funding. Clearly, there is a gap between what the state and local districts want to do and their ability to pay for it. Efforts to improve the quality and retention of teachers cost money. Whether these efforts succeed may depend on how much the public is willing to pay for better education.

**ENDNOTES:**

1. The National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, April 1983, [www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk](http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk).
2. See Suzanne Wilson, ed., *Education Policy White Paper on Teacher Quality*, (National Academy of Education, 2009) at [www.naeducation.org](http://www.naeducation.org), click on publications.
3. Ibid.
4. Harry Wong, "Induction Programs That Keep New Teachers Teaching and Improving," *NASSP Bulletin* 88, March 2004: 41.
5. Edward Wiley, et al, *Denver ProComp: An Outcomes Evaluation of Denver's Alternative Teacher Compensation System* (Denver, CO: Denver Classroom Teachers Association, 2010).
6. "The Case against Quality-Blind Teacher Layoffs," (The New Teacher Project, February 2011) p. 13. Available at <http://tntp.org>, search by article title.
7. "High Court Not Fully Funding Education," *Seattle Times*, January 5, 2012.
8. Race to the Top U.S. Dept. of Education website: [www2.ed.gov/programs/race to the top/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/race-to-the-top/index.html).
9. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, "What Makes a Teacher Effective: A Summary of Key Research Findings on Teacher Preparation," p. 3. Available at their website, <http://ncate.org>, search by title of article.
10. See [www.pesb.wa.gov](http://www.pesb.wa.gov).
11. Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, Professional Educator Standards Board, Guest Speaker for Education Committee, League of Women Voters of Seattle Office, September 29, 2010.
12. Professional Educator Standards Board, <http://www.pesb.wa.gov/>
13. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, <http://www.ncate.org>.
14. Wallace talk, September 29, 2010.
15. See <http://www.aacte.org/index.php?/Programs/Teacher-Performance-Assessment-Consortium-TPAC/teacher-performance-assessment-consortium.html>.
16. Margit McGuire, Professor and Director of Teacher Education Program, Seattle University, interview January 26, 2011.
17. Wallace talk, September 29, 2010; Rick Eigenbrood, Dean, Seattle Pacific University School of Education, interview, January 27, 2011.
18. Eigenbrood interview, and Frank Kline, Ph.D., Associate Dean, Seattle Pacific University School of Education, interview, January 27, 2011.
19. Ibid.
20. Seattle University College of Education MIT Brochure, [www.seattleu.edu/coe](http://www.seattleu.edu/coe); McGuire interview, January 26, 2011.
21. McGuire interview, January 26, 2011.
22. Ibid.
23. Morva McDonald, Associate Professor of Education, University of Washington, Director of the Ackerley Network, interview April 4, 2011.

24. UW College of Education, Ackerley Partner Schools Network Brochure, 2010.
25. McDonald, interview Nov. 5, 2010.
26. Kenneth Zeichner, Boeing Professor of Teacher Education, Director of Teacher Education, University of Washington, interview May 10, 2011.
27. Ibid.
28. <http://www.waproteach.com/overview/index.html>.
29. Jennifer Wallace comments on reviewing this document.
30. "What is National Board Certification?" National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, [www.nbpts.org](http://www.nbpts.org).
31. Callaghan, Peter, "Board Certification Makes Better Teachers—Isn't That Enough?" *News Tribune* (Tacoma, WA), March 29, 2011, A3.
32. District Demographics come from Office of Superintendent of Instruction [www.k12.wa.us](http://www.k12.wa.us).
33. Wong, "Induction Programs," 42-55.
34. Eileen Mary Weiss and Stephen Gary Weiss, "Beginning Teacher Induction," November 1999, available at ERIC Digest ED436487 1999-11-00.
35. The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession, "More Swimming and Less Sinking and Why Do High-Poverty Schools Have Difficulty Staffing Their Classrooms with Qualified Teachers," joint initiative of the Center for American Progress and the Institute for America's Future. November 2004.
36. Tom Duenwald, Principal, Sammamish High School, Bellevue School District, interview on March 23rd, 2011. Overview of Mentoring and Resources for Novice and Struggling Teachers, Professional Development and Evaluation in the Bellevue School District.
37. Ibid.
38. MET Project, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, "Working with Teachers to Develop Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching," June 2010. Available at [www.gatesfoundation.org](http://www.gatesfoundation.org), search by key words.
39. Donna Blankinship, "Gates study: Once a year teacher evaluations not enough," *Seattle Times*, January 6, 2012. The full report can be found at [www.metproject.org](http://www.metproject.org).
40. <http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness>.
41. See full text at [www.nea.org/grants/46326.htm](http://www.nea.org/grants/46326.htm).
42. "Gregoire signs K-12 education bills into law," *Seattle Times*, March 29, 2010.
43. OSPI Website: [www.k12.wa.us/EdLeg/TPEP](http://www.k12.wa.us/EdLeg/TPEP).
44. Interviews with Bellevue School Superintendent Amalia Cudeiro and BEA President Michele Miller.
45. Charlotte Danielson, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd ed. (Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, 2007).
46. Agreement Between Mercer Island School District #400 and Mercer Island Education Association for Certificated Employees, September 1, 2009 – August 31, 2011, p. 40.
47. Interview with T. Lindquist, President, Mercer Island Education Association, February 28, 2011.

48. Seattle Public Schools began issuing School Reports in the fall of 2010. Schools are rated from Levels 1 to 5 with Level 1 being the lowest level; levels 4 and 5 the highest. Level 5 schools have higher scores and achieve an achievement gap of less than 25%. Level 2 schools are schools that have a medium-to-low number of students who meet state math and reading standards, and have low-to-medium number of students who improve in math and reading from one year to the next. Schools with higher levels receive more autonomy; schools at lower levels receive more oversight from the district. Unlike NCLB ratings, SPS school levels measure student growth in addition to student performance. From “Segmentation: Using Data to Group Schools and Create Improvement Plans,” on the SPS Website.
49. SB 5914 as described by Sen. Rodney Tom and Sen. Joe Zarelli, “Every Student Deserves and Excellent Teacher,” *Seattle Times*, April 5, 2011.
50. Susan Moore Johnson, “How Best to Add Value”, (Economic Policy Institute, 2009). Reprinted in Spring, 2010 on website of Voices in Urban Education. Available on <http://annenberginstitute.org/VUE>, p. 11 of pdf.
51. Ibid, p. 14.
52. Michael S. Knapp, et al, “Teachers Count: Support for Teachers’ Work in the Context of State Reform.” (Center for the Strengthening the Teaching Profession, August 2005). Available on [www.cstp-wa.org](http://www.cstp-wa.org).
53. “Professional Learning Communities,” Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, under “Resources by Topic, [www.centerforscri.org](http://www.centerforscri.org).
54. Milbrey W. McLaughlin and Joan E. Talbert, “Professional Learning Communities: Building Blocks of School Culture and Student Learning,” VUE Spring 2010, p. 35. Available on <http://annenberginstitute.org/VUE>.
55. Building Collaborative Cultures, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession informational document. Go to [www.cstp-wa.org](http://www.cstp-wa.org).
56. Amalia Cudeiro, Superintendent, Bellevue School District, interview, Feb. 7, 2011.
57. Duenwald, interview, March 23, 2011.
58. Tani Lindquist, President, Mercer Island Education Association, interview, Feb. 18, 2011.
59. SEA Contract, Article II, p.10
60. Mark Roschy, Associate Principal, Mercer Island High School, interview, Feb. 28, 2011.
61. Duenwald, interview.
62. “Struggling West Seattle Elementary Gets a Fresh Start,” *Seattle Times*, Nov, 6, 2010.
63. “What Research Says about Parent Involvement in Children’s Education in Relation to Academic Achievement,” Michigan Department of Education brief, p. 1 March 2002.
64. Ibid, p.3
65. Dan Goldhaber, “Teacher Pay Reforms: The Political Implications of Recent Research,” Center for Education Data and Research (CEDR) Working Paper #2010-4, p.1
66. Goldhaber comments on report, May 9th, 2011.
67. Sam Dillon, “In Washington, Large Rewards in Teacher Pay,” *New York Times*, January 4, 2012.

68. Dave Eggers and Ninive Clements Calegari, "The High Cost of Low Teacher Salaries," *New York Times*, May 1, 2011.
69. "Making a Difference In Education Reform: ProComp External Evaluation Report 2006-2010," The Evaluation Center School of Education and Human Development, Buechner Institute for Governance School of Public Affairs, Center for Education Data and Research, October 20, 2011, Executive Summary p.xi.
70. Ibid, p.xii.
71. "Restructuring Teacher Pay to Reward Excellence," National Council on Teacher Quality, December 2010, p. 1. Available on [www.nctq.org](http://www.nctq.org), search by title.
72. Ibid., p.3.
73. Goldhaber interview.
74. NCTQ, "Restructuring Teacher Pay," p. 8.
75. Goldhaber, "Teacher Pay Reforms," p. 5.
76. Ibid., p. 33.
77. SEA Contract, p. 39-41.
78. <http://www.k12.wa.us/qec/default.aspx>.

**APPENDIX A: Persons Interviewed**

Olga Addae, President and Jonathan Knapp, Vice President, Seattle Education Association

Ann Chan, former Human Resources Director, Seattle School District

Ricardo Cruz, Assistant Superintendent, Bellevue School District

Amalia Cudeiro, Superintendent, Bellevue School District

Tom Duenwald, Principal, Sammamish High School, Bellevue School District

Rich Eigenbrood, Dean, School of Education, Seattle Pacific University

Dan Goldhaber, Director, Center for Educational Research and Data

Pat Hunter, Principal, Maple Elementary School, Seattle School District

Frank Kline, Associate Dean, School of Education, Seattle Pacific University

Tani Lindquist, President, Mercer Island Education Association

Morva McDonald, Associate Professor of Education, Director of Ackerly Network,  
College of Education, University of Washington

Margit McGuire, Professor and Director of Teacher Education Programs, Seattle University

Michele Miller, President, Bellevue Education Association

Howard Pripas, former Director of Labor and Employee Relations, Seattle School District

Mark Roschy, Associate Principal, Mercer Island High School, Mercer Island School District

Steve Sundquist, former Director, Seattle School Board

Jennifer Wallace, Director, Professional Educators Standards Board

Jennifer Wright, Education Director, Learning and Technology Service,  
Mercer Island School District

Kenneth Zeichner, Professor and Director of Teacher Education, University of Washington

**APPENDIX B: Summary of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching**

The chart on the next page shows the four major domains of teaching responsibility and the major components of each domain. Teachers are evaluated for their level of performance in each component and receive a rating of unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, or distinguished. For more in-depth information on the Framework for Teaching see <http://charlottedanielson.com/theframeteach.htm>.

## COMPONENTS OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

### DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

- 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy**  
 Knowledge of content  
 Knowledge of prerequisite relationships  
 Knowledge of content-related pedagogy
- 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students**  
 Knowledge of characteristics of age group  
 Knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning  
 Knowledge of students' skills and knowledge  
 Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage
- 1c: Selecting Instructional Goals**  
 Value  
 Clarity  
 Suitability for diverse students
- 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources**  
 Resources for teaching  
 Resources for students
- 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction**  
 Learning activities  
 Instructional materials and resources  
 Instructional groups  
 Lesson and unit structure
- 1f: Assessing Student Learning**  
 Congruence with instructional goals  
 Criteria and standards  
 Use for planning

### DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

- 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport**  
 Teacher interaction with students  
 Student interaction
- 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning and Risk Taking**  
 Importance of content  
 Student pride in work  
 Expectations for learning and achievement
- 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures, Transitions and Routines**  
 Management of instructional groups  
 Management of transitions  
 Management of materials and supplies  
 Performance of non-instructional duties  
 Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals
- 2d: Managing Student Behavior**  
 Expectations  
 Monitoring of student behavior  
 Response to student misbehavior
- 2e: Organizing Physical Space**  
 Safety and arrangement of furniture  
 Accessibility to learning and use of physical resources

### DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION

- 3a: Communicating Clearly and Accurately**  
 Directions and procedures  
 Oral and written language
- 3b: Using Questioning, Discussion Performance Expectations & a Variety of Instructional Strategies**  
 Quality of questions  
 Discussion techniques  
 Student participation  
 Relates to various student learning styles
- 3c: Engaging Students in Learning**  
 Representation of content  
 Activities and assignments  
 Grouping of students  
 Instructional materials and resources  
 Structure and pacing
- 3d: Providing Feedback to Students**  
 Quality feedback: accurate, substantive, constructive, and specific  
 Timeliness
- 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness**  
 Lesson adjustment  
 Response to students  
 Persistence
- 3f: Recognizes Learning Differences & Adapts Instruction**  
 Differentiates instruction
- 3g: Integrates Technology and/or other Resources**

### DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

- 4a: Reflecting on Teaching**  
 Accuracy  
 Use in future teaching
- 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records**  
 Student completion of assignments  
 Student progress in learning
- 4c: Communicating with Families**  
 Information about the instructional program  
 Information about individual students  
 Engagement of families in the instructional program
- 4d: Contributing to the School and District**  
 Relationships with colleagues  
 Service to the school  
 Participation in school and district projects
- 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally**  
 Enhancement of content knowledge & skills
- 4f: Showing Professionalism**  
 Service to students  
 Advocacy  
 Decision making  
 Demeanor  
 Written and oral communication

---

# March Program - Fostering Effective Teaching: No Easy Answers

---

## UNIT MEETING AGENDA:

### UNIT BUSINESS:

- Introductions and welcome of guests and visitors
- Attendance and sign-ups
- Board Announcements
- Vote on Program Planning

### DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

1. Think about a teacher you had in elementary or secondary school. What made that teacher memorable? What positive effect did that teacher have on your performance in school?
2. What status do teachers have in the community? Are there ways that the society should provide them more support?
3. How have teacher preparation programs changed in recent years?
4. What do you think makes an effective teacher?
5. Currently, Washington State sets teacher salaries based on academic credentials and years of experience. Do you think this is the best system? If not, what alternative approaches would you like to see?

### CONSENSUS QUESTIONS:

1. Under state legislation establishing a new four-tiered evaluation system for Washington, multiple measures of student growth, where available and relevant, should be included in evaluating teachers. Do you agree that information on student growth should be part of the evaluation of teachers? Why or why not?
2. Which of the following should be included in determining which teachers lose their jobs in a reduction in force (RIF)? Choose one or more criteria.
  - Evaluation of the teacher
  - Seniority based on years of experience
  - Needs of the school
  - All of the above
3. Support for teacher collaboration and professional development should be given a high priority in district budgets.

Strongly Agree   Agree   No Consensus   Disagree   Strongly Disagree