



SPECIAL PRESENTATION

**“EVALUATING DIFFERENTLY”
TOWARD USEFUL AND REALISTIC EVALUATION OF
TEACHERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

INTRODUCTION BY:

**JOHN PODESTA, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURED SPEAKER:

SENATOR MICHAEL BENNET

MODERATED BY:

**ROBIN CHAIT, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR TEACHER QUALITY,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURED PANELISTS:

**ELIZABETH ARONS, SENIOR HUMAN RESOURCES POLICY ADVISOR,
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND THE GATES FOUNDATION**

JESSICA CUNNINGHAM, PRINCIPAL, KIPP DC: WILL ACADEMY

**MORGAEN DONALDSON, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, NEAG SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT**

HEATHER PESKE, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF PROGRAMS, TEACH PLUS

**KIM URSETTA, KINDERGARTEN ELA-S (BILINGUAL) TEACHER,
MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY, DENVER PUBLIC
SCHOOLS**

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 2010

TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY

DC TRANSCRIPTION – WWW.DCTMR.COM

MR. JOHN PODESTA: Good morning everyone. I'm John Podesta. I'm the president of the Center for American Progress. I'd like to welcome you all for what promises to be an exciting discussion about how to improve teacher evaluation systems.

Some of you may have thought that it was so exciting that we needed security downstairs where also Prime Minister Papandreou is coming to CAP here this morning in a couple of minutes. I may need to duck out for a few minutes to greet him. But Cindy Brown will take over in my absence and until my return.

But this morning I have the distinct honor of introducing a very special guest, Senator Michael Bennet.

Education, as I think a lot of the people in the room know, has been a priority issue for CAP since its beginning. We have always believed that for every individual a high quality education offers the promise of economic mobility, the ladder to higher income, greater opportunity and civic engagement, yet today we're failing to provide that ladder for far too many students.

There is certainly a lot to do. For example, we welcome today's announcement from the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers of a common core of standards for our nation for math and English.

But I don't, I think, have to tell this group that ensuring that every child has an effective teacher is one of the most important things we can do to provide them with a high-quality education.

Since its founding six years ago, CAP has been a leader in promoting the importance of effective teachers, particularly for students living in poverty. In fact, since research has demonstrated that if students have an outstanding teacher as opposed to a weak teacher, it can mean as much as a full year's growth in academic achievement.

Improving the quality of teaching in high-poverty schools has the potential to dramatically close the achievement gap and lift up every kid in our country.

So CAP has focused on developing, promoting policies that improve teacher effectiveness and check and retain effective teachers to the schools that need them the most. We've highlighted the need for meaningful tenure processes, high-quality innovative alternative certification programs and have promoted a variety of compensation reforms, school funding reforms and career advancement opportunities for teachers.

Yet none of these reforms are possible without rigorous evaluation systems that differentiate among teachers and provide detailed information about teacher performance.

The inadequacy of teacher evaluation systems has received a lot of attention. Over the past couple of years we've heard a lot about the systems that grade all teachers as satisfactory and don't give teachers useful feedback on their strengths or weaknesses.

So today we're going to talk about what a better system might look like. And we're fortunate to have a number of papers that will be presented today. And we're particularly fortunate to have Senator Michael Bennet to launch our conversation because he is the leader in the Senate on education reform issues and an expert on how to change district policies so that they work better for students.

Prior to his service in the Senate and after an extremely successful private sector career, Senator Bennet took on the challenge of becoming superintendent of the Denver, Colorado, public schools and inherited a school district whose achievement rates were flat. With the help of the Denver public schools principals and teachers, Senator Bennet turned the system around and improved student achievement and graduation rates with Denver's kids growing faster than all kids in the state on virtually every single test at every single grade level.

The senator also worked with the Denver Classroom Teachers Association to revolutionize compensation through ProComp, a system of differentiated pay that pays teachers for more driving student achievement, for serving in high-poverty schools or bringing a special set of talents like the teaching of math or special education.

Although the changes proposed were controversial, nearly 80 percent of Denver's teachers voted for the new proposal and he did much more for Denver, but I'm going to let him spend a little more time talking about that.

Senator Bennet, of course, was appointed to the United States Senate by Colorado Governor Bill Ritter to replace my friend, former Senator Ken Salazar who was appointed by President Obama to be the secretary of Interior. He is a member of the Senate Agriculture, Banking and Health Committees.

Whether the issue is job creation and economic reform, providing affordable and quality healthcare, investing in clean energy, immigration reform or investing in our 21st century students, it's clear that Senator Bennet is a reformer. He has a history of facing tough challenges and getting results.

Since coming to the Senate he's been active on a range of fronts but particularly on educational reform. He supported the Race to the Top fund. He's introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator McCain to expand the Troops-to-Teachers program. He was original cosponsor of the School Principals' Recruitment and Training Act.

We really look forward to hearing your thoughts, senator. So with that I'm honored to present Senator Michael Bennet.

(Applause.)

SEN. MICHAEL BENNET (D-CO): Thank you all. It's great to see you this morning and I really appreciate your letting me have the chance to come. I'm going to try to be as brief as possible. Having said that, I'll break that promise. And then we'll have some Q&A afterwards.

But I want to say before I recognize CAP's great work here – acknowledge two people from Denver with whom I have had a very cherished relationship: my union president, Kim Ursetta, who's here who ran the Denver Classroom Teachers Association with whom I battled, with whom we struggled, and I think with whom we made a huge difference together; and with Brad Jupp, who worked with me side by side from the day before I became superintendent. Brad was a union leader in the Denver public schools for many years. He came over to work with me and to help refine and develop ProComp and he's one of the true education reformers in this country now working for Arne Duncan. It's a great pleasure to see you. Even though we work in the same town, we never, ever see each other anymore.

And to CAP, I want to thank you, John, for focusing on what really matters rather than the reform of the day, the flavor of the day, but to understand that fundamentally and at its core, education, just like almost everything else, comes down to the human beings that are actually in the classroom. And I'm very grateful for your focus on that, for the focus of the panels on that, the papers you're going to hear. I looked at them last night. There's a lot of good stuff in there so you're going to have a good conversation today.

I always start by reminding people what we're really dealing with here because not enough people in the country understand what the outcomes are for kids in our country. And if you look at the fact that – a couple of statistics. I'm not going to bore with a bunch but I'll give you a couple.

One, when I took the job as superintendent of schools, one of the most alarming statistics that I read was that on the 10th grade math test administered by the state, we had, in a city of – a school district of 75,000 children, a city of 550,000 people, 33 African-American students proficient on our 10th grade math test and 61 Latino students proficient on our 10th grade math test – fewer than four classrooms worth of kids in that 75,000-kid school district proficient on a test that measures a junior high school standard of mathematical proficiency in Europe.

We know that children in poverty by the time they get to the fourth grade are already two to three grade levels behind their middle-class peers. And we know that today's fourth graders that are living in poverty stand a one in two chance of graduating from high school and a one in 10 chance of graduating from college. Those were the

same odds, by the way, that their older brothers and older sisters had, the same odds that their parents had: a one in 10 chance of graduating.

And our economy has already transformed itself. If you look at the last job creation we had in the United States of America, we created about five million jobs that required a four-year degree. We created somewhere in the neighborhood of two or three million jobs that required something less than that in terms of post-high school education. We lost jobs for people without high school diplomas. We lost jobs for people with a high school diploma but not any work in college. That trend is not going to reverse itself.

So these gaps that we have that we confront today, if we do nothing different, are only going to grow and they're going to grow exponentially.

In my view, there are a lot of things – we don't have time today. We're not going to have time today to talk about all of the things that we need to change in our delivery of public education which by and large owes its design to colonial America and to the period right around World War Two. So we could take up the whole week talking about what we could do but this is what I want to talk about today.

In my view, there's nothing more important for us to recognize than that we are – no longer live in a labor market that discriminates against women and says you have two professional choices: one is being a teacher and one is being a nurse.

Our entire system of training, of compensation, the way we think about retaining teachers, evaluating teachers, the way we think about inspiring teachers – maybe that's the most important thing – belongs to an era that no longer exists.

And we got away with a system that used that discrimination to subsidize our public education system and to say, you know, we are going to have the very best people in our classrooms willing to teach "Julius Caesar" every year for 30 years because nobody's going to ask them to do anything else.

And I don't mean this – this is not a political (job ?) for me. This is the hardest job anybody can do is teaching in one of these urban school districts. It's harder than whatever anybody else here does besides the teachers that are here. And we have got to come together and design a system that's a 21st century approach to attracting and retaining teachers to our schools.

And what I would just submit at the end of that – I'll say one more thing – is that the policy conversation we're having right now is not at risk of actually dealing with the issue that we're confronting. It is too narrow. It is too small. It is a national conversation that we should be having because this is a national issue that we have.

And I think that we should be doing everything we can to encourage the kind of innovation that we see in Denver and see in other places, encourage the kind of

discussions that Kim and I had. They were tough, but they were worth it and it shows it can be done.

The last thing I want to say is this – and this is something I really thought hard about this last night before I came.

One of the acquired learnings that I had based on my time in Denver is that there is enormous reform fatigue in this country. There's huge reform fatigue among our teachers. There's huge reform fatigue among our principals, and that's particularly problematic when you're dealing with a culture that is defined as much as this culture is by mistrust and by worry.

And so while I used to say that our reform -- our instructional reform was absolutely breathtaking in its lack of originality – and I continue to believe that – our approach was different and for reasons that I don't understand no one else seems to be doing it.

So let me give this to you as an idea for the people that are actually thinking about the policies and asking the question of yourself, how do we actually get this done? How do we move from a good idea to getting it done? How do we deal with the conflict that inevitably arises in schooling?

And I think that the first piece of that is recognizing how tough the culture is and the reasons why. It's hard when you've dedicated your life to teaching and your kids don't seem to make any progress and you lose all sense of your efficacy or collective efficacy in your building. That's tough. That's a tough starting point.

So here were my two ideas on this and I thought – and they worked out well. One was before I became superintendent – I asked Brad about this – I said that I would meet every morning or virtually every morning with a group of 15 of our principals for two hours in their schools. Every three weeks I saw every principal in the school district for two hours for the nearly four years that I was superintendent of schools. And the conversations were not about who got left on the bus or was the boiler broken or anything else. The conversations were all about teaching and learning.

I'll give you an example. It was this narrow case. For three weeks, we took around the same 1.5 page piece of student work.

It's important for people to look at student work. Here's how professional development goes in America on student work. It's important that you look at student work. Go back to your building and tell your teachers they need to look at student work.

We took the same 1.5 page piece around with us and we would pass it out to the principals at all levels. It was a fourth-graders' writing but we did it the same writing at every level and the same thing would happen every single time, which is people would

look at it and they'd say, I can't read this. This doesn't make any sense to me. This looks like a foreign language.

And just when it would crescendo my chief academic officer would say based on what you've read, what are Nancy's strengths as a writer? So everybody would have to dive back into the piece of paper.

And for an hour, we would have a discussion that said – where people would say, Nancy writes from left to right. She has some sense of story structure. She spells high-frequency words correctly. We'd say, why is that? And they'd say, well, maybe she had a vocabulary test. And we'd say, maybe, or maybe her teacher has a word wall in her classroom that she's using to scaffold her instruction. The point is we don't know, but let's not make an assumption about that. And they'd say, well, she has stamina as a writer which would turn out for reasons I'm not going to bore you with today not to be true.

Then the last part of our conversation was how do you take what you just went through and what you just learned back to your building and engage your teachers in this conversation so that the instruction changes, not next year, not after professional development next summer, but in the next period for Nancy and for all the Nancies that in every school district in our country who are writing something that our own folks are saying they can't read?

That had an enormous impact on the culture because we built a principal corps that understood that their job was not to keep the system the same. It was to change the system. And by and large, they understood that their job was not to grind down the people that were working with our kids, but to try to support them.

And I don't remember the numbers exactly but the DCTA did a survey of its members every year and there was a question on that survey that said – from the teachers – the question was, my principal supports me as a professional in the building and respects me. That went in a year from something like 35 percent yes to something like 71 percent yes. Can you imagine how much easier it is to do the kinds of reforms you all care about and I'm thinking about when people feel like they're being respected by their principals?

The second thing I'll do – and I'll stop with this – the second thing I did was that I said I would meet with every faculty in the school district every single year. We had 150 schools, give or take, and we spent an hour. Five minutes at the beginning is all I took and the rest of it was completely open and completely free form. Sorry, John. I'm finishing.

And the point of it was, the first year, to be piñata, to have people say – which they said the first year – Kim will remember this – we were here before you got here. We're going to be here after you leave and you know nothing about what it is we do every day, to which I could say, you're correct about that. That's why I'm here.

But the next year, what it allowed us to do as we were implementing the reforms, was to get feedback directly from the teacher unmediated by the bureaucracy. And they would say things like, you must not have intended this or you guys are completely out of your minds for doing this.

The one I remember that comes to mind today is a very simple one: we had gone to a standard base report card. No more A, B, C and D and F but one, two, three and four, standard base report card.

Because of the reform that we did, because of what I did as superintendent teachers were no longer able to print their report cards at their desk when they needed them for their kids. The IT department was printing these things in the building downtown and then trucking them to our teachers when it was convenient. Because of their feedback we changed that. We took that pain point away from people and we didn't – (laughter). Other things. Except for Kim Ursetta's.

But there were things like that that we changed and in January of the second year we cut a video that said, based on the feedback you guys have given us here are all the changes that we're making to the reform that we're engaged in, something that had never happened in the history of the Denver public schools which was people actually listening.

So my final observation is this: we need to radically change the delivery of public education in this country but we're not going to do it if we don't attend to the cultural work that has to be done to make sure we go faster on this rather than slower on this.

Sorry. I'll stop there and see what questions people have. Thank you.

(Applause.)

Do you have any corrections that you'd like to make?

MR. : I'll leave those to the union president.

MS. CYNTHIA BROWN: Okay. He has a few moments for questions if any of you –

SEN. BENNET: Don't feel the need to restrict yourself to anything I talked about. I'm happy to talk about anything else: comp or healthcare or – (laughter).

MS. BROWN: Anyone? We'll start with press. See you and – (off mike).

SEN. BENNET: There's one back there.

MS. BROWN: And then the woman back.

Q: Stephen Sawchuk with *Education Week*. I'd just like to hear a little bit about what your education priorities are on the Hill particularly with training and development of teachers. I know you've been working on a bill to that end, and if you have a sense of how that bill might proceed, whether it might be wrapped in the ESEA reauthorization, I think we'd all like to hear about that.

SEN. BENNET: I appreciate it. I think it's too early to tell whether it will be wrapped in the ESEA authorization. I hope that the principles that are reflected in the bill will be part of ESEA reauthorization.

My priorities, not surprisingly, are teachers. And hoping our school districts and states think differently about their recruitment, their retention, their compensation, all the things that I talked about earlier.

I think that one of the things that I like about the Race to the Top program is that it's a search for willing dance partners in the sense that what they're looking for are people that want to put their hands up and say, we're willing to try something different which I think is enormously important because in my judgment it really is time for the burden of proof to shift from the people who want to change the system to the people who want to keep the system the same given the outcomes that I described at the beginning of this conversation.

And I think that work is principally going to revolve around how we think about Title Two and whether we think that Title Two is really a very effective use of resources or whether there might be other ways to use it to engage our teachers, to engage more senior teachers as master teachers to bring people into the profession.

I think we need to think very strongly about alternative licensure regimes in this country so that we're getting the benefit of all the talent that we have in the United States of America to do the most important work that we have.

We need multiple pathways for people into the profession in order to fill the gaps that we have in things like math and science and special ed. So those are the kinds of things that I'm going to be focused on.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Great. Yes.

Q: Good morning. My name is Wangui Njuguna with *Education Daily*. If you could talk just a little bit about your experience of ProComp and the whole issue of teacher evaluation, what was a sticking point and how did you get beyond, one example, and how you got beyond that challenge.

SEN. BENNET: Okay. Well, you've got two better experts than I on teacher evaluation. The one thing I will say about teacher evaluation is that the crisis in this country – look, there isn't anybody – there is nobody that doesn't think we'd be better off without the lowest performing teachers in our classrooms. Let's stipulate to that.

But the real issue in my view is that we're losing 50 percent of the people from the profession in the first five years. So that ought to be the frame that we think about all of these things in including teacher evaluation. How are we using teacher evaluation to improve instruction and to inspire people to want to stay in the work?

You know, I mentioned earlier – sorry to digress on this but I left it out of my remarks. I mentioned earlier the reform fatigue that creeps in. It doesn't just creep in. It slams in on people.

One of the things that I'm so pleased about in Denver, and I go back there every weekend and I talk to the superintendent and others, teachers that I see in the supermarket and other places, is that we really are in that city on a path of continuous improvement and that was what we were trying to do was to get the place into the position where the work was getting better at the work and having people come to their job every day understanding that that was what they were there to do.

And Kim leads a teacher-led school, or is part of a teacher-led school in our city and there are all kinds of schools in our city where people are approached as professionals there to improve the job that they're doing.

So when we think about – I just want you to know when I think about evaluation systems, when I think about compensation, when I think about training, what I'm thinking about is not the question of the lowest performer, because I think that ought to be a given, in my own view – I know it's not in a lot of places but my own view – but how we're doing a better job of supporting folks so that we're not losing them in the first five years.

On ProComp, again, you've got the world's expert here who probably doesn't want to claim that title but he is – Brad Jupp. He literally wrote the book on ProComp.

But just – very simply what it does, first of all, it is a guaranteed source of revenue which can be used only for paying teachers in this performance and differentiated pay system. That's very important to understand because people that are after performance pay but aren't going to guarantee that the pay is really going to be there are on a fool's errand because too many of these things have been cut the minute budgets get cut.

So we have a dedicated revenue stream from the city and county of Denver the taxpayers voted for. It was – (inaudible) – increase that is annual and indexed to inflation that can only be used for this system. That's a very important fact that's often overlooked by people that are thinking about changing pay.

The second thing I'll say is as long as you're measuring and you've got an accountability system that is irrational, nobody will subject themselves to it. If you ask me, if you said to me, Michael, we've got this great idea: we're going to pay you based

on how this year's fourth graders did compared to last year's fourth graders, I would never agree to that. But it's the way we measure progress around this country.

The relevant question is how did this group of fifth graders do compared to how they did as fourth graders compared to how they did as third graders and in our case compared to every single child in Colorado that has a statistically similar test history. If you start measuring it like that, maybe we can start to have a conversation.

And the last point is that the way system works is that if you're in a high-poverty school, you get paid more for that. If you bring in a special set of skills that's in short supply like math and science, you get paid more for that. If you're driving student achievement based on multiple but measurable metrics, you get paid for that.

Teachers said to me – and on a school wide basis, by the way – individual – only 28 percent of our teachers taught something that was measured by the state assessment. And if they show (outside ?) gains and their kids show outside gains, they get paid for that.

But our teachers, as a group in our buildings, if they are in – this is more detail than you probably one – in a high-growth school in Denver or a high-growth, high-performing school in Denver, everyone gets paid for that whether they're teaching something that's measured by the state examiner or they're not.

And the reason for that is that people said to me, you know, this was not – by the way, none of – a lot of this was not in the system before I got there. People said to me, we think it's really hard to measure this or that. We think it's really hard to design these tools. And they're right about that.

And I didn't want to let the perfect be the enemy of the good and so my view was if your music teacher and art teacher in a school where the performance is growing, you've been a supportive member of the team, we're going to pay you for that.

And then finally, and Kim will talk about this later I'm sure, if you're setting student growth objectives and you're meeting those student growth objectives, you get paid for that.

The important thing about ProComp is not just that it differentiates pay, although that's important. It also allows, as Brad would say, teachers to manage their career, to manage their compensation, to make decisions about whether they might want to go to a high-poverty school in order to be paid more or whether they want to stay in that high-poverty school to be paid more, to think about whether they want that certification in mathematics or in special ed or in English language acquisition which we desperately needed every single year as a way of increasing their compensation.

This, as everybody would say – and I certainly agree – this is not a problem to be solved by compensation. It's only one of many issues that we need to address to create a 21st century approach to track and retaining teachers to America's classrooms.

MS. BROWN: One last question. The guy right there.

Q: Good morning. I'm Don Glass. I'm VSA at the Kennedy Center. I'm extremely thrilled to hear that you were using – looking at student work as a process to engage principals and teachers. I'm wondering how you see – looking at student work or professional learning communities where teachers look at student work, how does that fit into a system of accountability and evaluation or does that play a role in terms of certain kinds of indicators for teachers to show progress?

SEN. BENNET: Yes. I mean, if we're honest with ourselves today, in most urban school districts in the country, even if you wanted to find out who the best fourth grade math teacher was, you wouldn't have a way of doing it.

You couldn't – I mean, it would be impossible to do. The systems aren't in place. People aren't identified. They don't come in contact with each other in a way that would demonstrate that. And so, it's just a common place that the schools where adults, as I said earlier, came together in an effort around continuous improvement to do the shared craft of learning how to teach.

My chief academic officer used to say that part of what we were doing in schools is that we have classrooms that are sort of a series of adjoining caves where this is my cave and that's your cave and that's your cave and you never go into each other's room.

You know, the most successful schools that we have in our district are schools where people are doing the kind of work and the kind of planning that you're describing. And I think that that work ought to inform any evaluation system that one would produce.

MS. BROWN: Thank you very much, senator. It is so exciting to have someone with this degree of expertise on our issue in this room with a voice in the U.S. Senate. (Applause.)

SEN. BENNET: Well, thanks for having me. And I hope you'll keep – I know you will so I don't have to say I hope you will. Let me know what I can do to help carry the ideas that you have and let's keep this conversation going because there is – you know, I talked about the jobs stuff earlier and we're going through an enormously difficult time in our economy.

We will not be equipped to compete – this is not just rhetoric. We will not be equipped to compete in the 21st century. We will not be equipped to deliver this democracy in decent shape if we don't solve these issues.

And I think it's time for us to set aside the conflict and come together and say, you know, we've got a set of aspirations for our kids and our grandkids that's going to make it in everybody's interest to make sure we get this done. So thanks for your leadership. (Applause.)

MS. BROWN: Thank you much, senator, for a great start to our morning and I want to invite the panelists to come up. And I'm going to turn the podium over to Robin Chait who is the associate director for teacher quality here at the center and she will lead this morning's discussion on everything evaluation.

MS. ROBIN CHAIT: Thank you, Cindy. And I'd like to again thank Senator Bennet for those really inspiring remarks. They really helped to set the context for why we're having this conversation today.

I'm Robin Chait, associate director for teacher quality here at the Center for American Progress and I'm going to talk briefly about two of the papers we're releasing today and then I'm going to moderate the rest of the event this morning.

So the goal of today's discussion is to talk about how we might move forward from the existing inadequate teacher evaluation practices that have received so much recent attention.

According to the New Teacher Project's recent widget effect study of evaluation practices in 12 districts, in districts that rate teachers as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory, more than 99 percent of teachers receive satisfactory ratings. In districts that have more than two categories, about 94 percent of teachers receive one of the top two ratings and less than 1 percent are rated unsatisfactory. Moreover teachers generally don't receive useful feedback or guidance on areas to improve. Again, from the widget effect study, 73 percent of teachers surveyed said their most recent evaluation did not identify any areas for further development.

And state policies have done little to ensure rigorous evaluation practices at the district level. According to the National Council on Teacher Quality Policy Yearbook, just 16 states require any objective measures of student learning to be part of evaluations. Twenty-one states do not even require that evaluations must include classroom observations and only 15 states require annual evaluations of tenure teachers with some states permitting teachers to go five years or even longer without an evaluation.

However, there are districts and schools that are evaluating differently. One of the questions posed by our event today is what do those systems look like and what are they doing differently?

In a few minutes, Morgaen Donaldson and Heather Peske will launch our discussion with a presentation of their paper, "Supporting Effective Teaching through Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Teacher Evaluation in Five Charter Schools."

Morgaen Donaldson is assistant professor of educational leadership at the University of Connecticut's Neage School of Education. And Heather Peske is the national director of programs at Teach Plus.

Their paper discusses their original research on teacher evaluation practices in high-performing charter management organizations and they find that these CMOs did evaluate differently but they didn't differentiate among teachers as much as they would have expected given the flexibility that charter schools have.

Evaluation systems that fail to differentiate among teachers have many weaknesses. One is that highly-effective teachers are not recognized or rewarded.

In one of the papers that we're releasing today, "Treating Different Teachers Differently: How State Policy Should Act on Differences in Teacher Performance to Improve Teacher Effectiveness and Equity," my colleague Raegan Miller and I offer a number of state and district policy options for dealing differently with three groups of teachers so the paper outlines strategies for highly effective teachers, moderate performers and chronically ineffective teachers.

It outlines the different policy goals states and districts might have for these groups of teachers and that's the different strategies that might be employed. For example, for highly effective teachers states and districts should have policies that encourage them to stay in the profession, encourage them to teach in high-poverty and low performing schools and leverage their talents to help other teachers and reach more students.

In a recent working paper on extending the reach of the most effective educators, Emily and Bryan Hassel outlined a number of potential models for leveraging the talents of the most effective teachers. These models include inducing highly effective teachers to teach larger classes with financial incentives, capturing, distributing electronic versions of their lessons and giving them time to offer online courses.

Other possibilities include limiting their non-instructional duties to give them more time to offer instruction or to help develop other less effective teachers. These options also allow highly effective teachers to be recognized for their performance and to be paid more without a greater level of district funding.

So there are a number of ways to maximize the reach of highly effective educators. The paper also deals with strategies that are important for moderate performers such as having highly targeted job and vetted professional development and strategies for those who are chronically ineffective.

But we can't differentiate policies and strategies for teachers without having high-quality information on their performance to base them on.

The third paper we're releasing today focuses solely on dismissing chronically ineffective teachers. It deals with the difficult legal and policy barriers to dismissing those teachers who are persistently ineffective even when being provided with support.

This issue should be addressed within the context of a discussion about evaluation systems because it's not possible to create a culture of accountability and continuous improvement in schools if there are no consequences for chronic low performance.

Right now, very few teachers are dismissed for poor performance. Only about 1.4 percent of tenure teachers are dismissed on average. That's data from the U.S. Department of Education Schools and Staffing survey.

Yet, when they're asked, teachers say there are teachers in their schools who are not effective. In a recent survey of a nationally representative sample of teachers conducted by Public Agenda and Learning Point Associates, 59 percent of teachers reported that there were a few teachers in their building who failed to do a good job. And 18 percent reported that there were more than a few.

It's dispiriting to talented teachers to teach next to those who aren't providing high-quality instruction. Moreover, chronically ineffective teachers affect the learning of many students throughout their careers.

So why are so few teachers dismissed? There are many legal and policy barriers as well as cultural barriers. Their weak evaluation practices or systems that we've been talking about this morning; the time and cost of dismissal cases that can cost districts over \$100,000 per teachers and can take a year or more and that's just the hearing itself – it can take one to two years to bring a case to a hearing – a school culture that's uncomfortable differentiating among teachers and singling out those who are struggling. Many principals aren't used to differentiating among teachers because they haven't done so in the past. And this lack of differentiation has become embedded in the culture of many schools. And I'll be interested in the panelists' thoughts on that issue.

There's also the difficulty of hiring replacements in some districts. In a district where it's very difficult to get a high school math or science teacher, for instance, a principal may be less likely to fire an ineffective one.

There are a number of policy changes that could both mitigate some of these barriers to dismissing chronically ineffective teachers and support stronger evaluation systems. There are detailed policy recommendations in the two papers but in general state laws can help to ensure that evaluation practices are rigorous.

For example, teachers should be evaluated annually and perhaps even more than that for new teachers and objective measures of student learning, measures of teacher effectiveness derived from achievement test data and classroom observations should all be significant components of evaluation systems.

States should ensure that the tenure decision is based upon meaningful information about teacher performance derived from a strong evaluation system and a dismissal process for chronically ineffective teachers should be fair but efficient. So states should continue to ensure due process for teachers but the process should be streamlined. Statutes should include poor performance as a cause for dismissal in their tenure statutes.

Right now, a lot of statutes just say that – just have vague causes for dismissal and they don't specify explicitly that poor performance is a reason for dismissal. States should limit the time period for dismissal hearings. States should only allow one appeal for tenure teachers who are dismissed based on poor performance.

Districts should ensure that evaluation systems are rigorous and well implemented. They should review school evaluation data to ensure that schools are differentiating among teachers. They should ensure that achieving tenure is a meaningful benchmark. Right now in most districts, tenure indicates the passage of time rather than that a meaningful benchmark of performance has been achieved.

They can also work with the new representatives to create streamline systems for removing chronically ineffective teachers. One option is to create peer assistance and review programs. I'm sure we'll talk about that later in our conversation.

While these policy changes would likely lead to improvements and evaluation practices, a lot of what needs to happen are the changes in districts and schools.

So the rest of our conversation today will focus on what new evaluation practices could look like in schools and then what are further implications for policy.

We'll start with Morgaen and Heather's presentation of their research on teacher evaluation practices in three high-performing charter management organizations. Then we will hear from three expert practitioners about their experiences in conducting and participating in teacher evaluation practices on the ground and what they've learned that could inform state and district policy.

Jessica Cunningham is the founding principal of the KIPP Middle School here in D.C. called the WILL Academy.

Kim Ursetta is a bilingual kindergarten teacher at a teacher-led school, the Mathematics and Science Leadership Academy in Denver public schools. And she's the former president of the Denver Classroom Teachers Association.

And Elizabeth Arons is a senior human resources policy adviser for the New York City Public Schools and the Gates Foundation and has consulted with many districts on their evaluation practices. So let's begin.

MS. HEATHER PESKE: Good morning. Thank you for coming. So our paper is about teacher evaluation in charter schools. And the first question is why study teacher evaluation in charter schools?

We know, of course, that there's growing interest in teacher evaluation as a mechanism for increasing teacher quality. Indeed, we've all been hearing about and reading about the race to the top requirements in terms of states having to link student achievement with teacher evaluation. And we've also been hearing a lot about charter schools as a possible solution to low student performance. And again, we know from President Obama's agenda in terms of expanding charter schools that the administration among others are seeing charter schools as a real opportunity to try to increase student achievement.

So given the profound influence that we know teachers have on student achievement, accurately evaluating their performance is a natural leverage point for increasing teacher quality and for expanding student learning.

We have reasons to expect that charter schools may evaluate teachers differently from conventional schools. And those reasons are because of the structure of charter schools.

So, for example, charter schools have the opportunity to create their own teacher evaluation systems, they're not usually constrained by school district mandates, by union laws or by other laws governing tenure and dismissal so they may have greater autonomy than conventional schools.

Again, I want to stress though that operative word here is "may" and we're going to talk a little bit more about that.

And finally, why study teacher evaluation in charter schools? Because there's very little published research on this topic. Although there's lots of research on the student demographics of students in charter schools and student achievement, there's little about the norms and practices.

So given that there is little about the norms and practices, we sought to answer some critical questions. First, does teacher evaluation in charter schools improve instruction, enhance student learning and raise achievement?

Second, do charter school evaluation ratings exhibit wider variation than the narrow distribution of high marks commonly found in conventional public schools, those statistics that Robin just reviewed, for example.

And number three, are charter school administrators able to use teacher evaluation as a means to identify and dismiss teachers who are not effective as well as a means to recognize and reward those teachers who are effective.

So this is how we set out to answer those questions. First, we went to three charter management organizations, which we call West, North and National, and then we looked specifically into five schools and I'm going to give you a few more details about those charter management organizations and those schools in just a moment.

We did interviews with teachers, principals and with the charter management officials. We did document analysis. Now, we want to remind you that this study is very modest in scope and scale but it's the first of its kind. So again, we're examining the practices, procedures and norms related to teacher evaluation.

But I want to be cautious here. Our aim is not to generalize to all charter schools or all charter management organizations. However, there's a lot to be learned from the five schools that we studied and we're very grateful for the generosity of the teachers and administrators in those schools and in those charter management organizations.

So let me tell you a little bit about the CMOs. They were all selected because they have demonstrated success overtime with low-income and minority students and this success was evidenced by their student achievement data. And let me tell you know about the three different CMOs.

So first there's the CMO that we call West CMO. And West CMO is a group of schools serving students in two of the nation's largest urban centers. It's a network of conversion and startup charter schools and it serves about – there are about 20 schools in that network. It's important to note that in West CMO the teachers collectively bargain.

And next we have North CMO. North CMO represents a network of about 15 schools in several medium-sized cities in the northeast. And the CMO grew out of a relatively small geographic region – it represents a relatively small geographic region. It grew out of one successful school.

And finally, we looked at National CMO. And National CMO is a much larger network of about 75 schools serving approximately 20,000 students across the country. This CMO is much more decentralized than we found in West or North CMO.

And now, very briefly, I want to tell you about the five schools where we interviewed administrators and teachers.

So, as you can see from the table when you look at it, you see that we have a variety of levels of schools so we have elementary, middle and high schools included in this small sample. And also you can see that each of the schools serves a very high percentage of African-American or Latino students. And the majority of the students in each of the school receive free or reduced price lunch.

For each of these schools you can also see in the two columns on the right side of the table the number of evaluators and the numbers of the teachers within the school. And as you can see from the data here, in the north and national CMO, there's a high

number of evaluators compared to teachers, particularly in comparison to what we see in conventional schools.

And now I'm going to hand over the meat of the presentation, what you really want to hear – which is the findings – to my colleague Morgaen Donaldson. Thank you.

MS. MORGAEN DONALDSON: So we framed our findings around the three critical questions that we set out not explicitly to answer but to begin to answer as this research is formative.

And our first question was about whether teacher evaluation in these settings actually improves instruction and whether we might be able to trace some line through to student learning and student achievement.

And what the teachers told us is that they experience evaluation in these charter schools as more robust and more frequent than in their previous settings, whether those previous settings were conventional or other charter schools outside of these particular CMOs.

We also found that these three CMOs appear to focus on the performance growth function of the evaluation, much more than on the summative assessment function of the evaluation.

So for example, in North and National CMOs there was no distinction between formal and informal observation. All observations were continuous and ongoing and they could all inform the summative assessment that came down the road.

In general, the aim of evaluation in these settings was to cultivate a mindset of continuous improvement rather than a checklist of appropriate teacher behaviors and to really inculcate evaluation as a professional habit that's ongoing rather than a one-time administrative act or event.

We do want to note that student performance data in these settings at the time of the interviews played a qualitative role so there was no factoring in of value added scores at the time of our interviews, although all three CMOs and the schools are very seriously looking into value added methodology.

Looking at the procedures and the practices in each of these CMOs and schools, there are annual summative evaluations for every teacher regardless of how many years that teacher has been teaching. There are frequent observations, weekly, monthly, annually and detailed feedback.

In North and National, they've really made a concerted effort to take non-instructional duties off the plate of the administrators so the administrators really have the time to be in classrooms and meeting one on one or one on two or one on three with teachers and giving them really high-quality feedback.

The upshot of this, these frequent observations followed by feedback sessions, is that there was a pretty tight link between evaluation and professional development in these sites.

Thirdly, attention to a day-to-day culture of reflection and accountability – one teacher told us in North CMO that feedback is a gift and that everyone believes that and you have to really live it if you want to work in that organization.

And we also saw across the board in all the CMOs that people were constantly asking for feedback, principals solicited it from teachers and vice versa.

We also found that hiring was a crucial primary step to ensuring teachers who fit so these CMOs were hiring at the – you know, doing the first level of screening at the CMO level looking for people who had an evaluative mindset, who were self-critical and really committed to improving their practice.

We also found that these schools made efforts to advance a no-surprise policy so being very clear and honest and upfront with teachers about how their performance was going and what they needed to do to improve.

And this was beneficial to teachers in two ways. Number one, they go the feedback they needed to know what to do to improve. And also, if they were struggling, it wasn't a surprise when they were not asked back or they were dismissed.

And lastly, we found that these CMOs really devote substantial training and time for evaluators and learning how to observe instruction and provide feedback. They had explicit norms about what makes for good feedback and they really dedicated time and effort to training evaluators in how to convey feedback in a way that it would be implemented.

In terms of the consequences, we found that in these schools there was a slightly broader range of summative ratings than some of the statistics that Robin cited but we do want to raise a word of caution here because the CMOs do not collect these sort of data and this bullet is based on principals' perception so we don't want to go too far without finding.

We did find at the time of data collection these CMOs and schools were recognizing teachers who performed exceptionally well in their observations although North is exploring this very seriously.

We found a somewhat higher rate of dismissals at North and national CMO schools than the rates that Robin cited, as high as 11 percent annually which was actually – we expected to see it even higher.

And we were also kind of surprised because the participants stressed to us that dismissals were often not for performance reasons. They were more for cultural reasons so the teacher didn't fit. And one example of this was in national – in the school in the national CMO where the teacher with students who had the highest reading scores was dismissed for being a, quote, unquote, “culture killer.”

In terms of the barriers to dismissal we found interesting convergences with those experiences – with conventional schools so lack of principal time was cited as a barrier to more dismissals; supply issues, so the inability to find a really good replacement math teacher was also cited by these schools.

And then lastly some reluctant – some of the cultural issues were also cropping up where principals were reluctant to dismiss struggling teachers especially since so many of these features in these settings are relatively inexperienced so the question of when to dismiss a teacher, especially if she's really starting out as so many new teachers do, struggle (mightily ?).

So more broadly speaking we found that these schools encountered some challenges to high-quality evaluation that we also see conventional schools encountering.

So first off, lack of time, you know, just getting time to get in there and do the classroom observations and do the high-quality feedback sessions, especially in Western CMO where the ratio of teachers to evaluators was so much higher. Time was cited as a challenge.

Secondly, lack of recognition for outstanding performance. We've discussed this. It was something that was on the minds of many of the people we spoke with but hadn't really come to fruition yet.

Thirdly, lack of agreement about high-quality instruction – we found that, in general, these schools showed more consensus than we would probably see in other settings but there was still some evidence of dissonance and disagreement around what makes for good teaching.

And then lastly, variation in the use of evaluation feedback – some of the teachers we talked to really said that they used the evaluation feedback. They were constantly referring to it while others said it's in the file cabinet somewhere; I hadn't really thought about it since September. So those are the challenges that they encountered.

So in conclusion, we really want to highlight that in these settings, evaluation seems to contribute to improved teaching by serving as an ongoing tool to develop teacher effectiveness rather than a summative judgment.

So evaluation is really tightly linked with professional development and completes a continuous feedback loop. And so how do they do that? They really show an organizational commitment to developing a strong evaluation system and really a

strong system of support for teachers that extends beyond evaluation by developing the norms for feedback, by taking on instructional duties off administrators' plates, by allowing multiple people to be in classrooms to give feedback, by providing a lot of training for evaluators and what constitutes good teaching and how do you identify it and how do you move a teacher from point A to point B.

And then another thing we haven't really talked about, the credibility – there was a lot of credibility for these evaluators because the teachers knew they had been strong teachers before becoming administrators and in two of the three CMOs administrators were teaching as well administering. So the teachers really took their advice and their feedback to heart.

And we just want to raise a question given these findings. They are modest. They are preliminary but we seem to see here that focus on ongoing continuous improvement really seems to be making a difference in the classroom.

And so we wonder whether this emphasis on dismissals, emphasis on dismissing more teachers, emphasis on getting more unsatisfactory ratings is really taking us down the wrong path or diverting our attention from what might be the better strategy for raising the teaching quality of the large amount of teachers who are in that unsatisfactory category and whether we're focusing more on ongoing improvement and cultivating this sort of effort might be a better use of time and effort.

MS. CHAIT: It's really helpful to hear about how that mindset of continuous improvement is actually operationalized in schools. And now we'll hear from Jessica Cunningham.

MS. JESSICA CUNNINGHAM: Good morning. I wanted to talk a little bit first about my experience being evaluated as a former public school teacher. I actually started teaching through the New Teacher Project. I was a D.C. teaching fellow and so I taught fourth grade in D.C. public schools. And I had a good experience. I worked with two fine principals.

But I wasn't very good and I met expectations every year. And I didn't – and I also never really knew what good was. I didn't know what it meant to really be an excellent teacher and nobody really had solutions for me. So when I did get some critical feedback which was not often – nearly often enough in hindsight, it was just that – you know, well, you need to work on your classroom management. Well, how? What specifically? That's a pretty broad topic as we know.

And so that was very helpful when I came to KIPP and when I started my school four years ago because I had what I think was a better understanding of what a teacher would need to become very successful in the classroom. And I think my other colleagues within KIPP at least understood that because we're all largely former public school principals and urban public school principals who had very similar experiences when either being evaluated or not evaluated for years.

And so, at KIPP, I think our teacher evaluation process really honestly begins with hiring and I say that because we don't hire you unless we see you teach. It's one of the things that I think sometimes gets left out of this conversation about teacher efficacy is that large public school systems are constantly hiring teachers every year and the thing that you do is teach but when we hire you, we don't know if you can teach. That's rather appalling. A bank would not do that. A bank needs to see that you actually understand finance before they hire you to work in their finance department. But in education, apparently, that's not needed.

And so I think it's important to note that that's kind of how our process starts: we see you teach. And so then at least we're familiar with your – somewhat familiar with your strengths and weaknesses and we're also – at that point, if we extend an offer, we're comfortable enough with where you are on the trajectory to hire you.

Now, once you come onboard, I think also again the teacher evaluation starts with then professional development because we have seen you teach. We also can (see ?) our professional development opportunities and onboarding process around what it is we know you're already good at and what we know that you – where we already know you need to grow.

As far as what happens once teachers are in our buildings, I appreciate what Morgaen said in terms of – there are a ton of observations and I don't care whether you call them formal, informal, short, long, 90 minutes, five minutes, we're constantly looking at teaching and learning in our buildings and we're constantly having conversations about it.

Whether it's in the cafeteria, whether it's in a formal one-on-one meeting that we have with our teachers every single week with an administrators, we're constantly talking about instruction in our building which I think changes the culture of a building which is also important to note.

We are very specific with our teachers about what we think excellent instruction looks like and how that impacts, most importantly, students. So when you come to our schools and before we even start the school year, we do have a rubric. It's not – I'm glad to say that it is not a checklist but it is very, very specific because we want teachers to know what does it mean to be an excellent teacher here. When you come into my classroom, what are you looking for because I think too often teachers don't even know and sometimes administrators don't even know what they're looking for.

And so teachers know – well here are the give strands that we're looking at. We have classroom management. We have pedagogy. We have assessment, so on and so forth. And so if you're going to get an exemplary rating and assessment versus an advanced proficiency rating or novice rating, you need to know specifically what it means to be a novice versus what it means to be exemplary in this area.

And then we also have our teachers do self-assessments. And I think that's also an important piece because self-awareness is key when evaluating teachers, especially when you're talking about improving.

And I think that's kind of the line in the sand when you look for a teacher who's struggling and you're trying to make a decision about is this someone who need to keep in the building, is this someone who's going to grow and who's going to, quite frankly, grow quickly enough so that we're not penalizing a group of children for someone's incompetence. And a lot of that it's just about the teacher being aware enough of their shortcomings and what they need to do and how much work needs to go into them getting better.

Like I said, we do meet with our teachers weekly, one on one, every single week. We have our teachers submit lesson plans and constantly kind of give feedback about what's going on in the classroom.

And also teacher evaluations at KIPP aren't simply based on the rubric in terms well, did you this, did you do this, does it look like this, does it feel like this but also how are your students faring and not just on standardized tests but what do your grades look like? What proportion of your kids are passing your class with Bs and As, what proportion of your boys, of your black boys, of your special ed kids, how is everyone doing in your class?

And I think that's an important – just as important as student work in many ways. How do your kids feel about you? How do your parents feel about you? What are those relationships like?

And so I think that kind of more organic approach to teacher evaluations assists us in making really sound decisions each year if we have to terminate a person during the year and also when we get to the end of the year and we're making decisions about who's being invited back and who is not.

MS. CHAIT: Thanks so much, Jessica. Kim?

MS. KIM URSETTA: Good morning. My name is Kim Ursetta and I'm a bilingual kindergarten teacher at the Math and Science Leadership Academy in the Denver public schools.

And I want to acknowledge the senator for just a second because without working with the senator when I was the president of the Denver Classroom Teachers Association we would have no Math and Science leadership Academy. This was an idea that I brought as union president to him of allowing us to start our own school. And so we were able to do that.

We opened this year. We are on our 122nd day because – K one and two we count everyday with many of our teams. And we serve 93 percent free and reduced lunch at our school. We are 60 percent English language learner and 98 percent Hispanic.

And so this is a community we chose to work in. This is the community that we chose to base our philosophy and our model around these students and making sure that our ethnic minority students have access to the high-quality and rigorous program that will be able to train our students in math and science and technology so that they can lead in a global society.

And so we opened this past fall as a teacher-led school, the first one in the Denver public schools and in Colorado and really follow a leadership model and have four of our 12 teachers are national board certified. I am one of those teachers.

And we really worked hard on creating a model that would allow teachers to serve as leaders and also encourage students and parent leadership which is something different in our school.

We also use peer assistance and review which is very unique in Colorado. We looked at different districts around the country and we were able to develop a model based on what we had seen elsewhere for our school.

In our school we do follow the same policies and procedures of the school district. We are still under the collective bargaining agreement and have not waived any of those provisions.

The only waiver that we needed, ironically, was from state statute because our state statute says that a principal has to do evaluations. We don't have a principal and so we either needed that waived or we would not be doing evaluations. We, of course, knew that we wanted to do evaluations. And it's a very important and vital part of what we do at our school.

We base everything on formative assessment which then, of course, leads to the summative assessment as Jessica referred to. There are constant observations. We're constantly in each other's rooms. We've set up formal mechanisms where teachers go on and observe each other formally once a month and we sit down and come up with protocols.

Now, before we go to all of that, I want to echo what Jessica had to say is that are really did sit down and talk about what does quality teaching look like? And so looking at our standards based evaluation system that is used across the district we wanted to use it differently so we could actually look at how to continually improve instruction.

And so we sat down as a staff and talked about what does a four look like? What does a one look like and the different evidence that you would need in order to prove that you are at any of those levels. And so we have what is called records of teaching where

teachers actually have to bring in data or some kind of evidence to prove that they have met that level.

And so every month we go and observe each other's classrooms, give each other a formal and informal feedback and we use that feedback to also help inform our professional development in what we're doing with our students.

As we go through that piece I think it's important to point out as well the student work piece that the senator referred to. And we really – you know, based on the national board's process and how you go through a national board certification we take the data piece very seriously and we meet formally once a month and actually have to bring a common set of data.

So, for example, the last one that we did was our midyear everyday math assessments and so we charted where our students were in kindergarten first and second grade, talked about what the expectation was for the following year and then talked about how we would be adjusting our instruction to get our kids to where they needed to be for the following year as well as within the next few months.

And so it's a very rigorous process and the amount of accountability we have for each other is tremendous. When your data is put up in front of your entire staff and you need to talk about what you're doing as a teacher, where your students are and where they need to be, it's a very different culture and a very different way of doing things.

We also use that information to, as I said, improve – to inform our professional development and so we really look at what you need as a teacher and what the data is showing.

Another important piece is just around the professional development. As the other panelists referred to there is very – very rarely do you actually have an opportunity to talk about how to improve your instruction and what you need as a teacher.

And teachers are very reflective. They might not always share that information but they really do think about their practice and what kids need at any second. Just last night I was worrying about one of my students that is still struggling in being able to do one-to-one correspondence with just a lot of learning issues. And so we're constantly worrying about where our students are and where they need to be.

And so we really talk about trying to get them to that next point. And it's very important to really talk about the professional development that you need as a teacher, the data showing you where your kids need to be as well as how to hold each other accountable.

And so whenever we're meeting together and I see that one of my colleagues needs to help in a certain strategy that I may have an expertise in, I am very quickly pulling that information so that I can help them improve as well. And they do the same

for me. And so it's really a mutual accountability through student work as well as where you are in your teaching.

We're doing videotapes, observations, professional development. It's just an incredible experience and the most professionally invigorating experience I've ever had to be able to work with my colleagues to improve, not only my instruction but where my kids are and where they need to be.

MS. CHAIT: Thanks, Kim. Both Jessica and Kim talked about basing evaluation on a vision of excellent instruction and then having constant observation and discussions about instruction and that's something that we'll probably come back to in our discussion. Betsy.

MS. ELIZABETH ARONS: Okay. I promise I'm the last speaker before your opportunity to ask questions. And I want to try and take us back to the beginning remarks that Michael Bennet made because I think it's really important to see this issue in context of a much broader set of initiatives that we need to work on, all of which involve for lack of a better word human capital issues.

And that really – I mean, 10 years ago in Montgomery County we called that workforce excellence and it really just is about investing in your people, understanding the importance of the people that work for that organization. We are no different in this industry than any other industry. It is all about the quality and the productivity of the people that you are working with.

So for lack of really being able to spend time on all those other issues, I will speak about evaluation but I really want to say that I'm very worried in this country that we're going to race towards another single solution at the expense of all the other issues that need to be addressed. Just saying we're going to have a better evaluation system and that's going to solve of our problems is really not going to work.

So part of our success is going to be around whether we are really focusing on preparation and licensure, where are the universities in all of these dialogues, why aren't we talking more to them and forcing them more to the table, recruitment, selection practices and policies, the induction period that teachers have when they first come in and the quality or lack thereof of that induction, the staffing and deployment, how to really get the best teachers working with the highest need students, all of the differentiated roles that we have to have in our system to really retain high-quality teachers. Those issues are equally as important as performance management.

I think we're focusing on this mostly because we've done such a bad job with performance management. So we need to talk about it a lot, but it really is developing capacity of teachers to work in a continuous improvement environment and developing the capacity of our principals to really give rich and important feedback around teaching and learning. And those are two things I think we really need to focus on.

So the second point I want to make is we need to really talk about what Kim has just brought forward. We again are developing systems in this country where the principal seems to be the lone ranger. The principal's going to come into the classroom, give you instead of six observations 10 observations and that's going to make all the difference in the world. It isn't.

The whole point that I think we're missing here is around teacher leadership and the capacity of teachers to help each other improve their practice. This is no different than doctors or lawyers who discuss their cases and help each other come up with good solutions.

We need to provide the time, whether it's after school or before school or in the summer or during inter sessions but help teachers find the time and structure our schools so that they can provide common understandings and get in each other classrooms and have rigorous peer review for both underperforming teachers but definitely for all teachers who are able to help each other improve.

And the other thing I like that I'm seeing in places like Atlanta and Fairfax and others is a lot of focus on the team so it's not just the individual teacher. It's how is the whole team doing, the whole third grade team, the entire math department? It's not looking at teachers in isolation but helping the team improve their productivity, and actually in Atlanta, they have a team evaluation. They both have individual accountability but the whole team is looked at in terms of an overall productivity level around their students.

I'm going to focus again one more time on why we need to really do a much more rigorous and aggressive job around either improving or exiting low-performing teachers. And I say this because it really changes the culture of a school if low-performing teachers continue to really sap some of the energy around the professional learning community.

So if the attitudes and beliefs of those teachers are not where they need to be, I think you call it a culture breaker. What did you say – a culture – I kind of like that phrase.

So we look at this a lot in New York City because principals and teachers will tell us if the attitudes and beliefs of those teachers are not in keeping with the rest of the school, it is tremendous strain on the morale. And so quality teachers will find a way out if there is a preponderance of low performing teachers who are simply allowed to be where they are and not produce more on behalf of kids.

And we also have terrible systems right now of evaluation that are anything but continuous improvement. In fact, we've treated most of our evaluation systems like legal documents.

I was working with the district last week where literally the requirement is the principal gives feedback on an observation within 24 hours and if they don't, the entire

observation is invalid. I mean, how goofy is that? So if there's an emergency in the school the next day and the principal's tied up, the entire observation is invalid. It is not a legal document.

An evaluation process should be about continuous improvement and feedback should be about helping you improve teaching and learning. And so we have got to get rid of the mindset that these are legal issues and that principals and others are held to some ridiculous standard around giving that feedback.

And that is true all the way through the process. If teachers are in jeopardy of being dismissed, the legal requirements get more and more severe all the way through the end and I think Robin's really wonderful paper highlights how much we need the states to help us in this reform effort because what we've developed over the years is a process that doesn't work for anyone. And I don't think there are any teacher unions who really believe that these processes should be about two or three years' worth of documentation.

In New York City, the average cost of this is about \$300,000 per teacher. No wonder we can't do a better job of it. And I don't think due process was ever designed to come out with that kind of result.

So we all need to get together, unions, union leadership, school leadership, to find better ways, and definitely the states as well, to find better ways to improve this very laborious process.

So I'm going to just ask for probably the opportunity, I think, that they all want to have and that is to ask your Q&A and to thank the rest of the panelists. I learned a lot today. Thank you.

MS. CHAIT: Great. I'm just going to ask a couple of questions and then open it to the audience. So several of you have talked about having constant observations, constant discussions about learning and Betsy talked about the capacity of schools to be able to do that. What needs to change in schools to enable this?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think there's not a – sorry. I think better PD, or professional development, for principals. We were talking earlier about the comfort level of many principals in our country in terms of not just observing teachers and doing different forms of observations but also in giving feedback, especially critical feedback because it is hard.

And so I think one of the things that needs to happen is better professional development for principals and administrators and coaches, instructional coaches around the country in terms of how this process should or can work.

The other thing is that I think that we need to start having conversations at schools around, not just what it, A – it's so important for teachers to always be thinking about getting better and there is no mountain top, so to speak, in terms of instruction because on

your day there's probably something or a few things that you could have done better to reach just one more child in your classroom. But also having more conversations with teachers about how this process, all of it – I think sometimes we lose sight of how everything affects the children.

And so we get very much caught up in the effect that things have on adults and what it means for adults but making – I don't know if teachers everywhere understand really how important they are and how much of a difference it makes when they're better or when they're best selves in the classroom. I think if they realized that and principals were better prepared to do this type of work and be instructional leaders in the schools then that would make a big difference.

MS. DONALDSON: Also there's the whole issue of language and really I think people in schools have been talking across each other for a while and so talking about what constitutes good teaching and talking about it over and over and over again and does it look like and going to each other's classrooms is absolutely imperative.

And I think going back to the senator's remarks, I think we should stop the reform, reform, reform where teachers and principals and everybody just gets caught up in the next thing and just focus on doing one thing and do it really well and that takes time.

So I think in answer to your question, what schools need is time and just opportunity to focus on what makes for good instruction and have those conversations built in and have people visiting each other's classrooms on an ongoing basis overtime. We can't expect this to happen overnight.

MS. URSETTA: I think there's something that is not talked about very often and that is teacher leadership. And so whenever you look at our public school system it's really based on a hierarchy where the principal is the sole keeper of knowledge and no one else knows anything or can't do anything in their school. And it's something that we try to create differently in my school is – well, obviously, we don't have a principal so we always joke about well, we'll do that when the principal comes.

But I think it's really important to look at teacher leadership just like you would in any business where we have people that have expertise in certain areas and allow them to lead.

And so, for example, when it comes to bilingual education and what's best for second language learners, that is my area of expertise and so I'm so allowed to lead those conversations and help my colleagues improve their instruction and their knowledge in that area – I have other teachers that have expertise in other areas.

And so we have to get away from this culture of fear in buildings of saying anything or being able to express your knowledge or be able to share with your colleagues what is working best for kids because principals are not the sole keepers of

knowledge of what's best for students. Teachers have a lot of expertise. And so we need to allow them to use their strengths in order to help our students as well.

MS. ARONS: And I think also the fourth thing is time is an enemy. We just don't have enough time in the day. The day is too short. We either need to extend the timeframe for teachers so that everyone is there until – I don't know – 5:00 p.m. in the afternoon and an hour after schools around team time to discuss what happened that day and what went well and how the kids are doing from that day of instruction. We need a longer timeframe in the summer.

We can't do this job in nine months anymore. Listen, this is tough job. Teaching and learning is hard and in urban environments even harder. And I think that we are kidding ourselves that we can do this on a nine-month timeframe and a six-hour day which is very typical in a lot of urban districts.

MS. CHAIT: And what could the role of the principal be as compared to the role of the teacher leaders? How do they work together in implementing this model of continuous improvement? Or how could it work?

MS. URSETTA: I think that the role of a principal needs to be very different. I think that one thing that you can do is actually become kind of the manager of making sure that all of the parts fit together, to use very simple terms, so making sure that as you're looking at different aspects of the school – for example, in my school we have four teams.

One focuses on professional development. They plan and implement all professional development or find someone they can in an area we don't have. We have another one that focuses on student data so they look at all of the intervention programs and all the different assistance that our students need whether it's from special ed through kids who are in a grey area that we're watching through gifted. We have another team – and the one that I'm on – is on peer assistance and review and so we make sure that the entire system is working well. And another one on climate and culture.

We do have co-lead teachers and their job is to make sure – well, they're one on those teams as well but they also make sure that everything is working well together, I mean, including the parents and students. And so I think it's just looking very differently at the way we organize things.

I also wanted to mention too that this idea of longer school day and longer school year, I don't think teachers are opposed to that but I don't see the districts being able to afford to extend the school year or school day. So we also need to look differently at how to use time.

At our school, our students are in school an extra hour a day and we have just arranged our teacher time differently so that our teachers are able to meet for longer periods of time and so looking at how – instead of doing just the traditional bell schedule

and looking at traditional teacher show up at 8:00 a.m. and leave at 4:00 p.m. thing – first of all, teachers don't really do that, most teachers.

But the other piece is how do we use our time differently to make sure that we're able to meet together and really talk about how our students are doing and how we're doing as teachers and whether or not we're meeting our students' needs.

MS. CHAIT: Okay. So we'll open it to the floor for questions beginning with the press first. Anyone?

Q: Hi. This is Stephen Sawchuk with *Ed Week*, again. And in the national dialogue about teacher evaluations we've talked a lot about multiple measures. And Jessica mentioned something about getting feedback from students on teacher performance and clearly people have been talking a lot about test scores and things like that but I was really interested in what other measures might be applicable, particularly student and parent feedback.

So I wanted to ask you all whether you either use that kind of feedback now or know of examples of schools or districts that routinely use that kind of feedback and whether or not you think it's appropriate to do that.

MS. ARONS: I'll start. Certainly in New York City we have quality reviews that are comprehensive reviews of the school environment and have both parent surveys and teacher surveys and in some places for our high schools, for example, student surveys as well.

And I know that there are districts that do that all the way down to the elementary level where there are, not only surveys that are done about the climate and conditions of the school but also those that are all published on the website so that any parent can look at that and principals are required to have dialogues with their faculty around the results of those surveys.

So I think that there a number of places you could find that are using school wide surveys. I don't know of many that are using individual teacher surveys that are done by students or parents around that individual teacher. Maybe you've seen that somewhere.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: At KIPP we have – and this is – we use this model nationally now. We have what's called a Healthy Schools project and so part of the Healthy Schools project is each school of the students take a pretty extensive survey as well as parents and have to answer questions like my teacher's lesson are interesting. And so it's critical that teachers get that type of feedback and know, well, how many of my kids are bored.

I think most – a self-aware teacher can see that on a daily basis but seeing that on paper that 60 percent of your kids don't think that your lessons are very interesting is crucial in having those tough conversations with teachers as well as the really powerful

conversations with teachers who are probably too humble and letting them know 90 percent of your kids think your class is absolutely awesome and then figuring out how can we – like what’s going on in that classroom that makes kids think that and how can we expand that and make that a norm in more of our classrooms.

MS. PESKE: I know that the Gates project, the Measures of Effective Teaching project is piloting in a number of districts the use of student feedback mechanisms for teacher improvement and one of those is called the Tripod survey. So if you look on the Gates website in Measures of Effective Teaching project you can learn more about it.

Q: Hello. It’s Wangui Njuguna with *Education Daily*. I have a question for Jessica. I was really interesting seeing that you start the whole process evaluation process kind of with the hiring. How do you observe the teachers before you hire them? How do you know that they know how to teach?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I think it’s important to note that you don’t ever really know for a fact until they’re in your buildings and the school year has begun. You just have a better idea.

And so when a person applies to teach at a KIPP school, one of two things happen. If the teacher is in a situation they’ve made their current principal aware that they are looking to transition out and move into another environment and it’s okay, then we can come to them and observe them in their classrooms which is ideal because you get to see them in really their own environment and you note everything from how they’ve decorated their classrooms, how their students who they’ve been working with at that point for at least a few months or seven or eight months, how they’re responding to them. If not, then we also invite teachers to come to us and come into our classrooms as a guest teacher and do a sample lesson because we just can’t hire you and not have a clue as to how you respond to students and also for us what’s also important is because we do – we do at KIPP deal a very particular demographic.

In D.C. we’re 99 – our students are 99 percent African-American and 80 percent receive free and reduced lunch. We also want to make sure that this particular demographic is – that you are an appropriate fit for this particular demographic and the only way to really – it’s nice that you tell me that you’re really excited about teaching black kids. That’s great. But I need to see you with them and I need you to – I also need you to understand the realities of teaching in an impoverished neighborhood in Anacostia or in Shaw. You need to understand what this looks like and feels like on a daily basis.

MS. PESKE: Can I just add one thing? I think what’s important to – and what we saw in a couple of the schools is that it’s not just about observing that teacher’s practice. It’s also about the conversation that happens after you see that teacher. So it’s really gauging the teacher’s capacity for receiving critical feedback and for making that critical feedback him or herself. So it’s not just about how good are you with the kids. It’s also how much do you reflect on what you just did.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm glad you said that. That is part of the process. After we watch them teach, the first question we always ask a person is how do you think that went because a lot of times I just – sometimes when you – you may see an awful lesson but if you at least know that the person recognized that that lesson was awful, that's really, really helpful.

And then often times because they're just so nervous, or a number of factors can play into something because you're kind of auditioning, what would you have done to make that lesson better because knowing, knowledge is just part of the battle. You kind of get half way there if you at least know what you did wrong and what you could do the next day to make that much better.

MS. CHAIT: And how do you evaluate a completely novice teacher? How do you determine whether they have the potential to be successful?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: We do hire – not every year and not very many but we do sometimes hire novice teachers, whether it's through Teach for America or – we also have our own kind of teacher corps, teaching fellows program within our own organization. And much of that – we actually still have them do a practice lesson to be a part of our residency program.

But it's also, you know, about attitude and so we want novice teachers to have the right attitude and understand how hard this work is, how important this work is and also how receptive they are to feedback and understanding that they're going to get a ton of feedback as well a ton of support.

MS. CHAIT: Thank you. Next question. The woman back here.

Q: I will ask a follow-up question on the issue of what I'm going to call fit and extending the widget metaphor given that we're pushing for these evaluation systems, I'm curious has anybody seen evaluation systems that pick up this issue of fit so an effective teacher in one school might not be as effective in another school with different student demographics or content or grade level. I'm curious if the practitioners or the researchers could speak to that issue.

MS. ARONS: If I can jump in for one minute. There are some personality inventories that are out there that have had some correlation to student achievement success in urban districts.

There's both a Gallup and a Haberman instrument that at least measure the attitudes and beliefs around urban students and whether or not the teacher comes with the right mindset to work with students in that environment and it does correlate slightly.

I think there's also a benefit, a strong benefit to a team interview and I have seen some districts where groups of teachers, that that teacher is actually going to work with,

are part of the interview process. So at least they can be determining if the attitude and the fit, if you will, is commensurate.

And if you believe the research that Tom Kane (sp) has done around novice teachers, there's very little that differentiates and correlates to I can guarantee you this teacher will be a success in your school regardless what kids you give them. So there's very really that correlates in advance and so maybe the fit interview is the most important thing.

MS. DONALDSON: I think to add to that we found an interesting thing in North and I believe in National CMO – correct me if I'm wrong – the fit was screened for at the interview at the CMO level and so people coming in, people who were hired to come into classroom had demonstrated some fit and then there was this – a piece of the evaluation was okay, you're fit for this organization, you fit with the organization but do you fit with the job of teacher?

And so, often – well, not often but sometimes principals told us that they would transfer a teacher out of a teaching position and into another position, an operations position or an administrative assistant position because that person demonstrated the commitment to low-income kids of color and the commitment to the North way of doing business but didn't quite have it in the classroom. And so in that way fit was sort of – it was kind of a sub-definition of fit there.

MS. CHAIT: Great. Thank you. This woman here in the green shirt.

Q: I have to stand because I can't see everybody. My name is Camsie Matis and I'm originally from Colorado and live here in D.C. now and I'm a New York City public school teacher here as an Einstein fellow so it's really exciting to see the breadth of experience on the panel and where people are coming from.

I want push a little bit more on this idea of teacher leadership because as a teacher who's worked in urban schools to 10 years and constantly getting a mix of evaluation from the chart that has just like check, check, check, check satisfactory to my current one in New York which has also a little sticker about this big was like 8.5 writing on it that says, Camsie, you do this, this, this, this, this and this well, and then to getting some sort of national recognition like national awards. I'm here as an Einstein fellow. I've been a presidential award finalist.

But how do you take the excellence that's recognized at the school level because I do think that principals do a pretty good job at the school level of letting you know that you're doing a good job? My principals all have. You know, they say it at the school level. But how do you take that and then scale it into anything beyond that?

How do you go to your union or to your district in a large urban school district like Oakland, California, or New York City and say, you know, there should be a way to give me either more time, more money, more recognition to let me do something a little

bit more than just coming to class and teaching five sections of algebra everyday and then working on the side as the team leader?

How do you take that from the school, take it to maybe the next level and then try to scale it up especially in these large urban school districts where union issues are a big deal and where the conversation isn't so easy. You can't just call up the superintendent and at least maybe in Denver he met with you guys but not in New York City and definitely not in Oakland you weren't sitting down and having a cup of coffee with the superintendent.

I'd like to see especially Kim and maybe Elizabeth talk a little bit to that about how you get that going.

MS. URSETTA: I think that's a really good question and a very hard one to answer because it's so different kind of depending on where you are.

But I think that there's a lot of examples around the country of career lattices. I'm not going to call them ladders because I think that based on your strengths and what you want to do there should be different opportunities for you to use your leadership skills around the district.

And you know, when I was the president of the Denver Classroom Teachers Association I spent a lot of time in buildings listening to what people wanted and what they needed in their schools and was able to address those issues with the superintendent, with district leadership to try and make things happen and then also just putting out own ideas and so that was what I did.

But I think it really – it starts at a school level of being able to try and create different opportunities at the school so you're not just teaching five sections of algebra and that you are able to create some different structures but it also creates – it also requires the leadership that's willing to allow other people to lead. And I think that that within education that is just a pretty rare culture.

And so it's really about getting people in the room in your school that are really bought into the mission and vision of the school and that are willing to let other people lead as well.

And as far as the district level, I have a pretty big mouth and so I have always been pretty vocal about what I need as a teacher and I think it really comes to teachers coming together and advocating for themselves and I think the union is a great way to do that.

MS. PESKE: Can I just add because this is my day job when I don't do research? So I'm working with Teach Plus and one of the things that we're trying to do is to connect reform results minded teachers to policy and to amplifying their voices in policymaking.

And so embedded in that is this idea that we absolutely essentially need teacher leadership in order to be able to advance policies that are smart and thoughtful and will make changes ultimately for students.

So last night I was with 20 of our teaching policy fellows and they're desperate to have their voices heard. And so what we talked about ways in which they can do that. And there are a lot of outlets now. They do things like they blog, they write commentary, they write in response to Stephen Sawchuk's writing on "Teacher Beat." They write articles. They present at panels. They testify both at the district and at the state and at the national level. And we encourage them to organize.

So if you don't like what your union is doing, run for building rep. Run for executive committee. You know, there are lots and lots of outlets and I think teachers often need to be encouraged to tap into them particularly teachers who are in the early to kind of second stage of their careers, years three to eight, when we know that they are gaining in effectiveness and also making decisions to lead. So I'm happy to talk more about it because I'm really interested in the subject.

MS. ARONS: I think this is one of the areas that's very exciting in this country is that we have recognized the value of teacher leadership. We're beginning in many, many places to formalize that and operationalize that. We have an expert in the room, Mark Simon, who's been working on teacher leadership for 10 years now.

And I think that there are many places including New York City where we've developed a lead teacher position where you teach half a day and you mentor and you coach a half a day. You get a \$10,000 stipend for doing that and it's only available at high-need schools so that you both stabilize that population of teachers, you really get great teachers wanting to transfer into those schools to make a difference and they really have an opportunity during the day, they share a classroom so they're only 50 percent of the day. That's the kind of structure that we need to have more of.

But listen, we've had differentiation for a long time: team leaders, department chairs. We may not have used them correctly and we may not have had always the very best teachers doing those roles but now that we know that we've gotten differentiation and we can utilize it and compensate for it, we need to just keep expanding it as Heather said.

MS. CHAIT: And I think more districts could actually take the initiative to create corps of master teachers that could then provide professional development to other teachers in the district.

MS. DONALDSON: And I just want to add that there's a really good argument to be made based on research for teacher leadership roles. There's more and more research coming out that some of the best teachers by different standards really want these roles and if they don't get them, they're going to leave. I'm thinking of a recent

study by Helen Ladd who found that value added top performing teachers wanted differentiate – that money was not going to keep them in teaching. And so what are the alternatives? Roles are a really good alternative. So I think there is a case to be made to these big districts that you're going to lose some of your best teachers if you don't invest in this way.

MS. CHAIT: Great. Thank you. This woman up here.

Q: Hi. Yes. I just wanted to ask a question looking a little bit more at what you do with the chronically ineffective teachers because I completely, 100 percent agree with the idea that the main focus should be on improving those teachers who can't improve but as a past public school teachers in rural Louisiana – which may be different than an urban district – but in rural Louisiana where I had the first eighth grade class in years that had passed the state test. You know, we were full of teachers who were chronically ineffective and nothing was done about it.

So if you could just talk a little bit more about what that should look like and then also what does it look like but where do you go once you know that you have these ineffective teachers?

MS. ARONS: I'm going to jump in. Unfortunately, or fortunately this is huge passion of mine.

The first place you need to start with a collective will. You have to say this is no longer going to be tolerated in our system, in our nation that we know that this is an area that we've ignored and neglected. We've moved teacher around for years. If it's a big district we just simply move them to another school or we've lessened the impact that they have on kids by putting them into the computer lab room or some other place.

We really have to say there's a collective will in this country where we are going to tackle this issue, we're going to seriously help these teachers, maybe for the first time, get seriously better at their craft and if they do not improve, we are going to exit them from the profession, not just from that school and put them in another building.

I'm constantly confronted with principals who are working very hard to get their level of student achievement up only to be given five or six or seven teachers from other buildings that perhaps are being closed or downsized or simply moving teachers out and they inherit these teachers and they look at you with – you know, how can you hold me accountable if you're going to continue to move teachers into my building that have been proven to be ineffective elsewhere? So collective will is number one.

The second thing is we've got to sit down with the leadership of our unions. They too are invested in this issue. If I'm a third grade teacher and accountability is holding me responsible for my student achievement and the second grade teacher down the hall continues to send me students that are a year or two behind, that is not just fair. It's not

to the third grade teacher and it's not fair to the rest of the school. So we have got to sit down with the union leadership and say what's fair.

And if peer review is the best way to go then we have to go into peer review and it must be rigorous and it has to be – the quality of support that that teacher gets has to be above reproach so that we can say we did everything in our power to help this teacher and they are still underperforming or their attitude is so bad that they refuse to try and improve. Many of these teachers are dysfunctional in other ways so we have to find ways to deal with that issue so that we can see whether or not they actually have the skill set to teach.

And at the end of the day, as I harped with Robin a million times, the states have to help us in this process and the federal government has to help us. We can't have a great teacher evaluation system, a strong peer review system and then spend two years in litigation trying to prove that this teacher cannot work with our students. I think that that is an unfair standard and it's got to change and the states are the only ones that can make that change. Okay. I'm off my soap box now.

MS. URSETTA: I just wanted to – I agree with everything that Betsy said. And I think it's really important that we are providing those supports for teachers in really raising that bar and doing the things that Jessica and I talked about with the continual conversations and the culture of continual improvement. And if you have a teacher that is ineffective and you've tried to help them and they are not able to improve, no, they should not be there.

Something that we did in Denver is around our transfer process is that if a teacher was not effective – I'm using that – you know, everyone has a different term of effective, but if you did not feel that that teacher was performing where they should be, they were not allowed to transfer. So we eliminated or tried to eliminate the process of just moving teacher from building to building and said that, no, they need to stay in that school or you either help them improve or they are no longer employed.

I am concerned with Betsy's comment about the two-year process because I don't think that that's a nationwide problem. I don't know of any – very few cases – I'm looking at Brad – where the process takes that long, in Colorado and so I don't know that that's necessarily a federal problem or might be a state or a local problem but it's not everywhere in the country, at least not in Colorado. So I'm a little cautious of moving to a national solution to something that might be a state or a local problem.

But the key, again, is the continual support and that culture of continual improvement in schools. And if we're able to do that starting from onboarding all the way through your professional development, the formative feedback to teachers, it should eliminate a lot of those problems.

MS. CHAIT: There are definitely things that states can do to help districts in this process. They could specify time limits for hearings. They could specify that dismissal

for chronic low performance is allowed and they can specify that the tenure decision should be a meaningful benchmark of performance and I think those things would all help.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I agree. I would just want to add three things. I think number one, you need better leadership because I think if you have better leadership – the school systems are kind of like the only industry that I can think of where you have a boss but the boss really can't hire and fire. That's crazy.

So you need – but I do understand that the current bosses in many cities and states aren't necessarily qualified to even make those decisions. So I think you need better leadership in schools in general and people who are truly qualified to make sound hiring and firing decisions.

Then you need a better branding nationally around the profession of teaching because I think the issue in schools like mine where I do make the hiring and firing decisions and I can fire quickly, but I've got to get somebody else in there too. And the pool right now just it's not big enough and it's certainly not good enough. And so the way, as a country we thought of the profession and the art of teaching, if that improved dramatically and we just had a better pool, obviously that would help.

And then I agree with what Betsy was saying. I don't understand why it even takes nine months. That's nine months of learning that did not happen. That's unacceptable. I don't understand why it takes six months. I don't need to prove to anybody for six months that somebody can't teach. I can see that relatively early in the year and I need to be able to get you out then while I can still salvage these kids' educational lives.

MS. CHAIT: Thank you. The woman in the back in the black sweater.

Q: Hi. I'm with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. And this particular – this administration is looking to tie teacher education programs with the quality of practicing teachers.

Did the data in your evaluation systems go back to the teacher education programs in order for us to do a better job at the pre-service level?

MS. ARONS: This is something that we have been working on in New York with our teacher institutions and we are feeding back to them the data around just standardized testing in terms of value added, your teachers graduating from your program did this on the value added data but the only state I'm aware of is Louisiana that has done that consistently with all their teacher ed programs.

MS. CHAIT: There are a couple of states that are developing that capacity now. Yes. I can't remember which.

MS. PESKE: But also just one quick point. The schools that we say the charter schools, they assume that there will be much more development needed so this notion that you're somehow prepared when you walk in on day one and that your teacher preparation program was responsible for doing that, like that's not in the way that they think about how to develop and continuously develop the teachers which is what I think you also were hearing from Jessica that it's constant reflection even if you're the best teacher in the school.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: And even if you have 15 years of experience in another setting.

MS. CHAIT: Great. This woman up here.

Q: Hi. I'm Laura O'Neill-Leone (ph). I'm here from Yale Haynes Public Charter School. And I think to build on that question, we're here talking about what is sort of contributing to teacher effectiveness once they're in the school and the focus there really being on ongoing observation and ongoing feedback.

And I kind of pose the question about how we are then best preparing teachers to enter that classroom on day one because it seems to me like it definitely supports this notion of teacher residencies in a school where teachers are really getting that practice and getting ongoing feedback sort of doing that pre-service period.

I'm wondering what your thoughts are on those residency programs and sort of strengths and weaknesses maybe of the programs.

MS. URSETTA: There's a model in Minneapolis that I'm very fond of that it works as a residency model where a new teacher would teach 75 percent of the time and then they're coached 25 percent of the time so they then have in-building coaches who would be teaching 25 percent of the time and then they're out mentoring the new teachers 75 percent of the time. And I think it's a great model and a great way to make sure that our new teachers have what they need in order to succeed but it's very costly.

We have a residency program in Denver that is just starting and it's all through grants from foundations and it's a great model. The concern is the cost.

And also whenever we're looking at where our student teachers are placed, I think we need to – both student teachers and if you come with a residency model really making sure that you're doing a good job of placing people so that they are with master teachers and finding a way to identify teachers so that they really have a quality placement as they come in through the model.

MS. DONALDSON: I'll just add, I think they're fabulous. I mean, the idea that you can learn to teach in one or two of even four years of undergraduate is just totally outdated if it was ever accurate.

We've just talked today about how complex the job of teaching is, how difficult the job of teaching is and I think we owe it to teachers and student to give teachers a graduated entry and a lot of support and scaffolding as they learn to teach.

So I think that really – the cost issue is something we need to figure out but I think this is – I hope it's the way of the future.

MS. ARONS: I think the model of residency which is excellent is only going to work if we come to grips with the understanding in this country that we put new teachers almost exclusively into high-need schools in urban districts. They get the toughest assignment, the toughest – they often don't have a classroom. They move from school building to building, classroom to classroom.

We really make it – it's almost an initiation rite to give them the toughest kids and when are we going to come to grips with that and say, our experienced, highly effective teachers need to be with the highest needs kids and then the new teachers are given assignments that they actually can kind of learn the practice and the craft with rather than go home every night and standing in the parking lot crying.

MS. CHAIT: And I think we have to close the event with that. I'd like thank all of the panelists so much for coming and I'd like to thank all of you for coming and engaging in this ongoing conversation. And I just wanted to repeat one of the senator's remarks because I think we did talk about it a lot today and I hope we continue to think about it: how are we using teacher evaluation to improve instruction and inspire people to want to stay in the profession.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

(END)