2013

A Review of Literature on Teaching Evaluation

Martin Reardon

Virginia Commonwealth University, rmreardon@vcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/merc_pubs

Part of the Education Commons

Downloaded from
http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/merc_pubs/14

This Research Report is brought to you for free and open access by the MERC (Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium) at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in MERC Publications by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.
A Review of Literature on Teaching Evaluation

Martin Reardon

METROPOLITAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH CONSORTIUM
Background

Virginia Commonwealth University and the school divisions of Chesterfield, Colonial Heights, Hanover, Henrico, Hopewell and Richmond established the Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (MERC) on August 29, 1991. The founding members created MERC to provide timely information to help resolve education problems identified by practicing professional educations.

MERCC membership is open to all metropolitan-type school divisions. It currently provides services to over 12,000 teachers and 152,000 students. MERC has based funding from its membership. Its study teams are composed of university investigators and practitioners from the membership.

MERC is organized to serve the interests of its members by providing tangible material support to enhance the practice of educational leadership and the improvement of teaching and learning in metropolitan educational settings. MERC’s research and development agenda is built around four goals:

- To improve educational decision-making through joing development of practice-driven research questions, design and dissemination,
- To anticipate important educational issues and provide leadership in school improvement
- To identify proven strategies for resolving instruction, management, policy and planning issues facing public education, and
- To enhance the dissemination of effective school practices.

In addition to conducting research as described above, MERC conducts technical and educational seminars, program evaluations, and publishes reports and brief on a variety of educational issues.
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Introduction: A Review of Literature on Teaching Evaluation

This review of the literature on teacher evaluation was developed at the invitation of the Policy and Planning Council of the Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (MERC) in the context of the current focus on teacher evaluation in Virginia. Consequently, in this document, high priority was accorded to the areas of focus formulated by the Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers (Standards, Virginia Department of Education, 2011), the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers (Guidelines, Virginia Department of Education, 2011) and The Research Base for the Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers (Research Base, Virginia Department of Education, 2011). As the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education, Superintendents Memo #136-11 explained, the Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers define what teachers should know and be able to do, and they establish a foundation upon which all aspects of teacher development from teacher education to induction and ongoing professional development can be aligned. The revised Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers incorporate these teaching standards” (p. 1).

Part 1 of the Research Base (2011) repeats the performance standards from Part 5 of the Guidelines (2011). Part 2 opens with an acknowledgment of a “high degree of alignment” (p. 12) between the seven uniform performance standards for teachers in Virginia and the standards promulgated by both the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS)—except that neither INTASC nor NBPTS include measures of student academic progress. The remainder of Part 2 provides insight into the literature that supports each standard. This insight is helpful, and perhaps all that is necessary in such a document. However, the discussion of the nine individual literature references in the one and one-half pages supporting Student Academic Progress (Standard 7) does not constitute a strong defense of the addition of a standard that is absent from both the INTASC and NBPTS standards.

The members of MERC’s Policy and Planning Council are well aware of the challenges that school divisions are facing as they conscientiously endeavor to honor the stipulations of the Guidelines (2011) in a loosely coupled system. In keeping with the context out of which the request for this literature review arose, a sense of the literature invoked in the Research Base (2011) has been taken for granted. The focus of this document, then, is on literature—predominantly recent literature—that addresses issues associated with the implementation of teacher evaluation. This emphasis on implementation is in keeping with MERC’s mission to engage in research that school divisions can use.

The Imperative for Change

In the first section of Accelerating the Agenda (2008), the National Governors Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of State Boards of Education, and the Council of Chief State School Officers joined to assert that “improvement in student learning can dramatically boost economic growth,” that “readiness for college and career remains more relevant today than ever before,” that “U.S. students are exiting high school with weaker skills than their counterparts of 20 years ago,” and that “it is up to states to lead this charge for college- and career-readiness” (pp. 3-5). These beliefs have been supported by the national policies that have been in place throughout the current U.S. Presidency.
According to the Executive Director of Research and Strategic Planning at the Virginia Department of Education, the purpose of Virginia’s focus on teacher evaluation is to improve student achievement with a particular focus on high-poverty and/or persistently low-performing schools (Jonas, 2011, personal communication). According to Jonas (2011, personal communication), in terms of the Standards (2011), the rationale underpinning teacher evaluation is that the performance of students is likely to show strong and measurable learning gains (the seventh standard) if students are taught by teachers whose practice exemplifies the first six standards (professional knowledge, instructional planning, instructional delivery, assessment of and for learning, learning environment, and professionalism). The evaluation of teachers using “multiple ways over time” (Guidelines, 2011, p. 41), the rationale continues, will reliably measure teacher’s ability to add value to students’ learning and drive professional development, or, in extreme cases, provide grounds for dismissal.

This entire rationale is plausible at the policy level, but there are inherent subtleties in its implementation. For example, there is evidence for a decrease in returns attributable to teachers’ learning “on-the-job” up to about the third year of teaching, with a plateau thereafter (Henry, Bastian, & Fortner, 2011). A body of research confirms that students taught by teachers who are in the second year of teaching post larger average achievement gains than similar students in similar schools who are taught by beginning teachers (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2006; Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2007, 2010; Goldhaber, 2007; Kane, Rockhoff, & Staiger, 2008; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005). In the same way, the students of teachers in their third year of teaching post analogous but less large average achievement gains compared to the students of their second-years peers (Boyd et al., 2006; Kane et al., 2008; Staiger & Rockoff, 2010).

However, the magnitude of the statistically significant gains that have been reported in these years during which there is consensus that the greatest changes take place translate into educational differences that would be arguably invisible to a supervisor. For example, Henry, Bastian, and Fortner (2011) cite the first-year, second-year, and third-year teacher deficits in their North Carolina study as -0.043, -0.010, and -0.001 standard deviation units respectively. The question for the supervisor is how deficits of this magnitude can be detected in the walk-through conducted last week, in the third hour formal observation of a teacher scheduled for the first Tuesday in March, in the returns from a teacher’s student survey, in a teacher’s student goal setting report, or in the penultimate section of a teachers’ annual review portfolio—to list just a few of the teacher evaluation approaches explored in the Guidelines (2011). Further challenging the nexus between performance on the first six standards and student academic performance gains, Henry et al. concluded that “prior research has overestimated returns to experience, as both teacher on-the-job training and the differential attrition of less effective teachers contribute to the apparent gains in average first- and second-year teachers’ effectiveness” (p. 278).

This rest of this document is divided into four non-exclusive, conceptually related sections. Section 1 provides a thumbnail sketch of the history of teacher evaluation leading up to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, 2002). In the five or six years prior to the NCLB milestone, an informal consensus emerged about the elements of best practice in teacher evaluation, and how these elements could be incorporated into viable models. These models remain viable, and 10 of them were incorporated to varying degrees in the models proposed in the Guidelines (2011). Section 2 provides an overview of aspects of the legacy consensus in the light of the post-NCLB literature. Section 3 sharpens the focus of the preceding discussion, looking specifically at literature from the past five years. Section 4 suggests
In a comprehensive overview of teacher evaluation up to the mid-1990s, Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) drew attention at the outset to the fact that formal evaluation of teachers is a relatively recent phenomenon. They described the practice as “virtually unknown until the turn of the 20th century” (p. 9), but even then not gaining momentum until the 1970s. They identified *A Nation at Risk* (1984) as a significant catalyst, but they critiqued the widespread adherence to practices of teacher evaluation as “motivated as much by the enactment of state legislative requirement as the desire to improve the professional status of teachers” (p. 9). It would indeed be the exceptional school division that did not highly value the improvement of the professional status of its teachers, but it is also unlikely that as much effort would be being expended to implement defensible teacher evaluation processes in the absence of legislative requirements.

Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) also listed three challenges for the future of teacher evaluation that have proved to be prescient: (a) the association of teacher evaluation with merit pay, (b) the decision about who should be involved in the evaluation process, and (c) the untangling of the differential impact of teaching styles, contexts, and social environments on student achievement. Further, they pointed out the inherent difficulty of combining the functions of formative (developmentally oriented) and summative (oriented to the meeting of consumers’ needs) evaluations (Scriven, 1967), and mused that “history may record that (the formative and summative functions) are incompatible unless they are controlled and administered separately” (p. 31).
Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) referred to earlier work in laying out 15 models of “ways to evaluate teachers that implicitly define good teaching” (p. 175). These models (listed with contemporary references in Table 1) cover the gamut of teacher evaluation, and provide a useful reference point. They are models in the sense that they focus on the main concepts of teacher evaluation that the authors of various approaches aligned with these models believe are important. In the first column of Table 1, the distinctive feature of model is followed by a reference to the Guidelines (2011), where appropriate. The comments in Table 1 are offered as brief explanations, and to suggest some noteworthy contemporary instances. The first four models rely on classroom observation.

Five years after Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) and shortly before the NCLB (2002) landmark, Peterson (2000) made the point that using student achievement as evidence of teacher quality made sense—especially to noneducators—and that omitting such a yardstick from a measure of teacher quality was “not credible to many audiences” (p. 136). Of course, in NCLB, student achievement was enshrined as the yardstick, regardless of sense or credibility. However, Peterson went on to highlight three problems associated with the use of student achievement as a yardstick of teacher quality that are still relevant today: (a) teacher quality and student achievement are logically but only indirectly associated (e.g., student disinterest can lessen the impact of the most brilliant teaching), (b) the collection of defensible data on teacher effects on student achievement is technically difficult (e.g., questionable validity and reliability of measures), and (c) such a yardstick distorts the education system (e.g., potentially downplaying important non-tested aspects of schooling like the ability of students to collaborate with others or think critically). As Peterson wryly summarized, student achievement is “a most compelling source for teacher evaluation, if only evaluators can defensibly get it for the teacher under review” (p. 136). Assuredly, this is still the crux of the matter.

**Section II: After NCLB**

The teacher evaluation process gained considerable traction as one component of the imperative to leave no child behind educationally. NCLB (2002) was intentionally designed to usher in a new era in public education. The hallmark of the new era was that teachers and principals would be held accountable for student achievement. In order for teachers and principals to be accountable, they had to be evaluated. The rationale of NCLB was that better teachers teach students whose achievements meet the standards as defined by the state. As Harris (2011) asserted, teachers and principals should only be held accountable for what they can control, and some highly skilled teachers may be judged harshly if measured by student achievement on state-mandated tests because of factors beyond their control like class size (Glass, Cahen, Smith, & Filby, 1982; Mosteller, 1995), teacher qualifications (Ferguson, 1991), or school size (Monk & Haller, 1993). Some students are motivated by excellent teachers in non-academic areas in which achievement is not measured on state tests, and some involved in education (e.g., excellent librarians and superb counselors) have an even more indirect effect on student achievement in state-mandated tests (Amrein-Beardsley & Collins, 2012).

The simple global concept that teacher and principal accountability will produce improved academic outcomes for students became even more complex as, over time, the national policy was customized at the state level, adapted at division level, and implemented at the individual school level. Principals had been evaluating the teachers in their schools well before NCLB (2002), but the conduct of those evaluations had been seen of part of the professional duty of the principal—as an indication that the principal took seriously his or her
instructional leadership role. NCLB’s insistence on accountability initiated an evaluative approach that cast principals in a different role. A year into the NCLB era, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF, 2003), in considering how to build professionally rewarding career paths in teaching (and thereby stem the hemorrhaging of teachers from the profession), cited “countless studies,” to support the engagement of teachers in the analysis of their own profession, (a) because the complexity of teaching renders the reliance on a single source problematic (the variety of contexts in which a teacher teaches are unlikely to be adequately assessed by a single source of information), and (b) because no single source of data is “valid or feasible for each and every teacher in a school district” (p. 215). The chapters included in Stronge’s (2006) text provide a list of multiple sources of data:

- Classroom-based assessment of teaching & learning
- Client surveys
- Student achievement
- Portfolios
- Teacher self-evaluation

Section III: More Recent Perspectives

Even in pilot projects, (value-added methodology) estimates of teacher effectiveness that are based on data for a single class of students should not be used to make operational decisions because such estimates are far too unstable to be considered fair or reliable.

Letter Report to the U.S. DOE on the Race to the Top Fund, Board on Testing and Assessment, National Academy of Sciences (p. 10)

The one source of data that was missing in Stronge’s (2006) text that has received a great deal of attention in recent years is the use student achievement test scores to evaluate teachers. The most visible of the approaches towards the end of the last century to show the impact on student achievement scores of effective and ineffective teachers were associated with the work of Sanders and his colleagues in Tennessee (for example, Sanders & Rivers, 1996; see Reardon, 2011).

The early and subsequent work in this field has been called into question by those who are skeptical of both the validity and reliability of the results as applied to
individual teachers. For example, in recent years, the Board on Testing and Assessment (BOTA, 2009) applauded the Race to the Top Fund emphasis on the removal of legislative obstacles in any funded state to the creation of data systems that link students and teachers—a necessary prerequisite for the use of student achievement data as measures of teacher quality. However, the caveat from BOTA at the start of this section is only one of their cautions. BOTA’s concerns grew from supporting literature, and similar reservations have been expressed subsequently (Schochet & Chiang, 2010). For example, Baker et al. (2010) cited a study that found that “students’ fifth grade teachers were good predictors of their fourth grade test scores” (p. 2). Even in the absence of an outcome that is as startling as that discussed by Baker et al., Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, and Rothstein (2012) suggested that when the specific class or grade-level assignment was a stronger predictor of the value-added rating than the teacher, then reference to a teacher effect was problematic.

Reardon (2011) set student percentile growth modeling (Virginia’s version of value-added growth modeling) in the context of the value added literature. In summary, Reardon agreed that Betebenner’s (2009) intentional retreat from the accuracy of individual student scores to percentile ranking avoided some of the more obvious pitfalls of score-based value-added approaches.

However, score-based value-added measures do have a role in research (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012). In an edited volume that gathered the papers from a 2008 conference on teacher effects hosted by the University of Notre Dame’s Center for Research on Educational Opportunity, Kelly (2012) cited data from Milwaukee and surmised that the primary reason that children in schools serving neighborhoods with high concentrations of poverty score lower on achievement tests is the influence of high-poverty home and neighborhood environments—not low teacher quality. Kelly’s surmise is supported by the findings of a much earlier longitudinal study by Entwistle, Alexander, and Olson (1997) that noted nearly identical achievement growth across high- and low-SES schools, except in summer when SES-related educational opportunities varied widely. The Entwistle et al. finding was replicated by Downey, von Hippel, and Hughes (2008), and highlighted by Darling-Hammond et al. (2012). The point is that a solid body of evidence fails to support the attribution of the most “obvious” student achievement discrepancies—those across schools—to variance in teacher quality.

When it comes to student achievement discrepancies within schools, however, Konstantopoulos (2012) asserted that student achievement varies considerably depending on which teacher the student is assigned. Konstantopoulos cited research from the past 30 years to support his assertion, although three of the four works he cited are much more recent than that time range suggests (Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rowan, Correnti, & Miller, 2002).

If student achievement varies considerably depending on the teacher, then it is reasonable to suggest that the characteristics of the teacher may be at least partially responsible. There are many list of characteristics of effective teachers, but one comprehensive list is that provided by Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005), who suggested that effective teachers

- Understand subject matter deeply and flexibly;
- Connect what is to be learned to students’ prior knowledge and experience;
- Create effective scaffolds and supports for learning;
- Use instructional strategies that help students draw connections, apply what they’re learning, practice new skills, and monitor their own learning;
♦ Assess student learning continuously and adapt teaching to student needs;
♦ Provide clear standards, constant feedback, and opportunities for revising work; and
♦ Develop and effectively manage a collaborative classroom in which all students have membership.

There is great scope for evaluating teacher performance on any one of the above seven characteristics through observation, or any of the other approaches that honor the context of teaching. However, a strong incentive for turning to more quantitative approaches has been the noteworthy failure of conventional, qualitatively oriented evaluation processes to promote improvement in student achievement.

There are many instances in the literature where researchers have critiqued the conventional processes. For example, von Frank (2011) focused on a district where 99% of the 12,000 teachers were rated satisfactory or outstanding and “nearly half of high school teachers received perfect scores” (p. 32). This was a high-performing district, but as von Frank commented “many in the district agreed the evaluations must be misleading” (p. 32). Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhearn, and Keeling (2009) concluded from a twelve-district, four-state study that “a teacher’s effectiveness—the most important factor for schools in improving student achievement—is not measured, recorded, or used to inform decision-making in any meaningful way” (p. 1). The New Teacher Project (2007) found that “87% of (Chicago’s) 600 schools, including 69 schools that the city declared to be failing, did not issue a single ‘unsatisfactory’ teacher rating between 2003 and 2006” (Toch, 2008, p. 32).

Donaldson (2010) referred to a situation in which teacher evaluations were full of valentines—“vague, meaningless praise—largely devoid of constructive criticism or concrete feedback” (p. 54). As suggested above, it would be expected that teachers within any school would vary across a list of characteristics of effectiveness as impressive as that provided by Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005). Donaldson cited her earlier research in which she showed that “on the whole, teacher evaluation has not substantially improved instruction” (p. 54). Danielson (2002) insisted that the two fundamental purposes of teacher evaluation were “quality assurance and professional learning” (p. 64), so clearly something is amiss if improved instruction was not evident as a result of teacher evaluation. Donaldson proposed that one of the reasons for the ineffectiveness of teacher evaluations in promoting improved instruction were the valentines that instructional leaders awarded to teachers.

Section IV: At the Cutting Edge

*If you select the right measures, you can provide teachers with an honest assessment of where they stand in their practice that, hopefully, will serve as their launching point for their development.*

Thomas J. Kane, Harvard Graduate School of Education, MET Director

Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein (2012) referred to “a growing consensus that evidence of teacher contributions to student learning should be part of teacher evaluation systems, along with evidence about the quality of teacher practices” (p. 8). Darling-Hammond et al. went on to recommend the use of professional standards to evaluate teachers because evaluations based on the professional standards (for example, INTASC standards) “produce ratings that are much more stable than value-added measures” (p. 13). Darling-Hammond et al. highlighted the work of the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project in this area.

The MET project was a three-year endeavor funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to “identify great
teaching and empower teachers to help students to succeed” (http://www.metproject.org/more.php). The culminating findings of MET were released in January, 2013, when Kane made the comment quoted at the start of this Section in an interview for Education Week (Sawchuk, 2013). Taking into account the elegance of the research design, the participation of 3,000 teachers from seven widely dispersed and diverse school districts, the credentials of the principal investigators, and the caliber of the research partners, MET represents a definitive snapshot of the state of the art in terms of teacher evaluation at this time.

As indicated on the MET website, MET researchers collected data in five areas related to effective teaching (http://www.metproject.org/more/components.php). The understanding supporting the research in these five areas emerged from an interpretation of Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2005) to the effect that “the teacher has more impact on student learning than any other factor controlled by school systems, including class size, school size and the quality of after-school program, or even which school a student is attending” (MET, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d, 2010e, p. 1 in each document). Short explanations of the five areas are as follows:

1. **Student achievement gains on state standardized tests and supplemental tests**

MET calculated two value-added estimates—one based on the particular state’s assessment scores, and another based on supplemental tests, including the ACT QualityCore series for Algebra I, English 9, and Biology, the Balanced Assessment in Mathematics for grades 4 through 8, and the Stanford 9 Open-ended Reading Assessment for grades 4 through 8 (MET, 2010c).

2. **Classroom observations and teacher reflections**

MET investigated teachers’ classroom instruction styles. Videos of classroom teaching accompanied by written commentary, supporting/contextual material, and the personal reflections of the teacher were analyzed by trained and supervised analysts (MET, 2010a).

3. **Teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge**

As the Research Base (2011) also notes, Shulman (1986) discussed pedagogical content knowledge as the second of three categories of content knowledge—a knowledge that “goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension...of content knowledge that embodies the aspects of content most germane to its teachability” (p. 9). Prior to Shulman’s article, Byrne (1983) had stressed also the importance of both content knowledge and how to teach that content. Teachers involved in the MET project took assessments to evaluate their pedagogical content knowledge in relation to, for example, their ability to evaluate student understanding and diagnose common student errors (MET, 2010b).

4. **Student perceptions of the classroom instructional environment**

MET utilized surveys developed over the past decade by Cambridge Education to “assess whether or not students agree with a variety of statements designed to measure seven teaching practices” (MET, 2010d, p. 1) that have been shown to be related to higher average student achievement scores.

5. **Teachers’ perceptions of working conditions and support at their schools**

MET (2010e) cited the work of Ladd (2009) who, from a North Carolina study, concluded that “working conditions variables account for 10 to 15 percent of the explained variation in math and reading scores across schools, after controlling for individual and school level characteristics of schools” (p. 37).
The essence of the findings from analyzing the “unprecedented data collected by the MET project over the past three years” (Measures of Effective Teaching, 2013, p. 21) include:

- Student perception surveys and classroom observations can provide meaningful feedback to teachers,
- Training and certification of observers, and averaging the observations of multiple lessons by different observers can boost the reliability of observations,
- Student learning gains can help identify groups of teachers who are helping students learn more (MET uses the term “cause” to describe the impact of effective teachers because of the random assignment of students to classrooms, however the random assignment was not strongly maintained), and
- A balanced approach in which student achievement gains account for between 33% and 50% of the evaluation leads to more consistent teacher evaluations.

The findings from MET demand attention for the reasons highlighted above. The arbitrary allotment 40% of a teacher’s evaluation to measures of student achievement stipulated in the Guidelines (2011) is supported by the MET findings. The classroom observations conducted in the context of MET were focused on Domains 2 and 3 of Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (originally published in 1996). The use of Danielson’s Framework has been greatly facilitated by a wide range of support functions (see http://www.danielsongroup.org/article.aspx?page=frameworkforteaching). These support functions have encouraged large-scale implementation of the Framework (for example, it is the default approach to teacher evaluation in Maryland). A strong alternative approach is that offered by Marzano’s (2013) Teacher Evaluation Model. These two are arguably the most prominent current approaches to digitally enabled observations as part of teacher evaluation, and both offer extensive support for the task. Instructional leaders can activate remote video recorders in teachers rooms, share videos of exemplary teaching episodes from extensive pre-coded video libraries, and communicate with teachers in a social network environment. Although both Danielson and Marzano make strong claims for the scientific basis for their observational approaches, McCutcheon’s caveat that an observation tool limits what is perceived—maybe to the point where the observation may “misrender the classroom” (p. 9) is well made.

The MET findings regarding the training and utilization of observers point to the need to invest in developing expertise among a number of observers, who will then conduct multiple observations. If approached in the most obvious way (intensive professional development of large numbers of observers), the MET finding in this regard seems quite impractical in the absence of the financial backing that MET enjoyed. However the inability to mimic the research conditions should not discourage close approximations. One such local approximation will serve to conclude this section.

In an endeavor to maximize the return for the investment of resources in raising student achievement, a current research project is establishing a blueprint that leverages the sociology of teacher evaluation (Peterson, 2004) and peer review in a systemic approach to instructional improvement. The blueprint touches many of the bases of improvement that have been addressed in this review of literature. The blueprint utilizes withinschool instructional rounds (City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel, 2009) staffed by teachers to take the academic pulse of the school. In brief overview, the learning from the instructional rounds visits constitutes the input into small professional learning community structures, out of
which lesson study visits are motivated and debriefed. According to the blueprint, this entire process continues throughout the year, with two instructional rounds visits per semester. In a test-bed middle school, participants in this blueprint trial have observed noticeable positive changes over the course of 18 months in both student engagement and lesson structure. Students’ perspectives on hope and engagement are being gathered by means of an externally administered survey. Whether through this blueprint or other alternative approaches that build on the literature, perhaps the gathering of data from multiple sources through the use of multiple approaches can enable a reasonable approximation to best practice.

**Conclusion**

Teacher evaluation remains a signature task for instructional leadership in schools. The *Guidelines* (2011) constrain a range of percentages of the evaluation of various teachers’ performance, but, to a large degree, alternative approaches for the remaining percentage for some teachers, and the total percentage for the majority of teachers, is at the discretion of the school division. Thus, for the majority of teachers, the evaluation model that is implemented is constrained only by the policy adopted in the school division. It is this context that an overview of the extant literature is most relevant. The development of systemic approaches which approximate best-practice, well-funded research, and seek to optimize the return from the considerable resources committed to teacher evaluation may generate a collaborative professional culture that manifests and facilitates the ongoing refinement of effective teaching.
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