



NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER
FOR **TEACHER QUALITY**

Summary of
**“Expert Forum on the Evaluation of Teachers
of English Language Learners”**

JULY 2012

Forum Summary

Forum Summary

Summary of

**“Expert Forum on the Evaluation of Teachers
of English Language Learners”**

July 2012

BACKGROUND

In response to federal initiatives such as Race to the Top (RTTT), Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waiver requests, and the Teacher Incentive Fund competition, states have made dramatic changes in their policies related to teacher evaluation during the past three years. Historically, teacher evaluation systems have been developed at the district level and have relied heavily on principals' assessments of teacher performance based on annual classroom observations. In contrast, Race to the Top requires states to create fair and transparent teacher evaluation systems that: (1) are developed in collaboration with teachers; (2) use multiple rating categories; and (3) include student growth data as a significant factor in determining teacher effectiveness. Evaluations of teachers must be conducted annually to inform decisions related to professional development, compensation, retention, tenure, certification, and removal.

These requirements have also been included in the U.S. Department of Education's ESEA flexibility waiver request process. To qualify for these waivers, states must commit to developing and implementing a teacher evaluation system that will improve instruction and increase student learning. The evaluation system must: include at least three performance levels; use multiple measures of performance, including student growth; evaluate teachers on a regular basis; provide educators with constructive feedback; and use evaluation data to inform personnel decisions. In response to ESEA waiver and RTTT application requirements, states and districts across the country are currently designing and implementing new teacher evaluation systems. These systems are being developed at a rapid pace, and most have not fully addressed the challenges that are specific to evaluating teachers of English language learners (ELLs).

In response to this need in the field, the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center) convened a forum of distinguished experts in December 2011 to discuss current efforts to develop evaluation systems designed to assess how well teachers of ELLs are educating these students. Forum participants worked to identify challenges to the development of these systems and to provide recommendations to states and districts for creating them. The agenda for the TQ Center's expert forum can be found in Appendix A of this document. The participant list appears in Appendix B.

Current Efforts Related to Teacher Evaluation and ELLs

The TQ Center is a national resource center dedicated to improving the quality of teaching—especially in high-poverty, low-performing, and hard-to-staff schools—and providing guidance to ensure that highly qualified teachers are serving students with special needs. To support the implementation of meaningful reform in state and district teacher evaluation systems, the TQ Center has developed a broad spectrum of tools, guides, and briefs regarding teacher evaluation, such as **A Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems**. In addition, the TQ Center has published numerous reports related specifically to teachers of ELLs and focused on recruiting, preparing, licensing, and evaluating these teachers. For example, a 2010 research and policy brief, **Challenges in Evaluating Special Education Teachers and English Language Learner Specialists**, outlines the issues associated with evaluating teachers of ELLs and highlights policy and practice recommendations.

The TQ Center has identified eight essential components of designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems. They include: specifying evaluation system goals; securing and sustaining stakeholder investment and cultivating a strategic communication plan; selecting measures; determining the structure of the evaluation system; selecting and training evaluators; ensuring data integrity and transparency; using teacher evaluation results; and evaluating the system. These components are applicable to all teachers, including those who instruct ELLs.

TESOL P–12 Professional Teaching Standards. Over the past decade, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has worked collaboratively with Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) to develop performance-based standards for programs that prepare teachers of ELLs. Diane Staehr-Fenner, Ph.D., president of DSF Consulting and TESOL/NCATE program coordinator, described the TESOL P–12 Professional Teaching Standards. The standards include five interactive domains (language, culture, instruction, assessment, and professionalism) and 11 standards (e.g., language acquisition and development, planning for standards-based teaching of English as a second language (ESL) and content instruction, and classroom-based assessment for ESL). These standards were designed in 2001 and then revised in 2009. Evaluators use these standards to determine if ESL teacher preparation programs meet NCATE requirements for national recognition. Institutions of higher education voluntarily request this evaluation to underscore the credibility of their ESL programs. TESOL has reviewed approximately 250 programs to date.

TESOL has also published *Preparing Effective Teachers of English Language Learners*, which applies the TESOL P–12 Professional Teaching Standards for: (1) creating new or revised ESL teacher education programs; (2) preparing ESL teacher education programs for NCATE/CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) review; and (3) providing professional development to all teachers of ELLs (including content/general education and ESL/bilingual teachers).

States are beginning to use these standards. Florida, for example, requires elementary education preparation programs to infuse the TESOL standards throughout their curricula. Participants commented that they would like to see all teacher preparation programs—not just those that prepare ELL specialists—incorporate these standards.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The National Board is a nonprofit organization that has developed professional standards for effective instruction to improve the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms across the country. In order to receive National Board Certification, teachers voluntarily complete a rigorous process to demonstrate that they meet NBPTS standards. Lisa Stooksberry, the National Board’s chief standards and assessment officer, described the Board’s “English as a New Language Standards,” which were developed for teachers who serve ELLs between the ages of 3 and 18. The standards include two different pathways: content and language. The content pathway is for those who teach core subjects to ELLs. The language pathway is for teachers who focus on language development. The nine NBPTS standards include: knowledge of students; knowledge of culture and diversity; home, school, and community connections; knowledge of the English language; knowledge of English language acquisition; instructional practice; assessment; teacher as learner; and professional leadership and advocacy.

In contrast to the TESOL/NCATE standards, which are focused on teacher preparation programs, the National Board standards are directed toward teachers who have been practicing for at least three years. The National Board standards were developed through a process of deliberation with experts and practitioners in the field. The standards were revised in 2010 under the leadership of Diane Staehr-Fenner.

When invited to comment on research related to the National Board standards, Drew Gitomer, Ph.D., observed that a comparison of the impact on student performance of National Board-certified versus noncertified teachers found a modest difference favoring the Board-certified teachers (Cantrell, Fullerton, Kane, & Staiger, 2008). Dr. Gitomer further commented that in the context of this comparison, large numbers of individual scores were clustered around the cut score, which was quite high. Consequently, scores that just exceeded the cut and scores that fell just below it might not be statistically different. This study included a broad range of teachers and did not focus specifically on teachers of ELLs.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Education Foundation Educator Evaluation for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (E3TL). Giselle Lundy Ponce, associate director of the AFT's Educational Issues Department, described the E3TL Consortium, which is supported by an Investing in Innovation Fund (i3) grant. The E3TL Consortium has been working in 10 districts in New York and Rhode Island to develop and implement comprehensive performance-based teacher evaluation systems that include standards for the effective instruction of ELLs and students with disabilities. The evaluation instrument and process is based on Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*, but the *Framework* was modified in New York and Rhode Island to fit their unique contexts. As part of its work, the Consortium brought in experts to assess each performance indicator and to make adaptations to the rubric to ensure that it fully addressed effective teaching for ELLs and students with disabilities. In conducting this work, ELL specialists worked collaboratively with their mainstream colleagues. Teacher involvement from the onset created buy-in for the system and resulted in less pushback related to implementation.

The AFT team has also developed an evaluator certification process to ensure that evaluators are trained to be as precise and objective as possible. Certified evaluators, a mix of administrators and peers, will evaluate each teacher at different times during the school year. The final evaluation of the teacher will be a compilation of the three observations. Each observation takes approximately 30 minutes and is preceded by a preconference and followed by a postconference. Consequently, the process is time-consuming. In addition to issues related to the time required for evaluations, other challenges include building local capacity to implement a new evaluation system, training evaluators to recognize effective instructional practices for ELLs, and securing buy-in from school leaders and teachers. Despite these challenges, there has been a generally positive response from the districts that are involved in the initiative.

Stanford Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observation. Susan O'Hara, Ph.D., executive director of the Center to Support Excellence in Teaching (CSET) at the Stanford University School of Education, described how her work is an extension of Dr. Pam Grossman's focus on examining instructional practices of secondary English language acquisition (ELA) teachers through the Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observation (PLATO). PLATO is a research-based classroom observation protocol that includes 13 elements of ELA classroom instruction, two of which are related to accommodations for ELLs. PLATO was validated with standardized test scores in ELA

and writing assessments. The student sample was diverse and included many ELLs. PLATO has been used in several studies of ELA instruction and is currently being used in large-scale studies of teacher quality, such as the Gates Measures of Effective Teaching.

Dr. O'Hara noted that PLATO instructional practices align with the language arts strand of Common Core. Her team is articulating that connection more clearly through the development of the Academic Language and Literacy in Every Subject (ALLIES) Core Practices protocol. The protocol will assess the teaching practices that are most critical to developing the academic language of ELLs in content area classrooms.

As part of the development of ALLIES, Dr. O'Hara led a Delphi study of 22 experts in the field of academic language and literacy of ELLs to explore instructional practices that are associated with the academic language and literacy development of ELLs in content area classrooms. Her team has identified core practices and is in the process of developing rubrics to measure different levels of implementation of these practices. Examples of core practices include supporting student interaction using academic language and training students to read complex texts.

Dr. O'Hara's goal is to help teachers identify language demands in lessons, tasks, and texts that students will be using and then to modify their instruction so it is appropriate for ELLs. To meet the need for professional development that aligns with best practices, her team will design professional development to help teachers clearly understand and implement core instructional practices that are particularly effective for ELLs.

National Evaluation of Title III Implementation Supplemental Report: Exploring Approaches to Setting English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitoring English Learner Progress. This 2012 report was coauthored by two of the forum's participants, Gary Cook of the Wisconsin Center for Educational Research (WCER) and Robert Linqunti of WestEd. The report is one of a number of studies related to the larger evaluation of the Title III program that have been conducted by researchers at American Institutes for Research (AIR).

The U.S. Department of Education commissioned AIR to evaluate the Title III program to determine how, and how well, states are implementing Title III provisions; how state policies translate into district practices; and how well ELLs are mastering grade-level content and improving their English language proficiency. In this report, the authors examined approaches to: setting meaningful performance standards and accountability criteria for ELLs; analyzing data to determine English language proficiency standards; developing expected time frames for ELLs to attain the English language proficiency standards; and accounting for ELLs' English language proficiency levels when setting expectations for content area progress.

Challenges in Evaluating Teachers of ELLs

Tricia Miller, Ph.D., director of the TQ Center, provided a general overview of the current context of teacher evaluation and the challenges that states and districts face. Forum participants then discussed a range of issues related specifically to evaluating teachers of ELLs. These issues include:

Limited Research Base on Effective Instruction for ELLs. Forum participants agreed that while there has been more research focused on effective instruction of ELLs in the past decade, there is still a very weak research base compared with the research base on the effective instruction of English proficient students. The National Reading Panel report, released in 2000, cited approximately 450 experimental studies focused on developing reading skills in students in grades K–12. A 2006 panel report focused on ELLs (August & Shanahan) identified only 50 experimental studies related to effective writing and reading instruction for ELLs. The research base related to effective ELL instruction in mathematics, social studies, and science is even more limited. Without a strong research base, it is difficult to develop evidence-based evaluation systems.

Reliable, Valid Assessment of ELLs' English Knowledge and Skills. Evaluation decisions are only as valid as the data used to make those decisions. A major concern is that the validity and reliability of assessments administered in English to ELLs may be seriously compromised when the students are not sufficiently proficient in English (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999; Durán, 1989). Because of language barriers for ELLs, these assessments might not fully measure students' skills and content knowledge. For example, ELLs may need more time than monolingual students to complete written tests because they tend to process text in a second language more slowly (Mestre, 1984; Rincón, 1980). They may know different vocabulary items in each of their languages, making it difficult to assess their total vocabulary knowledge with an instrument that uses only one of their languages (García & Pearson, 1994). ELLs may have well-developed cognitive skills that support comprehension, such as integrating background knowledge with textual knowledge or drawing inferences across propositions; but they may not be able to apply these skills to text because their limited English proficiency interferes with their ability to access enough of the text's meaning. Similarly, assessments developed for and/or normed on the dominant group in a society may pose issues of cultural bias for language-minority students from different ethnic/racial/national groups and socioeconomic classes (García & Pearson, 1994; Mercer, 1979; Samuda, 1975).

When analyzing data related to ELLs, it is also important to understand issues that arise from the instability of the ELL subgroup. ELLs who have attained proficiency in English move out of the subgroup, leaving only students who are not proficient in English. Tracking the progress of this subgroup can be a significant challenge when the composition of the subgroup is constantly changing.

Incorporating Measures of Student Learning in Evaluation Systems. Many states and districts incorporate student assessment data into their teacher evaluation systems. All of these models attempt to make a causal argument about the teacher's impact on student learning; but the models are built on assumptions, many of which are problematic, particularly when evaluating teachers of ELLs. One key assumption is that responsibility for learning can be assigned to an individual teacher. However, because ELLs also learn language outside of the classroom, and because they are often served by a variety of educators in a school, it is extremely difficult to attribute student learning to a particular teacher, or even to a particular school. A second assumption is that standardized tests validly and reliably assess students' content knowledge, which may not be the case (as indicated above). A third assumption is that standardized assessments adequately capture growth. Models that are used to predict growth for native English speakers may not be appropriate for use with ELLs because the rates of growth for ELLs might be different.

Variation in Instructional Settings. A complication related to evaluating teachers of ELLs is that ELLs can be instructed in many settings, and effective practices may differ depending on the setting in which ELLs receive instruction. For example, effective teaching in a mainstream class may entail more scaffolding for ELLs than effective teaching in a classroom where all other students are ELLs. In a classroom where all students are ELLs, effective teaching may require creative methods to enable ELLs to interact in English with native English speakers, which is very important in helping students acquire a second language. Effective instruction in bilingual programs will require the skillful use of two languages. Using the same evaluation system to evaluate teachers in each of these settings would not be fair; nor would it provide an accurate reflection of teachers' performance.

Capacity of States and Districts. Race to the Top has pushed states to develop teacher evaluation systems quickly. The capacity to create and implement these complex systems quickly, however, is a challenge for both states and districts. As states have drafted new policies related to evaluation systems or have passed new legislation, little thought has been given to how effective instruction might differ for special populations such as ELLs. In addition, as these policies are developed, silos within state departments of education might prevent effective cross-office communication that could otherwise enable ELL experts to make recommendations for revised plans that fully incorporate effective instructional practices for ELLs. Although states are moving forward with these models, many of their plans are silent about ELLs and do not include measures of language proficiency or other measures that might be more appropriate for ELLs within the evaluation system.

For state education agencies (SEAs), moreover, providing districts with sufficient technical assistance, training, and resources requires a significant investment in personnel and time. Some states set very broad parameters for evaluation systems and allow local educational agencies (LEAs) to design their own systems. However, many LEAs have limited capacity to build solid, research-based evaluation systems. Forum participants noted that districts will need guidance and assistance to design and implement evaluation systems that are research-based and that take into account how effective instruction for ELLs may differ from effective instruction for students already proficient in English.

Unintended Consequences. Forum participants voiced concern about the development and implementation of teacher evaluation systems for teachers with ELLs in their classrooms, which are subsystems within larger accountability systems. Participants questioned how it will be possible to reduce perverse incentives—such as motivation for principals to rate teachers highly—if teacher ratings impact the schools' accountability ratings.

Stakeholder Buy-In. Finally, as many of these evaluation systems were developed, many stakeholders with expertise in the education of ELLs in states were not consulted. Consequently, stakeholders concerned about the instruction of ELLs are now speaking out to raise concern about how these systems will affect their members and the students they serve.

State and District Considerations When Designing Evaluation Systems

After highlighting the challenges related to evaluating teachers of ELLs, forum participants discussed a variety of possible responses.

Develop evaluation systems that set high standards for teachers and reflect the special knowledge and skills teachers require to effectively educate ELLs, but that can also differentiate among teachers to ensure that teachers with ELLs are included. Forum participants agreed that evaluation systems should be aligned with the Common Core State Standards in Language Arts and Mathematics and with the Next Generation Science Standards to ensure that ELLs are provided with the instruction and support they need to meet these new and challenging standards. The experts also agreed that teaching standards for teachers of ELLs should begin with standards for high-quality instruction that apply to all teachers, but should then be differentiated to include the special knowledge and skills that teachers of ELLs should exhibit in their practice.

Additional skills and knowledge required of teachers who teach ELLs might include: an understanding of the process of second language acquisition and the role that students' first language plays in learning a second language; familiarity with the cultural backgrounds of their students and how to identify instances where it would be helpful to provide background information about American culture; development of a repertoire of strategies to help ELLs access content delivered in English, including providing additional background knowledge, modeling expected student responses, and using visuals and gestures to accompany speech; development of differentiated instruction for ELLs based on first and second language proficiency and content knowledge; creation of environments that foster second language acquisition; and communication with parents who may not be literate or proficient in English. In order to ensure that evaluators are trained to recognize these specialized skills, forum participants agreed that principals and evaluators will need training on these quality instructional practices for ELLs so they know what to observe when evaluating teachers of ELLs.

Use the same basic evaluation system to evaluate mainstream teachers with ELLs in their classrooms and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teachers or bilingual specialists, with some additional differentiation for the latter two groups. Teachers interface with ELLs in different ways, depending on their roles and the types of programs in which they teach. For example, mainstream teachers teaching in English generally teach ELLs alongside English proficient students. Bilingual mainstream teachers may teach mixed classrooms of students (ELLs and English proficient students) or only students learning in their native, non-English language. ESOL specialists may teach a classroom of ELLs, a group of ELLs outside of a mainstream classroom, or a group of ELLs within a mainstream classroom. Bilingual teachers may serve as classroom teachers or as specialists. The majority of forum participants agreed that it would be preferable to use a common framework for evaluating teachers who work with ELLs, but to include additional criteria for ESOL or bilingual specialists. Use of a common framework would be easier to implement in the field.

Further, forum participants cautioned against using ESOL or bilingual certification to identify teachers of ELLs, but rather to look at the roles they play in given instructional contexts. Denver was cited as a model approach. In the Denver system, all teachers are evaluated on their ability

to improve ELLs' skills with academic language and to provide ELLs with access to grade-level content. In addition, however, components of the Denver evaluation system are differentiated based on the instructional settings in which teachers work and the roles they play in those settings.

Use multiple measures in evaluation systems. Forum participants recommended that evaluation systems include both qualitative and quantitative data to develop a better understanding of teacher effectiveness with ELLs. Outcomes other than those derived from standardized assessments could also be incorporated and might include results of curriculum-based assessments, language proficiency assessments (in English or the native language), and attendance.

Develop exemplars of teaching practice at different levels of teaching proficiency to guide evaluators in evaluating effective teaching practices for ELLs. Most current evaluation systems do not provide examples of what teaching looks like at different levels of proficiency. This makes it difficult for evaluators to validly and reliably rate teachers of ELLs. When creating these exemplars, it will be important to consider different teaching contexts. For example, effective lesson plans will differ depending on the student composition of a classroom. Classrooms with many different levels of ELLs will require more differentiation than classrooms in which all ELLs have relatively similar levels of proficiency.

Attribute growth in ELL learning to teams of educators, rather than to individual teachers. This is particularly important for teachers of ELLs, because ELLs learn language and content in a variety of settings. Thus, it is difficult to attribute learning to one educator. Moreover, accountability systems that are based on shared responsibility might foster collaboration among teachers serving ELLs. Evaluating teachers as a group may also address some of the challenges related to insufficient 'n' sizes to report out disaggregated data for this group of students. In one possible model, districts might assign a score to a school, rather than to a teacher.

Develop evaluation systems that can be linked to professional development. Participants indicated that current evaluation systems are not constructed in ways that enable them to be used for professional development purposes. The forum's experts agreed that it is important to build evaluation systems that can foster teacher development.

Connect evaluation standards to teacher preparation programs. ELL specialists often see their role as teaching language, but not content. In contrast, content teachers frequently focus only on content and not on the development of academic language. As the number of ELLs grows, it will become more common for mainstream teachers to have ELLs in their classrooms. To address this need, forum participants agreed that all teachers should be prepared to teach ELLs. High-quality teaching standards that are linked to evaluation systems should also be used to guide knowledge and skills developed in teacher preparation programs.

REFERENCES

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language-minority children and youth*. (Executive summary). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/projects/archive/nlpreports/Executive_Summary.pdf
- Cantrell, S., Fullerton, J., Kane, T., & Staiger, D. (2008). *National Board certification and teacher effectiveness: Evidence from a random assignment experiment*. Retrieved from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~pfpie/pdf/National_Board_Certification.pdf
- Cook, G., Linquanti, R., Chinen, M., & Hyekyung, J. (2012). *National evaluation of Title III implementation supplemental report: Exploring approaches to setting English language proficiency performance criteria and monitoring English learner progress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/files/Final_version_for_Release_Title_III_Exploratory_Report_020112_630pm.pdf
- Durán, R. P. (1989). Testing of linguistic minorities. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 573–587). New York: American Council on Education & Macmillan.
- Fenner, D. S., & Kuhlman, N. (2012). *Preparing effective teachers of English language learners: Practical applications for the TESOL P-12 professional teaching standards*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.
- García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Assessment and diversity. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 337-391.
- Goe, L., Holdheide, L., & Miller, T. (2011). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems: A tool to assist in the development of teacher evaluation systems*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/practicalGuideEvalSystems.pdf>
- Holdheide, L., Goe, L., Croft, A., & Reschly, D. (2010). *Challenges in evaluating special education teachers and English language learner specialists* (Research & Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/July2010Brief.pdf>
- Mercer, J. (1979). *SOMPA: Technical and conceptual manual*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Mestre, J. P. (1984). The problem with problems: Hispanic students and math. *Bilingual Journal*, 32, 15–19.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Retrieved from http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/upload/smallbook_pdf.pdf
- Rincón, E. (1980). *Test speededness, text anxiety, and test performance: A comparison of Mexican American and Anglo American high school juniors*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas at Austin.
- Samuda, R. J. (1975). *Psychological testing of American minorities: Issues and consequences*. New York: Harper & Row.
- U.S. Department of Education. *ESEA flexibility*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility>
- U.S. Department of Education. *Race to the Top fund: Applicant information*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/applicant.html>
-

APPENDIX A

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality Expert Forum on the Evaluation of Teachers of English Language Learners

American Institutes for Research (AIR)
1050 Thomas Jefferson NW, Washington, D.C.
Room 3251
December 14, 2011

Agenda

8:30–8:45 a.m.

Welcome and Meeting Overview

Forum goals:

- *Identify the challenges and strategies for:*
 - *Evaluating teachers with ELLs in their classrooms*
 - *Incorporating ELL student learning into teacher evaluation systems*
 - *Teachers of ELL classrooms*
- *Identify next steps for the TQ Center and in the national dialogue*

Facilitator: Tricia Miller

8:45–9:45 a.m.

Introductions and Share-Out

Each participant will be asked to share the following:

- *A very brief (one or two sentences) overview on what your organization is doing related to the evaluation of teachers of ELLs*
- *1-2 issues or challenges you believe are crucial to consider in this area*
- *What you would like to come from this meeting*

Facilitator: Ellen Cushing

9:45–10:15 a.m.

Current Teacher Evaluation Practice

Tricia Miller will provide a brief overview of current evaluation methods. Meeting participants will be asked to identify challenges to evaluating effective teaching.

Facilitator: Tricia Miller

10:15–10:30 a.m.

Break

10:30–12:00 p.m.

Evaluating the Performance of Teachers With ELL Students in Their Classrooms: Current Practices and Challenges

This discussion will focus on the practices of teachers with ELL students in their classrooms to identify effective instructional practices and methods for capturing and evaluating those practices.

Facilitator: Jennifer O'Day

12:00–12:30 p.m. **Lunch**

12:30–2:00 p.m. **Incorporating Student Growth Measures in Systems to Evaluate Teachers of ELL Students**

Forum participants will discuss challenges to the use of student growth measures with teachers of ELL students and strategies to address these challenges.

Facilitator: Diane August

2:00–2:15 p.m. **Break**

2:15–3:45 p.m. **Evaluating the Performance of Teachers of ELL Classes: Current Practices and Challenges**

This discussion will focus on the practices of teachers of ELL classes to identify effective instructional practices and methods for capturing and evaluating those practices.

Facilitator: Diane August

3:45–4:45 p.m. **Discussion Review and Next Steps**

Review of challenges and strategies identified during the Forum and identification of next steps for the TQ Center and in the national dialogue.

Facilitator: Jennifer O'Day

4:45–5:00 p.m. **Forum Wrap-Up and Adjourn**

Facilitator: Tricia Miller

APPENDIX B

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality Expert Forum on the Evaluation of Teachers of English Language Learners

Participants

Gary Cook

Associate Scientist
Wisconsin Center for Education Research

David Francis

Director, English Language Learning
Center on Instruction

Drew Gitomer

Rose and Nicholas DeMarzo Chair in Education
Rutgers Graduate School of Education

Robert Linquanti

Project Director for English Learner Evaluation
and Accountability Support (ELEAS)
WestEd

Sam Lopez

Team Leader
Office of English Language Acquisition

Luís-Gustavo Martínez

Senior Policy Analyst, Quality School Programs
and Resources, English Language Learner
Policy Desk, Center for Great Public Schools
National Education Association

Susan O'Hara

Executive Director, Center to Support
Excellence in Teaching (CSET)
Stanford University School of Education

Kathleen Paliokas

Director, InTASC
Council of Chief State School Officers

Maria-Avery Paz

Education Development Center
New England Comprehensive Center

Giselle Lundy Ponce

Assistant Director, AFT Educational Issues
Department
American Federation of Teachers

Teddi Predaris

ESOL Coordinator
Fairfax County Public Schools

Cindy Ryan

Discretionary Grants Supervisor
Office of English Language Acquisition

Sharon Saez

Program Director; Standards, Assessment
and Accountability
Chief State School Officers

Diane Staehr-Fenner

President, DSF Consulting
TESOL/NCATE Program Coordinator

Lisa Stooksberry

Chief Standards and Assessment Officer
National Board for Professional Teaching
Standards

Gabriela Uro

Manager, ELL Policy and Research
Council of the Great City Schools

Joanne Urrutia

Deputy Director
Office of English Language Acquisition

Santiago Wood

National Executive Director
National Association for Bilingual Education

AIR and TQ Center Staff

Diane August

Managing Director, AIR

Ellen Cushing

Researcher, AIR and TQ Center

Peggie Garcia

Senior Technical Assistance Consultant, AIR

Laura Golden

Researcher, AIR

Tricia Miller

Director, TQ Center

Jennifer O'Day

Managing Researcher, AIR

Jess Unger

Principal Test Development Specialist–
Assessment, AIR

ABOUT THE NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER FOR TEACHER QUALITY

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center) was created to serve as the national resource to which the regional comprehensive centers, states, and other education stakeholders turn for strengthening the quality of teaching—especially in high-poverty, low-performing, and hard-to-staff schools—and for finding guidance in addressing specific needs, thereby ensuring that highly qualified teachers are serving students with special needs.

The TQ Center is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and is a collaborative effort of ETS, Learning Point Associates, and Vanderbilt University. Integral to the TQ Center's charge is the provision of timely and relevant resources to build the capacity of regional comprehensive centers and states to effectively implement state policy and practice by ensuring that all teachers meet the federal teacher requirements of the current provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act.

The TQ Center is part of the U.S. Department of Education's Comprehensive Centers program, which includes 16 regional comprehensive centers that provide technical assistance to states within a specified boundary and five content centers that provide expert assistance to benefit states and districts nationwide on key issues related to current provisions of ESEA.



NATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE CENTER
FOR **TEACHER QUALITY**

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW

Washington, DC 20007-3835

877.322.8700 | 202.223.6690

www.tqsource.org

Copyright © 2012 National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, sponsored under government cooperative agreement number S283B050051. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B050051. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality is a collaborative effort of ETS, Learning Point Associates, and Vanderbilt University.

2419_07/12