How Does TAP Work?

TAP™ Elements of Success

- Multiple Career Paths
- Instructionally Focused Accountability
- Ongoing Applied Professional Growth
- Performance-Based Compensation
Specifically, TAP employs the following methods to ensure an aligned approach to performance-based compensation:

- Teacher evaluation and professional development help teachers develop a clearly defined repertoire of instructional skills that are rewarded by annual bonuses.

- The school’s improvement planning process and professional development provide teachers with new instructional strategies that have been proven to produce learning gains for students in the school—an another factor rewarded by annual bonuses.

- Differentiated pay is used to create a team of teacher-leaders who have the authority, time, and expertise to improve teacher evaluations, professional development, and school improvement planning.
How Does TAP Work?

Multiple Career Paths

Powerful opportunities for more responsibility and commensurate pay

Career Teachers

Mentor Teachers

Master Teachers
Research Supporting Multiple Career Paths

- A positive relationship exists between employee motivation and one’s ability to advance within their career. (Barrier 1996)

- Effective leadership is characterized by collective responsibility. (Elmore 2000)

- Collective leadership through consensus of teachers rather than mandate is more effective. (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster & Cobb 1995)
Basic Job Responsibilities:

- Cluster implementation
- Support teachers’ individual growth plans
- Conduct evaluations and conferences
- Provide individualized teacher support
- Leadership team participation
- Each teacher has unique job responsibilities. Annually, a survey is given to all teachers to ensure responsibilities are met.
TAP Principal

Selects master and mentor teachers with assistance and input from the director

- Leads development of school plan
- Facilitates TAP leadership team meetings
- Monitors cluster and classroom activities
- Conducts classroom evaluations and conferences
- Coaches master and mentor teachers in classroom instruction, cluster implementation and coaching of teachers
Shared Leadership
TAP Leadership Team

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Master Teachers
- Mentor Teachers
- Or others seen as instrumental in the implementation of TAP within a school
Teacher Support For Multiple Career Paths

- **2005:**
  - Strong: 31%
  - Moderate: 41%

- **2013:**
  - Strong: 48%
  - Moderate: 31%
**Training and Support**

**Initial TAP CORE Training**
- Overview and Evaluation A (3 days)
- Cluster and Leadership Team (3 days)
- Evaluation B and Certification Test (2 days)

**Principal meetings**

**Master teacher meetings**

**TAP National Conference & TAP Summer Institute**

**On-site visits (ongoing)**
- Observation and feedback on implementation of cluster meetings
- Observation and feedback on implementation of leadership meetings
- Coaching (master/mentor teachers and principals)
Lessons Learned from Having Multiple Career Paths

• Teacher ownership and increased collective efficacy on campus.
• Shared decision making – not everything falls on the administrative team.
• Create a robust interview committee and criteria for the selection of the teacher leaders.
• The teacher leaders should be evaluated on instruction, coaching and professional development annually.
• Great teachers do not always make great coaches
• Increased job satisfaction
• Multiple levels of teacher leaders include more faculty members with diverse skill sets and areas of expertise.
How Does TAP Work?

Ongoing
Applied
Professional
Growth

Continuous on-site professional development during the school day

“Cluster Group”
Student achievement and teacher learning increases when professional development is teacher-led, ongoing and collaborative. (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; Smylie, Allensworth, Greenberg, Harris, & Luppescu, 2001).

Schools that regularly link teachers to other teachers to form a supportive community are capable of successfully reforming teaching and learning. (Fullan 2001)
Cluster Group

How many minutes per week will each cluster group meet?

a minimum of 50 minutes

How often do cluster meetings occur?

a minimum of once per week
Sample Cluster Diagram

Principal

Master Teacher
(Grade/Subject)

Master/Mentor Teacher
(Grade/Subject)

(Name/Grade)

(Name/Grade)

(Name/Grade)

(Name/Grade)
Steps for Effective Learning in Cluster

1. **Identify** problem
   
   Evidence of (using pre-test) is clear, specific, high quality and measurable in student outcomes and addresses student content learning with links to teacher strategies and the Rubric.

2. **Obtain** new teacher learning aligned to student need and formatted for classroom application
   
   Using credible sources
   
   Proven application showing student growth

3. **Develop** new teacher learning with support in Development through demonstration, modeling, practice, team teaching and peer coaching with subsequent analysis of student work

4. **Apply** new teacher learning to the classroom
   
   Evidenced through observation, peer coaching and self reflection applied to student work as a formative assessment

5. **Evaluate** the impact on student
   
   Evidence includes student assessment (post-test) aligned with data analysis and the new teaching strategies
Teacher Support for Ongoing Applied Professional Growth

- **2005**: 50% Strong, 37% Moderate
- **2013**: 60% Strong, 28% Moderate
Lessons Learned from On-Going Professional Growth

• Increased Teacher Ownership of learning
• Professional Development is blend of relevant student and teacher need.
• Consistent follow-up in **ALL** teachers’ classrooms.
• Delivered in smaller groups of teachers (e.g. 3-10) versus school wide to ensure more relevant content
• Teachers are provided a model in the professional development setting of a specific strategy along with the “how” and “why” of each step.
• All strategies are thoroughly vetted before being presented in Professional Development.
How Does TAP Work?

- Multiple observations
- Multiple trained and certified observers
- Cluster training and classroom support

Instructionally Focused Accountability

*Fair evaluations based on clearly defined, research-based standards*
The challenge of creating an effective teacher accountability system is to improve the quality of teacher instruction, and thereby raise student achievement.

States and school districts need to identify the knowledge and skills that a teacher needs to teach successfully, and then create standards and rubrics to measure teaching performance.

Odden, Milanowski & Youngs (1998)
Odden and Clune (1998)
The TAP Teaching Standards are based on education psychology research focusing on learning and instruction, and continue to be validated by more recent research. In addition, the development was influenced by focus groups with outstanding educators, including many Milken Educators.

The work was informed by materials from numerous sources, including:

- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)
- National Board for Professional Teacher Standards
- Massachusetts’ Principles for Effective Teaching
- California’s Standards for the Teaching Profession
- Connecticut’s Beginning Educator Support Program
- New Teacher Center’s Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities
- Danielson's Framework for Teaching
Evaluation Recommendations

- 3-4 Observations annually
- At least half of observations are unannounced
- Consistent collaboration by evaluators for inter-rater reliability
- Pre-Conference prior to announced observations
- Post-Conference after all observations
In TAP, the teacher rubric is used in two ways:

- as a summative measure in determining pay for performance
- as a formative measure which identifies instructional areas where master and mentor teachers can provide support to career teachers to increase student achievement
The Rubrics: Four Domains

- Designing & Planning Instruction
- Instruction
- Responsibilities
- Learning Environment
- TAP Teaching Standards
TAP Teaching Performance Standards:
Skills, Knowledge & Responsibilities

- Instructional Plans
- Student Work
- Assessment
- Staff Development
- Instructional Supervision
- School Responsibilities
- Reflecting on Teaching
- Managing Student Behavior
- Expectations
- Environment
- Respectful Culture
- Standards & Objectives
- Motivating Students
- Presenting Instructional Content
- Lesson Structure & Pacing
- Activities & Materials
- Questioning
- Academic Feedback
- Grouping Students
- Teacher Content Knowledge
- Teacher Knowledge of Students
- Thinking
- Problem Solving
TAP has defined a set of professional indicators known as the TAP Instructional Rubrics to measure teaching skills, knowledge and responsibilities of the teachers in a TAP school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Objectives</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)*</th>
<th>Proficient (3)*</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All learning objectives and state content standards are explicitly communicated.</td>
<td>Most learning objectives and state content standards are communicated.</td>
<td>Few learning objectives and state content standards are communicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-objectives are aligned and logically sequenced to the lesson’s major objective.</td>
<td>Sub-objectives are mostly aligned to the lesson’s major objective.</td>
<td>Sub-objectives are inconsistently aligned to the lesson’s major objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives are: (a) consistently connected to what students have previously learned, (b) know from life experiences, and (c) integrated with other disciplines.</td>
<td>Learning objectives are connected to what students have previously learned.</td>
<td>Learning objectives are rarely connected to what students have previously learned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for student performance are clear, demanding, and high.</td>
<td>Expectations for student performance are clear.</td>
<td>Expectations for student performance are vague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State standards are displayed and referenced throughout the lesson.</td>
<td>State standards are displayed.</td>
<td>State standards are displayed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is evidence that most students demonstrate mastery of the objective.</td>
<td>There is evidence that most students demonstrate mastery of the objective.</td>
<td>There is evidence that few students demonstrate mastery of the objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher Responsibilities Survey: Master Teacher

Note: Career teachers are to respond to items #1-13. Mentor teachers and administrators who are completing this survey should respond to items #1-22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The master teacher leads the design and delivery of research-based professional development activities for his or her cluster group.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The master teacher consistently presents new learning in cluster that is supported with field-tested evidence of increased student achievement.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The master teacher models new learning in cluster meetings and in classrooms throughout the year demonstrating how to effectively implement the skill developed in cluster meetings.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The master teacher is a resource, providing access to materials and research-based instructional methods to his or her cluster group members.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The master teacher works closely with cluster team members to plan instruction and assessments during cluster development time.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The master teacher guides and reviews the cluster members’ growth plans.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four Key Elements of the Instructional Post-Conference

1. Introduction
   - Greeting/Establish Length
   - Review Conference Process
   - General Impression Question

2. Reinforcing the Teacher
   - Reinforcement Area (Indicator)
   - Self-Analysis Question
   - Examples from script about what the teacher did well
   - Recommendations for continued use and feedback from the teacher
   - Evidence
3. Refining the Teacher’s Skill:
   - Refinement Objective
   - Provide an example based on best practice
   - Provide guided practice

4. Review ratings and evidence
TAP Teacher Evaluations vs. Traditional Teacher Evaluations

- **TAP**: TAP teacher evaluations nationwide
- **Other**: Weighted average of teacher evaluations in five major urban school districts, based on data from The New Teacher Project’s “The Widget Effect.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Teachers</th>
<th>Lowest Ratings</th>
<th>Middle Ratings</th>
<th>Highest Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Support for Instructionally Focused Accountability

2005:
- 29% Strong
- 20% Moderate
- 51% Total

2013:
- 63% Strong
- 28% Moderate
- 91% Total
How Does TAP Work?

- The teacher’s instructional performance
- Student achievement growth a teacher makes in the classroom
- Student achievement growth the school makes as a whole

Salaries and bonuses tied to responsibilities, instructional performance and student achievement growth.
How Teacher Performance is Determined

- **Teacher skills, knowledge and Responsibilities**: 50%
  - Determined by evaluations using TAP Rubrics and Responsibility Survey
- **Individual student growth Achievement**: 30%
- **School-wide student growth**: 20%
  - Determined by approved Testing or SLO
How Administrator Performance is Determined

- Approved 360° Survey Instrument: 30%
- School-wide Growth: 50%
- TAP Leadership team rubric: 20%

Determined using valid and reliable student data
Teacher Support for Performance-Based Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned on Performance Based Compensation

- If using student achievement in the Performance based compensation formula, the metric should be for student growth and not attainment.
- Significant component should be based on School Wide Growth
- Multiple independent measures should be used (e.g. classroom evaluations, class growth, school growth, etc.)
- All evaluators should go through multiple days of training on the evaluation instrument culminating in a rigorous certification test followed by annual recertification tests.
- A local appeals process should be in place for the process.
TAP Works for Teachers and Students

Results

A Decade of Impressive Results

- Student Achievement
- Teacher Practice
TAP Results – Louisiana

Results of TAP Schools compared to matched non-TAP schools

- **Student Achievement**
  - Overall, TAP students significantly outperform students in matched schools in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies
  - Louisiana’s “School Performance Score” comparison shows that students in TAP schools significantly outperform students in matched schools
  - The School Performance Score comparison also shows that in each consecutive year of implementation over a four-year period, TAP schools’ students gain in achievement compared to match schools’ students

- **Teacher Practice**
  - Real-time, work sample comparisons show growth in TAP related practices by teachers
  - Web survey results show TAP teachers grow in usage of preferred effective practices from TAP
  - 90% of teachers report “TAP rubrics are helpful in making my teaching more effective”
  - 92% of teachers report TAP made a positive difference in student achievement
  - 90% of principals indicate they would recommend TAP to a colleague

Louisiana TAP School

School Performance Score

Implementation Year - *denotes significant difference
TAP Schools Outperform Other Schools Over Time

Mean Change in SPS

TAP Schools Outperform Other Schools Over Time:

- 1st Year: 3.5 (TAP), 1.4 (Comparison)
- 2nd Year: 9.7 (TAP), 2.8 (Comparison)
- 3rd Year: 14.7 (TAP), 5.2 (Comparison)
- 4th Year: 20.0 (TAP), 14.0 (Comparison)

Base Year to Implementation Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from TIF 1 – Algiers Charter Association

PERCENT OF STUDENTS SCORING BASIC OR ABOVE IN MATH
Louisiana statewide average versus cohort of ACSA schools

ACSA data shown for all 6 schools in ACSA TAP from 2006-07 through 2010-11
Results from TIF 1 – Algiers Charter Association

PERCENT OF STUDENTS SCORING BASIC OR ABOVE IN ELA
Louisiana statewide average versus cohort of ACSA schools

% of Students

2006-07  2010-11

45.5     70.6

STATEWIDE

ACSA

ACSA data shown for all 6 schools in ACSA TAP from 2006-07 through 2010-11
Accuracy of NIET’s Teacher Evaluation Rubric: Higher Retention of Effective Teachers

Probability of Retention into Following Year

Teachers’ Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities Score as measured by NIET’s Teacher Evaluation Rubric
Results from Knox County TAP, Tennessee

Number of Schools

- 2 SE below a year of growth: 1
- 1 SE below a year of growth: 1
- A year of growth: 1
- 1 SE above a year of growth: 1
- 2 SE above a year of growth: 11
TAP Alignment to Common Core
The Common Core State Standards Initiative is sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA), and is supported by 46 states and the District of Columbia.

The CCSS were created in an attempt to address the student achievement gap.

The CCSS present a set of skills for students, teachers and parents that are uniform regardless of where the student lives.

The initiative’s goal is having common educational standards in math and English-language arts for students at each grade level, regardless of what state they live in.

“The CCSS will provide a greater opportunity to share experiences and best practices within and across states that will improve our ability to best serve the needs of students.” (NGA and CCSSO 2010).

In other words, it is no longer acceptable that students in different states learn at different rates.

Student assessments aligned to the Common Core are currently being developed, and these new tests are slated to be implemented in the 2014 school year.
Context and Background of the Common Core State Standards Initiative

- The CCSS provide the “what” each student needs to know and be able to do in each grade or course whereas; the TAP Teaching Indicators provide the “how” for educators to use in order to help students master the standards and demonstrate their understanding.

- The CCSS and TAP Teaching Standards both value the importance of critical thinking, creative problem solving, collaboration and communication to daily instruction.
Alignment of CCSS and the TAP Teaching Standards

- Like the TAP Standards, the CCSS provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them.

- Both sets of standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that teachers need to ensure that young people will be successful in college and in their careers.

- Although the CCSS focus on what students need to learn, while the TAP Standards focus on what teachers need to do in order to be effective, they do have similarities.

- Both are based on research and best practices.

- Both sets of standards have a similar focus and set of priorities.
TAP™ System Training Portal Overview

The TAP System Training Portal provides a web-based, state-of-the-art delivery vehicle of interactive, individual TAP trainings and support. The portal is designed to provide tiered access to users based on role, and contains the most updated training, resources, videos and materials for TAP leaders to download, review and deliver to their target audiences in order to improve instruction. Most importantly, real-time access to information linked to TAP models of instructional growth will be available to all schools implementing the TAP system. To see what is included in the portal, click on the button below.

CLICK HERE FOR AN OVERVIEW OF THE TAP SYSTEM
PREVIEW WHAT’S INSIDE.

Advancing education, your career and your students.

Welcome to the TAP System Training Portal! Here you will find a wealth of resources at your fingertips in real time. These include strategies, training modules, CORE trainings videos, TAP documents and much more! Every tool that you will need for successful TAP implementation is just a click away.
Best Practices Center: CODE System

- Mentor A
- Mentor B
- Mentor C
Best Practices Center: CODE System
tapObserver app Features

- Script faster by typing directly into your iPad
- Capture photos and videos
- Create time stamps to track lesson pacing
- Categorize your evidence by TAP rubric indicator
- Generate an evidence collection template that is automatically populated with your categorized evidence
- Assign a score of 1-5 on the TAP rubric
- Export the completed evidence collection and scores into an HTML file for easy emailing
The Best Practices Center
Based on more than a decade of experience in schools across the country, the Best Practices Center (BPC) works with its partners to redesign educator evaluation systems to more effectively measure performance and support improvements in instructional practice.

The BPC also provides support for performance-based compensation systems and creating teacher leadership roles in schools.

With proven results and leadership in educator quality and reform, BPC works to engage schools, districts and states through:

Service  Support  Solutions
Best Practices Center Examples

- Over 11,000 Evaluators
- Teacher Evaluation
- Principal Evaluation
- State-wide Implementation impacting over 100,000 teachers
- Created unique state-wide training portal
Best Practices Center Examples

- TAP Rubrics Selected as One of Two Evaluation Instruments for State Pilot (Year 2 in progress)
- Schools utilize both CODE and the Training Portal
- New Partnership with Texas Tech University to embed the TAP Rubric into clinical field experience
Best Practices Center Examples

- Over 78,500 Educators
- 1,500 schools
- Teacher & Administrator Evaluations
- CODE System being used to store observation data and calculate teacher effectiveness scores
Year 1 Student Achievement Results from Tennessee

Continued TCAP Growth

Grades 3-8 Results by Subject

Math 41.0→47.3 Gains +6.3
Reading 47.5→49.9 Gains +2.4
Science 54.9→60.5 Gains +5.6

Commissioner Huffman on the rubric:
“Right now this tool is improving instruction. In districts across the state, instruction is getting better.”
Year 1 Student Achievement Results from Tennessee

- Algebra I: 46.9 → 55.4 Gains +8.5
- Algebra II: 30.8 → 33.3 Gains +2.5
- English I: 66.3 → 66.1 Loss -0.2
- English II: 58.1 → 60.7 Gains +2.6
- Biology: 52.0 → 55.8 Gains +3.8
NIET Best Practices Center Online Portal

The National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) is a public non-profit organization committed to improving educator effectiveness. The NIET Best Practices Portal is a subscription-based interactive Web tool that provides real-time access to individualized trainings and support in order to improve instruction and evaluation.
Planning Year Support

• During the 2013-2014 Planning Year NIET would provide the following support:
  • Site Presentations
  • Research Supporting the Model
  • Site Visits to Existing TAP / Best Practice Schools
  • National Conference Participation
  • On the ground support for participating districts
  • Webinars
Costs of TAP Implementation

Based on a Sample School of 30 teachers:

1.0 FTE – Master Teacher = $8000 Stipend* (Full Time Release)

or

2 - .5 FTE Master Teachers (Part Time Release 1.0 FTE)

4-5 – Mentor Teachers = $4000 Stipend *

30 – Career Teacher Performance Based Compensation = $2000 *

Total Major Costs: $145,000 – Estimated based on sample school size and given model

*Amount Can be Adjusted and is for demonstration purposes only
Cost of Best Practices Center Implementation

Based on a Sample School of 30 Teachers:

4-5 Master Teachers (Limited Release) = $10,000*
5-6 Mentor Teachers (Limited Release) = $5000*

No Performance Based Compensation

Total Major Costs = $80,000

*Amount Can be Adjusted and is for demonstration purposes only
Questions

Jason Culbertson – Chief Operating Officer
jculbertson@niet.org

Mark Oesterle – Senior Program Specialist
moesterle@niet.org
Closing