



Mitigating Teacher Shortages: Evaluation and Feedback

EMILY WORKMAN AND MICAH ANN WIXOM

The first brief in this series, *Teacher Shortages: What We Know*, explores research on teacher shortages and highlights recent state task force findings. This report is one of five policy briefs examining strategies states are using to address shortages:

- 1 ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION
- 2 FINANCIAL INCENTIVES
- 3 INDUCTION AND MENTORSHIP
- 4 EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK
- 5 TEACHER LEADERSHIP



Click on any title to view other reports in this series.

Providing teachers with ongoing feedback and targeted professional development following evaluations can be an effective strategy to **retain** teachers. A definition of the evaluation feedback loop is provided, followed by a summary of supporting research on this strategy, state policy examples and considerations for policymakers.



What is a feedback loop in an evaluation system?

Research on employee retention across industries indicates that professional employees are more likely to remain in their roles and be more satisfied when they feel valued and believe that the employer is investing in their professional growth and development.¹

Through teacher comprehensive evaluation systems, school leaders have an opportunity to provide this kind of support to teachers by conducting regular evaluations of teaching, providing ongoing feedback – both positive and constructive – and offering targeted professional development that aligns with individuals’ needs and goals. A primary goal of any teacher evaluation system should be to help every teacher – even the most effective – continuously improve.

An effective teacher evaluation system typically serves two distinct purposes:

- **Accountability.** Evaluations are used to monitor teacher performance and ensure they are following established standards and teaching practices. As a summative tool, evaluations are often part of a rewards or sanctions system.
- **Development.** Evaluations are used as a formative tool to enhance teachers’ skills. They create a feedback loop that provides ongoing and actionable feedback based on observations during the evaluation, identify areas for growth and link results to targeted development activities.²

Over the years, the rhetoric around teacher evaluations has primarily focused on identifying and removing ineffective teachers rather than retaining teachers by helping them continually improve their teaching practice.

While some state and local evaluation policies tend to be used more as an accountability tool, evaluations have a far greater impact on teaching quality and student achievement when used as a coaching model that emphasizes feedback, corrections and continual improvement.³ Simply put, “evaluation results should form the foundation of teacher development.”⁴

To use teacher evaluation systems as a retention tool, state policies can emphasize the need for frequent classroom observations followed by immediate, concrete and actionable feedback that is linked to high-quality professional growth opportunities.⁵

As with any professional industry, teachers want to feel supported, are open to meaningful feedback and are constantly looking for ways to improve their craft. Providing employees with meaningful performance feedback and supports and recognizing their contributions are important components of retention.⁶

“IF YOU START FROM THE PREMISE THAT TEACHER EVALUATIONS ARE MEANT PRIMARILY TO DRIVE TEACHER DEVELOPMENT, THEN REGULAR FEEDBACK IS ESSENTIAL.”

– Paul Bambrick-Santoya, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development⁷



What does the research say?

Using evaluations to provide teachers with meaningful feedback and aligned professional development opportunities leads to more effective teaching and greater student success.⁸ Many also believe that professional growth opportunities induce teachers to remain in their profession.⁹

It is no surprise, then, that as of 2015, 38 states require that teachers receive some degree of feedback – either verbal or written – following a classroom observation and 31 states specifically require that the results be used to inform and shape professional development for all teachers. This is an improvement from only 12 states in 2011.¹⁰

The number of annual classroom evaluations a teacher receives is directly linked to the frequency of feedback and the amount of target professional development given to that teacher. Only 11 states require multiple observations for all teachers while 27 states require multiple observations only for new or low-performing teachers.¹² High performing teachers may go two or more years without a classroom observation.¹³ Focusing only on the newest and weakest teachers, however, may not be a wise choice. When states and districts invest in the highest achieving teachers, it increases the chances that those teachers will be retained. “The solution is to *improve* retention, not to blindly increase it.”¹⁴

In a large survey of high-performing teachers from four large school districts, TNTP found that if those teachers received two or more of the following retention strategies, they would remain in their current school for an average of two to six more years than they otherwise would have.¹⁵ Five of the eight retention strategies listed are dependent on findings from teacher evaluations, including strategies around providing feedback and development and recognizing accomplishments.

In a survey of more than 10,000 teachers from four large school districts, about 75 percent of the teachers surveyed believed that feedback plays a crucial role in improving teacher practice, yet only 3 percent of teachers reported that observations or feedback were the form of professional development that had helped them the most.¹¹

LOW-COST RETENTION STRATEGIES FOR HIGH-PERFORMING TEACHERS



Source: TNTP, *The Irreplaceables* (Brooklyn: TNTP, 2015), http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_Irreplaceables_2012.pdf (accessed April 17, 2016).



State examples

In 2015, 38 states required that teachers receive feedback following their evaluations and 31 states had policies requiring that teacher evaluation results be used to inform teachers' professional development activities.¹⁶ These requirements take different forms in different states.



Arkansas requires that all teachers be evaluated annually with novice and poorly performing teachers receiving a formal summative assessment each year, while all other teachers receive one every four years with an interim appraisal in the remaining years. All classroom observations are to include a pre- and post-evaluation conference with the teacher and evaluator. Teachers and evaluators are expected to jointly develop a professional development plan that links areas of needed improvement with professional development.¹⁷



Louisiana requires that teacher evaluations include the provision of professional development services based on individual teachers' needs and the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard. Evaluations must also provide teachers with opportunities for career development and professional growth.¹⁸



New Jersey recently increased the number of required observations for all teachers from one to at least three per year. Evaluators must provide feedback to help employees improve their teaching effectiveness and include a process for ensuring that evaluation results help inform instructional development.¹⁹



Policy considerations

To use teacher evaluation systems as a retention tool, state policies can consider the following:

- Provide teachers with “frequent and regular feedback” and ensure teacher evaluations are part of an ongoing “feedback loop” between teachers and school leadership rather than administering a one-time assessment at the year’s end.²⁰
- Evaluate all teachers regularly, regardless of their experience or skill level.
- Use evaluation results to target professional development to teachers’ needs, both individually and collectively.
- Provide both evaluators and those being evaluated with substantive, meaningful training on evaluation tools and processes.²¹
- Include teachers in the development of goals, monitoring of improvements and celebrations of successes.
- Provide teachers opportunities to put what they’ve gained through professional development into practice.



ENDNOTES

1. David G. Allen, *Retaining Talent* (Alexandria: Society for Human Resource Management, 2008), <https://www.shrm.org/about/foundation/research/documents/retaining%20talent-%20final.pdf> (accessed April 5, 2016); Josh Bersin, "Time to Scrap Performance Appraisals?," *Forbes*, May 6, 2013, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/joshbersin/2013/05/06/time-to-scrap-performance-appraisals/#1b7f6053121d> (accessed April 5, 2016).
2. TNTP, *Teacher Evaluation 2.0* (Brooklyn: TNTP, 2010), <http://tntp.org/assets/documents/Teacher-Evaluation-Oct10F.pdf> (accessed March 18, 2016); Sarah Almy, *Building the Balanced Teacher Evaluations that Educators and Students Deserve* (Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust, 2011), http://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Fair_To_Everyone_O.pdf (accessed March 21, 2016); "Section IVV - Teacher Evaluation and Development," U.S. Department of Education, <http://www.ed.gov/teaching/national-conversation/vision/section-vii-teacher-evaluation-and-development> (accessed April 6, 2016); Marzano, Robert J. "The Two Purposes of Teacher Evaluation," *Teacher Evaluation: What's Fair? What's Effective?*, vol. 70, no. 3 (2012): 14-19, <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/nov12/vol70/num03/The-Two-Purposes-of-Teacher-Evaluation.aspx> (accessed April 26, 2016).
3. Paul Bambrick-Santayo, "Beyond the Scoreboard," *Teacher Evaluation: What's Fair? What's Effective?*, vol. 70, no. 3 (2012): 26-30, <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/nov12/vol70/num03/Beyond-the-Scoreboard.aspx> (accessed April 26, 2016).
4. *Ibid.*, TNTP, *Teacher Evaluation 2.0*.
5. Southern Regional Education Board, *Toward Trustworthy and Transformative Classroom Observations: Progress, challenges and lessons learned in SREB states* (Atlanta: SREB, 2015), http://publications.sreb.org/2015/SREB_COReportOnline.pdf (accessed April 17, 2016).
6. *Ibid.*, David G. Allen; *Ibid.*, Josh Bersin.
7. *Ibid.*, Paul Bambrick-Santayo.
8. *Ibid.*, SREB.
9. *Ibid.*, David G. Allen.
10. Kathryn M. Doherty and Sandi Jacobs, *State of the States 2015: Evaluating Teaching, Leading and Learning* (Washington, D.C.: National Center on Teacher Quality, 2015), <http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/StateofStates2015> (accessed April 17, 2016).
11. TNTP, *The Mirage* (Brooklyn: TNTP, 2015), http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP-Mirage_2015.pdf (accessed April 7, 2016).
12. *Ibid.*, Kathryn M. Doherty and Sandi Jacobs.
13. *Ibid.*
14. TNTP, *The Irreplaceables* (Brooklyn: TNTP, 2015), http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_Irreplaceables_2012.pdf (accessed April 17, 2016).
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*, Kathryn M. Doherty and Sandi Jacobs.
17. Ark. Code § 6-17-2801 et seq.
18. La. Stat. Ann. § 10-151b
19. N.J. Rev. Stat. 18A:6-123; State of New Jersey Department of Education, *2013-14 Final Educator Evaluation Implementation Report* (Trenton: State of New Jersey Department of Education), <http://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/resources/201314AchieveNJImplementationReport.pdf> (accessed April 16, 2016).
20. Daniel Weisberg et al., *The Widget Effect: Our National Failure to Acknowledge and Act on Differences in Teacher Effectiveness* (Brooklyn: TNTP, 2009), http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TheWidgetEffect_2nd_ed.pdf (accessed April 6, 2016); National Association of State Boards of Education, *Gearing Up: Creating a Systemic Approach to Teacher Effectiveness* (Arlington: NASBE, 2011), <http://www.nasbe.org/wp-content/uploads/Gearing-Up-Teacher-Workforce-Report-Summary-NASBE-1.pdf> (accessed April 6, 2016).
21. *Ibid.*, NASBE.



AUTHORS

*Emily Workman is the manager of the K-12 Institute at Education Commission of the States. When she's not hard at work, she and her husband are likely navigating their wonderful and absolutely chaotic new life as parents of two under two. Contact Emily at eworkman@ecs.org or **303.299.3655**.*

*Micah Ann Wixom is a policy analyst in the K-12 Institute at Education Commission of the States. She has a master's degree in public administration. She enjoys riding her bike to work, puttering around the kitchen and spending time outside. Contact Micah at mwixom@ecs.org or **303.299.3673**.*

© 2016 by the Education Commission of the States. All rights reserved. Education Commission of the States encourages its readers to share our information with others. To request permission to reprint or excerpt some of our material, please contact us at (303) 299.3609 or email askinner@ecs.org.

Education Commission of the States | 700 Broadway Suite 810 Denver, CO 80203

