



**Carnegie Foundation** for the Advancement of Teaching

# **ASSESSING-TEACHING- IMPROVING-LEARNING CONVENING**

## Meeting Summary

Report prepared by: Alicia Grunow, Jeannie Myung, Anthony S. Bryk and Paul LeMahieu

**October 20-21, 2011**

**Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching**

*Funded through a cooperative agreement with the Institute for Education Sciences*

Assessing • Teaching • Improving • Learning



---

Assessing • Teaching • Improving • Learning

---

Convening #2  
October 20-21, 2011

## Meeting Summary

On October 21<sup>st</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching convened a group of sixteen individuals with experience designing and implementing systems for teacher assessment in schools, districts and educational organizations (for a listing of participants including biographies see Appendix A.) The conversations built on those from our convening of technical experts in May 2011 and contributed to the development of a multi-stakeholder R&D agenda of teacher assessment questions.

Our objectives for this convening were to identify critical issues for inquiry and development in the area of teacher assessment as well as to initiate a learning community around these issues. The agenda was organized around two major uses of teacher assessment. We focused the first day of the convening on the necessary components of a system that supports the generation and use of data for improvement. The second day focused on the necessary components of a system that generates and uses data to inform high-stakes personnel decisions. We also discussed the unintended consequences that could occur in the implementation of new teacher assessment systems. This agenda spurred a lively conversation leavened by the practical issues that arise from the implementation of teacher assessment tools and practices.

In the following pages we summarize the 2-day conversation in three sections:

- (1) Characteristics of Data for Improvement and Conditions for Their Use
- (2) Version 2.0 of the Multi-stakeholder R&D Agenda
- (3) Unintended Consequences of Evaluating Teachers for Personnel Decisions

In addition to contributing to these emerging frameworks, the convening succeeded in building relationships among the participants and generating interest in further collaborations on teacher-evaluation topics. The participant reflections reveal that the content of the convening challenged them to think deeply about the nuances and implications of their work in teacher evaluation.

# Characteristics of Data for Improvement and Conditions for Use

---

*Background.* Research has shown that teachers are the most important school-level influence on student outcomes, and that teacher quality is highly variable.<sup>1</sup> The creation of more robust teacher assessment systems could increase teacher quality in at least two ways. First, teacher assessments can be used to rank-order teachers by performance and inform consequential decisions about their employment (i.e. tenure, dismissal, promotion). Second, more and better information about student performance and teacher practices could help improve teachers' instructional practices, as well as enhance school and district capacity to support teachers in that effort.

Historically, school systems have collected little systematic information about teacher performance. Recent efforts to assess teacher performance purport to collect information to both guide personnel decisions and support improving teacher practice. However, designing a system that serves both of these functions well is complicated by the fact that the kinds of assessments needed for each purpose may differ. For example, rank-ordering teachers requires generalized rating tools and methodologies that ensure comparability across grades and subjects so that districts can distinguish high-, average-, and low-performing teachers on a single metric. Using data for improving practice, however, requires information that has prescriptive use, signaling to the teacher (or mentor) what to do next. This latter kind of information is likely to require assessments tailored to appropriate pedagogical practices for particular grade-levels and subjects. In addition, the use of data for one purpose may undermine the other.

In our earlier convenings and conversations in the field, it became obvious that much thought has gone into how better teacher assessments can support employment decisions. Less thought has been given to the ideal design of assessment systems intended to help teachers improve their instruction. Therefore we began this convening by engaging participants in what turned out to be a rich conversation about the information required to improve teacher practice.

*Examples of Systems to Support Practice Improvement.* In an effort to provide concrete examples of how data systems might be leveraged to support practice improvement, we began the convening with a panel discussion moderated by Tony Bryk. The panelists were teacher developers from organizations that systematically use data to support the development of teaching practice – Gay Su Pinnell from the Literacy Collaborative, Jesse Solomon from the Boston Teacher Residency and Marcie Wolfe from the National Writing Project. Each panelist began with a brief presentation on their work in improving teacher practice, with a focus on how data, broadly conceived, informs their organizations' efforts to improve teaching. Tony Bryk followed up with questions about the types of evidence they collect in the process of supporting teachers to improve practice. He also asked about and the contextual characteristics required for information to be used for improvement.

During the panel discussion we asked the participants to listen with a particular ear for the characteristics of information and the contextual conditions that support practice improvement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanders & Horn (1998), Wright, Horn and Sanders (1997).

After the panel discussion we had a whole group conversation on what was discussed and how it intersected with their experience in supporting practice improvement in their schools, districts and educational organizations. This resulted in Table 1 below, which begins to specify the characteristics of data to support improvement of teacher practice and the conditions for their use.

Table 1: Characteristics of Data for Improvement and Conditions for Their Use

Characteristics of data for improvement of practice
Tied to a system-wide theory of instructional practice
Reflective of and collectable as part of the daily work
Specific & detailed
Diagnostic & prescriptive
Timely: Quick turn around and frequent
Conditions for the use of data for improvement
Articulation of a system-wide theory of instructional practice (common language)
Access to resources and time to engage in improvement
Teacher investment into the process
Collaborative professional community
Trust/ Perception of fairness
Capacity to interpret and use data
Low stakes

## Informing a Multi-Stakeholder R&D Agenda

---

*Assessment to Support Improvement.* After the whole-group conversation, the participants broke out into small groups to consider how the list of characteristics of data for improvement and the conditions for their use intersected with the current conditions in their organizations. We asked the participants to identify what they considered to be the barriers in establishing a system that exhibited these elements.

Small group conversations led to a set of questions our participants considered to be high-priority areas of inquiry to support building teaching assessment systems for improvement. Participants then voted for which issues, if addressed, would lead to largest improvements in the use of data for improvement. The resulting set of questions, prioritized by votes, is listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: R&D Agenda Items to Support the Use of Data for Practice Improvement

What else do we need to measure to predict the student outcomes we care about?
How do we design and build systems and structures such that the regular use of data to improve student learning is integrated into the daily life of teachers?
What is the right mix of data elements (over time, contexts, etc) and balance of types (improvement, summative) and alignment for greatest usefulness and impact?
How can the link between improvement data and summative data be forged and tested?
Quality of feedback. What is good feedback? How to get good at it?
How to build a system to better learn from each others' efforts?
What can we learn from human capital management practices in other fields?
Where/how do "soft skills" (for students) fit in as data?
Need to define the floor of teacher quality (to build trust and flexibility for growth orientation).
Better understand the relationship between formative and summative measures.
How can teachers use data with students (and those beyond) to activate student agency?
Need for intermediary to accelerate learning about technical concerns around measurement of teacher quality.
What are features of student outcome data that can drive improvements?
How does classroom observation for improvement and observation for evaluation differ?
What are the cost-benefit tradeoffs between different assessments and assessment practices?
Cost-efficiency around use of assessment resources.

*Assessment to Support Evaluation.* The second day of the convening focused on measurement to support key evaluative decisions, including: (1) granting tenure, (2) dismissing low-performing teachers, and (3) identifying high-performers for additional opportunities and/or compensation. Participants added to and prioritized areas of inquiry generated at the first convening. Table 3 presents this set of questions prioritized by the system designers at this convening.

Table 3: R&D Agenda Items to Support the Use of Data for Evaluation

	Evaluation
Measures of Student Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much might individual student outliers influence value-added estimates? Are more robust methods needed?</li> <li>• How do contextual factors influence value-added estimates?</li> <li>• How many performance levels can we statistically and meaningfully distinguish in value-added data?</li> <li>• How do differences in test content and difficulty affect value-added?</li> <li>• How consistent are teacher performance results across alternative value-added models?</li> <li>• To what extent are an individual teacher’s effects consistent across students or subjects?</li> <li>• How should we account for “summer effects”?</li> <li>• Can we establish a statistically and conceptually defensible “minimum level of teacher performance”?</li> <li>• How should value-added systems handle students who do not spend a full year with one teacher? Have multiple teachers of record? Receive supplemental interventions?</li> <li>• What processes are necessary to roster students reliably?</li> <li>• What inferences about <i>improvement (growth)</i> in teacher performance can be supported with value-added estimates over time?</li> </ul>
Observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the capacity (training, ongoing retraining, audits, dynamic analysis, etc) requirements for inter-rater reliability? What does it take to maintain reliability of observations in practice?</li> <li>• How do we manage the cost and capacity issues involved with observational measures?</li> <li>• How many observations need to be conducted to derive a reliable and valid measure of instructional behavior? Does this vary as a function of grain-size and behavior prevalence?</li> <li>• What other kinds of data can be used to supplement observations? For example, logs, surveys, video, classroom artifacts.</li> <li>• How do we avoid the dangers of local norming of observational measures?</li> <li>• Can teachers across contexts and instructional models be validly assessed using the same observational system?</li> <li>• How can observational data or protocols be systematized to track teacher growth?</li> <li>• What should be done when different observers yield different assessments with observational systems?</li> </ul>
Overall Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How best to combine multiple measures of teacher effectiveness?</li> <li>• How correlated do we want value added and observational measures to be and why?</li> <li>• What are the actual costs to implement and sustain reliable teacher assessment systems? What are the components of these costs (monetary, in-kind, opportunity)?</li> <li>• How robust are these systems against cheating/gaming?</li> <li>• What should happen when observation data and value-added measures do not agree?</li> <li>• How can we best communicate the results of teacher assessment systems (value-added &amp; observation) to teachers/parents?</li> <li>• How should assessment systems accommodate the arc of development of teachers?</li> </ul>

## Anticipating Unintended Consequences

In the final session of the convening we engaged participants in a conversation about the unintended consequences that may occur as new teacher evaluation systems are introduced. We used the concept of “balancing measures” from the quality-improvement literature to launch the conversation. In quality improvement three kinds of measures are collected to evaluate whether improvement is occurring in a given system: (1) outcome measures, which measure progress towards the ultimate goal; (2) process measures, which are leading indicators of the outcomes of interest; and (3) balancing measures, which track how changes are affecting other parts of the system that are not the subject of current improvement efforts.

As a group we developed a set of potential unintended consequences we might anticipate from the implementation of such a system. We might want to track these consequences to know if changes introduced by teacher evaluation systems produce unwanted consequences elsewhere in the human capital system. Table 4 presents the set of unintended consequences that were raised in this conversation.

Table 4: Unintended Consequences of Evaluating Teachers for Personnel Decisions

<b>Human capital issues</b>
Loss of good teachers
Rigidity will turn away who wants to teach
Takes the joy out of teaching
Loss of teachers of particular demographics
Inequitable distribution of teachers (teacher leaving high-need schools)
Increased attention to teacher preparation
Training needs
<b>Social capital issues</b>
Competitiveness in school culture, loss of collaboration
Reluctance of teachers to reveal problems and seek help
Increase in cheating
<b>Redistribution of resources</b>
Overemphasis of resources toward low-performance
Equitable distribution of resources
<b>Impacts on school leaders</b>
Taxes school leaders' time
<b>Defining good teaching</b>
Locking into a narrow conception of good teaching
Narrows the curriculum
When stakes are placed on proxies, they stop being proxies
<b>Unintended applications of data, misuse</b>
<b>Tension between what is public and private</b>
<b>Decisions about assessment privilege capturing teacher evaluation over student learning</b>
<b>Incentive to push students out of the system</b>

As part of this conversation on unintended consequences, Tony Bryk presented preliminary findings on potential scoring errors that are likely to result from combining current assessment methodologies to assign teachers to performance categories. He presented some initial simulation findings and led a discussion of the potential consequences of these types of errors. In addition to stimulating the conversation, this presentation served to “test” whether this kind of exploration would be useful to those designing teacher assessment systems. The consensus was that such information would be very helpful to practitioners and we plan to pursue the topic in future research.



## Appendix A. Participant Biographies

---



**Joanna Cannon** is the Executive Director of Teacher and Principal Evaluation at the NYC Department of Education. In this role, Joanna is responsible for designing and implementing a new teacher and principal evaluation system for NYC's 80,000 teachers and 1,700 principals. Joanna also serves on the NY State Task Force for teacher and principal evaluation, which is responsible for creating recommendations and guidance for the recently adopted legislation governing educator evaluation in NY State. Joanna joined the NYCDOE in 2007 and previously served as the Deputy Executive Director of the NYCDOE's Research Office. Joanna holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University and completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of

Chicago, where her research focused on lesson study, teacher cognition, and the design of mathematics curriculum and assessment.



**Jill Constantine** is a senior economist, associate director of Human Services Research, and education area leader at Mathematica. An expert in evaluating education interventions for at-risk children and youth, she has technical expertise in using random assignment, matching procedures such as propensity scoring, and advanced statistical modeling. Constantine directs the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) as well as Mathematica's evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Fund grants. Constantine, who joined Mathematica in 2001, directed the firm's study of the efficacy of different teacher preparation methods in contributing to the academic achievement of elementary school students. She also directed Mathematica's evaluation of Talent Search, one of the federal TRIO programs designed to improve access to college for low-income students, and has designed evaluation studies of other college-access programs.

She has conducted impact and statistical analyses on several large-scale projects, including the National Early Head Start Research and Evaluation project, which focused on the cognitive and socio-emotional outcomes of young children and parenting skills of their parents. Before joining the firm, she was an assistant professor at Williams College. She has published in and serves as a reviewer for a number of peer-reviewed journals, including *Child Development*, *Developmental Psychology*, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *Industrial Relations*, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, and *Review of African American Education*. She holds a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Pennsylvania.



**Bonnie Cullison** is a life-long educator. She received a Master's degree in speech pathology in 1978 and began her career in public schools in St. Mary's County, MD. In 1981, she moved to Montgomery County, and began working in Montgomery County Public Schools, where she has spent the remainder of her 31 years in education serving special education students. Teaching was professionally rewarding and fulfilling; however, Bonnie wanted to outreach to colleagues and create teaching and learning environments in which all students could be successful, regardless of their backgrounds, ethnicity and socio-economic status. She believed that the key to reaching that goal was to empower front-line educators to be leaders in the development of educational policy and instruction. From 2003 to 2009, Bonnie served as the president of MCEA, with 11,500 members. During those years she established new levels of collaborative

working relationships with school system leaders. As a result, many new programs were put into place in which students have flourished and employees were viewed as the most essential assets of the system. Bonnie is now retired from MCPS. She is currently working with the NEA Foundation for Innovation in Education on a grant-funded project to build the capacity of education union leaders and school system leaders to work collaboratively for the benefit for all students. The goal is to enable those who are leaders in public schools to become meaningful partners in educational reform and students can achieve the skills they need to be most successful in this age of information, technology and constant change. Bonnie was elected to Maryland House of Delegates in 2010 to represent the residents of District 19 in Montgomery County. She serves on the Health and Government Operations Committee.



**Beverly Donohue** joined New Visions for Public Schools in 2003. Since then, she has served as vice president for policy and research, formulating and advocating policies to support the improvement of public education in New York City. Areas of focus have included the systemic reform of secondary education and the use of early-warning data to improve student performance. She spent seventeen years in New York City government, focusing on issues of agency and program finance and management, including four years as deputy director of the Office of Management and Budget and seven years as chief financial officer of the school system. Donohue is a nationally recognized expert on school budgets and funding in support of educational reform. She was responsible for developing widely recognized, transparent reports for educational expenditures at the school, regional and system-wide levels; developing software and changing business practices to enable school-based budgeting and instituting “placement-neutral” funding in support of special education reform. Donohue holds a B.A. from Radcliffe College and a M.A.T. from Harvard University.



**Tracy Dorland** is the Executive Director of Educator Effectiveness in the Denver Public Schools. In this role, she leads the development of a comprehensive definition of teacher and principal effectiveness and the creation and implementation of performance management systems that align to those definitions. Prior to this role, she served as an Instructional Superintendent for a network of Elementary Schools in DPS. She has also been a principal, assistant principal, instructional coach and teacher. Tracy has a BA in Psychology from the University of Colorado at Boulder and an MA in Administrative Leadership and Policy Studies from the University of Colorado at Denver.



**Carrie McPherson Douglass** is the director of talent strategy for Aspire Public Schools in California where she previously served as the director of human resources. In this role, Douglass leads The College Ready Promise Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation teacher effectiveness grant, as well as talent initiatives such as leadership pipeline, recruiting, performance management and compensation and retention. Prior to joining The Broad Residency, Douglass worked as a financial consultant for a number of public and non-profit companies in the Boston area, including Boston Public Schools, EdVestors, Outward Bound, the New Sector Alliance and the Neighborhood House Charter School. Previously, Douglass worked as a nonprofit development director and interim executive director at Commonwealth Children’s Center. She began her career as a teacher in Portland, Oregon and then moved to Boston as a volunteer teacher with the Jesuit Volunteer Corps, eventually teaching high school science at a new Cristo Rey High School in Cambridge, Mass. Mrs. Douglass received a BA in Education from the University of Portland and an MBA from Boston University.



**Keith Dysarz** serves as the Director of Teacher Effectiveness and Common Core Implementation for Baltimore City Public Schools. In this capacity, he oversees the development and training on the qualitative standards that define excellence in teaching for Baltimore City Schools. He also coordinates the district’s transitional work to the Common Core State Standards. Prior to this position, Keith served as the Coordinator of Curriculum and Assessments in the Office of Teaching and Learning, where he led the advancement of the district’s benchmark assessment and curriculum development programs. Keith’s work in Baltimore City began as an elementary mathematics teacher, a position he held for 6 years after coming to the district as a Teacher for America corps member.



**Amy Holcombe** is currently the executive director of talent development for Guilford County Schools in Greensboro, NC. She has been working with Guilford County schools since 1995, serving in positions including lead teacher, curriculum specialist, technology program director, and principal, among others. As executive director of talent development, Ms. Holcombe is responsible for programs such as Mission Possible, North Carolina's first differentiated compensation system; the Cumulative Effect, an initiative designed to increase the content knowledge of math teachers; the Lateral Entry Resource Advising Center, a comprehensive support model for lateral entry teachers; the Administrative Cohort Program; the School Executive Evaluation; and Value-Added Data. Ms. Holcombe holds a B.A. in English, a graduate certificate in Education, a Master of Education in English, a Master of School

Administration, and a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Teaching.



**David Lussier** is the Executive Director for the Office of Educator Quality, and directs the Austin ISD Strategic Compensation Initiative. David was a high school history teacher in Massachusetts, where he earned National Board Certification and was named the Massachusetts Teacher of the Year in 2000. As a White House Fellow, David served as Associate Director of Domestic Policy in the Clinton and Bush Administrations and participated in the development of the No Child Left Behind Act. After leaving the White House, David joined the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, where he served as a policy advisor to the president of NBPTS and later as research director. David is currently an advanced doctoral student in the Urban Superintendents Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He earned a Bachelors Degree in History from the University of Massachusetts Lowell, a Masters Degree in Teaching from Boston University and a Masters Degree in Education Policy and Management from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.



**Gay Su Pinnell** is a professor in the School of Teaching and Learning at The Ohio State University. She has extensive experience in classroom teaching and field-based research, and in developing comprehensive approaches to literacy education. She has received the International Reading Association's Albert J. Harris Award for research and the Charles A. Dana Foundation Award for her contributions to the field of education. She is also a member of the Reading Hall of Fame. Together with Irene Fountas she has authored numerous books, videos, and websites with Heinemann that are considered standards in the field of literacy instruction and staff development. Their latest innovations are The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention and The Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System, a comprehensive assessment

system for grades K-8. Fountas and Pinnell together present workshops nationwide on a variety of literacy-instruction topics through Heinemann Professional Development.



**Ted Quinn** is the VP of Strategy and Research for Teach for America. Ted joined Teach For America three years ago, where he leads efforts to understand the program's impact across a broad range of outcomes, to generate fundamental insights into what works and what doesn't in pursuit of the organization's mission to end educational inequity, and to ensure that these insights drive both short-term performance management and long-term transformation. Before joining Teach For America, Ted spent seven years at McKinsey & Co., working with companies and organizations on a wide range of strategy and performance issues. Ted holds a PhD in Physics from University of Chicago and a B.S. in Physics from Stanford University. He lives in New York City.



**Jesse Solomon** currently serves as the Executive Director of the Boston Plan for Excellence (BPE). With support from Boston Public Schools (BPS) and BPE, Mr. Solomon founded Boston Teacher Residency (BTR) in 2003 to recruit and prepare teachers for the BPS. He has been named a Barr Foundation Fellow for his leadership, and BTR has become a national model of teacher preparation, with more than a dozen cities replicating its approach. Mr. Solomon taught middle and high school math for ten years at the King

Open School (Cambridge), Brighton High School (Boston), and City On A Hill Public Charter School (Boston), where he was a founding teacher, lead teacher for curriculum and instruction, and a member of the board of directors. While at City On A Hill, he founded The Teachers' Institute, a school-based teacher preparation program. He has been an instructor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and is a National Board certified teacher. Mr. Solomon holds a B.S. in mathematics from M.I.T. and a M.Ed. from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.





**Rob Weil** is the Director of Field Programs, Education Issues Department, at the American Federation of Teachers. Before coming to the AFT, Mr. Weil taught high school math in Colorado for 20 years. As the president of the Douglas County Federation of Teachers, which represents approximately 3,000 Kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade teachers, he led the development and implementation of numerous school and teacher quality improvement efforts including the district’s groundbreaking performance pay plan for teachers and its successful teacher-led professional development program. In the summer of 2001, Mr. Weil joined the national office of the AFT. His current responsibilities include managing many of AFT’s in-the-field efforts regarding school and teacher improvement at the state, district, school and classroom level. These responsibilities include the AFT’s Center for School Improvement, its work on teacher development and evaluation throughout the country, and the design and implementation of performance-based compensation systems.



**Richard J. Wenning** served as Associate Commissioner at the Colorado Department of Education, where he lead CDE’s Office of Performance and Policy. His responsibilities have included public policy development and the design and implementation of Colorado’s educational accountability system, including SchoolView and the Colorado Growth Model. Before joining CDE, Mr. Wenning was Vice President for Quality & Accountability at the Colorado League of Charter Schools. Mr. Wenning also served as an Executive on Loan to the Superintendent of Denver Public Schools, where he focused on strengthening the district’s performance management practices and led the development of the district’s School Performance Framework. Prior to moving to Colorado from Washington, DC, Mr. Wenning was President of the Education Performance Network, an affiliate of New American Schools, where he led a consulting practice focused on educational accountability systems and new school development. Mr. Wenning also served as Senior Policy Advisor to the CEO of the D.C. Public Schools during the school district’s takeover by the congressionally appointed D.C. Control Board. While at DCPS, he headed its offices of intergovernmental affairs and educational accountability and was responsible for implementation of charter school legislation enacted by Congress.



**Ross Wiener** joined the Aspen Institute in May 2009. In his role as Executive Director, Ross leads professional learning networks for urban school district leaders and senior Congressional Education staffers. The program assists policymakers and education leaders in strengthening human capital systems, supporting implementation of Common Core State Standards, and strategically reallocating financial resources. In addition to facilitating networks, the Education & Society Program hosts public conversations as well as off-the-record workshops, and publishes original research and commentary. From 2002 to 2009, Ross worked at the Education Trust, a national, non-profit organization dedicated to raising standards and closing achievement gaps in public education. As policy director and then as vice president for

program and policy, Ross managed the Education Trust’s research/data analysis, policy development, conference programming, and technical assistance to educators and policymakers in both K-12 and higher education. Prior to Education Trust, Ross served for five years as a trial attorney in the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Educational Opportunities Section, where he represented the United States in cases dealing with desegregation, harassment, and the adequacy of services to limited-English proficient and disabled students. Ross is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and received a law degree with high honors from the George Washington University Law School. He clerked for Judge Kermit Lipez of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.



**Marcie Wolfe** is the Executive Director of the Institute for Literacy Studies (ILS), an organized research unit of The City University of New York located at Lehman College, Bronx, NY. Wolfe is principal investigator for the ILS’s numerous funded projects related to instruction and assessment in literacy and mathematics education, and, in addition, co-directs Lehman College’s Writing Across the Curriculum Initiative. She has provided technical assistance in various educational sectors related to literacy and adult education, after-school education, and urban education reform, serving as a consultant to the Academy for Educational Development, CUNY’s Office of Academic Affairs, the Center for Employment Training, the New York City Department of Education, the Robert Bowne Foundation, and

various sites of the National Writing Project. Ms. Wolfe has taught graduate and undergraduate students in Lehman College’s English Department and Adult Degree Program, as well as in New York City high schools and adult

literacy programs. With Bonne August, she is the editor of *Facilitating Collaboration: Issues in High School/College Professional Development* (CUNY 2004), and, with Jessica Yood, of *Teaching with Writing: Documenting a Semester of Inquiry*, an Edited Collection of Faculty Snapshots (Knowledge Media Laboratory of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2008). Wolfe is the author of “Consenting to be Peers” (CUNY 2004, with B. August), “Our Approach to Faculty Development” in *Looking Both Ways: High School and College Teachers Talk About Language and Literacy* (CUNY 1999), “Writing Projects and School Reform: A Local Perspective,” *Quarterly of the National Writing Project* (1998), *Adult Literacy Education: Program Evaluation and Learner Assessment* (with Susan Lytle), *ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education* (1989), as well as numerous conference papers, book reviews, and technical reports. Currently she is also a member of the leadership team for the National Writing Project’s initiative, Literacy and the Common Core.



**Judy Wurtzel** served in the U.S. Department of Education as a Deputy Assistant Secretary for planning, evaluation and policy development for the first two years of the Obama Administration. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (OPEPD) coordinates policy, budget and evaluation activities within the Department. Judy also helped launch the Department’s new Implementation Support Unit designed to support systemic and coherent state reforms and served as that office’s first Deputy Director for Technical Assistance and Technical Assistance Policy. Immediately prior to joining the Department, Wurtzel was Co-Director of the Aspen Institute Program on Education and Society. During her tenure, Aspen education initiatives included: a senior congressional staff network, an urban superintendents network and related networks of chief academic officers, chief financial officers and secondary mathematics and literacy leaders and policy initiatives on improving high schools and on strengthening human capital. Wurtzel previously was Executive Director of the Learning First Alliance and also served as a senior advisor at the U.S. Department of Education during the Clinton Administration, working on a wide range of elementary and secondary education issues.



**Maureen Yoder** is the Assistant Director of Education Quality at the Ohio Department of Education. She directs the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF), which was awarded a \$20.5 million grant in 2006 and a \$56 million grant in 2010. In that capacity, she manages the TIF programs in 24 districts, including the state’s four largest urban districts. She assisted in the development of the Ohio Principal Evaluation System in 2007, developed training modules for the system, and facilitated the rollout statewide this year. More recently, she is assisting with the development of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. Previously, Ms. Yoder taught middle level science and also served as a middle school principal, and for the last 13 years of her career served as principal of a suburban high school. She has been recognized for her teaching and also for her work as an administrator. She was one of the original members of the Ohio Educator

Standards Board and served as Chair. She received a master’s degree in education administration from Wright State University in Ohio.

## CARNEGIE STAFF BIOGRAPHIES



**Anthony S. Bryk** is the ninth president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He held the Spencer Chair in Organizational Studies in the School of Education and the Graduate School of Business at Stanford University from 2004 until assuming Carnegie's presidency in September 2008. He came to Stanford from the University of Chicago where he was the Marshall Field IV Professor of Urban Education in the sociology department, and where he helped found the Center for Urban School Improvement, which supports reform efforts in the Chicago Public Schools. He also created the Consortium on Chicago School Research, a federation of research groups that have produced a range of studies to advance and assess urban school reform. His current research and practice interests focus on the organizational redesign of schools and school systems and the integration of technology into schooling to enhance teaching and learning.



**Alicia Grunow** is the Senior Managing Partner for Learning Teaching at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. She leads the Foundation's program of work focused on the development of assessments and practices for the purposes of improving teaching. She also leads efforts to adapt tools from improvement research to support change efforts in education. Her background has afforded her with an unusual combination of practical experience in the development of teachers and technical skills in statistical analysis. For the past four years she has worked as an instructor in Stanford's Teacher Education Program (STEP), teaching classes on practices to support the academic achievement of English Language Learners. During that time she also worked as a research assistant on a variety of projects, conducting large-scale quantitative analyses. She is finishing her masters in economics and doctorate in educational administration and policy analysis at Stanford University. Grunow received her B.A. in Psychology from Reed College in 1999 and completed the Bilingual and ESL Teachers Leadership Academy at Bank Street College in 2005. Before coming to Stanford, she taught for seven years in elementary school programs designed for English Language Learners in both Denver and New York City.



**Paul G. LeMahieu** is the Senior Managing Partner for Design, Development, and Improvement Research at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and is graduate faculty in the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i – Mānoa. His scholarly interests focus on educational assessment and accountability as well as classroom learning and the professional development and policy environments that support it. From 2002 to 2010, LeMahieu was Director of Research and Evaluation for the National Writing Project at the University of California, Berkeley. Prior to that, LeMahieu served as Superintendent of Education for the State of Hawai'i, the chief educational and executive officer of the only state system in the United States that is a unitary school district, serving nearly 200,000 students with annual budgets totaling over \$1,800,000,000. LeMahieu has published extensively on issues as diverse as testing policy and practice; educational accountability; staff development; school effectiveness; nontraditional work roles for women; minority achievement issues; science education; and vocational education. He has received a number of major awards for his contributions to educational theory and practice from the American Educational Research Association, the Evaluation Research Society, the Buros Institute of Measurement, the National Association of Test Directors, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. He has been President of the National Association of Test Directors and Vice President of the American Educational Research Association. He served on the National Academy of Sciences' Board on International Comparative Studies in Education, and Mathematical Sciences Education Board. He is a Founding Director of the Center for the Study of Research on Expertise in Teaching and Learning, served on the National Board on Testing Policy, and the National Board on Professional Teaching Standards. LeMahieu holds degrees from Yale College (AB), Harvard University (EdM), and University of Pittsburgh (PhD).



**Jeannie Myung** is a research associate for the Learning Teaching program at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Previously, she has worked as a researcher for the Teacher Pathways Project, the School Leadership Research Project of the Center for Education Policy Analysis, and the Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice. She has published work on new teacher mentoring, teacher recruitment and retention policies, and teacher and principal career pathways. She completed her doctoral work in Administration and Policy Analysis at the Stanford University School of Education. Her dissertation focused on school district personnel practices around the selection and development of teacher leaders. She previously taught in an elementary public school in San Jose, California. Jeannie holds a B.A. in Political Science from Yale College.



**Thomas Toch** is a leading education policy expert and a highly regarded education writer. He is a founder and former co-director of the think tank Education Sector and he has been executive director of Independent Education, a consortium of private schools in the Washington, DC, region. He spent a decade as the senior education correspondent at U.S. News and World Report and has contributed to The Atlantic, The New York Times, and other national publications. Toch has been a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution and has taught at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He helped launch Education Week in the 1980s, serving variously as writer, commentary editor, and co-managing editor at the newspaper. He has authored two books on American education, *In the Name of Excellence* (Oxford University Press) and *High Schools on a Human Scale* (Beacon Press) and he currently writes the monthly WashingtonView column for Kappan magazine and is a regular contributor to the National Journal’s Education Experts blog.



**Kareen Mo Yang** is the Program Manager for the Learning Teaching program at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Before coming to the Foundation in 2010, she was Research Manager at the National Writing Project at the University of California, Berkeley. In this role Kareen led the development and administration of the instrumentation and coding systems for the Legacy Survey, a major study that documents the career paths of over five thousand current and past participants in NWP programming. She also managed the National Scoring Conferences (including workflow design and maintenance as well as data entry and management) at which an average of six thousand pieces of student writing was scored annually. She has a B.A. in Psychology from UC Berkeley.

## US DEPT OF EDUCATION

**April Bolton-Smith**  
TIF Team Leader

**Amanda DeGraff**  
Project Officer  
Institute of Education Sciences

**Patricia Johnson**  
Acting Teacher Quality Group Director

**Steve Means**  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

**Carol O’Donnell**  
Institute of Education Sciences

**Elizabeth Warner**  
National Evaluation Lead  
Institute of Education Sciences

## Appendix B. Convening Agenda

---

### **Thursday, October 20**

12:30-1:30pm	Lunch
1:30-1:45pm	Welcome and Introductions
1:45-2:15pm	<i>Presentation</i> The Design of Teaching Assessment Systems
2:15-3:00pm	<i>Panel Discussion:</i> Examples of Systems to Support Practice Improvement
3:00-3:45pm	<i>Whole Group Discussion:</i> Measurement for Improvement
3:45-4:00pm	<i>Break</i>
4:00-5:00pm	<i>Small Group Discussions:</i> Informing a Multi-Stakeholder R&D Agenda to Support Practice Improvement
5:00-5:15pm	Reflections & Closing

### **Friday, October 21**

8:00-8:30am	Breakfast
8:30-9:30am	<i>Presentation &amp; Small Group Discussions:</i> Measurement to Inform Key Evaluative Decisions
9:30-10:15am	<i>Whole Group Discussion:</i> Informing a Multi-Stakeholder R&D Agenda to Support Evaluation
10:15-10:30am	<i>Break</i>
10:30-11:30am	<i>Whole Group Discussion:</i> Identifying Unintended Consequences
11:30am-12:00pm	Reflections & Next Steps
12:00pm	Lunch