Role of the TAP Evaluation and Compensation Guide

The TAP Evaluation and Compensation (TEC) Guide provides schools with a framework and instruments to implement TAP’s Instructionally Focused Accountability and Performance-Based Compensation systems.

Under TAP, teacher performance is measured by:
1. The skills, knowledge, and responsibilities a teacher exhibits as evaluated during classroom observations;
2. The value-added gains the teacher produces in his or her classroom’s achievement; and
3. The value-added gains the school produces in student achievement.

Both teaching processes (instructional skills, knowledge, and responsibilities) and teaching outcomes (student achievement gains) play a role in determining teacher performance and pay. This guide helps schools measure master, mentor, and career teacher performance, and then pay teachers according to their skills, knowledge, responsibilities, and student achievement gains. In addition to the information contained within this guide, the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) provides detailed trainings and workshops designed for schools or districts implementing TAP™: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement.

We encourage you to use this TEC Guide as you pursue your goals of Teacher Excellence → Student Achievement → Opportunities for All
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Overview and Recommended Policies
TAP™: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement was launched by the Milken Family Foundation in 1999 and is now operated by the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET). The goal of TAP is improved teacher professional practice resulting in improved student achievement. TAP is a reform system designed to elevate the teaching profession through the implementation of four interrelated elements:

1. **Multiple Career Paths:** TAP allows teachers to pursue a variety of positions throughout their careers — career, mentor, and master teacher — depending upon their interests, abilities, and accomplishments. As they move up the ranks, their qualifications, roles, and responsibilities increase — and so does their compensation. This career path allows teachers to advance without having to leave the classroom. Along with the principal, the master and mentor teachers form a leadership team to deliver school-based professional support and conduct evaluations with a high level of expertise.

2. **Ongoing Applied Professional Growth:** TAP restructures the school schedule to provide time during the regular school day for TAP teachers to participate in weekly cluster group meetings. Led by master and mentor teachers, cluster group meetings allow teachers to examine student data together, engage in collaborative planning, and learn instructional strategies that have proven successful in their schools.

3. **Instructionally Focused Accountability:** TAP teachers are observed in classroom instruction several times a year by multiple trained observers, including principals and master and mentor teachers, using research-based rubrics for several dimensions of instructional quality. Evaluators are trained and certified on these rubrics, and leadership teams monitor the reliability and consistency of evaluations in their schools.

4. **Performance-Based Compensation:** Teachers in a TAP school have the opportunity to earn bonuses each year based on their performance in the classroom, their students’ achievement gains, and the entire school’s achievement growth. Master and mentor teachers also receive additional compensation based on their added roles and responsibilities.

This document outlines the specific policies for implementing:
1. The teacher performance evaluation component as called for by the Ongoing Applied Professional Growth and Instructionally Focused Accountability elements of TAP; and
2. The salary augmentations and performance awards component as called for by the Multiple Career Paths and Performance-Based Compensation elements of TAP.

For more information about the TAP system, visit [www.tapsystem.org](http://www.tapsystem.org).
Teacher Performance Evaluation

Performance-Based Standards
At each school site, it is recommended that this document be approved by a committee made up of certified staff members. The committee may suggest revisions; however, these suggestions need to be submitted in writing to the TAP Director or site administrator, and then must be approved by both the TAP Director or supervising agency as applicable. After reviewing this document, the school staff must approve the policies, measurement instruments, compensation model, and standards within.

Each teacher will earn a score based on his or her performance as compared to the standards that are set. Standards are set for the following criteria:
1. Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR)
2. Classroom achievement gains
3. School-wide achievement gains

The above criteria are measured using the following:
1. Classroom observations
2. Classroom-level value-added assessment
3. School-wide value-added assessment

Qualified evaluators assess these standards for decision-making related to:
1. Annual evaluation process according to law
2. Qualification for career path movement
3. Determination of performance awards

Qualified Evaluators
1. Principals, master teachers, mentor teachers, and district personnel are eligible to serve as qualified evaluators.
2. All designated evaluators must participate in required certification training and demonstrate proficiency in the TAP evaluation process by successfully completing an annual certification test to be qualified.

Evaluation Team
The TAP teacher evaluation system requires that each teacher be evaluated multiple times each year by multiple qualified evaluators. The evaluation team consists of an administrator (principal, assistant principal, or district personnel), a master teacher, and a mentor teacher. The teacher also serves as a self-evaluator to facilitate reflection on his or her own teaching.

Evaluation Cycle Frequency and Weighting
1. Each teacher will be observed 4-6 times during a school year. For each of these observations, teachers are also required to complete a self-evaluation.
2. For career and mentor teachers, the following evaluator type frequency is required:
   » At least 1 time per year by a master teacher
   » At least 1 time per year by a mentor teacher
   » At least 1 time per year by an administrator (principal, assistant principal, or district personnel)
   » The school leadership team should determine the type of evaluator for the remaining observations.
For master teachers, the following evaluator type frequency is required:

- At least 1 time per year by an administrator (principal, assistant principal, or district personnel)
- At least 1 time per year by another master teacher or a mentor teacher
- The school leadership team should determine the type of evaluator for the remaining observations.

3. Evaluations are weighted differently based on who is conducting the evaluation. These weights are computed at the end of the year when final SKR scores are averaged. The chart below illustrates TAP’s recommend weightings by teacher type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career and Mentor Teachers</th>
<th>Master Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluator Type</td>
<td>Weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Additionally, teachers will receive a summative evaluation report each year. This report will include the averaged ratings for performance in the Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities criteria. The written report will be discussed with the individual being evaluated before the end of the school year. The classroom value-added achievement and school achievement data will be discussed when results are returned (timing contingent upon availability of state test results and value-added analyses). Performance awards will be distributed after value-added results and evaluation scores are calculated.

**Teacher Performance Evaluation Domains**

When a teacher is evaluated according to the Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities criteria, he or she will be given an averaged performance rating for each evaluation based on the indicators in each of the four domains:

1. Designing and Planning Instruction
2. The Learning Environment
3. Instruction
4. Responsibilities

In each domain, performance will be rated on a five-point scale, averaged, and assigned a single score. Further, each domain will be assigned a weight on which performance awards are based:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Weights</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designing and Planning Instruction</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Learning Environment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the year, all evaluators’ data will be averaged with these weights to produce a final score for each teacher (SKR score).
Announced and Unannounced Classroom Observations
At least half of the classroom observations should be unannounced. Prior to announced observations, the evaluator conducts a “pre-conference” meeting with the teacher to ask pertinent background questions about the lesson plan and the students in the class in order to provide context. After each classroom/lesson observation, the teacher being observed will receive written and/or oral feedback from the individual evaluator in a “post-conference” meeting. In the post-conference, the evaluator shares points of “reinforcement” to highlight the teacher’s strengths, as well as points of “refinement” where the teacher has growth areas. All observations (announced and unannounced) must include post-conference meetings.

Salary Augmentations and Performance Awards

Salary Augmentation Related to Career Path
As part of TAP’s Multiple Career Paths, teacher compensation increases as qualifications, roles, and responsibilities increase. Therefore, if qualified and selected to fill an open position as a mentor or master teacher, the teacher will receive the salary addendum for which he or she qualifies. Salary augmentations are determined locally based on position and local compensation structure. In different TAP locations, addendums have ranged from a minimum of $2,500 for mentor teachers to a maximum of $15,000 for master teachers.

Performance Award Fund
At a minimum, $2,000 per teacher should be allocated for the school’s performance award fund (Note: many schools base their award fund on $2,500-$3,000 per teacher, which is recommended by NIET). The award fund is divided into six pools:

1. Career teachers with student achievement data
2. Career teachers without student achievement data
3. Mentor teachers with student achievement data
4. Mentor teachers without student achievement data
5. Master teachers with student achievement data
6. Master teachers without student achievement data

Note: Teachers are considered “without” student achievement data if they teach subjects or grades without high stakes or district tests, or do not have enough students with previous test data to calculate a value-added growth score for their classroom.

The award pool for each group is apportioned based on the ratio of the number of teachers in each of the six pools to the total number of teachers eligible for an award.

To reiterate, the awards are based on three criteria:

1. Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR score)
2. Classroom achievement gains (value-added)
3. School achievement gains (value-added)

Each criterion must be assigned a weight that determines what percentage of the award pool is designated for that criterion. TAP recommends 50% for Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities, 30% for classroom achievement, and 20% for school achievement.

In the event that the classroom achievement portion is not applicable due to lack of data, that teacher’s 30% for classroom achievement gains will be shifted to school achievement gains. In other words, TAP recommends that teachers without student achievement scores are weighted 50% for Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities and 50% for school achievement gains.

All performance awards in TAP are considered a one-time award and must be earned yearly.
Performance Award Requirements

Below are the minimum requirements on the Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities to be eligible to earn the portion of the award pool set aside for that criterion:

1. Master teachers must earn a SKR score of no less than “4”
2. Mentor teachers must earn a SKR score of no less than “3.5”
3. Career teachers must earn a SKR score of no less than “2.5”

Additionally, there are minimum requirements for both classroom and school-wide achievement scores to be eligible to earn the portions of the award pool set aside for each of those criteria:

1. All teacher types must earn a value-added score of no less than “3” on their individual classroom achievement (a score of “3” means that the teacher’s students made one year’s expected growth on the state or comparable district assessment).
2. The school-wide achievement score must be a value-added score of no less than “3” (a score of “3” means that the school made one year’s expected growth on the state or comparable district assessment).

For example, if a career teacher received an SKR score of “3,” a classroom value-added score of “2,” and a school-wide value-added score of “2,” they would only be eligible for the SKR portion of the award pool.

TAP Definition of Inadequate Performance

A teacher’s performance is evaluated as inadequate when he or she receives an average score of below “2” on a five-point scale for either the Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities standards or the classroom achievement gains criteria. If a teacher earns an average score of below “2” in either of these evaluation criteria, he or she will take part in the school district’s improvement plan.

Appeal Process

Example Site-Based Appeal Process

In the event a TAP teacher disagrees with the evaluation scores for individual performance on the Skills and Knowledge standards, he or she may appeal if there is a discrepancy of three or more points between any of the evaluator’s scores for any of the nineteen indictors from the Instruction, Designing and Planning Instruction, or The Learning Environment rubrics.

The site-based appeal process will follow the outlined procedures:

1. Completion of an Appeal Request letter stating the specific nature of the discrepancy, full disclosure of evidence of performance, and a statement of expected performance evaluation.
2. The evaluation team will meet with the teacher to review and provide information related to performance to achieve a mutual agreement.
3. In the event of non-agreement, a master teacher from the same school will reassess evaluation materials regarding the teacher’s performance by reviewing existing evidence.
4. After reviewing the information, the principal makes the final determination in writing regarding the TAP teacher’s score.
District-Level Appeal Process

If a TAP teacher disagrees with the assessed score after following the site-based appeal, the teacher may appeal at the district level utilizing the established district appeal process.

The following conditions must be met:
1. The District Appeal Committee, in addition to the members established by statute, must include at least one master teacher from the TAP school.
2. A review of the TAP teacher contract will be presented.
3. A review of the TAP teacher evaluation documentation will be presented.
4. Decisions from the District Appeal Committee will be final.
### Instructionally Focused Accountability and Performance-Based Compensation Summary Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500 to $4,500 (determined by district)</td>
<td>$6,000 to $15,000 (determined by district)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Skills, Knowledge, &amp; Responsibilities – 50%</td>
<td>Skills, Knowledge, &amp; Responsibilities – 50%</td>
<td>Skills, Knowledge, &amp; Responsibilities – 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 Standards (Minimum Averaged Score 2.5)</td>
<td>26 Standards (Minimum Averaged Score 3.5)</td>
<td>26 Standards (Minimum Averaged Score 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Designing and Planning Instruction – 15%</td>
<td>Designing and Planning Instruction – 15%</td>
<td>Designing and Planning Instruction – 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instruction – 75%</td>
<td>Instruction – 60%</td>
<td>Instruction – 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Learning Environment – 5%</td>
<td>The Learning Environment – 5%</td>
<td>The Learning Environment – 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsibilities – 5%</td>
<td>Responsibilities – 20%</td>
<td>Responsibilities – 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td>Instructional Supervision</td>
<td>Instructional Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>School Responsibilities</td>
<td>School Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
<td>Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td>Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mentor Teacher Review – 20%</td>
<td>Mentor Teacher Review – 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Master Teacher Review – 35%</td>
<td>Master Teacher Review – 35%</td>
<td>Master (or Mentor) Teacher Review – 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Administrator Review – 35%</td>
<td>Administrator Review – 35%</td>
<td>Administrator Review – 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Self Evaluation – 10%</td>
<td>Self Evaluation – 10%</td>
<td>Self Evaluation – 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Responsibilities Survey</td>
<td>Responsibilities Survey</td>
<td>Responsibilities Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Classroom Achievement Attributed to Teacher – 30%*</td>
<td>Classroom Achievement Attributed to Teacher – 30%*</td>
<td>Classroom Achievement Attributed to Teacher – 30%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Level 5 – 2 standard errors above average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 5 – 2 standard errors above average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Level 4 – 1 standard error above average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 4 – 1 standard error above average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Level 3 – Neither 1 standard error above nor below the average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 3 – Neither 1 standard error above nor below the average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Level 2 – 1 standard error below average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 2 – 1 standard error below average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Level 1 – 2 standard errors below average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 1 – 2 standard errors below average teacher gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>School-Wide Achievement: Award Is Equally Distributions to All Staff – 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Level 5 – 2 standard errors above average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 5 – 2 standard errors above average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Level 4 – 1 standard error above average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 4 – 1 standard error above average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Level 3 – Neither 1 standard error above nor below the average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 3 – Neither 1 standard error above nor below the average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Level 2 – 1 standard error below average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td>Level 2 – 1 standard error below average school gain in the state or representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Level 1 – 2 standard errors below average school gain in the state of representative sample</td>
<td>Level 1 – 2 standard errors below average school gain in the state of representative sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Career, mentor, and master teachers without classroom achievement data (e.g., grades K-3 and specialist teachers) are evaluated based on Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (50%) and School-Wide Achievement (50%).

**Because in some cases master teachers do not carry a teaching register, they do not receive a classroom-level achievement score. The percentage is shifted to the school-wide award, thus 50% is based on Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities and 50% on School-Wide Achievement.
**Instructionally Focused Accountability and Performance-Based Compensation Summary Line Item Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Number</th>
<th>Row Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 1</strong></td>
<td>Different career-level teachers in the TAP system (career, mentor, and master)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 2</strong></td>
<td>Suggested addendum for career path positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 3</strong></td>
<td>Recommended percentage (out of 100) of the individual performance award that shall be designated for Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities for each level teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 4</strong></td>
<td>Recommended number of teaching standards and the minimum average performance score for each level teacher to be eligible to earn the portion of the award pool set aside for that criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rows 5-7</strong></td>
<td>Domains of the teaching standards that will be appraised and the percent each domain shall count towards the teacher’s final Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR) score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rows 8-15</strong></td>
<td>Recommended responsibility standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rows 16-19</strong></td>
<td>Possible evaluators of each teacher’s performance and what percentage each evaluator’s score should count in calculating the total score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 20</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of self-evaluation scores calculated in the total score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rows 21-23</strong></td>
<td>Measurement instruments to evaluate teacher Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 24-29</strong></td>
<td>Recommended percentage of award that shall be designated for classroom achievement attributed to the teacher. Recommended criteria for teachers to earn the student achievement performance award at different levels of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row 30</strong></td>
<td>Recommended percentage of the award that shall be designated for school-wide achievement gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rows 31-35</strong></td>
<td>Recommended criteria for a school to earn the school-wide performance award at different levels of achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAP Evaluation System
The TAP Teaching Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities Performance Standards are the backbone of TAP's Instructionally Focused Accountability element. To measure teaching skills, knowledge, and responsibilities, one must define the skills and determine how they are demonstrated at different levels of performance. These standards were developed based on education psychology and cognitive science research focusing on learning and instruction, as well as an extensive review of publications from national and state teacher standards organizations.

The research for the Teaching Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities Performance Standards includes the following:

- Milanowski, Odden & Youns (1998) argue that the challenge of creating an effective teacher accountability system is to improve the quality of teacher instruction, and thereby raise student achievement. To do this, Odden and Clune (1998) instruct states and school districts to identify the knowledge and skills that a teacher needs to teach successfully, and then create standards and rubrics to measure teaching performance.

- TAP reviewed instructional guidelines and standards developed by numerous national and state teacher standards organizations and from this information developed its own set of standards for teacher accountability. The work reviewed included guidelines and standards developed by:
  - The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)
  - The National Board for Professional Teacher Standards
  - Massachusetts's Principles for Effective Teaching
  - California's Standards for the Teaching Profession
  - Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support Program
  - The New Teacher Center's Developmental Continuum of Teacher Abilities

- The criteria for the TAP teaching standards came from both experimental design studies and correlation studies that used valid and reliable achievement tests in classrooms (see Schacter & Thum, 2004).

- The work of Danielson (1996) served as a valuable resource for defining the teaching competencies at each level of teacher performance.

- Rubrics were designed based on the work of Rowley (1999) and various teacher accountability systems, including:
  - Rochester (New York) Career in Teaching Program
  - Douglas County (Colorado) Teacher's Performance Pay Plan
  - Vaughn Next Century Charter School (Los Angeles) Performance Pay Plan
  - Rolla (Missouri) School District Professional Based Teacher Evaluation

The TAP Instruction, Designing and Planning Instruction, and The Learning Environment rubrics are on the following pages. These rubrics and their 26 indicators are only intended for use by administrators, master teachers, and mentor teachers who have successfully completed their initial TAP evaluator certification and annual recertification. A more thorough explanation of the TAP Rubrics is found in the TAP Leadership Team Handbook. Following the rubrics is the evaluation report form used for teacher evaluations and self-evaluations.
### Teaching Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities

#### Performance Standards Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Standards and Objectives*</td>
<td>1. Expectations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motivating Students*</td>
<td>2. Managing Student Behavior*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presenting Instructional Content*</td>
<td>3. Environment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lesson Structure and Pacing*</td>
<td>4. Respectful Culture*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activities and Materials*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Questioning*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Feedback*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Grouping Students*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teacher Content Knowledge*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teacher Knowledge of Students*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Thinking*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Problem Solving*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGNING AND PLANNING INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional Plans</td>
<td>1. Staff Development**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Work</td>
<td>2. Instructional Supervision**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment</td>
<td>3. Mentoring**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Community Involvement**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. School Responsibilities**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Reflecting on Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates criteria that are evaluated during classroom observations.

** Indicates criteria that are only applied to master and mentor teachers.
### Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary (5)*</th>
<th>Proficient (4)*</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Standards and Objectives
- Most learning objectives and state content standards are communicated.
- State content standards are displayed and referenced throughout the lesson.
- Expectations for student performance are clear.
- Instruction is coherent, with a beginning, middle, end, and time for reflection.
- Lessons start promptly.
- Routines for distributing materials are efficient.
- No instructional time is lost during transitions.

#### Motivating Students
- The teacher consistently develops learning experiences where inquiry, curiosity, and exploration are valued.
- Pacing is appropriate and sometimes provides opportunities for students who progress at different rates.
- Raters can score performance at levels 2 or 3.

#### Presenting Instructional Content
- Presentation of content always includes: visuals that establish the purpose of the lesson; preview the organization of the lesson, and include new concepts and ideas; modeling by the teacher to demonstrate his or her performance expectations; concise communication, logical sequencing and segmenting; all essential information and; no irrelevant, confusing, or nonessential information.
- All lessons start promptly.

#### Lesson Structure and Pacing
- Lessons have a structure, with a beginning, middle, end, and time for reflection.
- Raters can score performance at levels 2 or 3.
- Raters can score performance at levels 2 or 3.

---

*Performance definitions are provided at levels 3, 4, and 5. Raters can score performance at levels 2 or 3 based on their professional judgment.
### Instruction Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities and Materials</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities and materials include all of the following:</strong></td>
<td>• support the lesson objectives;</td>
<td>• support the lesson objectives;</td>
<td>• support the lesson objectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• are challenging;</td>
<td>• are challenging;</td>
<td>• are challenging;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sustain students' attention;</td>
<td>• sustain students' attention;</td>
<td>• sustain students' attention;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• elicit a variety of thinking;</td>
<td>• elicit a variety of thinking;</td>
<td>• elicit a variety of thinking;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provide time for reflection;</td>
<td>• provide time for reflection;</td>
<td>• provide time for reflection;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• are relevant to students' lives;</td>
<td>• are relevant to students' lives;</td>
<td>• are relevant to students' lives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction;</td>
<td>• provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction;</td>
<td>• provide opportunities for student-to-student interaction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• induce student curiosity and suspense;</td>
<td>• induce student curiosity and suspense;</td>
<td>• induce student curiosity and suspense;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provide students with choices;</td>
<td>• provide students with choices;</td>
<td>• provide students with choices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• incorporate multimedia and technology and;</td>
<td>• incorporate multimedia and technology and;</td>
<td>• incorporate multimedia and technology and;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• incorporate resources beyond the school curriculum texts (e.g., teacher-made materials, manipulatives, resources from museums, cultural centers, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In addition, sometimes activities are game-like, involve simulations, require creating products, and demand self-direction and self-monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher questions are varied and high quality, providing a balanced mix of question types:</td>
<td>Teacher questions are varied and high quality, providing for some, but not all, question types:</td>
<td>Teacher questions are inconsistent in quality and include few question types:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o knowledge and comprehension;</td>
<td>o knowledge and comprehension;</td>
<td>o knowledge and comprehension;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o application and analysis; and</td>
<td>o application and analysis; and</td>
<td>o application and analysis; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creation and evaluation.</td>
<td>creation and evaluation.</td>
<td>creation and evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions are consistently purposeful and coherent.</td>
<td>Questions are sometimes purposeful and coherent.</td>
<td>Questions are random and lack coherence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high frequency of questions is asked.</td>
<td>A moderate frequency of questions asked.</td>
<td>A low frequency of questions is asked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions are consistently sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.</td>
<td>Questions are sometimes sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.</td>
<td>Questions are rarely sequenced with attention to the instructional goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions regularly require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, written and shared responses, or group and individual answers).</td>
<td>Questions sometimes require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers).</td>
<td>Questions rarely require active responses (e.g., whole class signaling, choral responses, or group and individual answers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time (3-5 seconds) is consistently provided.</td>
<td>Wait time is sometimes provided.</td>
<td>Wait time is inconsistently provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher calls on volunteers and nonvolunteers, and a balance of students based on ability and sex.</td>
<td>The teacher calls on volunteers and nonvolunteers, and a balance of students based on ability and sex.</td>
<td>The teacher mostly calls on volunteers and high ability students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruction Continued

Academic Feedback

Exemplary (5)
- Oral and written feedback is consistently academically focused, frequent, and high quality. Feedback is regularly given during guided practice and is used to support engagement and monitor and adjust instruction.
- The teacher engages students in giving specific and high-quality feedback to one another.
- Teacher displays extensive content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches.
- Teacher displays correct content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches.
- Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.

Proficient (3)
- Oral and written feedback is mostly academically focused, frequent, and high quality. Feedback is sometimes given during guided practice and is used to support engagement and monitor and adjust instruction.
- The teacher engages students in giving specific and high-quality feedback to one another.
- Teacher displays underdeveloped content knowledge in several subject areas.
- Teacher rarely implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.
- Teacher sometimes highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.

Unsatisfactory (1)
- Oral and written feedback is almost never given during guided practice and is not used to support engagement or monitor and adjust instruction.
- The teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas and therefore presents content in an unconnected way.
- Teacher practices demonstrate minimal knowledge of students’ anticipated learning difficulties.
- Teacher practices rarely incorporate student interests or cultural heritage.
- Teacher practices demonstrate little differentiation of instructional methods or content.

Grouping Students

Exemplary (5)
- Instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, or individual; heterogeneous or homogeneous ability) maximize student understanding and learning efficiency. All students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.
- Instructional group composition remains unchanged, irrespective of the learning and instructional goals of a lesson.
- Teacher regularly implements a variety of subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.
- Teacher regularly displays understanding of each student's anticipated learning difficulties.
- Teacher regularly provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure that children have the opportunity to master what is being taught.

Proficient (3)
- Instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, or individual; heterogeneous or homogeneous ability) adequately enhance student understanding and learning efficiency. Most students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.
- Instructional group composition is varied (e.g., race, gender, ability, and age) to, most of the time, accomplish the goals of the lesson.
- Teacher rarely implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.
- Teacher sometimes provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure that children have the opportunity to master what is being taught.

Unsatisfactory (1)
- Instructional grouping arrangements (either whole class, small groups, pairs, or individual; heterogeneous or homogeneous ability) inhibit student understanding and learning efficiency. Few students in groups know their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations.
- Instructional group composition remains unchanged, irrespective of the learning and instructional goals of a lesson.
- Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas and therefore presents content in an unconnected way.
- Teacher practices demonstrate minimal knowledge of students’ anticipated learning difficulties.
- Teacher practices rarely incorporate student interests or cultural heritage.
- Teacher practices demonstrate little differentiation of instructional methods or content.

Teacher Content Knowledge

Exemplary (5)
- Teacher regularly highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.
- Teacher frequently gives feedback during guided practice and homework review.
- Teacher monitors and adjusts instruction based on feedback from students.
- Teacher displays extensive content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches.
- Teacher regularly implements a variety of subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.

Proficient (3)
- Teacher sometimes highlights key concepts and ideas and uses them as bases to connect other powerful ideas.
- Feedback is sometimes given during guided practice and homework review.
- Feedback is sometimes used to monitor and adjust instruction.
- Teacher displays correct content knowledge of all the subjects she or he teaches.
- Teacher sometimes implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.

Unsatisfactory (1)
- Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas and therefore presents content in an unconnected way.
- Feedback is rarely given during guided practice.
- Feedback is rarely used to monitor and adjust instruction.
- Teacher displays underdeveloped content knowledge in several subject areas.
- Teacher rarely implements subject-specific instructional strategies to enhance student content knowledge.
- Teacher does not understand key concepts and ideas and therefore presents content in an unconnected way.
### Thinking

Over the course of multiple observations, the teacher consistently and thoroughly teaches all four types of thinking:
- analytical thinking, where students analyze, compare and contrast, and evaluate and explain information;
- practical thinking, where students use, apply, and implement what they learn in real-life scenarios;
- creative thinking, where students create, design, imagine, and suppose and;
- research-based thinking, where students explore and review a variety of ideas, models, and solutions to problems.

The teacher regularly provides opportunities where students:
- generate a variety of ideas and alternatives;
- analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints and;
- monitor their thinking to ensure that they understand what they are learning, are attending to critical information, and are aware of the learning strategies that they are using and why.

Over the course of multiple observations, the teacher consistently and thoroughly teaches two types of thinking:
- analytical thinking, where students analyze, compare and contrast, and evaluate and explain information;
- practical thinking, where students use, apply, and implement what they learn in real-life scenarios;
- creative thinking, where students create, design, imagine, and suppose and;
- research-based thinking, where students explore and review a variety of ideas, models, and solutions to problems.

The teacher sometimes provides opportunities where students:
- generate a variety of ideas and alternatives and;
- analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints.

The teacher implements few learning experiences that thoroughly teach any type of thinking.

The teacher provides few opportunities where students:
- generate a variety of ideas and alternatives and;
- analyze problems from multiple perspectives and viewpoints.

NOTE: If the teacher regularly and thoroughly teaches one type of thinking, he or she shall receive a score of 2.

### Problem Solving

Over the course of multiple observations the teacher implements activities that teach and reinforce 6 or more of the following problem-solving types.
- Abstraction
- Categorization
- Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solutions
- Predicting Outcomes
- Observing and Experimenting
- Improving Solutions
- Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information
- Generating Ideas
- Creating and Designing

Over the course of multiple observations the teacher implements activities that teach and reinforce 4 or more of the following problem-solving types.
- Abstraction
- Categorization
- Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solution
- Predicting Outcomes
- Observing and Experimenting
- Improving Solutions
- Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information
- Generating Ideas
- Creating and Designing

Over the course of multiple observations the teacher implements less than 2 activities that teach the following problem-solving types.
- Abstraction
- Categorization
- Drawing Conclusions/Justifying Solution
- Predicting Outcomes
- Observing and Experimenting
- Improving Solutions
- Identifying Relevant/Irrelevant Information
- Generating Ideas
- Creating and Designing
### Designing and Planning Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Instructional Plans**  | Instructional plans include:  
  • measurable and explicit goals aligned to state content standards;  
  • activities, materials, and assessments that:  
    o are aligned to state standards.  
    o are sequenced from basic to complex.  
    o build on prior student knowledge, are relevant to students’ lives, and integrate other disciplines.  
    o provide appropriate time for student work, student reflection, and lesson and unit closure;  
    • evidence that plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, and interests of all learners and;  
    • evidence that the plan provides regular opportunities to accommodate individual student needs. | Instructional plans include:  
  • goals aligned to state content standards;  
  • activities, materials, and assessments that:  
    o are aligned to state standards.  
    o are sequenced from basic to complex.  
    o build on prior student knowledge.  
    o provide appropriate time for student work, and lesson and unit closure;  
    • evidence that plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, and interests of most learners and;  
    • evidence that the plan provides some opportunities to accommodate individual student needs. | Instructional plans include:  
  • few goals aligned to state content standards;  
  • activities, materials, and assessments that:  
    o are rarely aligned to state standards.  
    o are rarely logically sequenced.  
    o rarely build on prior student knowledge.  
    o inconsistently provide time for student work, and lesson and unit closure;  
    • little evidence that the plan is appropriate for the age, knowledge, or interests of the learners and;  
    • little evidence that the plan provides some opportunities to accommodate individual student needs. |
|                          | Assignments require students to:  
  • organize, interpret, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information rather than reproduce it;  
  • draw conclusions, make generalizations, and produce arguments that are supported through extended writing and;  
  • connect what they are learning to experiences, observations, feelings, or situations significant in their daily lives, both inside and outside of school. | Assignments require students to:  
  • interpret information rather than reproduce it;  
  • draw conclusions and support them through writing and;  
  • connect what they are learning to prior learning and some life experiences. | Assignments require students to:  
  • mostly reproduce information;  
  • rarely draw conclusions and support them through writing and;  
  • rarely connect what they are learning to prior learning or life experiences. |
| **Student Work**         | Assessment Plans:  
  • are aligned with state content standards;  
  • have clear measurement criteria;  
  • measure student performance in more than three ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test);  
  • require extended written tasks;  
  • are portfolio-based with clear illustrations of student progress toward state content standards and;  
  • include descriptions of how assessment results will be used to inform future instruction. | Assessment Plans:  
  • are aligned with state content standards;  
  • have measurement criteria;  
  • measure student performance in more than two ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test);  
  • require written tasks and;  
  • include performance checks throughout the school year. | Assessment Plans:  
  • are rarely aligned with state content standards;  
  • have ambiguous measurement criteria;  
  • measure student performance in less than two ways (e.g., in the form of a project, experiment, presentation, essay, short answer, or multiple choice test) and;  
  • include performance checks, although the purpose of these checks is not clear. |
### The Learning Environment

#### Exemplary (5)
- Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.
- Teacher establishes clear rules for learning and behavior.
- Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student.
- Teachers can experience success.
- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes some minor learning disruptions may occur.
- Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate student behavior.
- Teacher applies developmental behavior and stops the lesson.
- The teacher deals with disruptions, yet sometimes the student addresses the entire class.
- The classroom welcomes all members and guests. The classroom is organized and understandable to all students. Supplies, equipment, and resources are easily and readily accessible.
- The classroom is arranged to promote individual and group learning.
- Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for each other, and respect for all students.
- Teacher seeks out and is receptive to the interests and opinions of all students.
- Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the classroom.

#### Proficient (3)
- Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.
- Teacher establishes clear rules for learning and behavior.
- Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student.
- Teachers can experience success.
- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes some minor learning disruptions may occur.
- Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate student behavior.
- Teacher applies developmental behavior, but other times addresses it, stopping the lesson.
- The teacher deals with disruptions, yet sometimes the student addresses the entire class.
- The classroom welcomes most members and guests. The classroom is organized and understandable to most students. Supplies, equipment, and resources are accessible.
- The classroom displays student work. It is arranged to promote individual and group learning.
- Teacher-student interactions are generally friendly, but may reflect occasional inconveniences. The teacher and students are generally polite to each other.
- Teacher is sometimes receptive to the interests and opinions of students.

#### Unsatisfactory (1)
- Teacher sets high and demanding academic expectations for every student.
- Teacher establishes clear rules for learning and behavior.
- Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student.
- Teachers can experience success.
- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes few rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses few techniques to maintain some inconsequential behavior and inappropriate behavior.
- Disruptions frequently interrupt instruction.
- The classroom is somewhat cold and uninviting. The classroom is not well organized and understandable to students. Supplies, equipment, and resources are difficult to access.
- The classroom does not display student work. It is not arranged to promote group learning.
- Teacher-student interactions are sometimes authoritarian, negative, or inappropriate. The teacher and students exhibit disrespect for one another. Disputes and disagreements are characterized by conflict, sarcasm, or put-downs.
- Teacher is not receptive to the interests and opinions of students.

### Expectations

- Teacher establishes clear rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate student behavior.
- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes some minor learning disruptions may occur.
- Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate student behavior.
- Teacher applies developmental behavior, but other times addresses it, stopping the lesson.
- The teacher deals with disruptions, yet sometimes the student addresses the entire class.
- The classroom welcomes all members and guests. The classroom is organized and understandable to all students. Supplies, equipment, and resources are easily and readily accessible.
- The classroom is arranged to promote individual and group learning.
- Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for each other, and respect for all students.
- Teacher seeks out and is receptive to the interests and opinions of all students.
- Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the classroom.

### Managing Student Behavior

- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes clear rules for learning and behavior.
- Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student.
- Teachers can experience success.
- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes some minor learning disruptions may occur.
- Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate student behavior.
- Teacher applies developmental behavior, but other times addresses it, stopping the lesson.
- The teacher deals with disruptions, yet sometimes the student addresses the entire class.
- The classroom welcomes all members and guests. The classroom is organized and understandable to all students. Supplies, equipment, and resources are easily and readily accessible.
- The classroom is arranged to promote individual and group learning.
- Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for each other, and respect for all students.
- Teacher seeks out and is receptive to the interests and opinions of all students.
- Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the classroom.

### Environment

- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes clear rules for learning and behavior.
- Teacher optimizes instructional time, teaches more material, and demands better performance from every student.
- Teachers can experience success.
- Students take initiative and follow through with their own work.
- Teacher establishes some minor learning disruptions may occur.
- Teacher establishes rules for learning and behavior. The teacher uses several techniques, such as social approval, contingent activities, and consequences to maintain appropriate student behavior.
- Teacher applies developmental behavior, but other times addresses it, stopping the lesson.
- The teacher deals with disruptions, yet sometimes the student addresses the entire class.
- The classroom welcomes all members and guests. The classroom is organized and understandable to all students. Supplies, equipment, and resources are easily and readily accessible.
- The classroom is arranged to promote individual and group learning.
- Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect for each other, and respect for all students.
- Teacher seeks out and is receptive to the interests and opinions of all students.
- Positive relationships and interdependence characterize the classroom.
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The TAP system requires a teacher career path component comprised of master teachers, mentor teachers, and career teachers. This career path distributes school and instructional leadership and creates different job expectations and responsibilities for different types of teachers. Master teachers have responsibilities and job expectations in addition to those of career teachers. The same is true for mentor teachers, but on a lesser scale than master teachers. In addition, there are certain responsibilities for career teachers in schools implementing TAP. For this reason, responsibilities performance standards were established for master, mentor, and career teachers to document areas and levels of effectiveness and provide benchmarks of performance. These aggregated responsibilities scores are included in the SKR portion of the TAP performance award.

To evaluate these responsibilities the following process is suggested:

**Master Teacher**

The administrator and the teachers in the master teacher’s cluster group (career and mentor teachers) fill out the master teacher responsibilities survey at the end of the school year. Some questions on the master teacher survey are answered only by the administrator and mentor teachers. The results are averaged to produce a final responsibilities score.

**Mentor Teacher**

The administrator, master teacher(s), and career teachers who work with the mentor teacher complete a responsibilities survey at the end of the school year. Some questions on the mentor teacher survey are answered only by the administrator and master teachers. The results are averaged to produce a final responsibilities score.

**Career Teacher**

The mentor and master teacher(s) complete the responsibilities survey at the end of the school year for each career teacher whom they support. The results are averaged to produce a final responsibilities score.

The responsibilities surveys for master, mentor, and career teachers are provided on the following pages.
# 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><strong>Staff Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The master teacher provides specific evidence, feedback, and suggestions during coaching identifying areas of reinforcement and refinement.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The master teacher advances the career and mentor teacher's knowledge of state and district content standards and the TAP Rubrics.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Teacher Responsibilities Survey: Master Teacher Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The master teacher observes and guides the mentor teacher’s professional relationships and responsibilities to career teachers.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The master teacher guides, supports, and monitors the growth plans of career and mentor teachers.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The master teacher identifies resources for career and mentor teachers that enhance instructional planning, assessment design, and classroom management.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The master teacher provides ongoing follow-up and support (e.g. demonstration lessons, team teaching, observations with feedback) to career and mentor teachers.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The master teacher actively supports school activities and events.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The remaining items, #14-22, are to be completed by mentor teachers and administrators only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>School Responsibilities</strong></th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. The master teacher works with other leadership team members in developing appropriate school and cluster plans to target student academic and teacher instructional needs.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The master teacher leads and supports the analysis of school and student achievement data to identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The master teacher communicates and reflects the visions and decisions of the TAP Leadership Team.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The master teacher assists the administrators in inducting new teachers into the TAP school environment and processes.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Teacher Responsibilities Survey: Master Teacher Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growing and Developing Professionally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The master teacher develops and works on his/her Individual Growth Plan (IGP), which includes new learning based on school goals, self-assessment, and feedback from observations.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The master teacher includes activities on his/her IGP to enhance content knowledge or pedagogical skills in order to increase his/her proficiency.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflecting on Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The master teacher thoughtfully assesses the effectiveness of his/her instruction, as evidenced in cluster by the new learning modeled and the student work presented from his/her field tests.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The master teacher considers the varied strengths and weaknesses and personal/cultural differences of adult learners through communications and actions that promote effective teaching with all cluster members.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The master teacher plans, offers, and implements specific alternative actions to improve teaching.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional, and not part of the score):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
### Teacher Responsibilities Survey: Mentor Teacher

**Note:** Career teachers are to respond to only items #1-11. Master teachers and administrators who are completing this survey should respond to items #1-21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The mentor teacher assists the design and delivery of professional development activities for his/her cluster group as needed.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The mentor teacher provides follow-up (e.g. observations, team teaching, and/or demonstration lessons) that supports/models how to use the ideas and activities learned in cluster.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The mentor teacher is a resource, providing access to materials and research-based instructional methods to his/her cluster group and/or mentee.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The mentor 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><strong>Instructional Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The mentor teacher advances the career teacher's knowledge of state and district content standards and the TAP Rubrics.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The mentor teacher’s feedback during coaching specifically defines the areas of reinforcement and refinement.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Standard</td>
<td>Exemplary (5)</td>
<td>Proficient (3)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The mentor teacher provides opportunities/support for the career teacher/mentee through team planning and team teaching.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The mentor teacher serves as a resource for curriculum, assessment, instructional, and classroom management strategies and resources.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The mentor teacher guides and coaches career teachers/mentees in the development of their growth plans.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The mentor teacher observes and coaches mentees and/or career teachers to improve their instruction and align it with the TAP Rubrics.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The mentor teacher actively supports school activities and events.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The remaining items, #12-21, cannot be answered by career teachers. They are to be completed only by master teachers and administrators who work with the mentor teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. The mentor teacher participates and supports the analysis of school achievement data to isolate school strengths and weaknesses in order to make suggestions for improvement.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The mentor teacher accepts leadership responsibilities and/or assists peers in contributing to a safe and orderly school environment.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The mentor teacher participates in the setting of school and cluster goals.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Teacher Responsibilities Survey: Mentor Teacher Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplary (5)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Responsibilities Cont.

| 15. The mentor teacher communicates and reflects the visions and decisions of the TAP Leadership Team. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |
| 16. The mentor teacher supports the master teacher during development time in cluster meetings by providing individual support to career teachers. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |

### Growing and Developing Professionally

| 17. The mentor teacher develops a yearly plan/growth plan for new learning based on analyses of school improvement plans and goals, self-assessment, and input from master teacher and principal observations. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |
| 18. The mentor teacher selects targeted content knowledge and pedagogical skills to enhance and improve his/her knowledge. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |

### Reflecting on Teaching

| 19. The mentor teacher makes thoughtful and accurate assessments of his/her lessons' effectiveness and the extent to which they achieved their goals. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |
| 20. The mentor teacher considers strengths and weaknesses, as well as personal and cultural differences, of adult learners as evidenced in his/her communications and actions that promote effective teaching with all cluster members. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |
| 21. The mentor teacher provides specific actions to improve his/her teaching. | Regularly | Sometimes | Rarely |

### Comments (optional, and not part of the score):

---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
---
# Teacher Responsibilities Survey: Career Teacher

<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 career teacher is prompt, prepared, and participates in cluster meetings, bringing student artifacts (student work) when requested.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The career teacher appropriately attempts to implement new learning in the classroom following presentation in cluster.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The career teacher develops and works on a yearly plan for new learning based on analyses of school improvement plans and new goals, self-assessment, and input from the master/mentor teacher and principal observations.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The career teacher selects specific activities, content knowledge, or pedagogical skills to enhance and improve his/her proficiency.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The career teacher makes thoughtful and accurate assessments of his/her lessons' effectiveness as evidenced by the self-reflection after each observation.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The career teacher offers specific actions to improve his/her teaching.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The career teacher accepts responsibilities contributing to school improvement.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The career teacher utilizes student achievement data to address strengths and weaknesses of students and guide instructional decisions.</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (optional, and not part of the score):

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
One of the core principles of TAP is that instructional effectiveness should be measured partly in terms of the contribution that the teacher and the school make to student achievement, using a method called value-added assessment. This represents a revolution in educational accountability. The system of public K-12 education in the United States has long measured the success of schools and teachers by the status of their students — the level of attainment students demonstrate by test scores at a fixed point in time. Such an approach is flawed because it assigns too much responsibility to the school and teacher for what students bring to the classroom at the beginning of the year, and not enough responsibility for what the students learn during the year. In contrast to status-based assessment, value-added assessment measures school and teacher performance in terms of student growth over time. This method adjusts for the substantial initial status differences seen between students.

The underlying concept has long been familiar to educators, although the labels and methods have changed in recent decades. If you give students a pretest on a topic before studying it in the classroom, and then give them a posttest after covering the material, you can interpret the difference between the two test scores as the value added to the students’ knowledge or skill on that topic. The differences between pretest and posttest scores are often called gains. This is a common assessment strategy, used by many teachers to measure how well students in their classrooms are learning.

Value-added assessment expands this concept to an entire year’s learning, and uses annual achievement test scores as the pretest and posttest. Multiple years of pretest scores for each student are used wherever possible in order to obtain a more precise picture of the student’s learning trajectory. Value-added assessment applies sophisticated statistical methods, rather than simply subtracting scores, in order to incorporate multiple years of test data. These methods allow including scores on tests with different scales, tests designed to different grade-level standards, or even tests on different subjects — all of which would make it inappropriate simply to subtract scores. In spite of its complexity, the essence of value-added assessment is simply to use gains or growth in student achievement to measure the instructional performance of teachers and schools.1

1. The terms “gains” and “growth” are used interchangeably here to refer to the student's progress. The term “value-added” refers to a performance indicator that attributes student progress to the teacher and the school, using advanced statistical methods. Some writers make technical distinctions between “gains models,” “growth models,” and “value-added models,” but such distinctions are irrelevant to this discussion.
In recent decades, research has confirmed that having a high-quality teacher is the single most important school-related factor responsible for student learning. Structural school reforms (e.g., class size reduction) have demonstrated little or no overall impact on student learning relative to the impact of teachers. The same is true of curriculum-based and technology-based reforms. Of all school-related factors, the teacher makes by far the most difference to student learning. Several studies have shown that students assigned to ineffective teachers for multiple consecutive years are likely to score much worse at the end of that time — perhaps 50 percentile points worse — than similar students assigned to effective teachers for the same period.

To emphasize the value and importance of the teacher and classroom instruction, TAP schools evaluate teachers, in part, by using value-added assessment as described in the previous section. Teachers are then compensated differently based on the gains in achievement they produce. A value-added score is calculated for the entire school, as well as for each teacher with enough qualifying students in a tested grade and subject. The teacher’s individual score is called the “classroom-level value-added.” It is the average gain of all the students assigned to a teacher. In most elementary grades, this represents a classroom of students, but in departmentalized grades, it represents the classes assigned to a teacher across all periods of the school day.

To receive a classroom-level value-added score, a teacher must teach in a tested grade and subject and must have at least 10 students with linked prior and current year testing data. Because of the need for prior year data, value-added scores cannot be calculated for the first grade in which testing takes place. For example, if tests are administered in grades 3 through 8, value-added assessment scores can only be calculated for teachers in grades 4 through 8.

Teachers whose students make a full year’s academic growth compared to their expected performance for the year based on previous tests as well as comparison to similar students receive a score of “3.” Teachers whose students make more than one year of academic growth receive a score of “4,” and teachers whose students make significantly more than one year of academic growth receive a score of “5.” Similarly, teachers whose students make less than an expected year of academic growth receive a score of “2,” and those whose students make significantly less than a year of growth receive a score of “1.”

2. In order to have “linked” testing data, each student must have test scores from previous years that can be identified with that specific student and that can also be identified with the specific teacher or teachers who were assigned to that student during each school year.

3. The exact calculations vary between states depending on their assessment systems and their value-added statistics providers. The definition of an “average” teacher is based on the entire population of students and teachers for whom linkable data is provided on the same assessment in the same year. It is adjusted through the value-added method so that teachers are essentially being compared to other teachers with similar students. The average growth of those students in one year is used as the baseline for one year of growth unless the state sets different benchmarks. The definition of “somewhat” and “much” better or worse than average is based on standard errors or standard deviations, so that a score of “1” or “5” is always statistically significantly different from a score of “3.”
School-wide achievement growth is important in the TAP system for compensating teachers for two critical reasons. First, not all teachers have enough students in tested grades and subjects with linkable prior test data to calculate individual classroom results. These teachers receive compensation based on the school-wide value-added assessment score. Second, theory and research indicate that school-wide performance awards create conditions favorable to professional collaboration, staff collegiality, and alignment of organizational resources for instructional improvement. All of the teachers in the school share in the responsibility and the credit for the school-wide value-added score.

The school-wide score is a composite of all the tested grades and subjects in the school. As with the classroom value-added score, each student included in the calculation must have at least two consecutive years of linkable test results, so the first grade in which tests are administered cannot be included in the score. A school that achieves a year of academic growth as compared to other schools with similar students receives a score of “3.” A school that achieves somewhat better than a year of growth receives a score of “4,” and one that achieves much better than a year of growth receives a score of “5.” Similarly, a school that achieves somewhat less than a year of growth receives a score of “2,” and one that achieves much less than a year of growth receives a score of “1.”

For more information on value-added assessment, see the Appendix: Value-Added FAQs.

---

4. It is important to note that the school score is not merely the average of the classroom scores. Teachers are compared to other teachers, and schools are compared to other schools. As with classroom scores, the exact calculations vary between states, depending on their assessment systems and their value-added statistics providers. The definition of an “average” school is based on the entire population of students and schools for whom linkable data is provided on the same assessment in the same year. It is adjusted through the value-added method so that schools are essentially being compared to other schools with similar students. The average growth of those students in one year is used as the baseline for one year of growth unless the state sets different benchmarks. The definition of “somewhat” and “much” better or worse than average is based on standard errors or standard deviations, so that a score of “1” or “5” is always statistically significantly different from a score of “3.”
TAP Compensation System
We recommend allocating a minimum of $2,000 per teacher to establish the award fund (Note: Many schools base their award fund on $2,500-$3,000 per teacher, which is recommended by NIET). The award fund is divided into six award pools using a ratio of the career path level (e.g., career teachers with student achievement data, career teachers without student achievement data, mentor teachers with student achievement data, mentor teachers without student achievement data, master teachers with student achievement data, master teachers without student achievement data) to the total number of teachers eligible for an award.

Achievement Award Weights

For the career teacher with student achievement data, the award pool monies will be allocated as follows:

- 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities
- 30% Classroom achievement gains
- 20% School achievement gains

For the career teacher without student achievement data, the award pool monies will be allocated as follows:

- 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities
- 50% School achievement gains

For the mentor teacher with student achievement data, the award pool monies will be allocated as follows:

- 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities
- 30% Classroom achievement gains
- 20% School achievement gains

For the mentor teacher without student achievement data, the award pool monies will be allocated as follows:

- 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities
- 50% School achievement gains

For the master teacher with student achievement data, the award pool monies will be allocated as follows:

- 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities
- 30% Classroom achievement gains
- 20% School achievement gains

For the master teacher without student achievement data, the award pool monies will be allocated as follows:

- 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities
- 50% School achievement gains
Teacher Compensation Formulas

The following section uses a hypothetical school to illustrate how teacher compensation formulas are computed in a TAP school. In this school, $3,000 is allotted as the amount per teacher to determine the total award fund. The hypothetical school has 18 teachers, which makes a total award fund of $54,000 ($3,000 × 18). The school is comprised of the following six pools of teachers:

» 3 career teachers with student achievement data
» 6 career teachers without student achievement data
» 1 mentor teacher with student achievement data
» 4 mentor teachers without achievement data
» 2 master teachers with student achievement data
» 2 master teachers without student achievement data

The example below will demonstrate in detail how bonuses would be calculated for the teachers in the first category above — the 3 career teachers with student achievement data. However, it is important to note that the bonuses for the other categories of teachers would be calculated using the same technique. The only difference between calculating bonuses for career teachers and master and mentor teachers is that master and mentor teachers have a higher minimum SKR score to be eligible for a bonus. The mentor teachers must earn a “3.5” and master teachers a “4.0,” while the minimum requirement for career teachers is “2.5.”

As a reminder, for the career teacher with student achievement data, the award pool monies are allocated as follows:

» 50% Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR)
» 30% Classroom achievement gains
» 20% School achievement gains

In the hypothetical school, $9,000 (3 teachers × $3,000) is allocated to the career teacher with achievement data pool. The chart below illustrates the compensation pool for the career teachers used in the example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Award Pool</th>
<th>SKR (50% of pool)</th>
<th>Classroom Value-Added (30% of pool)</th>
<th>School-Wide Value-Added (20% of pool)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>50% x $3,000 = $1,500</td>
<td>30% x $3,000 = $900</td>
<td>20% x $3,000 = $600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 teachers x $3,000 = $9,000</td>
<td>50% x $9,000 = $4,500</td>
<td>30% x $9,000 = $2,700</td>
<td>20% x $9,000 = $1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections outline the steps for calculating the SKR, classroom achievement gains, and school achievement gains portions of the bonus.

Calculations for Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR) Portion of the Bonus
For career, mentor, and master teachers, 50 percent of the teachers’ bonus award allocation depends on their Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR) score. For each teacher, a final SKR score is averaged from all teacher evaluation scores from that year. The monetary value of the SKR portion of a teachers’ payout is based on weighting that is determined by fixed pay ratios.
(listed below in Table 2, column C). These pay ratios correspond to the teachers’ final SKR score. Teachers must receive a minimum SKR score to be eligible to receive a bonus (for career teachers, the minimum SKR score is “2.5”). If career teachers earn higher scores than “2.5,” their pay ratio increases correspondingly. For example, in Table 2, column A represents teachers’ SKR scores. For a score of “5,” the teacher earns a pay ratio of “7;” for a score of “4.5,” the teacher earns a pay ratio of “6,” and so on (See Table 2, column C for the complete list of ratios). Therefore, a teacher earning a score of “5” would earn seven times more than a teacher earning a score of “2.5.” Next, the number of teachers who received each score was multiplied by the pay ratio (See Table 2, column B for the complete list of teachers attaining specific scores). Column D of the table below represents the product of the number of teachers attaining a specific score (column B) and the pay ratio (column C).

In the example, $1,500 (50 percent of the career teachers' award allocation of $3,000) is designated for the SKR category. Therefore, the total SKR pool for the 3 career teachers with student achievement data is $4,500 (3 teachers × $1,500). The $4,500 is then divided by the sum of the number of teachers attaining each score multiplied by the pay ratios for each score (e.g. $4,500/15 in the example in column D of Table 2). The resulting value is the award amount per teacher at a pay ratio of 1 (e.g. in this example it is $300). Therefore, the award amount per teacher in this example for the SKR portion of the bonus is the teacher's pay ratio (as determined by their SKR score) multiplied by $300.

Therefore, the table below illustrates that the teacher scoring a “3” would receive $600 ($300 × 2), the teacher earning a “4.5” would receive $1,800 (300 × 6), and the teacher earning a “5” would receive $2,100 (300 × 7).

### Career Teacher Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR) Underlying Pay Computations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills, Knowledge, &amp; Responsibilities Score</td>
<td>Number of Teachers Attaining Score</td>
<td>Pay Ratio</td>
<td>Pay Ratio Multiplied by Number of Teachers Attaining Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Award Pool Designated for SKR | $4,500 |
| Sum (Pay Ratio x Number of Teachers Attaining Score) | 15 |
| Award Amount at Pay Ratio = 1 ($4,500/15) | $300 |
Calculations for Classroom Achievement Portion of the Bonus
In the example, $900 (30 percent of the career teachers’ award allocation of $3,000) was designated for classroom achievement. Like SKR scores, each teacher’s classroom achievement score (Table 3, column A) is assigned a pay ratio that determines how the score is weighted (for a list of the fixed pay ratios for classroom achievement, see Table 3, column C). Consequently, a score of “5” earns a pay ratio of “10,” a score of “4” equals a pay ratio of “6,” and a score of “3” is a pay ratio of “1.” Therefore, a teacher earning a score of “5” would earn ten times more money than a teacher earning a score of “3.” Next, the number of teachers who received each score is multiplied by the pay ratio (column D). Following the same metrics as Table 2, the award amount is then divided by the sum of all teachers’ pay ratios multiplied by the number of teachers attaining the score (e.g., $2,700/17). The result is the award amount per teacher at a pay ratio of 1 (e.g., $158.82). The award amount per teacher is the teacher’s pay ratio multiplied by $158.82.

The table below shows that in the hypothetical school, the teachers earning a value-added score of “3” would each receive $158.82 ($158.82 × 1) for the classroom achievement portion of their bonus award; the teachers earning a value-added score of “4” would each receive $952.94 ($158.82 × 6); while the teachers scoring a “5” would receive $1,588.24 ($158.82 × 10).

Calculations for School-Wide Achievement Portion of the Bonus
For career, mentor, and master teachers with student achievement data, 20 percent of the teachers’ bonus award allocation depends on the school-wide value-added score. As shown in table 4 on the following page, if the school achieves level “5” performance, 100 percent of the school-wide portion of the award fund is equally distributed to teachers. If the school achieves level “4” performance, 75 percent of the fund allocated for the school award is distributed to teachers. If the school achieves level “3” performance, 50 percent of the school award amount is distributed. Finally, in schools that score at levels “2” or below, none of the school-wide funds are distributed to teachers. In schools that earn less than a score of “5,” the undistributed funds from the school-wide award are at the discretion of the fiscal authority.
In the hypothetical school, career, mentor, and master teachers in the categories with individual classroom gain would each receive $600 ($3,000 × 20%) with a school-wide gain score of “5,” which is 100 percent of the school-wide portion of the award fund. With a school-wide gain score of “4” each teacher would receive $450 (75% of the award fund) and with a school-wide gain score of “3” each teacher would receive $300 (50% of the award fund). If the school received a school-wide gain score of “2” or below, none of the school-wide funds would be distributed to teachers.

In the hypothetical school, career, mentor, and master teachers in the categories without individual classroom gain would each receive $1,500 ($3,000 × 50%) with a school-wide gain score of “5,” which is 100 percent of the school-wide portion of the award fund. With a school-wide gain score of “4” each teacher would receive $1,125 (75% of the award fund) and with a school-wide gain score of “3” each teacher would receive $750 (50% of the award fund). If the school received a school-wide gain score of “2” or below, none of the school-wide funds would be distributed to teachers.

The payout spreadsheet on the next page provides a sample of the calculations used to determine how the awards would be distributed to all of the 18 teachers in the hypothetical school.
## Sample Compensation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Path</th>
<th>Award Proportion</th>
<th>SKR Score</th>
<th>Student Achiev. Score</th>
<th>SKR Pay</th>
<th>Student Achiev. Pay</th>
<th>Score of 5</th>
<th>Total Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career with Achiev.</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$346.15</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$2,076.92</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,576.92</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$692.31</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,192.31</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,730.77</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,230.77</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,730.77</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,230.77</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,423.08</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,923.08</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master without Achiev.</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$3,900.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure**

Award Pool based on $3,000 × 18 (number of teachers) = $54,000.00

*Note: The “Award Proportion” is determined by the number of teachers in the category divided by the total number of teachers in the compensation model. For example: 3 career teachers divided by 18 total number of teachers, or 3/18, = .17.*

### Required SKR Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Required SKR Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Career with Achiev.</td>
<td>Master: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mentor with Achiev.</td>
<td>Mentor: 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Master with Achiev.</td>
<td>Career: 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Career without Achiev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mentor without Achiev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Master without Achiev.</td>
<td>Required Value-Added Scores: Score of 3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many schools that have adopted the TAP system have decided to include their administrators in the performance award fund. In developing possible compensation structures for principals, it is important to keep in mind the key principles that guided the development of TAP’s performance-based compensation for teachers. They are:

- The system should balance the payout percentages between student achievement gains and performance.
- The performance portion may contain a score for how the principals carry out their responsibilities with TAP or other instructional supervision duties.
- The award should be dependent upon the individual’s performance, as well as the school’s performance as applicable.

Below are brief descriptions of three models that current TAP schools have adopted for principal compensation:

**Model 1: 50%-30%-20%**
This model replicates the payout percentages for teachers.

- 50%: School-wide value-added scores. The administrator receives:
  - The entire 50% if the school scores a “5” on value-added
  - Three-fourths of the 50% if the school scores a “4”
  - Half of the 50% if the school scores a “3”
  - None of the 50% for scores of “1” or “2”
- 30%: Based on principal effectiveness as applicable
- 20%: Based on the overall TAP School Review score

**Model 2: 100% Based on Value-Added**
This model pays the principal based solely on the school-wide value-added score. The administrator receives:

- The entire amount if the school scores a “5” on value-added
- Three-fourths of the amount if the school scores a “4”
- Half of the amount if the school scores a “3”
- None of the amount for scores of “1” or “2”

**Model 3: Hybrid**
Various TAP schools have adopted their own performance-based compensation system for administrators that include some or all of the elements listed below:

- Value-added scores
- AYP designation
- TAP School Review results
- Principal evaluation scores on district/state assessment
- Other indicators deemed important by the state and/or district

---

5. TAP School Reviews are conducted at school sites by NIET representatives or designees, and are designed to evaluate how fully and effectively each school is implementing the TAP elements.
References


1. **What is value-added analysis?**
Value-added analysis is a method for measuring the contribution of a teacher or school to gains in student achievement. The method uses individual student growth data linked from year to year, rather than cross-school or cohort average scores. It applies statistical methods to (a) measure the academic gain or growth of each student over a period of time, and (b) attribute that gain or growth to the specific school and teacher(s) responsible for educating each student during that time.

2. **How is value-added analysis different from traditional attainment measures?**
Many accountability systems measure school and teacher performance in terms of student attainment at a certain point in time, rather than student growth over time. Such attainment measures do not account for the many differences that characterize individual students and influence their achievement test results (e.g., socioeconomic status, parent level of education, etc.). As a result, attainment measures tend to attribute those student differences to the teacher and the school, when in fact those differences are not due to the teacher and school. In an accountability system based on attainment, this gives the advantage to teachers and schools that serve the most advantaged students and creates an incentive to avoid teaching disadvantaged and low-achieving students. In contrast, value-added measures control for each student’s previous achievement results, which — as it turns out — controls for the relevant differences between students. By adjusting for what each student brings to the classroom on day one of the school year, value-added measures identify the new contribution of the teacher and the school to the student’s learning during the school year.

3. **Does value-added assessment take into account student family income, race, ethnicity, and other socioeconomic factors?**
Yes, either directly or indirectly. Some models include these factors directly. However, research has shown that the student’s pattern of previous test scores contains enough information about the influence of these factors on current test scores that it is not necessary to include them as distinct factors. By controlling for previous test scores, these items are indirectly but effectively accounted for.

4. **What are the requirements for a school, district, or state to use value-added assessment?**
   A. There must be individual student test data that can be linked from year to year, and linked from the student to the teacher(s) assigned to that student.
   B. The test data must be based on an appropriate assessment that is related to learning standards and general enough to measure student achievement across a wide range of levels.
   C. For the best analysis, tests must be given at least annually, preferably near the end of the school year (although some adjustments can be made for mid-year testing).
   D. For the best analysis, students should have at least three previous test scores to compare with current test results. These may be from different subject tests in one previous year, but ideally will include same-subject tests in at least two previous years.
   E. A teacher needs at least 10 students, each of whom has at least three previous test scores (either different tests from one previous year, the same test from three previous years, or some combination), and each of whom has been in the teacher’s classroom for a sufficiently large fraction of the school year, in order to calculate a teacher value-added result.
5. What does the TAP 1-5 value-added (VA) scale represent?
In all TAP states, the scale is interpreted as follows:

- **VA 1**: Far below average in effectiveness, with students gaining much less than a year's growth.
- **VA 2**: Below average in effectiveness, with students gaining less than a year's growth.
- **VA 3**: About average in effectiveness, with students gaining approximately a year's growth.
- **VA 4**: Above average in effectiveness, with students gaining more than a year's growth.
- **VA 5**: Far above average in effectiveness, with students gaining much more than a year's growth.

6. In statistical terms, what does the TAP 1-5 value-added (VA) scale represent?
In most TAP states, the value-added scale represents how widely distributed the value-added results are, with an adjustment for the size of the classroom and therefore the statistical significance of the results. Where this is done, the results can be interpreted as follows:

- **VA 1**: Two or more standard errors below the mean, *i.e.*, low and significant at the 95% confidence level.
- **VA 2**: Between one and two standard errors below the mean, *i.e.*, low and significant at the 68% confidence level.
- **VA 3**: Less than one standard error away from the mean, *i.e.*, not distinguishably different from average.
- **VA 4**: Between one and two standard errors above the mean, *i.e.*, high and significant at the 68% confidence level.
- **VA 5**: Two or more standard errors above the mean, *i.e.*, high and significant at the 95% confidence level.

A standard error is a measure of how strong an effect is, adjusted for sample size (or in teacher value-added assessment, class size). Thus, a value-added score of “5” means that the school's or teacher's measured student growth is far enough above expected growth that it is highly unlikely to be the result of a chance draw of students. Using standard errors as the basis for the TAP scale ensures that teachers with outstanding influence on student achievement are recognized as such.

7. What does it mean if a teacher’s value-added score seems at odds with the teacher’s SKR performance ratings?
In many cases, there will be no divergence between these measures. TAP research shows that there is a positive correlation between SKR and value-added results. However, they measure different things. The SKR is a process-oriented measure, and the value-added score is an outcome-oriented measure. They often agree, but the fact that they don't always agree is an important reason to include both of them in a multiple-measure incentive system like TAP. If there is an apparent discrepancy, the teacher and the TAP leadership team should look more closely at the following questions for insights into how the teacher's performance can be enhanced in the future:

- **A.** What can be learned from the detailed indicators making up the SKR, and the feedback provided after each observation? Are there specific areas of strength or weakness that shed light on the teacher's value-added results?
- **B.** What can be learned from the teacher's value-added results disaggregated by student achievement level or subgroup? Does the teacher need to focus more on differentiated instruction for specific groups or levels of students?
- **C.** Are there any non-instructional factors in the classroom's experience during the year that would help to explain unexpected results? Were there disturbances that were beyond the control of the teacher? (The value-added portion of the TAP incentive should not be adjusted on the basis of such considerations, lest this become an incentive to make creative excuses.
instead of focusing on instruction. One of the markers of a highly effective teacher is the ability to help students learn in spite of distractions. Nevertheless, this is useful diagnostic information to help the teacher and the TAP leadership team understand the teacher's results and make improvements in the following year.

8. What does it mean if a teacher's value-added score seems at odds with the teacher's percent proficient or other state accountability measure?

In many cases, there will be no divergence between these measures. However, there are two scenarios where they might seem to be at odds. If the teacher's students are low-achieving under the state accountability system, but the teacher has high value-added scores, this means that the teacher is effective at helping low-achieving students learn more rapidly than their peers. This represents an affirmation of the value that the teacher is contributing to the neediest students in the school system, even though the teacher might not get credit for it under a traditional accountability system. On the other hand, a teacher may have students who are high-achieving under the state accountability system, but may still receive low value-added scores as a teacher. This means that the teacher needs to improve in effectiveness in teaching those high-achieving students. Even high-achieving students need to learn more each year, and an effective teacher will help those students to gain more rapidly than their peers rather than allowing them to rest on their laurels.