

RILS: *Evaluating the Evaluators*
A personal response

Brian Gong
Center for Assessment
Reidy Interactive Lecture Series
September 14, 2012 Boston, MA



Thanks

- Thanks to all who made this such a terrific conference!
 - Presenters and panelists
 - Discussants and participants
 - Scott Marion for organizing
- I learned some important things for me.



Four things I can do right away



Perspective: Evaluation

- Put more energy and attention on evaluation of evaluation systems
 - Most attention and resources now on design and implementation
 - I can apply the validation frameworks shared by Henry Braun and Courtney Bell in the work I'm doing with states/districts who are currently working on or considering educator evaluation systems (bring two worlds of theory and practice together)



Perspective: Evaluation - 2

- Work to foster formative evaluation to improve of the educator evaluation systems:
 - Because it is likely the educator evaluation systems will not be perfect the first time out
 - And we can tell already there are problematic technical challenges in many systems as currently designed
 - My colleagues Charlie DePascale and Erika Hall and I will develop a “Toolkit” districts and states can use to self-evaluate along the lines of evaluation discussed at RILS



Big idea for me for current efforts

- Work more on developing measures at appropriate units of analysis
 - When is individual educator not the right unit, and the unit is student-teacher, class-teacher, teacher teams, departments, schools, districts?
 - Help develop group-level measures
 - More on attending to context in current measures
 - When should Context out (standardize) vs. Context in?



BIG new idea for me

- Work on design, implementation, and formative evaluation of educator evaluation systems to inform improvement of teaching, teachers, and school/districts through development, not accountability
- Systemic – evaluation informs but is not primary means for improving quality
 - Primary means are supports, supervision, culture of self-improvement, etc., a la Montgomery Co.
 - Theory of action is NOT black box “no means” of contemporary “standards/assessment/accountability” model



Formative Evaluation Systems

- Focus on “outcomes” of each systemic layer or unit, in addition to distal outcomes.
- Use these “proximal outcomes” for formative feedback
- Develop systems that support good use and provision of feedback



Feedback Frameworks

- Shute (2007)
- Feedback purpose
- Cognitive (& affective, social) mechanisms & feedback
- Feedback specificity
- Features of feedback
 - Kulhavy & Stock (1989): verification, elaborative
- Feedback complexity/length
- Formative feedback as scaffolding
 - Feeding back, feeding up, feeding forward
- Goal-directed feedback and motivation
- Timing
- Feedback and other variables
 - Learner level, response certitude, goal orientation (Black & Wiliam: directive, facilitative), normative feedback



Feedback Frameworks - 2

- Target: Specific task (content/skill/practice), task motivation, meta-task processes
- Tunstall & Gipps (1996)

Evaluative Feedback				Descriptive Feedback			
Positive		Negative		Specifying		Constructing	
Reward- ing	Approv- ing	Punish- ing	Disap- proving	Specify- ing attain- ment	Specify- ing improve- ment	Con- structing achieve- ment	Con- structing the way forward



Feedback Types Arrayed Loosely by Complexity

(Shute, 2007 – computer-based assessment focus)

Feedback type	Description
No feedback	Refers to conditions where the learner is presented a question and is required to respond, but there is no indication as to the correctness of the learner's response
Verification	Also called <i>knowledge of results</i> (KR), or <i>knowledge of outcome</i> , it informs the learner about the correctness of her response(s), such as right/wrong or overall percentage correct.
Correct response	Also known as <i>knowledge of correct response</i> (KCR), it informs the learner of the correct answer to a specific problem with no additional information.
Try-again	Also known as <i>repeat-until-correct</i> feedback, it informs the learner about an incorrect response and allows the learner one or more attempts to answer the question.
Error-flagging	Also known as <i>location of mistakes</i> (LM), error-flagging highlights errors in a solution, without giving correct answer.
Elaborated	A general term, it refers to providing an explanation about why a specific response was correct, and it might allow the learner to review part of the instruction. It also might present the correct answer (see below for six types of elaborated feedback).
Attribute isolation	Elaborated feedback that presents information addressing central attributes of the target concept or skill being studied.
Topic-contingent	Elaborated feedback that provides the learner with information relating to the target topic currently being studied. This might entail simply re-teaching material.
Response-contingent	Elaborated feedback that focuses on the learner's specific response. It may describe why the answer is wrong and why the correct answer is correct. This does not use formal error analysis.
Hints/cues/prompts	Elaborated feedback that guides the learner in the right direction (e.g., strategic hint on what to do next or a worked example or demonstration). It avoids explicitly presenting the correct answer.
Bugs/misconceptions	Elaborated feedback that requires error analysis and diagnosis. It provides information about the learner's specific errors or misconceptions (e.g., what is wrong and why).
Informative tutoring	The most elaborated feedback (from Narciss & Huth, 2004), this presents verification feedback, error-flagging, and strategic hints on how to proceed. The correct answer is not usually provided.



Educator Evaluation Systems & Feedback

- Current RTTT educator evaluation systems focus on “sorting” teachers into a few categories
 - A lot of information is aggregated into highly reliable but not very useful for directing improvement, i.e., giving feedback at Shute’s “verification” level
 - Also many other conditions not useful for improvement (e.g., timing, motivation, agental/social responsibilities)
 - Very much like student scores in annual summative state assessment
- Educator systems to improve would include evaluation designed to give feedback to help **improve** (e.g., consider Shute’s other “higher complexity feedback types)



Network and Dialog

- There is a lot of expertise and commitment that is widely distributed and loosely connected (or not connected at all)
 - I can follow up with the contacts I made at RILS this year, and other contacts I wish I had developed more deeply, in my on-going work in educator evaluation. I can learn from you.
 - I can expand my scope, e.g., what is being done in other industries (outcome vs. performance, feedback)



I hope you found things from this
RILS conference you could also
productively apply.

I'll look forward to hearing from you.



For more information:

Center for Assessment

www.nciea.org



Brian Gong

bgong@nciea.org

