

# THE TEACHER SELF-ASSESSMENT SCALES

The *Teacher Self-Assessment Scales* (TSAS) questionnaire is related to and derived from the state *NMTEACH Educator Effectiveness System, specifically the Classroom Observation Protocol (NMTEACH Rubric)*. The primary reason for selecting the NMTEACH content is because NMTEACH is the primary teacher evaluation measure adopted by the state education agency and is required of schools, and therefore teachers and administrators are becoming more and more familiar with its framework and content.

Aligning to the same framework and content therefore avoids overburdening schools with yet another assessment classification system. The TSAS approaches the NMTEACH content from a different set of foundational and methodological premises, however, and is based on a different set of uses. While they differ in this regard, the intention is that the two systems should be seen as inter-related and supportive of one another.

## PREMISES

The primary differences between the NMTEACH and TSAS include the following:

1. NMTEACH items are based on five-point qualitative rubric, and the TSAS items are based on a quantitative scale of 1 to 100, the difference being a qualitative assessment of where teachers are in a snapshot (NMTEACH) versus a numerical measure of how far along they may be on a roadmap or in a journey (TSAS);
2. NMTEACH is designed to guide administrator evaluations of individual teacher quality and performance, while TSAS is designed to guide teachers in self-assessing their personal and collective capabilities to perform designated functions and tasks aligned with the NMTEACH criteria; and,
3. NMTEACH is based on complex array of domains, strands, elements, and aspects; while TSAS focuses on just the "Highly Effective" aspect of each element and deconstructs it so that it is simpler to understand and is also self-reflective. For example, NMTEACH presents the aspect from an observational standpoint, while TSAS presents it from a self-reflective standpoint. To briefly illustrate this point, consider the following versions of the same aspect, Item 1A. *Demonstrating knowledge of content*, presented below:
  - a. **NMTEACH:** *In addition to the indicators for effective, the teacher's lesson plans contain instructional outcomes that...*
  - b. **TSAS:** *I feel confident that I can demonstrate to observers that my lesson plans...*
    - reflect extensive knowledge of the content area(s) being taught, including academic language demands, and that they correlate IEP objectives with lesson plans, when applicable;
    - incorporate research and resources related to all NM adopted standards as well as evidence-based specialized instruction according to the IEP, when applicable;
    - create opportunities for students to contribute to the lesson design and content; and
    - include opportunities for modifications in the IEP or language proficiency levels to be implemented across content areas, when applicable.

In addition to being self-reflective, the TSAS adaptation of NMTEACH is participant anonymous to ensure a non-intimidating, personalized process; is very quick and easy for teachers to self-administer online (taking about five minutes of their time); and, is analyzed in various aggregate forms to provide a collective overview of a school's ever-changing collective *teacher efficacy* (i.e. teachers' personal assessments of their own personal capabilities to perform designated tasks — in

this case, the NMTEACH criteria — at greater levels and to persist and grow professionally in the face of difficulties. For seminal overviews of the self-efficacy construct and Social Cognitive Theory, see Bandura, 1977, 1986, and 2006. For an excellent, succinct overview of teacher efficacy research, see Protheroe, 2008.

## USES

The TSAS can serve several purposes, including providing support for...

1. looking beyond individuals and assessing for school- and district-level gaps in strengths and needs;
2. stimulating a school or program-wide conversation about current status and capacity building;
3. developing a shared understanding of the 'highly-effective' aspect of the NMTEACH rubrics;
4. informing the process of customizing professional development for specific schools and programs;
5. initiating the conversation of using teacher capabilities assessment through the lens of a growth mindset (Dweck, 2006) , instead of as a scorecard of success or failure; and/or,
6. assisting individual teachers to construct a personal summary for themselves and use it to help focus their professional development plan (PDP), which in New Mexico is due to the principal on the 40th day of each school year.

The TSAS, therefore, is more than an assessment or evaluation measure because its primary purpose is to serve teachers and administrators as a stimulus for differentiating and focusing the content and processes of both external technical assistance and internal (self-regulatory) professional learning. The result of all-of-the-above, therefore, suggests that the TSAS could be used in support of the supreme purpose of teaching: to consistently generate and apply new strategies and action for improving the teaching-learning process.

## METHODOLOGY

For brevity and focus, we withhold for now a discussion of the methodological processes of design, data gathering, and analysis. You can obtain the methodological description however from your technical assistance facilitator, or by contacting the cognizant project consultant at the Center for Positive Practices.

## DATA ANALYSIS

For those already familiar with the TSAS, the data tables and charts are probably self-explanatory. While there are many ways of looking at the data presented, it is recommended that the reader keep the following guidance in mind.

1. The data provided are not an indicator of teacher quality and are not evaluative in the sense that they represent a value judgment of teachers within a school.
2. The data are provided by the schools themselves, and therefore these are the schools own self-assessments submitted in the spirit of informing their collective professional development (i.e. learning for personal growth and advancement).
3. Because the variables presented in the analyses are addressed from the standpoint of *teacher efficacy*, they are fluid and can therefore be changed, often quickly. The challenge is to keep them moving ever upward.

## TSAS SUMMARY WORKSHEET — 2016

Note. You may also enter responses online. See <http://positivepractices.com/tsas/> for details.

| Domain   | Strand                                       | Element  | Rating |
|--|--|--|--------|
| Domain 1: Preparation and Planning   | Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy            | 1A: Demonstrating knowledge of content             |        |
|  |  | 1B: Designing Coherent Instruction                 |        |
|  |  | 1C: Setting Instructional Outcomes                 |        |
|  |  | 1D: Demonstrating knowledge of resources           |        |
|  | Knowledge of Students                        | 1E: Demonstrating knowledge of students            |        |
|  |  | 1F: Designing student assessment                   |        |
| Domain 2: Creating an Environment for Learning   | Creating an Environment of Respect & Rapport | 2A: Creating an environment of respect and rapport |        |
|  |  | 2B: Organizing Physical Space                      |        |
|  | Establishing a Culture of Learning           | 2C: Establishing a culture for learning            |        |
|  | Managing Classroom Procedures                | 2D: Managing Classroom Procedures                  |        |
|  | Managing Student Behavior                    | 2E: Managing Student Behavior                      |        |
| Domain 3: Teaching for Learning  | Communicates Clearly and Accurately          | 3A: Communicating with Students                    |        |
|  | Uses Questioning and Discussion Techniques   | 3B: Using questioning and discussion techniques    |        |
|  | Engaging Student Learning                    | 3C: Engaging students in learning                  |        |
|  |  | 3D: Assessment in Instruction                      |        |
|  |  | 3E: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness   |        |
| Domain 4: Professionalism  | Provides Feedback to Parents                 | 4A: Communicating with Families                    |        |
|  | Professional Collaboration                   | 4B: Participating in a Professional Community      |        |
|  | Professional Growth                          | 4C: Reflecting on Teaching                         |        |
|  |  | 4D: Demonstrating Professionalism                  |        |
|  |  | 4E: Growing and Developing Professionally          |        |
|  |  | 4F: Maintaining Accurate Records                   |        |
| <b>5. Name of your school:</b> Enter district if you are not assigned to a school:   |  |  |        |
| <b>6. Today's Date (mm/dd/yyyy):</b>   |  |  |        |
| <b>7. Professional Learning:</b> During the last completed school semester, did you participate in training, presentations, or consultations sponsored by the current technical assistance provider? |  | Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> |        |
|  |  | Don't Know <input type="radio"/>                   |        |

Note. You can download this form and other related resources at <http://positivepractices.com/tsas/>

## ENDNOTES

**Self-efficacy** is simply one's judgments of his or her personal capabilities to initiate and successfully perform specified tasks, expend greater effort, and persevere in the face of adversity. According to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 2006), self-efficacy maintains the greatest potential of inhibiting or facilitating one's learning and performance. But it is domain-specific, so one could presumably have high efficacy in one domain (e.g. science) and low efficacy in another (e.g. English composition). For example, "mathematics efficacy" is theoretically one of the most potentially powerful sources of influence on students' learning and action in the mathematics domain.

**Teacher efficacy** (i.e. one's self-efficacy for being a better teacher) has also shown significant promise in many studies (Protheroe, 2008).

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change, *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Adolescence and education, Vol. 5: Self-efficacy and adolescence* (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset*. New York: Random House-Elliot.

Hoy, A. (2000). *Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Multon, K. D. Brown, S. D. & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(1), 30-38.

**Protheroe, Nancy (2008). Teacher Efficacy: What Is It and Does It Matter? *Principal, May/June*. National Association of Elementary School Principals. Available online at [http://naesp.org/resources/1/Pdfs/Teacher\\_Efficacy\\_What\\_is\\_it\\_and\\_Does\\_it\\_Matter.pdf](http://naesp.org/resources/1/Pdfs/Teacher_Efficacy_What_is_it_and_Does_it_Matter.pdf)**