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### Scope of Study

**Summary:** The MET project is based on two premises: First, a teacher's evaluation should depend to a significant extent on his/her students' achievement gains; second, any additional components of the evaluation (e.g., classroom observations) should be valid predictors of student achievement gain.

Student achievement was measured in two ways -- through existing state assessments, designed to assess student progress on the state curriculum for accountability purposes, and supplemental assessments, designed to assess higher-order conceptual understanding. The supplemental assessments used were Stanford 9 Open-Ended Reading Assessment in grades 4 through 8, Balanced Assessment in Mathematics (BAM) in grades 4 through 8, and the ACT QualityCore series for Algebra I, English 9, and Biology.

Panoramic digital video of classroom sessions were taken of participating teachers and students, teachers submitted commentary on their lessons (e.g., specifying the learning objective) and then trained raters scored the lesson based on classroom observation protocols using the following five observation protocols:

- Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), developed by Robert Pianta, University of Virginia
- Framework for Teaching (FFT), developed by Charlotte Danielson
• Mathematical Quality of Instruction (MQI), developed by Heather Hill, Harvard University, and Deborah Loewenberg Ball, University of Michigan

• Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observations (PLATO), developed by Pam Grossman, Stanford University

• Quality Science Teaching (QST) Instrument, developed by Raymond Pecheone, Stanford University

A subset of the videos also are being scored using an observational protocol developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and using the UTeach Observational Protocol (UTOP), developed by the UTeach Preparation Program.

Close to 3,000 teacher volunteers from across the following six, predominantly urban, school districts participated in the MET project: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Dallas Independent School District, Denver Public Schools, Hillsborough County Public Schools, Memphis City Schools, and the New York City Department of Education. Participants teach math and English language arts (ELA) in grades 4-8, Algebra I, grade 9 English, and high school biology.

The Item-Level Survey Instruments and Assessment Files release consists of data files created from the six collection instruments described below:

• The Principal Survey focuses on whether principals already know what they need to know about the effectiveness of their teachers or whether the instruments provide new information to these principals. The survey asks principals to provide an effectiveness rating for up to 12 MET teachers. It asks them how confident they are about each rating and what information they use to assess effective teaching.

• The Student Perception Survey analyzes the value of elementary and secondary student feedback on the effort to improve both teaching and learning. Questions were created to elucidate the perceptions of the students and their school and classroom experiences.

• The Teacher Web Survey was created to help answer whether teachers take seriously the rating provide by their administrator. It asks teachers to report whether they trust their principal -- Using Meyer, Davis, and Schoonhoven's three bases of trust: consistency, competency, and benevolence. It also asks teachers whether and to what extent they have acted on the feedback provided by their principal and whether the change made a positive difference in their teaching effectiveness.
The Teacher Working Condition Survey questions were intended to shed light on the level of support existing for teachers at their school environments, e.g., whether educators are valued, trusted, and have the time and ability to collaborate to improve instruction, as well as other aspects of working conditions such as time, facilities and resources, empowerment, professional development, community engagement, induction and leadership.

The Teacher Knowledge Assessment questions were intended to test the utility of both newly developed and well established measures of teacher knowledge to predict measures of teacher effectiveness.

The Survey of Enacted Curriculum was intended to investigate the role that the content of instruction plays in affecting student achievement gains, as compared to the study's broader focus on instructional quality measures.
Participating non-profit organizations include Educational Testing Service, RAND Corporation, and the New Teacher Center. Participating education consultants include Cambridge Education, Teachscape, and Westat. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Teach For America supported the project and have encouraged their members to participate. The American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association were involved in discussions about the MET project and supported the research.

Teachscape conducted the classroom video recordings, Educational Testing Service (ETS) managed the lesson-scoring process.

**Methodology**

**Mode of Data Collection:**
- paper and pencil interview (PAPI)
- web-based survey

**Response Rates:**
2746 teachers began the year 1 of the MET project, 1868 completed year 2 of the MET project.

**Extent of Processing:**
Performed consistency checks.
Created variable labels and/or value labels.
Checked for undocumented or out-of-range codes.

**Access and Availability**

**Note:**
A list of the data formats available for this study can be found in the summary of holdings. Detailed file-level information (such as record length, case count, and variable count) is listed in the file manifest.

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided solely as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Please contact the data producers for information on permissions to use the instruments for other purposes.

**Restrictions:**
The Measures of Effective Teaching Longitudinal Database (MET LDB) is restricted from general dissemination; a Confidential Data Use Agreement must be established prior to access. Researchers interested in gaining access to the data can submit their applications via ICPSR's online Restricted Contracting System, linked above.

Applicants will be required to:
- ICPSR 34345 -

- Submit IRB approval/exemption documentation;
- Scan and email the completed Confidential Data Use Agreement, signed by the Primary Investigator and an Institutional Representative;
- Pay annual access fee and renew yearly for continued data access.

Please visit the MET LDB Web site for more information.

Original ICPSR Release: 2012-09-15

Version History: The last update of this study occurred on .

2014-12-16 - A versioning system was installed in the file names.

2014-08-01 - A series wide update to assure that files distributed through internal systems are current with those turned over.

2014-06-23 - Released survey instruments corresponding to the Teacher Knowledge Assessment and Teacher Working Conditions data files.


2013-09-24 - 2013-09-23 2013-08-05 Updated variable labels for ID variables in all files. Added DISTRICT_ICPSR_ID to all files.


2013-03-12 - Added Teacher Knowledge Assessment data file and documentation.

2012-09-25 - Added restricted documentation

Dataset(s):
- DS1: Principal Survey
- DS2: Student Perceptions Survey - Year 1 Elementary
- DS3: Student Perceptions Survey - Year 2 Elementary
- DS4: Student Perceptions Survey - Year 1 Secondary
- DS5: Student Perceptions Survey - Year 2 Secondary
- DS6: Teacher Web Survey
- DS7: Teacher Working Conditions Survey
- DS8: Teacher Knowledge Assessment
- DS9: Survey of Enacted Curriculum