

## Section B

### Matrix of Teacher Self-Assessment/Survey Instruments

A second subgroup identified existing instruments and developed a set of key components that should be considered when selecting an assessment instrument. These components are included in the table below. The purposes of developing this matrix was to establish a set of criteria on which a state or district might base a decision to select one of these or other instruments, as well as to provide an example of a comparison of these instruments to one another across the set of criteria the group developed.

The group recorded as much information as was available to them at the time of the work group sessions on the set of instruments selected. Those selected were included because at least one member of the subgroup had used or had knowledge of, the instrument. There was no intent to exclude other existing instruments nor to provide an endorsement of those selected by the group. After the work group session, SETDA staff contacted state representatives to add information regarding the Idaho Performance, Idaho Portfolio, and TAGLIT instruments.

	<b>enGauge</b>	<b>LoTi</b>	<b>Profiler</b>	<b>TAGLIT</b>
<b>Purpose</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systemic effective technology use in schools</li> <li>• School improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher survey designed for technology integration &amp; instruction practice</li> <li>• Teacher self improvement</li> <li>• School improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For school leaders to gather, analyze, and report information about how technology is used for teaching and learning.</li> <li>• Geared toward administrator taking the lead but process can be modified</li> </ul>
<b>Domains</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic skills</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Design/assessment &amp; decision-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning</li> <li>• Budget</li> <li>• Policies</li> <li>• Resources</li> <li>• Technical and instructional support</li> <li>• Teacher and student skills</li> <li>• Classroom use</li> <li>• Community involvement</li> <li>• Professional development</li> <li>• Technology</li> </ul>

**Section B (continued)**  
**Matrix of Teacher Assessment Instruments**

	<b>enGauge</b>	<b>LoTi</b>	<b>Profiler</b>	<b>TAGLIT</b>
				integration
<b>Audience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislators</li> <li>• Boards</li> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Educators</li> <li>• Tech specialists</li> <li>• Parents (community)</li> <li>• Students</li> </ul>	Teacher Building / district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Tech coordinators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• Students</li> </ul>
<b># of Items</b>	98	50	No more than 40	Approximately 75 Varies by survey
<b>Format</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online selected response</li> <li>• Obsentium</li> </ul>	On-line Selected response	Online selected response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online selected response</li> <li>• 6 surveys targeting grade level &amp; audience</li> </ul>
<b>Completion time</b>	45 min - 1 hour	1/2 hour or less	1/2 hour or less	30 – 45 minutes Administrators need to prepare prior to completing the survey
<b>Cost</b>	Free for base survey and analysis	Negotiable	Free	Free
<b>Research-based</b>	Yes	Yes	No	Not formally
<b>Validity</b>	Yes (in whole)	Limited		Limited because responses are self-reported, though three constituencies give input enabling valid comparisons & discussion
<b>Reliability</b>	Yes	Limited		Better than most self-report instruments because of the diversity of input and

**Section B (continued)**  
**Matrix of Teacher Assessment Instruments**

	<b>enGauge</b>	<b>LoTi</b>	<b>Profiler</b>	<b>TAGLIT</b>
				breadth of questions
<b>Usefulness</b>	Yes	Yes		Very high
<b>***Utility</b>	Yes	Yes		Yes
<b>Longitudinal</b>	Yes		Yes	Yes
<b>Professional development resources</b>	Yes - filter Web based research	Yes	Yes	Not part of report
<b>Unit of analysis</b>	Individual school district	Individual school district	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual</li> <li>• School-level</li> </ul>
<b>Customizable</b>	Yes (for additional fees)	Limited	Yes (easy)	Not at present
<b>Data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data points</li> <li>• Aggregate</li> <li>• School level</li> <li>• District level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disaggregate</li> <li>• Aggregate</li> </ul>	Individual school district	Aggregate
<b>Reporting capability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual report</li> <li>• School report</li> <li>• District report</li> <li>• National report</li> </ul>	Individual school district	Individual school district	School-level report for administrator, teachers, students
<b>Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional support</li> <li>• facilitators</li> <li>• onsite personnel</li> <li>• data workshop</li> </ul>	Technical support needed		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One state-level person must set up "windows" for survey-taking</li> <li>• Simple support structure</li> </ul>
<b>SETDA contacts</b>	Neah Lohr, WI Carolyn White, IN	Cathy Higgins	Jayne James, HPR*TEC	Bill Romond, VT
<b>Other</b>	Multiple day process			
<b>Comments</b>			Very easy to use shell allowing users to create up to 40 items	Easy to use and expanded reporting possibilities are under consideration