

# Critical Education

Volume 4 Number 11

October 15, 2013

ISSN 1920-4125

## *An Analysis of Teacher for America's Research Page*

Philip Kovacs

Erica Slate-Young

*University of Alabama, Huntsville*

Citation: Kovacs, P., & Slate-Young, E. (2013). An analysis of Teach for America's research page. *Critical Education*, 4(11), 67-80. Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/184138>

An article in the *Critical Education* Series Teach for America and the Future of Education in the United States

### **Abstract**

*On paper, Teach for America (TFA) has all the markings of an excellent program with real potential for social service and change. Given a hard to staff school in a poverty stricken city, allowing enthusiastic college graduates with some training to go in and put their hearts and souls into classrooms that would otherwise be staffed with less-prepared or unprepared individuals may seem like a good idea. Upon further examination, TFA becomes more problematic as its claims to success do not stand up to close scrutiny, and the program has evolved from placing its "corps members" (TFA's language) in hard to staff schools to replacing certified teachers. This paper analyzes TFA's claims to "success" through analysis of the organization's "research" page. While TFA has some data in support of its assertions, analysis of the data and the interpretations drawn from it softens TFA's assertions considerably, if it does not outright contradict them.*



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and *Critical Education*, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or *Critical Education*. *Critical Education* is published by the Institute for Critical Educational Studies and housed at the University of British Columbia. Articles are indexed by EBSCO Education Research Complete and Directory of Open Access Journals.

## TFA's "Research" Page

This research analysis was conducted during the months of November and December 2011. Teach For America has since updated their Research Page, adding a PDF download which contains studies not addressed in our initial critique.<sup>1</sup> The studies discussed here, however, remain on the organization's website, which has changed its claim from "A large and growing body of independent research shows that Teach For America corps members make as much of an impact on student achievement as veteran teachers" to

"Teach For America corps members help their students achieve academic gains equal to or larger than teachers from other preparation programs, according to the most recent and rigorous studies on teacher effectiveness."<sup>2</sup> The downloadable .pdf titled "What the Research Says," it should be noted, contains the following wording, "The most rigorous research over time has shown that corps members' impact on student achievement exceeds that of other teachers in the same high-needs schools. This is true even when corps members are compared with veteran and fully certified teachers."<sup>3</sup> While the language has changed over time, the message remains the same, TFA recruits outperform both veteran and fully certified teachers. While there are a number of peer reviewed and think tank produced pieces that contradict this claim, we examined its veracity using the research supplied by TFA.<sup>4</sup> The message, based on the studies (we use "studies" here somewhat hesitantly as only two of the 12 were peer reviewed papers) supplied by TFA in November of 2011, range from irrelevant as they have no bearing on performance, to problematic/mixed as the results are not conclusive and positive, though potentially misleading as no data set is included.

What follows is a closer analysis of the twelve studies, grouped into three categories:

1. Four out of twelve of the studies are categorized as **irrelevant**, since they have no bearing on performance.
2. Seven of the twelve studies are categorized as **problematic / mixed**, since the results are not conclusive.
3. One of the twelve studies is classified as **positive** but potentially misleading as no data set is included.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/Research\\_on\\_Teach\\_For\\_America\\_2012\\_1.pdf](https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/Research_on_Teach_For_America_2012_1.pdf). Accessed 1/23/13.

<sup>2</sup> This claim is leveled on the website itself. See <http://www.teachforamerica.org/our-organization/research>. Accessed 1/23/13.

<sup>3</sup> See [https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/Research\\_on\\_Teach\\_For\\_America\\_2012\\_1.pdf](https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/Research_on_Teach_For_America_2012_1.pdf). Accessed 1/23/13.

<sup>4</sup> For example see Ildiko Laczko-Kerr & David Berliner, "The Effectiveness of Teach for America and Other Under-certified Teachers on Student Academic Achievement: A Case of Harmful Public Policy," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10 (37), 2002. <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/316>. Accessed 1/23/13. Also see Linda Darling-Hammond et al., "Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence About Teacher Certification, Teach for America, and Teacher Effectiveness," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13 (42), 2005. <http://tinyurl.com/anltoxw> (.pdf). Accessed 1/23/13.

## Irrelevant Studies

Four of the 12 “studies” are irrelevant to the argument re: “make as much of an impact on student achievement as veteran teachers.” Of these four:

One, “Creating a Corps of Change Agents,” is a promotional piece from *Education Next* that discusses the high rate of entrepreneurs who come from TFA. It makes no mention of effectiveness.<sup>5</sup>

The second is a peer-reviewed piece, “The Price of Misassignment: The Role of Teaching Assignments in Teach For America Teachers’ Exit from Low Income Schools and the Teaching Profession,” which discusses improving TFA retention.<sup>6</sup> As with the first piece, it makes no mention of effectiveness.

The third, “Teacher Characteristics and Student Achievement: Evidence from Teach For America,” discusses predicting outcomes at the time of TFA hire.<sup>7</sup> This study could have gone under “problematic” as the front page contains the disclaimer “PRELIMINARY AND INCOMPLETE” in all caps lettering. Regardless, it does not offer a strict comparison between veteran teachers and TFA graduates. The fourth study is another peer reviewed article, “Assessing the Effects of Voluntary Youth Service: The Case of Teach for America,” but it astonishingly presents evidence against TFA’s claim that its recruits go on to “pro social” jobs.<sup>8</sup> From the abstract:

Specifically, [TFA] graduates lag behind non-matriculants in current service activity and generally trail both non-matriculants and drop-outs in self-reported participation in five other forms of civic/ political activity measured in the study. Graduates also vote at lower rates than the other two groups. Finally, fewer graduates report employment in “pro-social” jobs than either non-matriculants or drop-outs.

While this study could have gone into “problematic,” we leave it under irrelevant, though we find it interesting to note that it is an argument against the organization’s own claims.

It is crystal clear, then, that none of these four studies supports the claim TFA makes about the relationship between its teachers and experienced teachers. These studies are in fact irrelevant to the claim.

---

<sup>5</sup>,” *Education Next* 11, no. 3 (Summer 2011). Online at <http://educationnext.org/creating-a-corps-of-change-agents/>. Accessed 1/25/13.

<sup>6</sup> Morgaen L. Donaldson and Susan Moore Johnson, “The Price of Misassignment: The Role of Teaching Assignments in Teach For America Teachers’ Exit From Low-Income Schools and the Teaching Profession,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 32 (May 2010). Online at [www.nctq.org/docs/Donaldson\\_Johnson.EEPA.pdf](http://www.nctq.org/docs/Donaldson_Johnson.EEPA.pdf). Accessed 2/3/13.

<sup>7</sup> Will Dobbie, “Teacher Characteristics and Student Achievement: Evidence from Teach for America. Online at [www.people.fas.harvard.edu/%7Edobbie/research/TeacherCharacteristics\\_July2011.pdf](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/%7Edobbie/research/TeacherCharacteristics_July2011.pdf). Accessed 1/25/13.

<sup>8</sup> Doug McAdam and Cynthia Brandt, “Assessing the Effects of Voluntary Youth Service: The Case of Teach for America,” *Social Forces* 88, no. 2 (December 2009). Online at <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sof/summary/v088/88.2.mcadam.html>. Accessed 1/31/13.

## Problematic or Mixed Studies

Seven of the 12 studies are “problematic” or “mixed.” They either have methodological flaws making the findings problematic or have mixed results. Indeed two of the seven acknowledge such flaws and warn readers against making judgments based on their data. The “mixed” category indicates the results were mixed and by no means definitive. For example a study may show TFA recruits are better at math than some teachers in some cases but are not better in other subjects; or they are better than novice teachers but not better than those with experience, etc. It should be noted here that these mixed results are not without their own methodological problems, which we address below.

Importantly, six of the seven studies that show mixed or problematic results are based on the use of Value Added Measurement (VAM). While this is not the space to discuss the highly debated use of VAM to measure teacher effectiveness, we offer a brief critique with links for the reader interested in learning more. One early peer reviewed critique of the method, “Teacher Effects and Teacher Effectiveness, a Validity Investigation of the Tennessee Value Added System,” argues that there are “several logical and empirical weaknesses of the system.”<sup>9</sup> This particular system, and this particular test, is in use in Tennessee, and TFA cites it as justification for success; for further discussion of this see “Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs” below.

A more recent critique of VAM comes from Diane Ravitch who analyzed the methodology via a report from the Annenberg Institute, an organization that can hardly be called partisan or pro-status quo.<sup>10</sup> Ravitch, in discussing the Annenberg report, asks an important question: “[Dr. Corcoran] describes a margin of error so large that a teacher at the 43rd percentile (average) might actually be at the 15th percentile (below average) or the 71st percentile (above average). What is the value of such a measure? Why should it be used at all?”<sup>11</sup> Extending Ravitch’s critique, a teacher raising student scores from the 15th to 25th percentile is going to look, to bean counters, much more effective than a teacher who raises student scores from the 85th to the 90th. Which teacher is more effective? That’s debatable, but it is the type of debate that happens when people go to football games and stare at the scoreboard for two hours. Both teachers might be equally effective. The teacher with the smaller gain might be more effective, but to really know, you’d have to know something about the teams and you would have to watch the game.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Haggai Kupermintz, “Teacher Effects and Teacher Effectiveness: A Validity Investigation of the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 25, no. 3 (September 2003). Online at <http://epa.sagepub.com/content/25/3/287.abstract>. Accessed 2/3/13.

<sup>10</sup> See Sean Corcoran, “Can Teachers be Evaluated by Their Students’ Test Scores? Should they Be? The Use of Value-Added Measures of Teacher Effectiveness in Policy and Practice.” Online at <http://annenberginstitute.org/publication/can-teachers-be-evaluated-their-students%E2%80%99-test-scores-should-they-be-use-value-added-mea>. Accessed 1/31/13.

<sup>11</sup> Diane Ravitch, “The Problems with Value Added Assessments,” *Bridging Differences*, October 5, 2010. Online at [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/Bridging-Differences/2010/10/dear\\_deborah\\_you\\_asked\\_what.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/Bridging-Differences/2010/10/dear_deborah_you_asked_what.html). Accessed 2/10/13.

<sup>12</sup> For more issues with VAM see Dan D. Goldhaber, Pete Goldschmidt, and Fannie Tseng, “Teacher Value-Added at the High-School Level Different Models, Different Answers?” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 35, no. 1 (January 2013). Online at

## *Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs*<sup>13</sup>

This report is a collection of analyses done on teacher effect estimates based on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAS). This report is specifically intended to compare various teacher preparation programs therefore only teachers in their first 3 years of teaching are included. The TVAS system uses the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment System (TCAP) which includes the Tennessee Achievement Test (grades 3-8), the Writing Test, the Competency Test, the Gateway Tests and the End of Course Tests. Each teacher preparation program is analyzed based on 3 different comparisons. The mean t-value effects for beginning teachers from each program are compared to 1) State distribution of teacher t-value effects, 2) the mean of means for other Tennessee teacher training programs, and 3) the mean for veteran teachers. The first comparison seeks to identify the percentage of teachers from each teacher preparation program in the top and bottom quintiles of the state distribution of t-value effects. In this comparison, 8 programs were identified as having a statistically significant negative difference (meaning that a higher than expected percentage of teachers from the program scored in the lowest quintile) and 2 were identified as having a statistically significant positive difference (meaning that a higher than expected percentage of teachers from the program scored in the highest quintile). The Teach for America program was one of these two.

The second comparison focuses on comparing means for novice teachers from individual programs with the mean of means for all novice teachers across all programs. Here, 5 programs were identified as having a statistically significant negative difference (the mean teacher effect for this program was significantly lower than the mean of means) and 6 programs were identified as having a statistically significant positive difference (the mean teacher effect for this program was significantly higher than the mean of means). Here again, the Teach for America program is noted as having a statistically significant positive difference.

The third comparison is an analysis of the teacher effects of the novice teachers from the various teacher preparation programs compared with the statewide average of teacher effects of veteran teachers (those with more than 3 years experience). Not surprisingly, there were numerous programs (14 to be exact) with statistically significant negative differences (the mean teacher effect for novice teachers from these programs was significantly lower than state averages for veteran teachers). Two programs did show statistically significant positive results (the mean teacher effect for novice teachers from these programs was significantly higher than state averages for veteran teachers); once again, Teach for America was one of the two. In general, the analyses yielded relatively few statistically significant results especially considering the great number of comparisons conducted. This is in large part due to one of the major limitations of this study namely, the small numbers of teachers in each comparison group and those small comparison groups being measured against state averages. In instances such as these, the statistical power of the analysis is greatly reduced. Also, with small numbers of subjects in the comparison group, extreme cases have a larger impact on the group means.

---

<http://epa.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/01/15/0162373712466938.abstract>. Accessed 2/10/13. See also Jesse Rothstein, "Teacher Quality in Educational Production: Tracking, Decay, and Student Achievement," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 125 no. 1 (2010). Online at <http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/125/1/175.short>. Accessed 2/10/13.

<sup>13</sup> There is no author attribution for this report. It is available from the Tennessee Higher Education Commission at [http://www.tn.gov/thecc/Divisions/ftt/report\\_card\\_teacher\\_train/report\\_card.html](http://www.tn.gov/thecc/Divisions/ftt/report_card_teacher_train/report_card.html). Accessed 2/10/13.

Additionally, the comparison measures appear to be based off of the teachers' Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) gain scores. These are normalized scores that work very much like percentiles where, by definition, 50% of the scores are "at or below average." With a forced normalized scale, there is no real measure of how "good" the top performers are nor how "bad" the lowest performers are. This limitation calls into question any claim to TFA effectiveness and renders the report problematic at best.

### *Portal Report: Teacher Preparation and Student Test scores in North Carolina*<sup>14</sup>

This study focuses on novice teachers (teachers in their first 5 years of teaching) in North Carolina. The authors identify twelve different modes of entry or "portals" into teaching in North Carolina public schools and compare each of these using value added measures based on student test scores on the End of Grade test (EOG) and End of Course test (EOC). The primary comparison group is the set of teachers who graduated from undergraduate teacher preparation programs at one of 15 public universities in the UNC system. This portal provided approximately 32 percent of the teachers in this study. In comparison, the Teach for America portal provided approximately 0.3 percent of the teachers in this study.

The study analyzed student outcome data linked to approximately 20,000 teachers over the 4 year time period using impact models (value added assessment models) with extensive control variables factored in. All analyses were done at the teacher level rather than the school or district levels. At the elementary level, analyses were performed on two assessments: EOG scores in reading and math. At the middle school level, they used EOG and EOC scores in reading, math, Algebra I and science. At the high school level, analyses were conducted on EOC assessments in English I, math, science, and social studies. At each level, the UNC prepared teachers were compared with the teachers from the other 11 portals. Overall, 97 comparisons were made. Of these, the UNC prepared teachers performed significantly better in 14, significantly worse in nine and not significantly different in 74. Of the nine comparisons where they did significantly worse, five were in comparison to teachers from the TFA portal. Specifically, the TFA teachers scores were significantly higher than the UNC prepared teachers in the areas of high school math, English, science and overall high school gains, and middle school math.

In several instances, the authors point out the fact that the TFA portal only accounts for 0.3 percent of the teaching force in the state and urges caution for broad policy decisions made based on the comparison of this group with the much larger population of UNC prepared teachers. This is a limitation of this study. The main comparison group is nearly 100 times larger than the TFA group. Also, the main comparison group makes up a large portion of the total population being studied. Therefore, extreme values are more likely to get "washed out" in the averages. The two groups lack homogeneity of variance most likely due to the discrepancies in their sizes. Comparisons under such conditions should be carefully interpreted.

This study is also problematic for those who claim TFA has a long-term positive effect on school districts because of the documented high turnover of TFA recruits: 85% are gone after

---

<sup>14</sup> See Gary T. Henry, et al., "Portal Report: Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina." Available online at <http://tinyurl.com/b26kzq8>. (.pdf). Accessed 1/31/13.

four years. And this makes the “Portal Report” not just problematic, but damning. In the report’s own words:

The final and in some ways most important finding of this study is that first year teachers perform worse than those with four years of experience in 10 out of 11 comparisons, and in their second year as teachers perform worse in 6 out of 11 comparisons. To provide perspective, we estimated that elementary students taught math by a first year teacher lose the equivalent of 21 days of schooling when compared to similar students taught by teachers with four years of experience.<sup>15</sup>

*Making a Difference? The Effects of Teach for America on Student Performance in High School*<sup>16</sup>

This report focuses on comparisons between TFA teachers and traditionally trained secondary teachers in North Carolina. The primary sources of data are the student scores from the End of Course (EOC) tests across multiple subjects for academic years 2000-01 through 2006-07. The data came from the 23 Local Education Agencies (LEA) across the state that hired TFA teachers during those years. The student outcome data for the TFA teachers were compared with the data from both novice teachers and teachers with more than 3 years of experience.

The authors used a fixed effects model to examine the within-student variation across multiple subjects. Because, in the case of the North Carolina EOC examinations, no initial test data exists for a particular subject, the authors were not able to use a value added approach. Instead they used the students’ scores from their 8<sup>th</sup> grade math and reading tests to control for prior knowledge. Overall, the authors state that the TFA teachers show a statistically significant positive difference in improvement in student performance when looking at averages of scores across all subjects as well as when looking at averages of math scores and science scores separately. No data is presented for analysis of student performance on the English EOC.

There are a few limitations to this study. In North Carolina, student test scores are linked to the proctor for a particular test. The proctor may or may not be the actual classroom teacher. Because of this, matching teachers with their students’ test scores poses more of a challenge. A fit statistic is used to match teachers to scores, however some margin of error still exists. Additionally, the sizes of the comparison groups are vastly different – there are 441 TFA teachers in the study, but there are over 60,000 traditional teachers included. The authors used multiple statistical methods in order to account for the differences between the groups, but the fact remains that statistical analyses under these circumstances should be carefully interpreted.

Finally and importantly, the report’s authors caution against their own findings, noting that “When both teacher quality and student performance are systematically related to student ability and motivation, the relationship between teacher and student performance cannot be reliably estimated.”<sup>17</sup> The phrase “cannot be reliably estimated” undermines TFA’s claim that

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>16</sup> Zeyu Xu, Jane Hannaway, Colin Taylor, “Making a Difference?

The Effect of Teach for America on Student Performance in High School.” Report made available online by the Urban Institute at <http://www.urban.org/publications/411642.html>. Accessed 2/10/13.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 12.

“rigorous” studies show “Teach For America corps members help their students achieve academic gains equal to or larger than teachers from other preparation programs.”<sup>18</sup>

### *Evaluation of Teach for America in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools*<sup>19</sup>

This evaluation report was conducted on Teach for America teachers and non-TFA teachers in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school district (CMS) in North Carolina during the academic years 2007-08 and 2008-09. The student-level data for the report came from End of Grade (EOG) and End of Course (EOC) exam scores and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction ABC Growth Model scores (which are based on EOG and EOC assessments); therefore the only teachers included in the study were those teaching in EOG/EOC tested grades and subjects. This includes EOGs for grades 3-8 reading and math, EOCs for Algebra I, Algebra II, Biology, Civics and Economics, Chemistry, English I, Geometry, and Physical Science. Furthermore, in order to help control for non-random assignment of students to classes, the comparison groups of non-TFA teachers were limited to only those who were teaching the same subjects, in the same schools as the TFA teachers. Unlike the other studies reported here, this one also includes a qualitative component. Qualitative data collected for analysis were principal interviews (for TFA and non-TFA teachers), TFA teacher interviews, and classroom observations (of TFA and non-TFA teachers).

There were six research questions the authors addressed in this study, summarized here: 1) How well does teacher type (TFA vs. non-TFA, experienced vs. novice) predict student achievement? 2) How well does teacher type predict student growth? 3) Are there differences in variation of student achievement between TFA and non-TFA teachers? 4) What are the principals’ perceptions of TFA teachers regarding student achievement? 5) How do first and second year TFA teachers view the Teach for America program? and 6) What are the differences in instructional practices between TFA and non-TFA teachers? Questions 1-3 are addressed using quantitative measures on student-level assessments and questions 4-6 are addressed using the qualitative measures listed above.

Because the data set was limited to only TFA teachers in CMS and the non-TFA teachers teaching the same subjects in the same schools, the sample sizes were small. To compensate for this, the authors collapsed the EOC data into one measure. Even then, there were only 45 teachers total (32 TFA and 13 non-TFA) in 2007-08 and 82 teachers total (57 TFA and 25 non-TFA) in 2008-09 included in the EOC data. Such a small sample greatly reduces the power of the statistical analyses conducted. EOG data was based on higher *n* values (close to 1000 total teachers in 2007-08 and nearly 2000 total teachers in 2008-09) and therefore is not subject to the same degree of error.

Overall, the study found that there were no statistically significant differences between TFA and all non-TFA teachers on the EOG assessments in grades 3-8. Statistically significant differences, favoring the TFA teachers, were found when examining the merged EOC data both in the raw scores comparisons and the student growth model comparisons. These differences are

---

<sup>18</sup> Again, see TFA’s Research Page, <http://www.teachforamerica.org/our-organization/research>. Accessed 2/10/13.

<sup>19</sup> Jason A. Schoeneberger, “Teach for America Evaluation Report, May 2011.” Available online from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools at <http://tinyurl.com/bhnqxsz>. (.pdf). Accessed 2/10/13.



statistically significant, but are still relatively small. The authors themselves state that this difference represents only a “minor advantage for TFA-taught students.”<sup>20</sup> When the authors matched TFA teachers with non-TFA teachers with similar years of experience, they found similar results with one notable exception: a statistically significant difference favoring non-TFA teachers in the Growth Model for EOG Reading.

The qualitative data was based on data from three sources: interviews with CMS principals, interviews with current TFA teachers and observations of TFA and non-TFA classes. A total of eight CMS principals were selected for interviews, each one from a different school type – high, average and low achieving schools as well as elementary, middle and high school. No low achieving, high school principal participated. In general, the comments from the principals were favorable regarding the TFA teachers’ abilities in the classroom. Not all comments were positive; however overall the authors classified the principal satisfaction level to be high.

The eight principals in the study each selected 2 TFA and 2 non-TFA teachers at their schools for participation in the classroom observations and (for the TFA teachers) the individual interviews. The principals were asked to select two TFA teachers from different subject areas/grade levels and to identify a “matching” non-TFA teacher with similar teaching assignments and levels of experience. The interviews with the TFA teachers themselves showed that the TFA teachers were, for the most part, satisfied with the program; however, some noted a few issues such as tensions between the TFA and non-TFA teachers at their particular schools. No interviews were conducted with the non-TFA teachers, which is problematic for making conclusions based on interview data.

Data from the 32 classroom observations (16 TFA classes and 16 non-TFA classes observed 1 time each) showed both similarities and differences. Similarities included comparable levels of confidence and evidence of pre-planned activities. The authors note several differences in classroom climate and execution of lessons. The authors state that there were observed differences in the types of questions the teachers asked. The TFA teachers were more likely to ask open-ended questions and placed a greater emphasis on real-world applications than their non-TFA counterparts. Also, the non-TFA teachers were more likely to use lecture-based teaching strategies. They also noted noticeable differences in classroom management strategies employed with the TFA teachers utilizing a greater variety of techniques. It should be noted that these data points were based on one classroom observation per teacher. The question should be asked – “Is the observation of one class period a good measure of the common practice in a teacher’s classroom?”

This report is well designed in that the authors use both quantitative and qualitative measures to answer their research questions. They pay particular attention to finding matched samples for both types of data. This, of course, leads to a limited sample size for their quantitative analyses, which could account for the lack of statistically significant results. The qualitative data could be strengthened by conducting more than one classroom observation per teacher, as well as adding in a non-TFA teacher interview component.

Setting the lack of statistically significant results aside, the authors of this report come close to acknowledging issues with their own data, as they conclude with words that are hardly

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 18.

an endorsement. On page 46 they note (emphasis ours): "...a more focused approach in observing differences between math and reading classrooms by TFA and non-TFA-led classrooms might generate insight into why TFA teachers **may show** positive results with respect to math achievement and why non-TFA teachers **may show** similar results to TFA teachers for reading achievement." The words "may show" are problematic in a report being used to justify replacing traditionally certified teachers with TFA recruits.

### *Teacher Preparation Programs and Teach for America Research Study*<sup>21</sup>

This research study analyzes the performance of Teach for America versus non-Teach for America novice teachers for two cohorts, in four school districts in Texas. The four research objectives for this study are 1) compare student achievement gains on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) at all grade levels and across all subjects, 2) determine the cost effectiveness of various teacher preparation programs, 3) compare retention rates of teachers in high-poverty schools, and 4) compare the degree to which teachers are closing the achievement gaps. Because only four school districts participated in the study, the sample sizes for the different comparison groups are small. In order to adjust for this, the study merges the data for grades 3-8 into one measure and the data for grades 9-11 into another rather than analyzing each grade separately. Also, in order to maintain similar demographics of students taught by Teach for America versus non-teach for America teachers, no data from White students or students not eligible for free or reduced lunch are included.

The authors state that at the time of the report, an actual cost analysis of the teacher preparation programs was not feasible, so they focus the discussion of their results on the other three research objectives. The retention rate data is as to be expected considering the TFA program involves a 2 year commitment. The retention rate for non-TFA teachers declines steadily over the course of the first three years of teaching (around 85% after 1 year, and 79% after year 2) while the retention rate for the TFA teachers is relatively high after the first year (around 95%) but drops off drastically after year 2 (around 50%).

Regarding student achievement gains, overall the study finds that TFA teachers had statistically significant greater gains in student achievement than the non-TFA teachers in grades 3-8 English Language Arts/Reading (ELA/R) and in grades 9-11 both ELA/R and Math. Regarding the achievement gap that exists for African American students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students, the results are mixed. For economically disadvantaged students, TFA teachers show statistically significant positive gains in student achievement for only grades 9-11 Math, but show statistically significant negative gains in grades 3-8 ELA/R and Math as well as grades 9-11 ELA/R. For African American students, TFA teachers show statistically significant positive gains in student achievement for grades 3-8 ELA/R as well as grades 9-11 ELA/R and Math. For Hispanic students, TFA teachers show statistically significant positive gains in student achievement only in grades 9-11 Math, but show statistically significant negative gains in grades 3-8 ELA/R and Math as well as grades 9-11 ELA/R. There are several issues with the data collected for this study. First, as stated earlier, the relative numbers of

---

<sup>21</sup> See Anne Ware, et al., "Teacher Preparation Programs and Teach For America Research Study." Report available from The University of Texas at Dallas Education Research Center at <http://tinyurl.com/akzbss8>. (.pdf). Accessed 2/10/13.

students, teachers and schools included are small which significantly limits the power of the study. Further, the authors self-report problems in accurately matching student scores with teachers therefore making it difficult, if not impossible, to make valid inferences about the true teacher impact on student test scores. As the authors themselves note (emphasis ours): “Given data limitations and the requirements of the rider, the analyses were limited to descriptive and inferential statistics. **As such readers are encouraged to interpret the findings related to student achievement with caution.**”<sup>22</sup> Returning to TFA’s claim that research “shows,” this addendum is particularly problematic. Arguably, “with caution” is a substantial qualifier to any claims using the word “shows.”

### *Recruiting Effective Math Teachers, How Do Math Immersion Teachers Compare*<sup>23</sup>

This report ultimately undermines TFA’s claim regarding veteran teachers. From page 31 of the report (emphasis ours): “TFA teachers produce student achievement gains in middle school math that **exceed those of teachers from other pathways with comparable experience.**” Not, contra TFA’s claim, veteran teachers.<sup>24</sup>

Furthermore and importantly, from pages 23-24 of the report (emphasis ours): “However, this [gains on middle school math tests] is **largely eliminated once the much higher attrition of TFA teachers is taken into account.**”<sup>25</sup> Said differently, when you start to consider how quickly TFA recruits leave their jobs, the gain is negated. This is the same conclusion reached by the authors of the “Portal Report” and therefore renders this report problematic at best.

### *Teach for America Teachers’ Contribution to Student Achievement in Louisiana in Grades 4-9: 2004-2005 to 2006-2007*<sup>26</sup>

This report argues: “In all areas except for social studies, TFA corps members were statistically significantly more effective than other new teachers.” The key phrase here is “new teachers.” The authors do not reveal whether or not the “new teachers” contained unlicensed, uncertified teachers teaching out-of-field, as is common in poor, hard to staff schools.

When compared to experienced teachers, the authors report that there was “no significant difference” between the test data for TFA recruits and traditionally trained, experienced, teachers. Furthermore, the authors do not define what “experienced” means. Does that body of “experienced” teachers contain only teachers with three years of experience? After all, they are, by the report’s own admission, more experienced than most TFA recruits because most TFA

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 1.

<sup>23</sup> Donald Boyd, et al. “Recruiting Effective Math Teachers: How Do Math Immersion Teachers Compare?: Evidence from New York City.” Report available from the National Bureau of Economic Research at <http://www.nber.org/papers/w16017>. Accessed 1/31/13

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 23-24.

<sup>26</sup> George H. Noell, & Kristin A. Gansle, “Teach for America Teachers’ Contribution to Student Achievement in Louisiana in Grades 4-9: 2004-2005 to 2006-2007.” This “technical report” is made available by the National Center on Teacher Quality online at <http://tinyurl.com/9wqpm8y>. (.pdf). Accessed 1/31/13.

recruits leave after year two. Arguably, if the authors had used only teachers with five years of experience in the control, the results would have been significantly different.

With these caveats in place, this is the only report, out of the 7 “problematic” and “mixed” reports that even remotely supports TFA’s claim that “Teach For America corps members make as much of an impact on student achievement as veteran teachers.”

### **Positive Studies**

One “study” is overwhelmingly positive, but that “study” is actually a one-page summary from a survey of principals.<sup>27</sup> The questions and data are not available, but the one page summary is overwhelmingly positive. The missing data may render this one-page summary problematic. For example, if the principals interviewed were from KIPP charter schools, owned by TFA founder Wendy Kopp’s husband, they may have felt compelled to praise the TFA recruits frequently hired by KIPP schools. We can’t know because the data is not available.

### **Conclusion**

It is fitting to close this analysis with a discussion on the topic of peer review and its importance. Scholars and scientists have the mechanism in place to make sure research is sound and people aren’t simply making things up and convincing others that they have found the cure for cancer, created a miracle drug like Vioxx, cloned a sheep, or narrowed the achievement gap. If “studies” are misleading, cherry picked, based on flawed instruments, and avoid the topic at hand, is it research or is it marketing?

Of the studies listed on TFA’s research page, two are peer-reviewed. As we showed above, both are irrelevant to TFA’s claim “that Teach For America corps members make as much of an impact on student achievement as veteran teachers.” Given that they have no connection to TFA’s claim, these two studies are arguably included to pad TFA’s resume. What is troublesome here is that we live in a world where foundations and organizations have millions of dollars to spend lobbying (TFA has spent well over 2 million on lobbyists over the past decade) and at the same time can bypass peer-review in order to make a case for whatever they are selling.<sup>28</sup> If powerful interests have enough money, science no longer matters. For more on this ask the scientists trying to address global warming.<sup>29</sup>

What can be done to slow the spread of TFA is perhaps more troubling than the flawed “science” it uses to sell its wares. Despite cutbacks in funding for schools across the nation, states continue to earmark funds for Teach for America. We’d like to believe we live in a world where rational actors make decisions based on rigorous science, but experience has led us to believe this is a rare case when it comes to educational policy at federal and state levels. Doing something about the influence of money in shaping policy is beyond the scope of this paper.

---

<sup>27</sup> See “National Principal Satisfaction With Teach For America Teachers.” Available online from Teach for America at <http://tinyurl.com/bfwn6v5>. (.pdf). Accessed 2/10/13.

<sup>28</sup> For annual lobbying by Teach for America see <http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000057438&year=2000>. Accessed 1/30/13.

<sup>29</sup> See Union of Concerned Scientists, “Scientific Integrity, Let Science Do Its Job.” Online at [http://www.ucsusa.org/scientific\\_integrity](http://www.ucsusa.org/scientific_integrity). Accessed 2/10/13.

## **Authors**

Philip Kovacs is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Alabama, Huntsville and Co-editor of the Critical Education series “Teach For America and the Future of Education in the United States.”

Erica Slate-Young is Assistant Professor of Education at University of Alabama, Huntsville.

# Critical Education

[criticaleducation.org](http://criticaleducation.org)

ISSN 1920-4175

## Editors

Stephen Petrina, *University of British Columbia*  
Sandra Mathison, *University of British Columbia*  
E. Wayne Ross, *University of British Columbia*

## Associate Editors

Abraham P. DeLeon, *University of Texas at San Antonio*  
Adam Renner, 1970-2010

## Editorial Collective

Faith Ann Agostinone, *Aurora University*  
Wayne Au, *University of Washington, Bothell*  
Marc Bousquet, *Emory University*  
Joe Cronin, *Antioch University*  
Antonia Darder, *Loyola Marymount University*  
George Dei, *OISE/University of Toronto*  
Stephen C. Fleury, *Le Moyne College*  
Kent den Heyer, *University of Alberta*  
Nirmala Erevelles, *University of Alabama*  
Michelle Fine, *City University of New York*  
Gustavo Fischman, *Arizona State University*  
Erica Frankenberg, *Penn State University*  
Melissa Freeman, *University of Georgia*  
David Gabbard, *Boise State University*  
Rich Gibson, *San Diego State University*  
Dave Hill, *Anglia Ruskin University*  
Nathalia E. Jaramillo, *University of Auckland*  
Philip E. Kovacs, *University of Alabama, Huntsville*  
Saville Kushner, *University of Auckland*  
Zeus Leonardo, *University of California, Berkeley*  
Pauline Lipman, *University of Illinois, Chicago*  
Lisa Loutzenheiser, *University of British Columbia*  
Marvin Lynn, *University of Illinois, Chicago*  
Linda Mabry, *Washington State University, Vancouver*  
Sheila Macrine, *Montclair State University*  
Perry M. Marker, *Sonoma State University*  
Rebecca Martusewicz, *Eastern Michigan University*  
Peter McLaren, *University of California, Los Angeles*  
Brad J. Porfilio, *Lewis University*  
Stuart R. Poyntz, *Simon Fraser University*  
Kenneth J. Saltman, *DePaul University*  
Özlem Sensoy, *Simon Fraser University*  
Patrick Shannon, *Penn State University*  
Kevin D. Vinson, *University of the West Indies*  
John F. Welsh, Santa Fe, NM