

Comparison of States that use Student Achievement in Teacher Evaluation Systems

State	Implementation Date	Overview of the Evaluation System	Aid Tied to Teacher Evaluation
New York	School districts must adopt a teacher evaluation plan for the 2012-2013 school year. <i>2012-13 Executive Budget (S.6257-B/A.9057-B)</i>	<p>Uses multiple classroom observations Student performance linked to ratings Strengthens classroom observations</p> <p>Objective: 40% - State assessments can be used for up to 40% - local measures must be approved by state</p> <p>Subjective: 60% - Multiple classroom observations, one of which must be unannounced; must be the majority of subjective points - Remaining points determined by subjective measures approved by the state</p> <p>State Education Commissioner approves every district's plan to ensure quality and rigor.</p> <p><i>2012-13 Executive Budget (S.6257-B/A.9057-B)</i></p>	Yes
Arizona	<p><i>Teacher Evaluation Law (SB1040) enacted in 2010, requires the State Board of Education to develop and adopt a Framework for teacher evaluation that includes student achievement data before December 15, 2011, to be used beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. ARS §15-203(A)(38)</i></p> <p>The Framework allows local district's to develop their own teacher evaluation rubrics as long as they are in compliance with the standards of the Framework. <i>Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, Adopted by State Board of Education 4/25/11.</i></p>	<p>LEAs must develop their own evaluation systems that are in compliance with the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness for implementation at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>Objective: At least 33% but not more than 50% of evaluation must be based on student achievement data. - Districts must use multiple data elements. - Teachers in tested subject areas must use statewide assessments as at least one measure of student achievement. - Teachers in non-tested subjects must use valid and reliable school level data.</p> <p>Subjective: Between 50%-67% of evaluation must be based on teacher performance. - Must be based on multiple classroom observations</p> <p><i>Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, Adopted by State Board of Education 4/25/11.</i></p>	No
Colorado	<p>Piloting of the evaluation system is taking place over the next two years, 2011-12 and 2012-13. Every district must have a system in place by July 2013.</p> <p>While the State Board of Education approved regulations on the evaluation framework in November 2011, the state legislature will review the rules and approve or repeal various provisions this month.</p> <p>For any provisions that are repealed by the state legislature, the State Board will promulgate emergency rules in May 2012 and re-submit to the General Assembly for Review</p> <p><i>SB 10-191</i></p>	<p>The State Council for Educator Effectiveness (SCEE) spent a year developing and redrafting a framework that is now set in regulations as of November 2011. <i>Regulations 1 CCR 301-87:</i></p> <p>50% Objective, growth on state summative tests, and "other assessments" for non-tested areas.</p> <p>50% Subjective, "Professional Practice Standards" that include observations and other measures. CO DOE will develop the rubrics.</p> <p>There is no official scoring matrix to determine how all the points shall be aggregated into a single score. An example is provided in the SCEE Report (April 2011). Colorado is waiting for information to be collected from the pilots</p>	No
DC (Won Race to the Top)	IMPACT teacher evaluation system passed by teacher's union and district administration in 2009, effective immediately.	<p>DCPS IMPACT Guidebook: OBJECTIVE: 50% based on individual value-added. SUBJECTIVE: - 35% based on observations against the Teaching & Learning Framework. - 10% is based on collaboration in the community. - 5% on school-wide test scores.</p>	No
Delaware (Won Race to the Top)	Evaluation system enacted in 2008. Implementation is piloted in stages, with all districts using the new system not later than the 2011-2012 school year. <i>Regulations, AC Title 14, 1006A (1.0)</i>	<p>Regulations establish 4 levels of teacher effectiveness ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, Ineffective. <i>Regulations, AC Title 14, 1006A (6.0)</i></p> <p>Statute does not define the standards for the evaluation, but does require: - Teachers must be evaluated annually - Student performance must be a significant factor, but carves out high-risk students. - The Dept of Education to promulgate regulations</p> <p><i>Statute: DE Title 14, Chpt 12, §1270</i></p> <p>(a) An educator must receive at least 1 Delaware Performance Appraisal System II (DPAS II) evaluation annually.</p> <p>(b) DPAS II must have no more than 5 components and must have a strong focus on student improvement, with 1 component dedicated exclusively to student improvement and weighted at least as high as any other component. The measure of student improvement must include an off-grade assessment, if available, along with other measures determined by the Department and the State Board. The measure of student improvement must take into consideration student absence, student mobility, student chronic noncompliance with school rules, chronic failure by parents to abide by the Parents' Declaration of Responsibilities under § 157 of this title, and other factors that may adversely affect the evaluation. If a student has missed more than 15% of the class time, the student's performance evaluation shall not be used in evaluating a teacher under this chapter.</p> <p><i>Preliminary Guidelines:</i> In December 2011, the DE Dept. of Education released preliminary guidelines to be used as a recommendation: Objective Measures: 50% - School-wide assessment measure based on state assessment: 30% - Student Cohort assessment measure 20%</p> <p>c) Teacher Specific assessment measure 50% - At least one announced observation, and unannounced observation for all teachers except Highly Effective teachers. - Pre-conference/self-assessment to determine goals and measures for improvement. - Summative Evaluation, which includes student growth measures. <i>DPAS II Guide for Teachers, Revised December, 2011, pg 37-39.</i> <i>Regulations, AC Title 14, 1006A</i></p>	No
Florida (Won Race to the Top)	Enacted in April 2011, and expected to be implemented during the 2011-2012 school year. "The department must approve each school district's instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems. The department shall monitor each district's implementation of its instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems for compliance with the requirements of this section."	<p>Statute establishes 4 levels of teacher effectiveness ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory. <i>FL Title XLVIII Chapter 1012.34(2)E</i></p> <p>OBJECTIVE: 30%- 50% - At least 50% must be based on student growth data measured annually by state tests. The growth portion of the evaluation must include three years of data. If less than three years of data are available, the percentage counted in the overall evaluation drops to 40%. - For teachers in non-tested subjects, 3 years of data must be accounted for by state-wide tests, or a combination of student learning growth data specific to that position, and will only count for 30% of the evaluation.</p>	No

Comparison of States that use Student Achievement in Teacher Evaluation Systems

	By December 1, 2012, the Commissioner of Education shall report to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the approval and implementation status of each school district's instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems. The report shall include performance evaluation results for the prior school year for instructional personnel. <i>FL Title XLVIII Chapter 1012.34(1)(b) and (c)</i>	SUBJECTIVE: 70%-50%. - At least one classroom observation a year. - Standards must be consistent with Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, and determined by the district but approved by the state. <i>FL Title XLVIII Chapter 1012.34(3)(a)1</i>	
Georgia (Won Race to the Top)	Teacher evaluation systems are being piloted in the 26 RTT school districts beginning January 2012. The remaining 135 school districts did not sign onto RTT and are not required to participate in new teacher evaluation systems. The state board shall develop a model annual evaluation instrument. Statute is silent on implementation dates. <i>OCGA §20-2-210(2009)</i>	Preliminary guidelines establish 4 levels of teacher effectiveness ratings: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, Ineffective. Objective: 60% - 50% student growth on state assessments. - 10% Student Achievement Gap Reduction For non-tested teachers; - 50% DOE- approved district achievement growth measures. - 10% Student Learning Objectives Subjective: 40% - 2 formal observations, 1 unannounced - Self-assessment - Surveys of instructional practice <i>RT3 Great Teachers and Leaders Presentation by GA State School Superintendent John Barge, 9/13/11.</i>	No
Hawaii (Won Race to the Top)	Hawaii teachers voted down their state-wide contract, which included the design of a teacher evaluation system. The state is at greatest risk of losing its grant among all the RTT states.	N/A	No
Illinois	The timing for implementation is drawn out considerably. In 2012-13, 300 Chicago schools and all the persistently low-achieving (PLA) schools in the state must have a new teacher evaluation model in place. In 2013-14, evaluations will be required in the remaining Chicago schools. In 2015-16, the lowest performing 20 percent of schools must complete evaluations under the new model. All districts are not required to use a new evaluation system until 2016-17. <i>105 ILCS 5/24A-5 Ch. 122, par. 24A-5</i>	Structure is currently built on draft regulations that will not be finalized by the Illinois State Board of Education until Spring, 2012. At first glance, the state model appears more rigorous, with objective measures counting for 50 percent. But the details of the state model are more in line with what exists in New York regulations: - 20% growth on state test scores - 10% attainment on state test scores (percentages meeting or exceeding standards) - 10% growth on other interim measure (not scored by the district) - 10% based on increasing attendance and/or other non-test measures aligned to the school improvement plan. Subjective: Draft regulations (<i>ISBE Non-Regulatory Guidance on PERA & SB 7, December 2011</i>) propose observations to count for 50%, with at least 2 formal observations and as many informal observations as needed.	No
Indiana	Indiana is currently piloting teacher evaluation systems in six school districts. Three districts are piloting the state model, RISE and three are piloting their own models that include the five priorities outlined in Public Law 90. State law requires all districts to establish a teacher evaluation system by July 1, 2012.	Objective: P.L. 90 and the regulations (LSA Document #11-405(F)) say: - 35% growth on state test score - 10% on student learning objectives (locally determined) - 5% on a school-wide learning measure. Subjective: 50% observations P.L.90 also defines the four performance level descriptors and says that "expectations for academic growth be based on guidelines suggested by the department." The guidelines then establish that Highly Effective teachers must generate 1.5 years of growth in a year's time.	No
Idaho	Enacted in 2011 as SB 1108, and to be fully implemented by July 1, 2012 when 50% of the evaluation must be based on objective measures of student achievement. <i>IC 33-514.4</i> Limits collective bargaining to salary and benefits.	By the 2012-2013 school year: Objective: 50% based on student growth measures. Subjective: 50% based on teacher performance and classroom observation with the statewide use of the Danielson Framework, <i>Student Comes First changes to Teacher Evaluation System, Idaho State Department of Education, 2011.</i>	No
Louisiana	Teacher evaluation law (Act 54) was enacted in 2010. Implementation of statewide evaluation system in which 50% of evaluation is based on student growth data will begin in the 2012-2013 school year. Statute requires the State Board of Education, with input from the Educator Evaluation Advisory Committee (EEAC) to set the standards and guidelines for teacher evaluations and student growth measures in tested and non-tested subjects. <i>LA RS Chapter 39, title 17 §3881-3883 aka Act 54 (2010)</i>	The Educator Evaluation Advisory Committee (EEAC) shall submit its initial recommendations for the standards and guidelines of the evaluation system to the board no later than April 30, 2012. <i>LA RS Chapter 39, title 17 §3883(A)(6)(d)</i> The standards must include: Objective: 50% By the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year, 50% of evaluations will be based on student achievement using a value-added model as determined by the state board. Subjective: 50% - At least one announced classroom observation per year - Unannounced classroom visitations For non-tested subjects, the board shall establish measures of student growth. For non-tested subjects, the board shall establish measures of student growth. <i>LA RS Chapter 39, title 17 §3901©</i>	No
Massachusetts (Won Race to the Top)	Evaluation system enacted in 2011. Implementation in stages, with all districts using the new system in the 2013-14 school year. School Districts shall implement evaluation systems pursuant to the following timeline: (a) Districts with chronically failing schools must begin implementation during the 2011-2012 school year. (b) RTT shall begin implementation during the 2012-2013 school year. About 2/3 of MA districts. (c) Remaining districts shall begin implementation during the 2013-2014 school year. <i>Note: School districts are permitted to phase in implementation of its new evaluation system over a two-year period, with at least half of its educators being evaluated under the new system in the first year.</i> <i>603 CMR 35.11</i>	The procedures for conducting such evaluations, but not the requirement for such evaluations, shall be subject to the collective bargaining." M.G.L. c.71, §38. Neither the state law nor the regulations state the percentage breakdown of subjective and objective measures. However, the regulations were amended on June 28, 2011 to remove language that student performance be a significant factor in a teacher's evaluation. Regulations 603 CMR 35.06 define the steps of a teacher evaluation: 1) Self-assessment: educator must gather and provide to the evaluator information on the educator's performance. 2) The educator and evaluator must set goals and develop an Educator Plan which the teacher will be responsible for implementing successfully by achieving goals and participating in aligned professional development. 3) A formative assessment or evaluation, which includes observations, one of which must be unannounced. 4) The final evaluation must be based on everything above, as well as multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement, including growth on the state assessment. Student Growth Data: By July 2012, the Department shall supplement these regulations with additional guidance on the development and use of student performance measures. <i>Note: Until such measures are identified and data is available for at least two years, educators will not be assessed as having high, moderate, or low impact on student learning outcomes consistent with 603 CMR 35.09(3).</i>	No
	Evaluation system enacted May 2010. Implementation is piloted in stages, with all districts using the new system not later than July 1, 2013. <i>State Board Guidelines "Timeline for Implementing Model Performance Evaluation System." (June 2011)</i> The State Board shall adopt regulations that establish general standards for performance evaluations for certified teachers..	School districts must develop, in collaboration with their local negotiating unit, an evaluation system in alignment with the MD State Dept of Ed. (MDSE) guidelines and standards, which prescribes what flexibility the LEA has to negotiate with its union. <i>SB 1263, Chapter 189.2(l) - (3)(l)</i> State law required the MDSE to develop general standards, which were created on June 24, 2011:	

Comparison of States that use Student Achievement in Teacher Evaluation Systems

<p>Maryland (Won Race to the Top)</p>	<p>The County Board shall establish performance evaluation criteria for certified teachers.</p> <p>SB 1263, Chapter 189</p> <p>All decisions that go into the determination of the overall teacher evaluation rating must be detailed for Maryland State Education Department (MSDE) to review and approve.</p> <p>MDSE General Standards, Teacher/Principal Evaluation System, June 2011.</p>	<p>Student growth measures must account for 50%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA Growth measures (20%), chosen by the LEA from a menu of options and approved by MDSE. • Statewide Growth Measures (30%), chosen by the LEA from a list and approved by MDSE. <p>Ratio for State Growth Measures to LEA Growth Measure must always be 3:2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All locally negotiated decisions that go into the determination of the rating must be detailed for MSDE to review and approve. <p>Professional Practice must account for 50%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determined by the LEA but must be approved by MDSE and consistent with MSDE guidelines of allowable metrics and acceptable evidence. <p>Overall rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A teacher must be at least effective in the student growth component in order to receive an overall rating of Effective. • All decisions that go into the determination of the overall rating must be approved by MSDE. <p>MDSE General Standards, Teacher/Principal Evaluation System, June 2011.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Michigan</p>	<p>Teacher Evaluation Law passed in July of 2011 (Public Act 102).</p> <p>Districts must start assigning one of four ratings to teachers and administrators by September 2011</p> <p>A new body, the Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness, must recommend an evaluation model for educators by April 2012</p> <p>Districts must begin using the new tool in the 2013-14 school year</p>	<p>Objective: Performance evaluation must include a year-end evaluation where student growth and assessment is at least 25% in 2013-14 year, 40% in 2014-15, and at least 50% in 2015-16. Certain pupils can be excluded if the Superintendent approves it.</p> <p>Subjective: Must include classroom observation, which include review of lesson plans, the State curriculum standard being used, and review of pupil engagement.</p> <p>Both the evaluation tool and the student growth and assessment tool along with the range for the ratings system is to be developed by the Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness.</p> <p>(Public Act 102 of 2011)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Nevada</p>	<p>Legislation takes effect July 2011. (Senate Bill 197, signed into law as Chapter 380)</p> <p>This bill disbands the current elected Board of Education and replaces it with a mixture of elected officials and appointments made by the Governor commencing in January of 2013.</p> <p>Legislation requires the States 3 regional training programs establish an evaluation system for teachers and other licensed education professionals.</p> <p>These provisions are expected to take effect July 1, 2011.</p>	<p>The law requires that each evaluation system include specific measures of the success of each teacher, including objective data.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>North Carolina (Won Race to the Top)</p>	<p>Passed in, 2008, amended in July 2011. In pilot in 2011-12. <u>Must be fully rolled-out in 2012-13 school year.</u></p> <p>Does not have to be collectively bargained. But local school board may "adopt additional evaluation criteria and standards." However, within parameters established by the State Board of Education. GS §115C-333 – 333.1</p> <p>Also, "[a]ll teachers...shall be evaluated annually unless a local board adopts rules that allow [tenured] teachers to be evaluated more or less frequently, provided that such rules are not inconsistent with State or federal requirements."</p> <p>GS §115C-333 – 333.1</p> <p>NC State Law: GS §115C-333 – 333.1, Personnel Evaluations</p> <p>Regulations: 16 NCAC 06 C.0501, 0503-0504</p> <p>Regulations: 16 NCAC 06 C.0501, 0503-0504</p>	<p>The teacher evaluation system in North Carolina is based almost exclusively on subjective measures through observations. But local school board may "adopt additional evaluation criteria and standards – if the measures are within parameters established by the State Board of Education.</p> <p>4 ratings: Developing, Proficient, Accomplished, Distinguished.</p> <p>Observations: both probationary and tenured teachers must be observed at least 3 times annually, which includes 1 formal observation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observations are announced. - Formal observations are preceded by a "pre-observation" conference and followed by a "post-observation conference" <p>Rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before the end of the year, or within timeline set by the LEA, the principal and teacher complete a "summary evaluation conference" in which the teacher is rated by the principal and allowed to make comment on the record. <p>16 NCAC 06C .0503</p> <p>Teacher Evaluation Rubric: "The State Board created the teacher evaluation rubric to be used by districts, unless it is otherwise determined the local board and approved by the state." The rubric is based on the Standards and Elements for performance set by the State Board. Standard 4, Teachers facilitate learning for their students," mentions using a variety of methods to assess student learning, including formative and summative assessments.</p> <p>However, the student growth on those assessment is not mentioned as a factor in scoring the teacher.</p> <p>16 NCAC 06C. 0504</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Ohio (Won Race to the Top)</p>	<p>Evaluation system enacted September 2011. Implementation in stages, with all districts using the new system not later than July 1, 2013.</p> <p>Any collective bargaining agreement entered into after September 29, 2011 must include provisions which will allow for the implementation of the board adopted teacher evaluation policy.</p> <p>ORC 3319.111 (Same as HB 153).</p>	<p>School districts must develop, in collaboration with their local negotiating unit, an evaluation system in alignment with the OH Dept of Education framework (outlined by the OH. Board of Regents, 11/15/11) and standards consistent with <i>ORC 3319.111</i></p> <p><i>OTES Overview PPT, Ohio Board of Regents 11/11</i></p> <p>State law required the OH Ed Dept. to develop a standards-based state framework, which was made public on 11/15/11:</p> <p>Student growth measures must account for 50%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Value-added growth for teachers in tested subjects; - Local school boards may choose from the Oh. Ed Dept. assessments list for teachers of subjects where value-added scores are not available. - Local measures of student growth using state designed criteria and guidance. <p>Teacher Performance must account for 50%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 formal observations; - Periodic classroom walkthroughs. <p>Teacher's performance rating will be combined with the results of students growth measures to produce a summative evaluation rating.</p> <p><i>OH Ed Dept. Guidance and Framework 11/15/11.</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Oklahoma</p>	<p>Teacher Evaluation Law signed into Law by the Governor in May 2010. (SB 2033)</p> <p>Oklahoma State Board of Election will adopt rules for the new teacher evaluation system by December 15, 2011.</p> <p>Value added system has to be implemented by 2014-15 school year.</p>	<p>Statute requires that:</p> <p>50% of evaluation on teachers shall be based on qualitative components. (35% based on student academic data using multiple years of standardized test data, 15% based on other academic measures to be developed)</p> <p>50% of evaluation on teachers is to be based on rigorous and fair qualitative assessment components.</p>	<p>No</p>

Comparison of States that use Student Achievement in Teacher Evaluation Systems

<p>Rhode Island (Won Race to the Top)</p>	<p>In 2009, the Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education adopted the Rhode Island Educator Evaluation System Standards</p> <p>Implementation was piloted in stages beginning in 2011, with all districts implementing the evaluation system in the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p><i>Notably – Rhode Island's teacher evaluation process was created administratively, as opposed to by statute. This is because pursuant to Rhode Island law, the Board of Regents has the authority to make such a change.</i></p>	<p>A work group is currently designing an evaluation rubric based on input from current pilot evaluation systems.</p> <p>To comply with the state standards, each local evaluation system must: Adopt the state-provided educator evaluation system: the Rhode Island Model Evaluation. OR Adapt its own educator evaluation system, which must meet state standards and be based primarily on student growth and achievement.</p> <p>Educators will receive one of four effectiveness ratings: Highly Effective; Effective; Developing; Ineffective.</p> <p>Student Growth: Growth model scores, developed by the Rhode Island Department of Education and known as the Rhode Island Growth Model, will not be available until the 2012-2013 school year. - Teachers in tested subjects (ELA/math 3-7) will be evaluated on students' growth on state assessments as compared to students with a similar academic history. - All other teachers will use Student Learning Objectives. <i>The RI Model: Guide to Evaluating Building Administrators and Teachers 2011-2012, pg 43.</i></p> <p>Subjective Measures: - Each teacher will receive a beginning, middle and end of year conference to identify goals, improvement plans, and identify progress through self-assessment and evaluator feedback. - Each teacher will have at least one announced observation and several unannounced, shorter observations <i>The RI Model: Guide to Evaluating Building Administrators and Teachers 2011-2012, pg 25-32.</i></p> <p>Summative Rating: The final effectiveness rating is derived from the combined results of the matrices which measure Professional Practice, Professional Responsibilities and Student Learning.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
<p>Tennessee (Won Race to the Top)</p>	<p>TN is currently implementing teacher evaluations in all school districts.</p> <p>The teacher evaluation system "shall be effective no later than July 1, 2011, in order to be implemented prior to the 2011-2012 academic year."</p> <p><i>TC §49-1-302(d)(3)</i></p> <p>The statute allows the Commissioner to appoint the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) to issue guidelines on all standards and procedures of the statewide evaluation system. Districts can propose observation protocol to be approved by the State before July 1, 2011. The State Board of Education supplies all evaluation forms as well</p> <p><i>TC §49-1-302(d)(1)</i></p>	<p>Objective: 50% of evaluation comprised of student achievement data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 35% based on student growth measures on state assessments (TVAS) - 15% based on measure from TEAC approved list, in which the teacher and evaluator must mutually agree on the measure. If they don't agree, the evaluator shall chose the measure. <p>Subjective: 50% of evaluation comprised of subjective measures, determined by TEAC regulations, which must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of prior evaluations - Conferences to discuss strengths/weaknesses - A minimum of 4 classroom observation, with at least 2 in each semester. <p><i>TC §49-1-302(d)(2)</i></p> <p><i>TEAC Guidelines, Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy IV.C April 15, 2011. Guidelines and Criteria.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>