

Teacher Performance

2011 Interim

Staff: Juliana Roe, Senate Early Learning & K-12 Education Committee (360-786-7438)

Interim Work Plan:

In the 2010 Legislative session, E2SSB 6696 was introduced that dealt with, in part, a pilot program for implementing a revised evaluation system criteria, student growth measurement tools, professional development programs, and evaluator training. For the 2010-11 school year, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) was required to select school districts to pilot the new teacher and principal evaluation systems. The new evaluation system is to be implemented in all school districts beginning in the 2013-14 school year. OSPI is required to provide the Legislature with reports on the status of the evaluation system by July 1, 2011.

Staff will review other states' methods of measuring teacher performance and compile information as to what method has been most successful. The states reviewed will include those states that received federal Race to the Top funds; states that specifically include student growth in the evaluation systems; and Georgia, which is developing a student performance index to determine student growth. The information provided to the committee will include how teacher evaluations have been used in these states in staffing decisions and a comparison of the time required for principals to evaluate staff compared to the time required by Washington.

Bellwether Education Partners, a non-profit organization, is analyzing teacher effectiveness in all fifty states, many of which have taken recent legislative or regulatory action on this topic. The resulting report "Recent Teacher Effectiveness Legislation: How Do The States Stack Up?" can be found here: <http://bellwethereducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/State-Teacher-Leg-Comparison.pdf>.¹

Teacher Performance Evaluations in Washington State

In 2010, the Legislature passed E2SSB 6696 that included, among other things, changes to the teacher evaluation system. The portion consisting of changes to the teacher evaluation system can be separated into two distinct parts: Part I creates a state accountability process that uses federal funds (the federal grant requires the use of an evaluations system); and Part II establishes state teacher/principal evaluation pilots that use state funds.

¹ As of December 2011, there are eight states included in this report's database. The database will eventually include all 50 states. Bellwether Education Partners has collected the information on most of the other states but is waiting for the information to be individually verified by each state. This interim report will be updated as more states are added to the database.

Part I of the legislation provides authority to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the State Board of Education to implement a state accountability system that recognizes successful schools. The accountability system is a required action beginning in 2011. The legislation also establishes a state process for school districts, which are eligible for federal Title I funds and have the persistently lowest-achieving schools, to access a federal School Improvement Grant (SIG). The SIG is used to implement one of four federal intervention models: Turnaround; Transformation; School Closure; or Restart Model².

A SIG is provided for one year but can be renewed for up to two additional years. Recipients, called MERIT schools (Models of Equity and Excellence through Rapid Improvement and Turnaround), receive grants ranging from \$47,641 to \$4,500,001 (based on the district's plan to implement the required elements of the federal intervention models) and include schools in the Grandview, Highline, Longview, Marysville, Seattle, Sunnyside, Tacoma, Wellpinit, and Yakima school districts.

The SIG has an additional requirement for recipients that choose the transformation or turnaround model to "implement rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that are developed with staff and use student growth as a significant factor." Student growth is defined as, "the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student's score on the State's assessment. A state may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms."

SIG recipients must have evaluation models implemented in the 2011-12 school year.

Part II of the legislation requires development, piloting, and implementation of new classroom teacher, four-level rating evaluation systems with specified minimum criteria³.

² The 4 SIG School Intervention Models. Turnaround, Restart, Closure and Transformation.

- *Turnaround*. Includes replacing the principal and rehiring no more than 50% of the school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with the state's academic standards.
- *Transformation*. Includes replacing the principal, developing teacher and principal leader effectiveness, implementing comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extending learning time, creating community connections, providing operating flexibility, and sustained support.
- *School Closure*. The district closes the school and enrolls the students who attended the school in other higher-achieving schools in the district.
- *Restart Model*. The district converts the school or closes it and reopens it under the management of an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. Note that while charter school operators and charter management organizations (CMOs) constitute a restart under the federal guidelines, these are not currently authorized by the Washington State Legislature.

³ Minimum evaluation criteria for Classroom Teachers. The revised evaluation criteria must include: centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement; demonstrating effective teaching practices; recognizing individual student learning needs, and developing strategies to address those needs; providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum; fostering and managing a safe, positive learning

Pilot districts must have the agreement of the local associations representing teachers and principals to collaborate with the district to pilot the new teacher evaluation systems. OSPI created a steering committee that, based on a number of factors, recommended the pilot districts to Superintendent Dorn. For the 2010-11 school year, districts received between \$100,000 and \$180,000 (based on student enrollment). An additional \$1.5 million per fiscal year (FY 12 & FY 13) was budgeted in the 2011 legislative session to support state level work and fund grants for implementation plans for additional districts. The teacher/principal evaluation pilot (TPEP) school districts for the 2010-11 school year included 65 school districts.⁴

The legislation provides that when student growth data (showing a change in student achievement between two points in time) is available for evaluations, it must be based on multiple measures to be referenced in the evaluation.

The evaluation pilots were required to be conducted during the 2010-11 and 2011-12 school years with full implementation of the new evaluation systems in all school districts beginning in the 2013-14 school year. OSPI provided a report to the Legislature on July 1, 2011 in which it was required to recommend whether a single statewide evaluation model should be adopted, whether modified versions developed by the school districts should be subject to state approval, and what the criteria would be for determining if a school district's evaluation model meets or exceeds a statewide model. The report was also required to identify challenges posed by requiring a state approval process. Superintendent Dorn provided the following recommendations in the report:

1. Districts should be encouraged to select from a limited number of state-approved teacher and principal evaluation models. However, it is recommended that a state approval process be developed for those districts not wanting to select from the state-approved models.
2. All systems will be required to have specified components that include, but are not limited to:

environment; using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning; communicating and collaborating with parents and the school community; and exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning. The locally bargained short-form may also be used for certificated support staff or for teachers who have received one of the top two ratings for four years. The short-form evaluations must be specifically linked to one or more of the evaluation criteria.

⁴ Cheney, Chewelah, Lind, Nine Mile Falls, Odessa, Ritzville, Spokane, West Valley, Cle Elum, Easton, Royal, Selah, Toppenish, Camas, Castle Rock, Evergreen/Vancouver, Hockinson, Kelso, Ridgefield, Stevenson-Carson, White Salmon, Adna, Chehalis, Elma, Griffin, Lake Quinalt, McCleary, Mossyrock, Ocosta, Rainier, Raymond, South Bend, Tenino, Toledo, Tumwater, Cape Flattery, Chimacum, North Kitsap, South Kitsap, Bainbridge Island, Bellevue, Carbonado, Eatonville, Highline, Issaquah, Shoreline, Asotin-Anatone, Finley, Pomeroy, Waitsburg, Walla Walla, Brewster, Cascade, Cashmere, Entiat, Ephrata, Lake Chelan, Orondo, Quincy, Waterville, Conway, Coupeville, Everett, Mt. Vernon, and South Whidbey.

- a. Research-based instructional and leadership frameworks which utilize rubrics based in a four-tiered evaluation system;
 - b. State adopted evaluation criteria, definitions, tier labels, summative statements, and a common satisfactory/not satisfactory delineation;
 - c. Multiple measures for determining effective teacher and principal performance;
 - d. Professional learning for principals and classroom teachers that will include training for all evaluators on the components of an evaluation system.
3. Once the pilots have concluded, the Superintendent will finalize the components and requirements that must be included in the evaluation systems. All districts will be required to include all of the components as specified by the Superintendent.

During the 2012-13 school year, school districts should be required to submit a description of their proposed evaluation systems that they intend to use beginning in the 2013-14 school year. The description of the system shall include how they will address each of the required components, which will be subject to a thorough, rigorous state review process conducted by OSPI with the assistance of principals, teachers, and administrators.

4. The challenges to a state review process rest in two areas: time and resources. The capacity over the next two years to approve all models will be time consuming and require state-level expertise and consultation to remain intact and be enhanced. If the system is to be functioning at a high level during the 2013-14 state-wide implementation year, serious consideration will need to be given to providing targeted resources to prepare all districts in an intentional way for the new teacher and principal evaluation system.

Further information regarding TPEP can be found here: <http://tpep-wa.org/>

The TPEP July 2011 Report to the Legislature can be found here:
http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/tpep_leg_report-july_2011_full.pdf

Teacher Performance Evaluations in Georgia

The state of Georgia has been working on changing its teacher performance evaluation system for the past few years. Over the past three years, Georgia has researched, developed, and tested a teacher performance process called the **CL**assroom **A**nalysis of **S**tate **S**tandards (CLASS Keys) that is used to support teachers' work in standards-based classrooms to improve student learning. The 2009-10 school year was the first year in which pilot schools fully implemented CLASS Keys. Additional schools and districts implemented CLASS Keys in the 2010-11 school year.

CLASS Keys is a process based on teacher standards designed to evaluate teacher performance, promote professional growth, and positively impact student learning. It is organized into five strands that describe teacher effectiveness: Curriculum and Planning, Standards-Based Instruction, Assessment of Student Learning, Professionalism, and Student Achievement. The student achievement strand is slightly different than the other four strands in that it is determined at a local level. The local district can choose to evaluate teacher performance based on student achievement by setting goals based on bench marks, student assessment data, or any other goal the local system deems appropriate.

This process serves as both a formative and summative instrument to identify a teacher's level of performance on the elements through the use of evidence-based rubrics with four levels of performance: Not Evident, Emerging, Proficient, and Exemplary. Performance on each element within a strand is aggregated at the strand level for the purpose of scoring the teacher's annual evaluation.

Based on what Georgia has learned since the 2009-10 pilot year, continuing research, Race to the Top, and the Gates Momentum Grant, the state has decided to restructure CLASS Keys into a more condensed and refined process. The student achievement strand will be removed from the CLASS Keys observation system so that it can be further researched and brought back to the table at a later date. Georgia plans to move forward with the restructured CLASS Keys in pilot districts in January 2012. No high stakes decisions will be made with these pilot districts using the restructured CLASS Keys until 2012-2013, after validity and reliability studies are completed.

In January 2012, there will be districts that: (1) still use the original teacher performance system called the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP); (2) will continue to use the original CLASS Keys system; and (3) begin to use the restructured CLASS Keys program.

More information regarding the CLASS Keys system can be found here:

<http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/DMGetDocument.aspx/CK%20Standards%203-23-2011.pdf?p=6CC6799F8C1371F6F17B4077B982AA3DCDFB4A4F927577740FF40AAB5C68B690&Type=D>