

Title: Summaries of state guidelines regarding student achievement for teacher evaluation

Date: October 2014

Question: >> Among states with laws requiring that a significant proportion of a teacher's evaluation be based on student achievement, what guidance has the State Education Agency provided for the 2014/15 school year regarding (1) the specific student achievement data elements/ indicators that can be used (i.e., the data options), and (2) how those data elements/ indicators can be used (i.e., the degree of local flexibility)?

Response:

This memo includes excerpts from and links to state guidelines regarding the use of student achievement data in teacher evaluation. The documents were retrieved from the state education agencies' websites or from a Google search, and are from 2014 unless otherwise noted. Links to the documents are provided.

REL West researchers selected eleven states to review: six states that won federal grants from the first two rounds of Race to the Top (RttT), and five western states with student demographics (overall enrollments and proportions of English learners) similar to Nevada. We believe that the six RttT states (DE, FL, MA, NC, RI, TN) represent a group with several years of experience working in this topic area. Since these states are all in the east, we selected the five western states (AZ, CO, NM, OR, TX) that we know have also been working in this area.

The memo also includes a 50-state table of information from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders summarizing the states' rules regarding the inclusion of student achievement/growth data in teacher evaluation (table 1, page 14).

Summary:

- Forty-three states allow alternative student growth measures to be used in teacher evaluation, including results from vendor-, district-, or teacher-developed pre/post tests, teacher portfolios, student performance assessments, and/or student learning objectives (SLOs).
- Among the 11 selected states with student growth assessment guidance reviewed here:
 - Eight states (DE, MA, RI, TN, AZ, CO, OR, TX) give local evaluators discretion to determine the evidence of student learning to be used in individual teachers' evaluations in 2014/15.

- DE, RI, and CO changed their regulations regarding the use of teacher-level growth scores (derived from statewide standardized tests) into teachers’ final evaluation ratings for 2014/15.
- Many states also allow the use of measures other than observation and student growth in teacher evaluation; for example, 25 states allow the use of student, parent, or peer surveys, while nine allow the use of graduation or attendance rates.

Selected Race to the Top States

DELAWARE

Delaware Department of Education—Teacher & Leader Effectiveness Unit (TLEU) DPAS-II: Component V [Student Improvement] for Group 1 Educators 2014–2015
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/aps/StudentImprovementComp.pdf>

Excerpt: Component V of DPAS-II for Group 1 Educators shall be comprised of two student growth measures’ “data points” equally weighted (50% for each):

1. Measure A, ELA/Math Student Growth: Measure A will be based on student scores from the State Assessment in ELA and Math. In 2014–2015 only, Measure A will not be officially incorporated into educator evaluation. However, student achievement results (from “Smarter”) and unofficial ratings will be provided to educators, administrators, schools, and districts for informational purposes in Fall 2015 (after official summative ratings have been determined and documented in Spring 2014).
2. Measure B, Student Growth Measures: Measure B will have two “data points.” The first data point will be based upon student performance on any state-approved Measure B assessment in ELA or Mathematics at the grade level(s) which the educator serves. The second data point will be an additional student performance measure based on another Measure B assessment, as approved by the educator’s evaluator. If there is no second Measure B available, an educator may use an approved student growth goal for the second data point. There shall be two total data points used for the purposes of Component V in 2014–2015. Each Measure B data point will be worth 50 percent of an educator’s overall Component V rating.

Measure B, first data point: The first data point shall be based upon the selection of a state-approved Measure B assessment (External or Internal) in ELA and/or Mathematics for students in the applicable grade level(s) served by the educator. The guidelines for the first section of Measure B are outlined below:

- I. Measure selection and goal/target identification must be approved by each educator’s evaluator. LEA and school leadership may set guidelines requiring the use of specific assessments across districts, schools, or grade levels.
- II. For each educator, students in the applicable grade levels served by the educator (as “Educator-of-Record”) shall constitute their roster for this data point in the measure. Goal-setting for this data point should include all students the educator instructs.
- III. Goals should be set based upon student achievement baseline data on a pre-test. Educators and administrators should work together to set ambitious goals based on the content area taught and the desired student learning outcomes for the year or measuring period. Group 1 educators will set “Satisfactory” and “Exceeds” targets with their evaluator. Final approval rests with the evaluator. For the purpose of determining measures and targets, educators

and administrators should consider how student achievement goals in ELA/Mathematics will align with rigorous state standards and assessments to be administered in 2014–2015.

- IV. Scoring on the first “data point” of Measure B for Group 1 Educators shall be determined by local goal-setting and be based upon the degree of student attainment on approved assessments in ELA/Mathematics. Measures must be state-approved, and LEAs must adhere to all state-required data entry procedures (e.g., online platforms) delineated by DDOE for the 2014–2015 school year.

FLORIDA

2014 Florida Statutes

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=1000-1099/1012/Sections/1012.34.html

1012.34 Personnel Evaluation Procedures and Criteria:

(1) Performance of students: At least 50 percent of a performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student learning growth assessed annually by statewide assessments or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by statewide assessments, by school district assessments as provided in s. 1008.22(6). Each school district must use the formula adopted pursuant to paragraph (7)(a) for measuring student learning growth in all courses associated with statewide assessments and must select an equally appropriate formula for measuring student learning growth for all other grades and subjects, except as otherwise provided in subsection (7).

(a) For classroom teachers, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a), excluding substitute teachers, the student learning growth portion of the evaluation must include growth data for students assigned to the teacher over the course of at least 3 years. If less than 3 years of data are available, the years for which data are available must be used and the percentage of the evaluation based upon student learning growth may be reduced to not less than 40 percent...

(7) Measurement of Student Learning Growth:

(a) The Commissioner of Education shall approve a formula to measure individual student learning growth on the statewide, standardized assessments in English Language Arts and mathematics administered under s. 1008.22. The formula must take into consideration each student’s prior academic performance. The formula must not set different expectations for student learning growth based upon a student’s gender, race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. In the development of the formula, the commissioner shall consider other factors such as a student’s attendance record, disability status, or status as an English language learner. The commissioner shall select additional formulas as appropriate for the remainder of the statewide assessments included under s. 1008.22 and continue to select formulas as new assessments are implemented in the state system. After the commissioner approves the formula to measure individual student learning growth, the State Board of Education shall adopt these formulas in rule.

(b) Each school district shall measure student learning growth using the formulas approved by the commissioner under paragraph (a) for courses associated with the statewide, standardized assessments administered under s. 1008.22 no later than the school year immediately following the year the formula is approved by the commissioner. For grades and subjects not assessed by statewide, standardized assessments but otherwise assessed as required under s. 1008.22(6), each school district shall measure performance of students using a methodology determined by the district. The department shall provide models for measuring performance of students which school districts may adopt.

(c) For a course that is not measured by a statewide, standardized assessment, a school district may request, through the evaluation system approval process, to use a student's achievement level rather than student learning growth if achievement is demonstrated to be a more appropriate measure of classroom teacher performance. A school district may also request to use a combination of student learning growth and achievement, if appropriate.

(d) For a course that is not measured by a statewide, standardized assessment, a school district may request, through the evaluation system approval process, that the performance evaluation for the classroom teacher assigned to that course include the learning growth of his or her students on one or more statewide, standardized assessments. The request must clearly explain the rationale supporting the request.

(e) For purposes of this section and only for the 2014–2015 school year, a school district may use measurable learning targets on local assessments administered under s. 1008.22(6) to evaluate the performance of students portion of a classroom teacher's evaluation for courses that are not assessed by statewide, standardized assessments. Learning targets must be approved by the school principal. A district school superintendent may assign to instructional personnel in an instructional team the student learning growth of the instructional team's students on statewide assessments. This paragraph expires July 1, 2015.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education—Massachusetts Educator Evaluation: Rating Educator Impact: The Student Impact Rating
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/ddm/EducatorImpact.pdf>

Excerpt: Evaluators are responsible for determining a Student Impact Rating of high, moderate, or low for each educator based on patterns and trends using multiple measures of student learning, growth, and/or achievement. Annual data for each educator from at least two measures is needed to establish patterns and trends...Statewide growth measures (e.g., median MCAS student growth percentiles (SGPs) must be used as one measure where available. However, while SGPs provide districts with a solid starting point for this work, they are available for fewer than 20 percent of educators throughout the state. Even where SGPs will be used, they will need to be supplemented with District Determined Measures (DDMs)¹. As a result, districts will need to identify or develop DDMs for most grades and subjects, as well as for specialized instructional support personnel (SISP) and administrators.

There are no weights or percentages that dictate how an evaluator must interpret pattern and trend data to determine a Student Impact Rating for an individual educator. Rather than adopt a more mechanistic, one-size-fits all approach to supervision and evaluation, the Massachusetts evaluation framework places paramount importance on evidence and the professional judgment of evaluators and educators in the evaluation process. While the scoring of individual measures and the determination of whether students demonstrated high, moderate, or low growth must be based on agreed-upon, transparent methods that are appropriate for each measure and fair to students and educators alike, formulaic or numerical processes that preclude the application of professional

¹ DDMs are measures of student learning, growth, and achievement related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks, or other relevant frameworks that are comparable across grade or subject level district-wide. These measures may include, but shall not be limited to: portfolios, approved commercial assessments and district-developed pre and post unit and course assessments, and capstone projects.

judgment and dictate how evaluators must use pattern and trend data to determine Student Impact Ratings are inconsistent with the letter and the spirit of the evaluation framework...

The use of professional judgment promotes a more holistic and comprehensive analysis of impact, rather than over-reliance on one individual data point or rote calculation of impact based on predetermined formulas. By emphasizing the application of professional judgment, the Massachusetts framework recognizes that student outcomes on state- and district-determined measures should not be considered in a vacuum. Evaluators are encouraged to bear in mind an educator's student population and specific instructional context. Considerations related to a specific measure or a combination of measures may also factor in to an evaluator's determination of an educator's Student Impact Rating. For example, it is likely that as districts try out DDMs, some will prove more meaningful than others. Suppose in the first year of implementation a pre-/post-DDM is found to suffer from a significant ceiling effect because a high number of students earn perfect scores on a pre-test. An evaluator may decide not to consider the results of this DDM as heavily as other measures.

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction—Measuring Student Learning for Educator Effectiveness: A Guide to the Use of Student Growth Data in the Evaluation of North Carolina Teachers (December 2013)

<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/effectiveness-model/student-growth/measuring-growth-guide.pdf>

Excerpt: In 2012–13, the State Board of Education determined that a teacher's sixth standard rating would be based 100 percent on a teacher's individual growth value. For a teacher without an individual student growth value, 100 percent of the sixth standard will be based on the school-wide growth value. The school-wide growth value serves as an interim measure until the Department of Public Instruction has completed the development of measures of student learning for all grades/subjects and courses without state assessments. Teachers whose student growth value is based on data for the entire school will not have that data count toward a three-year rolling average for determination of effectiveness status ... Beginning with the 2014/15 school year, a school district or charter school may elect to use local assessments and methods for measuring growth to determine sixth standard ratings for teachers who would otherwise administer the NC Final Exams or the Middle School Career and Technical Education State Assessments or participate in the Analysis of Student Work. Please note that districts and charter schools must administer the End-of-Grade assessments, End-of-Course assessments, the Beginning-of-Grade English Language Arts assessment for Grade Three, the K–2 process that measures students' reading skill development, and Career and Technical Education High School Assessments. The Department of Public Instruction will provide districts and charter schools with a template to use in submitting information on their local assessments and processes to the State Board of Education for approval.

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island Department of Education—Rhode Island Model Evaluation & Support System
(Teacher)

http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Guidebooks-Forms/Teacher_Guidebook.pdf

Excerpt: The Rhode Island Model relies on multiple measures to paint a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated on three criteria:

1. Professional Practice—A measure of effective instruction and classroom environment as defined in the Teacher Professional Practice Rubric.
2. Professional Responsibilities—A measure of instructional planning and the contributions teachers make as members of their learning community, as defined in the Teacher Professional Responsibilities Rubric.
3. Student Learning—A measure of a teacher’s impact on student learning through the use of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and/or Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs), and the Rhode Island Growth Model (RIGM), when applicable.

... The Rhode Island Growth Model (RIGM) is a statistical model that measures students’ achievement in reading and mathematics by comparing their growth to that of their academic peers. It does not replace the proficiency data from state assessments. Rather, the RIGM enables us to look at growth in addition to proficiency to get a fuller picture of student achievement. Using this model, we can calculate each student’s progress relative to their academic peers on the NECAP Math and Reading tests for grades 3–7. Academic peers are students who have scored similarly on the NECAP in the past. Because all students’ scores are compared only to those of their academic peers, students at every level of proficiency have the opportunity to demonstrate growth in their achievement. The 2013–14 school year marked the first time that teachers and support professionals who were designated by their LEA as contributing educators in math and reading in grades 3–7 received an in-progress RIGM score. These scores were released via the Educator Performance and Support System (EPSS) to provide teachers and school and district leaders with a critical piece of information to improve teaching and learning. In 2014–15, contributing educators, where applicable, will once again receive a RIGM score. Although, these scores will not factor into the Final Effectiveness Rating, they should continue to be used for self-reflection and to improve teaching and learning. We anticipate that RIGM scores will be factored into Final Effectiveness ratings when RIGM scores become available through the new statewide assessment system (PARCC). When that happens, teachers will earn a RIGM rating of Low Growth, Typical Growth, or High Growth. These ratings will be supplied by the Rhode Island Department of Education.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee Department of Education—Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM-TN)
(December 2013)

<http://team-tn.org/achievement/>

Excerpt: Fifty percent of the [teacher] evaluation to be comprised of student achievement data:

- 35 percent based on student growth as represented by the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) or a comparable measure
- 15 percent based on additional measures of student achievement adopted by the State Board of Education and chosen through mutual agreement by the educator and evaluator

Fifty percent of the evaluation is determined through qualitative measures such as teacher observations, student perception surveys, personal conferences, and review of prior evaluations and work. The 50 percent quantitative portion of TEAM combines student growth (35%) and student achievement (15%). The State Board of Education approved a matrix of options for teachers and principals for the 15 percent achievement measure component that reflects those measures that showed a relationship to student growth and that could be returned in a timely manner. Teachers should meet with their evaluator to choose a 15 percent measure and set clear and rigorous goals early in the school year. As with all approved achievement measures, districts have discretion with how they choose to set the scale scores. This practice should encourage districts to use the 15 percent measures to set academic achievement goals and measure progress towards those goals.

[Also, see <http://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/PC-885.pdf> for 15% Achievement implications. *Excerpt:* During the most recent legislative session Chapter 885 of the Public Acts of 2014 (PC 885) passed and is in effect for the 2014–15 school year. This piece of legislation redefines the process around the 15 percent achievement measure selection process.]

Selected Western States

ARIZONA

Arizona Department of Education—Arizona Framework for Measuring Teacher Effectiveness
<http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/08/2014-15-arizonaframeworkformeasuringeducatoreffectiveness.pdf>

Excerpt: The Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness detailed in this document complies with all legal requirements while also providing LEAs with as much flexibility as possible to develop evaluation systems that meet their individual needs...

Student Academic Progress:

- Classroom-level data elements shall account for at least 33% of the **total** evaluation outcomes. Districts and charters may increase the weight of these elements as they deem appropriate; however, the total weight of these data shall not exceed 50% of the **total** evaluation outcome. If available and appropriate to a teacher's content area, data from state-administered assessments shall be used as at least one of the classroom-level data elements. Districts and charters may determine which additional classroom-level data will be used and in what proportions.
- The use of school-level data elements is optional for teachers using the Group A framework (i.e., all teachers with available classroom-level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona's academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers' content areas). If school-level data (e.g., stakeholder surveys) are used, the total weight of these data shall account for no more than 17% of the **total** evaluation outcomes. Additionally, the sum of school-level data and classroom-level data shall not exceed 50% of the **total** evaluation outcome.
- Districts and charters shall ensure that the total measure of Academic Progress (classroom level and/or school level) includes a calculation of the amount of Academic Growth students experience between two or more points in time. The Academic Growth calculation shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.
- Districts and charters shall ensure that multiple data elements are used to calculate the portion of each teacher's evaluation dedicated to student academic progress.

COLORADO

Colorado Department of Education—The Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System User’s Guide
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/usersguide>

Excerpt: During the 2014–15 school year, all districts/BOCES will continue to evaluate every teacher, principal, and specialized service professional on all Quality Standards including measures of student learning/outcomes. Districts will still submit a Standard 6 (for teachers) and a Standard 7 (for principals) rating in the yearly HR collection. District flexibility comes in the final step of the evaluation process when determining how much weight the measures of student learning/outcomes standard counts in the educator’s final evaluation rating. During the 2014–15 academic year only, districts/BOCES may choose to weight measures of student learning anywhere between zero and 50 percent. This flexibility provides districts with another year to refine existing measures and identify or create new measures. Teachers’ final effectiveness ratings for the 2014–2015 school year will count towards earning/loss of non-probationary status. After the 2014–15 school year at least 50 percent of the final effectiveness rating will be accounted for by measures of student learning/outcomes with the other 50 percent accounted for by the overall professional practices rating.

See also: Fact Sheet: Senate Bill 14-165’s Impact on Educator Evaluation Requirements for the 2014–15 School Year. <http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/sb14165factsheet>

Excerpt: In the 2014 legislative session, additional flexibility was passed for districts/BOCES regarding the 50 percent measures of student learning/outcomes portion of the evaluation for the 2014–15 school year only.

- During the 2014–15 school year, all districts/BOCES will continue to evaluate every teacher, principal, and specialized service professional on all of the Quality Standards including measures of student learning/outcomes.
- Teachers, principals, and specialized service professionals will receive a rating/score for each standard, including the measures of student learning/outcomes standard.
- District flexibility for the 2014–15 school year comes when determining how much weight the measures of student learning/outcomes standard counts in the educator’s final evaluation rating. For example, when the professional practices (Quality Standards 1–5 for teachers and specialized service professionals or 1–6 for principals) and measures of student learning/outcomes portions (Quality Standard 6 for teachers and specialized service professionals or 7 for principals) of the evaluation are combined, districts are able to weight the measures of student learning/outcomes rating anywhere between 0–50 percent.
- Districts choosing to assign no weight (zero percent) to the measures of student learning/outcomes portion of the evaluation are still required to submit the measures of student learning/outcomes rating (Quality Standard 6 for teachers and specialized service professionals or 7 for principals) in the data submission process for CDE.
- This flexibility provides districts with another year to refine existing measures and identify or create new measures. District personnel should review and discuss the rating for Quality Standard 6 (for teachers and specialized service professionals) or 7 (for principals) during the evaluation process with all educators to learn from it, practice with it, and improve it for the following year.
- A teacher’s final evaluation rating during the 2014–15 school year will count towards the earning/loss of non-probationary status.

The full 50 percent weight for measures of student learning/outcomes is expected in the 2015–16 school year.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico Public Education Department—NMTEACH Educator Effectiveness System
http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/NMTeach_EvaluationPlan.html

The evaluation portion of the NMTEACH Educator Effectiveness System is comprised of three categories: Observations (25%), locally adopted Multiple Measures (25%), and Improved Student Achievement (50%). Improved student achievement indicates a teacher's impact on the growth of individual students. Because not all students come to the classroom at grade-level readiness, student achievement is scored using a Value Added Model (VAM). VAM measures individual teacher contribution to student achievement by comparing the *expected* growth of the individual student against the *actual* individual student growth while in the teacher's classroom.

OREGON

Oregon Department of Education—Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/educatoreffectiveness/oregon-framework--for-eval-and-support-systems.pdf>

Excerpt: In May 2014, ODE submitted to USED final state guidelines which included a method for incorporating student learning and growth that is consistent with the requirements of the ESEA Waiver... Teachers and administrators, in collaboration with their supervisors/evaluators, annually establish challenging and meaningful student learning and growth (SLG) goals, select evidence from valid and reliable measures, and regularly assess progress. The goal-setting process for teachers must reflect most closely the teaching and learning that occurs in the classroom and allow teachers to choose goals based on the needs of their students and select appropriate measures that align with their goals ... All districts will use the Oregon Matrix for summative evaluations beginning in the 2014/15 school year to determine educators' overall performance level and professional growth plan. The Oregon Matrix is described in detail (see page 27)... Districts must align their systems to these elements but have local flexibility in their design and implementation. Local systems must meet or exceed the state criteria for evaluation and support systems.

TEXAS

Texas Education Agency—May 2 Teacher Waiver Submission

Excerpt: During the spring of 2014, a teacher steering committee developed an evaluation system tied to the teaching standards. In the redesign of the state evaluation system, the committee focused on creating a system that would be used for continuous professional growth and that will destigmatize the observation process, moving the mindset around observation and evaluation away from one of compliance to one of feedback and support. The system they created will provide for actionable, timely feedback that will allow teachers to make efficient and contextual professional development choices that will lead to an improvement in their teaching. The characteristics of this system that will promote these goals include:

- Multiple measures of performance, including rubric-based observations, a teacher-directed goal-setting process that will allow for all teachers, in consultation with their campus leadership team or principal, to identify key areas for improvement and track his/her growth towards those goals (referred to as the teacher self-assessment component), and a measure of student growth at the level of the individual teacher.

- A rubric (see Attachment II) with five performance levels that clearly differentiate practices. The rubric allows for immediate feedback built into the document itself — any teacher can self-assess, and any teacher can look to the practices articulated in the levels above his or her observation score and understand which practices will elevate their performance.
- A teacher self-assessment that allows all teachers to determine their professional growth goals, build a professional development plan to attain those goals, and track the progress of their development over the course of the year based on both their assessment of their practice within their unique teaching context and the feedback received during the ongoing formative and end-of-year summative conversations with their appraiser.
- A student growth measure at the individual teacher level that will include a value-add score based on student growth as measured by state assessments for teachers for whom a value-add score can be determined, or student growth based on student learning objectives, portfolios, or district pre- and post-tests.
- These multiple measures, taken together, will provide a more complete narrative of teacher performance than any single measure taken by itself and will comprise a summative evaluation score based on the following weights: observation and teacher self-assessment will comprise 80% of the evaluation score, and student growth will comprise 20% of the evaluation score.

The relative weight of the rubric-based observation (80% overall, which includes 10% of the overall evaluation score attributed to the teacher self-assessment) aligns with the idea that a teacher’s primary focus should include the daily interaction between a teacher and his/her students — around building positive relationships with students in the midst of productive learning environments that seek to address students’ academic, cognitive, and developmental needs. Although this focus will lead to academic gains, the positive benefits of this learning environment are not limited to academic gains as measured by tests, whether local, state, or national. With the rubric comprising the bulk of a teacher’s evaluation score, teachers are encouraged and incentivized to build skills in students that may not manifest themselves on tests or by the end of a single academic year, but will be captured within the performance levels of the observation rubric.

Student Growth

Districts will be given flexibility in choosing from student learning objectives, portfolios, and district pre- and post-tests as means by which to measure student growth for teachers for whom value-add scores cannot be calculated. In making these choices, districts will have the option of using any of the three methods, provided that the choice for a particular grade and subject is uniform throughout the district (i.e., if a district chooses to use portfolios for a teacher’s student growth score for Art I, then all district Art I teachers would need to use portfolios for their measure of student growth). TEA is working with SAS Institute, Inc. to develop a value-add model to capture student growth for teachers whose students take state assessments. Although this model is still in development, it likely will cover teachers of state-tested subjects from fourth or fifth grade through end-of-course exams at the high school level. TEA will provide guidelines on its website for districts in how to use student learning objectives, portfolios, and district pre- and post-tests as measures of student growth. TEA will provide value-add scores to districts. In addition, TEA will assist in developing the capacity of the state’s 20 regional service centers to support districts in building processes for each optional method, including housing models for portfolios and student learning objectives. These guidelines and processes at both the state and regional levels will continuously be updated and revised as best practices emerge during pilot year and statewide implementation.

TEA will also provide guidance on uses of student growth data. This guidance will reinforce the idea that student growth data, like observation data, should be used to inform professional growth and development decisions for teachers. In addition, guidance will reinforce the idea that single-year

student growth data should not be the sole factor in employment decisions and that multiple years of student growth data provide more robust feedback on a teacher's influence on student performance.

Table 1. State information about the inclusion of multiple measures in teacher evaluation

STATE	Achievement/ growth data included in teacher evaluation by mandate or recommendation	Weighting of student achievement/ growth for 2014/15 and 2015/16	Weights vary by teaching context?	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Pre- and post- tests	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Interim/ benchmark or curriculum- based assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Teacher- developed assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Project, portfolios, performances or products	Other performance measure: Student, parent, or peer surveys	Other performance measure: Graduation/ attendance rates
Alabama	Recommends									
Alaska	Mandates	Minimum 20% for 2015/16							Yes	
Arizona	Mandates	33–50%	Yes	Yes		Yes	No		Yes	
Arkansas	Mandates				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
California	Recommends	Minimum 20% for 2015/16				Yes	Yes		Yes	
Colorado	Mandates	Minimum 50%	Yes	Yes					Yes	
Connecticut	Mandates	45%	No	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Delaware	Mandates			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
District of Columbia		50%	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Florida	Mandates	50%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Georgia	Mandates	50%	No	Yes						
Hawaii	Mandates	50%	Yes	Yes	No	No	No		Yes	

STATE	Achievement/ growth data included in teacher evaluation by mandate or recommendation	Weighting of student achievement/ growth for 2014/15 and 2015/16	Weights vary by teaching context?	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Pre- and post- tests	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Interim/ benchmark or curriculum- based assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Teacher- developed assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Project, portfolios, performances or products	Other performance measure: Student, parent, or peer surveys	Other performance measure: Graduation/ attendance rates
Idaho	Mandates	33%	No	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Illinois	Mandates	30–50%	No	Yes		Yes				
Indiana	Mandates	20–35%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Iowa	Mandates									
Kansas	Mandates			Yes						Yes
Kentucky	Mandates			Yes					Yes	
Louisiana	Mandates	50%	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Maine	Mandates			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Maryland	Mandates	50%	No	Yes		Yes		Yes		
Massachusetts	Mandates			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		
Michigan	Mandates	2014/15: 40% 2015/16: 50%		Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Mandates	35%	No	Yes				Yes	Yes	
Mississippi	Recommends	50%	No		Yes				Yes	
Missouri	Mandates			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

STATE	Achievement/ growth data included in teacher evaluation by mandate or recommendation	Weighting of student achievement/ growth for 2014/15 and 2015/16	Weights vary by teaching context?	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Pre- and post- tests	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Interim/ benchmark or curriculum- based assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Teacher- developed assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Project, portfolios, performances or products	Other performance measure: Student, parent, or peer surveys	Other performance measure: Graduation/ attendance rates
Montana	Mandates								Yes	
Nebraska	Recommends				Yes				Yes	
Nevada	Mandates	Minimum 50%		No	No	No	No	No		Yes
New Hampshire	Recommends			Yes				Yes	Yes	
New Jersey	Mandates	30%	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes	
New Mexico	Mandates	50%	No			Yes			Yes	Yes
New York	Mandates	25%	No	Yes					Yes	
North Carolina	Mandates		No		Yes			Yes	Yes	
North Dakota	Recommends			Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Ohio	Mandates	50%	No	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Oklahoma	Mandates	50%	No	Yes		Yes				
Oregon	Mandates			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Pennsylvania	Mandates	50%		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
Rhode Island	Mandates			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		
South Carolina	Recommends	50%	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		

STATE	Achievement/ growth data included in teacher evaluation by mandate or recommendation	Weighting of student achievement/ growth for 2014/15 and 2015/16	Weights vary by teaching context?	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Pre- and post- tests	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Interim/ benchmark or curriculum- based assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Teacher- developed assessments	Achievement/ growth measures for non-tested subjects/ grades can include: Project, portfolios, performances or products	Other performance measure: Student, parent, or peer surveys	Other performance measure: Graduation/ attendance rates
South Dakota	Mandates			Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Tennessee	Mandates	35%	Yes							Yes
Texas	Mandates	20%		Yes	Yes			Yes		
Utah	Mandates			Yes					Yes	
Vermont	Recommends					Yes			Yes	
Virginia	Mandates	40%	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	
Washington	Mandates			Yes		Yes				
West Virginia	Mandates	20%	No						Yes	
Wisconsin	Mandates	50%	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No		Yes
Wyoming	Mandates		No	Yes						

Source: Center on Great Teachers and Leaders database on state teacher evaluation policies (online at <http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/Compare50States.aspx>); the database also provides links to the relevant teacher evaluation statute(s)/regulation(s) in each state.

Note: Blank cells indicate that this information is not applicable, not yet determined, or not specified (i.e., the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders researcher was unable to locate sufficient information to provide an accurate answer).

This memorandum is one in a series of quick-turnaround responses to specific questions posed by educators and policymakers in the Western region (Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah), which is served by the Regional Educational Laboratory West (REL West) at WestEd. This memorandum was prepared by REL West under a contract with the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Contract ED-IES-12-C-0002, administered by WestEd. Its content does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

WestEd — a national nonpartisan, nonprofit research, development, and service agency — works with education and other communities to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults.

.....
REL West at WestEd • 730 Harrison Street • San Francisco, CA 94107 • 866.853.1831 • relwest@WestEd.org • <http://relwest.wested.org>