

ESTIMATING THE COST OF IMPLEMENTING SB191 IN COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Augenblick, Palaich and Associates
Amanda Brown and John Augenblick
March 18, 2011

What APA Was Asked to Do

- Estimate the cost of the new resources school districts would need in order to evaluate teachers and principals in accordance with SB191 and the recommendations of the State Council for Educator Effectiveness
- Make a presentation to the Council
- Prepare a report summarizing our findings and the procedures we used in developing them by March 31, 2011

How We Went About the Work

- Reviewed the Council's recommendations about evaluating teachers and principals
- Convened a "professional judgment" (PJ) panel to estimate the new resources a typical district would need to meet the Council's recommendations
- "Costed out" the resources identified by the PJ panel
- Talked to several small school districts about their needs and capacity
- Visited Harrison school district as a case study of a district how has implemented an evaluation system similar to SB191 requirements

The PJ Panel: Who Participated

- Zach Allen, Principal at Sunset Elementary, Moffat County
- Elliott Asp, Assistant Superintendent of Performance Improvement, Cherry Creek
- Barbara Conroy, former Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, Boulder; currently conducts training on teacher evaluation
- Todd Fukai, Director of Human Services, Cherry Creek
- Donna Howell, retired Superintendent, Steamboat and Brush
- Amy Spicer, former teacher, Jefferson County; currently Policy Director at Stand for Children
- Stephanie Watson, Assistant Superintendent of Finance, Windsor

The PJ Panel: What Information APA Shared with Participants

- “Colorado Professional Standards for Principals”- including definition, standards and elements
- “Colorado Professional Standards for Teachers”- including definition, standards and elements
- Council flow chart of the “Framework for System to Evaluate Principals”
- Council flow chart of the Framework for System to Evaluate Teachers”
- APA document summarizing expected tasks to be undertaken by districts and the state from Council’s draft recommendations

The PJ Panel: Assumptions Concerning the State Role

- Create an exemplar educator evaluation system and resource bank of evaluation tools
- Conduct a pilot evaluation system using rubrics and tools
- Provide student, parent, and teacher survey results to districts
- Monitor the entire system

The PJ Panel: Assumptions Concerning the State Role (Continued)

- Develop materials and support for professional development
- Collect and report evaluation data for the state
- Also:
 - Assessment tools in each content area
 - Student tracking system linking students to teachers

The PJ Panel: The Work

- The panel first identified what evaluation tools they thought would be most likely used by districts to evaluate teachers and principals against the standards and elements
 - All evaluation tools identified by the Council as tools that should/could be included were expected to be used.

The PJ Panel: The Work

- Teachers
 - Observations with pre/post interviews (all standards);
 - Examination of lessons, unit plans, assignments and assessments (standards I-III);
 - Student feedback (standards I-III);
 - Parent feedback (standards II-III);
 - Peer observation and feedback (standards I, IV);
 - Teacher self-reporting and interviews (standards IV, V); and
 - Analysis of student performance and growth data (Standard (VI)).

The PJ Panel: The Work

- Principals
 - TELL survey results (standards I-V);
 - Teacher feedback (standards I-V);
 - Supervisor feedback (standards I-V);
 - Parent Feedback (standards II, V);
 - Examination of the School Unified Improvement Plan (standard I);
 - Percentage and number of highly effective, effective and ineffective teachers (standard IV);
 - 360 degree survey tools (standards I-V);
 - Examination of a portfolio of relevant documentation (standards I-VI); and
 - Self- reporting survey (standard VI).

The PJ Panel: The Work

- The panel then identified what it thought would be new resources (personnel and materials) above what they are currently doing.
 - To evaluate effective teachers and principals every year, instead of every three years
 - To use student performance data in all subject areas
 - To provide training on evaluation system to new teachers and principals
 - To provide additional services to newly identified ineffective teachers (at same level as current remedial teachers)

The PJ Panel: The Work

- The panel also identified what it felt would be start-up resource needs.
 - Upfront training for all staff and evaluators
 - Selecting evaluation tools and measurements
 - One time data set up
 - Developing appeals process
- Assumed that the majority of development tasks would be done by the state

Caveats to Using Costing out Figures

- Is a one time snap shot of costs
 - Based on Council's recommendations and the assumed role of the state at the time
 - Current resource level in districts, not inclusive of any future budget cuts
- Uses statewide average salaries
- Costed out evaluations at the principal salary level-- would be lower if APs or other designated evaluators are allowed
- Captures the cost for an average district that is doing what it is currently required to do, no more or less
 - Wide variation in the state of what districts are currently doing in the area of educator evaluation

What We Found as Up Front Costs

- \$53 per student, not adjusted for size
 - Onetime, not ongoing

What We Found as Annual Costs

- Teachers
 - Novice -- \$343
 - Applied to all novice teachers. Reflects cost to train on new system and increased teacher collaboration time and data analysis.
 - Effective -- \$531
 - Applied to all effective teachers. Reflects increased data analysis and increased teacher collaboration time and data analysis, as well as increasing frequency of evaluation from every three years to every year.
 - Ineffective -- \$3,873
 - Applied to any newly identified ineffective teacher. The panel estimated that the percent identified might increase from 1% to 5%.
- Principals
 - Novice -- \$225
 - Applied to all novice principals. Reflects training cost to train on new system.
 - Effective -- \$609
 - Reflects increasing frequency of evaluation from every three years to every year.

District Capacity

- The PJ panel felt that principals could only evaluate so many teachers in a year.
 - Assuming that effective teachers require one unit of time (7.5 hours), that novice teachers require 2 units of time, and that ineffective teachers require 4 units of time, the panel felt that a principal could evaluate 24 units of time, on average.
- Based on applying this measure of capacity to school districts, we found that 39 districts might not have the capacity to evaluate teachers if the principal is the only evaluator.
 - Could require allowing others besides principals to be designated evaluators, additional school administration personnel (such as Assistant Principals), district personnel support, BOCES support, or partnerships with neighboring districts

Harrison 2 School District

- Harrison has independently created a teacher evaluation system similar to what is expected under SB191
 - Evaluation system created as part of pay-for-performance system
 - New system includes:
 - Evaluating all teachers every year, with more time spent with novice and ineffective teachers
 - Emphasis on using student performance data, and growth when appropriate
 - Have common assessments in all subjects as of this year
 - Student performance accounts for 50 percent of teacher rating

Harrison 2 School District

- Harrison has added new resources (one time and ongoing) for its evaluation system:
 - Assistant principals in every school (14 new positions)
 - Assessments development personnel to create and revise assessments
 - Data management and analysis personnel
 - Staff to collect and sort assessments
 - An executive director to oversee
 - Additional professional development and training days for teachers (4 new days) and principals (no new)
 - Three days per teacher for scoring, bring in outside help for scoring in elective areas
 - Supplies, materials and equipment
- Also see possibility of increased resources needed in HR and in legal fees in early years

Harrison 2 School District

- They have paid for the new system (including pay-for-performance) in a number of ways:
 - Grant funds (Federal, Daniels Fund, Title II)
 - Increasing staff time expectations and improved efficiency in duties
 - Prioritization of resources, including reallocation and cuts in other areas
 - Shifted time from other instructional development tasks and professional development areas
 - Eliminated stipends for department heads/chairs, team leaders, etc.
 - Increased class sizes by 2, cut other programs, postponed infrastructure improvements and curriculum adoption
 - Accessing reserve funds
- Not all cuts made up front, others came later to protect system during budget reductions

Harrison 2 School District

- How does this compare to PJ Panel work?
 - Similar level of time requirements and staff needed for evaluations
 - Both have increased frequency for evaluations
 - Both have increased use of student performance data
 - PJ panel expected to see an increase in number of identified ineffective teachers -- this was not the case in Harrison, which already had 4% identified
 - Both required new resources -- Harrison was able to pay for those resources in a number of ways