

**Comparison of Drafts of SB 191 Rules**

	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Draft Presented at June/Aug. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Presented at Sept. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Draft Presented at Oct. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Draft Presented at Nov. SBE Meeting</b>
<p><b>Principal and Teacher Quality Standards (single set of standards vs. local flexibility)</b></p> <p><i>Sections 2.02 and 3.02</i></p>	All districts must base evaluation systems on state quality standards.	Greater local flexibility: Districts may adopt state quality standards, or adopt their own standards that are substantially similar, provided that they crosswalk their quality standards to the state quality standards and are able to report information to CDE for each principal and teacher on each of the state quality standards.	Added “meet or exceed” requirement: Districts may adopt state quality standards, or adopt their own standards that “meet or exceed” the state standards, provided that they crosswalk their quality standards to the state quality standards and are able to report information to CDE for each principal and teacher on each of the state quality standards.	No change.
<p><b>Teacher Quality Standard I: Knowledge of Content Taught (general vs. specific articulation of literacy and math knowledge)</b></p> <p><i>Section 3.02 (A)</i></p>	Quality Standard I requires that all teachers demonstrate mastery of the content they teach, and knowledge about student literacy development in reading, writing, speaking, viewing, and listening. Quality Standard III, element c, (at section 3.02 (C)) requires that all teachers demonstrate a rich knowledge of effective instructional practice to meet the academic needs of their students, including those practices specifically proven effective for literacy and mathematics.	Reference to knowledge of literacy and mathematics included in educator prep program standards: Element has been added to Quality Standard I that requires that all teachers have specific knowledge of literacy and mathematics, as required by the standards for educator preparation program content, found in a separate set of SBE rules.	More specific articulation of required knowledge of literacy and mathematics: One of the elements for this standard explicitly outlines the specific knowledge of literacy required for early childhood and elementary teachers, secondary teachers who are assigned to teach a language arts subject, and secondary teachers who are assigned to teach a subject other than language arts. Another element for this standard explicitly outlines the specific knowledge of mathematics required for early childhood and elementary teachers and secondary teachers who are assigned to teach a mathematics subject.	No change.
<p><b>State Framework and Decision-Making Structure (common framework and structure vs. local</b></p>	All districts must apply a common, statewide framework for aggregating evidence collected on multiple measures. All districts must apply a common, statewide scoring matrix for assigning final evaluation ratings.	Greater local flexibility: During the pilot period, CDE will develop a framework for aggregating evidence collected on multiple measures and a matrix for assigning final evaluation ratings. Districts may use the State Model System’s framework and matrix	Additional requirements for local flexibility: During the pilot period, CDE will develop a framework and a decision-making structure, using recommendations from State Council and information gathered during the pilot period. Districts may use the framework and decision-	No change.

	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Draft</b> <b>Presented at June/Aug. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Draft</b> <b>Presented at Sept. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Draft</b> <b>Presented at Oct. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Draft</b> <b>Presented at Nov. SBE Meeting</b>
<b>flexibility)</b>  <i>Sections 2.03 (A), 2.03 (B), 3.03 (A), and 3.03 (B)</i>		as an example.	making structure as an example, or develop their own. Districts that develop a local framework and decision-making structure must ensure that each of the state’s principal quality standards concerning professional practice has a “measurable influence” on each educator’s final professional practice score and his/her overall performance rating and that the student academic growth standards be 50% of his/her overall performance rating.	
<b>Performance Evaluation Ratings for Principals and Teachers (labels used)</b>  <i>Sections 2.03 and 3.03</i>	4 statewide performance ratings are established: highly effective, effective, partially effective and ineffective.	Greater local flexibility: 4 statewide performance ratings are established: highly effective, effective, approaching effective and ineffective. Districts may use different terms within their districts to describe each rating, but must ensure that they are able to report information to CDE about the performance of each teacher and principal using the statewide ratings.	Greater consistency: 4 statewide performance ratings are established: highly effective, effective, partially effective and ineffective.	No change.
<b>Definitions and Implications for Performance Evaluation Ratings (defined in rule now vs. after pilot period)</b>  <i>Sections 2.03 (D) – (G) and 3.03 (D)</i>	Definitions and implications for each rating are provided.  First year teachers that receive a rating of “partially effective” and then receive two consecutive ratings of “effective” will gain non-probationary status.	Definitions and implications for each rating are provided.  First year teachers that receive a rating of “partially effective” and then receive two consecutive ratings of “effective” will gain non-probationary status.	Defers on definitions for each rating: Implications for each rating are provided. During the pilot period, as CDE develops the framework and decision-making structure for the state model system, CDE will develop statewide definitions for each rating.  First year teachers that receive a rating of “partially effective” and then receive two consecutive ratings of “effective” will gain non-probationary status.	Descriptions of implications for each rating have been revised to better align with statute: State requires a minimum level of support for all teachers, regardless of evaluation rating. As required by section 22-9-106 (3), C.R.S., all evaluation reports must contain a written improvement plan that must be specific as to what improvements, if any, are needed in the performance of the teacher and must clearly set forth recommendations for improvements, including recommendations for additional education and training during the teacher’s

	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Draft Presented at June/Aug. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Presented at Sept. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Draft Presented at Oct. SBE Meeting</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Draft Presented at Nov. SBE Meeting</b>
				<p>license renewal process. As required by section 22-9-105.5 (3) (a), C.R.S., each teacher must be provided with an opportunity to improve his or her effectiveness through a teacher development plan that links his or her evaluation and performance standards to professional development opportunities.</p> <p>All teachers, including first year teachers, must receive three consecutive ratings of “effective” to gain non-probationary status.</p>
<p><b>CDE Monitoring Efforts (application vs. assurances)</b>  <i>Section 6.04</i></p>	<p>Each district must implement the state model system, unless it submits an application to CDE demonstrating that its locally developed system satisfies statutory and regulatory requirements and CDE approves that application.</p>	<p>Use of assurances and audit process instead of application: CDE will collect assurances from each district indicating whether the district is implementing the state model system or implementing its own system that satisfies statutory and regulatory requirements. CDE may incorporate evaluation system data into other accountability and improvement efforts. When data collected by CDE indicates that a district may need additional support in meeting regulatory requirements, CDE will conduct a more thorough review of the district’s processes and procedures.</p>	<p>Focus on whether district is meeting “objectives of SB 191”: CDE will collect assurances from each district indicating whether the district is implementing the state model system or implementing its own system that satisfies statutory and regulatory requirements. CDE also may incorporate evaluation system data into other accountability and improvement efforts. When data collected by CDE indicates that a district is unable to implement a system that meets the objectives of SB 191, CDE will conduct a more thorough review of the district’s processes and procedures.</p>	<p>Further clarification that, if CDE has reason to believe a district is not in compliance with statutory and/or regulatory requirements, CDE will notify the local school board that it has 90 days to come into compliance. If the district still has not come into compliance, the district may be subject to the interventions specified in the Education Accountability Act.</p>