

State Council for Educator Effectiveness – Draft Recommendations

Measuring Teacher Practice (QS I-V) for Use in Teacher Evaluations

DRAFT March 14, 2011

Framing language: Evaluation is a process not an event; while the actual rating of a teacher as “effective”, “ineffective” etc. will take place only once a year, the process of collecting a body of evidence to support that rating is an on-going process. The process can be more or less intense based on the needs of teachers and the resources of a district. However, regardless of what the process of data-collection looks like, educators must get feedback on their performance in an on-going manner throughout the process.

Framework recommendation language

- 1. All districts in the state shall evaluate the performance of teachers using an evaluation system that includes the components of the State Framework for Teacher Evaluation Systems (flow chart).**
- 2. Districts shall evaluate the performance of teachers against the Colorado Teacher Quality Standards using multiple measures of performance, which are weighted in such a way that the measures of Standards I – V determine no more than 50% of the educator’s performance; and the measures of Standard VI (student growth) determine at least 50% of the weight of the evaluation.**

Definition recommendation language

- 3. All districts shall use the Colorado definition of an Effective Teacher.**

Quality Standards recommendation language

- 4. All districts shall base their evaluations of non-administrative licensed teachers on the full set of Colorado Quality Standards for Teachers (“Teacher Quality Standards”) and associated detailed descriptions of knowledge and skills (also known as “Elements”). The narrative descriptions of the Elements within the Quality Standards are intended to assist districts in understanding the performance outcomes of the Element and to guide the selection and use by districts of appropriate tools to measure a teacher’s performance against the Teacher Quality Standards.**
- 5. Districts shall not create additional Teacher Quality Standards or Elements of the Teacher Quality Standards. However, districts may measure performance of the Teacher Quality Standards using tools that are locally selected or developed. Districts shall engage teachers in the process of selecting or developing the measurement tools.**

Quality Standards I – V Measures recommendation language

6. Districts, in collaboration with teachers including representatives of the local teachers association or federation if one exists, shall develop or adopt measures of teacher performance that measure a teacher's performance of the Teacher Quality Standards.
7. Districts shall clearly communicate to teachers the tools that will be used to measure their performance of the Teacher Quality Standards prior to their use, and how these tools will be used to arrive at a final effectiveness rating.
8. Districts shall use multiple measures to evaluate all teachers against Teacher Quality Standards I – V using multiple formats and occasions as defined in Sections 11-14 below.
9. A formal rating of teachers as effective, marginally effective, highly effective, and ineffective shall take place once a year, using a body of evidence collected systematically in the months prior. Districts shall collect evidence of teacher performance with enough frequency to ensure that the complete body of evidence leads to a fair and reliable measure of each teacher's performance against the Teacher Quality Standards I-V.
 - a. Whenever there is evidence that an educator is in need of support, districts are strongly encouraged to collect data about teacher performance through observations or other methods as soon as practicable. This data should be shared with the educator in a manner that facilitates improvement.
10. Districts shall use some combination of the measures indicated in section 10(a) to measure teacher performance against Teacher Quality Standards I-V for the purpose of high-stakes evaluations and in order to provide feedback on performance to teachers. The following types of measures have been validated for use in teacher evaluation. Districts may use additional measures that have been validated for use in teacher evaluations in a manner aligned with CDE guidelines.
 - a. Districts shall collect information on teacher performance against Teacher Quality Standards I - V through the use of supervisor or peer observations with corresponding feedback to teachers; these shall be aligned with technical guidance provided by CDE.
 - b. Districts shall collect teacher performance data using at least one of the following additional other measures:
 - i. Some form of student perception measures, where appropriate and feasible as defined by CDE guidelines;
 - ii. Feedback or evaluation by peers, in a manner that is aligned with technical guidelines issued by CDE;
 - iii. Feedback from parents or guardians in a manner that is developed in collaboration with relevant group members, and is aligned with technical guidance issued by CDE.
 - iv. Review of teacher lessons plans or student work samples in a manner aligned with technical guidance issued by CDE.

- c. Prior to and throughout the evaluation process, supervisors shall engage in a professional dialogue with individual teachers focused on their professional practice and growth for the course of the year.
 - d. In making decisions about how to use the data collected about teacher performance, districts shall consider whether the data collected are better suited for use in a high-stakes evaluation or for the purpose of providing feedback and professional development opportunities for the individual teacher. In making this decision, districts shall consider the technical quality and rigor of the methods used to collect the data, and the technical quality of the data itself.
11. District evaluation policies may reflect a determination that different categories educators require varying degrees of evaluation and support. These categories shall include those listed in sections 11(a) – (c) below.
- a. Because of the high stakes associated with evaluation results of teachers in the following categories, the categories of teachers identified in section 11(a)(i)-(ii) shall have a more intensive process of measurement that leads to a more robust body of evidence about their performance. Districts may collect this evidence in whatever manner they determine best.
 - i. Teachers in the year before they achieve non-probationary status;
 - ii. Teachers whose performance indicates they are likely to be rated as “ineffective” or “highly effective”.
 - b. Teachers evaluated as effective or highly effective for two or more consecutive years may be measured with fewer measurement tools than indicated in section 10 above.
12. With respect to the measurement tools and methods delineated in Section 10 above, CDE shall provide districts with technical and implementation guidelines. CDE’s Resource Bank (detailed in Section XX below) shall include examples of tools determined to be technically rigorous or to have an evidence base.

Weighting policies recommendation language

13. Districts shall determine locally how multiple measures of teacher performance against the Colorado Quality Standards will be aggregated for experienced educators to provide an overall effectiveness rating against Quality Standards I – V. CDE shall provide exemplars of such policies.
- a. In developing their weighting policies, districts shall ensure that Standards I-V are aggregated in such a way that no single standard I-V is weighted less than 15% of the overall total score. Local districts can choose to emphasize any single standard up to 40% of the total.
14. Districts shall communicate their weighting policies in order to ensure that all teachers understand the process whereby they are assigned an effectiveness rating against Quality Standards I – V.

15. Districts shall develop locally a policy for determining how the multiple measures of student growth required by Quality Standard VI will be used to determine a Teachers' performance of such Quality Standard.
 - a. In developing their weighting policies, districts shall ensure that weights assigned to student growth measures are consistent with the measures' technical quality and rigor.
16. Districts shall aggregate the multiple measures of teacher performance about quality standards I-V into a single score; and aggregate the multiple measures of teacher performance against quality standard VI (student growth) into a single score.
17. Districts shall be transparent and clear about how the body of evidence collected about a teacher's performance will be used to make a decision about a teacher's effectiveness.
18. The Council recommends that all districts statewide use the same scoring framework, which should be developed by CDE in accordance with Council recommendations, to assign teachers to performance categories on the basis of the measures of teacher performance against the quality standards.
19. CDE working in collaboration with stakeholders including a subset of this Council shall develop the state scoring framework in conjunction with the pilot period of the state model evaluation system.

Weighing policies recommendation language – judgments about how to use the data

20. Districts shall develop policies regarding the use of professional judgment in determining how the score developed through the aggregation of multiple measures will ultimately be used. Districts shall clearly articulate how instances of conflicting teacher performance data shall be handled for the purpose of high-stakes decisions. These policies shall align with CDE developed guidelines.

CDE support of district development educator evaluation systems recommendation language

21. CDE shall develop a complete state model system that complies with all of the requirements laid out in these recommendations. CDE shall ensure that this state model system can be implemented in all districts wishing to use it whether individually, through collaborative efforts, or with the support of CDE-provided resources and technical assistance.
22. Districts shall implement a system that satisfies the requirements laid out above and in CDE-developed technical guidelines for Educator Evaluator Systems for Teachers and Principals.
23. Monitoring system needs to measure whether educators understand how they are being evaluated, what they need to do to improve and how to access resources they need to

support their professional development.

Resource bank recommendation language (see separate document re: Resource Bank)

24. CDE must provide resources about how districts can develop this body of evidence. These resources should be part of the resource bank developed by CDE in accordance with the requirements of SB 191.

Kelly - Lingering question: the council has not yet determined the exact term it wishes to use for the category between ineffective and effective: “minimally effective”; “marginally effective”; “approaching effective”. Nor have they resolved how this will interact with the non-probationary status issue.