

State Council for Educator Effectiveness

Technical Advisory Group

Scoring Framework and Performance
Standards Work Group

State Council for Educator Effectiveness – Draft Recommendations

State Scoring Framework

DRAFT March 28, 2011

Context

The State Council for Educator Effectiveness (SCEE) engaged in lengthy and thoughtful deliberations about how to best categorize the performance of personnel on a statewide scoring framework. Deliberations have focused on the following:

1. To what extent does SB 191 advise that we revise or re-create the existing system of measuring educator effectiveness? In other words, are we essentially tasked with redefining performance standards (i.e. simply moving from “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” to “effective” and “ineffective”) and the consequences of those standards or are we being asked to think wholly differently about the system?
2. How many performance standards are needed in order to most accurately and fairly provide feedback to educators on their performance while also informing decisions about professional supports and statutory job protections?
3. What are the definitions, implications, and consequences of each performance standard?
4. How can the system both possess safeguards against negative consequences and allow for innovations?
5. What is the professional growth trajectory of novice educators (as defined in Section 6 below), and how can the state scoring framework acknowledge meaningful growth trajectories while still holding novice teachers accountable to high performance expectations?

The SCEE agreed that these questions lie at the heart of SB 191 and are central to the overall recommendations. As such, the Council takes seriously its obligation to provide recommendations that are supported by research, evidence and data; that support its stated goals; and have a strong likelihood of producing the desired results of increasing student achievement and elevating the education profession.

At this time, the Council is committed to putting forth the following initial recommendations and further recommends that additional data be gathered, analyzed and acted upon during the pilot phase of implementation. The Council strongly encourages the State Board of Education adopt rules that support accomplishment of these critical objectives.

Objectives

The SCEE has identified the following as critical objectives for a fair and transparent scoring framework for determining how individual educators are assigned to specific performance categories:

- The evaluation system should incorporate methods of identifying when unfair or inappropriate decisions are being made. Evaluations of educator performance will continue to be a largely human endeavor that relies upon systematic human judgments. Data should be analyzed to identify instances when that judgment is applied in a way that is unfair. Data should not, however, be used to make determinations without further inquiry. For example, consistently high performance ratings of the educators in a school with low overall student growth.
- Provide accurate feedback to teachers about their professional practice and impact on student achievement.
- Provide accurate and actionable feedback to building leaders about needed supports and professional learning for teachers.
- Create a system that strives for transformational change in student results and the professional practice of educators.
- Acknowledge and incorporate research about the unique learning needs and attributes of novice teachers during their first two years of service.
- Hold all educators to clear standards and high performance expectations.

The SCEE will review data about teacher performance as rated on this recommended scoring framework annually and make final recommendations to the State Board of Education about a statewide scoring framework no later than July 31, 2015.

Recommendations for Council Consideration

Scoring Framework

- 1) The Council recommends that there be four performance categories used statewide: ineffective, partially effective, effective and highly effective.
- 2) The Council recommends a single, common statewide teacher performance scoring framework that would be used to assign both novice and experienced educators to one of the four performance categories. This scoring framework would aggregate determinations of a teacher's performance on his/her professional practice (Quality Standards I-V) into a single rating and compare that to a teacher's performance on Quality Standard VI (impact on student growth) to determine overall performance.
 - a) The Council recommends adopting a scoring grid with a minimum of five scoring ratings for both professional practice and student growth to avoid a one-to-one correlation between final scores on professional practice and/or student growth and the performance standards. This would require districts to aggregate multiple measures of professional practice and multiple measures of student growth into a single score, in accordance with Council and CDE guidelines explicated elsewhere in this framework. These scores would then be inserted into the State Scoring Matrix/Grid and converted into a performance rating.

- 3) The Council shall support CDE in implementing the statewide scoring framework including the development of a final scoring matrix/grid during the pilot phase of implementation. CDE shall develop guidelines for how measures of personnel performance should determine assignment into one the performance categories. For example, this process will inform “how good is good enough?” to earn a 3 on the scoring framework.

SAMPLE MATRIX

Quality Standards Score	5	Partially Effective	Partially Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
	4	Ineffective	Partially Effective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
	3	Ineffective	Partially Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
	2	Ineffective	Partially Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
	1	Ineffective	Ineffective	Partially Effective	Partially Effective	Partially Effective
		1	2	3	4	5
		Student Growth Score				

- 4) The Council recommends that performance ratings assigned to teachers using the new statewide scoring framework be inconsequential during the pilot period. A teacher whose performance is or is likely to be deemed “ineffective” using the pilot framework should also receive a summative evaluation using an existing performance framework in place at the local school district.
- 5) For the purposes of the state scoring framework, a novice shall be defined as:
- A teacher within his/her first two years of service.
 - Implications for how a novice teacher is assigned to a performance category within the scoring framework are delineated below.
- 6) Districts shall utilize the indicators below for placement into each performance category, and implications for such a placement for different categories of educators.
- a) **Ineffective**
- Indicator: A teacher whose performance indicates that *both* their professional practice and impact on student achievement fall below minimal expectations.

- ii) Implication for support: A teacher whose performance is rated as ineffective shall be considered as being in need of additional support. As noted in the Teacher Framework Section [X], whenever there is evidence that an educator is in need of support, districts shall collect data about teacher performance through observations or other methods as soon as practicable. This data shall be shared with the educator in a manner that facilitates improvement and the educator shall be provided with additional professional development and supports in a timely manner.
- iii) Implications for earning or losing non-probationary status:
 - (1) Nonprobationary teacher: A teacher who is rated in the ineffective category for two consecutive years loses non-probationary status.
 - (2) Probationary Teacher: An ineffective rating does not count towards the accrual of years towards non-probationary status.

b) Partially Effective

- i) Indicator: A teacher whose performance indicates that *either* their professional practice or their impact on student achievement fall below minimal expectations.
- ii) Implication for support: A teacher whose performance is rated as partially effective shall be considered as being in need of additional support. As noted in the Teacher Framework Section [X], whenever there is evidence that an educator is in need of support, districts shall collect data about teacher performance through observations or other methods as soon as practicable. This data shall be shared with the educator in a manner that facilitates improvement and the educator shall be provided with additional professional development and supports in a timely manner.
- iii) Implications for earning or losing nonprobationary status:
 - (1) Novice teacher year 1: For a novice teacher in his/her first year of service, a rating of “partially effective” will count toward the accrual of three years of an effective rating needed to reach non-probationary status if the teacher is rated effective or above in the subsequent two years.
 - (2) Novice teacher year 2: For a novice teacher in his/her second year of service, a rating of “partially effective” will not count towards the accrual of three years of an effective rating.
 - (3) Probationary teacher: For a non-novice probationary teacher, a rating of “partially effective” will not count toward the accrual of three years of an effective rating needed to reach non-probationary status.
 - (4) Non-probationary teacher: For a nonprobationary teacher, a rating of “partially effective” will count as an ineffective for the purposes of reversing nonprobationary status.

c) Effective

- i) Indicator: A teacher whose performance indicates that *both* their professional practice and their impact on student achievement meet expectations.

- ii) Implication for support: Effective teachers will be evaluated and receive supports in accordance with the Council recommendations and determined by the district.
- iii) Implications for earning or losing nonprobationary status:
 - (1) Novice teacher: a novice teacher must earn three consecutive years of “effective” status before earning non-probationary status. A second year novice educator must earn an “effective” rating. See section 6(b)(iii) above for the conversion of a “partially effective” rating for a novice teacher in his/her first year.
 - (2) Probationary teacher: a probationary teacher must earn three consecutive years of “effective” status before earning non-probationary status.
 - (3) Nonprobationary teacher: a nonprobationary teacher must maintain an “effective” rating to retain nonprobationary status. Two consecutive ratings below “effective” will result in the loss of nonprobationary status.

d) Highly Effective

- i) Indicator: A teacher whose performance indicates that *both* their professional practice and their impact on student achievement exceed expectations.
 - ii) Implication for support: Highly effective teachers will be evaluated and receive supports in accordance with the Council recommendations and determined by the district.
 - iii) Implications for earning or losing nonprobationary status:
 - (1) For the purposes of gaining or losing nonprobationary status, a rating of “highly effective” shall have the same implications as a rating of “effective” as delineated in Section 6(c) above.
- 7) A formal rating of teachers as effective, progressing toward effective, highly effective, and ineffective shall be completed each 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.
- 8) In support of the statewide definition of “teacher effectiveness”, the educator scoring framework shall weight no professional practice standard less than 15% of the overall aggregate score for professional practice in Quality Standards I – V (or 7.5% of the overall score), ensuring that educators demonstrate proficiency against all standards in order to be considered effective. Local districts can allocate the remaining 25% among Quality Standards I-V in whatever manner they deem best meet the needs and goals of their local community. As a result, any one of Quality Standards I-V can determine up to 40% of a teacher’s overall professional practice performance as captured in Quality Standards I-V.
- 9) Districts may elect to weight professional practice standards differently for novice educators than for experienced educators in order to take into account district priorities for the expectations, development and support of novices.

10) The adoption of rules that set guidelines for establishing performance standards and criteria to be applied in assigning educators to appropriate standards pursuant to C.R.S. 9-22-105.5 (c)(III)(3)(c) requires an analysis of data as delineated below. This data will result from the initial implementation and pilot of the new performance evaluation system (2011-2015) and will be used to inform the creation of a finalized scoring framework. Specifically, CDE and pilot districts shall collect data on and analyze the following in partnership with an advisory group of SCEE members:

- a) What percentage of teachers fall into each category?
- b) How are districts responding to teachers who fall into each category in terms of decisions about:
 - i) Supports
 - ii) Dismissals
 - iii) State protections
- c) How do ratings on new system compare to ratings on previous system?
- d) How, and in what ways, do weightings influence performance ratings?
- e) What correlations exist between student growth and professional practice? What additional data is needed to assess large discrepancies between the professional performance standards and the student growth standard (e.g. 5/1 and 1/5)?
- f) What correlations exist between a school's performance and the ratings of teachers within that school?
- g) What correlations exist between a principal's rating and the ratings of teachers within that school?
- h) What correlations exist between ratings and appeals?
- i) What does disaggregated data suggest about the scoring of novice teachers as a separate personnel category?
- j) What does disaggregated data suggest about the scoring results for non-probationary teachers?
- k) What are the implications for districts and schools of this approach to scoring teachers?
- l) What are the implications for scoring results on the teaching profession as a whole?

11) In 2015, CDE, in consultation with an on-going advisory group from the State Council, shall evaluate the data and feedback collected during the 2011-15 window in order to determine whether the state scoring framework adequately supports the values outlined at the beginning of this recommendation, and present recommendations to the SBE based on this data and analysis.