State Council for Educator Effectiveness

Key Communication Points from October 29th, 2010 meeting

•The Council adopted a process for reaching consensus and a template for submitting a minority report. The Council set a high bar for the issuance of a minority report, agreeing that lack of consensus is a failure.

•The Council adopted a shared framework and set of vocabulary to define, frame discussions about, and drive decision making about the elements of an educator effectiveness system. Decisions about the elements will take into account the need to balance state uniformity with local flexibility and needs. See Exhibit A

•The Council agreed to request an extension until April 15th to complete its final recommendations. A "penultimate" set of recommendations on the educator effectiveness system will be presented to the State Board of Education in February. The additional time will be used to hear public input, as well as for the Council to complete a cost study, and policy and implementation recommendations.

•The Council directed a working group to revise the North Carolina teacher standards by incorporating the Council's draft standards, and addressing language and weighting concerns raised by the Council. More information can be found about the North Carolina standards at www.ncptsc.org.

•The Council and the State Leadership Academy Board will use the North Carolina principal standards in a similar way and has directed a working group to revise them using the SLAB's draft standards. Additional information about North Carolina standards can be found www.ncptsc.org.

•The Council built background knowledge on measurement frameworks, tools, and analytic approaches with a presentation from Dr. Damian Betebenner.

Exhibit A

Level of Detail	Hierarchy of Educator Effectiveness Components
	Quality Standards—These are the 6-10 major categories of standards that will serve as the basis of judging educators as effective or not. These quality standards also include the finer-grained descriptions that we have previously referred to as indicator and are used to further explicate the standards.
	Measurement Framework—This outlines the approaches that will be used to measure the quality standards and indicators. For example, a measurement framework would indicate that each of the quality standards should be measured using multiple approaches and at least two times during the school year (or evaluation period). The **measurement framework** will also outline the general approach for including both test based and non-test based information in the overall effectiveness determination.
	Measurement Tools—These are the actual surveys, observation protocols, etc that are used to collect data relative to the Quality Standards and Indicators. Rating this category as a "1" would mean that you favor having state developed tools that all districts **MUST** use to evaluate their educators and a "6" means that districts should be free to develop their own tools without any state role in checking the quality of such tools.
	Analytic approaches for student performance for CSAP-based subjects and grades—These are the methods used to analyze the evidence and data elicited from the measurement tools for the courses that have at least two years of CSAP data (e.g., reading in grades 4-10; math in grades 4-8). For example, if you think that each district **must** include the median student growth percentile results from the Colorado Growth Model (CGM) for teachers in these subjects and grades as part of the evaluation, then you would probably circle 1 or 2. On the other hand, if you think districts should be able to use any analytic method they choose instead of the CGM, again, without state oversight, you should probably circle 6.
	Analytic Approaches for "non-tested" subjects and grades—These are the methods used to analyze the evidence and data elicited from the measurement tools for the courses without at least two years of CSAP data. For example, one approach might involve calculating the difference between pretest and posttest scores on course-based assessments for all students in a particular course, while another approach would be based on evaluating the number of students who met specific goals. Another example could involve particular approaches for evaluating the complexity of student work generated in a particular course.
	Weighting/Combining Multiple Measures—Eventually all of the data and evidence will need to be combined in order to make a singular judgment about each educator. Certain weights are written in law, while the weighting of most components are not determined. This is related to the measurement framework, but this component really focuses on how the entire body of evidence is combined to make overall judgments. Since it is entirely

	unlikely that districts could use the same instruments for evaluating teachers, someone who selected a "1" in this category would essentially be saying that each district should use a specified weighting scheme for each of the indicators in the framework, whereas someone selecting a "2" or "3" in this category would probably want all districts to weight each of the quality standards similarly across districts. This does not mean that all teachers would be rated the same, but it might mean—depending on the Council's decisions—that all 7th grade science teachers would be rated using the same framework.
	Performance Standards—These are the text-based descriptions that are used to define highly effective, effective, and ineffective educators. Performance level descriptors (PLDs, the actual text descriptions) can be written at varying levels of specificity, starting from the policy description that tends to be somewhat general to a test-based descriptor that is often much more specific. These PLDs are intended to be the "how well" complement to the "what" defined by the quality standards. ***For this category, we are focusing on the "overacrching" or policy level Performance Standards.***