

State Council for Educator Effectiveness – Draft Recommendations

State Scoring Framework

DRAFT March 16, 2011

Values

The State Council has identified the following values as guidelines for a fair and transparent scoring framework for determining the performance levels of novice and experienced educators:

- 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 the education system and that minimally ensures that the status quo is not maintained.
- Avoids a possible unintended consequence that might disincentivize teachers from joining the profession due to an extended probationary period.
- Acknowledge research about the unique learning needs and attributes of novice teachers during their first two years of service.
- Hold all educators to the same high standards.

Recommendations for Council Consideration

Scoring Framework

- 1) The Council recommends a common statewide teacher performance scoring framework that would be used to assign educators to one of four performance levels: ineffective, progressing towards effective, effective and highly effective. An example of the framework is displayed below. **Please note that this should NOT be considered the final version of the state scoring matrix.**

Professional Practice	4	Progressing Toward Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
	3	Progressing Toward Effective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
	2	Ineffective	Progressing Toward Effective	Effective	Effective
	1	Ineffective	Ineffective	Progressing Toward Effective	Progressing Toward Effective
		1	2	3	4
Student Growth					

- 2) The Council shall support CDE in using data collected and analyzed during the pilot phase of implementation to create guidelines for how measures of personnel performance should determine placement into one of the above rating categories delineated on the statewide scoring framework. For instance, this process will answer the question “how good is good enough?” to earn a 3 on the scoring framework.
- 3) Teachers participating in the pilot phase of implementation shall receive a rating based on an initial scoring framework, but that rating will bare no consequence on a teacher’s non-probationary status.
- 4) For the purposes of the state scoring framework, a novice shall be defined as:
 - i) A teacher within his/her first two years of service.
 - ii) Districts may choose to classify the following personnel as novices:
 - (1) A teacher in the first year of a change in teaching content responsibilities who has not yet reached a rating of “effective” or above in his/her new teaching assignment.
 - (2) A teacher in the first year of a major change in grade level responsibilities (e.g. changes between primary, intermediary and secondary) who has not yet reached a rating of “effective” or above in his/her new teaching assignment.
 - iii) Implications for novice status within the scoring framework are delineated below.
- 5) The Council shall finalize specific definitions for each of the four performance categories; what follow below are generalized indicators for placement into each category, and implications for such a placement for different categories of educators.
 - a) **Ineffective**
 - i) Indicator: A teacher whose performance indicates that *both* their professional practice and impact on student achievement fall below minimal expectations.
 - ii) 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) Progressing Towards Effective

- i) Indicator: A teacher whose performance indicates that *either* their professional practice or their impact on student achievement fall below minimal expectations.
- (1) An educator who is rated progressing toward 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 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 and the educator should be provided with additional professional development and supports.
- ii) 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 “progressing toward 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 “progressing toward effective” will not count towards the accrual of three years of an effective rating.
- (3) Non-novice probationary teacher: For a non-novice probationary teacher, a rating of “progressing toward effective” will not count toward the accrual of three years of an effective rating needed to reach non-probationary status.
- (4) Nonprobationary teacher: For a nonprobationary teacher, a rating of “progressing toward effective” will count toward the accrual of two consecutive years of an ineffective rating needed to lose non-probationary 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: Effective teachers will be evaluated and receive supports in accordance with the shalls and mays outlined in the Council recommendations and determined by the district.

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: Highly effective teachers will be evaluated and receive supports in accordance with the shalls and mays outlined in the Council recommendations and determined by the district.

- 6) A formal rating of teachers as effective, progress toward 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.
- 7) In support of the statewide definition of "teacher effectiveness", the educator scoring framework shall weight no professional practice standard less than 15% of the total 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 professional practice performance as captured in Quality Standards I-V.
- 8) CDE, with ongoing support from the State Council, shall develop a method to fully leverage the initial four years of pilot and implementation (2011-2015) as an opportunity to learn from and improve the State Scoring Framework. Specifically, CDE shall collect data about the following:
 - a) The scoring results for novice teachers as a separate personnel category;
 - b) The scoring results for nonprobationary teachers;
 - c) Implications for districts and schools of this approach to scoring teachers
 - d) The implications for scoring results on the teaching professional as a whole
- 9) 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 make any necessary changes to the state scoring framework recommendations.