

---

**Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy**

---

**The Background:**

In July 2011, Tennessee became one of the first states in the country to implement a comprehensive, student outcomes-based, statewide educator evaluation system. This implementation was a key tenet of Tennessee's First to the Top Act, adopted by the General Assembly with bipartisan support during 2010's extraordinary session under the backdrop of the federal Race to the Top competition. This landmark legislation established the parameters of a new teacher and principal evaluation system and committed to implementation during the 2011-12 school year. The act required 50 percent of the evaluation to be comprised of student achievement data—35 percent based on student growth as represented by the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) or a comparable measure and the other 15 percent based on additional measures of student achievement adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) and chosen through mutual agreement by the educator and evaluator. The remaining 50 percent of the evaluation is determined through qualitative measures such as teacher observations, personal conferences and review of prior evaluations and work.

An important component of the First to the Top Act was the creation of the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC), a group of teachers, principals, superintendents, legislators, business leaders, and other community members, which met 21 times over the course of the following year to review and discuss various issues related to policy and implementation. The committee reviewed field tests of four different observation rubrics, which were conducted in the 2010-11 school year in approximately 125 schools across the state. The TEAC supported use of the TEAM (Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model) rubric as the state model and also voted on a number of key components of implementation, including the number and structure of observations for the year. By law, those recommendations were made to the State Board of Education, which was charged with adopting the final guidelines and criteria for the annual evaluation of all teachers and principals. The board ultimately unanimously adopted the TEAC-endorsed TEAM model and, in addition, approved three alternative models – 1) Project Coach in Hamilton County; 2) TEM (Teacher Effectiveness Measure) in Memphis City; and 3) TIGER (Teacher Instructional Growth for Effectiveness and Results) in 12, mostly municipal, school systems statewide. The board also approved a menu of achievement measures that could be used as part of the 15 percent measure.

Implementation of the evaluation system began at the start of the 2011-12 school year. The Department of Education made a concentrated effort to solicit and encourage feedback, meeting with teachers and administrators across the state. Educators voiced both strengths and concerns about various facets of the teacher evaluation process and implementation. The department and others heard positive comments from administrators about improvements in the quality of instruction in

classrooms and also heard concerns about particular facets of the system. As implementation continued through the first semester of the school year, it became clear that satisfaction with the evaluation system varied considerably from district to district, driven largely by district- and school-level leadership.

While administrators continued to tout the system's impact on instruction, the public discussion about teacher evaluation began to detract from the real purpose of the evaluation system: improving student achievement. In response, Governor Haslam, supported by legislative leadership, tasked the State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE) with conducting an independent review of the system through a statewide listening and feedback process and producing a report to the State Board of Education and department outlining a range of policy considerations. In addition, the Governor announced his support of House Joint Resolution (HJR) 520, which ultimately was adopted by the General Assembly. This resolution directed the department to follow through on its commitment to seek feedback, conduct an internal review of the evaluation system, and provide a report with recommendations to the House and Senate Education Committees by July 15, 2012.

On July 15, 2012, the department submitted its report on year one implementation of the evaluation system and made a number of recommendations based on its extensive feedback and review process. A number of these recommendations require revisions to the State Board of Education Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy and/or board action.

### **Number of Observations**

Under SBE Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201, "all educators, other than apprentice teachers and administrators, will have a minimum of four observations, with at least two observations in each semester, for a minimum total of at least 60 minutes each school year. At least half of all observations will be unannounced. Apprentice teachers will have at least six observations, with three in each semester, for a minimum total of 90 minutes each school year. An LEA may choose to allow principals to conduct a required observation relative to the instructional domain in conjunction with a required observation relative to the planning or environment domain, provided the requisite minimum time, semester, distribution and notice (announced versus unannounced) are met." Current policy states that the minimum number of required observations for educators must be based on licensure status.

At the conclusion of the 2011-12 school year, the Department of Education considered feedback from administrators, which highlighted the time-intensive nature of multiple classroom observations for every teacher every year. To decrease the amount of time administrators must spend on observations while ensuring that educators are continually improving their practice and helping students make significant academic achievement gains, the department proposes that the required number of observations be based in part on a teacher's final evaluation score or individual growth score in the preceding school year. This change will allow administrators to provide greater support to teachers with lower scores, while allowing more flexibility with teachers who have demonstrated success in the classroom. Under the proposal, any educator, regardless of licensure status, who has earned a level five on his/her individual student growth or overall final evaluation in the preceding school year would be required to have a

minimum of one formal observation covering three domains in the first semester, as well as two informal walk-through observations second semester. Additionally, any educator with a professional license who has earned a level one on student growth or overall evaluation in the preceding school year would be required to have the same number of observations as an educator with an apprentice license.

### **15 Percent Academic Achievement Options**

Under SBE Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201, the State Department of Education is charged with monitoring and making recommendations to the SBE for revising the menu of options under the 15 percent category based on increasing availability of higher quality measures of performance. Upon completion of the 2011-12 school year, the TDOE assessed the quality of these measures.

The following table outlines the 15 percent achievement categories currently approved by the State Board of Education and the percent of teachers who selected each option:

<b>15% Achievement Measure Choice</b>	<b>Percent Selecting Measure</b>
State Assessments (TCAP & EOC)	38.4%
School-Wide TVAAS	25.9%
Off-the-shelf Assessments	12.7%
Graduation Rate/CTE Concentrator Graduation Rate	11.1%
ACT/SAT	5.4%
9th Grade Promotion Rate to 10th Grade/9th Grade Retention Rate	4.2%
Completion/Success in Advanced Coursework, Including Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment	1.9%
AP/IB/NIC	0.3%
Post-Secondary Placement	0.0%

Some measures that are currently approved, by definition, result in data that returns well after the school year is finished. This late return in data means that some teachers will not have their overall evaluation completed until after the start of the 2012-13 school year. These measures, which include 9th Grade Promotion Rate to 10th Grade/9th Grade Retention Rate, Completion/Success in Advanced Coursework, Including Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment, AP/IB/NIC, and Post-Secondary Placement, were only selected by 6.4 percent of teachers. To expedite the ability to

have all evaluations completed by the start of the next school year, amendatory language is recommended.

### **Comparable Measures for Non-tested Grades and Subjects**

Under SBE Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201, for “teachers, librarians, counselors and other groups of educators who do not have individual TVAAS scores, LEAs will choose from a list of options that have been shown capable of measuring student growth” for the 35 percent student growth measures. The Department of Education has been charged with monitoring and revising the list of options under this category based on increasing availability of higher-quality measures of student growth. Additionally, the department is committed to ongoing efforts to develop valid and reliable student growth measures for those areas that do not currently have them.

To that end, the department has worked over the past year and a half with various educator groups to develop comparable measures of student growth so teachers in those groups can be evaluated on the basis of their own students’ growth. Based upon progress made by the educator groups and under the authority of Policy 5.201, the department has approved additional comparable growth measures for the 2012-13 school year.

### **Acceptable Range of Results**

Under SBE Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201, the “Department of Education will monitor observation scores throughout the year and enforce consistent application of standards across districts. Upon the conclusion of the school year and relevant data collection, the department will publish evaluation results by district. Districts that fall outside the acceptable range of results, subject to student achievement scores, will not be approved to use alternate models for the following school year, and will be subject to additional training and monitoring by the department.”

While the department does not expect perfect alignment between growth and observation scores, it does expect to see a relationship between the two measures as both provide important information about an educator’s ability to improve student achievement. Value-added scores measure student achievement, while observation scores focus on instructional strategies associated with positive student outcomes. Observations serve as a tool for identifying successful practices in the classroom and helping teachers improve specific aspects of their practice with the ultimate goal of improving student achievement.

#### *Relationship between value-added and observation scores*

To calculate the acceptable relationship between value-added and observation scores, the department determined that scores should, at a minimum, be within one performance level. For example, if a teacher has a value-added score at a level 3, the acceptable range of observation scores would be at a level 2, 3, or 4. Performance level discrepancies of two or more will be considered outside the acceptable range between value-added and observation scores. For example, if an evaluator rated a teacher’s observation score at a level 4, but that teacher’s value-added score was a 2, that

discrepancy would be considered outside the acceptable range of results. Relationships are demonstrated in the following table, with unshaded boxes indicating scores within the acceptable range and shaded boxes indicating scores outside of the acceptable range:

	1 (Observation)	2 (Observation)	3 (Observation)	4 (Observation)	5 (Observation)
1 (TVAAS)					
2 (TVAAS)					
3 (TVAAS)					
4 (TVAAS)					
5 (TVAAS)					

*School Level Targeted Support:* To determine which schools will be targeted with additional support and training, the department will consider the percentage of teachers with results outside of the acceptable range as previously described. The 10 percent of schools with the highest percentage of teachers with individual value-added scores whose results are outside the acceptable range will be required to participate in additional training and support as determined by the department.

*District Level Accountability:* At the district level, those districts that have 20 percent or more of their teachers with individual value-added scores whose discrepancies between growth and observation scores fall outside the acceptable range will lose their ability to apply for or implement alternate evaluation models or TEAM Flexibility the following year.

### **Professionalism Rubric**

Under SBE Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201, the “State Board of Education will approve an evaluation model by which to evaluate all educators’ effectiveness.” Throughout the year, the department collected feedback on the qualitative components of the evaluation model, including a review of all domains of the rubric. Specifically, the department received feedback that it was difficult to differentiate among the 10 indicators of the professionalism rubric and that all indicators were not necessarily tied to improvements in student outcomes. At the conclusion of the first year of the teacher evaluation system, the Department of Education determined that the professionalism rubric needed to be modified to reduce the number of indicators from 10 to four.

### **Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy – Knox County Alternate Model**

Under SBE Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201 - Local Evaluation of Teachers, Principals, and Non-Instructional, Certified Staff (2)(b) - “Principals and assistant principals who spend 50 percent or more of their time on administrative duties will be evaluated according to an approved evaluation model based on the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) and approved by the State Board of Education. The evaluation process will also include a review of the quality of the principals’ teacher evaluations. Principal and assistant principal qualitative appraisals should include school climate and/or teaching and learning conditions surveys. The Department of Education will develop a list of approved surveys that LEAs can use.”

Knox County Schools has proposed an alternate evaluation model (attached) for evaluation of principals and the department, after review, recommends approval.

**The Recommendation:**

The Department of Education recommends acceptance of this item on first reading. SBE staff concurs with this recommendation.

**Proposed Amendments/Action relative to Policy 5.201:**

**Number of Observations**

Local Evaluation of Teachers, Principals, and Non-Instructional, Certified Staff.

(2)(c) All educators, other than apprentice teachers, *teachers with individual student growth scores who earned a level five on such growth scores or final evaluation in the preceding school year*, and administrators, will have a minimum of four observations\*, *with at least two domains observed in a given semester*, for a minimum total of at least 60 minutes each school year. At least half of all observations will be unannounced. Apprentice teachers, *other than those with individual student growth scores who earned a level five on such growth scores or final evaluation in the preceding school year*, will have at least six observations\*, *with at least three domains observed in a given semester*, for a minimum total of at least 90 minutes each school year. *Any educator with individual student growth scores who earned a level five on such growth scores or final evaluation in the preceding school year will have a minimum of one observation that includes each of the three domains, as well as two walk-through observations during the second semester. Any educator with a professional license and with individual student scores who earned a level one on such growth scores or final evaluation in the preceding school year will have the same minimum number of observations as an educator with an apprentice license.* An LEA may choose to allow principals to conduct a required observation relative to the instructional domain in conjunction with a required observation relative to the planning or environment domain, provided the requisite minimum time, semester, distribution and notice (announced versus unannounced) are met.

<i>Licensure Status</i>	<i>Previous Growth or Final Evaluation Score</i>	<i>Minimum Required Observations*</i>	<i>Minimum Required Observations Per Domain*</i>
<i>Apprentice</i>	<i>1-4</i>	<i>Six observations, with a minimum of three domains observed in each semester</i>	<i>3 Instruction 2 Planning 2 Environment</i>
	<i>5</i>	<i>One formal observation covering all domains first semester; two walk-throughs second semester</i>	<i>1 Instruction 1 Planning 1 Environment</i>
<i>Professional</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Six observations, with a minimum of three domains observed in each semester</i>	<i>3 Instruction 2 Planning 2 Environment</i>
	<i>2-4</i>	<i>Four observations with a minimum of two domains observed in each semester</i>	<i>2 Instruction 1 Planning 1 Environment</i>
	<i>5</i>	<i>One formal observation covering all domains first semester; two walk-throughs second semester</i>	<i>1 Instruction 1 Planning 1 Environment</i>



CTE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Caseload Educators	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
PE and Health Educators	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X

State assessments (discipline-specific/TCAP): includes, TCAP Achievement (all forms, grades 3-8, TCAP EOC (secondary), TCAP ELDA (K-12 ELL), TCAP Writing (Grades 5, 8, 11), TCAP Constructed Response (Grades 3 and 7), TCAP Alt (SpEd), TCAP MAAS (SpEd).

TVAAS: School-wide value added composite, Individual Teacher Effect composite for teachers in the top 3 quintiles.

National/State “off the shelf” tests: PreK-12 diagnostic or achievement/attainment assessments (e.g. SAT 10, Dibels, DRA, Kindergarten-readiness, end of course, etc.) DOE will develop standard criteria for approval of tests submitted by LEAs.

AP/IB/NIC suites of assessments: Courses designed for Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), National Industry Certification (NIC) assessments.

~~Graduation rate/CTE Concentrator Graduation Rate:~~ School level calculated secondary rates ~~or CTE concentrator rates.~~

~~Postsecondary matriculation/persistence/placement as determined by the TDOE and THEC:~~ School rates as calculated for each instance

~~Participation in advanced coursework:~~ School level calculated secondary rates (e.g. Honors, AP, IB, NIC, college/high school dual enrollment and dual credit) according to SBE uniform grading policy.

~~9<sup>th</sup> grade Promotion and Retention Rate:~~ School level calculated rates

**Comparable Measures for Non-tested Grades and Subjects**

Based upon progress made by educator groups and under the authority of Policy 5.201, the department has approved the following additional comparable growth measures for the 2012-13 school year.

<b>Subject or Grade Level</b>	<b>Approved Comparable Measure</b>
First and Second Grade	Pre- and post-test for the SAT 10
Third Grade	End of year SAT 10 test for districts that adopted it during the previous school year
Fine Arts	Peer-review portfolio model

Additionally, the Department of Education has approved the following additional school-wide growth measures for the 2012-13 school year.

<b>Subject or Grade Level</b>	<b>Approved Additional School-Wide Measures</b>
CTE	CTE Concentrator Math/Literacy School-Wide Score
English Language Learners	English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) School-Wide Score

## **Acceptable Range of Results**

### General Guidelines.

(3) Annual evaluations will differentiate teacher and principal performance into five effectiveness groups according to the individual educator's evaluation results. The five effectiveness groups are: significantly above expectations, above expectations, at expectations, below expectations, significantly below expectations. ~~By August 1 of each year, the State Department of Education will publish an anticipated range of distribution of evaluation results for the coming school year, subject to variation based on differences in student achievement growth in individual schools and districts.~~ The Department of Education will monitor observation scores throughout the year and enforce consistent application of standards across districts. Upon the conclusion of the school year and relevant data collection, the department will publish evaluation results by district. Districts *and schools* that fall outside the acceptable range of results, subject to student achievement scores, will ~~not be approved to use alternate models for the following school year, and will~~ be subject to additional training and monitoring by the department *as outlined in section (4).*

*(4) For the purposes of these guidelines, performance level discrepancies between individual student achievement growth scores and observation scores of two or more will be considered outside the acceptable range of results. The 10 percent of schools with the highest percentage of teachers falling outside the acceptable range of results will be required to participate in additional training and support as determined by the department. Districts that have 20 percent or more of their teachers fall outside the acceptable range of results will, as determined by the commissioner, lose their ability to apply for or implement alternate evaluation models or TEAM Flexibility the following school year.*

### **Professionalism Rubric**

Following SBE policy 5.201, the Department of Education seeks approval of the attached professionalism rubric changes for the 2012-13 school year.

### **Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy – Knox County Alternate Model**

The department proposes that Knox County receive one-year provisional approval to use its proposed alternate model for administrator observations after which time the district and the department will review relevant results and data to inform full approval by the State Board of Education for subsequent years.