Teacher Overall Evaluation Options

The Policy Question

How should evidence of teacher practices be used to determine overall teacher renewal decisions?

The Framework for Effective Teaching (FET) provides clear domains, standards, and indicators for teachers to understand the expectations for highly effective teachers. All administrators are required to conduct at least two formal observations using the FET during the school year. In addition, administrators are expected to conduct regular unannounced observations and to collect additional evidence for indicators (e.g., Domain 4) that are not assessed during the formal observation process. Currently, the overall teacher evaluation based on evidence collected from the FET is 40% of the overall teacher effectiveness scorecard. The percentages in the options below are used to weight the ratings of separate events (primarily for Domains 1, 2, and 3) during the year to calculate an overall teacher evaluation rating.

Option 1: **Standards-Based Determination**	**Option 2:** **Equal Weighted Determination**	**Option 3:** **Unequal Weighted Determination**	**Option 4:** **Growth Potential Determination**
Overall teacher FET ratings are based on a running record throughout the school year. • Ratings from formal observations overwrite prior scores. • Unannounced observations increase or decrease scores by at most .5 points. • Domain 4 evidence (nonobservational) ratings overwrite prior scores during the year	• Formal observation 1 = 40% • Formal observation 2 = 40% • Unannounced observations (only Domains 2 and 3) = 20% • Domain 4 evidence (nonobservational) ratings overwrite prior scores during the year	• Formal observation 1 = 30% • Formal observation 2 = 50% • Unannounced observations (only Domains 2 and 3) = 20% • Domain 4 evidence (nonobservational) ratings overwrite prior scores during the year	• Growth Potential Gains from Two Formal Observations = 80% • Unannounced observations (only Domains 2 and 3) = 20% • Domain 4 evidence (nonobservational) ratings overwrite prior scores during the year Growth potential is calculated from scores of initial formal observation as rubric levels still attainable; growth potential gain is calculated from rubric levels attained in second formal observation divided by growth potential. *Example: Formal observation 1 Domain 2 indicator ratings include all 2's = 12 out of 24. Growth potential is 12 rubric levels possible. Formal observation 2 Domain 2 indicator ratings include all 3's = 18 out of 24, gain of 6. Growth potential gain = 6/12 = 50%*
Advantages: • This method is similar to the way students' grades are assigned in Alliance. • Emphasis is placed on overall performance by the end of the year. • Teachers are not penalized for poor initial performance at the beginning of the school year. • Unannounced observation ratings affect overall teacher FET ratings. • Teachers will see changes in their overall FET ratings more frequently.	**Advantages:** • High performing teachers are rewarded for their consistent performance throughout the year. • Unannounced observations are treated as distinct from formal observations. • Overall FET ratings are likely to be directly correlated to student achievement. • Tracking ratings is a more simple process.	**Advantages:** • Teachers who show growth throughout the year are rewarded for having a better second formal observation. • Unannounced observations are treated as distinct from formal observations. • Overall FET ratings are likely to be more correlated to student achievement. • Tracking ratings is a more simple process.	**Advantages:** • Teachers are rewarded for achievement over time. • Teachers are only measured against their own growth over time. • Emphasis is placed on overall performance by the end of the year. • Teachers are not penalized for poor initial performance at the beginning of the school year.
Disadvantages: • Overwriting prior scores masks the issue that student achievement may not be directly correlated to overall FET ratings (i.e., do overall FET ratings need to be directly correlated to student achievement?) • Tracking the ratings requires a different system than the existing process.	**Disadvantages:** • Teachers will be penalized for poor initial performance. • Teachers will not be able to change their FET ratings frequently.	**Disadvantages:** • Teachers will be penalized for poor initial performance. • Teachers will not be able to change their FET ratings frequently.	**Disadvantages:** • Teachers are unlikely to ever achieve 100% growth potential gain because indicator level four is difficult to achieve across all standards. • A target growth potential gain is necessary (e.g., 50% instead of 100%). • Growth potential gains are likely to result in overall FET ratings not being directly correlated to student achievement (e.g., teacher level 1 performance and growth still means students did not receive effective instruction at the beginning of the year). • Teachers will not be able to change their FET ratings frequently.