



Andy Baxter
 Vice President, Educator Effectiveness
 Southern Regional Education Board
 592 10th St. N.W.
 Atlanta, GA 30318
 704-247-7497
 andy.baxter@sreb.org

EDUCATOR EVALUATION IN SREB STATES: AN UPDATE

Background

State legislatures and state boards of education made changes to educator evaluation policies during the last 12 months in response to feedback from the field and due to the dissolution of federal ESEA waivers. While most state policymakers have made modest adjustments to their evaluation strategies, a smaller group of states have proposed or enacted more significant changes. This briefing provides an overview of state evaluation models and summarizes key components of state evaluation strategies in the 16 SREB states.

Overview of State Models

SREB organized each member state into one of the following four model categories:

State model

State	System Name	Administrative Rules
Arkansas	Teacher Excellence and Support System	ADE 321
Georgia	Teacher Keys Effectiveness System	160-5-1-.37
Louisiana	Compass	Bulletin 130
Mississippi	Educator and Administrator Professional Growth System	Rule 14.19
North Carolina	North Carolina Educator Effectiveness System	TCP-C-004
West Virginia	West Virginia Educator Evaluation System	Policy 5310

State model with district alternative(s)

State	System Name	Administrative Rules
Delaware	Delaware Performance Appraisal System II (DPAS II)	14 DE 106A
Kentucky	Professional Growth and Effectiveness System	704 KAR 3:370
South Carolina	Enhanced ADEPT Support and Evaluation System	R 43-205.1
Tennessee	Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model	5.201
Texas	Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System	19 TAC § 150, Subch. AA

District model with state-recommended system(s)

State	Description	Administrative Rules
Florida	State policy authorizes districts to create evaluation systems, as long as they include the components required in state law . The state-recommended model is based on Marzano.	6A-5.030
Maryland	State policy authorizes districts to create evaluation system based on requirements laid out in state law. Most of Maryland's 24 jurisdictions use the state model , which is based on Danielson's Framework for Teaching.	COMAR 13A.07.09.00 et seq.

District model with some or no state requirements

State	Description	Administrative Rules
Alabama	EDUCATEAlabama is a formative evaluation system that requires teacher self-assessment, collaborative dialogue, professional learning plan and supporting evidence. Districts create evaluation plans based on the Alabama Quality Teaching Standards and Continuum of Teacher Development .	None codified EDUCATEAlabama "At a Glance"
Oklahoma	State law requires districts to create "individualized programs of professional development" based on regulations promulgated by the State Board of Education.	Not yet re-codified HB 2957 (2016)
Virginia	State law requires districts to create educator evaluation models consistent with the standards outlined in the <i>Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards Criteria for Teachers</i> (Link)	Only codified in statute § 22-1-253.13:5

Observation Rubrics

Rubric	States
Danielson	Arkansas, Florida (approved alternative), Maryland (for State Model), Mississippi
Danielson (Modified)	Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Texas
Marzano	Florida (for State Model), Oklahoma (alternate rubric)
NIET	Oklahoma (alternate rubric), South Carolina, Tennessee
Other	Alabama and Virginia require districts to select rubrics aligned to the state teaching standards. Georgia uses the Teacher Assessment of Professional Standards (TAPS) rubric. North Carolina (link) and West Virginia (link) use state-developed rubrics. Oklahoma authorizes districts to use one of three rubrics : Tulsa, Marzano, or NIET.

Teacher Impact on Student Learning

SREB organized each member state into one of the following four teacher impact categories:

State model requires value-added measures and/or student learning objectives

State	Description	Evidence
Delaware	The SEA categorizes educators into one of three groups. Placement in a specific grouping influences which of the measures are applicable for determining the Student Improvement Component score. In SY 2017-18, state law will require Part A and Part B professional goals.	DPAS II Handbook (pp. 36-40) HB 399 (2016)
Florida	State law requires district adoption of the state value-added model for teachers of state-tested grades and subjects. At least one-third of the summative evaluation must be based on student performance. Legislators added a third component that recommends, but does not require, peer observations and student and parent surveys.	FL STAT Tit. 48, § 1012.34
Georgia	Administrative regulations require teachers of state-tested grades and subjects to receive a student growth score based on these assessments. Non-state-tested teachers will create growth measures through alternate means, such as student learning objectives. A third component will allow districts to develop additional professional growth measures or allow educators to develop professional growth goals and plans.	160-5-1-.37
Kentucky	Administrative regulations require the use of student growth percentiles for state-tested teachers and student growth goals for all other teachers. Regulations do not preclude districts or educators from developing student growth goals for state-tested teachers.	704 KAR 3:370
Louisiana	Administrative regulations require the use of a state value-added model for state-tested teachers and student learning targets for all other teachers.	Bulletin 130
North Carolina	Although student growth is no longer a standalone measure, administrative regulations still require calculation of student growth using the statewide method or the local district option plan. The SEA will continue to determine student growth using the measures of student learning.	TCP-C-006

Teacher Impact on Student Learning (Continued)

State model requires student learning objectives or professional growth goals only

State	Description	Evidence
Maryland	Administrative regulations require student learning objectives (SLOs) to comprise 50 percent of the summative rating. Teachers in state-tested grades and subjects will develop SLOs based on value-added model results.	COMAR 13A.07.09.05
Oklahoma	State law requires educators to develop at least one annual professional growth goal “tailored to address a specific area or criteria identified through the qualitative component.” (p. 9)	HB 2957 (2016)
South Carolina	The state department has pursued changes that de-emphasize the use of statewide assessments to determine student growth. The changes seek to incorporate student growth measures into the teacher evaluation, instead of existing as a separate measure.	December 2015 Press Release

Districts choose some or all of teacher impact measures

State	Description	Evidence
Alabama	State guidance authorizes districts to choose the student growth data that will comprise a component called “Impact on Engagement and Learning.”	Overview of Teaching Effectiveness Process
Mississippi	Administrative regulations require districts to incorporate three performance measures into their evaluation systems: (1) student surveys, (2) student outcomes, and (3) school outcomes.	Rule 14.19
Texas	Administrative regulations require districts to implement one or more of the following student growth measures: student learning objectives, student portfolios, pre/post-test results on district-level assessments and value-added data based on state assessment results.	19 TAC § 150, Subch. AA
Virginia	State law requires the use of student academic progress measures to determine 40 percent of the summative rating. State-tested teachers will use progress table data to determine half of their student growth component. Districts choose alternative measures of student progress for all teachers.	Uniform Performance Standards (pp. 39-53)

Teacher impact measures suspended indefinitely

State	Description	Evidence
Arkansas	The State Board of Education suspended the use of student growth until new measures are codified.	ADE 321 (p. 11)
West Virginia	The State Board of Education approved a waiver that enabled the suspension of the value-added component in Sept. 2016	September 2016 Minutes of State Board of Education

For More Information

SREB is here to serve you! If you have any more questions related to teachers and principals, please contact the Educator Effectiveness team.

Andy Baxter Vice President for Educator Effectiveness andy.baxter@sreb.org (704) 491-4768	Matthew Smith Program Manager, Educator Effectiveness matthew.smith@sreb.org (404) 879-5538
--	--