

SREB

*State Implementation of College-
and Career-Readiness Standards*

Evaluation of Teachers and Leaders

January 2015

Southern
Regional
Education
Board

SREB.org

One of six benchmarking reports on progress in 14 states

.....

These reports were prepared at SREB by Kimberly Anderson, director, Benchmarking College- and Career-Readiness Standards, and Mary Elizabeth Mira, assistant director, Benchmarking College- and Career-Readiness Standards. Research assistance was provided by Education First.

Six individual reports make up the set — a summary report, plus five reports with detailed state profiles by topic.

Cross-State Findings Report

Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments

Aligned Teaching Resources

Professional Development

Evaluation of Teachers and Leaders

Accountability

The *Cross-State Findings Report* summarizes the findings of this research. The five accompanying reports each present a detailed profile of each state's efforts in the topic area. Together, these reports represent the cumulative findings of SREB's Benchmarking College- and Career-Readiness Standards project. These reports replace the preliminary reports SREB released in March 2014. They update the information in the preliminary reports to reflect state efforts and plans between 2010 and summer 2014. Additional benchmarking studies are forthcoming from SREB. All of the reports are available at <http://www.sreb.org/page/1600/>.

This project is supported by a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The conclusions are those of SREB and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the funder.

Evaluation of Teachers and Leaders

Introduction to State Profiles

By 2012, all of the states in this study had started implementing new or revised teacher and leader evaluation systems. The systems include many and varying updates. In some cases, the updates were designed to meet conditions for a state's Race to the Top grant. In others, the updates were made to meet conditions for a state's waiver for certain provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind).

Teacher and Leader Evaluation Systems and New State College- and Career-Readiness Standards

The following profiles examine one particular aspect of states' new teacher and leader evaluation systems: how states integrate the higher expectations for student learning inherent in their new college- and career-readiness standards within the systems' requirements for continuous improvement of teachers and principals. Essentially, these profiles ask, what measures within state teacher and leader evaluation systems generate information about teacher and principal performance in terms of their implementation of, support for and effect on student learning of the new standards. For trends across the states in the design of their systems, successes, challenges, types of support needed to move this work forward, and practitioner experiences with putting the evaluations into practice, see the accompanying *Cross-State Findings Report*.

As SREB researchers reviewed information about state systems, they asked the following questions. These questions guide the organization of the state profiles.

- ◆ *Basic Information About the Systems:* When were the state's new or revised teacher and leader evaluation systems put into place?
- ◆ *Professional Teaching and Leadership Standards:* What are the state's professional teaching standards and leadership standards? Have they been updated to articulate the new knowledge and competencies needed to teach and lead the implementation of the state's new college- and career-readiness standards?
- ◆ *Components of the Systems and Their Alignment to the New College- and Career-Readiness Standards:* How do the measures within the evaluation systems produce information that can illuminate competencies and accomplishments in teaching and leading school implementation of the new college- and career-readiness standards?
- ◆ *Use of Evaluation Data for Continuous Improvement:* How are the results of the evaluation process used to assist practitioners, systems and the state in strengthening teaching and leadership of the new college- and career-readiness standards?

What Makes State Efforts Stand Out?

As SREB researchers reviewed information about state systems, some systems stood out according to the criteria below.

- ◆ *Updated Professional Standards:* Since adopting the new college- and career-readiness standards, the state Department of Education has updated the state's professional teaching and leadership standards so that they more clearly and thoroughly define what effective teaching, learning and leadership entail in the context of the college- and career-readiness standards.
- ◆ *Updated Classroom Observation Tools and Principal Practice Measures:* Since adopting the new college- and career-readiness standards, the department has updated the state's classroom observation tools (for example, rubrics, guides or checklists) and principal practice measures (for example, rubrics or leadership criteria) to help practitioners and evaluators identify what effective teaching, learning and leadership look like in the context of the new college- and career-readiness standards.
- ◆ *Extensive Use of Evaluation Data:* The department requires or recommends that local practitioners use evaluation data to identify individual strengths and areas for improvement in order to provide each practitioner with appropriate professional learning. The department provides guidance or technical assistance to districts to enhance their use of data for large-scale improvement planning and professional learning. The department can aggregate individual evaluation results to identify statewide trends to inform the planning of state-level improvement initiatives. And, the department can direct practitioners to individualized professional learning resources based on their unique evaluation results (for example, through an electronic interactive platform).

Highlights: While all states in this study have made strides in teacher and leader evaluation alignment to their new standards, notable efforts are as follows.

- ◆ **Overall : States with leading efforts in teacher and leader evaluation alignment** are Colorado, Louisiana and Tennessee.
- ◆ *Teacher Evaluation:*
 - **Leading** states are Colorado, Louisiana, New York, South Carolina and Tennessee.
 - **Strong** states are Delaware, Kentucky, North Carolina and Pennsylvania.
- ◆ *Leader Evaluation:*
 - **Leading** states are Colorado, Louisiana and Tennessee.
 - **Strong** states are Delaware, Maryland and Pennsylvania.

Refer to each state's profile for a description of its systems. Leading efforts and other aspects of the work across the states are also summarized in the accompanying *Cross-State Findings Report*.

Methodology

Information for these profiles was gathered from two sources:

- ◆ Review of publicly available information, including state policy documents and reports, department websites and other sources such as U.S. Department of Education reports
- ◆ Interviews with department leaders

Each state department of education reviewed and provided feedback on drafts of its profile, to ensure the accuracy of the information.

Alabama

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Alabama's new teacher effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in Alabama's new College- & Career-Ready Standards (CCRS, which incorporate the Common Core and a few Alabama-specific standards in English language arts, or ELA, and math) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Alabama is currently implementing some aspects of its EDUCATEAlabama (EA) system as a formative evaluation process, though much of the system is still in development. The Alabama Professional Evaluation Design Committee is developing the guidance and structure that the Alabama State Department of Education will use to finalize the design of the system.

Teaching Standards

The Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTS) form the backbone of EA. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Subject Matter Knowledge
2. Student Development
3. Diversity
4. Instructional Strategies
5. Classroom Management and the Learning Environment
6. Communication
7. Planning
8. Assessment
9. Professionalism
10. Collaboration

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the CCRS: In 2007, the department adapted the AQTS from the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The department has not undertaken a revision of the standards to more explicitly align them to the CCRS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the potential components of the EA system. It focuses on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the CCRS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of ELA and math.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Alabama, the student growth and achievement component comprises a yet-to-be-determined percentage of a teacher’s evaluation and is calculated based on the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth, to be determined by the state Board of Education.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth, to be determined by the board.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCRS:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* To align its assessments to the CCRS, Alabama adopted a suite of ACT assessments. For high school, Alabama uses ACT’s QualityCore end-of-course assessments. ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which these assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math and the literacy standards in history/social studies, science and technical subjects. For grades three through eight, as of 2013-14, Alabama uses ACT’s Aspire tests. ACT reports that the Aspire tests are fully aligned to the Common Core.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The process for determining student growth from non-tested grades and subjects, where applicable (for example, K-2 reading, writing, English and math), is in development.

Additional Components: Additional components may comprise a yet-to-be-determined percent of a teacher’s evaluation.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCRS Instruction

The process of determining how data from the comprehensive, finalized EA system will be used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the CCRS is under development. The AQTs form the basis of the Alabama Continuum of Teacher Development, which supports a teacher’s development from preparation, clinical experience, induction and mentoring to assessment and professional study. The continuum is intended to support meaningful conversations between teachers, coaches and administrators, and to support teachers in setting professional goals and pursuing professional development to reach these goals.

Alabama

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines the components of Alabama's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in Alabama's new College- & Career-Ready Standards (CCRS, which incorporate the Common Core and a few Alabama-specific standards in English language arts, or ELA, and math) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Alabama is currently implementing some aspects of its LEADAlabama (LEADAL) system as a formative evaluation process, though much of the system is still in development. The Alabama Professional Evaluation Design Committee is developing the guidance and structure that the Alabama State Department of Education will use to finalize the design of the system.

Leadership Standards

The Alabama Standards for Instructional Leaders form the backbone of LEADAL. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Planning for Continuous Improvement
2. Teaching and Learning
3. Human Resources Development
4. Diversity
5. Community and Stakeholder Relationships
6. Technology
7. Management of the Learning Organization
8. Ethics

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the CCRS: The department developed the Alabama Standards for Instructional Leaders based on research and best practice recommendations from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core), the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and other states. The department has not undertaken a revision of the standards to more explicitly align them to the CCRS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the potential components of LEADAL and focuses on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the CCRS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of ELA and math.

Alabama (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Alabama, the student growth and achievement component comprises a yet-to-be-determined percent of a principal's evaluation and is calculated based on the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth, to be determined by the state Board of Education.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth, to be determined by the board.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCRS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* To align its assessments to the CCRS, Alabama adopted a suite of ACT assessments. For high school, Alabama uses ACT's QualityCore end-of-course assessments. ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which these assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math and the literacy standards in history/social studies, science and technical subjects. For grades three through eight, as of 2013-14, Alabama uses ACT's Aspire tests. ACT reports that the Aspire tests are fully aligned to the Common Core.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The process for determining measures of student growth from non-tested grades and subjects, where applicable (for example, K-2 reading, writing, English and math), is in development.

Additional Components: Additional components may comprise a yet-to-be-determined percent of a principal's evaluation. Measures used in 2013-14 as part of the formative evaluation process included a self-assessment on the Alabama Continuum for Leadership Development (a five-level rubric based on the leadership standards), collaborative dialogue between the principal and evaluator, a professional learning plan developed collaboratively by the principal and evaluator, an evidence summary documenting professional learning toward leadership improvement, and stakeholder surveys.

Alignment of the Additional Components to the CCRS: The continuum is based on the Alabama Standards for Instructional Leaders, which incorporate research and best practice recommendations from the ISLLC standards (which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core) and from other national organizations. Alabama administers Vanderbilt University's Val-Ed Survey, which garners feedback about principal performance; survey questions for teachers address topics related to the ISLLC standards.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCRS Instruction

Ways in which data from the comprehensive, finalized LEADAL system will be used to help practitioners and systems strengthen leadership of the CCRS are currently under consideration. The Alabama Continuum for Instructional Leaders is designed to provide information that can guide the establishment and measurement of targets for the professional development of instructional leaders.

Colorado

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Colorado's new teacher support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new Colorado Academic Standards (CAS, which include the Common Core and some "unique to Colorado" standards in English language arts, or ELA, and math) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

The state's model system is called the Colorado State Model Evaluation System. All districts were required to implement an evaluation system (their own system or the state model) that meets or exceeds state law in 2013-14. Evaluation systems were implemented statewide in 2013-14, and the final evaluation rating is being used to impact personnel decisions beginning in 2014-15.

Teaching Standards

Colorado's Teacher Quality Standards (TQS) form the backbone of the Colorado State Model Evaluation System. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Pedagogy and Content Knowledge
2. Safe, Inclusive Learning Environment
3. Effective Instruction
4. Self-Reflection
5. Teacher Leadership
6. Student Academic Growth

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the CAS: Aligning teacher standards to the CAS is an aspect of the work in which Colorado is undertaking leading efforts. The state Department of Education developed the TQS with the CAS in mind, in order to incorporate instructional shifts required by the CAS. When developing the TQS, the State Council for Educator Effectiveness and the department also used other teaching standards as resources, including the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards (which are widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment). As such, the TQS define specific skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching in a CAS environment.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Colorado State Model Evaluation System, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the CAS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of ELA and math. Teachers in Colorado are evaluated on the TQS through two components.

Colorado (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

Teacher Professional Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher’s rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations and ongoing conversations between the teacher and the evaluator. To support the observation process, the department developed an evaluation rubric that includes observable elements.
- ◆ At least one of the following, as determined by the district: student perception measures (for example, student surveys), peer feedback, parent/guardian feedback, teacher lesson plans and student work samples. Districts provide annual assurances to the department that they are incorporating at least one of these measures.

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool (Colorado’s Rubric with Observable Elements) to the CAS: This is an aspect of the work in which Colorado is undertaking leading efforts. The state developed its evaluation rubric, including the observable elements, specifically considering the instructional shifts required by the CAS. As such, the rubric addresses and provides guidance around the specific skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching in a CAS environment, supporting the classroom observations process. Districts can use the state rubric or their own as long as it meets or exceeds the TQS. The department then tracks fidelity of district implementation.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Colorado, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation and is called Measures of Student Learning. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth are required, as determined by districts. These must include the annual state assessment, at a minimum. Examples of other measures include district assessments and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth are required, as determined by districts. Examples of measures include district assessments and SLOs.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CAS:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Since 2011-12, Colorado has used its Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) tests for ELA (reading and writing) and math in grades three through 10. The TCAP is partially aligned to the CAS. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Colorado plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through 11 in 2014-15. For other measures of student growth, the department provides sample end-of-unit performance tasks approved as aligned to the CAS in its online resource bank. Also, through its Content Collaboratives project, the department has vetted common assessments for district use where applicable (for example, K-2 in reading, writing and math). (See the accompanying state profile on *Aligned Teaching Resources* for more information on the Assessment Resource Bank and the Content Collaboratives.) Further, the department created student growth guides — tools to help teachers,

principals and district leaders define learning goals based on the CAS and identify assessments that are aligned to the standards. The department also provides guidance for districts on incorporating measures included in the state’s accountability system into educator evaluations. (The state accountability system provides some information on student learning of the CAS — see the accompanying state profile on *Accountability* for more information on alignment of the system to the CAS.) The department reports that its guidance on student growth will be revised annually to reflect increased understanding and emerging best practices.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* See the information in the For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects bullet above about tools and guidance the department provides to facilitate local selection and development of other measures of student growth aligned to the CAS where appropriate.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CAS Instruction

In Colorado, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the CAS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Evaluators are required to direct individual teachers to appropriate professional development opportunities based on their evaluation data. The department recommends that schools and districts use aggregate evaluation data to inform the large-scale professional development they offer. To support the local use of evaluation data, in spring 2014 the department piloted a State Model Online Performance Management System, with full implementation planned for 2014-15. This online system is available for districts as a tool to collect and analyze evaluation results, and to develop reports with useful and actionable feedback for teachers.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department plans to aggregate individual teacher evaluation results at the TQS standard level in spring 2015 when it receives the first finalized set of data. These data will be used to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, which can inform the department’s ongoing design of large-scale improvement initiatives.

Colorado is making leading efforts to align its teacher evaluation system to the state’s new college- and career-readiness standards, the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS, which include the Common Core and some “unique to Colorado” standards in English language arts, or ELA, and math). The State Council for Educator Effectiveness and the state Department of Education developed the Colorado professional teaching standards (the Teacher Quality Standards, TQS) with the CAS in mind in order to incorporate instructional shifts required by the new standards. The department also tailored its state evaluation rubric, which includes observable elements, to the CAS to incorporate criteria that define specific skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching in a CAS environment. The department provides an online platform enabling districts to aggregate evaluation data to inform professional development and plans to aggregate evaluation results to the state level in spring 2015 when such data become available.

Colorado

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines Colorado’s new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state’s new Colorado Academic Standards (CAS, which include the Common Core and some “unique to Colorado” standards in English language arts, or ELA, and math) within the system’s requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

The state’s model system is called the Colorado Model Educator Evaluation System for Principals and Assistant Principals. All districts were required to implement an evaluation system (their own system or the state model) that meets or exceeds state law in 2013-14.

Leadership Standards

Colorado’s Principal Quality Standards form the backbone of the Colorado Model Educator Evaluation System for Principals and Assistant Principals. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Strategy
2. Instruction
3. Culture
4. Human Resources
5. Management
6. External Development
7. Student Growth

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the CAS: This is an aspect of the work in which Colorado is undertaking leading efforts. The State Council for Educator Effectiveness and the state Department of Education developed the Principal Quality Standards with the CAS in mind, in order to incorporate the key shifts required by the new standards. When developing the Principal Quality Standards, the State Council for Educator Effectiveness and the department also used other leadership standards as resources, including the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core). As such, the Principal Quality Standards define skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the CAS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Colorado Model Educator Evaluation System for Principals and Assistant Principals, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about leaders within the context of their schools’ implementation of the CAS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of ELA and math. Leaders are evaluated on the seven Principal Quality Standards through the following two components of the evaluation system.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Colorado, student growth and achievement is called Measures of Student Learning, and it comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Multiple measures of student growth, determined by the district, must include measures from the school accountability report and the annual state assessment, and at least one other measure.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Other assessments or Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are required, as determined by districts (for example, district assessments, and numbers and percentages of highly effective, effective and ineffective teachers in a school). Measures used for principal evaluation must be consistent with those used for teacher evaluation.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CAS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Since 2011-12, Colorado has used its Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) tests for ELA (reading and writing) and math in grades three through 10. The TCAP is partially aligned to the CAS. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Colorado plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through 11 in 2014-15.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Through its Content Collaboratives project, the department has vetted common assessments for district use, which are accessible via the statewide Assessment Resource Bank. It reports that these assessments are aligned to the CAS where appropriate (for example, K-2 in reading, writing and math). (See the accompanying state profile on *Aligned Teaching Resources* for information about the Assessment Resource Bank.) The department also created student growth guides for principals and evaluators to support the alignment of selected measures to the CAS. The department reports that its guidance on student growth will be revised annually to reflect increased understanding and emerging best practices.

Professional Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. The measure that informs a leader's rating on this component is listed below.

- ◆ *Professional Practice Rubric:* The rubric generates a rating for the leader on the Principal Quality Standards (one through six) based on self-reflection, collection of evidence aligned to the rubric, and conversations between the principal and evaluator.

Alignment of Professional Practice to the CAS: This is an aspect of the work in which Colorado is undertaking leading efforts. The state Professional Practice Rubric was developed independently by the department. When the department developed the rubric, it considered key shifts required by the CAS. As such, the rubric provides explicit guidance on and concrete examples of specific skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the CAS. Districts can use the state rubric or their own, as long as it meets or exceeds the Principal Quality Standards.

Colorado (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CAS Instruction

In Colorado, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the CAS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and regional Boards of Cooperative Educational Services are required to collect and analyze performance data to provide actionable feedback and professional learning support to principals. The department aggregates evaluation results on its Schoolview Web portal and recommends that districts use this information to inform the professional development they offer. To support the local use of evaluation data, in spring 2014 the department piloted a State Model Online Performance Management System, with full implementation planned for 2014-15. This online system is available for districts as a tool to collect and analyze evaluation results and to develop reports with useful and actionable feedback for principals.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department plans to aggregate principal evaluation results in spring 2015 when it receives the first finalized set of data. These data will be used to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, which can inform the department's ongoing design of large-scale improvement initiatives. The department tracks fidelity of district implementation by looking at aggregated rating trends each year.

Colorado is making leading efforts to align its Colorado Model Educator Evaluation System for Principals and Assistant Principals to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS, which include the Common Core and some "unique to Colorado" standards in English language arts, or ELA, and math). The State Council for Educator Effectiveness and the state Department of Education developed Colorado's Principal Quality Standards and Professional Practice Rubric with the CAS in mind, to incorporate new skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the CAS. The department provides an online platform enabling districts to aggregate evaluation data to inform professional development, and plans to aggregate evaluation results to the state level in spring 2015 when such data become available.

Delaware

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Delaware's new educator support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

The state revised its Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II) to incorporate student growth and achievement as of 2012-13. However, student growth and achievement based on the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium tests that are being implemented in 2014-15 will not impact teacher evaluation until 2015-16.

Teaching Standards

Delaware's Professional Teaching Standards form the backbone of the DPAS II system. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Planning and Preparation
2. Classroom Environment
3. Instruction
4. Professional Responsibilities
5. Student Improvement

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the Common Core: Delaware's Professional Teaching Standards are a modified version of the 2007 Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The state Department of Education has not revised the Professional Teaching Standards since adopting the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the DPAS II system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math.

Each component is weighted equally, and a teacher must meet a minimum level of performance on each component in order to be effective. Additionally, the student growth and achievement component serves as the preponderant criterion, as it may override a teacher's rating on other components. Teachers in Delaware are evaluated on the five Professional Teaching Standards through the components listed below.

Delaware (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

The First Four Professional Teaching Standards: A teacher's rating on this component is assessed using rubrics specific to each of the first four standards. Ratings on each of the rubrics are determined by the following types of evidence:

- ◆ Classroom observations
- ◆ Professional responsibilities and professional growth goals
- ◆ Self-assessment filled out by the teacher and shared with the principal for discussion
- ◆ Additional evidence or documentation of teacher practice

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the Common Core: Delaware's classroom observation rubric criteria are adapted from the 2007 Danielson Framework for Teaching. As such, the criteria define skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. Though the department has not revised its observation rubric since adopting the Common Core, to align it more explicitly to the new standards, it does provide supplemental guidance and resources to facilitate application of the rubric in a Common Core environment (for example, providing descriptions of explicit instructional expectations).

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. Regarding student growth and achievement, the department differentiates between three groups of teachers: Group I educators are teachers of reading and math in grades three through 10; Group II educators are teachers of historically non-tested grades and subjects; and Group III educators are all other teachers. Student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects (Group I):*
 - Improvement on the annual state assessment, with goal set by the department (50 percent)
 - Improvement on another assessment (for example, a department-developed common assessment or department-approved national assessment), with goal set collaboratively by the teacher and principal (50 percent)
- ◆ *For Teachers of Historically Non-Tested Grades and Subjects (Group II):*
 - Improvement on another assessment (for example, a department-developed common assessment or department-approved national assessment), with goal set collaboratively by the teacher and principal (50 percent)
 - Educator growth goals or Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), determined collaboratively by the teacher and principal (50 percent)
- ◆ *For All Other Teachers (Group III):*
 - SLOs, determined collaboratively by the teacher and principal (100 percent)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2012-13, Delaware partially aligned its Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) in reading and math for grades three through 10. The department modified the assessments to more closely measure the learning expectations of the Common Core. The department reports that its end-of-course assessments in Algebra II and Integrated Math III are fully aligned to the Common Core. As a member of Smarter Balanced, Delaware plans to implement the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and 11 in 2014-15.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support the local selection of other assessments aligned to the Common Core, the department provides over 250 common assessments across multiple grades and subject areas. The department developed the assessments in partnership with educators, to align to the Common Core where appropriate; the department now manages the assessments. The department also provides a list of approved national tests with ratings for how well they align to the Common Core.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

In Delaware, novice teachers are evaluated annually, and experienced teachers who have received a “Highly Effective” rating on their most recent evaluation are evaluated every two years, though the student growth and achievement component for experienced teachers is still calculated each year. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and principals are required to use DPAS II data to identify individual teachers’ strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the department provides coaches through its Race to the Top funding (which will continue to be in place through 2014-15) and with various partners. Coaches support over 100 principals in developing their knowledge of the Common Core and strengthening their schools’ implementation of the DPAS II system. The department also shares evaluation results with districts and stakeholder groups to support continuous improvement activities.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department aggregates individual DPAS II data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, which can inform initiative planning and guide state-level professional development. Additionally, the department currently is exploring the possibility of using an online platform to provide individualized professional development resources to teachers based on their results.

Delaware

Evaluation of Leaders

This profile outlines the components of Delaware's new leader support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

The state revised its Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II) to incorporate student growth and achievement as of 2012-13.

Leadership Standards

The Delaware Administrative Standards form the backbone of DPAS II. The standards establish the competencies for which school leaders strive.

1. Vision and Goals
2. Culture of Learning
3. Management
4. Professional Responsibilities
5. Student Improvement

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the Common Core: Delaware adopted the 2009 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as its Delaware Administrative Standards. The ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The state Department of Education has not revised the standards further since it adopted the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of DPAS II, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math.

Each component is weighted equally, and a leader must meet a minimum level of performance on each component in order to be effective. Additionally, the student growth and achievement component serves as the preponderant criterion, as it may override a leader's rating on other components. Leaders are evaluated on the five Delaware Administrative Standards through the components listed below.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Delaware, student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Improvement on the annual state assessment, with goals and targets set by the department (50 percent)

- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* No more than two measures of improvement on another assessment or metric (for example, a department-developed common assessment, a department-approved national assessment) determined by the district, with goals and targets set collaboratively by the principal and evaluator (50 percent)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2012-13, Delaware partially aligned its Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) in reading and math for grades three through 10. The department modified the assessments to more closely measure the learning expectations of the Common Core. The department reports that its end-of-course assessments in Algebra II and Integrated Math III are fully aligned to the Common Core. As a member of Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, Delaware plans to implement the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and 11 in 2014-15.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support the local selection of other assessments aligned to the Common Core, the department provides over 250 common assessments across multiple grades and subject areas. The department developed the assessments in partnership with educators, to align to the Common Core where appropriate; the department now manages the assessments. The department also provides a list of approved national tests with ratings for how well they align to the Common Core.

Professional Practice: Measures that inform a leader's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ *Professional Practice Rubric:* The rubric provides a principal's rating on the first four Delaware Administrative Standards. The rubric was used in a limited number of districts in 2013-14, with statewide implementation planned for 2014-15.
- ◆ *Stakeholder Feedback:* This measure includes a school staff survey, feedback from the principal's supervisor, and a self-assessment discussed by the principal and evaluator.
- ◆ *Ongoing Conferences:* These occur regularly between the principal and evaluator.

Alignment of Professional Practice to the Common Core: Delaware's Principal Practice Rubric assesses criteria outlined in the Delaware Administrator Standards, which are the 2009 ISLLC standards. Delaware developed this rubric based on the ISLLC standards and on research and rubrics from a number of external organizations, including the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (Val-Ed) Framework, which is also based on the ISLLC standards. Though the department has not revised this rubric since adopting the Common Core, to align it more explicitly to the new standards, it does provide supplemental guidance and resources to facilitate application of the rubric in a Common Core environment (for example, providing descriptions that outline explicit instructional leadership expectations). Also, Delaware uses the Administrator ISLLC Survey to garner stakeholder feedback about principal performance. The school staff survey questions address the ISLLC standards, which include general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core.

Delaware (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

School leaders with less than three years of experience receive a summative evaluation annually, while school leaders with three or more years of experience receive a summative evaluation at least once every two years. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Evaluators are required to use DPAS II data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. Districts are encouraged to use aggregated DPAS II data to guide district-level professional learning. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department monitors district evaluation system activities and improvement plans and provides ongoing assistance to administrators through a variety of coaching models (in collaboration with external partners). Districts assign the leadership coaches locally. Across the state, coaches work with over 100 principals.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department aggregates individual DPAS II data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, which can inform initiative planning and guide state-level professional development.

Georgia

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Georgia's new teacher support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new College and Career Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Georgia piloted its Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) in 2012-13 and 2013-14, and began statewide implementation in 2014-15.

Teaching Standards

Georgia's Teacher Keys Performance Standards form the backbone of TKES. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive. The 10 standards nest in five domains:

1. Planning
2. Instructional Delivery
3. Assessment of and for Learning
4. Learning Environment
5. Professionalism and Communication

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the CCGPS: The state Department of Education developed the Teacher Keys Performance Standards. These standards define skills and knowledge needed for effective teaching in a standards-based instruction environment. The department has not undertaken a revision of the standards since adopting the CCGPS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the TKES system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the CCGPS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the 10 standards through two components.

Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS): This component comprises 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Supporting documentation of teacher performance
- ◆ Surveys of instructional practice (student surveys)

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the CCGPS: Georgia's classroom observation rubric includes criteria needed to demonstrate effective teaching as defined in the Teacher Keys Performance Standards. The department has not undertaken a revision of the Teacher Keys Performance Standards or the classroom observation rubric since it adopted the CCGPS.

Alignment of the Surveys of Instructional Practice to the CCGPS: These surveys provide some information relevant to the CCGPS, in that they elicit student feedback on standards within the TKES that relate to standards-based instruction. After conducting an analysis of its 2012-13 pilot data, the department found that the surveys are highly correlated with the TKES.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Georgia, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Annual state assessments
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) determined by the district and approved by the department

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCGPS:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Georgia reported that in 2012-13 it fully aligned its Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) for grades three through eight in reading, ELA and math, and its high school end-of-course test (EOCT) in ELA and math. For 2014-15 and beyond, the department is developing a new Georgia Milestones assessment system, which will include end-of-grade (for grades three through eight) and end-of-course (for high school) tests that will be fully aligned to the CCGPS.

Georgia (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The department provides districts with access to district-designed and department-approved SLOs, which it reports are aligned to the CCGPS where appropriate (for example, K-2 in reading, ELA and math). The department also provides a manual for operationalizing SLOs, in addition to a separate SLO guide for district leaders, principals and classroom teachers that includes guidance on aligning locally-developed SLOs to state standards. Districts develop their SLOs, and the department provides training and offers technical assistance as needed.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCGPS Instruction

Beginning in 2014-15, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the CCGPS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and principals are encouraged to use TKES data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the department provides online modules for teachers on using student survey data for instructional improvement, and guides for evaluators on providing effective feedback and on using professional development plans based on evaluation results. The department also offers step-by-step flow charts for evaluators on using student surveys for instructional improvement. Further, the department hired over 30 new staff in 2012-13 to support districts in implementing the evaluation system, and the department developed a sustainability plan to provide support to districts after the state's Race to the Top grant, which funded these positions, concluded in 2014. (The plan includes a graduated reduction of staff over a few years, accompanied by a partnership with Georgia's Regional Educational Service Agencies, which provide support to local systems on a variety of topics, and the provision of extensive online professional learning resources.) Additionally, the department provides the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) electronic platform for schools and districts as a resource to plan and implement appropriate individualized and large-scale professional learning based on individual and aggregate evaluation data.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Georgia demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. Through its TLE electronic platform, Georgia provides online professional learning resources for all teachers, based on TKES evaluation results. TLE platform specialists release monthly reports regarding system implementation, and districts use this information to monitor consistency and fidelity of implementation. The department uses statewide data to inform the development of additional professional learning resources. Additionally, the department provides online modules for teachers on how to address academically challenging environments and formative assessment practices aligned to the rigor of the CCGPS and tied to specific Teacher Keys Performance Standards.

Georgia

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines Georgia's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new College and Career Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Georgia piloted its Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES) in 2012-13 and 2013-14 and began statewide implementation in 2014-15.

Leadership Standards

Georgia's Leader Keys Performance Standards form the backbone of LKES. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Instructional Leadership | 5. Human Resources Management |
| 2. School Climate | 6. Teacher/Staff Evaluation |
| 3. Planning and Assessment | 7. Professionalism |
| 4. Organizational Management | 8. Communication and Community Relations |

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the CCGPS: The state Department of Education based the Leader Keys Performance Standards on the 2008 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department has not revised the standards since it adopted the CCGPS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the LKES system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the CCGPS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the Leader Keys Performance Standards through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Georgia, the student growth and achievement component comprises 70 percent of a principal's evaluation. Student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - Schoolwide growth on annual state assessments (weighted at 50 percent along with Student Learning Objectives, or SLOs — see more information in the bullet on Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects below)
 - Achievement gap reduction, or the change in the gap in annual state assessment scores between high-need students in a school and a statewide benchmark (weighted at 20 percent)

Georgia (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* SLOs determined by districts and approved by the department (weighted at 50 percent along with schoolwide growth on annual state assessments above)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCGPS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Georgia reported that in 2012-13 it fully aligned its Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) for grades three through eight in reading, ELA and math, and its high school end-of-course test (EOCT) in ELA and math. For 2014-15 and beyond, the department is developing a new Georgia Milestones assessment system, which will include end-of-grade tests (for grades three through eight) and end-of-course tests (for high school) that will be fully aligned to the CCGPS.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The department provides districts with access to district-designed and department-approved SLOs, which it reports are aligned to the CCGPS where appropriate (for example, K-2 in reading, ELA and math). The department also provides a manual for operationalizing SLOs, in addition to a separate SLO guide for district leaders and principals that includes guidance on aligning locally-developed SLOs to state standards. Districts develop their SLOs, and the department provides training and offers technical assistance as needed.

Leader Assessment on Performance Standards (LAPS): This component comprises 30 percent of a principal's evaluation. Measures that inform a leader's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ *LAPS Rubric:* The rubric generates a principal's rating on the Leader Keys Performance Standards based on two performance goals developed collaboratively between the principal and evaluator, and documentation of practice developed by the principal and the evaluator.
- ◆ *Governance and Leadership:* This component is measured through school staff surveys, student attendance data, and retention of teachers rated "effective" on the teacher evaluation system.

Alignment of the LAPS component to the CCGPS:

- The LAPS Rubric assesses principals on criteria needed to demonstrate effective leadership. (Though the department revised the rubric after the state adopted the CCGPS, the revisions do not relate specifically to the CCGPS.)
- The governance and leadership measures provide some information related to the CCGPS. The school staff survey questions address topics related to the Leader Keys Performance Standards, which address general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the CCGPS. The retention of teachers rated "effective" incorporates measures from the teacher evaluation system, some of which provide information related to the CCGPS.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

Beginning in 2014-15, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from LKES are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the CCGPS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and evaluators are required to use LKES data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the department provides guides for evaluators and district leaders on the evaluation system, including step-by-step flow charts on using school staff survey data for school and district improvement. The department also offers online modules for evaluators on giving feedback based on evaluation results. Additionally, the department provides the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) Electronic Platform for districts as a resource to plan and implement appropriate individualized and large-scale professional learning based on individual and aggregate evaluation data.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Georgia demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. Through its TLE Electronic Platform, Georgia aggregates principal evaluation data. TLE platform specialists release monthly reports regarding system implementation, and districts use this information to monitor consistency and fidelity of implementation. Statewide data are used to inform the development of additional professional learning resources. The department also provides online modules for principals on formative assessment practices aligned to the rigor of the CCGPS and tied to the Leader Keys Performance Standards.

Kentucky

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Kentucky's new teacher support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS, which include the Common Core in English language arts, or ELA, and math) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Kentucky piloted its Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) in 2013-14 and began statewide implementation in 2014-15. The system will not impact personnel decisions until 2015-16. Districts have the option to adopt the state system or develop their own, as long as the system meets statutory and regulatory requirements and is approved by the state Department of Education.

Teaching Standards

Kentucky's Framework for Teaching standards form the backbone of PGES. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive. The 22 standards nest in four domains:

1. [Planning and Preparation](#)
2. [Classroom Environment](#)
3. [Instruction](#)
4. [Professional Responsibilities](#)

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the KCAS: The department adapted its Framework for Teaching standards from the 2011 Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core

Kentucky (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

environment. The department also aligned the standards to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, which are also widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. Further, in 2014 the department revised the standards to take into account the state's program of studies and the KCAS. As such, Kentucky's updated Framework for Teaching standards provide explicit guidance for teachers and evaluators on effective teaching in a KCAS environment.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the PGES system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the KCAS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of ELA and math.

The separate components of PGES listed below are not assigned weights or percentages; instead, evaluators examine all the evidence of these components, using professional judgment and a matrix of criteria developed by the department to determine a teacher's overall rating on the Framework for Teaching standards.

Professional Practice: The required sources of evidence include the measures listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations by an administrator, using the Framework for Teaching rubric
- ◆ A minimum of one peer observation (only during a summative evaluation year)
- ◆ Supporting evidence
- ◆ Professional growth plan developed collaboratively by the teacher and evaluator
- ◆ Self-reflection of teacher practice
- ◆ Student surveys
- ◆ Additional district-determined sources of evidence, as approved by the department

Alignment of the Framework for Teaching Rubric to the KCAS: This classroom observation rubric is adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching and is aligned to the InTASC standards, both of which define the skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The department has not undertaken a revision of its classroom observation rubric since it adopted the KCAS. Additionally, questions in the student survey are aligned to Kentucky's Framework for Teaching standards, so survey results do provide some information related to teaching and learning of the KCAS.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. Student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects (Grades Four Through Eight in ELA and Math):* Annual state assessments (student growth percentiles, or SGP, are calculated) and a student growth goal (SGG) developed by teachers and approved by principals.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* An SGG developed by teachers and approved by principals.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the KCAS:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Since 2011-12, Kentucky has administered the Kentucky Performance Rating of Education Progress (K-PREP) tests, which it reports are fully aligned to the KCAS for grades three through eight in ELA (reading and writing) and math. Kentucky uses ACT's QualityCore end-of-course assessments for high school. ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which these assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math, and literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects. Kentucky was once a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, but withdrew from PARCC in 2014. The state continues to monitor the work of both PARCC and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, and anticipates releasing a Request for Proposal (RFP) in the future for developing new, aligned assessments. To support teachers and principals in selecting, creating and approving SGGs aligned to the KCAS where appropriate, the department offers tools and statewide training for teachers and evaluators.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* See information in the For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects bullet above about the tools, guidance and training the department provides to facilitate the local development of SGGs that are aligned to the KCAS where appropriate.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved KCAS Instruction

Beginning in 2014-15, non-tenured teachers receive a summative evaluation annually. Tenured teachers who earned a rating of "Effective" or above receive a summative evaluation every three years. However, every teacher sets SGGs annually, and they use data from all available measures annually to inform feedback and professional growth. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the KCAS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and principals are required to use PGES data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement, and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support local use of effectiveness data, the department provides districts with an online technology platform (Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System, or CIITS). Districts use these data and online resources to inform improvement plans, set goals for the following year and ensure the appropriate professional learning supports are in place. The department also provides online, on-demand trainings for evaluators on providing feedback and using Kentucky's Framework for Teaching to enhance instructional practice.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Kentucky demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. The department uses aggregate teacher effectiveness data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, monitor implementation, and identify districts that may serve as models for best practice as well as those that may need additional supports. These data can inform the department's ongoing development of large-scale professional learning and other supports. The department also provides individualized online professional learning resources (such as PD360) through CIITS for teachers, based on their evaluation results.

Kentucky

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines Kentucky's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS, which include the Common Core in English language arts, or ELA, and math) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Kentucky piloted its Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PPGES) in 2013-14 and began statewide implementation in 2014-15. The system will not impact personnel decisions until 2015-16. Districts have the option to adopt the state system or develop their own, as long as the system meets statutory and regulatory requirements and is approved by the state Department of Education.

Leadership Standards

Kentucky's Performance Standards for leaders form the backbone of PPGES. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Instructional Leadership
2. School Climate
3. Human Resources Management
4. Organizational Management
5. Communication and Community Relations
6. Professionalism

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the KCAS: The department worked with Dr. James Stronge of the College of William and Mary to develop its Performance Standards based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. The ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department has not updated the standards to further align them to the KCAS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of PPGES, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the KCAS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of ELA and math.

The separate components of PPGES listed below are not assigned weights or percentages; instead, evaluators examine all the evidence of these components, using professional judgment and a matrix of criteria developed by the department to determine a leader's overall rating on the leadership standards.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Annual state assessments, with goals set by the department
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* A minimum of two student growth goals (SGGs) directly tied to a school's improvement plan and achievement gaps, developed by principals and approved by evaluators

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the KCAS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Since 2011-12, Kentucky has administered the Kentucky Performance Rating of Education Progress (K-PREP) tests, which it reports are fully aligned to the KCAS for grades three through eight in ELA (reading and writing) and math. Kentucky uses ACT's QualityCore end-of-course assessments for high school. ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which these assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math, and literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects. Kentucky was once a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, but withdrew from PARCC in 2014. The state continues to monitor the work of both PARCC and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, and anticipates releasing a Request for Proposal (RFP) in the future for developing new, aligned assessments.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support principals in selecting and creating SGGs aligned to the KCAS where appropriate, the department provides principals and evaluators with guidance, tools and training by grade and subject area.

Professional Practice Rubric: Measures that inform a leader's rating on the Professional Practice Rubric include those listed below.

- ◆ *Professional Growth Plan:* The plan is developed collaboratively by the principal and supervisor.
- ◆ *Stakeholder Feedback:* Feedback is solicited through surveys of district staff and teachers on school working conditions and principal leadership.
- ◆ *Other Information:* Self-reflection on principal practice, observations or school site visits by the evaluator, documentation and artifacts, and conferences between the principal and evaluator also provide evidence of a principal's performance.

Alignment of the Professional Practice Rubric to the KCAS: The Professional Practice Rubric assesses principals on criteria in the Performance Standards and is aligned to the ISLLC standards, which include general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. However, the department has not undertaken a revision of the rubric to more explicitly align it to the KCAS. A district can opt to use a different rubric as long as it addresses the Performance Standards. The department reviews and approves rubrics selected by districts. Regarding stakeholder feedback, the surveys provide some information related to the KCAS. Kentucky administers Vanderbilt University's Val-Ed Survey and the Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Kentucky Survey in alternating years. The Val-Ed Survey addresses topics related to the ISLLC standards, and the TELL Kentucky Survey assesses working conditions in a school. Feedback from the evaluator and a principal's self-reflection may or may not include KCAS-specific references.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved KCAS Instruction

Beginning in 2014-15, principals receive a summative evaluation every two years, though professional growth planning, self-reflection and site visits from the supervisor occur annually. The ways in which data from PPGES are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the KCAS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and evaluators are encouraged to use PPGES data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate

Kentucky (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

professional learning. To support local use of effectiveness data, the department has provided districts with an online technology platform (Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System, or CIITS). Districts can use data from CIITS to inform improvement plans, set goals for the following year and ensure the appropriate professional learning supports are in place.

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Kentucky demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. The department uses aggregate principal effectiveness data to identify state-wide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, monitor implementation, and identify districts that may serve as models for best practice and those that may need additional supports. These data can inform the department's ongoing development of large-scale professional learning and other supports. The department also provides individualized online professional learning resources (such as PD360) through CIITS for principals, based on their evaluation results.

Louisiana

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Louisiana's new teacher support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Louisiana implemented its Compass system statewide in 2012-13. However, through 2015 the state will not require that value-added student growth and achievement data be used in teachers' ratings.

Teaching Standards

The Compass Teacher Rubric, which encompasses Louisiana's Framework for Teaching, establishes the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Setting Instructional Outcomes
2. Managing Classroom Procedures
3. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
4. Engaging Students in Learning
5. Using Assessment in Instruction

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the Common Core: This is an aspect of the work in which Louisiana is undertaking leading efforts. The Compass Teacher Rubric is an abridged version of the 2011 Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge

that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. Further, the state Department of Education updated Louisiana’s Framework for Teaching to sharpen its focus on competencies that are most closely aligned to the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Compass system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers’ competency/accomplishments in teaching the Common Core. For example, the student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the five standards through two components.

Professional Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher’s rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Feedback (ongoing conversations between a principal and a teacher about how the teacher can improve on specific actions)
- ◆ Review of teaching artifacts

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the Common Core: This is an aspect of the work in which Louisiana is undertaking leading efforts. Louisiana’s Compass Teacher Rubric, which includes observable elements, is based on its Framework for Teaching, which Louisiana adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching and refined to sharpen its focus on the Common Core. As such, the rubric articulates specific skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The department also provides additional tools that further define expectations of Common Core teaching and learning in specific grades and subjects, including an instructional video library and accompanying materials that link the Common Core standards and instructional shifts to the Compass rubric, and supplemental guidance and exemplars for students with disabilities.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Louisiana, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. It is calculated based on the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - Annual state assessments are included. However, through 2014 and 2015 there will be no requirement that value-added student achievement data be used in teachers’ ratings.
 - Two Student Learning Targets (SLTs), developed collaboratively by teachers and principals, are included.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Two SLTs, developed collaboratively by teachers and principals, are included.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Louisiana reports that in 2013-14, it fully aligned its own summative Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) and integrated LEAP (iLEAP) tests for grades three through eight and its high school end-of-course tests in ELA and math. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Louisiana plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three

Louisiana (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

through eight in 2014-15. Louisiana will not adopt the high school PARCC tests, and instead will continue administering its own fully aligned high school end-of-course tests. To support teachers and principals in creating SLTs aligned to the Common Core where appropriate, the department provides an SLT template and guide, exemplar SLTs covering a number of grades K-12 for ELA and math as well as other content areas, and exemplar SLTs for teachers of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* See the information in the For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects bullet above about tools the department provides to facilitate the local development of SLTs that are aligned to the Common Core where appropriate.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

In Louisiana, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the Compass system are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and principals are required to use Compass data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To enhance local use of evaluation data, the department provides guidance on how to use data to guide conversations with and among teachers. It also provides a sample agenda and on-demand webinars on summative evaluation conversations and feedback for evaluators. The department produces an annual Compass Final Report, with implementation findings and detailed evaluation data, to support regional network teams and district staff in using evaluation data. Additionally, district and school staff can access the Compass Information System (CIS) to identify trends in strengths and areas for improvement, in order to support teachers on a larger scale. The department also offers an extensive library of instructional videos aligned to the Compass Teacher Rubric, including footage of Louisiana classroom instruction. Videos may be used by individual teachers or evaluators for self-guided professional development or for school- or district-level professional development. (See the accompanying state profile on *Aligned Teaching Resources* for more information on the video library.)
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Through the CIS, the department aggregates teacher-level Compass data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement. These trends inform the department's ongoing development of large-scale professional learning and other supports.

Louisiana is making leading efforts to align its teacher evaluation system to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core. Louisiana's Compass Teacher Rubric, which encompasses Louisiana's Framework for Teaching, is an abridged version of the 2011 Danielson Framework for Teaching. The state Department of Education further updated Louisiana's Framework for Teaching to sharpen the focus on those competencies that are most closely aligned to the Common Core. The department also updated its classroom observation tool to define specific skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. Further, the department uses an electronic platform (the Compass Information System) to enhance the use of evaluation data for professional learning, and provides guidance to districts and schools on using evaluation results to inform professional growth. The department also offers an extensive library of instructional videos aligned to its classroom observation tool to support professional learning.

Louisiana

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines Louisiana's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Louisiana implemented its Compass system statewide in 2012-13.

Leadership Standards

Louisiana's Compass Leader Rubric establishes the competencies for which leaders strive. The seven leadership standards nest in three domains:

1. School Vision
2. School Culture
3. Instruction

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the Common Core: This is an aspect of the work in which Louisiana is undertaking leading efforts. The state Department of Education based the components of effective leadership as detailed in the Compass Leader Rubric on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. Further, the department updated the rubric to explicitly define skills and knowledge that principals need to be effective instructional leaders in a Common Core environment.

Louisiana (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of Compass, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the rubric through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Louisiana, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is measured by two Student Learning Targets (SLTs), determined collaboratively by the principal and evaluator, with requirements listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* SLTs should align with measures used in the school accountability model (which includes growth on annual state assessments), help students achieve college and career readiness, and tie into district goals.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* SLTs should reflect the rigor of the Common Core and align to the SLTs used in evaluation of a school's teachers.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Louisiana reports that in 2013-14, it fully aligned its own summative Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) and integrated LEAP (iLEAP) tests for grades three through eight and its high school end-of-course tests in ELA and math. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Louisiana plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight in 2014-15. Louisiana will not adopt the high school PARCC tests, and instead will continue administering its own fully aligned high school end-of-course tests in ELA and math.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support principals and evaluators in creating SLTs aligned to the Common Core where appropriate, the department provides an SLT template and guide, as well as exemplar SLTs for leaders by grade band.

Professional Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. The measure that informs a leader's rating on this component is listed below.

- ◆ *Compass Leader Rubric:* Principals receive ratings on the rubric based on site visits by the evaluator, a professional growth plan developed by the principal and evaluator, evidence or documentation of principal practice, and teacher and support staff surveys. Ongoing feedback and discussion between the principal and evaluator may be considered, too.

Alignment of the Compass Leader Rubric to the Common Core: This is an aspect of the work in which Louisiana is undertaking leading efforts. The department developed the Compass Leader Rubric under the guidance of the state Advisory Committee for Educator Excellence, comprised of educators,

union representatives, parents and state Board of Education members. The rubric was designed to align to Louisiana's Compass Teacher Rubric, which the department adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching and then further refined to sharpen its focus on the Common Core. Further, the Compass Leader Rubric provides explicit guidance on and concrete examples of specific skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department plans to continue to refine the rubric so that it even more thoroughly addresses specific aspects of school leadership within a Common Core environment.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

In Louisiana, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the Compass system are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Evaluators are required to use Compass data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning, and districts are encouraged to use aggregated Compass data to guide district-level professional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the electronic Compass Information System (CIS) offers districts real-time reporting capabilities, while the department shares regular CIS reports and guidance with district and school staff. The department produces an annual Compass Final Report, with implementation findings and detailed evaluation data, to support regional network teams and district staff in using evaluation data. The department also provides guidance and tools on how to use data to guide conversations with and provide feedback to leaders.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department aggregates individual Compass data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, which can inform initiative planning and guide state-level professional development.

Louisiana is making leading efforts to align its Compass leader evaluation system to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core. The state Department of Education updated its Compass Leader Rubric since the state adopted the Common Core, to explicitly define skills and knowledge that principals need to be effective instructional leaders in a Common Core environment. The Compass Leader Rubric has also been aligned to Compass Teacher Rubric, which Louisiana refined to sharpen its focus on the instructional shifts inherent in the Common Core. As such, the Compass Leader Rubric provides concrete guidance for principals and evaluators on how principals can support teachers in effectively implementing the Common Core. Further, the department provides guidance to districts on using Compass data to inform the provision of professional learning and support for principals, and aggregates individual Compass data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement, which can inform initiative planning and guide state-level professional development.

Maryland

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Maryland's new teacher effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the new Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Maryland educators implemented the State Teacher Evaluation Model statewide in 2013-14, though the state received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to delay the use of state assessment data in calculations for one year (all other parts of the model are in effect). House Bill 1167/Senate Bill 676 of 2014 reinforced this decision by requiring that state assessment data not impact personnel decisions before 2016-17 (unless already mutually agreed upon by local districts and unions). Districts can use the state model system or design their own evaluation model. Local district models are reviewed and approved by the Maryland State Department of Education.

Teaching Standards

Maryland's State Teacher Evaluation Model, which establishes the competencies for which teachers strive, is similar to the Danielson Framework for Teaching. The Maryland Educator Effectiveness Council (MEEC) endorsed the use of the Danielson Framework for Teaching and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) professional teaching standards as the basis for evaluation systems that local districts may design. The professional teaching competencies are as follows:

1. [Planning and Preparation](#)
2. [Classroom Environment](#)
3. [Instruction](#)
4. [Professional Responsibilities](#)

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards: The Danielson Framework for Teaching and the InTASC standards are widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The department has not revised these standards to further align them to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the State Teacher Evaluation Model, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In the State Teacher Evaluation Model, teachers are evaluated through two components.

Professional Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher’s rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Self-assessment
- ◆ Feedback from the evaluator, including mid-year and end-of-year conferences between the teacher and the evaluator
- ◆ Artifact collection and review

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the Maryland College and Career-Ready

Standards: Maryland’s classroom observation rubric is adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching, which defines skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The department has not revised its rubric to further align it to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. Districts that design their own evaluation system must provide the department with assurances that the districts will provide support to teachers and evaluators to ensure that they understand how the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards are reflected in their evaluation system.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Maryland, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects in Elementary and Middle Grades:*

- 20 percent must reflect the annual state assessment, though districts have some flexibility in how this is calculated.
- 30 percent is based on other measures of student learning, as determined by districts. Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) have been chosen by all districts, though they are not a required measure. Districts have discretion to set SLOs at the district level, at the school level, at the grade or subject level, and also specific to the classroom (for example, developed by teachers and approved by principals). Some districts use at least one school-level SLO and one classroom-level SLO. Districts may use additional local measures of student assessment (for example, national assessments, district assessments, classroom assessments) in addition to or in lieu of SLOs.
- **Note:** Based on approval from the U.S. Department of Education and state legislation, for 2014-15 and 2015-16, SLOs and other locally-selected measures will comprise 50 percent of a teacher’s evaluation rating. One SLO must be informed by the annual state assessment where appropriate; the state assessments do not serve as outcome measures but do serve to identify student progress and appropriate growth targets.

◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects (for example, K-2 in reading, writing and math) and High School Teachers:*

- 50 percent is based on other measures of student learning, as determined by districts. SLOs have been chosen by all districts, though they are not a required measure (with the exception of teachers of high school courses with associated annual state assessments — these teachers must use at least one SLO tied to the annual state assessment, per the U.S. Department of Education). Districts have discretion to set SLOs at the district level, at the school level, at the

Maryland (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

grade or subject level, and also specific to the classroom (for example, developed by teachers and approved by principals). Some districts use at least one school-level SLO and one classroom-level SLO. Districts may use additional local measures of student assessment (for example, national assessments, district assessments, classroom assessments) in addition to or in lieu of SLOs.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects in Elementary and Middle Grades:* Maryland has not aligned its own summative Maryland School Assessment (MSA) in reading and math grades three through eight in English and math to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Maryland will implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight in 2014-15. Additionally, Maryland received approval from the U.S. Department of Education for elementary and middle grades schools to select students to participate in the PARCC spring 2014 field test in one content area (either ELA or math), while taking the MSA in the other content area. Students not selected for the field test took the MSA in both content areas. One or two classrooms from nearly every Maryland school participated in the field test. To facilitate the local development of SLOs that are aligned to the new standards where appropriate, the department provides a framework and guiding questions for writing SLOs and additional guidance to determine the quality and alignment of SLOs. The department also created online modules on creating high-quality SLOs. In 2014-15, the department is providing training for educators at all levels on developing aligned and rigorous SLOs.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects and High School Teachers:* Maryland has not aligned its own summative Maryland High School Assessments (HSA) in English and math to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. As a member of PARCC, Maryland will implement the new, fully aligned PARCC Algebra I and English 10 high school assessments in 2014-15. See the information in the For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects bullet above about resources the department provides to facilitate the local development of SLOs that are aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards where appropriate.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards Instruction

As of 2013-14, non-tenured teachers and those rated “ineffective” are evaluated annually, and tenured teachers and those rated “effective/highly effective” are evaluated on a three-year cycle. The ways in which data from teacher evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Principals are required to use teacher evaluation data to identify individual teachers’ strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate profes-

sional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the department provides ongoing training and support for every principal and for district staff, to ensure that all supervisors understand how to use evaluation results to tailor professional development and to refine school improvement plans.

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts report de-identified, detail-level individual teacher evaluation data to the department. These data can inform the department’s ongoing planning of large-scale professional learning and other supports.

Maryland

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines the components of Maryland’s new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the new Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards within the system’s requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Maryland educators implemented the State Principal Evaluation Model statewide in 2013-14. In 2014, Maryland enacted House Bill 1167/Senate Bill 676, which requires that state assessment data not impact personnel decisions before 2016-17 (unless already mutually agreed upon by local districts and unions), though all other parts of the model are in effect. Districts can use the state model system or design their own evaluation model. Local district models are reviewed and approved by the Maryland State Department of Education.

Leadership Standards

Maryland’s State Principal Evaluation Model is based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and establishes the competencies for which leaders strive. The Maryland Educator Effectiveness Council (MEEC) also endorsed the use of the ISLLC standards as the basis for evaluation systems that local districts may design. The ISLLC standards establish the following instructional leadership competencies:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. School Vision | 7. Professional Development |
| 2. School Culture | 8. Stakeholder Engagement |
| 3. Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment | 9. School Operations and Budget |
| 4. Observation/Evaluation of Teachers | 10. Effective Communication |
| 5. Integration of Appropriate Assessments | 11. Influencing the School Community |
| 6. Use of Technology and Data | 12. Integrity, Fairness and Ethics |

Maryland (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards:

The 2008 ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. Further, the department currently is revising its leadership standards to more explicitly define skills and knowledge that principals need to be effective leaders within the context of the new Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the State Principal Evaluation Model, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. The student growth and achievement section focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the 12 leadership standards through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Maryland, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

◆ *For Elementary and Middle Grades Principals:*

- *Data from tested grades and subjects*
 - 20 percent annual state assessments
 - 10 percent Maryland School Progress Index (Maryland's school accountability system)
- *Data from non-tested grades and subjects*
 - 10 percent Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) determined by districts
 - 10 percent SLOs determined by principals

◆ *For High School Principals:*

- *Data from tested grades and subjects*
 - 20 percent SLOs based on the annual state assessments and a combination of Advanced Placement (AP) exam scores and the Maryland School Progress Index
 - 10 percent School Progress Index
- *Data from non-tested grades and subjects*
 - 20 percent SLOs determined by districts or by principals

- ◆ **Note:** Based on approval from the U.S. Department of Education and state legislation, for 2014-15 and 2015-16, SLOs and other locally-selected measures will comprise 50 percent of a principal's evaluation rating. One SLO must be informed by the annual state assessment where appropriate; the state assessments do not serve as outcome measures but do serve to identify student progress and appropriate growth targets.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Maryland has not aligned its own summative Maryland School Assessment (MSA) in reading and math for grades three through eight, or its Maryland High School Assessments (HSA) in English and math, to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Maryland expects to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and the Algebra I and English 10 high school assessments in 2014-15. Additionally, Maryland received approval from the U.S. Department of Education for elementary and middle grades schools to select students to participate in the PARCC spring 2014 field test in one content area (either ELA or math), while taking the MSA in the other content area. Students not selected for the field test took the MSA in both content areas. One or two classrooms from nearly every Maryland school participated in the field test. Regarding AP exam alignment, the College Board reports that student learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses and AP exams, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses. (See the accompanying report on *Accountability* for information on how Maryland's School Progress Index aligns to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards.)
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Currently the department provides an SLO framework, guiding questions and online modules to support the local development of SLOs aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards where appropriate. In 2014-15, the department is providing training for educators at all levels on developing aligned and rigorous SLOs.

Professional Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. The measure that informs a leader's rating on this component is listed below.

- ◆ *Professional Practice Rubric:* The rubric generates a principal's rating on the ISLLC standards, based on goal-setting between the principal and evaluator, site visits by the evaluator and ongoing conferences between the principal and evaluator.

Alignment of Professional Practice to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards: The ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. Further, the department currently is revising its Professional Practice Rubric to more explicitly align it to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards Instruction

As of 2013-14, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Evaluators are required to use principal evaluation data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department provides training and support for district staff to ensure that all principal supervisors understand how to use evaluation results to tailor professional development and to refine school improvement plans.

Maryland (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts aggregate individual principal evaluation data to the district level and send it to the department. These data can inform the department's ongoing planning of large-scale professional learning and other supports.

Mississippi

Evaluation of Teachers

This profile outlines the components of Mississippi's new teacher effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new College- and Career-Readiness Standards (CCRS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Mississippi began piloting its Mississippi Teacher Evaluation System in 2012-13, and is phasing in components of the system, with full statewide implementation planned for 2015-16.

Teaching Standards

Mississippi's Teacher Performance Standards form the backbone of the Mississippi Teacher Evaluation System. They establish the competencies for which teachers strive. The 20 standards nest in five domains:

1. Planning
2. Assessment
3. Instruction
4. Learning Environment
5. Professional Responsibilities

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the CCRS: The state Department of Education used the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and the Danielson Framework for Teaching as resources while developing its Teacher Performance Standards. The Danielson Framework for Teaching and the InTASC standards are widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The department has not revised the standards to more explicitly align them to the CCRS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Mississippi Teacher Evaluation System, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the CCRS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the 20 Teacher Performance Standards through three components.

Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric (M-STAR): This component comprises 30 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Pre- and post-observation conferences between the teacher and evaluator
- ◆ Review of teaching artifacts
- ◆ Self-assessment (filled out by the teacher and discussed with the principal)
- ◆ Student surveys (optional)

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the CCRS: The department worked with the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to develop its classroom observation rubric. The criteria in the rubric provide guidance to evaluators on how to determine if the state-adopted academic standards are being taught. The department currently does not plan to revise its rubric to incorporate the instructional shifts required by the CCRS. Additionally, districts may develop their own student surveys or use an established one, and the department provides sample student surveys for each school level.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Mississippi, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 20 percent schoolwide growth data on annual state assessments
 - 30 percent teacher-specific growth data on annual state assessments
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 20 percent schoolwide growth data on annual state assessments
 - 30 percent Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), developed by teachers and approved by principals

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCRS:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Mississippi did not align its Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2) for grades three through eight in ELA and math or its Subject Area Testing Program, Second Edition (SATP2) for high school in ELA and math to the CCRS. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, in 2014-15 Mississippi plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight, and in English II and Algebra I for high school.

Mississippi (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The department currently is developing protocols and guidelines for teachers and principals on creating CCRS-aligned SLOs where appropriate (for example, K-2 in ELA and math).

Professional Growth Goals: This component comprises 20 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. It is determined locally by teachers and principals, and is assessed through:

- ◆ 10 percent teacher-selected goal for improvement
- ◆ 10 percent principal-selected goal for teacher improvement

Alignment of the Professional Growth Goals to the CCRS: This component does not necessarily relate to the CCRS. Teachers and principals may select goals that may or may not provide information about how a teacher teaches the CCRS.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCRS Instruction

Beginning in 2015-16, when the Mississippi Teacher Evaluation System is implemented statewide, every teacher in each public school will be evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the CCRS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Principals are required to use teacher evaluation data to identify individual teachers’ strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. To enhance the local use of evaluation results for professional learning, the department provides school leaders with videos of evaluators leading feedback sessions and conferences with teachers.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department provides videos of classroom instruction tied to each of the domains of the M-STAR rubric to support self-guided professional development for teachers. Additionally, when the Mississippi Teacher Evaluation System is implemented statewide, districts will be required to submit individual teacher evaluation results by teaching standard to the department. This information could inform the department’s planning of large-scale professional learning.

Mississippi

Evaluation of Leaders

This profile outlines the components of Mississippi's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new College- and Career-Readiness Standards (CCRS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Mississippi implemented its Mississippi Principal Evaluation System statewide in 2013-14.

Leadership Standards

The Mississippi Standards for School Leaders form the backbone of the Mississippi Principal Evaluation System. They establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Vision of Learning
2. School Culture and Instructional Program
3. Organizational Management
4. Collaboration With Faculty and Community Members
5. Integrity, Fairness and Ethics
6. Understanding the Larger Context

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the CCRS: Mississippi adopted the 2008 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core, as its Mississippi Standards for School Leaders. The state Department of Education has not revised the standards further since it adopted the CCRS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Mississippi Principal Evaluation System, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the CCRS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the six Mississippi Standards for School Leaders through three components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Mississippi, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a leader's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Schoolwide student growth goals based on the annual state assessments.
 - One ELA student growth goal (25 percent)
 - One math student growth goal (25 percent)

Mississippi (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Data from non-tested grades and subjects are not included in a principal's evaluation in schools where data from tested grades and subjects are available. Schools that do not have any tested grades or subjects set their goals based upon data available, such as benchmark assessments or universal screener data. For 2014-15 and beyond, the department currently is revising its schoolwide student growth goal structure to enable the use of additional kinds of data.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCRS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Mississippi has not aligned its Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2) for grades three through eight in ELA and math, or its Subject Area Testing Program, Second Edition (SATP2) for high school in ELA and math to the CCRS. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, in 2014-15 Mississippi plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight, and in English II and Algebra I for high school. To support principals and evaluators in determining CCRS-aligned student growth goals where appropriate, the department currently is developing guidance and offering training to educators.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Data from non-tested grades and subjects are not included in a principal's evaluation in schools where data from tested grades and subjects are available. Schools that do not have any tested grades or subjects set their goals based upon data available, and the necessity of alignment to the CCRS depends on the subject. See the information in the Data From Tested Grades and Subjects bullet immediately above about tools the department is developing to facilitate the local creation of student growth goals aligned to the CCRS where appropriate (for example, K-2 in ELA and math).

Stakeholder Surveys: This component comprises 30 percent of a leader's evaluation. Measures that inform a leader's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Stakeholder survey (feedback from certified staff in the school and from the principal's supervisor)
- ◆ Self-assessment discussed with the supervisor

Alignment of the Stakeholder Survey component to the CCRS: Mississippi uses the Circle Survey (developed by the Research and Curriculum Unit at Mississippi State University) to garner feedback about principal performance. The Circle Survey addresses knowledge and competencies articulated in the 2008 ISLLC standards and the leadership standards of the Stronge Performance Evaluation System (created by Dr. James Stronge at the College of William and Mary — and aligned to the ISLLC standards), both of which are widely regarded as including general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department expects to revise the survey in the near future to further align it to the Mississippi Standards for School Leaders. Beginning in 2014-15, districts will be required to use the Circle Survey as part of the Mississippi Principal Evaluation System, though they can purchase other stakeholder surveys for their own continuous improvement purposes. Additionally, a principal's self-assessment and feedback from the principal's supervisor may or may not include CCRS-specific references.

Organizational Goals: This component comprises 20 percent of a leader’s evaluation. The measure that informs a leader’s rating on this component is listed below.

- ◆ Two organizational goals (each comprising 10 percent) developed collaboratively by the principal and evaluator. The goals are intended to target each school’s greatest area of need for improvement. Goals can address staff or student attendance, graduation or dropout rate, subgroup performance on the annual state assessments, or percentage of English learners who attain English language proficiency.

Alignment of the Organizational Goals Measures to the CCRS: The goals provide some information related to the CCRS. The goals are intended to reflect Mississippi’s Standards for School Leaders, which are based on the 2008 ISLLC standards (widely regarded as including general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core). To assist principals and evaluators in selecting aligned goals, the department provides videos and guidance on goal-setting.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCRS Instruction

Every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluations are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the CCRS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Evaluators are required to use principal evaluation data to identify individual principals’ strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. Principals are required to set professional growth goals (PGGs) with their evaluators based on their evaluation results and areas for improvement, and the department provides guidance on setting PGGs and rubrics to assess principal achievement of the PGGs. To enhance local use of evaluation data, in 2013-14 the department provided Canvas, an online management tool, to support districts with data collection and analysis and to inform district-level professional learning.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department accesses some statewide evaluation data to inform its planning of state-level professional development.

New York

Evaluation of Teachers

This profile outlines the components of New York's new teacher effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core (adopted as New York's Common Core Learning Standards, or CCLS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

New York implemented its Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) statewide in 2012-13.

Teaching Standards

The New York Teaching Standards form the backbone of the APPR. They establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Knowledge of Students and Student Learning
2. Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning
3. Instructional Practice
4. Learning Environment
5. Assessment for Student Learning
6. Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration
7. Professional Growth

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the CCLS: A committee of educators developed the New York Teaching Standards by drawing on research and best practices, as well as their own judgment and expertise. The committee also considered the Common Core and ensured that the standards they developed aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. The InTASC standards are widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. The New York State Board of Regents adopted the New York Teaching Standards in 2011. The New York State Education Department has not further updated the standards to more explicitly align to the CCLS.

Components of the System

This section describes the components of the APPR, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the CCLS. The student growth and achievement section focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In New York, many decisions about specific measures, instruments and procedures are left to local collective bargaining agreements within state law. This section describes the evaluation requirements per state law, but many of the decisions left to districts can vary widely. Teachers are evaluated on the seven standards through two components of APPR.

Other Measures of Teacher Effectiveness: This component comprises 60 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ *Teacher Practice Rubric (31 to 60 Percent)*: This measure is based on a teacher's rating on a Teacher Practice Rubric, selected from a list of state-approved rubrics and negotiated locally. The rating is based on at least two classroom observations by the principal or a trained administrator. Observations can be conducted in person or using video.
- ◆ *Additional Measures (Up to 29 Percent)*: Other sources of evidence of teacher proficiency, selected by districts, are included (for example, student or parent surveys, peer observations, student portfolios).

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the CCLS: This is an aspect of the work in which New York is undertaking leading efforts. Districts and their unions negotiate their selection of a Teacher Practice Rubric from a list of rubrics approved by the department, or districts can submit a variance request to the department to use a locally-developed rubric. All of the approved rubrics are aligned to the New York Teaching Standards, which are rooted in the InTASC standards. As such, the rubrics define skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a CCLS environment. The department also provides evidence guides that help evaluators identify evidence of the CCLS instructional shifts using the district-selected rubrics. Further, the department regularly reviews for approval new rubrics that more thoroughly address the specifics of the CCLS (for example, rubrics that provide explicit guidance and concrete examples of what CCLS teaching and learning look like in practice). Regarding the additional measures, the department provides a list of state-approved student and parent surveys for district use. The department approves only surveys that developers demonstrate are broadly aligned to the New York Teaching Standards for teachers.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In New York, the student growth and achievement component comprises 40 percent of a teacher's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects in Elementary and Middle Grades:*
 - Student growth on annual state assessments, using the state-provided growth model, is included. This measure was weighted at 20 percent for 2012-13 to 2014-15. (In 2014, the board approved the use of the current enhanced student growth model beginning in 2014-15; for more detail, see <http://www.engageny.org/resource/resources-about-state-growth-measures>.)
 - A measure of student growth and achievement selected by districts from a list of state-determined options (for example, locally-developed assessments, schoolwide student growth on annual state assessments) is included. This measure has been weighted at 20 percent for 2012-13 to 2014-15.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects and High School Teachers:*
 - 20 percent Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), developed according to state and district guidelines
 - 20 percent measure of student growth and achievement selected by districts from a list of state-determined options (for example, locally-developed assessments, schoolwide student growth on annual state assessments)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCLS:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects in Elementary and Middle Grades:* Since 2012-13, New York has been administering its own Common Core ELA and math tests in grades three through eight, which it reports are fully aligned to the CCLS. New York is a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, but it will not adopt the

New York (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

PARCC assessments in 2014-15. New York participated in the PARCC field testing for some students during 2013-14 and is scheduled to do so again in 2014-15. The decision to adopt new assessments for 2015-16 and beyond is yet to be made. Until the board establishes a timeline for transition, New York will continue to administer its own fully aligned assessments. For the measures selected by districts, the department provides an approved list of vendor assessments for district use.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects and High School Teachers:* New York reports that its high school English and Algebra I Regents Exams align to the CCLS as of 2013-14, and that it is in the midst of aligning others — geometry in 2014-15 and Algebra II in 2015-16. To support local creation of SLOs aligned to the CCLS where appropriate, the department provides a large number of model SLOs developed by districts, SLO templates, extensive guidance and webinars on SLO development (including support for teachers of K-2 and English learners) and advanced learning opportunities for educators with prior knowledge of SLOs. The department worked with the Reform Support Network to develop an SLO Toolkit and multi-state SLO rubric that include alignment to the Common Core. To support district selection of student growth and achievement measures from state-determined options aligned to the CCLS, the department also provides an approved list of vendor assessments for district use. (For information on alignment of these assessments to the CCLS, see http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/assessments/assess_sd_boces.html.) If districts choose to use their locally-developed assessments, they must verify the comparability and rigor of the assessments to the department.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCLS Instruction

As of 2012-13, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually through APPR. The ways in which data from APPR are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the CCLS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and principals are expected to use APPR data as one source of information to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning opportunities at the individual, school and district levels. To support local use of evaluation data, the department offers a number of grants to leading districts to help them implement and demonstrate best practices in creating systems and cultures of continuous educator improvement and recognition and retention of effective educators (known as Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness grants, in which approximately 25 percent of districts participate). The department also developed a professional development toolkit for district and school leaders on managing the APPR process and using the evaluation system to deliver feedback and inform continuous improvement. Additionally, the department provides supports and intervention for high-need and low-performing schools and districts. For example, it utilizes its Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness, which places an emphasis on improving teacher effectiveness. Further, the law requires that APPR data shall be a significant factor for

employment decisions, including but not limited to promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation, which decisions are to be made in accordance with locally developed procedures.

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Though the department does not have access to each individual teacher's observation data, districts submit individual teacher summative ratings by APPR component. These data allow the department to identify statewide trends in educator effectiveness (including differentiation across educator ratings), in the correlation of results between student growth and other measures of educator effectiveness, and in the equitable distribution of educator effectiveness across classrooms, schools and districts. These data also provide information on district implementation of the evaluation system, and state law allows the commissioner to take corrective action as needed, based on these data. The state-level data also inform the department's ongoing development of policies and supports for improving educator effectiveness.

New York is making leading efforts to align its teacher evaluation system to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core (called Common Core Learning Standards, or CCLS). In particular, the New York Teaching Standards are aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and were developed with the CCLS in mind. Also, the New York State Education Department provides supplementary resources to help evaluators and teachers identify evidence of the CCLS instructional shifts during classroom observations.

New York

Evaluation of Leaders

This profile outlines the components of New York's leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core (adopted as New York's Common Core Learning Standards, or CCLS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

New York implemented its Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) statewide in 2012-13.

New York (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Leadership Standards

New York's Educational Leadership Standards form the backbone of APPR. They establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Know and understand what it takes to be a leader
2. Have a vision for schools that they constantly share and promote
3. Communicate clearly and effectively
4. Collaborate and cooperate with others
5. Persevere and take the long view
6. Support, develop and nurture staff
7. Hold themselves and others responsible and accountable
8. Never stop learning and honing their skills
9. Have the courage to take informed risks

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the CCLS: The New York State Education Department based the Educational Leadership Standards on the 2008 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of instructional leadership for the Common Core. The department has not updated the Educational Leadership Standards since it adopted the CCLS.

Components of the System

This section describes the components of APPR, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the CCLS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In New York, many decisions about specific measures, instruments and procedures are left to local collective bargaining agreements within state law. This section describes the evaluation requirements per state law, but many of the specific decisions left to districts can vary widely. Leaders are evaluated on the nine Educational Leadership Standards through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In New York, the student growth and achievement component comprises 40 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures below.

◆ *For Elementary, Middle Grades and High School Principals:*

- *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - Student growth on annual state assessments, using the state-provided growth model, is included. This measure has been weighted at 20 percent for 2012-13 to 2014-15. (In 2014, the New York State Board of Regents approved the continued use of the current enhanced student growth model. For more detail, see <http://www.engageny.org/resource/resources-about-state-growth-measures>.)

- A measure of student growth and achievement selected by districts from a list of state-determined options (for example, locally-developed assessments, schoolwide student growth on annual state assessments), is included. This measure has been weighted at 20 percent for 2012-13 to 2014-15.

◆ *For those principals for whom a state-provided growth score cannot be generated:*

- *Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) will be used.*

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the CCLS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2012-13, New York began administering its own Common Core ELA and math tests in grades three through eight, which it reports are fully aligned to the CCLS. New York reports that its high school English and Algebra I Regents Exams align to the CCLS as of 2013-14, and that it is in the midst of aligning others — geometry in 2014-15 and Algebra II in 2015-16. New York is a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, but it will not adopt the PARCC assessments in 2014-15. New York participated in the PARCC field testing for some students during 2013-14 and is scheduled to do so again in 2014-15. The decision to adopt new assessments for 2015-16 and beyond is yet to be made. Until the board establishes a timeline for transition, New York will continue to administer its own fully aligned assessments. For the measures selected by districts, the department provides extensive resources and webinars on selection, as well as an approved list of vendor assessments for district use. (For information on alignment of these assessments to the CCLS, see http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/assessments/assess_sd_boces.html.) If districts choose to use their own, locally-developed assessments, they must verify the comparability and rigor of the assessments to the department. The department also provides extensive resources and webinars on developing principal-specific SLOs focusing on schoolwide growth.

Other Measures of Principal Effectiveness: This component comprises 60 percent of a principal's evaluation. Measures that inform a leader's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ *Principal Practice Rubric (31 to 60 percent):* Districts and their unions negotiate their selection of a Principal Practice Rubric from a list of department-approved rubrics, or districts can submit a variance request to the department to use a locally-developed rubric. A principal's rating on the rubric is based on multiple school visits by the supervisor or other trained administrators and can include an independent evaluator. At least one site visit must be made by the supervisor.
- ◆ *Professional Goals (up to 29 percent):* Includes one or more ambitious and measurable goals that address improvements to teaching and learning, set collaboratively by principals and their superintendents. The goals are measured by evidence (for example, student or staff surveys, or a review of school documents).

Alignment of the Other Measures to the CCLS: All of the approved rubrics are aligned to the Educational Leadership Standards, which are based on the 2008 ISLLC standards. As such, the rubrics define general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the CCLS. The department has not undertaken a revision of the rubrics to more explicitly align them to the CCLS. However, the department regularly reviews for approval new rubrics that more thoroughly address the specifics of the CCLS. Additionally, professional goals may provide some information on principal leadership of CCLS-based instruction, as they may be tied to the teacher evaluation system and academic improvement.

New York (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved CCLS Instruction

Beginning in 2012-13, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually through APPR. The ways in which data from APPR are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the CCLS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and evaluators are expected to use APPR data as one source of information to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and to provide appropriate professional learning opportunities at the individual and district levels. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department offers a number of grants to leading districts to help them implement and demonstrate best practices in creating systems and cultures of continuous educator improvement, recognition and retention (known as Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness grants, in which approximately 25 percent of districts participate). The department also provides supports and intervention for high-need and low-performing schools and districts. For example, it uses its Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness, which places an emphasis on improving principal effectiveness. Additionally, the law requires that APPR data shall be a significant factor for employment decisions, including but not limited to promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation, which decisions are to be made in accordance with locally developed procedures.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Though the department does not have access to each individual principal's site visit data, districts submit individual principal summative ratings by APPR component. These data allow the department to identify statewide trends in leader effectiveness (including differentiation across ratings), in the correlation of results between student growth and other measures of leader effectiveness, and in the equitable distribution of leader effectiveness across schools and districts. These data also provide information on district implementation of the evaluation system, and state law allows the commissioner to take corrective action as needed, based on the data. The state-level data also inform the department's ongoing development of policies and supports for improving leader effectiveness.

North Carolina

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of North Carolina's new educator support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

The state revised its North Carolina Educator Evaluation System (NCEES) to incorporate student growth and achievement as of 2012-13.

Teaching Standards

North Carolina's Professional Teaching Standards form the backbone of the NCEES. They establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Demonstrate Leadership
2. Establish Environment
3. Know Content
4. Facilitate Learning
5. Reflect on Practice
6. Contribute to Academic Success

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the Common Core: The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission developed the Professional Teaching Standards in 1998. The Professional Teaching Standards define skills and knowledge needed for effective teaching in a standards-based instruction environment. The department has not revised the Professional Teaching Standards to further align them to the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of NCEES, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math.

Each component is weighted equally, and a teacher must meet a minimum level of performance on each component in order to be considered effective. Teachers are evaluated on the six standards through two components.

Teacher performance: Measures that inform a teacher's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, which can be formal and informal, using a rubric
- ◆ Self-assessment, which is filled out by the teacher and may be shared with the principal for discussion

North Carolina (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

- ◆ Conferences between the teacher and principal
- ◆ A professional development plan developed by the teacher and, in some cases, the principal
- ◆ A new student survey, currently being piloted by the department, may be included in the future, if approved by the state Board of Education, as an additional measure to inform a teacher's performance rating

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the Common Core: North Carolina's classroom observation rubric includes criteria needed to demonstrate effective standards-based teaching as defined in the Professional Teaching Standards. The department has not revised the classroom observation rubric or the teaching standards since it adopted the Common Core. However, the department offers supplementary tools, such as reflective questions, that incorporate explicit guidance and concrete examples for teachers and evaluators of what Common Core teaching and learning looks like, including the instructional shifts and rigor. Additionally, the new student survey, if used, will be aligned to the Professional Teaching Standards.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In North Carolina, student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Annual state assessment
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Depending on the grade and subject for a teacher, student growth and achievement can be measured by:
 - Student growth using common pre- and post-assessments (for example, reading comprehension assessments for K-2);
 - Analysis of student work submitted by a teacher for blind review by a trained reviewer with subject area expertise; or
 - A specialized area local district plan, developed by districts and approved by the department, for teachers whose teaching assignments are such that other measures of student learning are not appropriate.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Since 2012-13, North Carolina has administered its own end-of-grade (EOG) assessments for grades three through eight in ELA and math; its high school end-of-course (EOC) assessments in English II and Math I; and its NC Final Exams in Math II and III and English I, III and IV. The department reports that these are fully aligned to the Common Core. The department has also created NC Final Exams for other North Carolina Standard Course of Study content areas, including science and social studies. North Carolina is a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. In January 2014 the board decided to convene an advisory group to evaluate testing options and provide recommendations for 2017-18. Senate Bill 812,

enacted in 2014, requires legislative approval for adoption of any assessment instrument to assess student achievement on state academic standards.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support the alignment of student growth and achievement measures in non-tested grades and subjects to the Common Core where appropriate (such as K-2 reading), the department provides guidance and assistance as well as the Analysis of Student Work process for K-12 arts, world languages and health/physical education.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

In North Carolina, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually, though career-status teachers can receive an abbreviated evaluation focusing only on three of the Professional Teaching Standards. The ways in which data from NCEES are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* North Carolina demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. Districts are encouraged to use NCEES data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the department provides the Home Base electronic platform. This tool enables school and district leaders to run reports to identify school- and district-level trends, which can inform large-scale professional development planning. The department has also provided 18 Regional Professional Development Leads to schools through Race to the Top federal grant funds, to assist them in using evaluation results. Additionally, it compiled a number of protocols and tools for evaluators on coaching and feedback, as well as a tool to track teacher progress on professional development plans based on evaluation results.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* North Carolina demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. The department uses Home Base to aggregate individual NCEES data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement. These trends inform the department's ongoing development of statewide professional learning resources. Also, the Home Base online professional development system houses professional development resources aligned to specific North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards. In 2014, the department launched a Professional Development Repository (<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/profdev/>) that includes online courses aligned to the teaching standards and a recommendation engine to direct teachers to professional learning based on their individual needs.

North Carolina

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines the components of North Carolina's new leader support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

The state revised its North Carolina Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Process to incorporate student growth and achievement as of 2012-13.

Leadership Standards

North Carolina's School Executive Standards form the backbone of the North Carolina Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Process. They establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Strategic Leadership
2. Instructional Leadership
3. Cultural Leadership
4. Human Resources Leadership
5. Managerial Leadership
6. External Development Leadership
7. Micro-Political Leadership
8. Academic Achievement Leadership

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the Common Core: A statewide task force developed the School Executive Standards, and the state Board of Education approved them in December 2006. The School Executive Standards define skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead in a standards-based instruction environment. The task force used the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core, to inform development of the standards. The task force also drew on resources from SREB, McREL, the Wallace Foundation and national principal associations. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction has not revised the School Executive Standards since it adopted the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the North Carolina Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Process, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math.

Each component is weighted equally, and a principal must meet a minimum level of performance on each component in order to be effective. Leaders are evaluated on the eight School Executive Standards through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In North Carolina, student growth and achievement is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Schoolwide growth on annual state assessments
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Schoolwide growth using common pre- and post-assessments (for example, reading comprehension assessments for K-2 or the NC Final Exams for grades four through 12)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Since 2012-13, North Carolina has administered its own end-of-grade (EOG) assessments for grades three through eight in ELA and math; its high school end-of-course (EOC) assessments in English II and Math I; and its NC Final Exams in Math II and III and English I, III and IV. The department reports that these are fully aligned to the Common Core. The department has also created NC Final Exams for other North Carolina Standard Course of Study content areas, including science and social studies. North Carolina is a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. In January 2014 the board decided to convene an advisory group to evaluate testing options and provide recommendations for 2017-18. Senate Bill 812, enacted in 2014, requires legislative approval for adoption of any assessment instrument to assess student achievement on state academic standards.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support the alignment of student growth and achievement measures in non-tested grades and subjects to the Common Core where appropriate (such as K-2 reading), the department provides guidance and assistance as well as the Analysis of Student Work process for K-12 arts, world languages and health/physical education.

Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Rubric: Measures that inform a leader's rating on the rubric include those listed below.

- ◆ A self-assessment completed by the principal
- ◆ Ongoing conversations between the principal and district leaders
- ◆ Evidence collected throughout the year (for example, stakeholder feedback and documentation of completed professional learning)

Alignment of the Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Rubric to the Common Core: The rubric assesses principals on criteria based in the School Executive Standards, which include skills and knowledge that principals need to demonstrate effective leadership in a standards-based instruction environment. The department has not revised the rubric to further align it to the Common Core.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

In North Carolina, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the evaluation system are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and evaluators are required to use principal evaluation data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department provides guidance to school leaders and evaluators on goal-setting and school improvement planning, based on

North Carolina (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

principal evaluation results. Also, the department recommends that districts use evaluation data when they nominate principals for participation in the state’s Distinguished Leadership in Practice program, which is an intensive professional development experience for practicing principals.

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* North Carolina demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. The department uses its Home Base electronic platform to aggregate individual principal evaluation data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement. These trends inform the department’s ongoing development of professional learning resources. Also, the Home Base online professional development system houses professional development resources aligned to specific North Carolina School Executive Standards. In 2014, the department launched a Professional Development Repository (<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/profdev/>) that includes online courses aligned to the leadership standards and a recommendation engine to direct administrators to professional learning based on their individual needs.

Pennsylvania

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Pennsylvania’s new teacher support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state’s new Pennsylvania Core Standards (PCS) within the system’s requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

Pennsylvania partially implemented its Teacher Effectiveness System in 2013-14 and is implementing it statewide in 2014-15. The new system was mandated by legislation, and Act 82 establishes what effective instruction looks like in Pennsylvania.

Teaching Standards

Pennsylvania’s professional teaching standards (called “components” in Pennsylvania), based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching, form the backbone of the Teacher Observation and Practice component of the system. They establish the competencies for which teachers strive. Twenty-two standards nest in four domains:

1. Planning and Preparation
2. Classroom Environment
3. Instruction
4. Professional Responsibilities

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to PCS: The state Department of Education adopted the teaching standards with all teachers in mind to define skills and knowledge needed for effective teaching in a standards-based environment. The standards are based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a college- and career-readiness standards-based environment. While some of the instructional shifts of the PCS are identified within the teaching standards, the department has not undertaken a further revision of the teaching standards to more explicitly align them to the PCS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the two components of the Teacher Effectiveness System, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the 22 standards.

Observation and Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Supporting documentation of teacher practice

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the PCS: Pennsylvania's classroom observation rubric is based on its teaching standards, which were designed with all teachers in mind. Some of the instructional shifts of the PCS are identified within the standards. Districts can use the state rubric or submit their own for approval by the department (district-submitted rubrics must meet or exceed the state teaching standards). The department provides supplementary tools for each of the 22 teaching standards. Each one includes specific examples of what observers should see in the classroom and critical attributes of the teacher by rating level. Additionally, the department provides tools to help evaluators apply the observation rubric to specific teachers, such as teachers of English learners, students with disabilities, and gifted education.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Pennsylvania, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation and is called Multiple Measures of Student Performance. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For all Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects and Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 15 percent School Performance Profile (SPP), Pennsylvania's school accountability index
 - 15 percent teacher-specific growth data
 - 20 percent elective data determined by districts from a department-approved list and through the Student Learning Objective (SLO) process

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the PCS:

- ◆ *For all Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects and Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2012-13, Pennsylvania implemented its own high school Keystone Exams in literature and Algebra I, which its reports are fully aligned to the PCS. Pennsylvania is currently in the process of aligning its summative Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) for grades three through eight in ELA and math, for implementation in 2014-15. To support teachers in developing SLOs aligned to the state

Pennsylvania (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

standards where appropriate (for example, K-2 in ELA and math), the department provides a number of model SLOs, design guides, templates and videos. The department partners with Research in Action to provide the process, materials and training for the creation and online management of SLOs. The department also provides a list of approved types of assessments for district use that may or may not align to the PCS (this report does not address the alignment of these assessments).

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved PCS Instruction

In Pennsylvania, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually. Districts have the option to implement a differentiated supervision cycle for teachers who have received a satisfactory summative rating for two years. The ways in which data from the Teacher Effectiveness System are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the PCS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* District leaders and principals are encouraged to use Teacher Effectiveness System data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support local use of evaluation data, the department provides professional development to district leaders on using evaluation results for professional learning. It also provides free professional development aligned to the Teacher Effectiveness System for districts to use if they so choose.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts aggregate individual teacher evaluation results and send district-level data to the department; individual teacher summative evaluations are not shared with the department. The department also gathers feedback from districts on evaluation outcomes to inform its ongoing development of state-level professional development and supports. For example, the department used the results of a qualitative study conducted by the University of Pittsburgh to identify areas for which professional development was needed. The department then developed corresponding online courses that address criteria in the classroom observation rubric and videos of classroom instruction for some of the observable elements, and made them available through Pennsylvania's Standards Aligned System (SAS) portal.

Pennsylvania

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines Pennsylvania's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's new Pennsylvania Core Standards (PCS) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Pennsylvania has piloted its Framework for Leadership since 2011-12 and is implementing most aspects of it statewide in 2014-15 (the implementation of Student Learning Objectives, or SLOs, is optional for districts in 2014-15). Pennsylvania expects to implement the full system statewide in 2015-16.

Leadership Standards

Pennsylvania's Framework for Leadership standards (called "components" in Pennsylvania) form the backbone of the leader effectiveness system. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive. The 19 standards nest in four domains:

1. Strategic/Cultural Leadership
2. Systems Leadership
3. Leadership for Learning
4. Professional and Community Leadership

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the PCS: The state Department of Education developed the Framework for Leadership based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing college- and career-readiness standards. The department has not further revised the framework to more closely address the specifics of the PCS.

Components of the System

The following section describes the two components of the Framework for Leadership, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the PCS. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the 19 standards.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Pennsylvania, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 15 percent building level data — the School Performance Profile (SPP), Pennsylvania's school accountability index
 - 15 percent correlation data — the correlation between a principal's evaluation and measures of teacher performance on the teacher evaluation system and student performance on annual state assessments
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 20 percent elective data — SLOs determined by principals and their supervising administrators, which can be based on the measures listed below.
 - District-designed measures and examinations
 - Nationally recognized standardized tests
 - Industry certification examinations
 - Student projects pursuant to local requirements
 - Student portfolios pursuant to local requirements

Pennsylvania (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the PCS:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2012-13, Pennsylvania implemented its own high school Keystone Exams in literature and Algebra I, which it reports are fully aligned to the PCS. Pennsylvania is currently in the process of aligning its summative Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) for grades three through eight in ELA and math, for implementation in 2014-15.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support principals and evaluators in developing SLOs aligned to the PCS where appropriate, the department provides a number of model SLOs, design guides, templates and videos. The department partners with the Regional Educational Lab Mid-Atlantic to provide the process, materials and training for the creation and online management of SLOs. The department also provides a list of approved national assessments and industry certification examinations for local use that may or may not align to the PCS (this report does not address the alignment of these assessments).

Principal Practice: This component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. The measure that informs a leader's rating on this component is listed below.

- ◆ *Framework for Leadership Rubric:* The rubric generates a principal's rating on the 19 standards nested within the four domains, based on a preponderance of evidence of the principal's practice. Evidence is gathered through mid-year and end-of-year conferences with the evaluator. Additional conferences may occur throughout the year.

Alignment of the Principal Practice Measures to the PCS: Pennsylvania's Framework for Leadership Rubric assesses principals on the Framework for Leadership standards, which are based on the ISLLC standards (the ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing college- and career-readiness standards). Further, the department designed the Framework for Leadership Rubric to align to its teacher observation rubric, which includes highlights of some instructional shifts of the PCS. Districts can use the state rubric or submit their own to the department for approval (district-submitted rubrics must meet or exceed the leadership standards). Additionally, the department provides guiding questions for evaluators to help them focus conferences with principals, and tools that outline examples of what evidence should be observable and available for each of the 19 Framework for Leadership standards.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved PCS Instruction

In Pennsylvania, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the Framework for Leadership are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the PCS include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* District leaders and evaluators are encouraged to use Framework for Leadership data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning.

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts aggregate individual principal evaluation results and send district-level data to the department. The department currently is developing online professional learning resources for principals aligned to the Framework for Leadership — these include eight 30-hour courses. The courses will be added to the state’s Standards Aligned System (SAS) online platform over the next two years.

South Carolina

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of South Carolina’s new teacher support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state’s college- and career-readiness standards for students within the system’s requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

South Carolina has been piloting its revised Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT) system since 2012-13, and the state Department of Education expects to implement its finalized system statewide in 2015-16. In 2014, the state received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education to delay using evaluation results to inform personnel decisions until 2016-17. This profile describes the teacher evaluation measures in terms of their alignment to the state’s current standards, the Common Core. The alignment of measures that South Carolina will use once it develops its new college- and career-readiness standards — for implementation in 2015-16 — is unknown at this time.

Teaching Standards

South Carolina’s professional teaching standards, the ADEPT Performance Standards (APS), form the backbone of the ADEPT system. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Planning
2. Instruction
3. Environment
4. Professionalism

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the State’s College- and Career-Readiness Standards:

This is an aspect of the work in which South Carolina is undertaking leading efforts. The department based the APS on the revised 2013 Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment. Further, the department updated the APS in 2012-13 to be more student-centered and to reflect the language and coherence of the Common Core. As such, the APS define specific skills and knowledge necessary for effective teaching in a Common Core environment.

South Carolina (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the ADEPT system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the state's college- and career-readiness standards. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the four APS through three components.

Professional Performance: This component comprises 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Multiple measures of quantitative and qualitative evidence inform a teacher's rating on this component, and one or more measures must be specified by districts to inform ratings for each APS. A scoring rubric accompanies each APS. Multiple measures can include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Documentation of teacher performance, provided by teachers

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the State's College- and Career-Readiness Standards: This is an aspect of the work in which South Carolina is undertaking leading efforts.

The department developed a classroom observation rubric to address the APS, which have been updated to more closely reflect the Common Core. Further, the department updated the rubric to provide explicit guidance for educators and principals, including concrete examples of what Common Core teaching, learning and assessment look like in practice.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In South Carolina, the student growth and achievement component comprises 30 percent of a teacher's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* Annual state assessment
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) based on assessments designed or selected at the local level (developed by teachers and monitored by principals)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the State's College- and Career-Readiness Standards:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2013-14, South Carolina partially aligned its own summative Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) for grades three through eight in ELA, writing and math and its high school End-of-Course Examination Program (EOCEP) tests in English I and Algebra I. The department modified the assessments to more closely measure the learning expectations of the Common Core. For 2014-15 and beyond, the state currently is conducting an assessment procurement process to determine which assessments will best meet the needs of its students.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The department requires that SLOs be aligned to state academic standards and school and district priorities, where applicable (for example, K-2 in reading, writing and math). To support the local development and selection of aligned SLOs where applicable, the department provides guidelines and optional templates for creating SLOs, as well as a number of exemplar SLOs. Pilot schools designed and implemented SLOs throughout 2013-14. Schools statewide are implementing SLOs in 2014-15.

District Choice: This component comprises 20 percent of a teacher’s evaluation. This measure, determined by districts and approved by the department, can be:

- ◆ Selected from a list of department-approved data sources and activities (for example, schoolwide growth on annual state assessments, student growth on a state-approved formative assessment, teacher self-reflection)
- ◆ An alternative data source proposed by districts and submitted to the department for approval (for example, parent surveys)

Alignment of the District Choice Component to the State’s College- and Career-Readiness

Standards: The department requires that data sources used in this component provide information on a teacher’s professional growth and lead to increased student academic growth. To support local selection of these measures, the department provides a list of approved data sources, and requires districts to submit alternative measures for approval. This component may or may not provide information on how a teacher teaches the state academic standards.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Instruction

In 2015-16, when the ADEPT system is finalized, every teacher in each public school will be evaluated annually. The ways in which data from ADEPT are currently used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Principals are required and districts are encouraged to use ADEPT data to identify individual teachers’ strengths and areas for improvement and to provide them with appropriate professional learning. Educators are required to develop professional growth and development (PGD) plans with their evaluators based on their evaluation results and aligned to the APS, and the department provides guidance and templates to teachers and evaluators on creating PGD plans. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department provides the online ADEPT Data System (ADS), enabling schools and districts to aggregate and analyze evaluation data (though the department released a Request for Proposal in summer 2014 for a new online data management system to replace ADS). Additionally, it offers assistance to school and district leaders, at their request, in analyzing evaluation data and using results to inform the planning of professional learning. Districts must submit annual ADEPT plans to the department for approval, to ensure that evaluation models are implemented with fidelity.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts are required to report aggregated teacher evaluation results to the department annually. These data can be used to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement.

South Carolina (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

South Carolina is making leading efforts to align its teacher evaluation system to its college- and career-readiness standards (currently these are the Common Core — the state will develop new college- and career-readiness standards for implementation in 2015-16). The ADEPT Performance Standards (APS) for teachers were based on the 2013 Danielson Framework for Teaching (which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment), and the state Department of Education further updated the standards in 2012-13 to reflect the language and coherence of the Common Core. The department also updated its classroom observation tool to more closely align it to the Common Core (for example, to provide explicit criteria, guidance and concrete examples of what Common Core teaching and learning looks like in practice). Further, to support the use of evaluation data, the department provides an online platform enabling schools and districts to aggregate evaluation results, as well as support to school and district leaders, at their request, as they analyze evaluation data and use results to inform the planning of local professional learning.

South Carolina

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines the components of South Carolina's new leader effectiveness system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the state's college- and career-readiness standards within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

South Carolina has been piloting its Program for Assisting, Developing and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP) since 2012-13, and the state Department of Education expects to implement its finalized system statewide in 2015-16. In 2014, the state received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education to delay using evaluation results to inform personnel decisions until 2016-17. This profile describes the leader evaluation measures in terms of their alignment to the state's current standards, the Common Core. The alignment of measures that South Carolina will use once it develops its new college- and career-readiness standards — for implementation in 2015-16 — is unknown at this time.

Leadership Standards

South Carolina's PADEPP Performance Standards (PPS) form the backbone of PADEPP. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Vision
2. Instruction
3. Effective Management
4. Climate
5. School-Community Relations
6. Ethical Behavior
7. Interpersonal Skills
8. Staff Development
9. Principal's Professional Development

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the State's College- and Career-Readiness Standards:

The department based the PPS on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department has not revised the PPS since it adopted the Common Core, though it reviewed the standards and determined that an update was not needed.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the PADEPP system, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the state's college- and career-readiness standards. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the nine PPS through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In South Carolina, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* Schoolwide growth on annual state assessments
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Annual state assessments, and graduation rates for high school principals

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the State's College- and Career-Readiness Standards:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* In 2013-14, South Carolina partially aligned its own summative Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) for grades three through eight in ELA, writing and math and its high school End-of-Course Examination Program (EOCEP) tests in English I and Algebra I. The department modified the assessments to more closely measure the learning expectations of the Common Core. For 2014-15 and beyond, the state currently is conducting an assessment procurement process to determine which assessments will best meet the needs of its students.

South Carolina (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* See the Data From Tested Grades and Subjects bullet above regarding information on the annual state assessments. Graduation rates do not provide data that directly reflect teaching and learning of the Common Core.

Principal Performance: This component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. The measure that informs a leader's rating on this component is listed below.

- ◆ *Principal Performance Scale:* A principal's scaled rating on the PPS is based on regular conferences between the principal and evaluator, development and monitoring of a Professional Development Plan, and development and monitoring of professional goals determined by the principal and evaluator.

Alignment of the Principal Performance Scale Measures to the State's College- and Career-Readiness Standards: The scale assesses principals on criteria based on the PPS. The PPS are based on the ISLLC standards, which are considered to define general skills and knowledge needed to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department has not updated the scale since its creation, to further align it to the Common Core.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Instruction

In South Carolina, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. Districts have the option to implement abbreviated evaluation cycles every other year for principals with more than one year of experience and previous summative ratings of Proficient or Exemplary. The ways in which data from PADEPP are currently used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Evaluators are required and districts are encouraged to use PADEPP data to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. Principals are required to develop professional development plans with their evaluators based on their evaluation results and aligned to the PPS, and the department provides guidance and templates for creating professional development plans. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department provides the online PADEPP Data System (PDS), enabling districts to aggregate and analyze evaluation data. Additionally, it offers districts, at their request, evaluation results by PPS standard. The department also provides assistance to district leaders in analyzing evaluation data and using results to inform their planning of professional learning.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department uses the PDS to aggregate individual principal evaluation results to monitor implementation and identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement. It also produces annual reports for the public on the aggregated results.

Tennessee

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of Tennessee’s educator support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system’s requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

The state implemented its Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) statewide in 2011-12.

Teaching Standards

Tennessee’s Teaching Skills, Knowledge and Professionalism Performance Standards (called the TEAM Standards) form the backbone of TEAM. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive. The 23 standards nest in four domains:

1. Instruction
2. Planning
3. Environment
4. Professionalism

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the Common Core: This is an area in which Tennessee is undertaking leading efforts. The state Department of Education developed the TEAM Standards, which were modified from the state’s previous TAP Standards. The standards define the skills and knowledge needed for effective teaching in a standards-based instruction environment. Further, the department revised the standards to more closely align them to the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of TEAM, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers’ competency/accomplishments in teaching the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the 23 TEAM standards through two components.

Observations: This component comprises 50 percent of the evaluation for teachers of tested grades and subjects and 60 percent of the evaluation for teachers of non-tested grades and subjects. Measures that inform a teacher’s rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Classroom observations, using a rubric
- ◆ Conferences between the teacher and evaluator
- ◆ Evaluator review of prior evaluations and work
- ◆ Student perception surveys (optional), which may count for five percent of this component

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the Common Core: This is an area in which Tennessee is undertaking leading efforts. Tennessee’s classroom observation rubric includes criteria needed to demonstrate effective standards-based teaching as defined in the TEAM Standards, which have been revised along with the rubric to more explicitly align to the expectations for teaching and learning in a Common Core environment. The department also provides guidance documents,

Tennessee (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

including key evidence and guiding questions, on how to apply the rubric to specific teachers (for example, teachers of career and technical education and special education). Additionally, the department has approved student perception surveys developed by the Tripod Project for district use. The department conducted a crosswalk of the survey questions with the TEAM standards, as well as analyses on the relationship between survey data and other evaluation data. It was found that criteria in the Tripod survey overlap with those in the classroom observation rubric and may provide some information related to instruction of the Common Core.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Tennessee, the student growth and achievement component comprises 50 percent of the evaluation for teachers of tested grades and subjects and 40 percent of the evaluation for teachers of non-tested grades and subjects. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 35 percent teacher-specific growth data on annual state assessments
 - 15 percent achievement measure selected by teachers and approved by principals, from a list of department-approved measures (such as a national assessment or graduation rate)
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* Depending on the grade and subject for a teacher, student growth and achievement can be calculated through the measures listed below.
 - 25 percent schoolwide or districtwide growth data on annual state assessments (depending on school context), or portfolios of student work (for teachers of fine arts and world languages)
 - 15 percent achievement measure selected by teachers and approved by principals, from a list of department-approved measures (for example, a national assessment or graduation rate)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects:* As of 2012-13, Tennessee partially aligned its Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Test for grades three through eight in reading and math, and as of 2013-14, Tennessee partially aligned its high school TCAP end-of-course (EOC) exams in English II and III and Algebra I and II. The department narrowed the tests to reflect only content that is covered in the Common Core. In 2014, Tennessee enacted legislation delaying the transition to any new assessment for one year, and withdrew from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium. Tennessee will continue to administer its TCAP Achievement Test and EOC exams in 2014-15, and will use a competitive bidding process to select a fully aligned assessment for 2015-16. To support the local selection of other achievement measures aligned to the Common Core where appropriate, the department provides guidance and an approved list of national assessments that may or may not align to the Common Core (this report does not address the alignment of these assessments). Graduation rates do not provide data that directly reflect teaching and learning of the Common Core.
- ◆ *For Teachers of Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* For the majority of teachers, the department uses schoolwide or districtwide growth data on the annual state assessments. See the information in the For Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects bullet above for the alignment of Tennessee's TCAP

Achievement Test and EOC exams, and for the state's plans for state assessments in 2014-15 and beyond. The department currently provides model growth measures for teachers of fine arts and world languages (with models for other subjects under development); portfolios of student work for fine arts and world languages reflect the philosophy of the Common Core by focusing on depth and performance of skills. Also, see the information in the bullet above about the guidance and list of approved national assessments the department provides to facilitate the local selection of achievement measures aligned to the Common Core where appropriate. Graduation rates do not provide data that directly reflect teaching and learning of the Common Core.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

Every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from TEAM is used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Tennessee demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional development. Districts and principals are required to use TEAM data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. Districts and principals are encouraged to use aggregated teacher evaluation results to inform planning for professional learning at the school and district levels. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department provides the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) Best Practices Portal (www.nietbestpractices.org), which offers a wealth of resources on classroom observations, coaching and implementing the evaluation system with fidelity. It also provides professional learning on giving feedback and coaching. The NIET Portal offers training modules and videos, aligned to specific TEAM Standards, for teacher use. To date, over 5,000 leaders and 70,000 teachers are registered on the portal. The department also provides the CODE online platform, enabling districts to collect and analyze evaluation results. The department provides tools for school leaders on developing professional development action plans, and on using CODE reports to drive instructional improvement.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department aggregates individual teacher evaluation results to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement to inform school support, school leader development activities, and initiative planning.

Tennessee is making leading efforts to align its teacher evaluation system to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core. The state Department of Education developed the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) teaching standards, and revised them further to more closely align to the Common Core. The department also revised its classroom observation rubric to more explicitly align it to the expectations for teaching and learning in a Common Core environment. Additionally, the department provides guidance documents, including key evidence and guiding questions, on how to apply the rubric to specific teachers (for example, teachers of career and technical education and special education). Further, the department offers extensive support to districts on using teacher evaluation results to inform professional learning, including a best practices portal, an online platform to aggregate and analyze results, and tools for school leaders on developing professional development action plans for teachers.

Tennessee

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines the components of Tennessee’s leader support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in the Common Core within the system’s requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

Tennessee implemented its Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) Administrator Model statewide in 2011-12.

Leadership Standards

The Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) form the backbone of the TEAM Administrator Model. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Instructional Leadership for Continuous Improvement
2. Culture for Teaching and Learning
3. Professional Learning and Growth
4. Resource Management

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the Common Core: This is an area in which Tennessee is undertaking leading efforts. The state Board of Education adopted the state’s revised TILS in April 2013. When developing the TILS, the state Department of Education used many national leadership standards as resources, including the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. Further, the department updated the TILS to more closely align them to the Common Core.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the TEAM Administrator Model, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools’ implementation of the Common Core. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the four TILS through two components.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In Tennessee, this component comprises 50 percent of a principal’s evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 35 percent schoolwide growth on annual state assessments
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - 15 percent locally-determined measures of student achievement, selected by the principal and evaluator from a state-approved list (for example, annual state assessments or national assessments)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the Common Core:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* As of 2012-13, Tennessee partially aligned its Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Test for grades three through eight in reading and math, and as of 2013-14, Tennessee partially aligned its high school TCAP end-of-course (EOC) exams in English II and III and Algebra I and II. The department narrowed the tests to reflect only content that is covered in the Common Core. In 2014, Tennessee enacted legislation delaying the transition to any new assessment for one year, and withdrew from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium. Tennessee will continue to administer its TCAP Achievement Test and EOC exams in 2014-15, and will use a competitive bidding process to select a fully aligned assessment for 2015-16.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* To support the selection of locally-determined achievement measures that are aligned to the Common Core where appropriate, the department provides some guidance to principals and evaluators on selection, as well as an approved list of national assessments. (This report does not address the alignment of these assessments.)

Qualitative Measures (Professional Practice Rubric): This component comprises 50 percent of a principal's evaluation. Measures that inform a leader's rating on the Professional Practice Rubric include those listed below.

- ◆ Two required on-site observations by the evaluator
- ◆ Stakeholder feedback (through a survey)
- ◆ Conferences between the principal and evaluator
- ◆ A review of progress made since the prior year's evaluation, if available
- ◆ Assessment of the quality of teacher evaluations (through a scale rating based on evidence such as a principal's feedback to teachers about instruction and use of teacher evaluation data)

Alignment of the Professional Practice Rubric to the Common Core: This is an area in which Tennessee is undertaking leading efforts. Throughout 2013-14, 10 districts piloted a revised rubric aligned to the revised TILS. Districts are using the rubric statewide in 2014-15. This revised rubric provides explicit examples and guidance on skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. (The department hired 16 leader evaluation coaches, two per region, to facilitate training and support for principals and supervisors on the revised rubric in 2014-15.) Additionally, the assessment of the quality of teacher evaluations provides specific information related to how effectively educators within the school are teaching the Common Core.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved Common Core Instruction

In Tennessee, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the TEAM Administrator Model is used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the Common Core include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Tennessee demonstrates extensive use of evaluation results for professional learning. Districts and evaluators are required to use principal evaluation results to identify individual principals' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support the local use of evaluation data, the department provides the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) Best Practice Portal (see www.nietbestpractices.org), which offers a wealth of resources on principal observation and implementing the

Tennessee (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

evaluation system with fidelity. It also provides feedback and coaching tips. To date, over 5,000 leaders are registered on the portal. The department also provides the CODE online platform, enabling districts to collect and analyze evaluation results. The department provides tools for district leaders on using CODE reports to drive instructional improvement.

- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department aggregates individual principal evaluation results to identify trends in strengths and areas for improvement to inform initiative planning and guide state-level professional learning.

Tennessee is making leading efforts to align its leader evaluation system to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core. The state Department of Education updated its leadership standards to more explicitly align them to the Common Core. In 2014-15, Tennessee is implementing a revised Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) administrator evaluation rubric that provides examples of and guidance on specific skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The department hired 16 leader evaluation coaches, two per region, to facilitate training and support for principals and supervisors using the revised rubric. Further, to support the local use of principal evaluation data for improvement, the department provides the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) Best Practice Portal, which offers a wealth of resources on principal development and implementing the evaluation system with fidelity. The department also provides an online platform for districts to collect and analyze evaluation results, and tools on using the results to drive instructional improvement.

West Virginia

Evaluation of Teachers

The following profile outlines the components of West Virginia's new educator support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in West Virginia's Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives (NxG CSOs) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of teachers.

West Virginia implemented the Educator Evaluation System statewide in 2013-14.

Teaching Standards

West Virginia's Professional Teaching Standards form the backbone of the Educator Evaluation System. The standards establish the competencies for which teachers strive.

1. Curriculum and Planning
2. The Learner and the Learning Environment
3. Teaching
4. Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal
5. Professional Responsibilities for School and Community
6. Student Learning
7. Professional Conduct

Alignment of the Teaching Standards to the NxG CSOs: The state Department of Education based the Professional Teaching Standards on the 2007 Danielson Framework for Teaching, which is widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching in a Common Core environment, and on a comprehensive review of national standards and resources. The resources included information from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). Though the department has not revised the Professional Teaching Standards since it adopted the NxG CSOs, a task force reviewed the Professional Teaching Standards after adoption to ensure that they support rigorous standards-based instruction.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Educator Evaluation System, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about teachers' competency/accomplishments in teaching the NxG CSOs. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Teachers are evaluated on the seven standards through two components.

Teacher Practice: This component accounts for 80 percent of a teacher's evaluation. Measures that inform a teacher's rating on this component include those listed below.

- ◆ Self-reflection (teacher self-assessment used to build performance goals)
- ◆ Classroom observations (optional for teachers with six or more years of experience), using a rubric
- ◆ Conferences between the teacher and evaluator
- ◆ Supporting evidence of teacher practice

Alignment of the Classroom Observation Tool to the NxG CSOs: West Virginia's classroom observation rubric addresses criteria needed to demonstrate effective teaching as defined in the Professional Teaching Standards. A task force reviewed the Professional Teaching Standards (and by extension, the observation rubric) after adoption of the NxG CSOs and found that they support rigorous standards-based instruction. The department has not updated the observation rubric to more specifically articulate the new instructional requirements of the NxG CSOs.

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In West Virginia, the student growth and achievement component accounts for 20 percent of a teacher's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

West Virginia (continued)

Evaluation of Teachers

◆ *For all Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects and Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:*

- Five percent schoolwide growth data on annual state assessments is included.
- 15 percent Student Learning Goals (at least two), developed by teachers and approved by principals, are included. For example, goals can be based on teacher-created assessments or national assessments.

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the NxG CSOs:

- ◆ *For all Teachers of Tested Grades and Subjects and Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* West Virginia has not aligned its own summative West Virginia Educational Standards Test 2 (WESTEST 2) in reading and math for grades three through eight and high school. As a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, West Virginia plans to implement the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and 11 in 2014-15. Any other assessments chosen for Student Learning Goals are required to align to the NxG CSOs. The department provides a number of model Student Learning Goals for teacher use. It reports that these goals are aligned to the NxG CSOs where appropriate (for example, in ELA, writing and math). The department also provides guidance on setting goals and rubrics for creating and reviewing the alignment of goals.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved NxG CSO Instruction

In West Virginia, every teacher in each public school is evaluated annually, though teachers with six or more years of experience are not required to receive classroom observations each year. The ways in which data from the Educator Evaluation System are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen teaching and learning of the NxG CSOs include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and principals are required to use teacher evaluation data to identify individual teachers' strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support the local use of evaluation data, the state's annual master plan for professional development in public schools outlines a uniform system of delivering professional development and using state resources. (See the accompanying state profile on *Professional Development* for more information on the state's annual master plan for professional development.) Additionally, the department provides a professional learning plan template, a set of best practices to help school and district leaders in improving professional practice, and an online monitoring tool (WVEIS on the Web, or WOW) that enables leaders to aggregate teacher evaluation results to the school and district levels, and to monitor progress made by educators.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department collaborates with each Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) to align RESA professional development opportunities with the identified areas for improvement for each district in the region, based on teacher evaluation results aggregated to the district level. (The department has the capability to access teacher-level evaluation data and aggregate it to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement.)

West Virginia

Evaluation of Leaders

The following profile outlines the components of West Virginia's new leader support and evaluation system and examines one particular aspect of the system: how it integrates the higher expectations for student learning inherent in West Virginia's Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives (NxG CSOs) within the system's requirements for continuous improvement of leaders.

West Virginia implemented its Educator Evaluation System statewide in 2013-14.

Leadership Standards

West Virginia's Professional School Leader Standards form the backbone of the Educator Evaluation System. The standards establish the competencies for which leaders strive.

1. Interpersonal and Collaborative Skills
2. Clear and Focused Learning Mission
3. Rigorous Curriculum, Engaging Instruction and Balanced Assessment
4. Positive Learning Climate and Cohesive Culture
5. Professional Growth and Retention of Quality Staff
6. Support Systems for Student Success
7. Operations to Promote Learning
8. Family and Community Connections
9. Continuous Improvement
10. Student Growth
11. Professional Conduct

Alignment of the Leadership Standards to the NxG CSOs: West Virginia's State Evaluation Task Force developed its Professional School Leader Standards. To develop the standards, the task force drew heavily on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, which are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core. The state Department of Education has not updated the leader standards since adopting the NxG CSOs.

Components of the System

The following section describes the components of the Educator Evaluation System, focusing on the ways in which the measures produce information and data about principals within the context of their schools' implementation of the NxG CSOs. The student growth and achievement section below focuses on the measures as they apply to the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. Leaders are evaluated on the 11 Professional School Leader Standards through three components.

West Virginia (continued)

Evaluation of Leaders

Student Growth and Achievement: States may use different terminology (for example, student improvement) to describe this type of measure. In West Virginia, the student growth and achievement component accounts for 20 percent of a principal's evaluation. It is calculated through the measures listed below.

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - Schoolwide growth data on annual state assessments (five percent)
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:*
 - One Student Learning Goal developed collaboratively by the principal and evaluator, based on data from two assessments, which can include Acuity formative assessments, ACT summative assessments or Advanced Placement (AP) summative exams (15 percent)

Alignment of the Student Growth and Achievement Measures to the NxG CSOs:

- ◆ *Data From Tested Grades and Subjects:* West Virginia has not aligned its own summative West Virginia Educational Standards Test 2 (WESTEST 2) in reading and math for grades three through eight and high school. As a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, West Virginia plans to implement the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and 11 in 2014-15.
- ◆ *Data From Non-Tested Grades and Subjects:* The department provides a number of sample Student Learning Goals for local use, which it reports are aligned to the NxG CSOs where appropriate (for example, in ELA, writing and math). The department also provides guidance and rubrics on creating and reviewing goals aligned to the NxG CSOs. CTB/McGraw-Hill reports that its Acuity assessments are fully aligned to the NxG CSOs. ACT reports that its course standards, on which its summative assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core. The College Board reports that student learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses and AP exams, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses.

Principal Performance Rubric: This component accounts for 80 percent of a principal's evaluation. Measures that inform a leader's rating on the Principal Performance Rubric include those listed below.

- ◆ Principal's self-reflection
- ◆ Goal-setting by the principal on one of the Professional School Leader Standards
- ◆ Evidence of principal practice
- ◆ A conference between the principal and evaluator
- ◆ Surveys of students, teachers and parents

Alignment of the Principal Performance Rubric to the NxG CSOs: The Principal Performance Rubric assesses principals on criteria based on the Professional School Leader Standards, which were strongly influenced by the ISLLC standards (the ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining general skills and knowledge that principals need to effectively lead schools within the context of implementing the Common Core). The department has not updated the rubric to more explicitly align it to the NxG CSOs. Districts determine which stakeholder surveys to use to inform a rating on the rubric.

Professional Conduct: This component is not weighted, but principals must meet these expectations for a successful evaluation. Professional conduct is assessed through:

- ◆ A list of professional duties and responsibilities. Evaluators must deem that principals successfully execute the duties and responsibilities.

Alignment of the Professional Conduct Expectations to the NxG CSOs: The duties and responsibilities do not necessarily relate directly to leadership in the implementation of the NxG CSOs, though principals are expected to implement state-adopted student learning standards.

Use of Evaluation Data to Foster Improved NxG CSO Instruction

In West Virginia, every leader in each public school is evaluated annually. The ways in which data from the Educator Evaluation System are used to help practitioners and systems strengthen instructional leadership of the NxG CSOs include those listed below.

- ◆ *Local Use of Evaluation Data:* Districts and evaluators are required to use individual principals' evaluation data to identify strengths and areas for improvement and provide them with appropriate professional learning. To support professional learning to increase leader effectiveness, the state's annual master plan for professional development in public schools outlines a uniform system of delivering professional development and using state resources. (See the accompanying state profile on *Professional Development* for more information on the state's annual master plan for professional development.) Additionally, the department provides a professional learning plan template, a set of best practices to help school and district leaders in improving professional practice, and an online monitoring tool (WVEIS on the Web, or WOW) that enables leaders to aggregate evaluation results to the district level and to monitor progress made by principals.
- ◆ *State Use of Evaluation Data:* The department can access individual principal evaluation data and aggregate the data to identify statewide trends in strengths and areas for improvement. These trends can inform the department's ongoing development of large-scale professional learning and other supports. The department currently is working to align appropriate professional development opportunities with identified areas for improvement.