

TEACHER & ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

Senate Bill 103 (S-4) as passed by the Senate
Sponsor: Sen. Phil Pavlov
House Committee: Education
Senate Committee: Education
Complete to 6-3-15

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

SUMMARY:

Overall, Senate Bill 103 (S-4) would amend the Revised School Code to require teacher and school administrator performance evaluation systems beginning in the 2017-2018 school year. The bill modifies the current law in several ways, specifically to:

- Eliminate a requirement that a school district, intermediate school district, or charter school adopt a specific educator evaluation tool prescribed by the state.
- Authorize districts and charter schools to develop their own evaluation tools.
- Reduce the portion of teacher and administrator year-end evaluations that must be based on student growth and assessment data.
- Require districts and charter schools to post information online regarding their tools for teacher and administrator evaluations.
- Require the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget to establish and maintain a list of recommended evaluation tools.

In addition to modifying the statute concerning educator evaluation, Senate Bill 103 (S-4) also would:

- Prohibit school districts and charter schools from assigning students to be taught for two consecutive years by a teacher who was rated as ineffective, and require parental or guardian notification if the school does not comply.
- Prohibit issuance of a professional teaching certificate to an individual who did not meet prescribed conditions, beginning July 1, 2018.

Finally, the bill also would repeal the section of the State School Aid Act that creates the Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund.

The bill would go into effect 90 days after it was enacted into law. A more detailed description of the educator evaluation bill follows.

Educator Performance Evaluation Systems

Performance Evaluation System. The Revised School Code requires the board of a school district, intermediate school district, or charter school, with the involvement of teachers

and school administrators, to adopt and implement for all teachers and administrators a rigorous, transparent, and fair performance evaluation system that does all of the following:

- Evaluates the teacher's or administrator's job performance at least annually while providing timely and constructive feedback.
- Establishes clear approaches to measuring student growth and provides teachers and administrators with relevant data on student growth.
- Evaluates a teacher's or administrator's job performance, using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor.
- Uses the evaluations to inform decisions regarding the effectiveness of teachers and administrators; promotion, retention, and development of teachers and administrators; whether to grant tenure and/or full certification; and removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and administrators.

Teacher Evaluation

Teacher Evaluation: Student Growth Assessment. Now under the law, beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, school district and charter school boards must ensure that the performance evaluation system for teachers meets certain criteria, including at least an annual year-end evaluation, 50 percent of which is based on student growth and assessment data.

Senate Bill 103 (S-4) requires, instead, that beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, an annual year-end evaluation be based at least 25 percent on student growth and assessment data.

Beginning in the 2018-2019, 40 percent of the annual year end evaluation would be based on student growth and assessment data.

Specifically, the bill specifies that for core content areas in grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered (in compliance with federal law), and for which student growth and assessment data from the state assessment are available for the most recent three consecutive school year period, at least 40 percent of student growth must be measured using the state assessments.

However, for core content areas in grades and subjects in which state assessments are not required, at least 50 percent of student growth must be measured using research-based growth measures or alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across schools within the school district, intermediate school district, or charter school. Student growth could also be measured by standards-based, nationally normed assessments, or other national or local assessments, or based on achievement of individualized education program goals.

Teacher Evaluation: Performance. The bill requires that the portion of a teacher's annual year-end evaluation that is not based on student growth and assessment data must be based

primarily on a teacher's performance, as measured by the evaluation tool developed or adopted by the school districts or charter school.

Teacher Evaluation System Criteria; Observations. Now under the law, the evaluation system must include an annual year-end evaluation for all teachers; a mid-year progress report for a teacher who is in the first year of a five-year probationary period for new teachers or who received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on the most recent annual evaluation; and classroom observations to assist in the evaluations. Senate Bill 103 (S-4) would retain these requirements. However, the bill reduces the requirement for "multiple evaluations" to "two evaluations," for those teachers who have not been rated effective or highly effective in the past two consecutive years. Further, beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, at least one of those observations must be unscheduled.

The bill specifies that beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, the school administrator conduct at least one of the observations, while others can be conducted by other observers who are trained, including teacher leaders. However, under the bill, this provision would not prohibit a school district or charter school from considering indicators of teacher performance observed by others who were not trained.

Beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, a school district or charter school must ensure that within 30 days after each observation, the teacher is provided with feedback. However, the bill specifies that failure to provide feedback about an observation does not prohibit a school district or charter school from considering the information obtained in it.

Currently, the manner in which a classroom observation is conducted must be prescribed in the evaluation tool. The bill would delete this requirement.

State Evaluation Tools; Local Option. Now under the law, for the purposes of conducting the annual year-end evaluations, school districts and charter schools must adopt and implement the state evaluation tool for teachers that is required under legislation enacted after review of the recommendations contained in the report of the Council on Educator Effectiveness, or a local tool that is consistent with the state evaluation tool. Senate Bill 103 (S-4) would eliminate this provision.

Instead, Senate Bill 103 (S-4) requires that beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, a district or charter school develop or adopt and implement an evaluation tool for teachers. The tool (or tools) used by as district, intermediate school district, or charter school would have to be used consistently across the schools it operated so that all similarly situated teachers were evaluated using the same tool.

Under the bill, the school district, intermediate school district, or charter school would have to post information about the evaluation tool on its public website. Further, beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, the schools would be required to provide information to teachers on the evaluation tool (or tools) used in their performance evaluation system, and also information about how each evaluation tool would be used.

Teacher Evaluation Online Information. Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, a school district or charter school would be required to post on its public website all of the following information about the evaluation tool or tools it uses for its performance evaluation system for teachers:

- The research base for the evaluation framework, instrument, and process (or if the school adapted or modified an evaluation tool, then that tool's research base, and an assurance that the adaptations or modifications did not compromise the validity of that research base).
- The identity and qualification of the author or authors (or if using a modified evaluation tool, then the identity and qualifications of a person with expertise in teacher evaluations who had reviewed the modified evaluation tool).
- Either evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy or a plan for developing that evidence (or if using a modified evaluation tool, then an assurance that the adaptation did not compromise the reliability, validity, or efficacy of the evaluation tool or the evaluation process.)
- The evaluation frameworks and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators.
- A description of the processes for conducting classroom observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans.
- A description of the plan for providing evaluators and observers with training.

DTMB Evaluation Tool List. The bill would require the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB) to establish and maintain a list of teacher evaluation tools that have demonstrated evidence of efficacy, to be used by school districts and charter schools to evaluate teachers. The list could include (but would not be required to include) evaluation models recommended in the final recommendations released by the Michigan Council on Educator Effectiveness in July 2013. Further, the list would have to include a statement indicating that school districts, ISDs, and charter schools were not limited to the evaluation tools included on the list.

Finally, the bill specifies that a school district would not be required to use the same evaluation tools for teachers as it uses for school administrators, or an evaluation tool that has the same author (or authors).

Instruction by Ineffective Teachers. Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, a school district or charter school would be prohibited from assigning a student to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by a teacher who had been rated as ineffective on his or her two most recent annual year-end evaluations.

Now under the law, beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, if a pupil is assigned to be taught by a teacher who has been rated as ineffective on the two most recent annual evaluations, the board of the school district or ISD or the PSA board of directors must notify the pupil's parent or legal guardian. The notice must identify the teacher. The bill would modify these provisions.

Instead, under the bill, beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, a school district or charter school could not assign a student to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by a teacher who had been rated as ineffective for two consecutive years. If the schools were unable to comply with this provision, the board would have to notify the pupil's parent or legal guardian and include an explanation of why the board was unable to comply.

Administrator Evaluation

Administrator Evaluation. Senate Bill 103 (S-4) would establish similar provisions with regard to tools for evaluating school administrators—both those working at the building level, and in the central office if they are regularly involved in instructional matters. That performance evaluation system would have to meet all of the following criteria.

First, the performance evaluation system would have to include at least an annual evaluation for all school administrators, completed by the local or ISD superintendent (or a designee), or chief administrator of a charter school. In turn, the superintendent and chief administrator would be evaluated by the school board or board of directors (or, if the superintendent or chief administrator were not employed directly by the board, then he or she would be evaluated by a designee of the board or board of director)s.

Second, Senate Bill 103 (S-4) requires that beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, an annual evaluation be based at least 25 percent on student growth and assessment data.

Further, beginning in 2018-2019, 40 percent of the annual evaluation would be based on student growth and assessment data. (The bill specifies that the student growth and assessment data to be used for the school administrator evaluation would be the aggregate year-end evaluations in each school in which the school administrator worked, or if a central office administrator, then for the entire school district or intermediate school district.)

Third, the portion of the annual evaluation that was not based on student growth and assessment data would have to be based on at least the following for each school in which the administrator works (or for the entire school district in the case of a central office administrator):

- If the administrator conducted teacher performance evaluations, then the administrator's proficiency in using the evaluation tools. [If an administrator designated another person to conduct the teacher evaluations, then the administrator's evaluation of this factor would be based on the designee's proficiency in using the evaluation tool, with the designee's performance to be counted as if it were the school administrator personally conducting the teacher performance evaluations.]
- The progress made by the school (or school district) in meeting the goals set forth in the school improvement plan;
- Pupil attendance in the school (or school district); and

- Student, parent, and teacher feedback, as available, and other information considered pertinent by the superintendent.

Senate Bill 103 (S-4) specifies that the measures used in an administrators' performance evaluation system be used consistently across the school district, so that all similarly situated school administrator were evaluated using the same measures.

Administrator Effectiveness Rating. The bill requires that the performance evaluation system assign an effectiveness rating to each school administrator of 1) highly effective, 2) effective, 3) minimally effective, or 4) ineffective.

Administrator Improvement Plan. The bill also requires that the performance evaluation system ensure that when a school administrator is rated as minimally effective or ineffective, the person conducting the evaluation be required to develop, and the school administrator be required to implement an improvement plan to correct the deficiencies. The improvement plan would have to recommend professional development opportunities, and other actions designed to improve the rating of the administrator on his or her next annual evaluation.

If ineffective: An administrator who was rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations would be dismissed from employment. (However, this subsection of the law would not affect the ability of a school district or charter school from dismissing an ineffective administrator regardless of whether the administrator was rated ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations).

If effective: Conversely, if a school administrator was rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual evaluations, then the school district could choose to conduct an evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if an administrator were not rated as highly effective, then annual evaluations would resume.

Senate Bill 103 (S-4) would require a school district or charter school to provide information to school administrators about the measures used in the performance evaluation system.

Generally, Senate Bill 103 (S-4) would also encourage a school district or charter school to adopt and implement a performance evaluation system for administrators that met all of the following criteria:

- A significant portion of a school administrator's evaluation would be based on student growth and assessment data (which could include value-added measures);
- The system used research-based measures to determine student growth;
- The system determined professional competence through evaluation of professional practices using a research-based framework;
- School administrator effectiveness and ratings, as measured by student achievement and growth data, are factored into school administrator retention, promotion, and termination decisions;

- School administrator performance evaluation results are used to inform school administrator professional development for the succeeding year; and
- The system ensures that school administrators are evaluated at least annually.

Administrator Evaluation Online Information. Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, a school district or charter school would be required to post on its public website all of the following information about the evaluation tool or tools it uses for its performance evaluation system for school administrators:

- The research base for the evaluation framework, instrument, and process;
- The identity and qualification of the author or authors;
- Either evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy or a plan for developing that evidence;
- The evaluation frameworks and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators.
- A description of the processes for conducting classroom observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans.
- A description of the plan for providing evaluators and observers with training.

Collective Bargaining Agreement. Under the Revised School Code, if a collective bargaining agreement that prevents compliance with the requirement to adopt and implement a performance evaluation system was in effect for teachers or school administrators as of July 19, 2011, the requirement does not apply until after the agreement expires. Under Senate Bill 103 (S-4), this exception would apply only if the same agreement were still in effect on the bill's effective date.

DTMB Evaluation Tool List. The bill would require the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB) to establish and maintain a list of school administrator evaluation tools that have demonstrated evidence of efficacy, to be used by school districts and charter schools to evaluate school administrators. The list could include (but would not be required to include) the two evaluation models recommended in the final recommendations released by the Michigan Council on Educator Effectiveness in July 2013. Further, the list would have to include a statement indicating that school districts, ISDs, and charter schools were not limited to the evaluation tools included on the list.

Finally, the bill specifies that a school district would not be required to use the same evaluation tools for school administrator as it uses for teachers, or an evaluation tool that has the same author (or authors).

Teacher Certification

Professional Teaching Certificate. Beginning July 1, 2018, the bill prohibits the superintendent of public instruction from issuing an initial professional teaching certificate, unless presented with evidence to demonstrate that the applicant met all of the following criteria:

- Had successfully completed at least three full years of classroom teaching,
- Was rated as effective or highly effective on the annual year-end performance evaluation for the three consecutive school years immediately preceding application for the certificate, or
- Was rated as effective or highly effective for at least three nonconsecutive school years before application and the individual submitted a recommendation from the chief school administrator of the school where currently employed.

Evaluation Reserve Fund

Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund. The bill would repeal Section 95a of the State School Aid Act, which creates the Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund in the state treasury; provides for allocating to the fund up to \$12.1 million from the School Aid Fund and \$2.7 million from the General Fund for the 2014-2015 school year; and, makes any expenditure of money from the fund conditional on the enactment of House Bills 5223 and 5224 from the 2013-2014 legislative session. Those bills—to establish a new educator performance evaluation system—were never enacted into law.

MCL 380.1249 et al

FISCAL IMPACT:

SB 103 (S-4) would create an indeterminate increase in administrative costs and teacher licensure revenue loss to the state, and would increase costs to local units of government including school districts, Intermediate school districts (ISDs), and public school academies (PSAs).

The Department of Education could incur indeterminate revenue loss related to changes to the teacher certification process. Currently, the state receives revenue from awarding provisional teacher certifications. SB 103 would change the requirements for receiving a provisional certification from three years of satisfactory performance to three years of effective or highly effective performance. The increase in standards could lead to a decrease in number of certifications, reducing teacher certification fee revenues by an indeterminate amount.

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB) would incur costs related to monitoring and maintaining a list of accepted teacher and administrator evaluation tools that have demonstrated evidence of efficacy. The number of applicable evaluation tools is unknown because each school district, ISD, and PSA would be picking its own tool.

School districts, ISDs, and PSAs also would see additional costs. At a minimum, districts, ISDs, and PSAs would have to spend time determining whether their current teacher and administrator evaluation tools meet the requirements under SB 103 and then describe and post online how their evaluation tools meet said requirements. If their evaluation tools did

not meet the requirements of a research-based teacher and administrator evaluation tool, they would need to align their tool, develop another tool, or purchase a tool to meet statutory requirements, which could create additional costs.

There would also be an indeterminate cost associated with training evaluation observers and conducting evaluations, for which the cost would be determined by the initial number of people needing training and future staff turnover. If districts, ISDs, and PSAs train and conduct their own evaluations, they would have to train teachers, building administrators, central office administrators, and school board members. If teachers are conducting observations of other teachers, there would be an added cost of providing a substitute for class time missed and added administrative duties borne by that teacher. Similarly, for administrator evaluations, there would be added costs for time committed to conducting evaluations and the administrative duties associated with tracking and reporting evaluations.

Previous fiscal estimates of a statewide framework that designated four different teacher evaluation tool options and two administrator evaluation tool options, estimated a total cost for tools and training ranging from \$16.0 million to \$42.0 million¹. Costs are likely to be similar, even if some school districts were able to utilize already existing evaluation tools.

Finally, Enacting Section 1 repeals Section 95a (Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund) of the State School Aid Act, which would eliminate a FY 2014-15 appropriation of \$14.8 million for these purposes.

Legislative Analyst: J. Hunault
Fiscal Analysts: Bethany Wicksall
Samuel Christensen

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.

¹ See House Fiscal Agency Summary of House Bills 5223 and 5224 of the 97th Legislature:
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2013-2014/billanalysis/House/pdf/2013-HLA-5223-15900F20.pdf>