



Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536



Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986

Senate Bill 103 (as introduced 2-12-15)
Sponsor: Senator Phil Pavlov
Committee: Education

Date Completed: 4-27-15

CONTENT

The bill would amend the Revised School Code to do the following:

- **Delay until the 2017-2018 school year the implementation of teacher and school administrator performance evaluation requirements.**
- **Revise conditions for the measurement and use of student growth and assessment data in conducting the evaluations.**
- **Eliminate a requirement that a school district, intermediate school district (ISD), or public school academy (PSA) adopt a specific evaluation tool prescribed by the State or a local tool consistent with the State tool.**
- **Authorize a school district, ISD, or PSA to develop its own evaluation tool.**
- **Require the evaluation tool used by a school district, ISD, or PSA to be used consistently among all of the schools it operated.**
- **Reduce the portion of a teacher's or administrator's year-end evaluation that must be based on student growth and assessment data.**
- **Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to give teachers and administrators information on the measures used in the evaluation system.**
- **Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to post information online regarding its tools for teacher and administrator evaluations.**
- **Require the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget to establish and maintain a list of recommended evaluation tools.**
- **Prohibit a school district, ISD, or PSA from assigning a pupil to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by a teacher who was rated as ineffective for two consecutive years; and require parental or guardian notification if the school district, ISD, or PSA could not comply.**
- **Prohibit issuance of a teaching certificate to an individual who did not meet prescribed conditions, beginning July 1, 2018.**
- **Encourage school districts, ISDs, and PSAs to develop alternative performance evaluation systems meeting the Code's criteria.**

The bill also would repeal a section of the State School Aid Act that created the Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund.

Performance Evaluation System

The Code requires the board of a school district or ISD or the board of directors of a PSA, 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.

For the 2014-2015 school year only, for grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered in compliance with Federal law, student growth must be measured at least partially using the assessments. For grades and subjects in which state assessments are not required and administered for purposes of Federal law, student growth must be measured at least partially using alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across schools within the school district, ISD, or PSA. Under the bill, these requirements would begin in 2014-2015, rather than for 2014-2015.

Teacher Evaluations

Beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, the Code requires the board of a school district, ISD, or PSA to ensure that the performance evaluation system for teachers meets the following conditions:

- The 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 his or her most recent annual evaluation; and classroom observations to assist in the evaluations.
- For the purposes of conducting the annual year-end evaluations, the school district, ISD, or PSA 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.
- The system must assign to each teacher an effectiveness rating of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective, based on his or her score on the annual evaluation.
- A school district, ISD, or PSA is encouraged to assign a mentor or coach to each teacher who is subject to a mid-year progress report.
- The system may allow for exemption of student growth data for a particular pupil for a school year upon the recommendation of the school administrator conducting the annual evaluation or his or her designee and approval of the school district or ISD superintendent or PSA chief administrator and his or her designee.
- The system must require the school district, PSA, or ISD to dismiss a teacher from employment if he or she is rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations.
- The system must permit the school district, ISD, or PSA to conduct a year-end evaluation biennially instead of annually if a teacher is rated as highly effective on three consecutive evaluations.
- The system must permit a teacher to request a review of the evaluation and the rating by the school district or ISD superintendent or PSA chief administrator, as applicable, if the teacher is not in a probationary period and is rated as ineffective on an annual evaluation.

The bill would delay application of these requirements until the 2017-2018 school year. The bill would include a requirement that the school district, ISD, or PSA provide information to teachers on the evaluation tool or tools used by the district, ISD, or PSA in its performance evaluation system and on how each tool was used.

The bill would eliminate the requirement that a school district, ISD, or PSA adopt and implement the State evaluation tool required under enacted legislation or a consistent local evaluation tool. Instead, the bill would require a school district, ISD, or PSA to develop or adopt and implement an evaluation tool. The tool or tools used by a district, ISD, or PSA would have to be used consistently among the schools it operated so that all similarly situated teachers were evaluated using the same tool. The school district, ISD, or PSA would have to post information about the tool on its public website.

Under current requirements, at least 50% of a teacher's annual year-end evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data. The bill would revise this requirement by decreasing this portion to 25% for the 2017-2018 school year and 45% beginning in 2018-2019.

The Code requires all student growth and assessment data to be measured using the student growth assessment tool required under legislation enacted by the Legislature after review of the recommendations contained in the report of the former Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness. The bill would delete this provision. Instead, the bill specifies that for grades and subjects in which State assessments are administered in compliance with Federal law, at least 50% of student growth would have to be measured using the State assessments. For grades and subjects in which State assessments were not required and administered, at least 50% of student growth would have to be measured using alternative assessments that were rigorous and comparable across schools within the school district, ISD, or PSA. The bill provides that student growth also could be measured by standards-based, nationally normed assessments, or other national or local assessments, or based on achievement of individualized education program goals.

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

The bill would require the school administrator responsible for a teacher's performance evaluation to conduct at least one of the observations conducted during the school year. Other observations could be conducted by other observers who were trained in the use of the evaluation tool. These other observers could be teacher leaders.

Administrator Evaluations

Beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, the Code requires the board of a school district or ISD or board of directors of a PSA to ensure that the performance evaluation system for building-level school administrators and for central office-level school administrators who are regularly involved in instructional matters includes at least an annual year-end evaluation for all school administrators by the school district or ISD superintendent or his or her designee, or chief administrator of the PSA, as applicable. (A superintendent or chief administrator must be evaluated by the board or board of directors).

In addition, the applicable board must ensure that the administrator evaluation system meets all of the following conditions:

- A percentage of the evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data, as required for teacher evaluations.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA must adopt and implement the State evaluation tool for school administrators, or a local tool consistent with the State tool.
- The system must assign to each school administrator an effectiveness rating of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective, based on his or her score on the evaluation tool.

- The system must ensure that if a school administrator is rated as minimally effective or ineffective, the person conducting the evaluation develops and requires the administrator to implement an improvement plan to correct the deficiencies.
- The system must provide that, if a school administrator is rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the school district, PSA, or ISD is required to dismiss the administrator from employment
- The system must provide that, if an administrator is rated as highly effective on three consecutive evaluations, the school district, ISD, or PSA may choose to conduct a year-end evaluation biennially instead of annually.

The portion of the evaluation that is not based on student growth and assessment data must be based on the administrator's training and proficiency in using the evaluation tool for teachers; the progress made by the school or school district in meeting the goals set forth in the school's school improvement plan or the school district's school improvement plans, as applicable; pupil attendance in the school or school district, as applicable; and student, parent, and teacher feedback, and other information considered pertinent by the superintendent or other administrator conducting the performance evaluation or the school board, ISD board, or PSA board of directors.

The bill would delay application of these requirements until the 2017-2018 school year.

The bill would delete the requirement that the school district, ISD, or PSA adopt and implement the State evaluation tool or a local tool consistent with the State tool. Additionally, the bill would require the measures used by the school district, ISD, or PSA in its evaluation system for school administrators to be used consistently among the schools it operated so that all similarly situated administrators were evaluated using the same measures.

The bill also would make the same changes to the percentage of the evaluation that must be based on student growth and assessment data as proposed for teacher evaluations.

Currently, the dismissal requirement for an ineffective administrator applies only if the three consecutive evaluations are conducted using the same evaluation tool and under the same evaluation system. The bill would delete this provision.

The bill would require the school district, ISD, or PSA to give school administrators information on the measures used in the performance evaluation system and on how each of the measures was used.

Online Information

The bill would require a school district, ISD, or PSA to post on its website all of the following information about the evaluation tool or tools it used for its teacher and administrator performance evaluation systems:

- 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.

Evaluation Tool List

The bill would require the Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (DTMB) to establish and maintain a list of tools that could be used for evaluating teachers. The list could include evaluation models recommended in the final recommendations released by the Michigan Council on Educator Effectiveness in July 2013. The list would have to include a statement indicating that school districts, ISDs, and PSAs were not limited to the tools included on the list.

The bill would establish similar provisions with regard to tools for evaluating school administrators. The list could include the two evaluation models recommended in the Council's final recommendations.

Collective Bargaining Agreement

Under the 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 the bill, this exception would apply only if the same agreement were still in effect on the bill's effective date.

Instruction by Ineffective Teachers

Beginning in 2015-2016, if a pupil is assigned to be taught by a teacher who has been rated as ineffective on his or her 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 delete these provisions.

Instead, beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, a school district, ISD, or PSA could not assign a pupil 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 school district, ISD, or PSA 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.

Teaching Certificate

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Code or a rule to the contrary, beginning July 1, 2018, the bill would prohibit the Superintendent of Public Instruction from issuing an initial professional teaching certificate to an individual unless the individual presented evidence satisfactory to the Superintendent demonstrating that he or she met all of the following criteria:

- The individual had successfully completed at least three full years of classroom teaching
- The individual was rated as effective or highly effective on his or her annual year-end performance evaluation for the three consecutive school years immediately preceding his or her application for the certificate, or was rated as effective or highly effective for at least three nonconsecutive school years before his or her application and the individual submitted a recommendation from the chief school administrator of the school where he or she was currently employed that he or she should be issued a certificate.
- The individual had completed at least six semester credit hours, or the equivalent in terms of trimesters, in a planned program at an approved teacher preparation institution; or six semester credit hours or the trimester equivalent of academic credit approved by the Superintendent as being appropriate to the grade level and subject area endorsement of the teaching certificate at any college or university.

Exceptions to Evaluation System Requirements

Currently, a school district, ISD, or PSA is not required to comply with the Code's requirements regarding the performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators if all of the following apply to a public school operated by the district, ISD, or PSA:

- As of July 19, 2011, the school district, ISD, or PSA had already implemented and is currently using an evaluation system meeting certain conditions for that school.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA notified the former Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness by November 1, 2011, that it was exempt from the requirements.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA posts a description of its evaluation system on its website.

The criteria for continued use of an existing evaluation system include the following:

- The most significant portion of an individual's evaluation is based on student growth and assessment data, which may include value-added measures.
- The system uses research-based measures to determine student growth.
- The system determines professional competence through multiple direct observations of classroom practices and professional practices throughout the school year.
- Under the system, teacher and administrator effectiveness and ratings, as measured by student achievement and growth data, are factored into teacher retention, promotion, and termination decisions.
- Under the system, performance evaluation results are used to inform professional development for the succeeding year.
- The system ensures that teachers and administrators are evaluated at least annually.

The bill would eliminate the exemption for a school district, ISD, or PSA using an existing system meeting the prescribed criteria. Instead, a school district, ISD, or PSA would be encouraged to adopt and implement such a performance evaluation system.

The Code provides that, after July 19, 2011, if a school district, ISD, or PSA begins operating a new public school, or implements a new performance evaluation system for an existing public school, the district, ISD, or PSA is not required to comply with the Code's evaluation system requirements if both of the following apply:

- The system adopted and implemented for that school replicates and is identical to the evaluation system of a public school that meets the criteria for exemption.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA posts a description of the system on its website.

The bill would eliminate this exemption.

Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund

The bill would repeal Section 95a of the State School Aid Act, which created the Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund in the State Treasury, provided for the allocation to the Fund of 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 made expenditure of money from the Fund conditional on the enactment of House Bills 5223 and 5224 from the 2013-2014 legislative session. (The House bills, which proposed revisions to the State's educator performance evaluation system, were not enacted.)

MCL 380.1249 et al.

Legislative Analyst: Julie Cassidy

FISCAL IMPACT

State: The bill would have a minimal fiscal impact on the Department of Education. The changes to the teacher certification process, from three years of satisfactory performance

currently required for a provisional teaching certificate to three years of effective or highly effective performance that the bill would require for an initial professional teaching certificate, would result in very little cost to the Department. This would not change the process for issuing a teaching certificate and the Center for Education Performance and Innovation (CEPI) currently collects teacher effectiveness ratings, so the information already is readily available. The Department estimates total costs to be \$50,000.

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget would not incur costs to maintain the list of the four approved teacher evaluation models and the two administrator evaluation models, because those models have already been selected and are known.

The elimination of the Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund would allow \$14.8 million to be allocated to other programs or put into the foundation allowance.

Local: The bill could result in additional costs to schools. Schools and districts would have to review current evaluation systems to ensure that the evaluation model, including the percentage requirement of student achievement and growth, was in line with the Code. If a district's evaluation system were not meeting statutory requirements, the district would have to adopt one of the approved models or develop a system within the district that was supported by research. Either activity would result in additional costs to the district, which would have to pay for one of the models, or devote time and resources toward developing one that complied with the Code. Since the State would no longer be issuing statewide requests for proposals for the evaluation models, the costs per district could increase as the economies of scale were reduced. The costs would have to come from the operations budget of the district since the Educator Evaluation Reserve Fund would be eliminated. These costs are indeterminate.

The elimination of the Evaluation Reserve Fund could have either negative or positive effects on local schools, depending on the current status of a district's evaluation system, and how the \$14.8 million from the Fund were re-appropriated upon its elimination. If a district already has an evaluation system that complies with the Code, then the district would not have had access to the Fund and instead could receive an increase to its foundation allowance or other school funding, depending on the Legislature's re-appropriation of the \$14.8 million. Thus, the impact on the district could be positive.

However, if the district does not currently have an evaluation model that satisfies the statute, the district potentially could receive less from the re-appropriation of the \$14.8 million into the foundation allowance or other programs than it might have with a grant from the Evaluation Reserve Fund, resulting in a negative impact compared with current law. It is not known how many schools would have benefited from the Evaluation Reserve Fund or how many would benefit more if the funds were put into the foundation allowance or any other program funded with these dollars.

There also would be minor costs associated with informing teachers, principals, and the community about the changes to evaluations. There would be ongoing costs associated with ensuring that each teacher was observed twice yearly by either the school principal or his or her designee. Those costs are indeterminate.

The prohibition against schools' assigning pupils to be taught in the same subject for two consecutive years by an ineffective teacher could have indeterminate ramifications for staffing levels and costs at a school.

Fiscal Analyst: Cory Savino