

Teacher Evaluation Guidelines Changes :

4 Levels of Teacher Performance

The recent changes to the teacher evaluation guidelines give greater clarity in the definitions of the 4 levels of teacher performance used in evaluation. This presentation will describe those changes and how they promote better practice.

2.1 : 4-Level Rating System

2012 Guidelines

Ratings & Definitions:

- **Exemplary** - substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- **Proficient** - meeting indicators of performance
- **Developing** - meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- **Below Standard** - not meeting indicators of performance

2014 Guidelines

Same ratings and definitions

Further explanation added :

- 'Performance' shall mean "progress as defined by specified indicators"
- Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, as applicable
- Progress shall be demonstrated by evidence

Although definitions used in the rating system haven't changed, adding a 'further explanation' significantly changes the tone of evaluation.

The change moves is from a strict focus on whether or not a teacher *met* the goals - whether those are practice goals for the teacher or student goals - to a focus on a teacher *showing progress toward* meeting mutually agreed upon goals. What progress 'looks like' must be specifically defined by indicators that are agreed upon by the teacher and evaluator.

The indicators must be supported by evidence.

2.1 : 4-Level Rating System

Guidelines Change

Same ratings and definitions

Further explanation added :

- 'Performance' shall mean "progress as defined by specified indicators"
- Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, 'as applicable'
- Progress shall be demonstrated by evidence

Promoting Better Practice

- Rating process more clearly encourages use of holistic system
- More reliance on how all evidence connects & shows trends & patterns of performance over time
- Promotes risk-taking and growth
- Focus on *quality* of evidence over quantity
- 'As applicable' means mutual agreement as it pertains to different components of evaluation

A shift from strictly meeting goals to making progress in meeting goals encourages the use of a holistic approach, rather than a mathematical calculation to determine the teacher's evaluation rating.

A holistic approach is very different from that used now in many districts :

- * When you look at patterns and trends in performance over time, it's a more realistic picture of a teacher's performance.
- * It uses multiple pieces of evidence for each indicator; as a teacher, you can have more influence over what's used in your evaluation.
- * As a teacher, if you know that your evaluation will be based on showing progress in meeting goals, it should encourage you to set more challenging goals that will help change your practice.

* This stresses the importance of quality in your evaluation, rather than just quantity of evidence...you can end up with a richer evaluation with less data collection.

‘As applicable’ a new phrase. This means that mutual agreement may apply differently in different parts of the evaluation components. For example, the Professional Development and Evaluation committee mutually agrees on the rubric that will be used for observations and reviews of practice, and this rubric is then used district-wide; the individual teacher and his or her evaluator don’t mutually agree on which rubric to use. However, the teacher and evaluator can mutually agree that, in the teacher’s evaluation, only certain indicators within certain domains will be used. Another example would be the dispute resolution process. The PDE committee mutually agrees on what the process will be, not the individual teacher and evaluator. A third example would be this : the PDE mutually agrees that teachers will write either one or two student growth goals; the individual teacher and evaluator mutually agree on what the number of actual goals will be.

CEA Web Site - Teacher Evaluation Information Pertaining to Rating Systems

- Sample language for teacher evaluation plans:
 - Section 3 – Four-level Rating System
 - Section 7 – Determining Summative Evaluation Ratings
- Guidelines & language changes in guidelines

See [CEA Teacher Evaluation web page](#) for more specific information

Questions? Contact CEA staff : Linette Branham (linetteb@cea.org)
Michele O'Neill (micheleo@cea.org)
Ray Rossomando (rayr@cea.org)

The CEA web site has a lot of information local PDE committees can use while developing plans, including information on using the 4-level rating system more effectively.

New information is posted on the web site regularly.

CEA staff is also available to work with local committees. Be sure to involve your Uni Serv rep with committee work whenever possible – they're one good link to information, and can help committee members advocate for better practice.

Keeping CEA informed of challenges and successes helps us advocate on the state level for changes.