

A: Teachers demonstrate leadership in their schools				
B: Teachers lead the teaching profession				
C: Teachers advocate for schools and students				
D: Teachers demonstrate high ethical standards				
Overall Rating for Standard V				
Standard VI: Teachers take responsibility for student growth				
A: Teachers pursue high levels of student growth in academic achievement				
B: Teachers pursue high levels of student growth in the skills necessary for postsecondary life, including democratic and civic participation				
C: Teachers use evidence to evaluate their practice and continually improve attainment of student growth				
Overall Rating for Standard VI				

State Council for Educator Effectiveness

Creating Summary Ratings for Novice and Experienced Teachers

DRAFT – March 9, 2011

As discussed earlier, once a district has ratings for educator performance against the elements of a standard, it will need a way to combine these scores to produce a summary at the level of each standard. The example delineated below uses a weighted average approach to combine sub-score information. This allows a district to make choices about the relative importance of particular standards in the context of its needs. The Council may wish, however, to give some guidance on parameters within which weighting decisions should be made.

Council members have questioned the need for a separate novice panel within the system requirements it recommends. The example below illustrates the types of differences that could arise from a decision to weight particular standards more heavily for novices, reflecting recognition that all novice teachers are not likely to demonstrate excellence, or even effectiveness, against all five professional practice standards.

A novice teacher and an experienced educator whose final scores on professional practice standards and the student growth standard are identical, are NOT identical in their performance at all given their performance against all of the standards as a whole. Having two different panels allows for value judgments (through differences in weightings of standards) to be made about what can fairly be expected from the majority of teachers in their first two years in-service, versus what can be expected from the majority of experienced educators.

The example which follows is based on a system that allows a 5-point rating for each standard. These points feed into multiple measures panels to arrive at an overall effectiveness ratings. The system allows a districts to weight standards differently, and then to use weighted averages to calculate a quality standards score.

The EXAMPLE panels used below have NOT been developed through the any type of standard setting process and are for illustrative purposes only. If done correctly standard setting is a deliberative and systematic process designed to develop shared meaning among those selected to participate in the standard setting activity (the panelists) so they may work to establish cutscores from a common understanding of performance. Such a process would need to be undertaken by a group of stakeholders after the implementation of this evaluation system generated data which could be used to decide the points at which educators transitioned between performance standards.

Novice 8th grade ELA: Aggregating Professional Practice and Student Growth Scores

STANDARDS I-V	POINTS	WEIGHT (6)	TOTAL
I: Know Content	3	.5	1.5
II: Establish Environment	4	2.25	9
III: Facilitate Learning	3	2.25	6.75
IV: Reflect on Practice	2	.5	1
V: Demonstrate Leadership	1	.5	0.5
CALCULATE WEIGHTED AVERAGE		6.0	18
		FINAL SCORE	3.1 -> 3

VI: STUDENT GROWTH STANDARD	POINTS	WEIGHT (6)	TOTAL
Measure 1 (CSAP score)	3	2	6
Measure 2 (school-wide CSAP average)	2	2	4
Measure 3 (SGO outcome, work portfolio)	3	2	6
CALCULATE WEIGHTED AVERAGE		6	16
		FINAL SCORE	2.66 -> 3

Experienced 8th grade ELA: Aggregating Professional Practice and Student Growth Scores

STANDARDS I-V	POINTS	WEIGHT (6)	TOTAL
I: Know Content	3	2.0	6
II: Establish Environment	4	2.0	8
III: Facilitate Learning	3	2.0	6
IV: Reflect on Practice	2	2.0	4
V: Demonstrate Leadership	1	2.0	2
CALCULATE WEIGHTED AVERAGE		10	26
		FINAL SCORE	2.6 -> 3

VI: STUDENT GROWTH STANDARD	POINTS	WEIGHT (6)	TOTAL
Measure 1 (CSAP score)	3	2	6
Measure 2 (school-wide CSAP average)	2	2	4
Measure 3 (SGO outcome, work portfolio)	3	2	6
CALCULATE WEIGHTED AVERAGE		6	16
		FINAL SCORE	2.66 -> 3

Quality Standards Score	6	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
	5	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective?	Highly Effective
	4	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
	3	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
	2	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
	1	Ineffective	Ineffective	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective	Minimally Effective
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	Student Growth Score						

State Council for Educator Effectiveness

Creating Summary Ratings for Novice and Experienced Teachers

DRAFT – March 9, 2011

As discussed earlier, once a district has ratings for educator performance against the elements of a standard, it will need a way to combine these scores to produce a summary at the level of each standard. The example delineated below uses a weighted average approach to combine sub-score information. This allows a district to make choices about the relative importance of particular standards in the context of its needs. The Council may wish, however, to give some guidance on parameters within which weighting decisions should be made.

Council members have questioned the need for a separate novice panel within the system requirements it recommends. The example below illustrates the types of differences that could arise from a decision to weight particular standards more heavily for novices, reflecting recognition that all novice teachers are not likely to demonstrate excellence, or even effectiveness, against all five professional practice standards.

A novice teacher and an experienced educator whose final scores on professional practice standards and the student growth standard are identical, are NOT identical in their performance at all given their performance against all of the standards as a whole. Having two different panels allows for value judgments (through differences in weightings of standards) to be made about what can fairly be expected from the majority of teachers in their first two years in-service, versus what can be expected from the majority of experienced educators.

The example which follows is based on a system that allows a 5-point rating for each standard. These points feed into multiple measures panels to arrive at an overall effectiveness ratings. The system allows a districts to weight standards differently, and then to use weighted averages to calculate a quality standards score.

The EXAMPLE panels used below have NOT been developed through the any type of standard setting process and are for illustrative purposes only. If done correctly standard setting is a deliberative and systematic process designed to develop shared meaning among those selected to participate in the standard setting activity (the panelists) so they may work to establish cutscores from a common understanding of performance. Such a process would need to be undertaken by a group of stakeholders after the implementation of this evaluation system generated data which could be used to decide the points at which educators transitioned between performance standards.