

**Responses to Written Comments on Draft SB 191 Rules  
Received September 14 — September 22, 2011**

	<b>Comment/Question</b>	<b>CDE Response</b>
1	<p>Flexibility: In order for a new educator effectiveness system to really take hold in Colorado, there must be some flexibility built into the system. We have 178 districts and some BOCES that must have the ability to innovate, experiment and customize based on the unique needs and circumstances of their student populations and communities. CASE appreciates the movement toward assurances articulated in section 6.04 of the rules (dated 8.24.11), instead of a one-size-fits-all state mandate. In addition, we see a concerted effort to honor local conditions and decision-making authority in the new draft of the rules. CASE is very aware of and sensitive to the differences among rural, urban and suburban districts and local funding conditions.</p>	<p>The department believes that the latest draft of the rules (dated 9.28.11) remains sensitive to these issues.</p>
2	<p>Funding: This remains an incredibly difficult issue to surmount in the current budget environment. CASE appreciates that so many districts have been selected for state pilot projects to begin testing how districts can meet new standards, but it will be very important to really listen to districts, assess the results of the pilots, and accurately reflect the funding needs for full implementation. We are particularly concerned about the workload for principals. These are jobs that are already so demanding, and we need principals to provide feedback on what makes the most sense for making progress on student achievement, which is at the root of this new law. The bottom line is that successful implementation of a new educator effectiveness system will require resources, and highlights funding crisis faced by public educators in Colorado.</p>	<p>The department is currently conducting surveys with pilot districts to learn more about the costs of evaluation systems prior to implementation of the requirements under the new law, and will continue to monitor costs required to implement new evaluation systems during the pilot of the state model system.</p>
3	<p>Data: Section 5.01 of the rules clarifies how data shall be used in a Principal Professional Performance Plan. Ultimately, the use of proper data elements will be very important to the success of Colorado’s push for educator effectiveness. CASE supports local determination of which models, or survey data, to use, in a way that would honor existing investments in materials and training and local priorities. This is an area that will change over time, so Colorado should be careful not to put too much emphasis on any one defined data source.</p>	<p>The department agrees and is recommending that the following additional language be added to section 5.01 (I) (4):</p> <p>“SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES ARE ALSO STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO INCLUDE goals related to staff participation in the TELL initiative survey, required</p>

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
		pursuant to section 22-2-503, C.R.S., OR OTHER CULTURE AND CLIMATE OR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP SURVEYS, and use of survey results to guide improvement efforts.”
4	<p>I am extremely concerned about section 5.03 as it is currently written. First of all, I do not believe it addresses the requirements of the revised Licensed Personnel Performance Evaluation Act regarding the training requirements of evaluators. The state requires very specific skills and the rules do not mention these. While many administrators will have received instruction in this area in their licensure programs in Colorado, many will have come from other states and not have the requisite skill set. Second, as it is currently worded, it only speaks to requiring school districts and BOCES to provide training that ensures that administrators and teachers have an understanding of their local evaluation system and its implementation. This essentially requires that evaluators only know about their local system, not that they have the skills and knowledge to implement it. I would strongly recommend restoring sections 5.03 (B) and 5.03 (C) to the rules. I would also suggest amending section 5.03 (A) as follows:</p> <p>“School Districts and BOCES shall provide training to all evaluators and educators (this is addressed in other sections) to ensure that they have an understanding of their local evaluation system and its the SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED FOR ITS EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION.”</p> <p>Finally, I was unable to locate the language allowing for evaluators who do not hold administrative licenses to perform evaluations and the training that would be required for them to do so. This may be my oversight but I have looked closely. It may have been inadvertently omitted with the elimination of the previous section 5.03(C).</p>	<p>The Department recommends the following revisions be made:</p> <p>“5.03 (A) School Districts and BOCES shall provide training to all evaluators and educators to PROVIDE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR LOCAL EVALUATION SYSTEM AND TO PROVIDE THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE NEEDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SYSTEM. “</p> <p>“5.03 (B) AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 22-9-106 (4) (A), C.R.S., ALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS MUST BE CONDUCTED BY AN INDIVIDUAL WHO <del>is an evaluator</del> <del>may be an individual with a principal or administrator license or a designee of an individual with a principal or administrator license</del> that has received education and training in evaluation skills approved by the Department. TEACHERS MAY FILL THE ROLE OF AN EVALUATOR IF THEY ARE A DESIGNEE OF AN INDIVIDUAL WITH A PRINCIPAL OR ADMINISTRATOR LICENSE AND HAVE COMPLETED A TRAINING ON EVALUATION SKILLS THAT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT. THE DEPARTMENT SHALL DEVELOP A PROCESS FOR APPROVING EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR EVALUATORS THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVAL PROCESS PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED PURSUANT TO SECTION 22-</p>

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
		<p>9-108, C.R.S.”</p> <p>“5.03 (C) <del>Peers may fill the role of evaluator, if they have received the training described in section 5.03 (B) of these rules.</del> School Districts and BOCES ARE ENCOURAGED TO <del>may also provide training specific to Teachers, so that they may conduct peer COACHING observations and</del> IN ORDER TO support other Teachers by providing actionable feedback on Professional Practice.”</p>
5	<p>These new standards and elements provide teacher-educators with substantive language for focusing on content knowledge, differentiation, planning, instructional delivery, reflective practice, leadership, and responsibility for Student Academic Growth. However, they seem to stop short of explicitly mentioning one skill common to effective teachers, and that is classroom management. Classroom management is certainly implied under Standards II and III, but language like “acceptable student behavior,” “efficient use of time,” “sound disciplinary practices,” and “appropriate intervention strategies and practices,” so helpful in the current Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers, seems conspicuous by its absence from the CTQS. Was there an underlying rationale for that omission? If not, I would suggest the addition of an element under Standard II, with language similar to that in the current PBSCT, such as “Teachers create a learning environment characterized by acceptable student behavior, efficient use of time, and appropriate intervention strategies.”</p>	<p>The Department recommends the following element be added:</p> <p>“3.02 (B) (6) <b>ELEMENT F: TEACHERS CREATE A LEARNING ENVIRONMENT CHARACTERIZED BY ACCEPTABLE STUDENT BEHAVIOR, EFFICIENT USE OF TIME, AND APPROPRIATE INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.</b>”</p>
6	<p>Recommended revision: Add to section 2.02 the statement that “School Districts and BOCES may also include additional standards or elements that meet the needs of particular student populations within the context of their local communities.”</p>	<p>The department believes that the current version of the draft rules already provides sufficient flexibility for school districts and BOCES to adopt standards that meet the needs of particular student populations. The draft rules, in section 2.02, state that school districts and BOCES may “adopt their own locally developed standards that meet or exceed the Teacher Quality</p>

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
		Standards and Elements.”
7	<p>Four categories of performance should be included as per 2.03 and 3.03, but performance categories not be defined until after the Pilot Period , as we learn more about how these measures combine, as the state model system and other district multiple measures systems are piloted and implemented.</p> <p>Recommended revision: 2.03 Performance Evaluation Ratings for Principals. The following four Performance Evaluation Ratings for Principals shall be used statewide: ineffective, approaching effective, effective, and highly effective. FURTHER INFORMATION REGARDING THE DEFINITION OF THESE CATEGORIES WILL BE PROVIDED FOLLOWING THE PILOT PERIOD.</p>	<p>The department recommends the following revision be made to section 2.03 (D):</p> <p>“DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, AS THE DEPARTMENT DEVELOPS THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM’S PERSONNEL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURE FOR ASSIGNING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS, THE DEPARTMENT WILL DEVELOP STATEWIDE DEFINITIONS FOR THE PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE, PARTIALLY EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE.”</p>
8	<p>Recommended revision: 2.03 (A) During the Pilot Period described in section 6.03 of these rules, the Department shall develop a personnel evaluation framework to aggregate evidence collected systematically on multiple measures of a Principal’s performance on Principal Quality Standards I-VI (Professional Practice) into a single score and to aggregate evidence collected systematically on multiple measures of a Principal’s performance on Principal Quality Standard VII (Student Academic Growth) into a single score. School Districts and BOCES may use this framework as an example, OR MAY ADOPT OTHER METHODS FOR ENSURING THAT EACH OF THE QUALITY STANDARDS IS REASONABLY REPRESENTED IN THE PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PROCESS.</p>	<p>The department recommends the following revision:</p> <p>“2.03 (A) ... SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES MAY USE THIS FRAMEWORK AS AN EXAMPLE OR MAY ADOPT THEIR OWN FRAMEWORK, PROVIDED THEY ENSURE THAT EACH OF THE PRINCIPAL QUALITY STANDARDS I-VI HAS A MEASURABLE INFLUENCE ON THE FINAL PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE SCORE ASSIGNED TO TEACHERS...”</p>
9	<p>Recommended revision: 2.03 (B) During the Pilot Period, the Department also shall develop a statewide performance scoring matrix to assign Principals to one of four Performance Evaluation Ratings once a year, using the single Professional Practice score and the single Student Academic Growth score identified in section 2.03 (A) of these rules. School Districts and BOCES may use this matrix as an example, OR MAY ADOPT OTHER METHODS FOR ENSURING THAT EACH OF THE QUALITY STANDARDS IS REASONABLY REPRESENTED IN THE PRINCIPAL</p>	<p>The department recommends the following revision:</p> <p>“2.03 (B)... SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES MAY USE THIS DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURE AS AN EXAMPLE OR MAY ADOPT THEIR OWN STRUCTURE, PROVIDED THEY ENSURE THAT EACH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING IS BASED FIFTY PERCENT ON THE</p>

	<b>Comment/Question</b>	<b>CDE Response</b>
	EVALUATION PROCESS.	PRINCIPAL QUALITY STANDARD VII (STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH) AND THAT EACH OF THE PRINCIPAL QUALITY STANDARDS I-VI (PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE) HAS A MEASURABLE INFLUENCE ON THE FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING.”
10	Recommended revision: 2.03 (C) The Department shall develop model rubrics and tools for School Districts and BOCES to use in measuring each individual Principal’s performance against the Principal Quality Standards. The Department also shall provide technical GUIDANCE, BASED ON RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICES THAT EMERGE FROM THE PILOT OF THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER DISTRICT SYSTEMS DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, for School Districts and BOCES to use in developing their own rubrics and tools if they choose to develop their own distinctive personnel evaluation system.	The department agrees with this recommendation.
11	Recommended revision: 3.02 Teacher Quality Standards. All School Districts and BOCES shall base their evaluations of licensed classroom Teachers on the full set of Teacher Quality Standards and associated detailed Elements included below, or shall adopt their own locally developed standards that are substantially similar to the Teacher Quality Standards and Elements. SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES MAY ALSO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL QUALITY STANDARDS OR ELEMENTS APPROPRIATE TO THE SIZE, DEMOGRAPHICS AND LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OR BOCES.	See response in row 6, above.
12	Recommended revision: 3.03 Performance Evaluation Ratings for Teachers. The following four Performance Evaluation Ratings for Teachers shall be used statewide: ineffective, approaching effective, effective, and highly effective. Further information regarding the definition of these categories will be provided following the Pilot Period. School Districts and BOCES may choose to use different terms to describe each of these evaluation ratings, but shall ensure that they are able to report the data required by section 6.04 of these rules.	The department recommends the following revision be made to section 3.03 (D):  “DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, AS THE DEPARTMENT DEVELOPS THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM’S PERSONNEL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURE FOR ASSIGNING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS, THE DEPARTMENT WILL DEVELOP STATEWIDE DEFINITIONS FOR THE TEACHER

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
		PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE, PARTIALLY EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE.”
13	Recommended revision: 3.03 (A) During the Pilot Period described in section 6.03 of these rules, the Department shall develop a personnel evaluation framework to aggregate evidence collected systematically on multiple measures of a Teacher’s performance on Teacher Quality Standards I-V (Professional Practice) into a single score and to aggregate evidence collected systematically on multiple measures of a Teacher’s performance on Teacher Quality Standard VI (Student Academic Growth) into a single score. School Districts and BOCES may use this framework as an example, OR MAY ADOPT OTHER METHODS FOR ENSURING THAT EACH OF THE QUALITY STANDARDS IS REASONABLY REPRESENTED IN THE TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS.	The department recommends the following revision:  “3.03 (A) ... SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES MAY USE THIS FRAMEWORK AS AN EXAMPLE OR MAY ADOPT THEIR OWN FRAMEWORK, PROVIDED THEY ENSURE THAT EACH OF THE TEACHER QUALITY STANDARDS I-V HAS A MEASURABLE INFLUENCE ON THE FINAL PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE SCORE ASSIGNED TO TEACHERS...”
14	Recommended revision: 3.03 (B) During the Pilot Period, the Department also shall develop a statewide personnel evaluation scoring matrix ... School Districts and BOCES may use this matrix as an example, OR MAY ADOPT OTHER METHODS FOR ENSURING THAT EACH OF THE QUALITY STANDARDS IS REASONABLY REPRESENTED IN THE TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS.	The department recommends the following revision:  “3.03 (B)... SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES MAY USE THIS DECISION-MAKING STRUCTURE AS AN EXAMPLE OR MAY ADOPT THEIR OWN STRUCTURE, PROVIDED THEY ENSURE THAT EACH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING IS BASED FIFTY PERCENT ON THE TEACHER QUALITY STANDARD VI (STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH) AND THAT EACH OF THE TEACHER QUALITY STANDARDS I-V (PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE) HAS A MEASURABLE INFLUENCE ON THE FINAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING.”
15	Recommended revision: 3.03 (C) The Department will develop model rubrics and tools for School Districts and BOCES to use in measuring each individual Teacher’s performance against the Teacher Quality Standards. The Department also will provide technical GUIDANCE, BASED ON RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICES THAT EMERGE FROM THE PILOT OF THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM AND THE	The department agrees with this recommendation.

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
	IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER DISTRICT SYSTEMS DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, for School Districts and BOCES to use in developing their own rubrics and tools if they choose to develop their own distinctive personnel evaluation system.	
16	Recommended revision: 3.03 (D) (2) (b) <i>Implications for earning or losing nonprobationary status:</i> (i) Beginning in July 2013, for a Novice Teacher, IN HIS OR HER FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE, a rating of approaching effective shall be considered the first of three consecutive years of effective performance needed to earn nonprobationary status. Nonprobationary status in this instance shall only be earned if the Teacher is subsequently rated effective or above in the following two consecutive years. FOR A NOVICE TEACHER IN HIS OR HER SECOND OR THIRD YEAR OF SERVICE, A RATING OF APPROACHING EFFECTIVE WILL NOT COUNT TOWARDS THE ACCRUAL OF THREE YEARS OF EFFECTIVENESS NEEDED TO REACH NON-PROBATIONARY STATUS.	<p>The department recommends the following revision:</p> <p>3.03 (D) (2) (b) <i>Implications for earning or losing nonprobationary status:</i> (i) BEGINNING WITH EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED DURING THE 2013-14 SCHOOL YEAR, FOR A Teacher IN HIS OR HER FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE, a rating of partially effective shall be considered the first of three consecutive years of effective performance needed to earn nonprobationary status....</p> <p>(ii) BEGINNING WITH EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED DURING THE 2013-14 SCHOOL YEAR, FOR A probationary Teacher THAT IS NOT IN HIS OR HER FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE, a rating of partially effective shall not count towards the accrual of three years of effectiveness needed to reach nonprobationary status.</p>
17	Recommended revision: 5.01 (F) (2) (b) Additional Measures of Principal Professional Practice. In addition to the required measures of Professional Practice, School Districts and BOCES may also <del>consider</del> USE other sources of evidence REGARDING A PRINCIPAL'S PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE. ...The Department will develop technical GUIDANCE, BASED ON RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICES THAT EMERGE FROM THE PILOT OF THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER DISTRICT SYSTEMS DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, FOR USE BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES IN DEVELOPING THEIR OWN <del>that outline criteria for ensuring that these additional</del> measures of Professional Practice <del>meet minimum standards of credibility, validity, and reliability.</del>	The department agrees with this recommendation.

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
18	<p>Recommended revision: 5.01 (F) (4) Weighting of Performance on Principal Quality Standards. ...</p> <p>Measures of Principal Professional Practice shall determine fifty percent of a Principal's OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING <del>total score on an evaluation</del>, and measures of Student Academic Growth shall determine the other fifty percent of a Principal's OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING <del>the weight of the total overall score</del>.</p>	The department agrees with this recommendation.
19	<p>Recommended revision: 5.01 (F) (6) Method for Evaluating Teacher Professional Practice. ...</p> <p>The method for evaluating Teachers' Professional Practice may include additional measures. The Department will develop technical guidance, BASED ON RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICES THAT EMERGE FROM THE PILOT OF THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER DISTRICT SYSTEMS DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, FOR USE BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES IN DEVELOPING THEIR OWN <del>that outline criteria for ensuring that these additional</del> measures of Professional Practice <del>meet minimum standards of credibility, validity, and reliability</del>.</p>	The department agrees with this recommendation.
21	<p>Recommended revision: 5.01 (F) (7) Method for Evaluating Teacher Performance Related to Student Academic Growth. ... The Department will develop technical GUIDANCE, BASED ON RESEARCH AND BEST PRACTICES THAT EMERGE FROM THE PILOT OF THE STATE MODEL SYSTEM AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER DISTRICT SYSTEMS DURING THE PILOT PERIOD, FOR USE BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES IN DEVELOPING THEIR OWN <del>elines for ensuring that the selected</del> Measures of Student Academic Growth, INCLUDING GUIDELINES FOR ENSURING THAT SUCH MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH meet minimum standards of credibility, validity, and reliability. ... Student Academic Growth shall be measured using multiple measures. When compiling these measures to evaluate performance against Teacher Quality Standard VI, School Districts and BOCES shall CONSIDER THE RELATIVE TECHNICAL QUALITY AND RIGOR OF THE VARIOUS</p>	The department agrees with this recommendation.

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
	MEASURES <del>strive to ensure that the most weight is given to those measures that demonstrate the highest technical quality and rigor.</del>	
22	<p>Recommended revision: 5.01 (I) (3) The Principal Professional Performance Plan shall include the following:</p> <p>5.01 (I) (3) (a) Goals <del>addressing</del> FOR INCREASING the number and percentages of effective Teachers in the school, and the number and percentage of Teachers who are improving, in a manner consistent with the goals for the school outlined in the school's Unified Improvement Plan...</p>	<p>The current language in the draft rules allows for a principal's professional performance plan, in the early years of implementation of a local evaluation system, to include goals related to making the distribution of evaluation ratings for his or her staff more meaningful, rather than merely requiring that the ratings for all educators be increased.</p> <p>See also the language in section 5.01 (F) (2) (a), which requires principal evaluations to incorporate information about the number and percentages of teachers with each particular type of evaluation rating, "in comparison to the goals articulated in the Principals' Professional Performance Plan." The department intends to further evaluate the use of this type of data in principal evaluations during the pilot of the state model system.</p>
	<p>Recommended revision: 5.01 (I) (3) The Principal Professional Performance Plan shall include the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p>5.01 (I) (4) SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES ARE ALSO STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO INCLUDE goals related to staff participation in the TELL initiative survey, required pursuant to section 22-2-503, C.R.S., OR OTHER CULTURE AND CLIMATE OR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP SURVEYS, and use of survey results to guide improvement efforts.</p>	<p>The department agrees with this recommendation, and also suggests adding the term "other working conditions [surveys]."</p>
23	Recommended revision: 6.01 (D) The Department shall develop technical guidANCE regarding the development and use of various Student Academic	The department agrees with this recommendation.

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
	Growth approaches BY DISTRICTS OR BOCES, which shall be updated as research and best practices evolve. Approaches to be addressed within these GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS include, but are not limited to...	
24	In July 2011, Stand for Children gathered input from several national literacy experts and submitted suggested revisions. In the August draft rules, it was included that a reference be made to existing standards in Rules 2260.5-R-5.00 instead of including literacy explicitly in the teacher quality standards. It is our understanding from previous State Board meetings that 2260.5-R-5.00 would be replaced by the teacher quality standards, not supplemental to existing performance-based standards. Our recommendation continues to be to include literacy explicitly in the teacher quality standards.	<p>The department is in the process of evaluating the alignment between educator preparation, licensure, induction, professional development, and evaluation and will make recommendations concerning which changes to statute, rules and policies might lead to better alignment. In the meantime, the educator preparation standards in rules 2260.5-R-5.00 governs the program content in schools of education and reflects the knowledge that is expected for all beginning teachers in Colorado, and the SB 191 rules, once adopted, will outline the standards against which licensed teachers in Colorado will be evaluated.</p> <p>The current version of the draft rules (dated 9.28.11) include suggested amendments to the quality standards, for the state board's review.</p>
25	1.20 and 5.01 (F)(8)(C): "... that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms" and "... comparable among teachers." It is important to clarify if this means across classrooms/teachers within a school or across schools. This may become an issue if differences exist between schools (e.g., Innovation Schools).	<p>The definition of Student Academic Growth was based on statutory language, in section 22-9-105.5, C.R.S.</p> <p>The department recommends the following revisions:</p> <p>"1.19 'Student Academic Growth' means the change in student achievement against Colorado Academic Standards for an individual student between two or more points in time, which shall be determined using multiple measures, one of which shall be the results of Statewide Summative Assessments, and which may include other standards-based measures that are</p>

	Comment/Question	CDE Response
		<p>rigorous and comparable across classrooms OF SIMILAR CONTENT AREAS AND LEVELS.”</p> <p>“5.01 (F) (8) (c)...IN THE EFFORT <del>School Districts and BOCES shall seek</del> to ensure that Measures of Student Academic Growth are comparable among Teachers OF SIMILAR CONTENT AREAS AND GRADES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND BOCES ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO INCLUDE TEACHERS IN A DISCUSSION OF WHICH MEASURES ARE MOST APPROPRIATE TO THE TEACHERS’ CLASSROOMS.”</p>
26	<p>2.03 (E) and 3.03 (D)(2): Both of these require a disjunctive model (matrix) that evaluates Professional Practice and Student Academic Growth separately. This means that if a teacher or principal is only slightly below the growth criterion, s/he will be rated as less than effective, regardless of the strengths seen in professional practice (the same holds true in the reverse).</p> <p>For example, let’s imagine a 100 point scale with 50 points for professional practice and 50 for growth. Let’s also say that the minimum score to achieve Effective is 30 points on each. As written, a teacher or principal obtaining 50 points for professional practice and 29 points for growth would not be considered Effective.</p> <p>If this person is a teacher, 3.03 (D)(2)(A) requires that s/he receive support even though the teacher obtained the highest value possible on the Professional Practice dimension. For principals, this sends the message that their ratings/observations do not matter if the growth scores are not high enough.</p> <p>Looking at this another way, imagine a pool of teachers and principals who have been rated Effective or Highly Effective on Professional Practice. A proportion of this pool will be designated as less than effective due to growth measures and will therefore be at some level of risk. Since we do not know how big this proportion is, we cannot estimate the human capital implications.</p>	<p>The department believes that statute requires that evaluation systems measure Professional Practice and Student Academic Growth separately. Section 22-9-106 (1)(e)(II), C.R.S., requires that at least fifty percent of a teacher’s evaluation be determined by the academic growth of a teacher’s students. Similarly, section 106 (7) (b), C.R.S., requires that at least fifty percent of a principal’s evaluation be based on the academic growth of students enrolled in the principal’s school.</p>

	<b>Comment/Question</b>	<b>CDE Response</b>
	I know of no other large scale system that takes this approach. Other systems allow for an evaluation of the total score, so in the example above, if the minimum score was 60, the teacher or principal would exceed this with a 79. While there are certainly limits that should be in place with a compensatory or additive system, such a system is far more reflective of the actual performance of individuals.	
27	5.01 (F)(7)(A): "... measures are attributed to an individual licensed person." The attribution of scores is a very large measurement challenge, however in the context of RTI, Special Education, ELL Resource assistance, etc., this requirement appears untenable. It could be argued that such language could preclude measures that are not attributable to an individual. I do not believe that this is the intent, however it may be the outcome.	The department agrees with the State Council for Educator Effectiveness, that every teacher should be evaluated on student academic growth using both a measure that is individually attributed (which may or may not be a test score) and a measure that is collectively attributed (which, again, may or may not be a test score).
28	5.01 (F)(8)(d): "... shall include Student Academic Growth scores from all subjects for which the Teacher is responsible." Given the resource constraints at both the state and district level, this requirement may exceed capacity in terms of providing measures for all subjects by the implementation deadline. I believe the state and most districts are thinking in terms of a phased approach wherein they consider development over time while ensuring that the majority of courses/subjects are considered. This requirement at the outset may not be plausible.	The department is developing a resource bank that will identify measures of student academic growth in all standards areas. While the process will take time to fully develop, the department recommends that each school district begin discussions about how it is currently measuring student success and begins to examine how those approaches may be used to meet the requirements of SB 191.