

**Your Question:** You wanted 50-state information on the use of student test scores in teacher evaluations.

**Our Response:** Our response is broken up into three sections: First, we provide a national snapshot on the status of teacher evaluations through 2015 and include a table with state specifics. We then provide an update on the implementation of state evaluation systems and a summary of the revised evaluation requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Finally, we provide a list of state policies passed this year on the topic of teacher evaluations.

### National Snapshot

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) tracks state trends in educator evaluations. According to their [report](#) and [updated 50-state scan](#) of educator evaluation policies, by 2015:

- **43 states required objective measures of student achievement to be included in teacher evaluations**, up from only 15 states in 2009. (Five states – CA, IA, MT, NE and VT had no formal state policy requiring that teacher evaluations take objective measures of student achievement into account, and three states—AL, NH and TX – had evaluation policies that existed only in waiver requests to the federal government.)
- **16 states included student achievement and growth as the “preponderant criterion” in teacher evaluations**, up from only four states in 2009. These states include: AK, CO, CT, DC, DE, GA, HI, KY, LA, MS, NC, NM, NY, OK, PA and TN.
- **19 states included growth measures as a “significant criterion” in teacher evaluations**. Eleven of those states (AZ, FL, ID, IL, MI, MN, NJ, NV, OH, RI, VA) explicitly define what “significant” means for the purposes of including student achievement in teacher evaluations. Eight states (AR, IN, KS, MD, ME, MO, OR, SD) do not provide these explicit guidelines.
- **Eight states required objective evidence of student learning in teacher evaluations**. (MA, ND, SC, UT, WA, WI, WV, WY). At one time, SC, UT and WI required student growth to be a “significant criterion.”
- **Seven states required that schoolwide achievement data be used in individual teacher performance ratings**, while 11 other states explicitly allowed the practice. With the exception of AZ, no state that required schoolwide measures counted school-level data for more than 20 percent of the rating.

**Table 1** at the end of this response provides 50-state information of the use of achievement data/student growth in teacher evaluations.

### State Implementation and ESSA

According to NCTQ, “while there has indeed been tremendous activity at the policy level [surrounding teacher evaluation systems] the reality is that most states have barely begun to implement these new systems.” In many cases, implementation has been delayed so as to allow for enough phase-in time of new student learning objectives and standards or to reassess the system in place. Implementation timelines for each state can be accessed in [this 2016 report](#).

In addition, the systems currently in place could change as a result of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). As explained on page 20 of our [ESSA Quick Guides](#) ESSA **removes the requirement** for teacher evaluation systems established under the federal waiver process, and instead, **simply permits** states and districts to develop and implement evaluation systems. ESSA prevents the U.S. Secretary of Education or any other officer of the federal government from prescribing specific characteristics or measures of effectiveness that states must use in their evaluation systems.

## State Policies in 2016

At least five states modified their teacher evaluation laws/regulations in 2016. ECS tracks these changes, and summaries of state policies relating to teacher evaluations for the past 20 years can be accessed [here](#).

- **Arkansas** [ADC 005.08.4-12.0](#): Requires teacher ratings to be based on the teacher's professional practice, as evidenced by the performance rating, and student growth. Requires teachers to submit artifacts as evidence of professional practice in determining the performance rating. Removes references to SOAR, the previous method used to calculate student growth, but clarifies that "student growth measure" as a measure that must be defined by the State Board in the future and is based on statewide assessments. Redefines "statewide assessment of student achievement."
- **Indiana** [H.B. 1003](#): Provides that ISTEP test scores or a school's category or designation of school improvement for the 2014-15 school year may not be used by a school corporation as part of an annual performance evaluation of a particular certificated employee unless the use of the ISTEP program test scores or a school's category or designation of school improvement would improve the particular teacher's annual performance rating. Requires that if ISTEP test scores or a schools' category or designation of improvement is not used in a particular employee's annual evaluation, the weight of all other measures be proportionately increased.
- **Louisiana** [S.B. 262](#) and [S.B. 477](#). For the 2016-17 school year, requires the state board to collect results from student assessments but may not require the use of such assessments for purposes of teacher evaluations or making placement decisions for 4th and 8th grade students. Repeals requirement that 50% of teacher evaluations be based on evidence of student growth using a value-added assessment model. Instead requires that 50% of teacher evaluations be based on evidence of growth in student achievement as determined by the state board. Requires that data from a value-added assessment model, as determined by the state board, be a factor in determining evidence of student growth for grade levels and subjects for which value-added data is available and that such data comprise 35% of the overall evaluation.
- **Oklahoma** [H.B. 2957](#): Pushes back from 2016-17 to 2017-18 the school year by which the state Board of Education and districts must work cooperatively to incorporate components of the new statewide system of evaluation into each district. Removes the qualitative and quantitative rating components of the evaluation system and requirements based on those components, including how to create a quantitative rating when the subject taught isn't tested. Adds a requirement that, if districts choose to use a quantitative measure, the measure must include at least one reliable, research-based measure approved by the Board. Requires that for all evaluations, student performance, including performance on state tests, must be discussed with the teacher. Allows student performance to be a consideration for the teacher's rating.

- **Utah [H.B. 201](#):** Prohibits educator evaluations from using end-of-level assessment scores. Prohibits the state's evaluation systems from using student assessment scores. Removes student learning growth or achievement and measures of student learning growth from educator evaluation. Prohibits a school district's employee compensation system from being based on end-of-level assessment scores.

**Table 1: Achievement data/student growth in teacher evaluations (2015)**

State	Use of achievement data/student growth in teacher evaluations
<b>Alabama</b>	Not addressed.
<b>Alaska</b>	Alaska is phasing student growth measures into teacher evaluations. By 2018-2019, fifty percent of teacher evaluations are to be based on student growth data. Policy is now under reconsideration in 2016. Alaska has also proposed the removal of specific percentages when it comes to inclusion of student learning data, and instead it has proposed to not allow an overall rating of proficient or higher if a teacher is evaluated as unsatisfactory on the student learning standard.
<b>Arizona</b>	For teachers with available classroom-level student achievement data classroom data must account for between thirty-three and fifty percent of total outcome. School-level data is optional and cannot account for more than seventeen percent. A measure of academic growth must count for twenty percent of the total evaluation. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, state assessment data must be a significant factor in the academic growth calculation.
<b>Arkansas</b>	Evidence of student growth must be a “significant” part of evaluations but the rules do not articulate what this will actually mean in practice. Arkansas rules require annual evidence of student growth from artifacts and external assessment measures, with evidence of student learning not limited to a single assessment.
<b>California</b>	Objective measures of student achievement are not required; state law does include reference to use of state test data and standards of expected pupil achievement ‘if applicable’.
<b>Colorado</b>	By 2013-2014, fifty percent of the overall performance evaluation rating must be determined by multiple measures of student growth. Measures of student growth must include the following: a measure of individually attributed student academic growth; a measure of collectively attributed student academic growth; statewide summative assessment results, when available, and for subjects with annual statewide summative assessment results in two consecutive grades, results from the Colorado Growth Model. Additional measures may also be used.
<b>Connecticut</b>	By 2016-2017, forty-five percent of the evaluation must be based on attainment of one-four goals for student growth. One half must be based on standardized tests. The other half may consist of one additional indicator.
<b>Delaware</b>	DPAS II is comprised of five components, including student improvement. Teachers cannot be rated “effective” unless they have met student growth targets. For tested grades and subjects, student achievement means scores on state assessments and other measures of student learning, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
<b>District of Columbia</b>	For LEAs in the District individual value-added information must account for fifty percent of the evaluation. Teachers in non-tested grades and subjects must have student growth count for at least 15 percent of their scores. Requirements for non-charter LEAs vary.
<b>Florida</b>	At least one third of teacher evaluations must be based on data and indicators of student

	performance. "Student performance data must reflect actual contribution of the teacher to the performance of the students assigned to that teacher and in the teacher's subject matter."
<b>Georgia</b>	When data are available to calculate student achievement growth measures, such measures must count for at least fifty percent of the teacher evaluations. For courses not subject to annual assessments, state must approve local measures.
<b>Hawaii</b>	Fifty percent of a teacher's evaluation score is based on multiple measures of student growth. For classroom teachers of tested grades and subjects, the Hawaii growth model counts for 25 percent, and student learning objectives (SLOs) comprise the other 25 percent. For non-tested grades and subjects, the breakdown is 5 percent for the growth model and 45 percent for SLOs.
<b>Idaho</b>	Student achievement must count for at least thirty-three percent of evaluation results based on multiple measures of growth; growth as measured by state assessments must be included.
<b>Illinois</b>	By the 2016-2017 school year, student achievement must be a "significant" factor in teacher evaluations. Illinois has defined significant as at least thirty percent of the performance evaluation rating assigned. State model requires student growth to count for fifty percent. For each category of teacher, districts must include the use of at least one Type I (statewide or beyond) or Type II (districtwide) assessment and at least one Type III (aligned with course curriculum) assessment, along with a measurement model to assess student growth on these assessments. SLOs are one option districts can choose as a measurement model.
<b>Indiana</b>	In Indiana, objective measures of student achievement and growth must "significantly inform" the evaluation. Objective measures must include state assessment results for teachers of subjects measured by such assessments, or methods for assessing student growth for teachers of subjects not measured by state assessments. Where a mandatory state assessment exists, districts must use it as a measure of student learning. If that state assessment provides individual growth model data, it must be used as that teacher's primary measure of student learning.
<b>Iowa</b>	Objective measures of student achievement are not required.
<b>Kansas</b>	Evaluation systems must require student growth to be a significant factor. Multiple measures must include state assessment results for grades and subjects in which such assessments are administered.
<b>Kentucky</b>	The statewide personnel evaluation system uses multiple measures of effectiveness, including student growth data as a "significant" factor in determining teacher effectiveness. Student growth data must utilize both standardized tests and local formative growth measures.
<b>Louisiana</b>	Fifty percent of the evaluation score is based on student learning and fifty percent on observation using the state's rubric. For subjects tested by state standardized assessments, student growth on such tests is used to measure student learning. For subjects not tested by state standardized tests, targets established by teachers and evaluators are used to measure student learning.
<b>Maine</b>	Teacher evaluations must use multiple measures of educator effectiveness, including but not limited to student learning and growth, although rules say student learning and growth must inform a significant portion of the effectiveness rating. Standardized tests, if applicable, must be used.
<b>Maryland</b>	Student growth must account for a "significant" portion of a teacher's performance evaluation and must be one of the multiple measures used. No single criterion is allowed to count for more than thirty-five percent of the total performance evaluation. For elementary

	and middle school teachers providing instruction in state-assessed grades and content, student growth consists of aggregate assessment scores, student learning objectives and the schoolwide index. For all remaining teachers, student growth consists of student learning objectives and the schoolwide index.
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Massachusetts requires its teacher evaluations to include “multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement” as one category of evidence in teacher evaluations. The state defines these measures as student progress on classroom assessments that are aligned with the state's Curriculum Frameworks; student progress on learning goals; statewide growth measures, including the MCAS Student Growth Percentile and the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA); and district-determined measures of student learning across grade or subject. Student feedback is also required.
<b>Michigan</b>	Beginning in 2015-2016, twenty five percent of teacher evaluations must be based on student growth and assessment data. For the 2018-2019 school year, forty percent must be based on student growth. For tested core content areas, half of student growth will be measured using state assessments, and half will be measured using "multiple research-based growth measures or alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across schools." Student learning objectives may also be used.
<b>Minnesota</b>	Value added assessment models will count for thirty-five percent of teacher evaluation results. For grade levels and subject areas for which value-added data are not available, state or local measures of student growth must be established. The state model uses student learning goals.
<b>Mississippi</b>	Fifty percent of teacher evaluation scores must be comprised of objective student growth data. For teachers in state-tested areas, thirty percent must be individual growth and twenty percent must be schoolwide growth.
<b>Missouri</b>	The state’s framework requires locally developed systems to include measures of student growth that are a “significant” contributing factor and to ensure that a proficient or distinguished rating cannot be earned if student growth is low.
<b>Montana</b>	Objective measures of student achievement are not required.
<b>Nebraska</b>	Objective measures of student achievement are not required.
<b>Nevada</b>	Student achievement data counts for at least forty percent of teacher evaluations, with statewide assessments accounting for at least 20 percent and pupil achievement data derived from assessments approved by the district accounting for 20 percent.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	New Hampshire’s task force outlines a system that incorporates student performance, however these elements are not required.
<b>New Jersey</b>	Student performance data are required to be a significant factor in a teacher’s evaluation score. The Commissioner of the Department of Education sets the weights each year. As state phased in new tests performance counted for ten percent in 2014-15 and twenty percent in 2015-16.
<b>New Mexico</b>	Evaluation plans must include measures of student achievement growth worth fifty percent. For teachers with a standards-based assessment, the growth component must be comprised of the standard-based assessment (thirty-five percent) and additional department-approved assessments (fifteen percent). For teachers without standards-based assessments, recent changes to the evaluation system now allow districts to decide whether student achievement will be part of the score. If so, the figure is capped at 25 percent. These changes also no longer allow the inclusion of student achievement in evaluation scores for new teachers.

<b>New York</b>	New York requires that half of a teacher’s evaluation score be based on student academic achievement. This student performance category is comprised of at least one subcomponent, with an optional second subcomponent. The first subcomponent is either the state-provided growth score or, for teachers in non-tested grades and subjects, a student learning objective (SLO) that results in a growth score. Districts may add a second subcomponent, which may either be another state-provided growth score on a state test or a growth score based on a supplemental state assessment.
<b>North Carolina</b>	All teachers must be evaluated based on six standards, including student growth. Three methods are used to determine student growth: 1) analysis of student work: used with courses and grades that focus on performance standards; 2) pre-post test growth model: used with courses and grades where statewide assessments are in place but the EVAAS cannot be used; and 3) EVAAS (Educator Value-Added Assessment System): used with courses and grades where there are statewide assessments and a prediction model has been determined. A teacher cannot be rated effective if he or she does not meet expected student growth standard. Once a teacher has a three-year rolling average of student growth values, an overall status is determined.
<b>North Dakota</b>	Districts must incorporate multiple valid measures in teacher evaluations including student academic achievement. These measures must include performance reports from established standardized assessments where such assessments are conducted.
<b>Ohio</b>	Ohio requires that student growth measures count as a significant factor in an evaluation score. Recent legislation has created a safe harbor for teachers with value-added ratings from state tests. Teachers will not use value-added results for evaluation until results from the state tests administered in the 2016-2017 school year are incorporated into the evaluation ratings in the spring of 2018.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	The state requires that fifty percent of the ratings of teachers must be based on quantitative components: thirty-five percent based on student academic growth using multiple years of standardized test data, as available, and fifteen percent based on other academic measurements. . The quantitative rating is based on student growth using multiple years of test data, as available, and performance measures for teachers in grades and subjects without state-mandated assessments.
<b>Oregon</b>	Student learning and growth must count as a “significant” factor in teacher evaluations. Measures must include state assessment results, along with additional measures of student learning such as state, national, international or common district assessments; and other valid and reliable measures of student learning, growth and proficiency such as formative assessments, end-of-course tests, performance-based assessments; and collections or portfolios of student work.
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	Student performance must count for fifty percent of a teacher’s evaluation score. This half must be based on multiple measures of student achievement and be comprised of the following: building-level data (15 percent), which must include student performance on assessments, value-added assessment system data, grad rates, promotion rates; teacher-specific data (15 percent), including student achievement attributable to a specific teacher as measured by student performance on assessments, value-added assessment system data, progress in meeting student goals; and elective data (20 percent), including measures of student achievement that are locally developed.
<b>Rhode Island</b>	Rhode Island now requires student learning to count for 30 percent of the overall evaluation score. The state measures contributions to student progress toward academic goals and learning standards (student learning objectives) and combines them, when applicable, with results from the Rhode Island Growth Model (RIGM) for teachers in tested grades 3-7 and

	for subjects in reading and math.
<b>South Carolina</b>	Student growth is only required to be included as 20 percent of teacher evaluation score. The state requires local districts to use the statewide evaluation system or a district evaluation instrument that is state approved and equivalent to the state instrument's expectation. Approved district choice measures include test scores, student surveys and teacher self-reflection.
<b>South Dakota</b>	South Dakota requires quantitative measures of student growth as a significant factor in determining teacher effectiveness. Impact on student growth is measured through student learning objectives. A teacher assigned to a tested grade or subject must use data from state-mandated assessments as part of the SLO process.
<b>Tennessee</b>	The state requires that fifty percent of evaluations must be based on student achievement data. Thirty-five percent of a teacher's yearly evaluation must rely on student growth data from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) or another comparable growth measure. The remaining fifteen percent must be based on other measures of student achievement.
<b>Texas</b>	Texas has received a conditional ESEA waiver which requires the state to include growth in student achievement as a significant factor in the evaluation framework. Texas proposes to encourage districts to include student growth as twenty percent of evaluation. Texas is in the process of piloting T-TESS (Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System), scheduled for implementation in 2016-2017. According to the T-TESS summative matrix, student growth counts for 20 percent and teacher observations and self-assessment results make up 80 percent of the final score.
<b>Utah</b>	Utah only requires that student growth count for 20 percent of teacher evaluation ratings. Student growth measurements must adopt "differentiated methodologies" for measuring student growth for teachers of subjects with available standardized tests and for subjects for which these tests are not available.
<b>Vermont</b>	No state policy. The state has recently posted a set of guidelines on its website developed by the Vermont Task Force on Teacher & Leader Effectiveness that suggest the use of student growth factors and multi-tiered rating categories.
<b>Virginia</b>	Teacher evaluations must include student academic progress as a "significant" component. A superintendent's memo requires forty percent.
<b>Washington</b>	Teacher evaluations include a minimum of eight criteria and student growth data must be a "substantial factor" in evaluating the performance of teachers for only three performance standards. Student growth data must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based and state-based tools and can include measures of performance across an instructional team or school.
<b>West Virginia</b>	West Virginia requires that 15 percent of a teacher's summative evaluation score be based on student growth as measured by student learning goals and 5 percent on student learning growth measured by the schoolwide score on the state summative assessment. The process adopted by the state board incorporates the use of two pieces of evidence at two points in time to demonstrate student learning as an indicator of educator performance, as well as the use of schools' schoolwide student learning growth as measured by the statewide summative assessment.
<b>Wisconsin</b>	For most teachers self-scored student learning objectives make up 95 percent of student outcome measures.
<b>Wyoming</b>	By school year 2019-2020, teacher evaluations will be based in part on student academic growth measures. Evaluations will be based on five equally weighted domains, with one domain being evidence of student learning.

Source: [All States Evaluation Timelines Briefs](#) (NCTQ, 2016). Additional state specifics were retrieved from [this interactive database](#).