

Your Question

You asked 1) what states are doing regarding the use of student growth in teacher evaluations, and 2) how often teachers are required to undergo evaluation.

Our Response

Overview

In 2018, Education Commission of the States published [this report](#) on teacher evaluations, highlighting the changes that states made to their teacher evaluation laws in 2017. We found that states have responded variably to the new flexibilities provided under the Every Student Succeeds Act, including changing their requirement for student growth (see page 4). Also in 2018, ACT published [this report](#), capturing and summarizing all post-ESSA legislation impacting teacher evaluations.

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) collects information across all 50 states on this topic. According to [its scan](#), by the end of 2017:

- [Thirty-eight states](#) and the District of Columbia required student growth to be included in teacher evaluations.
- [Twenty-four states](#) and the District of Columbia required districts to evaluate all teachers each year.
- [Fifteen states](#) require a combination of experience and prior rating to dictate how many times a teacher will be observed.
- [Eleven states](#) require all teachers be observed multiple times, and [26 states](#) require some teachers be observed multiple times.

State specifics can be retrieved by clicking on the drop-down menu in the top right corner of the page. NCTQ's 50-state table on the use of student growth in teacher evaluations and on the frequency of teacher evaluations can be retrieved [here](#) (select the red arrow at the top of the page to toggle between the two datasets).

State Policies Impacting the Use of Student Growth in Teacher Evaluations

Education Commission of the States tracks enacted and vetoed state legislation (our summaries are available [here](#)). Examples of recent state policies impacting the use of student growth in teacher evaluations are provided below.

2016

In 2016, at least five states made changes to policies impacting the use of objective measures in teacher evaluations.

- **Arkansas [state board rule change](#):** Requires teacher ratings to be based on the teacher's professional practice, as evidenced by the performance rating and student growth. Also 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 "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 school's category or designation of improvement are not used in a particular employee's annual evaluation, the weight of all other measures would be proportionately increased.
- **Louisiana [S.B. 477](#)**: Instead of requiring that 50 percent of student growth be determined using a value-added model, requires that 50 percent of student growth be based on measures determined by the state board. Specifies that 35 percent of the overall evaluation be based on data derived through a value-added assessment model as a factor to determine student growth.
- **Oklahoma [H.B. 2957](#)**: Requires that for all evaluations, student performance — including performance on state tests — must be discussed with the teacher. Allows, but no longer requires, student performance to be a consideration for the teacher's rating.
- **Utah [H.B. 201](#)**: Prohibits the use of end-of-level assessment scores in educator and administrator evaluations.

2017

In 2017, at least 11 states made changes to policies impacting the use of objective measures in teacher evaluations.

- **Arkansas [H.B. 1424](#)**: Makes substantive changes to teacher evaluations. Among other things, requires that summative evaluation ratings use multiple sources of evidence, including direct observation, indirect observation and data. Defines "data" as teacher, student or overall school performance data that may include multiple measures of student growth, school quality or student success. Removes the requirement that the state board of education "require annual evidence of student growth from artifacts and external assessment measures."
- **Connecticut [state board](#)**: Prohibits the use of state assessment scores in educator evaluations, but requires that districts measure educators based on non-state exams for 22.5 percent of an educator's evaluation.
- **Florida [H.B. 7069](#)**: Maintains the requirement that at least one-third of a performance evaluation be based on data and indicators of student performance, but removes the requirement that student growth be derived from the state's value-added model — leaving the measure to district discretion. The bill also requires an independent analysis of student learning growth data.
- **Indiana [H.B. 1003](#)**: Provides that a school corporation may revise its teacher evaluation plan for the 2017-18 school year to determine how to include ISTEP results in evaluations of certificated employees.
- **Kentucky [S.B. 1](#)**: Removes the statewide personnel evaluation system and instead requires districts to develop and implement an evaluation system based on a statewide framework for teaching. The bill also removes the requirement that districts include student growth as a significant factor in teacher evaluations.
- **Michigan [S.B. 133](#)**: Prohibits use of the value-added growth and projection analytics system as a mandatory part of teacher evaluation or educator pay-for-performance systems.

- **Nevada [A.B. 320](#):** Among other things, removes the requirements that pupil achievement data account for at least 40 percent of an evaluation, and that such data be derived from both statewide examinations and certain assessments approved by the board of trustees of a school district. Instead, requires pupil growth — as determined by student learning goals — to account for this portion of the evaluation. Provides that, for the 2017-2018 school year, pupil growth must account for 20 percent of the evaluation of a teacher or administrator.
- **North Carolina [S.B. 257](#):** Requires the state board eliminate and prohibit the use of the analysis of student work to assess teacher performance and professional growth as part of the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation System. Requires the consolidated state plan submitted to the department of education reflect this change. Removes the requirement that teacher mentors and clinical educators meet the expectations for student growth, leaving only the requirement that they have been rated — through formal evaluations — at least at the “accomplished” level.
- **South Carolina [H. 3969](#):** Allows districts to use the value-added system to evaluate teachers using student progress or growth. The bill specifies that the estimates of teacher effects on student progress must not be public record, but can be made available to the teacher, principal, superintendent and any teacher-preparation programs approved by the state board.
- **Tennessee [H.B. 309](#):** Makes changes to the teacher evaluation criteria. Maintains the requirement that 50 percent of the total evaluation score be based on student growth for teachers with access to individual data representative of student growth, but requires the TVAAS (Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System) measure only account for 10 percent in 2016-17, 20 percent in 2017-18 and 35 percent thereafter. Requires that from 2016 through 2019, the most recent year’s student growth data accounts for the full 35 percent of growth data required in a teacher’s evaluation — if such use results in a higher evaluation score. Maintains the requirement that 30 percent of the total evaluation score be based on student growth for teachers without access to individual data representative of student growth, but provides that in the 2016-17 school year, no more than 10 percent of the evaluation criteria will be based on TVAAS data.
- **Utah [H.B. 231](#):** Makes substantive changes to teacher evaluations. Among other things, changes a core purpose of educator evaluation from improving “student achievement” to improving “student academic growth.” Changes the components of an educator evaluation system to require each local school board, in consultation with a joint committee, to adopt a reliable and valid educator evaluation program that evaluates educators based on educator professional standards established by the state board of education and includes 1) a systematic annual evaluation of all provisional, probationary and career educators; and 2) use of multiple lines of evidence — including self-evaluation, student and parent input, employee input (for an administrator), a reasonable number of supervisor observations to ensure adequate reliability, evidence of professional growth and other indicators of instructional improvement based on educator professional standards established by the board, and student academic growth data (instead of student achievement as previously provided).

The **New Mexico** legislature passed [a bill](#) that would have required that 20 percent or less of a teacher’s evaluation be based on student achievement from multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement; but the bill was [vetoed](#). In addition, at least three states convened task forces, working groups or other independent reviews to examine the topic and provide recommendations.

- **Florida [H.B. 7069](#)**: Requires an independent analysis of student learning growth data.
- **Indiana [H.B. 1003](#)**: Urges the legislative council to assign to the interim study committee on education during the 2017 interim of the general assembly the topic of Indiana’s laws concerning school certificated employee evaluations. **[S.B. 108](#)**: Requires the department of education, in collaboration with the state board of education, to prepare a report that includes recommendations regarding certificated employee evaluations. Requires the department, not later than Nov. 1, 2017, to submit the report to the general assembly.
- **Louisiana [H.R. 158](#)**: Urges the state board to examine the validity of the data produced by the value-added assessment model used to evaluate public school teachers and to include its findings and recommendations in the annual report submitted to the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education by March 1, 2018. (In 2016, Louisiana passed legislation reducing the impact of the value-added assessment model from 50 percent to 35 percent of a teacher’s overall evaluation score.)

2018

In 2018, at least two states made changes to policies impacting the use of objective measures in teacher evaluations.

- **Ohio [S.B. 216](#)**: Requires the state board of education to revise the state framework for teacher and administrator evaluations, based on the recommendations of the Educator Standards Board. Requires the state board to adopt the revised framework by May 1, 2020, and requires school districts to update their teacher evaluation policies by July 1, 2020. Makes several changes to the specifications for the revised framework, including eliminating the requirement that student academic growth count for half of an evaluation, prohibiting the use of student learning objectives, prohibiting the use of shared attribution and requiring professional growth plans or improvement plans. Requires at least two measures of “high-quality student data,” as defined by the state board, to provide evidence of student learning. Specifies that the revised framework does not take effect until the 2020-21 school year and establishes a one-year pilot program for the 2019-20 school year in order to guide implementation.
- **Tennessee [H.B. 67](#)**: By the 2018-19 school year, requires local education agencies to use at least one alternative growth model that has been approved by the board of education for evaluation of teachers in non-tested grades and subjects. Requires the department of education to develop alternative student growth models for grade levels and subjects that do not have growth models. Identical to SB 250.