

Your Question

You asked for state examples related to student growth measures in teacher evaluation systems.

Our Response

Scholars and education researchers have conducted multiple analyses on the effectiveness of teacher evaluation on student performance. Recent [research](#) found that there was no significant impact of teacher evaluation reforms on students' academic performance as measured by test scores or educational attainment. Additionally, [research](#) into teacher value-added models (VAMs) on teacher evaluations shows wide variability in teacher evaluation scores across years. VAMs typically attempt to ascertain an individual teacher's performance by comparing their current students' standardized test performance across academic years. Specifically, the research noted that teacher's evaluation scores that use VAMs can vary widely and can be impacted by the students a teacher is assigned in a given academic year.

While an [article](#) from Education Week notes an increase in the number of states that required student growth measures in teacher evaluations from 2009 to 2015, 50-state information from The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) found a slight decrease in the number states that mandated student growth from 2015 to 2019. As of June 2019, the NCTQ [scan](#) found that 34 states require student growth to be factored into teacher evaluations, compared to 39 states in [2017](#).

The [2019 NCTQ scan](#) also found that state approaches to the use of student growth in teacher evaluations vary widely across jurisdictions. At least 16 states that mandate student growth do not specify the percentage that student growth comprises within teacher evaluations. In some cases, these states stipulate that student growth must be a significant factor within the evaluation systems. In other states, a range of percentages or a minimum student growth percentage is required for teacher evaluations. There is also a wide range among states that specify a percentage for student growth in teacher evaluations; this range goes from 15% to 50%. Likewise, two states differentiate the percentage of student growth required based upon whether teachers are in tested or non-tested subjects. The student growth percentage for teachers in tested subjects is greater than the percentage for teachers in non-tested subjects.

State Examples

The following state examples highlight enacted legislation from 2019 onward that mandated changes to student growth metrics in teacher evaluations. Some of these modifications reflect states' efforts to manage teacher evaluation and student assessments during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Colorado

[H.B. 21-1161](#) (2021) prohibits a school district from using student academic growth measures or student performance measures when evaluating licensed personnel for the 2020-21 school year.

Delaware

[H.B. 133](#) (2021) outlines a pilot of a new Delaware Teacher Growth and Support System to be piloted in at least three school systems for the 2021-22 academic year. All teachers will be evaluated under the new system beginning in the

2022-23 academic year. The pilot will weigh all performance areas equally and includes one area dedicated to student improvement.

Indiana

[H.B. 1002](#) (2020) removes the requirement that plans for employee evaluation to include objective measures of student achievement and growth.

Michigan

[S.B. 122](#) (2019) suspends for one year (from 2018-19 to 2019-20) the scheduled increase in the percentage of annual year-end teacher evaluations based on student growth and assessment data from 25% to 40%.

Nevada

[S.B. 475](#) (2019) amends the percentage of student growth as part of teacher evaluations from 40% to 15% beginning with the 2019-20 school year.

New York

[A. 783](#) (2019) eliminates the use of the state-provided growth model in a teacher or principal's evaluation.

Ohio

[H.B. 404](#) (2020) extends the prohibition against using certain academic growth data to measure student learning attributable to a teacher, principal or school counselor while conducting performance evaluations to the 2021-22 academic year.

Tennessee

[S.B. 442](#) (2020) authorizes local education agencies that receive pre-K program approval to use an alternative academic growth indicator approved by the state board of education and adopted by the LEA, rather than the pre-K/kindergarten growth portfolio model approved by the state board of education in the evaluation of pre-K and kindergarten teachers.