



TEACHER EVALUATION AND TENURE REFORM LEGISLATION 2010-2011

State	Summary	Creates advisory group?	Reforms tenure?	Reforms hiring?	Includes principals?	Specifies measures of performance?	Indicates specific percentage of performance measures?	Specifies evaluation for teachers of untested subjects? (art, music etc)	Timeline?
Alabama AL SB 310 (2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes the Students First Act • Provides rights, remedies, and obligations with respect to employment actions affecting or involving certain employees or categories of employees of county and city boards of education, the Institute for Deaf and Blind, including production workers at the Industries for the Blind, educational and correctional institutions under the control of the Department of Youth Services, and public two-year educational institutions • Relates to teacher tenure • Relates to teacher transfers 	No	Yes; Teachers shall attain tenure upon the completion of three complete, consecutive school years of full-time employment as a teacher with the same employer; may be terminated at any time because of a justifiable decrease in the number of positions or for incompetency, insubordination, neglect of duty, immorality, failure to perform duties in a satisfactory manner, or other good and just cause, but not for political or personal reasons	No	The term “teacher” also refers to principals who had attained tenure under prior law, but who have not elected to become contract principals	N/A	N/A	N/A	Effective July 1, 2011

<p>Arizona AZ SB 1040 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative data on student progress must account for 35-50% of evaluation outcomes Evaluations using State Board requirements must begin by the 2012-2013 school year 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes - 35-50%</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>SBOE must adopt model by December 15, 2011</p> <p>Evaluations begin 2012-2013</p>
<p>Arkansas AR HB 2178 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restructures the current method of evaluating Arkansas public school teachers Establishes the teacher excellence and support system, aligns provisions of the Arkansas code concerning professional development and teacher fair dismissal with the teacher excellence and support system Increases public awareness of effective teachers. “Teacher Excellence and Support System” 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes; provides technical assistance for developing and applying instruments to evaluate administrators that weight an administrator evaluation on student performance and growth to the same extent as provided for teachers</p>	<p>Yes; evaluation framework for summative evaluations shall include: planning and preparation; classroom environment; instruction; and professional responsibilities</p> <p>Performance to be indicated by an evaluation rubric using nationally accepted descriptors that consists of the following four performance levels: distinguished; proficient; basic; and unsatisfactory</p>	<p>Yes - 50%</p>	<p>For teachers in content areas without student growth data, the Arkansas Department of Education will recommend another measure to cover 50% of the evaluations</p>	<p>By September 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall develop the evaluation framework, evaluation rubric, and all rules for implementation of this act and conduct a one-year pilot in one or more school districts during the 2013-2014 school year</p> <p>Implemented in the 2014-2015 school year</p>

<p>California CA SB 1 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows CALPADS data system to be used to evaluate teachers and administrators and when making employment decisions. Can also be used in conjunction with data from another system Establishes structures and processes to assist “persistently low-achieving” schools Regional consortia can provide assistance in developing a “rigorous, transparent and equitable” evaluation system that includes the use of student growth data and other factors 	No	No	No	Yes	Yes - CALPADS (optional) and others	No	No	Superintendent of SBOE must provide final evaluation by June 1, 2014
<p>Colorado CO SB 191 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local school boards can create their own evaluation systems, but they must be aligned with state expectations At least 50% of a teacher's evaluation must be determined by the academic growth of the teacher's students Academic growth must take diverse factors into account Creates the State Council for Educator Effectiveness, which must 	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes - 50%	No	Tested 2012-2013, implemented 2013-2014

<p>Colorado (cont.)</p>	<p>adopt a definition of effectiveness to recommend to the State Board of Education. The Board must act on that definition by September 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Education must create a “resource bank” that identifies assessments, tools, policies and processes to help districts create an evaluation system that aligns with state criteria • Evaluation system must have ongoing training to ensure that all evaluators and educators fully understand it • Allows appeals process for non-probationary teachers who receive an “ineffective” rating • The new evaluation system must provide each teacher with a professional development plan 								
<p>Colorado (cont.)</p>		<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Model adopted by July 1, 2013</p>
<p>Connecticut CT SB 438 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superintendents must evaluate teachers on multiple indicators of student academic growth • Creates the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council under the State 								

<p>CT HB 6498 (2011)</p>	<p>Board of Education, which will adopt guidelines for model teacher evaluation programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for the inclusion of continuous employment in a cooperative arrangement as part of the definition of teacher tenure Amends dates regarding support and remedial services for graduating students Creates a task force to examine issues related to the changes in the high school graduation requirements 	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes - a non-tenured teacher who is employed by a local or regional board of education that enters into a cooperative may count the previous continuous employment towards tenure</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Immediately</p>
<p>Florida FL SB 736 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Success Act Revises provisions related to the evaluation of instructional personnel and school administrators Requires that the 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>For teachers, evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon each of the Florida Educator Accomplished</p>	<p>Both administrators and teachers: At least 50 percent of a performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of</p>	<p>For teachers of courses without district assessments, student learning growth must be measured by the</p>	<p>By December 1, 2012, the Commissioner of Education shall report to the Governor, the President of the</p>

**Florida
(cont.)**

Department of Education approve school district evaluation systems

- Requires the Department of Education to collect evaluation information from school districts and to report such information to the Governor and Legislature
- Provides requirements for the evaluation systems, etc.

Practices.
Teachers will be ranked by four levels of performance: “highly effective,” “effective,” “needs improvement/dev eloping,” or “unsatisfactory”

For school administrators, evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon the leadership standards adopted by the State Board of Education: effectiveness of classroom teachers in the school, administrator's appropriate use of evaluation criteria and procedures, recruitment and retention of effective and highly effective teachers, improvement in the percentage of instructional personnel evaluated at the highly effective or

student learning growth assessed annually by statewide assessments or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by statewide assessments, by school district assessments; must include growth data for students assigned to the teacher (for teacher evaluations) / school (for administrator evaluations) over the course of at least 3 years

If less than 3 years of data are available, the years for which data are available must be used and the percentage of the evaluation based upon student learning growth may be reduced to not less than 40 percent

growth in learning of the teacher's students on statewide assessments, or measurable learning targets must be established based upon the goals of the school improvement plan and approved by the school principal

Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the approval and implementation status of each school district's instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems

Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, each school district shall administer a student assessment that measures mastery of the content, as described in the state-adopted course description, at the necessary level of rigor for the course

<p>Florida (cont.)</p>						<p>effective level, and other leadership practices that result in student learning growth; system may include a means to give parents and instructional personnel an opportunity to provide input</p>			
<p>Georgia GA HB 285 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for the development of a course on educator ethics Relates to conditions of employment under the Quality Basic Education Act Provides for revision of certification renewal rules 	<p>Professional Standards Commission shall establish a task force to determine the level of evidence necessary for educators to demonstrate the impact of professional learning and how such evidence will be collected and submitted for purposes of certificate renewal</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>To be determined</p>	<p>To be determined</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Prior to July 1, 2015, the Professional Standards Commission shall revise its certification renewal rules to require demonstration of the impact of professional learning on educator performance and student learning for purposes of certification renewal</p> <p>Revised rules shall effective beginning July 1, 2015</p>

Idaho
[ID SB 1108
\(2011\)](#)

- Amends, repeals and adds to existing law relating to education to revise conditions relating to the employment of professional personnel by the Board of Trustees
- Revises provisions relating to employment contracts, provides that a district may place certain employees on unpaid leave of absence
- Revises provisions relating to contract categories
- Provides provisions relating to grandfathered renewable contracts
- Provides provisions relating to reductions in force

No

Yes, after January 31, 2011, no new employment contract between a school district and a certificated employee shall result in the vesting of tenure, continued expectations of employment or property rights in an employment relationship

Limits teacher contracts to two years, renewable with acceptable evaluation

Provides that reduction in force shall be at the sole discretion of the board of trustees except that the decision as to which employee(s) shall be subject to such reduction shall be made without consideration of employee seniority and contract status

Yes

Written evaluation based on student growth, as well as input from the parents and guardians of students shall be considered as a factor in the evaluation of teachers, principals and any other school-based administrative employees' evaluation

As least 50 percent of the evaluation must be based on objective measure(s) of growth in student achievement, as determined by the board of trustees

No

Pertains to all evaluations conducted after June 30, 2012

Idaho
(cont.)

<p>Illinois IL SB 315 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student growth must be “significant factor” in rating performance • State Board must adopt new rules establishing “fairness factors” • Chicago may use state assessment as sole measure in rating performance. 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No – “significant factor” (Chicago may use performance as sole factor)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Each school district must establish their plan ready by September 1, 2012</p>
<p>Illinois (cont.) IL SB 630 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends the School Code • Makes a technical change in a section concerning teacher tenure • The content of evaluation plans • Amends the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act in Sections concerning subjects of collective bargaining, impasse procedures, and strikes 	<p>No</p>	<p>For a probationary-appointed teacher in full-time service appointed on or after July 1, 2013 who: receives ratings of "excellent" during his or her first 3 school terms of full-time service, the probationary period shall be 3 school terms of full-time service; had previously entered into contractual continued service in another IL school district the probationary period shall be 2 school terms of full-time service, (depending on circumstances in the teacher's prior district); has not entered into contractual continued service after 2 or 3 school terms of full-</p>	<p>A school district's selection of a candidate for a new or vacant teaching position must be based upon the consideration of factors that include without limitation certifications, qualifications, merit and ability (including performance evaluations, if available), and relevant experience, provided that the length of continuing</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Rating of the performance of <u>all</u> teachers (not just those in contractual continued service) To be evaluated on a scale of "excellent," "proficient," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory"</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>September 1, 2012</p>

Illinois
(cont.)

[IL SB 7
\(2011\)](#)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends the School Code, the Chicago School District Article, the Educational Labor Relations Act and the Pension Code Relates to a survey of learning conditions, school board member leadership training, the dismissal of teachers and revocation of certificates, boards of school inspectors, an alternative evaluation dismissal process for PERA evaluations, removal for cause, notice and hearing, collective bargaining, impasses procedures, and strikes 	<p>No</p>	<p>time service as provided in this Section, the probationary period shall be 4 school terms of full-time service, provided that the teacher receives a rating of at least "proficient" in the last school term and a rating of at least "proficient" in either the second or third school term</p> <p>Tenure decision will be performance evaluation-based for teachers first employed in a district on/after implementation date of PERA</p> <p>Only eligible for tenure if Proficient/Excellent ratings in 2 of last 3 years, w/ Proficient/Excellent required in 4th year</p> <p>Accelerated tenure for 3 Excellent ratings in first 3 terms</p> <p>Portable tenure for previously-tenured teacher in new district with 2 Excellent ratings in first 2 terms in new district</p>	<p>service with the school district must not be considered as a factor, unless all other factors are determined by the school district to be equal</p> <p>District must base selection on certification, qualifications, merit and ability (including performance evaluations) and relevant service</p> <p>District-wide seniority only used if other factors are equal</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Remains the same; see here</p>	<p>Remains the same; see here</p>	<p>Remains the same; see here</p>	<p>The PERA implementation date for principals in all school districts is September 1, 2012</p> <p>Chicago Public Schools must implement PERA in half of its schools by the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year and the other half by the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year. Schools receiving School Improvement Grants must implement by the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year. All remaining school</p>
---	-----------	---	---	------------	---	---	---	---

<p>Illinois (cont.)</p> <p>IL H 3171 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends the School Code Provides for the employment of assistant principals; includes assistant principals in provisions concerning attendance centers, operation and evaluation of educational programs, and contracts Sets forth requirements for the evaluation of assistant principals; repeals a provision limiting assistant principals to a specified number of school days as acting principals during a principal's absence due to an extended illness 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes – includes assistant principals</p>	<p>Must consider the specific, responsibilities, management, and competence of an assistant principal; specify strengths and weaknesses with supporting reasons; align with the Illinois Professional Standards for School Leaders</p> <p>On and after September 1, 2012, the evaluation must also provide for the use of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating performance.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>districts and schools are not required to implement PERA until 2015-2016 or 2016-2017</p> <p>Immediately</p>
<p>Indiana IN SB 1 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to teacher evaluations and licensing 	<p>Eliminates the Advisory Board of the</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>At least 50% of the teachers in a charter</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Must include: student assessment</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Assessments must include: methods for</p>	<p>Effective July 1, 2011. A school corporation shall</p>

<p>Indiana (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates the Advisory Board of the Division of Professional Standards of the Department of Education Provides that not more than 50% of the teachers in a charter school are not required to be licensed as teachers, or be in the process of obtaining a license Requires the Department of Education to revoke the license of a licensed school employee if the employee is convicted in another state or under federal statutes of an offense 	<p>Division of Professional Standards of the Department of Education</p>		<p>school are required to be licensed as teachers, or be in the process of obtaining a license</p>		<p>results for teachers whose responsibilities include instruction in subjects measured in statewide assessments</p> <p>Annual designation of each teacher in one of the following rating categories: Highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, ineffective</p>		<p>assessing student growth for teachers who do not teach in areas measured by statewide assessments</p>	<p>implement the plan beginning with the 2012-2013 school year</p>
<p>Kansas <u>KS HB 2191 (2011)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to the provisions governing the offering of employment contracts to teachers by school districts Revises the provisions governing the type of crimes that preclude the awarding, renewal, or that may cause the revocation of a license to teach if a person is 	<p>No</p>	<p>Allows school districts to offer employment contracts to teachers for one or up to two additional years (that is, a fourth or fourth and a fifth year contract) at the end of the teacher's probationary period, thus extending until the sixth year of employment the ability of the teacher to attain</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No, but any teacher offered a contract will be evaluated and a plan of assistance will be written to help the teacher meet areas needing improvement as noted in the evaluation</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Expires July 1, 2016</p>

	<p>convicted thereof</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires an annual report regarding teacher contracts by school districts 		due process rights						
<p>Louisiana LA HB 1033 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of teacher/administrator evaluations must be based on evidence of growth in student achievement using a value-added assessment model The value-added assessment model must take into account factors such as special education status, eligibility for free/reduced lunch, student attendance and discipline Charter schools must follow the same general guidelines 	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes - 50%	Yes	Begins 2011-2012 school year, fully implemented by 2012-2013
<p>Louisiana (cont.)</p>									
<p>Maine ME SB 704 (2010) (LD 1799)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates the prohibition on the use of student assessment data in the establishment of models for evaluation of the professional performance of teachers Extends the models for evaluation developed by the Department of Education to principals 	The Commissioner of Education shall convene a stakeholder group to review the models developed	No	No	Yes	The models must include multiple measures	No	No	The stakeholder group shall review and approve models no later than July 1, 2011

<p>Maine (cont.)</p> <p>ME HB 317 (2011) (LD 391)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires that the models include multiple measures Concerns models for teacher and principal evaluations Repeals certain requirements regarding the use of student assessments as part of such evaluations Clarifies that a school administrative unit may adopt its own models for teacher and principal evaluation 	<p>The stakeholder group convened by the Commissioner of Education to review evaluation models is only charged with reviewing models proposed by the Department of Education</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Provides that the laws that require the Department of Education to propose models for teacher and principal evaluations do not prevent a school administrative unit from developing and adopting its own models for teacher and principal evaluation</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Removes the July 1, 2011 deadline for the stakeholder group review</p>
<p>Maine (cont.)</p> <p>ME HB 720 (2011) (LD 976)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extends probationary teacher contracts from 2 years to 3 years 	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes – extends the probationary teacher contract to 3 years</p> <p>Provides that a duly certified teacher is not eligible for a continuing contract until after the 3rd year of a probationary teacher contract</p> <p>Extends duly certified teachers’ contracts to 2 years and requires superintendent to notify teacher of decision to nominate</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Applies to newly hired teachers beginning in the 2012-2013 school year</p>

			for another contract before expiration						
<p>Maryland MD HB 1263 (2010)</p> <p>Maryland (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBOE must develop general standards and model performance evaluation criteria for a new teacher evaluation system If district school boards and exclusive employee representatives cannot agree on their own evaluation criteria within six months of the publication of the SBOE’s model performance evaluation criteria will take effect Student growth must be a significant factor in evaluation outcomes. No single criterion can account for more than 35% 	<p>No, but the Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness was subsequently created via Executive Order</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Requires that an evaluation include “observations, clear standards, rigor, and claims and evidence of observed instruction”</p>	<p>No – “significant factor”</p> <p>No single criterion can account for more than 35%</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Anticipated implementation date: 2012-2013</p>
<p>Michigan MI HB 4625 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sets new requirements on teacher tenure Relates to teacher probationary periods, performance evaluations, and individualized development plans 	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes – requires three years of effectiveness for a teacher to earn tenure</p> <p>Extends probationary period; teachers must earn “effective or better” on annual performance evaluations for at least three of the five year probationary period;</p>	<p>Yes – prohibits tenured teachers, when hired into non-teaching positions, from earning tenure in those positions</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Evaluations must occur annually</p> <p>Must be based on multiple observations and whether of not the teacher is meeting his or her IDP (Individualized Development Plan) goals</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Immediately</p>

<p>Michigan (cont.)</p> <p>MI HB 4626 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revises permissible grounds for discharge or demotion of a teacher on continuing tenure, the discontinuance or reduction of performance-based compensation, a reduction in personnel, including a reduction in workweeks or workdays Provides the procedures of a governing board upon criminal charges being filed against a teacher 	<p>No</p>	<p>three consecutive “highly effective” ratings would also complete the probationary period</p> <p>The discharge or demotion of a tenured teacher may be made only on the grounds of “a reason that is not arbitrary or capricious,” as opposed to the previous bill’s “reasonable and just cause”</p> <p>“Demote” is redefined to mean a minimum 15 day non-paid suspension, or the loss of at least 30 days of compensation</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Immediately</p>
<p>Michigan (cont.)</p> <p>MI HB 4626 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends the Revised School Code to provide policies regarding personnel decisions when conducting a staffing or program reduction or any other personnel determination resulting in the elimination of a position Requires specific terms by which to rate teachers 	<p>Yes – the Governor’s Council on Educator Effectiveness is created to contract with experts on the design and implementation of educator evaluations by October 31, 2011</p>	<p>Yes – length of service may not play a primary role in personnel decisions</p>	<p>Yes – the primary factor in decision making must be teacher effectiveness</p>	<p>Yes – the Governor’s Council will create a state evaluation for administrators that will include attendance, graduation rates, and school improvement plan progress, as well as student growth, student and teacher feedback, and the evaluations</p>	<p>Yes – observations, student growth, and individualized development plans</p> <p>Ranked on an effectiveness rating scale of “highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective”</p>	<p>For 2013-2014, base at least 25% of the evaluation on growth and assessment data; 2014-2015, at least 40% of the evaluation on growth and assessment data; 2015-2016, at least 49% of the evaluation on growth and assessment data</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>By the end of the 2013-2014 school year</p>

		Must submit recommendations to state board by April 30, 2012			that they or their designees conduct				
Minnesota MN HB 26a / SB 11a (2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to school funding, testing and records, enrollment of home schooled children, the length of the school year, an early graduation scholarship program, an early graduation military service award program, electronic textbooks, district tax levies, charter school and small school revenue, kindergarten and prekindergarten revenue, the Safe Schools levy, the teacher probationary period, peer coaching for teachers, student transportation, teacher licensing, and various other matters. 	Yes - Commissioner of education must convene a 12-member advisory task force to develop recommendations for repurposing integration revenue funds to create and sustain opportunities for students to achieve improved educational outcomes	No	No	Includes an annual evaluation of school principals in the list of duties a school superintendent is required to perform	Provides probationary teacher evaluations; establishes a three-year professional review cycle and includes at least one summative evaluation performed by a trained evaluator, based on professional teaching standard; uses longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures; requires qualified and trained evaluators to perform summative assessments	Yes - requires agreed upon teacher value-added assessment models and state and local measures of student growth, the data from which provide the basis for 35 percent of teacher evaluation results	No	Principal Evals: 2013-2014 school year Teacher Evals: 2014-2015 school year
Nevada NV SB 2 (2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student growth data must be considered, but may not be the sole factor in evaluating teachers and 	No	No	No	No	No	No, but student growth may not be sole factor	No	----

<p>NV AB 222 (2011)</p> <p>Nevada (cont.)</p>	<p>other professionals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates the Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada Requires the State Board of Education to establish a statewide performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators in relation to pupil achievement Revises provisions governing the policies for the evaluation of teachers and administrators Revises the designations required of the evaluations of teachers and administrators Makes an appropriation Provides procedures for putting teachers on probation and assistance to correct deficiencies 	<p>Teachers and Leaders Council of Nevada is created and required to make recommendations to the State Board of Education for the establishment of a statewide performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators employed by school districts and charter schools</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Must comply with the statewide performance evaluation system established by the State Board</p> <p>The statewide performance evaluation system will require the evaluation of an individual teacher or administrator as "highly effective," "effective," "minimally effective" or "ineffective"</p>	<p>50 percent of the evaluations of teachers and administrators must be based on pupil achievement which is maintained by the automated system of accountability information for Nevada</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Effective July 1, 2013</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires an additional probationary period for teachers and administrators who receive unsatisfactory evaluations Authorizes certain employees to request an expedited hearing related 	<p>No</p>	<p>A post-probationary employee who receives an unsatisfactory evaluation, or any other equivalent evaluation designating his or her overall performance as below average, for 2 consecutive school years shall be deemed to be a probationary employee, and must</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>July 1, 2011</p>

<p>NV AB 225 (2011)</p> <p>Nevada (cont.)</p> <p>NV AB 229 (2011)</p> <p>Nevada (cont.)</p>	<p>to arbitration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revises provisions governing annual reports of accountability information and performance of public schools and educational personnel Establishes a program of performance pay and enhanced compensation for the recruitment and retention of licensed teachers and administrators Amends provisions regarding probationary teachers Expands grounds for dismissal; revises provisions governing the reduction in the workforce of a school district; provides for expedited hearings regarding arbitration 	<p>No</p>	<p>serve an additional probationary period</p> <p>A post-probationary teacher who receives an evaluation of "minimally effective" or "ineffective" must be evaluated three times in the immediately succeeding school year</p> <p>Probationary period is revised from two 1-year periods to three 1-year periods, without a waiver of any of the probationary years</p> <p>The board of trustees of a school district that determines a reduction in the existing workforce of the licensed educational personnel in the school district is necessary must not base the decision to lay off a teacher or an administrator solely on the seniority of the teacher or administrator and must consider other factors</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Policies for evaluations of teachers and administrators to require the designation of an individual teacher or administrators as "highly effective," "effective," "minimally effective", or "ineffective"</p>	<p>Policies must require that certain information on pupil achievement which is maintained by the automated system of accountability information for Nevada account for at least 50% of the evaluations</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>July 1, 2013</p>
---	--	-----------	---	-----------	------------	---	--	-----------	----------------------------

<p>New Hampshire NH SB 196 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends the length of time required for a teacher to be entitled to the rights of notification and hearing for failure to be renominated or reelected Declares that in cases of nonrenomination or nonreelection because of reduction in force, the reduction in force shall not be based solely on seniority Limits a petition for review as the exclusive remedy available to a teacher on the issue of the nonrenewal of such teacher 	<p>No</p>	<p>Reduction in force may not be based solely on seniority</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The term "teacher" shall also include principals, assistant principals, librarians, and guidance counselors</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>July 1,2011</p>
<p>New Mexico NM SB 111 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds the use of certain professional development to the standards of annual performance evaluation for teachers Relates to accountability, peer intervention and mentoring The state education department will adopt criteria and minimum highly objective uniform statewide standards for the annual performance evaluation of licensed school employees At the beginning of each 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No, but at least every two years, school principals shall attend a training program approved by the department to improve their evaluation, administrative and instructional leadership skills</p>	<p>Performance evaluations shall be based in part on how well the professional development plan was carried out Observations by the principal</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Immediately</p>

<p>New Mexico (cont.)</p> <p>NM HB 71 (2010)</p> <p>New Mexico (cont.)</p>	<p>school year, teachers and principals shall devise professional development plans for the coming year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The professional development plan for teachers will include documentation on how teachers incorporate the results of required professional development in the classroom District must provide for the mentorship and evaluation of level one teachers. At the end of each year and at the end of the license period, the teacher shall be evaluated for competency, if the teacher fails to demonstrate satisfactory progress and competence annually, the teacher may be terminated If the teacher has not demonstrated satisfactory progress and competence by the end of the five-year period, the teacher shall not be granted a level two license 	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Framework will include procedures for a summative evaluation of beginning teachers' performance during at least the first three years of teaching, including annual assessment of suitability for license renewal, and for final assessment of beginning teachers seeking level two licensure</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Immediately</p>
--	---	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---	-----------	-----------	---------------------------

<p>New York NY AB 11171 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual performance reviews are required for teachers and principals. 40% of evaluation outcomes will be based on student growth. 	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes - state assessments and others</p>	<p>Yes - 40%</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Phase in 2011-2012, begins 2012-2013</p>
<p>North Carolina NC HB 758 (2011)</p> <p>North Carolina (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes the Arts Education Commission Provides that this analysis and assessment of student performance will be included in the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System for Arts Education Teachers Modifies the law relating to career status for public school teachers Provides that for a career 	<p>Establishes and directs the Arts Education Commission to work with the Department of Public Instruction in the creation of arts education assessment models that are complete in both music and visual art and currently under development in theater arts and dance to measure student achievement in arts education</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>For a career teacher, a performance rating below proficient shall constitute inadequate</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Student performance will be included</p> <p>Provides guidelines for the use of a "qualified observer"</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	<p>The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to the 2012 Regular Session of the 2011 General Assembly no later than May 1, 2012</p> <p>Immediately</p>

<p>NC SB 466 (2011)</p> <p>North Carolina (cont.)</p>	<p>teacher, a performance rating below proficient shall constitute inadequate performance unless the principal noted on the instrument that the teacher is making adequate progress toward proficiency given the circumstances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to dismissal or demotion administrative hearings and procedure and hearing officers and reporting requirements Relates to teachers licenses and mandatory improvement requirements 		<p>performance (unless the principal noted on the instrument that the teacher is making adequate progress toward proficiency given the circumstances) and is grounds for dismissal or demotion</p>			<p>Outlines a “Mandatory improvement Plan” for teachers who rate unsatisfactory</p>			
<p>Ohio OH SB 5 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abolishes continuing contracts for teachers, except for those continuing contracts in existence prior to the effective date of the bill Amends sections of the Revised Code to make changes to laws concerning public employees, including collective bargaining, salary schedules and compensation, layoff procedures, and leave Revises the law relating to limited contracts 	<p>No</p>	<p>Abolishes continuing contracts for teachers, except for those continuing contracts in existence prior to the effective date of the bill</p> <p>For teachers holding contracts prior to the effective date of amendments, contracts can be for no longer than 5 years</p> <p>For those hired after the effective date, the term of the contract cannot exceed 3 years</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, the framework for the evaluation of principals shall be comparable to the framework for the evaluation of teachers, but tailored to the duties and responsibilities of principals and the environment in which principals work</p>	<p>The framework requires each evaluation to consider the following factors, but shall not designate the weight of any factor or prescribe a specific method of assessing any factor: Quality of instructional practice, which may be determined by announced and unannounced</p>	<p>At least fifty per cent of each evaluation to be based on measures of student academic growth specified by the Department of Education (for both teacher and administrator evaluations)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Not later than April 30, 2012, the superintendent of public instruction shall develop and submit to the state board of education recommendations for a framework for the evaluation of teachers and a framework for the evaluation of principals</p> <p>The state board shall adopt the recommended or modified</p>

Ohio
(cont.)

[OH HB 153
\(2011\)](#)

- Appropriation bill
- Relates to teacher and principal evaluations
- Relates to teacher compensation

Requires the State Board to develop a standards-based framework for teacher evaluations

Any subsequent contract is required to be for a term of not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years

Clarifies the parameters for granting of a continuing contract

No

Yes - prohibits giving preference based on seniority in determining the order of layoffs or in rehiring teachers when positions become available again, except when choosing between teachers with comparable evaluations

Yes - Principal evaluations are required to be based on principles comparable to the teacher evaluation policy, specified for the duties and responsibilities of principals

classroom observations and examinations of samples of work, such as lesson plans or assessments designed by the teacher; Communication and professionalism, including how well the teacher interacts with students, parents, other school employees, and members of the community; Parent and student satisfaction, which may be measured by surveys, questionnaires, or other forms of soliciting feedback

State board must establish an evaluation framework that indicates four levels of performance: accomplished, proficient, developing and ineffective

Yes – 50% student academic growth

State board must create a list of student assessments that measure mastery of the course content in grade levels and subjects for which value-added measures do not apply

frameworks not later than July 1, 2012

The State Board must develop a standards-based framework for the evaluation of teachers by December 31, 2011

Districts and ESCs are required to consult with teachers in adopting a local policy that conforms to the framework by July 1, 2013

						Classroom observations, student achievement			
<p>Oklahoma OK SB 2033 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates the Race To The Top Commission (RTTT) State Board of Education will create a Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System (TLE) that will focus on incentive pay. RTTT Commission will advise State Board on TLE 50% of evaluation outcomes must be based on student growth. 35% must be based on multiple years of standardized tests, 15% on other measures State Board will identify persistently low-achieving schools 	<p>Yes, the Oklahoma Race to the Top Commission</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes (in persistently low achieving schools)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Expands teacher performance ratings to “superior,” “highly effective,” “effective,” “needs improvement,” or “ineffective”</p>	<p>Yes – 50%; made up of 35% student learning growth data, and 15% other academic measures</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>SBOE must adopt TLE by December 15, 2011 for implementation no later than the 2013-2014 school year</p>
<p>Oklahoma (cont.) OK HB 1267 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to education evaluation Relates to the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System Changes the name of the Oklahoma Race to the 	<p>The name of the Oklahoma Race to the Top Commission is changed to the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Remains the same: Same as teacher assessments with added component of stakeholder perceptions</p>	<p>Remains the same: Qualitative assessment by organizational and classroom management skills, ability to</p>	<p>Remains the same: 50% of the ratings of teachers and leaders shall be based on quantitative components which shall be divided as follows: thirty-five percentage points based on student</p>	<p>Remains the same: an assessment using objective measures of teacher effectiveness including student performance on unit or end-of-</p>	<p>July 1, 2011</p>

<p>Oklahoma (cont.)</p>	<p>Top Commission to the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates duties of the Commission relating to the federal Race to the Top program 	<p>Commission. Will continue as initially authorized until July 1, 2016 with duties reduced to oversight and advisement of the evaluation system only</p>				<p>provide effective instruction, focus on continuous improvement and professional growth, interpersonal skills, and leadership skills</p>	<p>academic growth using multiple years of standardized test data, as available, and fifteen percentage points based on other academic measurements; and 50% qualitative assessment components</p>	<p>year tests Emphasis shall be placed on the observed qualitative assessment as well as contribution to the overall school academic growth</p>	
<p>Oregon OR S 290 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directs the State Board of Education to adopt, no later than a specified date, core teaching standards to improve student academic growth and learning Requires the school district board, on and after a specified date, to include core teaching standards for all evaluations of teachers and administrators of the school district 	<p>Yes - The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, shall adopt core teaching standards to improve student academic growth and learning</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes – core teaching standards must be separately developed for teachers and administrators</p>	<p>The core teaching standards adopted under this section must take into consideration multiple measures of teacher effectiveness, based on widely accepted standards of teaching that encompass a range of appropriate teaching behaviors and that use multiple evaluation methods; take into consideration evidence of student academic</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No later than January 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt core teaching standards</p> <p>On and after July 1, 2013, school boards must include core teaching standards for all evaluations of teachers and administrators of school districts</p>

Oregon (cont.)						growth and learning based on multiple measures of student progress, including performance data of students, schools and school districts			
South Dakota SD SB 24 (2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes standards for teaching Requires an annual teacher evaluation Provides for the development of a model evaluation instrument 	A work group appointed by the secretary of education shall provide input in developing the standards and shall develop a model evaluation instrument that may be used by school districts	No	No	No	Require multiple measures	No	No	July 1, 2011
Tennessee TN SB 7005A/ HB 7010 A (2010) (Pub. Ch. 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee, which will consist of 15 members including Commissioner of Education (chair), Exec. Director of SBOE, chairs of house and senate education committees 50% of evaluation outcomes will be based 	Yes	Yes – new evaluations are to be used in tenure decisions, procedures for dismissal of tenured teachers modified to require that a hearing, if demanded by the teacher, be before an impartial hearing officer selected by the board of education	No	Yes	Yes - TVAAS and others	Yes – 50%; made up of 35% student learning growth data, and 15% other academic measures	No	Policies must be implemented before 2011-2012 school year

**Tennessee
(cont.)**

[TN SB 1528 / HB 2012 \(2011\)](#)
(Pub. Ch. 70)

on student achievement data. 35% must be from TVAAS (state assessment) or other comparable data if TVAAS data is not available, and 15% on other measures identified by the new Committee

- Sunset on committee July 1, 2011
- Relates to teacher employment
- Changes date by which assignments for the following school year and notices of termination must be sent to teachers from May 15 to June 15
- Specifies that director of schools must decide if a teacher is qualified for an open position
- Changes various requirements for obtaining tenure

No

Any teacher must meet the following requirements prior to becoming eligible for tenure status: Served 5 school years or not less than 45 months within a 7 year period as a probationary teacher; received evaluations demonstrating an overall performance effectiveness level of "above expectations" or "significantly above expectations" during the last 2 years of their probationary period

Any teacher who, after acquiring tenure status, receives 2 consecutive years of evaluations demonstrating an overall performance effectiveness level of "below expectations" or "significantly below expectations" shall be returned to

No

No teacher, including administrative and supervisory personnel, who has acquired tenure status is entitled to any specific position

No

No

No

July 1, 2011

<p>Tennessee (cont.)</p>			<p>probationary status by the director of schools until the teacher has received 2 consecutive years of evaluations demonstrating an overall performance effectiveness level of "above expectations" or "significantly above expectations"</p> <p>New provisions concerning "loss of tenure" do not apply to teachers who received tenure before July 1, 2011</p>						
<p>Utah UT SB 73 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends the Utah Orderly School Termination Procedures Act to prohibit a school district from using certain termination policies Prohibits a district from utilizing a last-hired, first-fired layoff policy when reducing staff Requires the Education Interim Committee to study how the performance of teachers may be evaluated for the purpose of awarding or eliminating teacher career employee status. 	<p>Yes – during the 2011 interim, the Education Interim Committee, in consultation with the State Board of Education, shall study how the performance of teachers may be evaluated for the purpose of awarding or eliminating teacher career employee status</p>	<p>Yes, a school district may not utilize a last-hired, first-fired layoff policy when terminating school district employees. A school district may consider the following factors when terminating a school district employee: the results of an employee's performance evaluation; and a school's personnel needs</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Not specified</p>
<p>Utah (cont.)</p>									

<p>UT SB 256 (2011)</p> <p>Utah (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modifies provisions related to teacher career ladders and educator evaluations Provides components that may be included in a career ladder Provides that annual evaluations for all teachers may be a component of a career ladder Requires that provisional and probationary educators be evaluated twice each school year, and that career education be evaluated annually Reduces time for education to request a review Removes requirements for districts to provide educators with improvement assistance 	<p>Requires the Education Interim Committee, in consultation with the State Board of Education, to study how teachers may be evaluated on certain performance measures</p>	<p>Requires that provisional and probationary educators be evaluated twice each school year, and that career educators be evaluated annually</p> <p>Removes requirements for districts to provide educators with reasonable assistance for improving performance</p> <p>Reduces the time in which an educator may request review of a summative evaluation</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>During the 2011 interim, the Education Interim Committee, in consultation with the State Board of Education, shall study how the performance of teachers may be evaluated in the following areas: student learning gains; instructional quality or performance as measured by classroom observation or other instruments; and parent, student, or community satisfaction</p>	<p>Not Yet</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>July 1, 2011</p>
<p>Washington WA SB 6696 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes new minimum criteria for evaluation of classroom teachers and principals Requires school districts to implement revised evaluation systems for teachers and principals, 	<p>Yes – Establishes steering committee of state associations representing teachers, principals,</p>	<p>Yes – Makes provisional (non-tenure) status for non-supervisory certificated employees three years rather than two years</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The revised evaluation criteria and systems apply to principals</p>	<p>Minimum criteria for evaluating teachers and principals are separately specified</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Minimum criteria apply to all teachers</p>	<p>Pilot districts implement in 2010-11</p> <p>All districts must implement starting September 1, 2013</p>

	<p>using the new criteria and a four-level rating system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires that, if student growth data is used in evaluations, it must be based on multiple measures Establishes a phased-in implementation, starting with selected pilot school districts in 2010 and 2011 Requires the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in collaboration with the pilot districts and a steering committee, to develop evaluation models, including student growth measurement tools, professional development, and evaluator training 	<p>and administrators</p>							
<p>Wyoming WY SB 146 (2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates to teacher contracts Establishes the Teacher Accountability Act Requires school district teacher performance evaluations to be based in part upon student achievement Establishes performance as a basis for contract determinations Modifies grounds for 	<p>Directs the state Board of Education to establish performance criteria based upon educational accountability measures to be established by law</p>	<p>Emphasizes performance as a basis for contract determinations</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Places emphasis on a teacher performance evaluation system based upon student achievement for use by school district boards of trustees in determining teacher contract performance and status</p> <p>Basis for the</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>July 1, 2012</p>

<p>Wyoming (cont.)</p> <p>WY SB 70 (2011)</p>	<p>teacher suspension, dismissal and termination, clarifies suspension with or without pay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates the Accountability in Education Act and establishing a statewide education accountability system Establishes system components and student performance measures Prescribes consequences for school level student performance Establishes a legislative select committee to review and expand system components 	<p>Yes – establishes the Select Committee of Accountability to study the issue of teacher/administrator accountability</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes – Requires evaluation of school principal performance by district superintendent as a component of the statewide education accountability system</p>	<p>evaluation system built upon the educational accountability system and the assessments and measures within to measure student achievement and the effectiveness of classroom teachers in improving student achievement</p> <p>Will be measured in part by student achievement</p> <p>Will apply measured performance to evaluation consequences and incentives</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Effective immediately, except for changes to statewide assessment which are effective July 1, 2012</p>
<p>**Executive Orders**</p> <p>Florida FL EO 10-126 (2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes Florida's Task Force on Excellent Teaching. Directs the task force to: Review performance appraisal systems and teacher 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Maryland MD EO 01.01.2010. 12 (2010)</p>	<p>certification systems; Identify initiatives and strategies that honor Florida's quality teachers for dedicating their careers to teaching; Examine the positive impact teachers have on the state's ability to compete in a global economy; Identify methods for establishing differential and performance-based merit pay for classroom teachers; Develop workable measures of student learning gains, including special education students; Formulate strategies for identifying and dealing with low-performing teachers; Identify successful strategies and initiatives for improving the recruitment, development and retention of quality teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes the Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness to develop a model system for evaluating these educators that defines "effective" and "highly effective" teachers and principals; and specifies how measurements of student learning relate to 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
--	---	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

<p>New Jersey NJ EO 42 (2011)</p> <p>New Mexico NM EO 2011-024 (2011)</p>	<p>other components of the evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates a New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force for School and District-level education professionals. Charges the task force with developing recommendations on how best to measure the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders, based on defined parameters. Requires that the effectiveness recommendations include: Identified measures of student achievement — representing at least 50% of the teacher or school leader evaluation — which should be used for evaluating educator performance; Demonstrated practices of effective teachers and leaders, which should comprise the remaining basis for such evaluations; How these measures of effective practices should be weighted Creates the New Mexico Effective Teaching Task Force that is charged with presenting recommendations to the 	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

governor regarding how best to measure the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders. The recommendations must include: identified measures of student achievement that will represent at least 50% of teacher evaluation; demonstrated best practices of effective teachers and teaching, which will make up remaining basis for evaluation; how the measures should be weighted; and how the state can transition to a performance-based compensation system