



How Are Early Childhood Teachers Faring in State Teacher Evaluation Systems? CEELO Policy Report

Lori Connors-Tadros, PhD, and Michelle Horowitz, BA
March 18, 2014

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Purpose of the Brief.....	6
Methodology.....	6
Sample.....	7
Findings.....	7
Stage of Implementation.....	8
State Role and District Requirements.....	8
Including Early Childhood Teachers.....	9
Components of Teacher Effectiveness Ratings.....	12
Professional Practice.....	14
Delving Deeper Into Using SLOs to Evaluate Early Childhood Teachers.....	17
Setting SLOs Based on Standards.....	18
(1) Balancing the Domains and Number of Student Learning Objectives.....	19
(2) Significant Training Needed to Set Reasonable but Rigorous Goals.....	19
Establishing Baseline Benchmarks and Targets for Growth.....	20
(1) Determining Appropriate Measure for Multiple Purposes.....	21
(2) Effectively Using Data from Multiple Sources Requires Significant Assessment Acumen.....	22
Moving Forward With Professional Development.....	23
Future Research Questions and Recommendations for Policy Makers.....	24
Future Research Questions.....	25
Recommendations for Policy Makers.....	25
Acknowledgements.....	27
Appendix A - Colorado.....	29
Appendix B - Connecticut.....	33
Appendix C - Delaware.....	38
Appendix D - Hawaii.....	42
Appendix E - Illinois.....	46
Appendix F: Maryland.....	51
Appendix G: Massachusetts.....	55
Appendix H: New Jersey.....	61

Appendix I: Ohio..... 65

Appendix J: Pennsylvania..... 70

Appendix K: Rhode Island..... 74

ENDNOTES 79

Table 1: Implementation Status by State as of FY2014 8

Table 2: Birth-Grade Three Teachers Included in the Teacher Evaluation System 10

Table 3: Prekindergarten Teachers Included in the State Teacher Evaluation System 11

Table 4: Components of Teacher Ratings for Early Childhood Teachers..... 13

Table 5: Observation Rubrics of Teacher Practice 15

Suggested citation: Connors-Tadros, L., & Horowitz, M. (2014). *How Are Early Childhood Teachers Faring in State Teacher Evaluation Systems?* (CEELO Policy Report). New Brunswick, NJ: Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes.

This policy snapshot was produced by the Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes, with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B120054. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

The Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes (CEELO) is a partnership of the following organizations:



Introduction

A great teacher can have a significant impact on children's learning. Research demonstrates that the quality of teachers working with children from birth through third grade affects important early outcomes ranging from numeracy and literacy to social and emotional development. Moreover, the quality of early childhood* teaching can affect children's school readiness, improve third grade reading proficiency, and ultimately reduce the achievement gap in the short and longer term.

Federal and state policymakers are promoting an early childhood agenda to bring greater attention to the impact of early childhood learning on college and career readiness of students. In turn, these policies have resulted in greater accountability for early childhood teachers. For example, the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge grant has prompted 20 states to both improve the quality of early childhood programs and also focus additional attention on the preparation and professional development of the early childhood workforce. And the President's new Preschool Initiative focuses on the role of quality teaching in improving outcomes for young children. These policy priorities have resulted in increased expectations for the early childhood workforce to implement new initiatives and show evidence of ameliorating achievement gaps for young children.

The public school workforce is also responding to increased requirements for accountability. Since 2009, states have designed new, more rigorous teacher evaluation systems driven by state legislation and federal policies that are propelling these efforts forward. For example, the U.S. Department of Education's compensatory education policies that are granting waivers from federal regulations require that states focus additional attention on teacher evaluation systems. In 2013, more than 40 States were implementing teacher evaluation systems that used multiple, objective measures of student achievement and observations of teacher practice, with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and differentiating among less effective and more effective teachers.¹

Across states, many early childhood teachers are required to participate in the teacher evaluation system. Teachers licensed by the state, as well as those employed by school districts to teach infants and toddlers in early intervention, teachers working in preschool special education, and school-based prekindergarten[†] (pre-K) teachers are required to participate. Moreover, pre-K teachers working in community settings who are paid through public school funds may also be required to participate in teacher evaluation systems.

* We use the term early childhood workforce to refer to those working with children from birth through grade three.

[†] Throughout this brief we use the term prekindergarten (pre-K) to refer to prekindergarten as well as preschool programs.

Of school-related factors, effective teachers matter most in boosting children’s learning. Research indicates that how teachers perform in the classroom are the best predictors of teacher effectiveness.² Specifically, the quality of teacher-child interactions, especially the way teachers foster an instructional climate, has been shown through extensive research, to have important effects on how students learn, particularly in early childhood.³ Currently, 29 states are using state standardized achievement data as one measure of teacher effectiveness.⁴ However, significant methodological challenges exist in reliably and accurately attributing to a specific teacher a student’s learning based on a test score.⁵ To address these challenges, states are exploring alternative methods for measuring teachers’ contributions to student learning.

More than half of states use student learning objectives (SLO)[‡] as a strategy to assess student learning and growth in one component of the rating of teacher effectiveness. A student learning objective is defined as ... *a specific learning goal set at the beginning of the year for all students or a subset of students, with a specific measure (s) of student learning to track progress toward that goal.*^{*}

A student learning objective is defined as ... *a specific learning goal set at the beginning of the year for all students or a subset of students, with a specific measure (s) of student learning to track progress toward that goal.*

The use of SLOs is particularly of interest in evaluating the quality of early childhood teachers and other school staff working in grades where standardized student assessments are not used.⁶ Assessing a teacher’s contribution to student learning and growth by setting student learning objectives can be more directly linked to evidence-based practice and can encourage teacher collaboration.⁷ But there are also risks associated with designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems that use SLOs. These risks include a lack of comparability across teachers, inconsistent or poor quality objectives and assessments, and time and resource intensity.^{8 9}

How well these systems are doing to improve teacher effectiveness is still undecided, in part due to the technical challenges of implementing a valid and reliable system for all teachers. Even less is known about how state and district teacher evaluation systems are being designed and implemented for early childhood teachers. The largest national study of measures of effective teaching (commonly known as the MET study) designed to determine valid approaches to using multiple measures and reliable classroom observations did not include teachers below 4th grade.¹⁰ Bornfreund’s 2013 report was the first to address the dearth of information about implementation of teacher evaluation systems with early childhood teachers. The report studied how five states and three districts used student learning objectives, shared attribution, and shared assessments to evaluate teachers working in pre-K through grade three classrooms. The author identified the risks and opportunities in designing teacher evaluation systems that use SLOs and advised states to “proceed cautiously in selecting assessments for measuring student learning in the early grades” given the limited research on these approaches.¹¹

[‡] We use the term “student learning objectives” (SLO) consistently throughout this document, except as noted when a specific state uses another term to define the process of setting goals for student learning and benchmarks for tracking growth.

Purpose of the Brief

Early childhood teachers are rightly concerned with implementing a system that was, at least in the initial stages, designed with a different set of teachers in mind—teachers of older students who have standardized achievement data. In most states, policy, practices, and guidance for early childhood teachers are just now being developed or adapted from materials developed for K-12 teachers of core subjects. While much about good teaching is the same for all teachers, it is important that the unique considerations of teaching young children are addressed in teacher evaluation systems' methods and measures.

The purpose of the brief is to provide state leaders and technical assistance providers with information about the design and requirements of teacher evaluations systems for early childhood teachers in selected states. The brief discusses the approach each state is taking to adapt the state system and develop resources for early childhood teachers. We identify specific opportunities and challenges state leaders are addressing in implementing student learning objectives as an alternative method of measuring early childhood teachers' contributions to children's learning. The brief discusses the following:

- Methodology of the research
- Summary of findings on implications for early childhood teachers in state teacher evaluation systems
- Considerations and challenges in implementing student learning objectives with early childhood teachers
- Future research questions and recommendations for policy makers implementing teacher evaluation systems with early childhood teachers

State profiles of the key characteristics of teacher evaluation systems of each state in the study can be found in Appendix A-K.

Methodology

The Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes (CEELO) conducted research on the policies state education agencies have developed to evaluate early childhood teachers. The study examined the following questions about the state model system of teacher evaluation in selected states, focusing on gaining a deeper understanding of the implications for early childhood teachers. The research questions are:

- What is the stage of implementation for the state system, and for early childhood teachers?
- What is the state model evaluation system and what amount of flexibility do districts have?
- Which early childhood teachers are included in the system?
- What are the components of the teacher effectiveness ratings?
- How are states assessing professional practice?
- How are states measuring student learning and growth for early childhood teachers?

- What professional development and guidance are states providing to teachers and administrators?

Sample

The sample of states was selected based on CEELO staff's knowledge of efforts to develop specific policies and practices to support implementation of the teacher evaluation system with early childhood teachers, and involvement in the NGA Policy Academy: Building a Foundation for Student Success.¹² We defined "early childhood teachers" as teachers licensed by the state department of education to teach children from birth through third grade. In this initial sample, we specifically focused on states that incorporate the use of student learning objectives to assess student learning and growth as one component of the teacher effectiveness rating. We did so because of the increasing preponderance of this approach in rating early childhood teachers.¹³

CEELO staff collected data from public documents and interviews with key personnel in state education agencies responsible for teacher evaluation systems and the early childhood administrator in 11 states. The states are: Colorado (CO), Connecticut (CT), Delaware (DE), Hawaii (HI), Illinois (IL), Maryland (MD), Massachusetts (MA), New Jersey (NJ), Ohio (OH), Pennsylvania (PA), and Rhode Island (RI). Data were collected between June 2013 and January 2014. Findings are limited by the sample size and selection criteria, and therefore intended to serve as an exploratory analysis of the research questions.

Findings

The study sought to understand the implications of teacher evaluation systems for early childhood teachers in these selected states. However, the findings are best viewed in light of some of the general characteristics of each state's teacher evaluation system for all teachers. These are:

- *Stage of Implementation*—The 11 states profiled include a range of implementation stages, from an initial launch of the newly designed system in School Year (SY) 2011 to statewide implementation in SY2014. In some states, early childhood teachers were or could be included in the system from the launch, and in others states implementation with early childhood teachers will not occur for another year.
- *Local Control*—All states have developed a state teacher evaluation system model, but in the profiled states there is some degree of district flexibility to design their own model, select specific measures, and/or include certain subgroups of teachers. In some cases, state staff does not have robust data on the numbers of early childhood teachers in district systems.
- *Teacher Licensing*—States vary on the types of licenses for early childhood teachers they have, how they are credentialed, and whether they require prekindergarten teachers to be licensed by the state. States vary on whether the state department of education is responsible for infant-toddler early intervention programs in the schools. Additionally, some states are implementing mixed delivery models of prekindergarten and have varied arrangements with schools, districts, and community based providers for licensing teachers.

The states profiled in the brief are engaged in significant efforts to develop training, resources, and guidance for districts on implementation with early childhood teachers. Therefore, what we report is a process that will *continue to evolve*.

Stage of Implementation

The profiled states are in different stages of implementing the teacher evaluation system (see **Table 1**). All profiled states are either entering the first full year of implementation statewide this school year (SY2014) or scaling up from partial implementation to full implementation in SY2015 or SY2016, with all teachers. States that received Race to the Top (RTT) funding (K-12) began implementing in at least some districts in 2011. For example, in **MA**, non-RTT districts are implementing the system with at least 50% of their educators this year, **CT** piloted their system with 10 districts in SY 2013 and will fully implement in SY2015, and **DE** has implemented the teacher evaluation system with early childhood teachers for more than two years.¹⁴

State	Implementation Status ⁵
Colorado	Full implementation
Delaware	
Hawaii	
Maryland	
Massachusetts	
New Jersey	
Ohio	
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
Connecticut	Partial implementation
Illinois	

State Role and District Requirements

All profiled states have developed state teacher evaluation system models, but in most of the profiled states, districts have significant autonomy to implement certain requirements of the system. In **DE** and **HI**, the state strictly interprets federal and state regulation and gives districts limited flexibility in adapting the model. In the other nine profiled states (**CO, CT, IL, MD, MA, NJ, OH, PA** and **RI**) the state strictly interprets some aspects of federal and state legislation, but districts have some latitude to develop their own system.¹⁵ Most states report that districts use the state model, in part because the state offers training and resources to implement the state model. In **CO**, even though it is not mandatory, 161 of the 178 districts are using the state model, though notably Denver Public Schools is not. Denver Public Schools developed their teacher evaluation system before the state system was

⁵ See State Profiles for more information on implementation status of each state.

developed, with funding from the Gates Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education’s Teacher Incentive Fund.¹⁶ Lessons learned from implementing Denver’s teacher evaluation system informed the state model.

States vary on the level of oversight and degree of accountability in the district’s approach or specific elements of the district system. For example, in **IL** a joint committee at the district level includes union and district representatives. The joint committee has significant flexibility to design and monitor the teacher evaluation system at the local level. The state informants suggested that this approach resulted in greater buy-in and customization to needs at the local level. However, states can develop processes that provide quality assurance to ensure the equivalency of district approaches and adherence to required elements of the teacher evaluation system, while supporting local flexibility.¹⁷

We are most proud of the fact that our state model respects local decision-making; however, the biggest challenge we face is to provide adequate support to districts around the development of appropriate measures.

State Informant

In the following section we present findings that are specific to implementing teacher evaluation systems for early childhood teachers in the profiled states.

Including Early Childhood Teachers

State statute or regulation determines the educator classifications to be included in the teacher evaluation system, typically those licensed by the state according to the state’s definition of “educator/teacher.” All profiled states are including teachers from kindergarten through grade three, and preschool special education teachers who are licensed by the state, in the roll-out of the system. States vary on whether they are including infant/toddler, preschool/Pre-K teachers; other support staff, such as parent educators; student service personnel, such as counselors, or occupational or physical therapists, in the evaluation system (see **Table 2**).

Table 2: Birth-Grade Three Teachers Included in the Teacher Evaluation System			
State	Birth-Age 3	Preschool/Pre-K	Kindergarten-Grade Three
Colorado	X	X	X
Connecticut	X	X	X
Delaware	X	X	X
Hawaii		X	X
Illinois		X	X
Maryland		X	X
Massachusetts		X	X
New Jersey		X	X
Ohio		X	X
Pennsylvania		X	X
Rhode Island		x ¹⁸	X

States with a mixed delivery system of prekindergarten programs operated in schools and community based settings, have taken different approaches.

- In **PA**, prekindergarten programs in schools with a licensed teacher are required to participate. Certified teachers in community-based Pre-K Counts (one type of pre-kindergarten program) are required to participate starting in 2014-2015, but policy, not the Teacher Effectiveness mandate, regulates their participation. Certified teachers in other pre-K settings are not required to participate.
- In **CT**, in the SY2013 pilot of the system, each district decided whether to include early childhood teachers.

Table 3 indicates that of the 11 profiled states, nine currently include state-funded, licensed, prekindergarten teachers in the teacher evaluation system, and one, **RI**, expects to do so in SY2015. Hawaii does not currently fund public preschool programs, except in six RTT-K-12 innovation districts. The Additional Information column includes information about how the state determines inclusion of other early childhood teachers in the teacher evaluation system.

Table 3: Prekindergarten Teachers Included in the State Teacher Evaluation System		
State	Pre-K Teachers Included (Yes/No)	Additional Information related to infant/toddler and other early childhood staff
CO	Yes	Any early childhood educator whose position requires a CDE license. If a district requires a license, but the state doesn't, district decides. These licensed teachers include: Infant/toddler; preschool; early childhood coordinators; Head Start/Early Head Start teachers. District may require evaluation of additional staff.
CT	Yes	Birth-to-3 teachers in nonpublic schools not subject to TE; those working for a public school, including an RESC or state-approved private special education facility, will be subject to the new evaluation system requirements but may fall under the guidelines for the Student and Educator Support Specialist Evaluation.
DE	Yes	Also include: Part B-619, Title 1 PreK, ECAP if work for school district, Birth mandate (autism, deaf, and hard of hearing), K-2, and Child Find Coordinators
HI	No	No state funded Pre-K, except in selected RTT-K-12 Zones of School.
IL	Yes	All teachers hired by the district and certified by the state program are required to participate, including early childhood teachers. Teachers in community- based programs, charter and private schools, and school service personnel (e.g., counselors, school psychologists) are not included in the TE process.
MA	Yes	All licensed educators will be included. Birth-Age 3 educators are not licensed by ESE and therefore not required to be evaluated under the new framework.
MD	Yes	Any individual certificated by MDSE, as defined in COMAR 13A.12.02. As a teacher who delivers instruction and is responsible for a student or group of students' academic progress in a Pre-K-12 public school setting, subject to local system interpretation.
NJ	Yes	Pre-K teachers employed directly by school districts are included, but the state-funded collaborative contracting sites are not necessarily included, as they are not directly individually paid by the district or "union" members. It will be a district decision as to how they handle the contracted sites.
OH	Yes	ODE Responsible to license: Preschool programs (birth-age 5 not in Kindergarten) operated by public schools,

Table 3: Prekindergarten Teachers Included in the State Teacher Evaluation System		
State	Pre-K Teachers Included (Yes/No)	Additional Information related to infant/toddler and other early childhood staff
		educational service centers, boards of developmental disabilities, and chartered nonpublic schools with multiple grades above kindergarten
PA	Yes	Any teacher serving children in a local education agency (LEA) or intermediate unit and who holds an instructional certificate must be evaluated. Pre-K Counts community-based settings not included in the mandate, but program policy has been provided which includes them in the evaluation system. Pre-K Counts community-based settings will transition to new system 2014-2015.
RI	Yes, in SY2015	Preschool special education teachers (ages 3-5) are currently included in system; plans to expand to pre-K teachers in SY2015.

Components of Teacher Effectiveness Ratings

Teacher effectiveness ratings are commonly derived from qualitative measures of professional practice and quantitative measures of student learning. Some states also use parent, peer, or student feedback or a school-wide or district measure to determine final ratings. The weightings of each component can vary significantly across states (See **Table 4**). In six of the profiled states (**CO, CT, HI, IL, MD, OH**), the weight or contribution of student learning and growth to an individual teacher’s rating of effectiveness accounts for about half of the total teacher rating. In **IL**, local districts can modify the student learning component in the first two years of implementation.

Five of the profiled states (**DE, HI, NJ, PA, and RI**) adjust the weighting of student learning for early childhood teachers (typically included in the “untested” category of teachers). All teachers are weighted the same in **CO, CT, MD, and OH**. In **IL**, weighting is locally determined.

Table 4: Components of Teacher Ratings for Early Childhood Teachers				
State	Professional Practice	Student Learning/ Growth	Parent/Peer/ Student Feedback (survey)	School-wide measure
Colorado	50%	50% (growth)		
Connecticut	50%	45% (5% of 45 is shared attribution with a school-wide measure)	10 or 5%	
Delaware	80%	20% (growth)		
Hawaii	50%	45%		5%
Illinois	Determined by the district	25% of the rating in the first two years of implementation, and then increases to 30%, in subsequent years. 50% if joint committee cannot agree and defaults to the state model		
Maryland	50%	50% ¹⁹		
Massachusetts	X	X	X ²⁰	
New Jersey	85%	15%		
Ohio	50%	50%		School-wide measures are an option (determined locally) and can contribute to the 50% weight for student growth.
Pennsylvania	50%	35%		15% ²¹
Rhode Island	does not use percentages	does not use percentages		

Recognizing the challenges of implementing the student learning/growth measure in untested grades, some states are modifying this component. A bill passed by the senate in 2013 in **OH** would reduce the percentage attributed to student learning for all teachers from 50% to 35%.²² Other approaches taken by states include:

- Some states modify weights for the untested grades. In **NJ**, student learning accounts for 15% of the total rating for untested grades, including early childhood and in **PA**, student learning accounts for 35% of the rating.
- In some states, weights are modified and determined at the local level. In **MD**, for non-tested grades, no single measure of student learning can account for more than 35% in a

locally designed system. In the state system, for untested grades, 50% of the total rating is determined by a summative rating comprising 20% school progress indicator, 15% district/school student learning objective, and 15% classroom student learning objective.

- In **IL**, local joint committees of union and district representatives determine the weight of student growth if they design their own system, and if a joint committee cannot reach agreement on the weighting of student growth, then the district must default to the state model which requires student growth to constitute 50%.
- Some states require a school-wide student learning goal in addition to individual teacher SLOs. In **HI** for untested grades, and in **CT** for all teachers, 5% is attributed to a school-wide learning goal and 45% to an individual teacher's contribution to learning. A school-wide measure may be calculated by the Department of Education, as it is in **PA**, and each school is given a school performance profile based on multiple measures, including student learning.

RI does not assign percentages to specific components of the rating, and uses a matrix to determine a final effectiveness rating based on the district-determined system. The state launched an online portal in SY2013 for districts to enter data and calculate ratings. Similarly, **MA** does not assign weights, but sets parameters for districts to determine a summative performance rating. This is based on the evaluator's professional judgment of the educator's practice as it relates to Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice defined in state regulations, and progress toward attaining both student learning and professional practice goals related to teacher status (new or experienced). A "student impact rating" based on trends (at least two years of data) and patterns (at least two measures in each year) will be added in SY2016.²³

Professional Practice

Professional practice frameworks commonly used in state teacher evaluation systems include the following: Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson,²⁴ Robert Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model,²⁵ and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS).²⁶ Except for **CT**, all states allow districts to choose from approved frameworks, in some cases only if they are aligned with the state's teaching standards.

As noted in **Table 5**, the most common commercially developed rubric to assess teacher practice allowed or required in nine of the profiled states, is the Framework for Teaching (the Danielson Framework). Ten states allow or require rubrics aligned to state standards of teacher practice. This includes the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (**InTASC**) Standards²⁷ adopted by **HI** and **NJ**, for example. Five states allow the Marzano framework and four states allow the CLASS.

Table 5: Observation Rubrics of Teacher Practice				
State	Danielson Framework	CLASS	Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model	Rubrics Aligned to State Standards of Teaching Practice
Colorado	X- if aligned to state standards	X- if aligned to state standards	X- if aligned to state standards	CO State Teacher Quality Standards
Connecticut				CT Common Core of Teaching
Delaware	X			DE Professional Teaching Standards
Hawaii	X			HI Teacher Performance Standards
Illinois	X			IL Professional Teaching Standards
Maryland	X			
Massachusetts	x- if aligned to state standards	x- if aligned to state standards	x- if aligned to state standards	MA Professional Standards for Teachers
New Jersey	X	X	X	NJ Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders
Ohio				Standards for OH Educators
Pennsylvania	X	X	x	Districts can submit for approval other rubrics that are aligned to the state model
Rhode Island	X	X	X	RI Professional Teaching Standards

Professional practice frameworks define the core knowledge and skills of effective teachers and associated rubrics guide the qualitative observations of teaching practice conducted by the evaluator. The Danielson and Marzano professional practice frameworks were developed and validated with teachers in the upper grades (i.e. 4th grade and above) and may not have enough detail to determine ratings on specific teaching practices as applied to early childhood (particularly pre-K and K) teachers. To address this:

- In **IL**, researchers at Illinois State University are adapting the Danielson Framework for early childhood teachers (pre-K-3rd grade) and developing resources to support effective use for teachers of this age span.²⁸
- **PA** developed guiding questions for early childhood teachers and administrators, and examples of evidence for each standard within the Danielson Framework for Teaching.²⁹
- **NJ** has developed an evidence document using the format of the Danielson Framework, aligned to the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, for pre-K and kindergarten teachers.³⁰
- **OH** has developed guidance to provide principals and other evaluators with examples of preschool-specific “look-fors” at the accomplished level that represent considerations when using the Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric. While the guidance document does not detail every quality practice that may be present in a preschool setting that is performing at the higher levels, it is a starting point to familiarize evaluators with considerations that may not be seen in K-12 classrooms.³¹

Most of the common early childhood observation tools were not developed or validated for high stakes decisions such as those made in some teacher evaluation systems. The CLASS has been validated for use in research, program evaluation, and professional development to improve teacher practice. It is often required of programs participating in quality rating and improvement systems and is required of all Head Start grantees. Researchers at the University of Virginia are now conducting a validation study of the CLASS for use in teacher evaluation systems. Further, many teachers in preschool and early elementary programs have been trained to use data from CLASS and other observational tools, such as the Assessment of Practices in Early Elementary Classrooms,³² to improve quality of teaching. States are considering how to build in greater coherence and alignment between assessments used for different purposes in early childhood programs so that policy reforms that all seek to improve teaching quality are aligned and seamless.³³

Administrators or evaluators typically observe teacher practice during unannounced and announced observations during the school year. The number of observations range from annually to several times a year, typically more for non-tenured or less experienced teachers. Evaluators are often principals or assistant principals, and all states in the study provide training to evaluators on the observation tools. **DE, IL, and MA** require certification or pre-qualification of evaluators, although currently the content is not specific to evaluating early childhood teachers. In **OH**, all evaluators in the state must attend three-day training and pass a credentialing exam. In addition, one state coordinator and five regional assessment specialists support LEAs in this work. **DE** and **IL** are developing early childhood-specific training for evaluators in the coming year.

School building administrators and principals, those most closely involved in providing instructional leadership, play a significant role in supporting teacher practice. However, most elementary principals have limited knowledge and experience with early childhood education, especially prekindergarten pedagogy or practice.³⁴ **MD's** study of the new teacher and principal evaluation system reported that teachers and principals alike had concerns about the capacity of principals to serve as evaluators, and

questioned the validity of the observational tool; and these concerns were exacerbated by the difficulty in implementing student learning objectives.³⁵ States are developing resources to ensure that administrators or evaluators have a good understanding of what “good teaching” looks like in relation to the allowed observational frameworks.

NJ is providing intensive professional development support to teams of principals and teachers from seven districts in the **NJ Early Childhood Leadership Academy** on effectively implementing state policy priorities, including teacher evaluation. CT’s “3 to 3 Institute” is sponsored by the state’s new Office of Early Childhood and the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS), a membership association of principals. They are hosting the “Getting Pre-K to Grade Three Right” symposia in April 2014 to address issues of the principal’s role in the evaluation of early childhood teachers.

Delving Deeper Into Using SLOs to Evaluate Early Childhood Teachers

As discussed above, measures of student learning are just one component of the teacher’s effectiveness rating, though technically the most challenging.³⁶ Even within professional practice frameworks, components and indicators also identify how well teachers establish learning objectives, plan lessons, and implement a curriculum to improve student learning. Fundamentally, teacher evaluation systems are premised on a model of multiple measures of teacher effectiveness. This means that the “fairness and reliability” of the total effectiveness rating is dependent on the sum of its parts or components. Thus it is critically important that both observations of teacher practice and attributions to teachers of growth in student learning result from reliable measures. Here we delve deeper into the challenges of using SLOs to evaluate early childhood teachers, as this emerged as a significant issue in interviews with state informants.

Establishing student learning goals, assessing individual child performance, and differentiating instruction are fundamental principles of good teaching.³⁷ Thus, articulating and using SLOs can provide educators and administrators with a tool to measure student learning that is linked to instructional practice. SLOs can vary significantly from state to state in how they are defined; the structure and elements of the objectives; and how they are identified, scored, and translated into effectiveness ratings. SLOs can be established at the classroom, school, or district level, by individual teachers, teams of teachers, or school-wide. SLOs can apply to all students in a class and/or subgroups of students. Teachers can choose from a variety of assessments, including state and national assessments, commercial or teacher-developed assessments, or district-developed assessments.³⁸

If SLOs are used as one of multiple measures, then the real test is whether or not the combination of those measures results in a fair and reliable determination of overall effectiveness.

State informant

Most of the evidence on how SLOs are used to rate teacher effectiveness is drawn from implementation studies, and few studies have looked specifically at application to early childhood teachers. These studies suggest that the quality of the SLOs and the number of years using SLOs within the context of a

teacher evaluation system are related to both the overall quality of the SLO and whether the objective will be met (or exceeded) and student learning will be achieved.³⁹

Potential challenges in designing and using SLOs in early childhood classrooms include: a) the lack of appropriate assessments of young children’s learning; b) difficulty creating appropriate growth targets that are rigorous but realistic given the variability in development in this age span; and c) the significant amount of training and implementation support that is needed to design and use SLOs appropriately and effectively.⁴⁰

Some of the profiled states report success in using SLOs. However, other states reported two significant issues that have implications for using SLOs in a teacher evaluation system for early childhood educators: (1) setting the goal of SLOs based on standards and (2) identifying the appropriate benchmarks to assess progress or growth of learning. We describe how states are supporting districts, the professional development they are offering, and the websites and other resources they are making available for teachers and administrators.

Setting SLOs Based on Standards

Standards for teacher performance and student learning are the foundation upon which good teaching practice is based. Setting student learning objectives is not a new practice in teaching, and in fact, most schools require teachers to set goals for student learning aligned to curricula or school or district goals.⁴¹ The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Association for Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education’s (NAECS-SDE) joint position statement on effective accountability systems for programs serving children from birth through grade three supports this tenet of effective teaching for early childhood teachers.⁴²

Nationally, all states are implementing early learning standards for children ages three to five (or birth to five in some states). Some are also revising early learning standards to reflect new concerns (for example, executive function) and to align early learning standards with the common core standards in English language arts and math. Kindergarten through third grade teachers are beginning to implement Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and mathematics, and some states are developing standards in other content areas (e.g. science) or in social-emotional development. Many states are preparing to field test common core aligned assessments for these grades.

We are having success with SLOs in preschool settings as well as other non-tested settings. We have state preschool standards and the SLO allows the teacher to choose/create an aligned pre-post assessment based on the instructional and student needs observed. I by no means want to indicate that we have perfected the process. I just want to emphasize that this can be done well, but for many teachers...it is definitely an ongoing learning process.

State informant

Because a high quality SLO relies on a teacher's use of standards and assessments to establish objectives and set benchmarks and targets, implementing new standards and new assessments means that early childhood teachers are implementing many new policy reforms at once. This requires administrators to recognize these demands on teachers and to craft an approach that creates coherence for the implementation of multiple policy reforms. Below we describe further specific challenges and considerations in implementing SLOs with early childhood teachers.

Specific challenges raised by state leaders related to setting early childhood SLOs include:

(1) Balancing the Domains and Number of Student Learning Objectives.

In most states in this study, SLOs can be identified for a range of domains of development and are often based on standards. Early learning standards for children before kindergarten entry typically address many domains of development, including cognitive, social-emotional and health. Kindergarten through grade three teachers are increasingly under pressure to address common core standards in English language arts and mathematics, so teachers may choose to address narrow, easily taught skills that do not represent most of what we want children to learn. Though it is allowable in most states, it is less likely that K-3rd grade teachers develop SLOs in domains other than English language arts and mathematics, unless directed by the district or principal. Teachers of children with special needs, for example, can set behavioral or mastery goals.

- In **DE**, early childhood teachers of children birth through age five, identify five SLOs, based on 19 standards-based, student-focused targets in six domains derived from the infant-toddler and preschool early learning foundations.⁴³
- In **RI**, teachers establish between two and four learning objectives in any domain aligned to the curriculum, including behavioral or functional skills for children with special needs.
- In **OH**, the state model recommends that teachers articulate between two and four SLOs. Most early childhood teachers identify at least two learning objectives in the academic content areas of English language arts and math but state funded preschool teachers are encouraged to set goals in all domains.
- In **CO, CT, and IL** teachers set SLOs aligned to the state's academic standards and as applicable, early learning standards for children birth to age five, aligned with the Common Core.

(2) Significant Training Needed to Set Reasonable but Rigorous Goals

Identifying SLOs aligned to standards requires that teachers know how to set reasonable but rigorous goals. At the same time as states are launching training to implement the teacher evaluation systems, they are also providing training to teachers on implementing the new early childhood standards to effectively align standards to curriculum, instruction and assessment. Additionally, teachers and evaluators (often school administrators) need training in how to support early childhood teachers in developing sound learning objectives based on standards, to effectively implement the educator evaluation system. Some state leaders acknowledged that implementing SLOs sheds further light on the

need for increased training and support to teachers on setting goals based on standards and on aligning standards to curriculum and instruction.

All profiled states have numerous resources to ensure high quality SLOs are set by all teachers. For example:

- **OH** developed online modules that walk teachers through the SLO development process. They are not specific to any grade level/subject, but are appropriate for all.⁴⁴
- **NJ** developed a student growth objectives quality rating rubric and other resources to support teachers.⁴⁵
- **RI** posted a video of teachers reflecting on their implementation of SLOs, in addition to other resources to support the quality SLO.⁴⁶

Many have, or are developing, rubrics, sample SLO's, and guidance specifically for early childhood teachers. For example:

- **CT** developed sample SLOs for pre-K-Grade 3 teachers, including an annotated example of a pre-K social awareness and interpersonal skills SLO.⁴⁷
- **RI** has sample SLOs for pre-K-Grade 3 posted on their website, intended to serve as guidance to teachers.⁴⁸
- **OH** posts sample SLOs for pre-K-Grade 3, using a template to indicate a high quality SLO that is aligned to an SLO Template checklist.⁴⁹

The SLO process highlights deficiencies that have always been present but never realized or addressed. This is a good outcome of using the SLO process. Agreed that teachers need additional support in data analysis and curriculum alignment; however, this is not unique to this school year. This has been an ongoing need since I have been an educator!

State informant

Establishing Baseline Benchmarks and Targets for Growth

Once teachers establish objectives for student learning, they set a beginning benchmark or baseline for student learning for children in the class or for subsets of children. Teachers are required to set objectives from baseline data on student learning established within the first few weeks/months of school, or from previous year data, and then to set targets for learning at other time points, including an end-point close to the end of the school year. In collaboration with their peers or an evaluator, teachers then establish targets that identify reasonable but rigorous expectations for improvements in student learning throughout the school year, based on an analysis of student performance data from previous years or the beginning of the year.

Multiple measures, including standardized and formative assessments; curriculum-aligned measures; and teacher-, school-, or district-developed measures, can be used to establish baseline performance targets and track progress of young learners. While not unique to early childhood settings, the most common ways to assess young children's growth in learning are often criterion-referenced,

performance-based methods. This is a tightly orchestrated process of teaching and learning that draws on a deep understanding of the skills and learning needs of all children in the class.

Specific challenges raised by state leaders related to early childhood teachers setting benchmarks and targets include:

(1) Determining Appropriate Measure for Multiple Purposes

The challenge for early childhood teachers is that standardized measures of student learning for children younger than five are limited, and/or are reliable for fairly narrow domains or constructs of learning (e.g. basic literacy skills). In early childhood classrooms, formal and informal methods of observation and authentic assessments (or formative assessments) are intended to inform instruction.⁵⁰ These measures are typically not standardized and were not designed for high-stakes accountability systems such as teacher evaluation. Additionally, concerns have been raised about using measures that rely on teachers' observations to assess student learning. This may create an inherent bias and conflict for teachers when the teacher's rating is dependent on showing growth of student learning.⁵¹ Strategies to reduce bias include using neutral observers or multiple assessments of learning, which have their own complications due to cost, time, and burden on children and teachers of multiple assessors.

Sound assessment practices, especially in early childhood, call for using multiple measures to identify and support children's learning in multiple domains, including cognitive and social-emotional development.⁵² States in the study generally allow early childhood teachers to choose from a range of assessment measures to set baselines and growth targets. For example:

- District-developed measures, curriculum-embedded assessments, and portfolios aligned to state standards and curriculum frameworks are allowed and encouraged in **MD**, **MA**, and **PA**, to set benchmarks and targets.
- Teaching Strategies Gold,⁵³ a formative and summative observational assessment, was the most common tool identified for use in preschool programs, likely due to the increasing prevalence of this tool in state prekindergarten programs. For example, in **CO**, **DE**, **MA**, and **NJ**, most preschool programs use this measure to assess children's progress and inform instruction.
- In **DE**, early childhood teachers setting growth goals are required to use at least four measures from a state approved list of standardized and observational measures.⁵⁴ The Child Outcomes Summary Form,⁵⁵ required for IDEA Part B/619 early childhood special education programs, is also allowed as a measure to set benchmarks and targets. The child outcomes summary form aggregates data from multiple sources, including parents, and is integrated into curriculum and instruction.
- In many states, such as **OH**, the specific measure is left to the teacher or district to determine, but state-funded pre-K programs are required to assess children with Get It, Got It, Go (literacy), Ages and Stages (social-emotional), and program-adopted curriculum-based assessment tools, so most use this data to set SLOs.
- **IL** and **MD** are also developing assessment item banks where teachers can select specific assessment items for identified learning objectives.

At the same time as states are choosing measures and standardized assessments to gather evidence for establishing SLO benchmarks and targets, the landscape is changing as many states are designing and implementing new assessment systems for all children. Forthcoming assessments tied to the Common Core for kindergarten through grade three teachers will require more professional development. Additionally, **IL, MD, OH, PA, and RI**, are each developing comprehensive early childhood assessment systems for children from birth through five, a kindergarten entry assessment, and formative assessments for children through grade three. States are currently providing significant professional development on how to use kindergarten entry and formative assessment measures effectively from preschool through grade three. These new measures are intended to provide more reliable and comprehensive data to improve instruction and learning for all children, but they are not being developed specifically for the purposes of teacher evaluation. This means that teacher evaluation ratings of student learning are reliant on measures that are in flux, potentially contributing to the lack of reliability in these ratings.

(2) Effectively Using Data from Multiple Sources Requires Significant Assessment Acumen

Whether teachers are using observational measures to assess young children’s learning or standardized measures, significant training and guidance is needed to ensure that scoring and interpretation are consistent and reliable across teachers and time, children are comfortable in the “testing” environment, and cultural and language issues are addressed.⁵⁶ In **MD, MA, NJ, OH, and RI**, for example, state leaders reported that implementing SLOs has revealed a significant gap in early childhood teachers’ ability to use data from formative assessments or other measures of student learning to make good decisions about reasonable benchmarks and targets for the range of children in the class.

States identified other important issues affecting the appropriate use of assessment data in setting student learning goals and benchmarks. These include balancing time, resources, and technical skill or assessment acumen to use multiple sources of data to make good decisions for the varied range of abilities and developmental needs of children in their classroom. While contextual factors should not influence best teaching practice, many pre-kindergarten and some kindergarten programs are half-day, and often require teachers to teach double sessions. In some states, class sizes can include 30 or more children, especially in low-income, urban school districts. If instruction and assessment are not well integrated into the teacher’s day, additional assessments place an incredible burden on teachers (and on children) in a very busy day.

To address these issues, states are creating professional development and other resources to improve teachers’ and evaluators’ assessment acumen. Although these resources are not specifically tailored to early childhood teachers, they provide a good foundation of information, and addenda or trainings could be developed that intentionally address unique considerations of teaching young children. A few examples include:

- **RI** has developed a number of online modules on assessment literacy and a related “Assessment Toolkit” that includes four major components: (1) guidance on developing and selecting quality

assessments; (2) using baseline data: guidance and worksheet; (3) assessment review tool and companion document; and (4) protocols for analyzing and scoring student work.⁵⁷

- **OH** offers training on assessment literacy and access to an assessment literacy specialist for teachers and building/district administrators on selecting assessments that can measure student learning.⁵⁸
- **CO** and **IL** are developing resources to improve teacher “assessment literacy,” to increase understanding of how data is collected and how measures are connected to targets.
- **MA** has developed resources to improve teacher assessment literacy, including guidance documents and an ongoing webinar series designed for district-based teams of educators working on identifying/developing student learning measures.

Moving Forward With Professional Development

For all states, professional development is a top priority and focus of their work right now. These efforts are necessary to ensure that all teachers and administrators understand the requirements of the system and know how to use the rubrics, tools, and other resources to ensure quality control and equity across schools and districts. All states have websites to share information and resources with teachers, administrators, and the public. Some states have more than one website, and navigating among them to find specific information applicable to early childhood teachers is sometimes challenging.

In **MD**, state staff delivered more than 200 workshops to superintendents, principals, and teachers on implementing the teacher evaluation system in the past year. In **CT**, **DE**, and **IL**, the state is supporting an online platform and professional development marketplace (e.g. Bloomboard⁵⁹) for teachers and administrators to access professional development, track certifications for required training, and engage with other teachers around strategies to set and achieve student learning goals. These online professional networks are customized by states, and so states can develop specific early childhood focused resources for the platform.

CT, **IL**, and **PA** are planning stakeholder meetings, producing training and guidance, and developing other strategies, with funding from the National Governor’s Association (NGA)

Center for Best Practices Policy Academy on Birth through Third Grade Reform to ensure that early childhood teachers, and their administrators, have the tools for fair and valid evaluation of early childhood teachers.

Our initial professional development has been well received. The biggest challenge is always how to get the professional development and information and training to teachers in the classroom. We want to give the process time and ensure that quality implementation makes a difference.

State Informant

Some states are coordinating regional education networks and private technical assistance intermediaries to develop training, utilize coaches, and provide resources to districts. A few examples include the following:

- **PA's** Regional Keys provide training on early childhood policies, including teacher evaluation, throughout the state to teachers and administrators.
- **HI** funds six educational support staff (many former principals) to work with regional superintendents to support implementing all policy reforms, including teacher evaluation with early childhood teachers.
- **HI, IL, OH,** and **RI** also have developed online professional development modules, including videos, to support the educator evaluation system implementation, although not specific to early childhood.
- In **MA**, a series of four workshops with detailed facilitation guides was designed by the state for districts to adapt for training with their teachers. The state is providing training subsidies to allow districts to use approved vendors to deliver evaluator training modules.
- **CO** has developed an implementation toolkit to guide districts through a process of identifying readiness, implementation, and transformation of the system.⁶⁰

State-level committees, including teachers and administrators, are informing resource development to support implementing the teacher evaluation system with early childhood teachers. **DE** includes early childhood teachers on subcommittees developing resources, and **IL** has an Early Childhood Advisory Group. **OH's** Student Growth Measure Advisory Group includes personnel from ECE.

Future Research Questions and Recommendations for Policy Makers

This significant and complex education policy reform represents a fundamental change in how we measure the unique contribution of teachers to children's learning and growth. Across states and districts, there is much variation in how elements of the teacher evaluation system are being implemented with early childhood teachers. In most cases, state leaders acknowledge that the specific application and applicability to infant-toddler, preschool/prekindergarten, and other early childhood staff is uncertain. In fact, it is just too early to know for sure the impact on teaching practice, as most states are at the beginning stages of implementation, especially for early childhood teachers. Most importantly, we don't yet know how the results of teacher effectiveness ratings are being used to improve teaching practice and support the retention and career development of early childhood teachers.

Specific insights into the implementation of teacher evaluation systems with early childhood teachers are sparse. The profiled states that received RTT, K-12 funding, such as **CT**,⁶¹ **MA**,⁶² **MD**,⁶³ **NJ**,⁶⁴ **OH**⁶⁵ and **RI**,⁶⁶ are conducting formative evaluations of the teacher evaluation system implementation. These studies identify the successes and challenges teachers and principals are facing in implementing these more rigorous teacher evaluation systems. States are revising teacher observation rubrics to provide more specific guidance to teachers, and gaining confidence in developing and utilizing student learning

objectives; while most report wanting more materials and tools developed to reflect the realities of how early childhood teachers teach and young children learn.

Future Research Questions

This research reveals that states are now attempting to address these concerns; however, much more research is needed to ensure that the teacher evaluation systems are relevant, valid, and fair for early childhood teachers. Additional research is needed to understand the following:

- What specific early childhood teachers are finding the most success in the evaluation system? Do preschool special education, kindergarten, first or second grade teachers or other teachers within the early childhood sector have different experiences in effectively complying with the requirements of the teacher evaluation system?
- What are the characteristics of the early childhood teachers who are struggling to implement the system well, including developing rigorous SLOs and measureable targets and using the ratings to improve practice?
- What are the types of training and professional development that is most effective for early childhood teachers to implement the system effectively and use their ratings to improve year to year?
- In what ways do the specific working conditions of early childhood teachers, including compensation, education, class size, school day, impact the usefulness of the teacher evaluation systems to improve practice?
- What supports are needed for principals and evaluators of early childhood teachers? What specific knowledge of early childhood pedagogy and developmentally appropriate practice is needed for evaluators to be valid raters of early childhood teachers' effectiveness? What knowledge is needed for principals or administrators to be effective instructional leaders to support the improvements in teaching quality?
- Are the commonly used measures of professional practice effectively recognizing and differentiating early childhood teachers? How well are the unique characteristics of teachers of children with special needs or English language learners reflected in methods and measures of determining teacher effectiveness?

Recommendations for Policy Makers

In conclusion, we recommend the following for a realistic approach to developing and implementing a teacher evaluation system with early childhood teachers:

- **Ensure inter-departmental coordination across teacher evaluation and early childhood offices** at the state department of education and, as relevant, at the district level so that leadership, policy guidance and decision-making is coordinated and implemented coherently.
- **Involve early childhood administrators, teachers, and early childhood content experts** early and often in the design and ongoing development and implementation of the system and resources. This will ensure that the unique considerations of early childhood teachers are

intentionally recognized, and will create greater buy-in and belief in the value of the teacher evaluation system to improve practice.

- **Keep student achievement attributions low** for early childhood teachers within legal or regulatory requirements, until more evidence exists that the approach is technically sound. In order to be technically sound, teachers need to have sufficient training to establish SLOs that are rigorous and developmentally appropriate, measuring all domains of learning. It is also important that measures exist that are aligned with the standards and are appropriate for young children.
- **Develop resources for early childhood teachers that are based on early childhood pedagogy and are developmentally appropriate.** Professional practice rubrics, SLO samples, and resources should reflect the unique features of early childhood teaching and account for young children's developmental learning trajectories. Develop training on assessment literacy for early childhood teachers and target professional development to increase assessment acumen.
- **Provide professional development and training for principals** or other evaluators on good teaching in early childhood and what this might look like in practice. In the absence of a solid understanding of early childhood teaching practice, inappropriate assessments of teaching practice or ratings that seem unfair to early childhood teachers could demoralize teachers.
- **Conduct evaluations of how early childhood teachers are implementing the teacher evaluation system** at the district level. Design studies to determine whether measures of teacher practice are relevant and reliable for early childhood teachers and how effective guidance resources are in improving the quality of early childhood teachers SLOs. Further study in how principals and early childhood teachers are using the results of ratings to design professional development plans is also needed.
- **Provide ongoing training to early childhood administrators and teachers** that build in alignment and coherence across multiple policy reforms.^{67 68} Provide training for early childhood educators to illustrate the alignment across policy reforms and resources that make the implementation more coherent and reasonable.

In sum, if correctly designed and implemented, teacher evaluation systems have the potential to assure that all young children have great early childhood teachers. We are still at the early stages of understanding what and how teacher evaluation systems could improve the quality of early childhood teaching practice. With limited research to draw on, it is important that stakeholders consider the recommendations from this early study and continue to learn from other states and districts in the coming years.

Acknowledgements

CEELO greatly appreciates the time and cooperation of the following state leaders who provided information on their state’s teacher evaluation system; offered insights on implementation with early childhood teachers; and reviewed early drafts of this brief.

Colorado	Nan Vendengna, Supervisor, Office of Early Learning, Department of Education
Colorado	Jean Williams, Evaluation Design Specialist, Office of Educator Effectiveness, Department of Education
Connecticut	Sarah Barzee, Division Director, Leadership Development, Talent Office, Department of Education
Connecticut	Andrea Brinnel, Coordinator/ ECE Consultant, Office of Early Childhood
Connecticut	Harriet Feldlaufer, Chief, Bureau of Early Care and Education, Office of Early Childhood
Connecticut	Kim Wachtelhausen, Education Consultant, Bureau of Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning, Department of Education
Delaware	Verna Thompson, Education Associate, IDEA 619/ECAP, Department of Education
Delaware	Ruszkowski Christopher, Chief Officer, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Unit, Department of Education
Hawaii	Tammie Picklesimer, Educator Effectiveness System Lead, Office of Strategic Reform, Department of Education
Illinois	Vince Camille, Principal Consultant, Preparation and Evaluation, Illinois State Board of Education
Illinois	Lisa Hood, Senior Policy Analyst, Illinois State University
Illinois	Mary O’Brian, Director of Assessment, Illinois State Board of Education
Illinois	Vicki Phillips, Division Administrator, Illinois State Board of Education
Illinois	Joyce Weiner, Policy Specialist, Ounce of Prevention
Maryland	David Volrath, Teacher/Principal Evaluation, Department of Education
Maryland	Judy Walker, Branch Chief, Early Learning, Department of Education
Maryland	Linda Burgee, Race to the Top Coordinator, Department of Education

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

Massachusetts	Ron Noble, Educator Evaluation Project Lead, Department of Education
Massachusetts	Donna Traynham, Office of Learning Support Services, Department of Education
New Jersey	Vincent Costanza, Early Childhood Program Specialist, Division of Early Childhood Education, Department of Education
Ohio	Stephanie Siddens, Director, Office of Early Learning and School Readiness, Department of Education
Ohio	Carolyn Everidge-Frey, Teacher Evaluation Office, Educator Equity and Talent, Department of Education
Ohio	Matthew Cohen, Policy and Research, Department of Education
Ohio	Matthew Lutz, Educator Equity and Talent, Department of Education
Ohio	Julia Simmerer, Educator Effectiveness, Department of Education
Pennsylvania	Deborah Wise, Chief of Standards and Professional Development, Department of Education
Rhode Island	Michelle Palermo, Assistant Director Instruction, Assessment & Curriculum, Department of Education
Rhode Island	Jessica Delforge Educator Quality Specialist, Office of Educator Quality and Certification, Department of Education
Rhode Island	Tim Heavey, Educator Quality Specialist, Office of Educator Quality and Certification, Department of Education

CEELO gratefully acknowledges the support of Amanda Szekely and Albert Wat, National Governors Association, Center for Best Practices, who provided additional funding for this research and reviewing early drafts of the brief. The authors also thank:

- Megan Carolan, CEELo Research Associate and Policy Research Coordinator, National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers University, who provided invaluable support to in producing the state databases, profiles, and tables in this document.
- Steven Barnett, Diane Schilder, Thomas Shultz, James Squires, and Shannon Riley-Ayers, CEELo senior staff, for their insightful comments on early drafts of the brief.
- Laura Bornfreund, New America Foundation; Lisa Lachlain, American Institutes for Research; and Sarah Silverman, National Governors Association for their expert review of the final draft of the brief.

Appendix A - Colorado

COLORADO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Colorado State Model Evaluation System		CO State Model Evaluation System
Implementation status of TE system	Pilot or field test and Full implementation	Districts have flexibility in creating own evaluation process timeline that meets legal requirements. See Sample Work Plan.	Sample Work Plan
Implementation Schedule	Statewide implementation 2013-14 school year (pilot until 2016)		
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth - age 3 • Preschool • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade • Early Childhood Special Education Teachers; Child Find Team Members 	Any early childhood educator whose position requires a CDE license. If a district requires a license, but the state doesn't, district decides. If the position does not require a license but the teacher has one, state law does not require evaluation. Districts could decide to include other sectors and 2013-2014 school year will collect this data. These licensed teachers include: Infant/toddler; preschool; early childhood coordinators; Head Start/Early Head Start teachers. Early childhood coordinators whose positions require a CDE license must be evaluated. District may require evaluation of additional staff.	Overview of Requirements
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	Senate Bill 10-191		Senate Bill 10-191
State approach	State Model but districts could develop their own model with some requirements/ approval by state	Colorado developed statewide evaluation system, but districts may use their own evaluations as long as they meet or exceed the state requirements in rule and law. Most districts (over 90%) however, choose to use state model.	
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation • Promotion/Tenure Decisions 	The first year of rollout (2013-2014) is considered a harmless year. Non-probation status earned after 3 consecutive years of	

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

COLORADO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Development Termination 	demonstrated effectiveness; lost after 2 consecutive years of ineffective ratings. Ratings during hold harmless year may count toward attainment of non-probationary status, but will not count as one of the two years needed to lose status due to ineffective ratings.	
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% Assessment of Teacher Practice 50% Student Achievement/Growth 	Assessment of teacher: Professional practices Student growth: Based on multiple measures of student learning that can be defined by the district as long as statewide assessments are used as at least one of the multiple measures "when available" for teachers.	
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	Yes	State Council for Educator Effectiveness (SCEE) recommends EC teachers covered by plan be evaluated under state model evaluation system using the teacher rubric, rather than locally determined. Changes have been made to the teacher rubric to be more appropriate for EC teachers.	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Preschool IDEA Part B 	State preschool: not required by state to be licensed Other ECE providers: not required by state to be licensed Any early childhood educator whose position requires a CDE license. If a district requires a license, but the state doesn't, district decides. These teachers include: Infant/toddler; preschool; early childhood coordinators; Head Start/Early Head Start teachers.	
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Ineffective/Partially effective/Effective/Highly effective		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	Professional growth plan form asks rating level previous year to set goals	
Student learning/achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State mandates, approves, and/or provides options of 1 or 	State has issued guidance on how to determine the 50% that is based on student learning. Districts are allowed to develop their	Determining a Final Educator

COLORADO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
	more standardized measure of student learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State allows formative assessments of other observation measures of children’s learning performed by teachers • Student Learning Objectives 	own student learning measures.	Effectiveness Rating
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value Added or Growth Models • Student Learning Outcomes • Other Methods Allowed • Assessment Tools Used: Results Matter and Global Child Outcome for Preschool, ECSE; School Readiness Assessment for K; and State Model Evaluation System tools for 1st-3rd 	Student Learning Outcomes: Student Growth Objectives in CO	
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards 	Based on The Colorado Academic Standards for students and the teacher Quality Standards	
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 annually for tenured teachers. At least 2 annually for non-tenured teachers • Principals, administrators conduct evaluations 	Number of observations: Probationary teachers: at least 2 observations, one summative evaluation each year; at least one observation per year and summative evaluation every three years for no probationary Announced: does not specify	
Measure of teacher practice	State Developed: Colorado Teacher Quality Standards		Quality Standards
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	Yes	Every educator involved in using the CO State Model Evaluation System is trained by a CDE approved training program. This process helps to ensure reliability & validity. DoE is required to ensure there are evaluator training courses throughout the state by 2014-15.	User’s Guide

COLORADO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
If training is provided, certification required	Not currently, but CDE will be monitoring the state approved trainers to ensure participants are high quality evaluators		
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State • District • Other 	Districts will have flexibility to partake in professional development activities provided by either the state, districts or other providers.	
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes, the Teacher Student Data Link	CDE is in initial phase of planning	
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Stakeholder group		System Transition Toolkit
Stakeholder Involvement	Stakeholder group		System Transition Toolkit
Independent evaluation/validation	No	State is examining and validating scores, and refers to system & tools as validated. CDE is conducting validation study of teacher & principal evaluation process & materials during SY 2013-14.	
Additional Information			
Modifications to process for some teachers	No	Early childhood teachers are evaluated using the state model unless their districts choose to require a different process. CDE is considering writing "implementation briefs" to help educators appropriately use the evaluation process and rubrics in meaningful ways.	

Appendix B - Connecticut

CONNECTICUT			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Connecticut System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED)		CT SEED website
Implementation status of TE system	Partial Implementation, full expected in 2014-2015 school year		
Implementation Schedule	2012-2013 - 10 pilot districts. Some districts have flexibility to include or not to include. 2014-15 - Pre-K inclusion and full implementation for all districts.	FY 2014 there was flexibility in all districts with a minimum of one third of staff included. Pre-K had a waiver and private special education for one year; DCF educational families.	Rollout Flow Chart
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth - age 3 • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade 	Certified teachers and/including Kindergarten. Would need to use a survey specific for pre-K if they used. Still trying to decide if including Part B preschool.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	Legislation in statue or regulation	Public Act 12-116, An Act Concerning Education Reform. Flexibility waiver not yet approved. Most districts choosing state test data from teacher evaluation.	
State approach	State Gives District Several Models to Choose From (with SEA Approval)	Local and regional BOE review and approve a teacher evaluation program that is consistent with CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation. SEED is the state model, can opt into SEED fully or use a hybrid. Individualized plans must be compliant with guidelines.	
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development • Termination 	All districts defined effective and ineffective related to a pattern of ratings. By year 3 or 4 need to be proficient to be effective. If a tenured teacher, 2 developing ratings could be ineffective. termination as defined by district ineffective, implementation of an assistance plan and demonstrate change and improvement. SEA	

CONNECTICUT			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		gave guidance but districts make decisions based on definitions and pathway for career development. No longer have CEUs, to promote customized professional development, job embedded, that is aligned with evaluation data	
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 40% • Student Growth/Value Added Model: 45% • Survey (Parent/Peer/Student): 10 or 5% • Schoolwide Measure: 5% 	Parent or peer feedback is. 10%. The final five percent comes from either schoolwide student learning indicators or student feedback. SEED guidance indicates survey should not be used in most cases for children grades K-3. 5% of the Teacher Evaluation, if the whole school indicator is dependent on the principals 45% rating-- informs the whole school learning indicator; same is true for admins-- dependent on success of teachers achieving student learning objs, shared responsibility.	
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	Yes	GTL indicates "stable" weighting across disciplines and contexts	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth to Age 3 • State Preschool/Pre-K 	Birth to Age 3 teachers in nonpublic schools not subject to TE; those working for a public school, including a RESC or state-approved private special education facility, will be subject to the new evaluation system requirements but may fall under the guidelines for the Student and Educator Support Specialist Evaluation." (Connecticut SEED)	CT State Teacher Certification
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	"Below standard", "developing", "proficient", "exemplary"	Statute says that the ratings that need to be reported in these 4 rating categories; some districts have changed for example proficient to accomplished. Not all teachers are using the SEED rubric for teaching observation/framework and has to be aligned with the CT common core of teaching	
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	Inform the individualized professional development and support. Professional learning standards will be released, for those districts that opted into the district data system, Bloom board, this would then suggest professional development based on the rating (state	

CONNECTICUT			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		of CT is funding for the teachers to access a professional development. Other data management systems available). All the training is free, bloom board platform is free itself, and districts make money to enhance what is offered. State of CT is funding the professional learning, certain dollar amount per teachers; don't know if Bloom board if it has any early childhood specific content	
Student learning/ achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State allows formative assessments of other observation measures of children's learning performed by teachers (note domains & give instrument name) • Student Learning Objectives 	<p>22.5% of total rating: performance and progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools</p> <p>22.5% of total rating: (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures (SLOs).</p> <p>SLOs: Each educator is responsible for two learning objectives which should be broad goals for student learning; address a central purpose of teachers' assignment; apply to a large proportion of students. SLOs can be developed through consultation with colleagues in same grade level or teaching same subject and through mutual agreement with supervisors. Developing SLO "drop box" in which teachers can share template rubrics for their grade/subject with other teachers. Putting together assessment literacy modules. IAGD- difficulty setting benchmarks. Working with NECC.</p>	
Student growth	Other methods allowed (portfolios, work sampling, etc.)	Teacher/school level assessments (5%)	
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	Assessment	State provides guidance on how to compose SLOs as well as samples.	Teacher SLO Samples
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 observations • Announced observations used • Unannounced observations used • Principal/ asst. principal or designee 	<p>Observations: Formal and informal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First- and second-year teachers – at least 3 in-class formal observations • Teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of below standard or developing - no fewer than three in-class formal observations. 	

CONNECTICUT			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary - of at least three formal observations/reviews of practice, one of which must be a formal in-class observation 	
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching State developed 	<p>State developed: Locally-developed curriculum standards; CT Common Core of Teaching; CT Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards. Districts could use be using a different observation framework but must align with Common Core and would be approved by SEA. Common Core of Teaching is for K-12, not pre-K. Had some supplemental standards that were content specific for pre-K-Grade 3. CCT and Charlotte Danielson Blend-- now called CT Common Core- state developed the observational tool, that rubric is undergoing a validations study and revision.</p> <p>Other: Common Core Standards; CMT/CAPT Assessments (Smarter Balanced Assessments); MET</p>	
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	How to administer child assessments (or other measures of student learning), note frequency of reliability training	All evaluators are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide districts with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators, evaluators and teachers in implementing the model across their schools.	
If training is provided, certification required		Proficiency assessment is part of the 5 day training for evaluators, if the district opted in to do the SEA training	
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	State		

CONNECTICUT			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	From Great Teachers and Leaders: "Yes. Connecticut's statewide longitudinal data system includes unique identifiers for students and teachers. The state is currently, however, in the process of linking student and teacher data by July 1, 2013"	
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Yes	Three smaller groups- evidence guides for contents or certain teachers; common core of teaching rubric; holistically at EC-pre-K to Grade 2, because gave a waiver to pre-K for FY2014 we want to give some guidance in pre-K; will bring experts together.	
Stakeholder Involvement	Stakeholders are routinely updated on the progress toward meeting goals and realizing the vision.		
Independent evaluation/ validation	Yes	Commencing in summer 2013, there will be an annual audit of evaluations.	
Additional Information			
Modifications to process for some teachers	Special Education	Special education students should not be administered survey if they are unable to complete it, even with accommodations. Guidance provided in how special education teachers may need to modify process.	SEED Student and Educator Support Specialists Guidance Document

Appendix C - Delaware

DELAWARE			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Delaware Performance Appraisal System (DPAS II)		DPAS II Website
Implementation status of TE system	Full Implementation		
Implementation Schedule	DPAS-II is a revised edition of DPAS which began in 2008. DPAS II Program revised edition began with "interim year" implementation in 2011-12 with full implementation beginning in the 2012-13 school year.		
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth - age 3 • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade • Child Find Coordinators 	Part B-619, Title 1 pre-K, ECAP if work for school district, Birth mandate (autism, deaf, and hard of hearing), K-2, and Child Find Coordinators	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	Legislation in statute or regulation	Delaware State Code Title 14, Chapter 12.	
State approach	Single State-Wide Model	Single model with additional flexibility provided to LEAs, should they choose to exercise it. (d) A local school district may develop and implement other assessment tools that measure annual student improvement, including assessments in other content areas. Assessment tools developed and implemented pursuant to this subsection must be approved by the Secretary and must be funded with local funds.	DE Title 14 Chapter 12 Educator Licensure, Certification, Evaluation, and Professional Development
Purpose/goals of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation 		DSEA – DPAS-II

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

DELAWARE			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development • Termination 		Description
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 80% • Student Achievement: 20% 	Student achievement: Modified SLO	
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	No	Define tested and nontested student achievement as two different requirements.	DPAS II Guide Revised for Teachers (2013)
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth to Age Three • State Preschool/Pre-K • IDEA Part B 	ECAP if work for school district (Head Start state funded model).	
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	"Unsatisfactory", "Basic", "Proficient", "Distinguished"		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	Improvement Plan must be developed when teacher is rated "Needs improvement" or "ineffective" on overall performance, or earns "unsatisfactory" on any component. May be created when teacher's performance in unannounced observation is unsatisfactory. Improvement plans must include measurable goals for improvement and PD meant to address specific areas needing improvement.	
Student learning/ achievement	•State mandates/ approves/ provides options of 1 or more standardized measure of student learning (note domains & give	Bank of available assessments	DE DOE DPAS II – Component 5 Part III – External

DELAWARE			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
	instrument name) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Learning Objectives 		Measures: Core Content Areas - Approved
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Learning Outcomes • Other methods allowed (portfolios, work sampling, etc.) 	See bottom Matrix of Measures for DPAS II Component V	Measuring Student Growth
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	Standards	Created 19 standards-based, student-focused targets derived from the infant/toddler/pre-K early learning standards across 6 domains. Incorporates standards state already holds teachers to, rather than developing a new set that may not align	
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 per year novice teachers (less than 3 years' experience), 1 per year experienced teachers • Experienced: 1 either announced or unannounced, Novice: 1 • Experienced: 1 either announced or unannounced, Novice: 2 • Trained credentialed observers 		106A Teacher Appraisal Process DPAS II Revised
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching • State teacher standards • DPAS II 		
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	Yes		

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

DELAWARE			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
If training is provided, certification required	Yes	All Evaluators must complete DPAS II training, as developed by the Delaware Department of Education to be credentialed by the Delaware Department of Education.	
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State • District 		
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	ERS Bloomboard	Bloomboard website
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals			
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	Does not include ECE professionals	106A Teacher Appraisal Process(DPAS II Revised)
Independent evaluation/validation	Yes		106A Teacher Appraisal Process(DPAS II Revised)
Additional Information			
Modifications to process for some teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education • Special subject (Art, Phy. Ed.) 	DCAS Alt	

Appendix D - Hawaii

HAWAII			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Educator Effectiveness System		HI Educator Effectiveness System Website
Implementation status of TE system	Full Implementation		
Implementation Schedule	Piloted in 18 schools in 2011-2012; expanded to 81 schools in 2012-2013. Statewide implementation 2013-2014 school year but "year of no consequence" (except for new teachers)		
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade 	Preschool teachers employed by school based programs, those belonging to union. Preschool teachers are involved in teacher evaluation, can depend on zones.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in statute or regulation • Race to the Top (K-12) 	Regulation: New State Board Policy 5100	State Board Policy 5100
State approach	Single State-Wide Model	Hawaii is one district EES is a state-wide system	Educator Effectiveness System Manual
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development 	No action to be taken in first year (13-14). Third and fourth year begin phasing in consequences. Beginning 2015-16 school year, teachers with effective or higher may receive pay increases.	2013 Teacher Contract Highlights (HI)
Components of teacher evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 50% 	Non-tested Classroom Teachers: 50% student growth and achievement. Within the 50% includes 45% Student Learning	Educator Effectiveness

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

HAWAII			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Growth/Value Added Model: 50% • Student Achievement: 50% • Survey (Parent/Peer/Student): 10% • Schoolwide Measure: 5% 	Objectives and 5% schoolwide measure (Hawaii Growth Model). Another 50% for Professionalism. Within this 50% includes 25% classroom observations, 15% core professionalism, and 10% for a tripod student survey. The student survey is a school and teacher report which is used as support for the system.	System Manual
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	No	Distinction is between tested vs. nontested grades. In tested, growth model is 25%; in nontested, growth model is 5%, with rest of that weigh going to SLOs.	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	Birth to Age 3		
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Highly effective / effective/ marginal/ unsatisfactory		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	The EES will help leaders determine what support teachers need, the best way to allocate resources, and what instructional approaches/structures work best. Teachers rated as "marginal" will receive an annual evaluation, which those rated "unsatisfactory" will have their employment terminated	Educator Effectiveness System Manual
Student learning/ achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State mandates/ approves/ provides options of 1 or more standardized measure of student learning (note domains & give instrument name) • Student Learning Objectives 	State mandates: Student growth measures: includes student learning objectives and curriculum based assessments, SLO: 5% school wide SLO, 45% teacher driven SLO	
Student growth	• Value added or growth models	Value added: Student growth percentile models, certain amount of	

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

HAWAII			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Learning Outcomes • Other methods allowed (portfolios, work sampling, etc.) • Assessment tools used 	<p>growth in percentiles</p> <p>Other methods: Observation working portfolios</p> <p>Assessment tool used: Charlotte Danielson Rubric</p>	
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	Standards	These targets should be specific, measurable, informed by baseline data, and aligned to state standards or national standards.	
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Observations: 2 per year annually for all teachers • Announced: 2 • Unannounced: None • Who conducts observations - Principals/evaluators 		2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook (HI)
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching • State developed 	State developed: PEP-T- Professional Evaluation Program (being phased out in the 2013-14 school year) New Evaluation: Educator Effectiveness System	
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	Not Applicable		2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook (HI)
If training is provided, certification required	Yes	Evaluator certification is required, but training is not. Observers must be certified by the Department	2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook (HI)
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	State		HI DOE Office of Human Resources

HAWAII			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	Reviewing for quality note and feedback Statewide --PDE3 data system	HI DOE Office of Human Resources
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Yes	Described in news article	Hawai'i Free Press article
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	Numerous stakeholders contributed to EES design and consults for decision making.	Educator Effectiveness System Manual
Independent evaluation/ validation			
Additional Information		One system- support allows for department to have a direct line to CAS so department is able to make mid-course corrections, so if department hears that teachers are struggling they can be responsive	
Modifications to process for some teachers			

Appendix E - Illinois

ILLINOIS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)		PEAC Website
Implementation status of TE system	Partial	It is to be fully implemented state-wide using student growth and through Race to the Top in 34 districts. Districts are advised to begin with a cohort (grade, subject, building, etc.) with no stakes implementation.	PEAC Website
Implementation Schedule	Began in Chicago in 2012-2013; fully implemented in all districts by 2016-2017	Signed in 2010.	PEAC Website
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/pre-K • Early Childhood (PreK-3) • Kindergarten - 3rd Grade 	All teachers that are hired by the district and certified by the state program (EC teachers included) are required to participate; union membership does not make a difference. Community based programs, charter, and private school teachers are not included in the teacher evaluation process.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in statute or regulation • Race to the Top (K-12) 	PERA (Performance Evaluation Reform Act) state wide legislation in Senate Bill 7	Amendment to Senate Bill 7
State approach	State Model but districts could develop their own model with some requirements/ approval by state	Districts are required to design and implement performance evaluation systems that meet state standards. Districts each have a joint committee (district & teacher representatives to ensure equal balance of power). Checks and balances on evaluation based on agreement of joint committee at district level must be aligned based on IL state professional teaching standards. For RTT- evaluation plan already in place but student growth needs is in the process of being phased in. In Illinois Performance Evaluation Advisory Council Update PPT: "Evaluation reforms provide	

ILLINOIS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		statewide consistency while offering local districts the opportunity to create their own evaluation systems that meet state rules"	
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion/tenure decisions • Termination 	Local joint committee makes decisions on compensation and termination. Teacher receiving can be dismissed for this reason without seniority preference. It will not affect compensation.	PEAC – FAQs
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Growth: 30 -50% 	Districts can negotiate percent and weight of student growth in joint committee and implement. Student growth must account for at least 30% for; if joint committee after 180 days of negotiation cannot come to an agreement, must revert to state model with minimum of 50%. Develop recommendations for appropriate assessment of student growth as part of P-3 teacher evaluation. Do not require a state test, although many districts use Danielson framework.	Framework – FAQs (PEAC)
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	Locally determined	Depends on decision of local joint committee	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Preschool/Pre-K • Other (parent educators, Title I, Child Find, etc.) 	Only public school preschool teachers can be evaluated (not charter or private) Preschool teachers must have a bachelor of arts, specialized training and certification.	
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Excellent/Proficient/Needs Improvement/ Unsatisfactory		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	Tenured teachers rated "Needs improvement" will develop a professional development plan with school district to target areas that have been identified as needing improvement. Must take into account the teacher’s on-going professional responsibilities, including his/her regular teacher assignments, and set forth any	

ILLINOIS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		support that the district will provide to address the areas identified as needing improvement. Plans can cross school years and do not have a set duration.	
Student learning/achievement	Student Learning Objectives	SLO's are not required to be used in a district unless the joint committee selects it or unless the district is defaulting to the Model Teacher Evaluation System. Teachers will receive training to use SLOs as primary way to determine student growth in nontested grades and subjects.	PEAC website
Student growth	Student Learning Objectives	Teachers will receive training to use SLOs as primary way to determine student growth in nontested grades and subjects. Helping teachers to collect data, process, and how achievement changing over period of time. student growth implementation chart	ISBE Guidebook on Implementing Student Growth Component
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	Not Applicable	Need to align SLOs standards to early learning standards.	
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 observations • Evaluator who successfully completes training and a pre-qualification 	3 observations annually for nontenured teachers and tenured teachers rated with "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory". 2 observations biannually for tenured teachers rated "excellent" or "proficient." SEA has not yet specified rules on announced and unannounced observations, still in development.	
Measure of teacher practice	Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching	Use of Danielson recommended by PEAC for teachers aligned with edTPA. Danielson is not required, but most districts use it. McCormick is funding 9-10 months of planning and engaging early education experts to go through Danielson and what different domains look like in early childhood lens. Can use early learning examples on what ratings they should give teachers. Will develop qualitative measures (interviews peer and teacher), more professional development, opportunities for answers, next summer 2014 implementation when districts use Danielson.	

ILLINOIS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice		Pre-qualifying web based growth through learning- 5 modules training for anyone who is going to be evaluating teachers. Doesn't address ECE, but rules and requirements of student growth. Not quite clear on what training is on, only states evaluators need training and pre-qualification	
If training is provided, certification required			
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	District	Districts will be expected to strengthen their professional development offerings so that educators get the support they need to help their students improve.	
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	In process	In process of phase II targeted state for teacher student data link project.	ISBE Guidance on Creating Operating Guidelines for Student Growth Models
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)	No EC Professionals	
Stakeholder Involvement			
Independent evaluation/			

ILLINOIS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Validation			
Additional Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to help teachers understand assessment and SLOs • Need to quickly scale up assessment literacy • Supporting implementation • Making change so whole concept can be done well 	IL is one of the few states that doesn't require or encourage the use of the state evaluation in assessment, IL is neutral.	
Modifications to process for some teachers			

Appendix F: Maryland

MARYLAND			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Maryland Teacher Principal Evaluation (TPE) Initiative		MSDE Teacher and Principal Evaluation website
Implementation status of TE system	Full implementation		
Implementation Schedule	Fully implemented in 2013-2014		
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade 	Any individual certificated by MDSE in COMAR 13A.12.02. as a teacher who delivers instruction and is responsible for a student or group of students academic progress in a Pre-K-12 public school setting, subject to local system interpretation	MD Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in statue or regulation • Race to the Top (K-12) • ESEA/NCLB Flexibility Waiver 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Reform Act of 2010; COMAR Title 13A.07.09 • ESEA Waiver • Maryland RTT Grant Application (only the 22 RTT districts in state) 	
State approach	District Developed with Some Requirements/Approval From State	The differences between the State Evaluation Model and allowed and approved local evaluation models are minor. To be acceptable, the local model must have the endorsement of the local collective bargaining unit as prescribed by the Act and Title 13A. The required union endorsement is the salient distinction between the state and local models.	
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Development 		
Components of teacher evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 50% 	Within 50% Student Growth (for nontested area teachers): 20% SLO Lag Measures based on school progress index indicators (such as	

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

MARYLAND			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Growth/Value Added Model: 50% 	achievement, gap reduction, growth, college and career readiness), AP tests or other measures. 15% SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the district or school level. 15% Annual SLO measure as determined by priority identification at the classroom level.	
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	Yes		
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth to Age 3 • State Preschool/Pre-K • Other (parent educators, Title I, Child Find, etc.) 	Any individual certificated by MDSE as defined in COMAR 13A.12.02. as a teacher who delivers instruction and is responsible for a student or group of students academic progress in a Pre-K-12 public school setting, subject to local system interpretation:	MSDE Early Care and Education Program Lists
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Highly Effective/ Effective/ Ineffective		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	A professional development component for all teachers and principals and a focused professional development, resources, and mentoring component for teachers and principals who are evaluated as ineffective and for all non-tenured teachers.	MD Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook
Student learning/ achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State allows formative assessments of other observation measures of children’s learning performed by teachers (note domains & give instrument name) • Student Learning Objectives 	For elementary and middle school teachers providing instruction in non-state assessed grades and content, student learning objectives in content area(s) being taught and the school-wide index. For elementary and middle school principals, student learning objectives, aggregate school-wide growth scores in state-assessed content areas, and the school-wide index	MD Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value added or growth models • Student Learning Outcomes 	For teachers in tested grades, growth based on aggregate class growth scores and school-wide index; for nontested, based on SLOs	MD School Performance –

MARYLAND			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		and school-wide index.	Developing a Monitoring Plan
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 observation • Evaluator can be principal or administrator who has been trained. 	Observation can announced or unannounced. Every teacher and principal evaluated at least once annually.	
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching • State developed: Maryland State Model for Educator Effectiveness 		MD Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	MSDE provides training to executive officers to train principals on teacher evaluation	MSDE personnel will provide training to the executive officers who will in turn train their principals to evaluate teachers. Training will be based on the State Models. MSDE will provide ongoing technical assistance to the LEAs in the form of training, consultation, and advisement in the use of the State Models.	
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	State		
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	No	Data system exists and they will eventually link it to TE, but unclear if they can now	
Independent evaluation/validation	Seven pilot school districts		

MARYLAND			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Modifications to process for some teachers		Not modification, per says, but " To be rated Highly Effective, a teacher or principal must show exceptional talent in increasing student growth well beyond one grade level in one year or exceptional success educating high-poverty, minority, English Language Learners (ELL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), or other high-needs students"	

Appendix G: Massachusetts

MASSACHUSETTS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	The Massachusetts Framework for Educator Evaluation		MA Framework for Educator Evaluation
Implementation status of TE system	Partial implementation	Staggered roll out	
Implementation Schedule	RTT districts (66% of districts) began evaluation system in Fall 2012; other districts will start by Fall 2013.	Implementation Schedule: In the 2012-13 school year, RTTT districts and charter schools completed implementation of the Summative Performance Rating for at least 50 percent of educators. In the 2013-14 school year, all RTTT districts and charter schools are implementing Summative Performance Ratings for their remaining educators and all non-RTTT districts are implementing with at least 50 percent of their educators. In 2014-15 all districts will implement district-determined measures, such that educators will earn Student Impact Ratings in 2015-16 based on trends (at least two years of data) and patterns (at least two measures in each year). See the Commissioner's August 15th memorandum for additional timeline details.	Implementation Plan Timeline
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through Grade 3 	All licensed educators will be included. However Birth-3 educators are not licensed by ESE and therefore are not required to be evaluated under the new framework.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in statue or regulation • Race to the Top (K-12) • ESEA/NCLB Flexibility Waiver 	Legislation: 603 CMR 35.00: M.G.L. c.69, §1B; c.71, §38, Race to the Top	603 CMR 35.00
State approach	State Model but districts could develop their own model with some requirements/approval by	State gives one model and districts can revise. Districts do not approve of models, they review and insure systems are consistent with regulations. Basically all districts have adopted verbatim or	Implementation and Reporting

MASSACHUSETTS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
	state	adapted state models. ESE does not have the regulatory authority to "approve" local evaluation systems. ESE is charged with "reviewing" systems to ensure they are consistent with the Board's Principles of Evaluation. Massachusetts has a single Model System. Districts can adopt or adapt the Model System, or revise their existing systems to comply with the new regulations. Over 95% of our RTTT-participating districts chose to adopt or adapt the model.	
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development • Termination 		
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice • Student Growth/Value Added Model • Student Achievement • Survey (Parent/Peer/Student) 	<p>Teachers rated based on unspecified percents on: Evaluator's observations re professional practice; Multiple measures of student learning/growth/achievement; Collection of additional evidence, including potentially from students, staff, parents. No weights system based on parameter</p> <p>Student growth: State mandates measure of student growth in untested grades. Districts determine which nonstate measures should be used, but must be "comparable across schools, grade, and subject matter district-wide." In 2014, student feedback will be incorporated into educator evaluation and staff feedback into administrator evaluation. A "student impact rating" (on scale of high, moderate, low) will be added in 2015-2016 which is informed by trends (at least two years of data) and patterns (at least two measures in each year). All districts are piloting district-determined measures in 2013-14 and will begin implementing district-determined measures in 2014-15. Ratings will follow in 2015-16, once two years of data is available.</p>	MA Model System for Educator Evaluation
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same		MA's system requires Summative Performance Ratings to be based on the evaluator's professional judgment and an examination of evidence that demonstrates the educator's performance against	

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

MASSACHUSETTS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		Performance Standards and evidence of the attainment of the Educator Plan goals. As such, there are no predetermined weights or algorithms imposed on evaluators for use in determining ratings for any educator or groups of educators.	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	State Preschool/Pre-K	Teacher means any person employed in a school district in a position requiring a certificate or license (see 603 CMR 7.04(3)) or who is employed in a comparable position in a collaborative. Those certs include a few that cover pre-K, such as Early Childhood: Teacher of Students With and Without Disabilities for PK-2, but sounds like only in school districts	Types of Educator Licenses
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Receive two ratings: 1) Summative Rating, Rated: Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvements, Unsatisfactory. 2) Rating of Impact on Student Learning: Rated low, Moderate, High		Overview of New MA Educator Evaluation Framework
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	PD options include: Developing Educator Plan; Self-Directed Growth Plan; Directed-Growth Plan; Improvement plan. Developed based on matrix of both ratings. See: Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvements, Unsatisfactory. There is also a required teacher training series comprised of four workshops. ESE designed the materials and districts facilitate the training with their teachers.	Training Workshops for Teachers
Student learning/achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State allows formative assessments of other observation measures of children’s learning performed by teachers • Student Learning Objectives 		
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value added or growth models • Other methods allowed 	Other: State mandates measure of student growth in untested grades. Districts determine which nonstate measures should be	District-Determined

MASSACHUSETTS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
	(portfolios, work sampling, etc.)	used, but must be "comparable across schools, grade, and subject matter district-wide." Department of Elementary and Second Ed must provide guidance to districts by July 2012.	Measures
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to		Not been advocating SLO approach, student learning goals as part of summative performance rating. Aligned to Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks in each of the following areas: early grade (K-3) literacy; early (K-3) grade math; middle grade (5-8); math; high school writing to text; and traditionally non-tested grades and subjects (e.g., fine arts, music, p.e.).	Quick Reference Guide: District-Determined Measures
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one unannounced observation • Evaluators are those people designated by Superintendent, could be Superintendent themselves 	Additional detail. Local collective bargaining agreements typically establish the type and duration of classroom observations and the minimum number of observations that will be conducted during each cycle. The regulations reference "frequent unannounced observations" and note that such observations may be "of any duration."	603 CMR 35
Measure of teacher practice	State Developed: Massachusetts Model System	ESE-developed rubrics for classroom teachers, school and district administrators, and specialized instructional support personnel are available. District determined measures, have an option of a number of data sources.	Educator Evaluation Rubrics
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to administer child assessments (or other measures of student learning), note frequency of reliability training 	ESE training modules are designed to prepare evaluators and school leadership teams to implement the new educator evaluation system in their schools. Have administrators that may/not have EC experience. State had developed training modules for both teachers and evaluators: Category B training is more intensive, but optional	Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation Training
If training is provided, certification	No		

MASSACHUSETTS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
required			
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State • District 	The evaluator training modules and teacher training workshops are designed with detailed facilitator instructions and speaker notes which allow districts to facilitate the PD in-house. However, ESE is providing training subsidies to allow districts to use approved vendors to deliver evaluator training (modules)	Approved Vendors to Support Implementation of Educator Evaluation
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	Education Personnel Information Management Systems (EPIMS) has unique identifiers for both students and teachers.	
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Formal group; role of early childhood unclear	District level representation. Advisory role through Task Force on The Evaluation of Teachers and Administrators, including principals, teachers, superintendents, parent orgs, and business and student reps. Not clear whether early education was specifically included.	
Stakeholder Involvement		ESE has principal advisory cabinets and is establishing a teacher cabinet in early 2014. ESE consults regularly with statewide associations regarding implementation of the educator evaluation system, including the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS), the Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC), the Massachusetts Teachers Association (MTA), the American Federation of Teachers Massachusetts (AFT-MA)	
Independent evaluation/validation	Yes	Implementation is being monitored by a third-party evaluator.	
Additional Information			RTT Application for Initial

MASSACHUSETTS			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
			Funding
Modifications to process for some teachers		"The rubric is designed to be applicable to general education teachers from pre-K through Advanced Placement, as well as teachers with specialized classes or knowledge, including teachers of English Language Learners, and special education teachers; districts may also choose to use this rubric for educators in other roles such as specialists. "	MA Educator Evaluation Guide to Rubrics and Model Rubrics

Appendix H: New Jersey

NEW JERSEY			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	AchieveNJ		NJ Teacher Evaluation
Implementation status of TE system	Full implementation		
Implementation Schedule	Effectiveness Task Force (EETF) released first recommendations in 2011; implementing statewide in 2013-2014 school year		
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/Pre-K • Kthrough 3rd Grade 	Law applies to: preschool teachers certified by State Board of Examiners & is a member of the professional staff of any public district or regional board of education, Part B	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	Legislation in statue or regulation	NJ Senate Bill 1455	NJ Senate Bill 1455
State approach	State Gives District Several Models to Choose From (with SEA Approval)		AchieveNJ: Educator Evaluation and Support in NJ
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development • Termination 	"Inform personnel decisions"	
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 85% • Student Achievement: 15% 	Student Growth Objectives (SGOs) are academic goals for groups of students that each teacher sets with his or her principal or supervisor at the start of the year. They should be developed using available student data and created to be ambitious but achievable. Assessments used to measure SGOs can include national standardized tests; statewide assessments; or locally-developed measures such as tests, portfolios, etc.	

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

NEW JERSEY			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	No	Nontested are 85% student practice, 15% student achievement; Tested grades are 55% teacher practice; 30% student growth percentile; 15% student growth objective.	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	State Preschool/Pre-K		
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Highly Effective/Effective/ Partially Effective/ Ineffective		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	All teachers receive individual PD plans based on ratings. Teachers rated Ineffective or Partially Effective work with their principals to create a Corrective Action Plan with targeted PD for subsequent year. To maintain tenure, all teachers have to continue to earn a rating of Effective or Highly Effective.	AchieveNJ: Teacher Evaluation and Support in 2013-14
Student learning/ achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State mandates/ approves/ provides options of 1 or more standardized measure of student learning (note domains & give instrument name) State allows formative assessments of other observation measures of children’s learning performed by teachers 	Student Growth Objective (SGO) for nontested grades	
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value added or growth models Student Learning Outcomes Other methods allowed (portfolios, work sampling, etc.) 	For teachers of nontested grades/subjects, recommended that districts identify or develop alternative measures of performance, including Student Growth Outcomes (SGOs, not SLOs), including 2 objectives in any domain. These may be anchored to portfolio,	AchieveNJ: Teacher Evaluation and Support in 2013-

NEW JERSEY			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		multiple assessments, or other goals. NJ DoE will provide guidance on selection and use of these measures.	14
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards Assessment 	NJ does not use "SLO" in teacher evaluation but rather "Student Growth Objectives (SGO's)" NJ provides Model Curriculum to provide guidance in implementing content and Common Core standards, including sample SLOs, for children K- Grade 2.	NJ DOE Model Curriculum
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Observations: 3/year, for both tenured and nontenured; length varies Announced: At least one Unannounced: At least one Observers trained on the instrument before evaluation 	Concern with EC teachers: not be able to be rated effectively because behaviors in higher domains can be done by children independently. Tenured teachers: not required that observations be announced but at least one must have a pre-conference. There are long (40 min) and short (20 min) observations. Tenured teachers receive 3 short observations, and multiple observers are recommended. For non-tenured teachers, Years 1-2 have 2 long, 1 short observation; Years 3-4 requires 1 long, 2 short. Multiple observers are required.	AchieveNJ: Teacher Evaluation and Support in 2013-14
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching CLASS Marzano State Developed: (locally developed) 	No one using CLASS, some using Marzano, STRONG, most using some form of Danielson. LEAs can choose from many evaluations	NJ DOE Approved Teaching Practice Evaluation Instruments
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must participate in two "co-observations" (reliability) and participate in yearly refresher training and certified that they are trained 	Observations are performed by trained staff. All observers must be trained on the instrument before evaluating educators and must participate in two "co-observations" (also known as double-scored observations) throughout the year. All observers must participate in yearly "refresher" training, and superintendents or chief school administrators must certify each year that all observers have been trained. An increased number of opportunities to engage in high-quality professional conversations with trained observers will allow	

NEW JERSEY			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		educators to reflect on their professional practice with more depth and clarity. Information derived from observations and their respective post-conferences will be used to tailor individualized professional development for each teacher.	
If training is provided, certification required	Yes, observers are certified by superintendents/administrators		
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State • District • Other 	Other: school	
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	NJSmart system: "Beginning 2011-2012, NJ SMART began the collection of Staff level data. Since this collection, over 260,000 unique staff member identifiers (SMID) have been assigned to staff." No SGO's being sent to state at time being	NJ SMART Education Data System
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Yes	35 members, including teachers, principals, central office administrators, and representatives of professional associations and higher education. No specific reference to grade-focus of members though app asks for grade experience	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes		
Independent evaluation/validation	Yes		New Jersey Teacher Evaluation, Year 1 Report
Modifications to process for some teachers	Special Education	Districts have flexibility within the evaluation system to address local needs, but the State seeks to be responsive to requests for guidance and clarification.	

Appendix I: Ohio

OHIO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System (OTES)		OH Teacher Evaluations
Implementation status of TE system	Full Implementation		
Implementation Schedule	Effective as of March 22nd, 2013	Teachers in district pre-K classrooms and early childhood special ed are expected to be in district's TE system in FY2014. Specific questions regarding local implementation must be directed to Board legal counsel due to collective bargaining agreements (RTTT, etc.).	Implementation
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade 	Any person who is employed under a teacher license and who spends at least fifty per cent of the time employed providing student instruction." (Ohio Revised Code 3319.111). Teachers in district pre-K classrooms and early childhood special ed are expected to be in district's TE system in FY2014.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in statute or regulation • Race to the Top (K-12) 	HB 555	HB 555
State approach	Single State-Wide Model		
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development 	Inform personnel decisions Ohio's new system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System - OTES) will provide educators with a richer and more detailed view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement.	
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 50% • Student Growth/Value Added Model: 50% 	Each teacher will be evaluated according to Ohio Revised Code and the Evaluation Framework which is aligned with the Standards for the Teaching Profession adopted under state law. Each teacher will be evaluated using the multiple factors set forth in the State Board	Approved Vendor Assessments

CEELO POLICY REPORT - ECE Teachers in State Teacher Evaluation Systems

OHIO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		of Education’s teacher evaluation framework. The evaluation factors are weighted as follows: 50% Teacher Performance, 50% Student Growth Measures. For SGMs, if approved-vendor assessments for teacher-level data are available, 10-50% comes from that measure, and 0-40% comes from LEA measure. A list of vendors approved measures by grade (some including pre-K) are available. If no-teacher level value-added or approved vendor assessment data available, all 50% of student growth will be LEA Measures. These can include SLOs or shared attribution.	
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	Yes	The weighting is still 50% for all teachers. The measures used to arrive at the 50% may be different, but all teachers are evaluated at the same SGM weight regardless of their K-12/ECE status. Different weights for value-added vs non teachers available. For all teachers, 50% comes from teacher practice	Approved Vendor Assessments
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth to Age Three • State Preschool/Pre-K • Other (parent educators, Title I, Child Find, etc.) 	ODE Responsible to license: Preschool programs (birth-age 5 not in Kindergarten) operated by public schools, educational service centers, boards of developmental disabilities, and chartered nonpublic schools with multiple grades above kindergarten	Preschool Program Licensing Rules
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Ineffective/Developing/ Proficient/Accomplished		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	During post- conference, the evaluator should offer area(s) of reinforcement and area(s) of refinement. These areas of refinement will guide improvement and professional development.	Professional Development
Student learning/achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State mandates/approves/provides 	For educators with no Value-Added data and no approved vendor data, schools should establish local measures, including student	Local Measures

OHIO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
	options of 1 or more standardized measure of student learning (note domains & give instrument name) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Learning Objectives 	learning objectives, to measure student growth.	
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value added or growth models • Student Learning Objectives • Other methods allowed (portfolios, work sampling, etc.) • Assessment Tools Used 	<p>If approved-venor assessments for teacher-level data are avialable, 10-50% comes from that measure, and 0-40% comes from LEA measure. A list of vendors approved measures by grade (some including pre-K) are available</p> <p>If no-teacher level value-added or approvaed vendor assessment data available, all 50% of student growth will be LEA Measures. These can include SLOs or shared attribution.</p>	Approved Vendor Assessments
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards • Assessment 	SLOs should be based on data from multiple sources when available such as standardized tests, portfolios of student work, and district-created assessments and based on academic domains. Many publicly-funded preschools use Get It, Go It, Go for indicators of children’s growth.	SLO
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual observation • Announced/unannounced - LEA decision • Superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, vocational director, administrative specialist or supervisor in any educational area issued under section 3319.22 of the Revised code or is qualified to conduct evaluations 	Announced/Unannounced an LEA decision. The evaluator can be chosen if student growth is above a certain expectation.	
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State teacher standards • State Developed: OTES 	Use Ohio Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric with indicators from Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. Developed by the state. LEAS may choose to use their own model; however, it must	Teacher Performance

OHIO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		be completely aligned to the state model. LEAs must complete a rubric alignment at the beginning of the evaluation cycle. Danielson not required framework used for evaluator training, as long as aligned with State Rubric.	
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to administer child assessments (or other measures of student learning), note frequency of reliability training • How to use assessments and observation data to improve practice 	All evaluators in the state must attend a three-day training and pass a credentialing exam. Additionally, assessment Literacy training is in progress in Ohio with 100 trainings scheduled regionally. In addition, there is one state coordinator and five regional assessment specialists supporting LEAs in this work. The State Support Team also provides guidance to teachers.	
If training is provided, certification required	Complete state-sponsored training and online assessment	All evaluators, regardless of evaluation system used, must complete state sponsored training and pass an online assessment.	
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	State	OTES/OPES trainings are conducted through trainers employed at Educational Service Centers throughout Ohio. Additional eTPES trainers are in place in ESCs as well. Additionally, one Coordinator and four SGM Specialists are in place to train and provide TA to LEAs statewide. An Assessment Literacy Coordinator and team of five specialists are in place as well.	
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	Details on teacher/student data linkage	OH Teacher Student Data Linkage
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes	Yes	There is a Student Growth Measure Advisory Group that includes personnel from ECE.	

OHIO			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
ECE professionals			
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	The Student Growth Measure Advisory Group includes key stakeholders across the state.	
Independent evaluation/validation	Yes		Ohio Department of Education Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Pilot
Additional Information		In nontested subjects: EC SLO Template	SLO Template
Modifications to process for some teachers	Not Applicable	If appropriate, when developing SLOs, develop the assessment in conjunction with an instructional coach, curriculum supervisor, special education teacher, English Language Learner teacher, and administrator or other faculty member with assessment expertise.	

Appendix J: Pennsylvania

PENNSYLVANIA			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	Educator Effectiveness Project		Educator Effectiveness Project
Implementation status of TE system	Full implementation	Act 82 of 2012 (22 Pa. Code § 19.1)	
Implementation Schedule	TE system mandated for 2013-2014; Principal/Ed specialists for 2014-2015		
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool/Pre-K • Kindergarten through 3rd Grade 	Any teacher serving children in a local education agency (LEA) or intermediate unit and that holds an instructional certificate is mandated to be evaluated. Pre-K counts community based settings not included in the mandate but program policy has been provided which includes them in the evaluation system. Pre-K Counts community-based settings will transition to new system 2014-2015.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in statute or regulation • Race to the Top (K-12) 	Act 82 in state law	Act 82
State approach	District Developed with Some Requirements/Approval From State		
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation • Promotion/Tenure Decisions • Professional Development • Termination 	"Provide summative scores for accountability purposes, inform decisions about tenure or dismissal, identify teachers in need of remediation, and provide formative feedback to improve teachers' practice." - Guidelines for Submission & Review of Locally-Developed Alternative Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Rating Tool that Modifies only Teacher Observation/Practice Component. Differs between local and state levels: no compensation in district,	

PENNSYLVANIA			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
		local level locally determined.	
Components of teacher evaluation for early childhood education Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Teacher Practice: 50% • Student Achievement: 35% • Schoolwide Measure: 15% 	Standard model for required nontested area. If building level data is not available for a teacher, then the model shifts to 50%/50%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50%: Classroom observation and practice models related to student achievement in the following areas: planning and preparation; classroom environment; instruction; and professional responsibilities. • 50%: Student performance, which shall comprise 50% of the overall teacher rating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15% for teacher-specific data, including value-added, student achievement, etc. 15% for school wide student growth and building-level data, including value-added data and program on IEPs 20% for elective data, which including measures of student achievement that are locally developed 	
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	No	Observations may be weighed differently in nontested grades	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Preschool/Pre-K • Other (parent educators, Title I, Child Find, etc.) 	Other: A person holding a valid PA certificate for Early Childhood is qualified to teach all courses from Pre-kindergarten and Nursery through Grade 3, although licensure not required for employment	Early Childhood PreK-3 Certification
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Distinguished/Proficient/Needs improvement/Failing	Cannot be rated “needs improvement” or “failing” based on student test scores alone,	
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	Employees who earn "Needs improvement" or "Failing" are required to participate in a performance improvement plan	

PENNSYLVANIA			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Student learning/ achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State mandates/ approves/ provides options of 1 or more standardized measure of student learning • Student Learning Objectives 	Teachers play a vital role in development of SLO's. Teachers can design their own SLO's since the state is just giving templates and bringing in other domains. Teachers can then design assessments appropriate for evaluating their SLO's. Currently developing exemplar templates for ECE	
Student growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value added or growth models • Student Learning Outcomes • Other methods allowed (portfolios, work sampling, etc.) 	<p>Student growth: 50 percent total 15% for teacher-specific data, including value-added, student achievement, etc. 15% for school wide student growth and building-level data, including value-added data and program on IEPs 20% for elective data, which includes student growth data on locally developed measures chosen from approved list from state, portfolios, etc. In nontested grades, observation may carry more weight rather than value-added model, but not specifically addressed yet. Other Methods: Portfolios, projects, and pre-and post- tests</p>	
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 observations • Administrators conduct observations if they meet qualifications; outside evaluators if they do not 	The mandate requires 2 observations per year for temp teachers, with pre- and post-conferences. Details of observation still pending; must be focused on planning and preparation; classroom environment; instruction; professional responsibilities	
Measure of teacher practice	Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching	As long as interpretation of rubric can be cleared and understood, it can be OK for pre-K, but need a lot of professional development for applying to EC age range. Districts can apply to use a different model, but Danielson is the one supported by PDE	
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	Yes		

PENNSYLVANIA			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Other Information			
State has a data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes	Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System tracks value-added data for each student; DoE updating system to link value-added model scores to individual teachers	
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	No ECE group in advisory role	TE system was launched as K-12 initiative for 3 years of piloting without ECE consultation. Currently developing guiding questions and sample SLOs for ECE.	
Stakeholder Involvement	Yes	Recommended through Team PA advisory committee through grant from Bill and Melinda Gates foundation	
Independent evaluation/validation	No		
Modifications to process for some teachers	Special Education	EC Special Ed. Mandated to use model and figure out what it means for community based teachers.	

Appendix K: Rhode Island

RHODE ISLAND			
Question	Answer	Comments	Citation Link
Background Information			
System name	The Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation and Support System		RI Educator Evaluation
Implementation status of TE system	Full Implementation	5 approved teacher evaluation systems	
Implementation Schedule	Field tested in 5 classrooms in 2011; full implementation in 2012-2013	State funded PreK will participate FY2015	
Early grades included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kindergarten through 3rd Grade 	Preschool special education teachers (ages 3-5) are currently included in system; plans to expand pre-K teachers in FY2015.	
Overview of Process			
Policy mandated	Legislation in statute or regulation	Legislation: in regulations, 2009 Board of Regents. RI will be linking their RTT assessment project to TE at a later date.	
State approach	State Model but districts could develop their own model with some requirements/ approval by state	A district developed system must include assurances of compliance with state-wide requirements for evaluation systems, descriptions of any variations by role categories (teachers, administrators, support professionals), and detailed documentation of evaluation instruments. The state must approve a district-developed model.	District Developed Educator Evaluation Systems
Purpose/goals of teacher evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensation Professional Development Other 	<p>At the state level, results are used to primarily inform the certification renewal process. At the district level, data should inform the full range of human capital decisions.</p> <p>Other: change district needs based on feedback, personnel decisions made at local level, only one or two districts use for compensation, mostly for certification purposes, if receives ineffective rating for entire term, cannot renew certification</p>	
Components of teacher evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of Teacher Practice Student Growth/value Added 	Assessment of teacher practice: Professional practice and responsibilities, modified Danielson.	The RI Model: Teacher

RHODE ISLAND			
for early childhood education Staff	Model • Student Achievement	Student growth: Using RI Growth Model for tested grades 3-7 in ELA and Math Student Achievement: "Contributions to student achievement and progress toward academic goals and learning standards" Professional Practice and Foundations, Student Learning, sole way of evaluating impact of student learning, tested and nontested	Guidebook
K-12 and ECE teachers weighted the same	No	Because of local decision-making, it seems they would not be weighted same.	
Type of early childhood staff licensed by the State & employed by the school district	• State Preschool/Pre-K	Other ECE providers not part of state pre-K system; Head Start, child care	
Measures and Methods			
How teachers are rated in the TE System	Highly Effective/ Effective/ Developing/Ineffective		
PD provided to teachers based on TE system rating	Yes	All teachers develop a Professional Growth Plan at beginning of year. A Performance Improvement Plan provides intensive support for teachers who are not meeting expectations; may be utilized at any time during the school year, but must be put in place if a teacher receives a final effectiveness rating of Developing or Ineffective. Additionally, feedback with conferences with evaluators serves as another form of PD.	RI Model Teacher Evaluation And Support System
Student learning/ achievement	• State allows formative assessments of other observation measures of children’s learning performed by teachers (note domains & give instrument name)	Formative Assessments: Third party, district, or regional "common" assessments, or assessments created by the individual teacher if appropriate. Student Learning Outcomes: For nontested grades, grade-level teams set SLOs aligned to district and school priorities. Teachers are responsible for two to four SLOs. There are both school- and	Student Learning Objectives

RHODE ISLAND			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Learning Objectives 	<p>classroom-level goals. Provides some examples online on SLOs for grades 1-2, and special education. Must be able to be measured for summative assessment.</p>	
If using SLOs, what they are based on/anchored to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards • Assessment 	<p>Guide for Teachers Writing Student Learning Objectives & Indicators of a Strong SLO, tied to curriculum, embedded measures/assessments</p>	<p>Student Learning Objectives</p>
Observation of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 4 observations • At least 1 announced • 4-6 unannounced • Evaluator - local decision, varies by district 	<p>Evaluators selected based on knowledge and expertise and are assigned based on subject matter knowledge and grade-level experience required to use specific evaluation instruments. Evaluators are trained on implementation of district’s instruments and are reviewed for accuracy on regular basis. Evaluator decided at local level.</p> <p>For the RIDE-led model, all teachers are required to be observed annually, but the minimum requirement is determined by the differentiated evaluation process for teachers.</p>	<p>Educator Evaluation System Standards</p>
Measure of teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlotte Danielson, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching • State developed 	<p>Rhode Island uses a modified Danielson Model, as well as the state-developed Rhode Island Professional Practices and Foundations. the RI Model uses Domains 2 and 3 from Danielson for the Professional Practice rubric. A separate rubric was developed locally to assess a teacher's professional responsibilities/foundations.</p>	

RHODE ISLAND			
Professional Development and Training			
Training provided for those evaluating/assessing teacher practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to administer child assessments (or other measures of student learning), note frequency of reliability training • How to use assessments and observation data to improve practice 	<p>RIDE expects all evaluators to complete all ongoing training. We report training completion/attendance data back to districts</p> <p>Training materials are detailed online</p>	In-Person Training
If training is provided, certification required	Local Decision		
Funder/provider of professional development on TE System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State • Other 	Many districts have additional training requirements at the local level.	
Other Information			
State has data system to link student outcomes to individual teachers	Yes		RTT State Rules for Linking Student and Teacher Data
Formal advisory group, and, if so, whether it includes ECE professionals	Yes, RI Model Advisory Groups. Includes elementary teachers/principals, but whether early grades are represented are unclear.		Educator Evaluation
Independent evaluation/validation		Technical advisory committee worked closely with the Center for Assessment to develop system, but no formal validation is anticipated.	

RHODE ISLAND			
Additional Information		Rhode Island’s Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) provides further guidance on the selection of assessment tools	Comprehensive Assessment System
Modifications to process for some teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education • English language Learners 	In some cases, evidence may need to be differentiated for English Language Learners to account for how they currently demonstrate content skills and knowledge (this can be found in the WIDA CAN-DO Descriptors by domain and grade level cluster). All educators should ensure their content targets for English Language Learners are informed by students’ language comprehension and communication skills.	

ENDNOTES

¹ For a recent review of teacher evaluation policies in the states, see *State of the States 2013 Connecting the Dots: Using Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness to Inform Policy and Practice*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.

² Rand Education (2012). *Teachers Matter: Understanding Teachers' Impact on Student Achievement*. Santa Monica, CA: Author.

³ Mashburn, A. & Pianta, B. (2010). Opportunity in Early Education: Improving Teacher-Child Interactions and Child Outcomes, in Arthur Reynolds et al. (eds) *Child Programs and Interactions in the First Decade of Life: A Human Capital Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

⁴ National Council on Teacher Quality (January 2014). *State of the States: Connect the Dots: Using Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness to Inform Policy and Practice*. Washington, DC: Author. http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/State_of_the_States_2013_Using_Teacher_Evaluations_NCTQ_Report

⁵ Haertel, E. (March 2013). Reliability and Validity of Inferences About Teachers Based on Student Test Scores. Washington, DC: William H. Angoff Memorial Lecture, National Press Club. Available at: <https://ed.stanford.edu/news/do-student-test-scores-provide-solid-basis-evaluate-teachers>

⁶ Lachlan-Hache, Lisa, Cushing, Ellen & Bivona, Lauren. (2012). *Student Learning Objectives as Measures of Educator Effectiveness: The Basics*. Washington DC: American Institutes for Research.

⁷ Lachlan-Haché, L., Cushing, E., & Bivona, L. (2012). *Student learning objectives: Benefits, challenges, and solutions*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://educatortalent.org/inc/docs/SLOs_Benefits_Challenges_Solutions.pdf

⁸ Bornfreund, L. (2013). *Ocean of Unknowns: Risks and Opportunities in Using Student Achievement Data to Evaluate PreK- Third Grade Teachers*. Washington, DC: New America Foundation.

⁹ Morgan, C. & Lacireno-Paquet (2013). *Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLO): Review of the Literature*. Waltham, MA: Northeast and Islands Regional Education Lab, Education Development Center.

¹⁰ Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2013). *Ensuring Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching: Culminating Findings from the MET's three year study*. Seattle, WA: Author.

¹¹ Bornfreund, L. (2013). *Ocean of Unknowns: Risks and Opportunities in Using Student Achievement Data to Evaluate PreK- Third Grade Teachers*. Washington, DC: New America Foundation.

¹² National Governors Association: Center for Best Practices. (July 2013). *Building a Foundation for Student Success: State Strategies to Improve Learning Outcomes from Early Childhood Through Third Grade*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association.

¹³ **NJ** uses the term student growth objectives (SGOs) and **MA** uses the term student learning goals but these terms refer to a similar set of activities employed by states that use the term SLO.

¹⁴ Reform Support Network (nd). [The View from the States: A brief on non-tested grades and subjects.](#) Washington, DC: Author.

¹⁵ For further information see Center on Great Teachers and Leaders Databases on State Teacher and Evaluation Policies, State Roles at <http://resource.tgsource.org/stateevaldb/StateRoles.aspx>

¹⁶ For further information on Denver's approach see, Leading Effective Academic Practice at <http://leap.dpsk12.org/>

¹⁷ Jacques, C. (2013). [Two of a Kind: Are Your Districts' Evaluation Systems Equivalent?](#) Washington, DC: Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, American Institute for Research.

¹⁸ In **RI** early childhood certification is pre-K-grade two for general education and birth-grade two for special educators, although no infant-toddler programs are offered in public schools, currently.

¹⁹ In **MD**, for non-tested grades, 20% of the SLO is based on a school progress indicator, 15% on a district or school SLO, and 15% of the SLO at the classroom level. An LEA can propose a model, to be approved by the state that attributes 35% of the teacher rating to SLOs linked to state or local goals.

²⁰ The **MA** framework will incorporate the use of student feedback in educator ratings and staff feedback in administrator evaluation beginning in FY2014-15. This feedback will be a source of evidence in determining educators' Summative Performance Rating.

²¹ If school-level data are not available for a teacher based on circumstances, then 50% of the rating is based on professional practice, and 50% student growth.

²² Provance, J. (2013). [Ohio Teachers' Rating Requirement Weighted.](#) Columbus, OH: The Blade

²³ The impact rating will be implemented in FY2015. See Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education. (2013). [Quick Reference Guide: District-Determined Measures.](#) Retrieved from <http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/>

²⁴ United Federation of Teachers. (2013). [The Danielson Framework for Teaching.](#) United Federation of Teachers. New York, New York: Author.

²⁵ Marzano, Robert J. (2013). [The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model.](#) Marzano Research Laboratory. Blairville, PA: Learning Sciences International.

²⁶ Teachstone. (2013). [The CLASS Tool.](#) Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone.

²⁷ Council of Chief State School Officers. [The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium InTASC.](#) Washington DC: Author.

- ²⁸ See Prek-Grade 3 Danielson Framework for Teaching; Adaptation for Early Childhood Teachers. Retrieved from <http://leadershiplinc.illinoisstate.edu/framework/>
- ²⁹ See Pennsylvania Department of Education. (2013). *Teacher Effectiveness*. Retrieved from <http://pdesas.org/Instruction/Frameworks>
- ³⁰ See NJ's Workgroup on Teacher Evaluation Evidence, *Teacher Evaluation Support Document: Prek and K*, 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/eval/Evidence.pdf>
- ³¹ Ohio Department of Education. (2013). *How to Design and Select Quality Assessments*. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/How-to-Design-and-Select-Quality-Assessments>
- ³² Hemmeter, M.M, Maxwell, K., Ault, M.J. & Schuster, J. (2001). [Assessment of Practices in Early Elementary Classrooms](#). New York, New York: Teachers College Press.
- ³³ Guernsey, L. & Ochsorn, S. (2011). [Watching Teachers Work: Using Observation Tools to Promote Effective Teaching in the Early Years and Early Grades](#). Washington, DC: New America Foundation.
- ³⁴ National Governors Association. (May 2013). *Leading for Early Success: Building School Principals' Capacity to Lead High-Quality Early Education*. Available at <http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/2013/1306LeadingForEarlySuccessPaper.pdf>. Washington, DC: National Governors Association.
- ³⁵ Slotnik, W., Bugler, D., and Guodong, L. (2013). [Spotlight on Maryland: Student Learning Objectives and Teacher and Principal Evaluation](#). Washington, DC: Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center.
- ³⁶ Gill, B., Bruch, J. & Booker, K. (2013). *Using Alternative Student Growth Measures for Evaluating Teacher Performance: What the Literature Says*. (REL 2013–002). Washington, DC: U.S.
- ³⁷ Darling-Hammond, L. & Falk, B. (2013). *Teacher Learning Through Assessment: How Student-Performance Assessments Can Support Teacher Learning*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- ³⁸ Lacireno-Paquet, N., Morgan, C. & Mello, D. (March 2014). [How States Use Student Learning Objectives in Teacher Evaluation Systems: A Review of State Websites](#). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- ³⁹ Community Training and Technical Assistance Center (CTAS) (February, 2013). *It's More Than Money: Teacher Incentive Fund- Leadership for Educators Advanced Performance Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools*. Boston, MA: CTAS
- ⁴⁰ Gill, B., Bruch, J. & Booker, K. (2013). *Using Alternative Student Growth Measures for Evaluating Teacher Performance: What the Literature Says*. (REL 2013–002). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education; U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2013). *Race to the Top: States Implementing Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems Despite Challenges*. United States Government Accountability Office.

⁴¹ Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting Teacher Evaluation Right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement*. New York City, NY: Teachers College Press.

⁴² National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) & National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS-SDE). (2003). *Early Childhood Curriculum, Assessment, and Program Evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

⁴³ Delaware Department of Education. (2013). *Delaware Early Learning Foundations for School Success*. Dover, DE: Author.

⁴⁴ Ohio Teacher Evaluation System, Local Measures. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples>

⁴⁵ See Achieve NJ Student Growth Objectives at: <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/objectives.shtml#sgo>

⁴⁶ See Rhode Island, Student Learning Objectives at <http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorEvaluation/StudentLearningOutcomeObjective.s.aspx>

⁴⁷ See Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development. (2013). *Teacher SLO Samples*. Retrieved from http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=2017

⁴⁸ See Rhode Island Department of Education, Student Learning Objectives. Retrieved from <http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorEvaluation/StudentLearningOutcomeObjective.s.aspx>

⁴⁹ Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System, Sample Student Learning Objectives. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples/Sample-Student-Learning-Objectives>

⁵⁰ See for example, Snow, C.E. & Van Hemel, S. B. (2008). *Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press.

⁵¹ Bornfreund, L. (2013). [Ocean of Unknowns: Risks and Opportunities in Using Student Achievement Data to Evaluate PreK- Third Grade Teachers](#). Washington, DC: New America Foundation.

⁵² National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) & National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS/SDE). (2003). *Early Childhood Curriculum, Assessment, and Program Evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- ⁵³ Teaching Strategies for Early Childhood. [Assessment Overview](#). Washington, DC: Author.
- ⁵⁴ For the list of approved measures in Delaware see <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/training/CompVExtMeasB11-13-12.pdf>
- ⁵⁵ The Early Childhood Outcomes Center. *ECO Resources: Child Outcomes Summary Process*. Chapel Hill, NC: The Early Childhood Outcomes Center.
- ⁵⁶ Snow, C. & Van Hemel, S. (Eds.), (2008). *Early childhood assessment: Why, what and how*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- ⁵⁷ See Rhode Island Department of Education. *Assessment Tool*. Retrieved from http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Assessment_Toolkit_output/story.html; See Rhode Island Department of Education. *Deepening Assessment Literacy*. Retrieved from http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Deepening_Assessment_Literacy_output/story.html
- ⁵⁸ Ohio Department of Education. (2013). *How to Design and Select Quality Assessments*. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/How-to-Design-and-Select-Quality-Assessments>
- ⁵⁹ See for more information <http://www.bloomboard.com/about>
- ⁶⁰ Colorado Legacy Foundation and the Colorado Department of Education (March 2012). [Educator Evaluation System Implementation Toolkit](#).
- ⁶¹ Connecticut State Department of Education. (2013). *Neag School of Education Study*. Hartford, CT: Author.
- ⁶² SRI International (January 2014). Research Brief: Early Implementation of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework. Retrieved on March 10, 2014 at <http://www.sri.com/sites/default/files/publications/educator-evaluation-research-brief-jan-2014.pdf>
- ⁶³ Slotnik, W., Bugler, D., and Guodong, L. (2013). [Spotlight on Maryland: Student Learning Objectives and Teacher and Principal Evaluation](#). Washington, DC: Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center.
- ⁶⁴ Firestone, W. et al. (January 2013). [New Jersey Teacher Evaluation, RU-GSE External Assessment, Year 1 Report](#). Available at New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.
- ⁶⁵ MGT of America, Inc.(June 2012). [Ohio Department of Education Teacher Evaluation System \(OTES\) Pilot](#). Retrieved on March 10, 2014 at
- ⁶⁶ Rhode Island Department of Education. (2013). *Rhode Island Educator Evaluations: Improving Teaching and Learning Year One Report*. Providence, RI: Author.
- ⁶⁷ For additional strategies on managing implementation, see Reform Support Network (July 2013). Making High-Quality Teacher Evaluation Manageable at Reform Support Network, (2013). *Making High-Quality Teacher Evaluation Manageable*. Washington, DC: Reform Support Network.

