

## Contents

Do any other states tie certification/licensure to local evaluations? .....	1
Which states have an initial certification level for traditionally prepared educators that has limits on renewal? .....	3
Which states use portfolios in the certification process?.....	4
What experience relevant to Idaho have other states had with their assessment frameworks? .....	5
Is there any information on how tiered certification systems affect teacher retention? .....	13

## Do any other states tie certification/licensure to local evaluations?

Yes. Some states require an evaluation as part of their induction/mentoring program. These 8 states are:

1. Colorado
2. Indiana
3. Kentucky
4. Massachusetts
5. New Jersey
6. North Carolina
7. Pennsylvania
8. Utah

The following 15 states with evaluation systems that are not tied to any induction program:

1. Delaware
2. Georgia
3. Iowa
4. Louisiana
5. Maine
6. Maryland
7. Michigan
8. Missouri
9. New Mexico
10. North Dakota
11. Ohio
12. Rhode Island
13. South Carolina
14. Vermont
15. West Virginia

One other state (Washington) ties certification/licensure to portfolio evaluations done by other educators. In Hawai'i, teachers can use their most recent teacher evaluation and professional development plan to meet all ten of the Hawai'i Teacher Performance Standards which is required for license renewal. Teachers in Hawai'i can also meet these performance standards through National

Board Certification or by activities which meet each standard individually. In Tennessee, teachers can use their overall evaluation score as Professional Development Points needed for license renewal.

For those states with evaluations not tied to induction programs, the formality of these evaluations varies. Less formal programs are found in Iowa, Maryland, North Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia. In Iowa, a local administrator verifies on the conversion form that the educator meets or exceeds all Iowa Teaching Standards. In Maryland, an employer of an educator is required to merely verify that the educator was “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory.” However, this performance rating is confidential. In North Dakota, recommendations from your most recent supervisor are required for renewal. Similarly, in Vermont, a recommendation is required to move from a Level I to a Level II license. And, in West Virginia, a recommendation is required both to move up a certificate level and for certificate renewal. In New Mexico, a teacher submits a professional development dossier (PDD). Part of this PDD is evaluated by two reviewers outside the school district and part of it is reviewed by the superintendent who then verifies that the educator has demonstrated the competencies for the current level of licensure.

Characteristics of more formal evaluation programs are below:

States with state-wide evaluation frameworks –

1. Delaware – DPAS-II
2. Georgia – TKES
3. Rhode Island - Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation & Support System. School districts may choose to implement other approved models.
4. South Carolina – SAFE-T

States with local evaluation frameworks –

1. Louisiana: The evaluation frameworks are local but the state mandates that 50 percent of the evaluation be composed of applicable measures of growth in student learning and the remaining 50 percent be based upon a qualitative assessment of teacher performance.
2. Maine: Maine requires the recommendation of a local Professional Learning Community Support System (PLCSS) to move up certification levels and to renew the highest level certificate. The PLCSS bases its recommendation on whether or not the educator has met state-level standards based on classroom observation and a Professional Certification Action Plan.
3. Michigan: The state mandates 4 effectiveness ratings – Ineffective, Minimally effective, Effective, and Highly Effective. Of the 770 districts who responded to a survey, 488 reported using either Charlotte Danielson’s “Enhancing Professional Practice for Performance of Teaching” or her “Framework for Teaching Proficiency Test Instrument (Teachscape)” as one of the primary tools for the observation of instructional practices.
4. Missouri: The local evaluation system must be structured and operated based on the seven Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation. The local school district determine whether or not the educator has been successful. If they determine the educator to be successful, the district will support the educator’s request to upgrade his/her certificate.
5. Ohio: Ohio requires educators to attain Master Teacher status in order to move up the certification ladder. To achieve Master Teacher status, the educator submits an application with supporting evidence and this is scored using a state-provided rubric by a local Master Teacher Committee.

States which use the Danielson Framework –

1. Delaware
2. Michigan - See note above
3. Rhode Island – See note above.

States which use student performance measures in their evaluation:

1. Delaware
2. Georgia
3. Louisiana
4. Michigan
5. Rhode Island – RI Growth Model Rating is not included as a part of the teacher's Student Learning Score in 2014-2015.

### Which states have an initial certification level for traditionally prepared educators that has limits on renewal?

1. Alaska – (1<sup>st</sup> Initial for teachers who have not passed required Alaska studies is valid for 2 years with possibility of a 1 year renewal; 2<sup>nd</sup> Initial is valid for 3 years with no renewal and no extension)
2. Arizona – Provisional is valid for 3 years and may be extended for 3 years
3. California – Preliminary is valid for 5 years and is not renewable
4. Colorado – 3 year initial license can be renewed multiple times if educator has not been able to complete an approved induction program.
5. Connecticut – 3 year initial certificate can be renewed up to 5 times if not served enough time to complete the mentoring program.
6. Delaware – 3 year Initial License is not renewable.
7. Indiana – 2 year Initial Practitioner license requires an explanation of why the educator has not completed the mentoring program in order to renew. Can renew twice and then have to complete a Professional Growth Plan.
8. Iowa – Initial license can be held for total of 6 years (original issuance + 2 renewals)
9. Kansas – 2 year Initial License can be renewed twice and then additional testing or professional development
10. Louisiana – 3 year Level 1 Certificate may be extended for 1 year at the request of a Louisiana employing authority. Limited to 2 such extensions.
11. Maine – 2 year Provisional Certificate. May be renewed only under administrator recommendation or because educator was not actually employed for 2 years.
12. Massachusetts – 5 year Initial License may be extended once for an additional 5 years.
13. Michigan – 6 year Provisional Certificate may be renewed 3 times (3<sup>rd</sup> renewal requires sponsorship of school)
14. Missouri – 4 year Initial Certificate is only renewable for those who have a doctoral degree in a content area. It is not renewable for those who completed a traditional route.
15. New Jersey – 2 year Provisional. The 2 year Provisional certificate is used for educators to complete the Provisional Teacher Program. After the individual has successfully completed the Provisional Teacher Program, they obtain a Standard certificate which is permanent.
16. New Mexico – 5 year Level 1 Provisional is not renewable.
17. New York – The 5 year Initial Certificate may have its time validity extended only under limited circumstances.

18. North Carolina – 3 year Standard Professional 1 is not renewable.
19. Ohio – 4 year Resident Educator License is not renewable but may be extended on a case-by-case basis.
20. Pennsylvania – 6 year Level 1 certificate is not renewable.
21. Rhode Island – 3 year Initial Educator certificate is not renewable
22. Tennessee – The 3 year Practitioner/Initial license can be renewed once.
23. Utah – 3 year Level 1 – Basic Certification is can only be renewed if the educator has less than 3 years of experience in Utah public or accredited private schools
24. Vermont – The 3 year Level 1 license may only be renewed once.
25. Washington – The 3 year Residency certificate may only be renewed once for a 2 year period.

Non-renewable does not mean that the certification cannot be extended in some circumstances. A traditionally prepared educator is one who has completed an approved teacher preparation program.

### Which states use portfolios in the certification process?

- **New Mexico** requires the submission of a Professional Development Dossier (PDD). According to a conversation with the New Mexico licensure bureau, it is likely that New Mexico will phase out the PDD in favor of their new teacher evaluation tool (NMTeach). Decisions about how this will be done have not yet been made. A 2012 report to the New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee found:

“The professional development dossier (PDD) does not effectively screen teachers for advancement, resulting in ineffective teachers receiving large pay increases. As a result, high and low performing teachers exist at each licensure level. The lack of clear and consistent performance among teachers in each licensure level shows the PDD process does not reward a teacher’s impact on student achievement.” (page 7)

<http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lfc/lfcdocs/perfaudit/Public%20Education%20Department%20%E2%80%93%20Promoting%20Effective%20Teaching%20in%20New%20Mexico.pdf>

**Ohio** requires the submission of an application with supporting evidence to attain Master Teacher status. Master Teacher status is required to move to a Senior Professional Educator license and either Master Teacher status or National Board Certification is required to move to a Lead Professional Educator License

- **Utah** requires the submission of a Professional portfolio to complete the Entry Years Enhancement (EYE) program. Completion of the EYE program is required to move from a Level 1-Basic License to a Level 2-Professional License. Specifically,

“The EYE portfolio is a record of the Level 1 educator’s growth, represented through artifacts and reflections. The portfolio is prepared and submitted according to the guidelines of the employing LEA. The portfolio is evaluated by the employing LEA. The portfolio provides a professional record to guide future professional development and may serve as supportive evidence in future employment interviews. It provides introspection opportunities for the Level 1 educator as well as a conversation tool between the mentor and the Level 1 educator. Each LEA will design and evaluate its own EYE Portfolio requirements, using the following guidelines.

The portfolio should:

- Be based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards
- Include teaching artifacts
- Include notations and reflections explaining the artifacts
- Be a vehicle for collaboration with the mentor
- Provide evidence of content knowledge and pedagogy”

<http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/educatoreffectiveness/Entry-Years-Enhancement/EYEBrochure.aspx>

- **Washington** educators complete a ProTeach portfolio to move from a Residency Certificate to a Professional Certificate. A master’s degree is not required to complete the portfolio nor can it be used in lieu of the Portfolio. However, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification can be used in lieu of the Portfolio.

<http://www.k12.wa.us/certification/default.aspx>

- **Indiana** used to require a portfolio but does not anymore. Indiana includes the following statement on their website:

IMAP Assessment Tool for Year Two Teachers - In the past, IMAP Year Two Teachers had to complete a portfolio in order to satisfy their IMAP requirements. Though the portfolio concept had the best intentions, it was felt by former IMAP Teachers, Scorers, Mentors, Administrators and the Indiana Department of Education that the portfolio caused a great deal of stress, anxiety and took up a great deal of time and energy from the beginning educator. In addition, the results of the portfolio did not really establish whether new teachers were ready for their five year Proficient Practitioner license.

<http://www.doe.in.gov/licensing/imap-assessment-information-year-two-teachers>

- **Vermont** currently requires completion of a portfolio for Level II renewal. However, a proposed rule would remove that requirement.

## What experience relevant to Idaho have other states had with their assessment frameworks?

Delaware, Michigan, and Rhode Island all use the Danielson model and student performance measures as part of their evaluation framework. There are key differences between their models. Delaware only requires an evaluation to move from the non-renewable 3-year Initial License to the Continuing License. Michigan requires 3 years of satisfactory teaching experience under an initial certificate to move to a Professional Education Certificate. This is verified by a form in which the superintendent fills out the dates, grades and subjects taught and rates the candidate as either “Successful” or “Unsuccessful”. Furthermore, Michigan requires 5 consecutive effective or highly effective ratings on the annual teacher evaluation in the most recent 5-year period to move from a Professional Education Certificate to an Advanced Professional Education Certificate. Teachers may move between the Professional and Advanced Professional certificates based upon their effectiveness ratings. While Michigan does not mandate the use of the Danielson Framework, 63 percent of responding school districts reported using it. In Rhode Island, evaluation is used both to move from initial certificate (which is not renewable) to professional educator certificate and from a professional educator certificate to an advanced educator certificate. It is also used to renew both the professional educator certificate and the advanced educator certificate. While student performance measures are slated to be used in the evaluation

framework, they were not used in 2014-2015. The rest of this discussion focuses on the Delaware experience as Delaware has 2 years of using student performance data in their evaluation and it is mandated across the state.

### **Delaware Background:**

Delaware uses the “Delaware Performance Appraisal System” (DPAS-II) to evaluate its teachers. As of 2012-12, student achievement results using a student growth model are fully integrated into educator evaluations. (Page 1 - “<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/2014%20Docs/CompVStudGrMod13-14.pdf>”). The document cited provides a description of the student growth model.

The components of DPAS-II for teachers are:

- Component 1 – Planning and Preparation
- Component 2 – Classroom Environment
- Component 3 – Instruction
- Component 4 – Professional Responsibilities
- Component 5 – Student Improvement

“The Delaware Framework for Teaching, the basis for DPAS II, is aligned to the Delaware Professional Teaching Standards and is based on Charlotte Danielson’s book, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition).” (Page 2 - <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/teachforms/DPASTeachFullGuidev3.pdf>)

“Rubrics exist for each of the first four components, with ratings as following:

**Distinguished** – Evidence of exceptional performance; outstanding knowledge, implementation, and integration of teaching standards along with evidence of leadership initiative and willingness to model and/or serve as a mentor for colleagues.

**Proficient** – Evidence of solid performance; strong knowledge, implementation, and integration of teaching standards; clear evidence of proficiency and skill in the component/criterion.

**Basic** – Evidence of mediocre or developing performance; fundamental knowledge and implementation of teaching standards is uneven or rudimentary. Integration of teaching standards is inconsistent. Teacher is making progress towards proficiency.

**Unsatisfactory** – Little or no knowledge and minimal implementation of teaching standards. Does not meet minimal teaching standards and needs substantial improvement. “ (Page 3).

## **Summative Evaluation Ratings**

DPAS II Components One, Two, Three, and Four are each assigned a rating of “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” on the Summative Evaluation. *A satisfactory rating for Components One through Four means the teacher demonstrates acceptable performance by having no more than one unacceptable rating on the appraisal criteria specified in each of the components.*

Component Five, is assigned a rating of “Exceeds”, “Satisfactory”, or “Unsatisfactory.” Within Component Five, a “Satisfactory” rating means the teacher’s students on average achieve acceptable levels of student growth. A rating of “Exceeds” means that teacher’s students on average achieve high rates of student growth.

The summative ratings is based on all five components. The ratings are calculated as follows:

Total # of Satisfactory ratings in Components I-IV	Component V	Summative Rating
4/4	Exceeds	Highly Effective
4/4	Satisfactory	Effective
4/4	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement
3/4	Exceeds	Highly Effective
3/4	Satisfactory	Effective
3/4	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement
2/4	Exceeds	Effective
2/4	Satisfactory	Effective
2/4	Unsatisfactory	Ineffective
1/4	Exceeds	Needs Improvement
1/4	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
1/4	Unsatisfactory	Ineffective
0/4	Exceeds	Needs Improvement
0/4	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
0/4	Unsatisfactory	Ineffective

(Page 65 - <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/teachforms/DPAS Teach Full Guide v3.pdf> )

No matter how well a teacher performs on Components I-IV, that teacher must have a Satisfactory evaluation on Component V in order to receive a satisfactory (Effective or Highly Effective) summative rating. However, a teacher could be unsatisfactory on 2 of the first four Components and be Satisfactory on Component V and receive a satisfactory rating.

### Pattern of Ineffective Teaching

A "Pattern of Ineffective Teaching" is based on the teacher's most recent Summative Evaluation ratings. Under state law, novice teachers are not eligible for a Continuing License unless they have earned at least two (2) satisfactory summative ratings. Beginning in 2014-2015, revised Regulation 106A no longer considers "Needs Improvement" as a satisfactory summative rating for a novice teacher.

The following chart shows the consecutive Summative Evaluation ratings that are considered a pattern of ineffective teaching:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
DPAS II Rating	Ineffective	Ineffective	
	Needs Improvement	Ineffective	Needs Improvement
	Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement	Ineffective
	Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Ineffective
	Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement
	Needs Improvement	Ineffective	Ineffective

For a novice teacher to attain a Continuing License, they must have at least 2 satisfactory summative ratings (Effective rating).

### **What do Delaware Educators think of DPAS-II?**

Delaware evaluates DPAS-II and, as part of that evaluation, surveys teachers and holds focus groups. The most recent evaluation is found at:

[http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/DPAS II Evaluation 20132014.pdf](http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/DPAS_II_Evaluation_20132014.pdf)

Teachers do not like the student achievement component (Component V) of DPAS-II. They “believe test data may be used to unfairly judge their productivity.” (Page 6). They also think it is given too much weight in the evaluation. Right now, no matter how well a teacher performs on Components I-IV, that teacher must have a “Satisfactory” evaluation on Component V in order to receive a satisfactory (Effective or Highly Effective) summative rating. However, a teacher could be unsatisfactory on 2 of the first four Components and be Satisfactory on Component V and receive a satisfactory summative rating. (See previous section).

Results from the survey are as follows:

- 64% of teachers gave DPAS-II a grade of C or better, 38% gave DPAS-II a grade of C
- Teachers were asked which components were good indicators of performance. The components and the share that thought it was a good indicator of performance follows:
  - Planning and Preparation – 68%
  - Classroom Environment – 71%
  - Instruction – 84%
  - Professional Responsibilities – 41%
  - Student Improvement – 29%
- Teachers were asked which components could be judged fairly and equitably. The share that either “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” for each component follows:
  - System overall – 47%
  - Planning and Preparation – 76%
  - Classroom Environment – 80%
  - Instruction – 82%
  - Professional Responsibilities – 75%
  - Student Improvement – 27%

Evaluation system as driver of student achievement gains:

- 61% of teachers and 67% of administrators agreed that the DPAS-II evaluation system was one of the top five drivers of student achievement in their school. This rate was higher among novice teachers with 69% of novice teachers rating the evaluation system as one of the top five drivers.
- 53% of teachers reported that the evaluation system had “some” or a “major” impact on improving their teaching (as opposed to limited or none). By component these percentages are:
  - Planning and Preparation – 64%
  - Classroom Environment – 61%
  - Instruction – 68%
  - Professional Responsibilities – 51%
  - Student Improvement – 56%

While less than a third of teachers thought the Student Improvement Component was a good indicator and less than a third thought it could be judged fairly and equitably, over half of teachers thought it had some or a major impact on improving their teaching.

Delaware provides on report on Year 2 implementation of DPAS-II.

[http://www.doe.k12.de.us/tleu\\_files/DPAS-II\\_Year\\_2\\_Report\\_2014.pdf](http://www.doe.k12.de.us/tleu_files/DPAS-II_Year_2_Report_2014.pdf)

Some of the key findings are as follows:

1. Virtually all Delaware educators (99 percent) receiving summative evaluations earned “Satisfactory” ratings on all 4 components observed by their evaluators. (Page 16).
2. If instead of examining summative ratings (Satisfactory versus Unsatisfactory) on all the 4 components, one examined the rubric ratings, then “on 16 or the 18 criteria, at least 95 percent of Delaware educators received “Proficient” or “Distinguished” ratings.” On average across the 18 criteria, 81 percent received a “Proficient” rating and 16 percent received a “Distinguished” rating. (page 18)
3. Differences were observed across school districts. The report concludes: “The district-level variation seen above can lead to a few conclusions. The variation could represent true differences in educator effectiveness across districts (i.e. educators are more skilled with “using questioning techniques” in Delmar, Lake Forest, and Milford). As criterion-level ratings are subjective appraisals of teacher performance and skills (though using a common rubric) the district variation may also represent a lack of calibration in the use of the DPAS-II rubric. Research<sup>15</sup> suggests some degree of the latter is likely true and that training and certification tests for observers, regular efforts to ensure evaluators are calibrated to standards, and the use of peer or additional credentialed observers is necessary to ensure the reliability and accuracy of classroom observations.” Page 20
4. The Student Improvement component was composed of multiple measures (each educator had two sets of measures). For each measure of the component, an educator received a rating of “Exceeds”, “Satisfactory”, or “Unsatisfactory”. In a case where an educator was rated differently on their two measures, the DDOE provided guidance for what an educator’s overall Component V rating would be.

<b>Combination of ratings on the 2 measures</b>	<b>Overall Component V rating</b>
Exceeds/Exceeds	Exceeds
Exceeds/Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Exceeds/Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory	Administrator had the discretion to upgrade to a “Satisfactory” (which they did in 87 percent of cases)

The overall Component V ratings were distributed as follows:

- “Exceeds” – 51 percent
- “Satisfactory” – 48 percent
- “Unsatisfactory” – 1 percent

After administrator discretion was taken into consideration and Measure A, B, or C ratings were combined (for the more than 10,000 educators with Component V ratings)

more than half (51 percent) received “Exceeds” ratings, 48 percent were rated “Satisfactory,” and 1 percent were rated “Unsatisfactory.” This distribution closely resembled the distribution of ratings during the first year of statewide implementation of the revised Component V (2013-13). These Component V ratings also mirrored Component I-IV ratings discussed earlier in that 99 percent of educators received the highest categories of ratings and only 1 percent were rated “Unsatisfactory.” When Component V ratings were compared for educators who also received Components I-IV ratings in 2013-14, the relationship between the classroom observation-based components and the student growth component was weak. 99 percent of educators rated “Exceeds” on Component V received 4 out of 4 “Satisfactory” ratings in Component I-IV. However, 98 percent of educators rated “Satisfactory” on Component V had the same ratings. While educators rated “Unsatisfactory” on Component V were significantly more likely to receive at least one “Unsatisfactory” rating in Components I-IV (16 percent received at least one “Unsatisfactory” rating), 84 percent of these educators received all “Satisfactory” ratings based upon classroom observations. This data point led the News Journal to call the system a “farce.”

<http://www.delawareonline.com/story/opinion/editorials/2014/08/24/way-evaluate-teachers-farce/14477963/> (Page 28)

The measures for Component V differ by educator group.

Group 1 – Teacher of Record for reading and/or math and give grades for at least 10 students in grades 3-10

Group 2 – Teacher of Record and give grades for at least 10 students at any grade or subject other than 3-10 reading and/or math

Group 3 – Any teacher that does not fit into Groups 1 or 2

Measures of Component V

Group 1 – Composed of a measure based on the statewide assessment and a measure composed of two assessments. The assessments on the second measure are given equal weight.

Group 2 - Composed of a measure composed of two assessments (as discussed above) and an educator-developed growth goal.

Group 3 – An educator-developed growth goal

The ratings for teachers varied by group:

Educator Group	Share “Highly Effective”	Share “Effective”
Group 1	27%	70%
Group 2	53%	46%
Group 3	65%	34%

“These patterns likely reflect the fact that while DPAS-II improvements strengthened the focus on student growth for all educators across the system, many of the student growth goals set by educators and their evaluators were less rigorous than predicted DCAS growth targets for Group 1 educators (see page 28 for an example

of Measure B and C goals). This was evident in the earlier comparison of Group 1 educators' Measure A and B ratings. 61 percent of the educators with less than 35% of their students meeting DCAS growth targets ("Unsatisfactory" on Measure A) were rated "Exceeds" on their Measure B assessment ratings (where educators collaboratively set targets and evaluators assess the results). Overall, at the summative rating level, DPAS-II continues to present a more optimistic picture of educator effectiveness than the data available on the proficiency and college-readiness of Delaware students." (Page 30)

### **Rhode Island**

Evaluation is used both to move from initial certificate (which is not renewable) to professional educator certificate and from a professional educator certificate to an advanced educator certificate. It is also used to renew both the professional educator certificate and the advanced educator certificate.

Rhode Island has had an educator evaluation system as part of their certification since 2012-2013. In 2012-2013, four different teacher evaluation systems and 2 different building administrator evaluation systems were implemented. All the evaluation systems use multiple measures to determine overall educator effectiveness including an educator's impact on student learning. The measures of student learning are consistent across all of the systems. There is a component based on Professional Practices X Professional Foundations and a component based on Student Learning.

In the second year,

- 0.4 percent of teachers were rated "Ineffective"
  - 1.3 percent of teachers were rated "Developing"
  - 41.7 percent of teachers were rated "Effective"
  - 56.6 percent of teachers were rated "Highly Effective"
- [http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/FER\\_Year2\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/FER_Year2_Report_Final.pdf)

It is noted that the Student Learning Score is based only on Student Learning Objectives until the transition to the Common Core State Standards and new assessments is complete. More than half of teachers received the highest possible score on Student Learning (57 percent). The evaluation expressed concern that the Student Learning Objectives are not set to a rigorous enough standard. Specifically, "With the ability to set tiered targets based on student' prerequisite knowledge and skills, it should not be the norm for a significant amount of a teacher's students to exceed the expectations that have been set for them. A Student Learning rating of 4 should be reserved for those cases of superior student mastery or progress and an outstanding effect on student learning, as described above." (Page 7).

60.6 percent of teachers attained the highest possible score on the Professional Practices X Professional Foundations part of the measure. Again, concern was expressed about this high share achieving the highest score. Specifically, "Administrators and teachers must be committed to setting high expectations for themselves. They show this commitment by assigning the highest possible scores only

to those demonstrations and examples of performance that exhibit the best practices described in the rubrics and that will advance the goals of improving student learning and the achievement of all students. The same principles that apply to fostering improved student learning by setting rigorous yet attainable expectations for students must also be applied to setting high expectations for educators.” (Page 8)

## **Michigan**

Michigan has 3 levels of certification: provisional, professional, and advanced professional. To move from provisional to professional, a teacher must have 3 years of satisfactory teaching experience. This is verified by a form in which the superintendent fills out the dates, grades and subjects taught and rates the candidate as either “Successful” or “Unsuccessful”.

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/WorkExperienceForm\\_2012\\_386545\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/WorkExperienceForm_2012_386545_7.pdf)

To move from a professional to an advanced professional certificate, a teacher must have received 5 consecutive effective or highly effective ratings on the annual teacher evaluations in the most recent 5-year period. This evaluation requirement is in addition to a requirement that the applicant holds National Board Certification or has completed a teacher leader training or preparation program approved by the superintendent of public instruction.

Educator evaluations were implemented beginning in the 2010-2011 school year. The specific evaluation system used is determined at the local level. There are four effectiveness ratings: Ineffective, Minimally effective, Effective, and highly effective.

In 2012-2013, of the 770 districts who responded to a survey, 488 reported using either Charlotte Danielson’s “Enhancing Professional Practice for Performance of Teaching” or her “Framework for Teaching Proficiency Test Instrument (Teachscape)” as one of the primary tools for the observation of instructional practices. (Page 6).

[http://michigan.gov/documents/mde/Educator\\_Evaluations\\_and\\_Effectiveness\\_Report\\_455793\\_7.pdf](http://michigan.gov/documents/mde/Educator_Evaluations_and_Effectiveness_Report_455793_7.pdf)

Districts are required to use student growth and assessment in their evaluations. State assessments are the most widely used assessment at the elementary level (multiple assessments can be used so they are not necessarily the only assessment used) although there has been a decline in their use over the past year. Also examined was the degree to which evaluations were based on student growth components. 69% of districts had at least 20% of the evaluation based on student growth.

The vast majority of teachers evaluated were either deemed “effective” (64.4%) or “highly effective” (32.6%). There was little correlation between the weight used for student growth and the share of teachers evaluated as “effective” or “highly effective.” One might have expected schools that placed more weight on student growth would see fewer teachers rated “effective” or “highly effective.” There were some inconsistencies in implementing the assessments (for instance, many districts used a single summative assessment such as the ACT which is not appropriate for measuring student growth).

Michigan also used regression analysis to examine the relationship between teachers’ characteristics and their effectiveness ratings. Below is their report of their findings:

It appears that a female teacher (holding all else equal) is more likely to receive a “highly effective” rating. The same appears to be true if the teacher is minority, if she or he has a longer

district tenure, if she or he is professionally certified, if she or he holds a Master's degree or higher, or if she or he has a full time assignment. ELA teachers and art teachers are more likely to receive higher ratings than elementary teachers in all subject areas, while teachers of mathematics, science, social science, special education, and world languages appear to have lower effectiveness ratings than elementary teachers. New teachers appear to get more of a boost from additional time in their district than experienced teachers do—this could suggest either that there is a substantial learning curve for new teachers or that the first several years are instrumental in determining who is “effective” and who is not. Similarly, older teachers are less likely to be rated “highly effective,” but experienced teachers who have taught in the same district for a number of years are more likely to be given a highly effective rating. In addition, teachers who hold a major in their certification area or who are in an area without a corresponding major appear to be less likely to be given a “highly effective” rating than teachers who are outside of their major. A likely explanation is that the teachers who teach outside of their major may be more effective to begin with—if a school has an area of need but lacks a teacher who is certified (or is endorsed) in that area, it is likely that they would fill that need with a more “effective” teacher, assuming that pedagogical skill may make up for a lack of specific content knowledge. (Page 16)

### [Is there any information on how tiered certification systems affect teacher retention?](#)

A 2012 report to the New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee found:

“The three-tiered system successfully retained teachers in New Mexico schools. A 2007 LFC, LESC, and OEA study found nearly 64 percent of teachers believed the three-tiered system helped with recruiting and retaining teachers. The study, which compared data from 2001 and 2007, found fewer teachers were leaving the profession within their first three years and fewer teachers overall were leaving to take positions in other states or outside the teaching profession.” (page 25)

<http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lfc/lfcdocs/perfaudit/Public%20Education%20Department%20%E2%80%93%20Promoting%20Effective%20Teaching%20in%20New%20Mexico.pdf>