

TPE ESEA Extension and RTTT Amendments

TPE Amendment #1: To Change State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Models

Discussion

In spring of 2012, Maryland developed State and Local Teacher and Principal Evaluation Models using assessment parameters that reflected 50% Professional Practice and 50% Student Growth. The Professional Practice portion for teachers included minimum component measures of Planning and Preparation, Instruction, Classroom Environment, and Professional Responsibilities. The parallel portion for principals included the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework Domains. Similarly, the Student Growth portion was comprised of multiple measures that included a 20% component measure of the Maryland School Assessments (grades 3-8 Reading and Math) and allowed component measures of the School Progress Index (Principle 3 ESEA), Student Learning Objectives, and other objective measures of student growth and learning that were linked to state and/or local goals.

The School Progress Index, approved as part of the ESEA waiver Principle #2, is a school wide collective measure of achievement, growth, gap, and college and career readiness. It was originally designed for school accountability. Standard setting was conducted in February 2012 to determine the recommendations for the weights of the elements within each component and for the three components of the elementary/middle and high school index. The five performance Strands that resulted from the School Progress Index were then proportionately applied to a 10% state evaluation value.

Student Learning Objectives were also determined to be a percentage of the student growth component in the state model and for the majority of the school systems in the new Teacher Principal Evaluation systems.

On August 30, 2012, the Maryland State Department of Education submitted a letter of amendment (approved January 9, 2013) increasing the contribution of Student Learning Objectives and decreasing the contribution of the School Progress Index. This amendment was intended to tighten the alignment between the state principal and teacher models. United States Department of Education's letter of amendment approval was conditional to the requirement that Maryland use data from assessments required under Title 1 of ESEA (Maryland School Assessments and eventually PARCC) in determining student growth in teacher and principal evaluation and that the State implement guidelines that require each high school teacher in tested areas and each high school principal include at least one Student Learning Objective with a Maryland High School Assessment data point on student performance in evaluation systems.

Field Testing

The purpose of the Field Test was to provide a collaborative and innovative platform for Local Education Agencies to develop and test components of their teacher and principal evaluation systems thereby ensuring readiness for full implementation of the new teacher and principal evaluation systems in school year 2013-14. As such, it was always anticipated that relevant changes in local and state models would emerge from lessons learned from these experiences. The outcomes of the Field Test experience were to demonstrate that intended models were approvable and could result in teacher and principal ratings. To facilitate this process, monthly Field Test meetings were conducted with teams from the twenty-four Local Education Agencies. These meetings engaged participants in collaborative group problem identification and problem solving scenarios designed to move districts closer to operational consistencies and implementation readiness as measured by effectiveness ratings at the conclusion of the Field Test period.

By the end of March 2013, more than 8,600 teachers (14% of the State population) and principals (26% of the State population) had participated in the Field Tests with resultant ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, and Ineffective. With functioning models in place, authentic incubators were available to identify data trends and to conduct various investigations. Simulations were conducted using the School Progress Index to test the impact of collective measures on individual teacher performance ratings, to investigate cohorts to determine the extent of shared measures on teacher rating scores, and to execute trials to refine the measurement and translation of student assessments for application in teacher and principal evaluation.

At the same time a cross-representative stakeholder group was created at the direction of superintendents, to craft recommendations for incorporating high school assessments into the evaluation of high school tested area teachers and high school principals. From January to April, the workgroup, conducted meetings both independent and inclusive of various focus groups. They explored approaches for employing the high school assessment data as both a lag and annual measure in evaluation. A report of their findings and recommendations was presented to and accepted by local superintendents on May 3, 2013.

Findings

Through repeated simulation and investigation, the Maryland State Department of Education learned that the introduction of the School Progress Index into teacher evaluation provided a positive contribution to only 5% of the teachers. The State also learned that its methodology for translating student test scores into growth measures, using the revised Maryland Tiered Assessment Index, was performing with precision and would tend to break when appropriate to the benefit of teachers and principals. Increased confidence in the contribution of the Maryland Tiered Assessment Index combined with reservations about the contribution of the School Progress Index has led Maryland to eliminate the School Progress Index from the state model. The State further believes that the indicators within the School Progress Index can be better elevated through the Student Learning Objective process which can be linked to district goals and school improvement plans specific to the needs of the school community and the individual classroom. The State also believes that the increased evaluation value that can be attributed to Student Learning Objectives provides greater incentive for teachers and principals to address issues related to gap reduction, achievement, growth and readiness for college and careers, than did the School Progress Index.

The State further accepts the workgroup's suggested model for the application of high school assessments into evaluation which is based upon two annual data Student Learning Objective measures and one lag data Student Learning Objective measure and expands this concept across the State teacher and principal evaluation models to bring consistency and fairness to all teachers and principals.

Recommendations

The Maryland State Department of Education requests that USDE approve amending the Maryland State Teacher and Principals Evaluation Models to reflect the attached model designs (see attached). The approval of this amendment further increases the alignments and brings all 22 Local Education Agencies into compliance with the state model frameworks, allowing the Maryland State Department of Education to focus the delivery of professional development and technical assistance to districts during the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years. The State further recommends moving oversight of Project 40-15, which focuses on the delivery of professional development services to executive officers, to the greater Teacher and Principal Evaluation project.

State Teacher Evaluation Model

Professional Practice

50 % Qualitative Measures

Domain percentages proposed by LEA and approved by MSDE

Planning and
Preparation
12.5%

Instruction
12.5%

Classroom
Environment
12.5%

Professional
Responsibilities
12.5%

Student Growth

50 % Quantitative Measures

As defined below



Amendment Pending

Elementary/Middle School Teacher Two Tested Areas

20% MSA Lag Measure based on 10% Reading **and** 10% Math
15% Annual 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

or

Elementary/Middle School Teacher One Tested Area

20% MSA Lag Measure based on either 20% Math **or** 20% Reading
15% Annual 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

or

High School Teacher Tested Subjects

20% SLO Lag Measure based on HSA Algebra, HSA English 2, HSA Biology, or HSA American Government and including an HSA data point
15% Annual 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

or

K-12 Non-Tested Area/Subject Teachers

20% SLO Lag Measure based on School Progress Index Indicators (Achievement, Gap Reduction, Growth, College and Career Readiness), Advanced Placement Tests, or similarly available 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

State Principal Evaluation Model

Professional Practice

50% Qualitative Measures
12 Domains Each 2-10%

Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework (8)

- School Vision
- School Culture
- Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
- Observation/Evaluation of Teachers
- Integration of Appropriate Assessments
- Use of Technology and Data
- Professional Development
- Stakeholder Engagement

Interstate School Leaders and Licensure Consortium (4)

- School Operations and Budget
- Effective Communication
- Influencing the School Community
- Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics

Student Growth

50% Quantitative Measures
As defined below



Amendment Pending

Elementary/Middle School Principals

20% MSA Lag Measure as determined by 10 % Reading MSA and 10% Math MSA
10% School Progress Index
10% Annual SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the district level
10% Annual SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the school level

or

High School Principals

20% SLO Lag Measure as determined by 10% HSAs and 10% AP scores, SPI Indicators (Gap Reduction, College & Career Readiness, Achievement), or similar valid delayed measures
10% School Progress Index
10% Annual SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the district level
10% Annual SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the school level

or

Other Principals (e.g., Special Center, PreK-2)

20% SLO Lag Measure as determined by 10% HSAs and 10% AP scores, SPI Indicators (Gap Reduction, College & Career Readiness, Achievement), or similar valid delayed measures
10% School Progress Index
10% Annual SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the district level
10% Annual SLO Measure as determined by priority identification at the school level

Local Teacher Evaluation Models 2013-2014*

Professional Practice

Student Growth

50 % Qualitative Measures

Domain percentages proposed by LEA and approved by MSDE

50 % Quantitative Measures

As defined below

Planning and
Preparation

Instruction

Classroom
Environment

Professional
Responsibilities

Additional Domains Based on Local Priorities



Amendment Pending

Elementary/Middle School Teacher Two Content Areas

Either

5 % - Reading MSA (Class)
5 % - Math MSA (Class)
10%- School Progress Index

or

10%- Reading MSA (Class)
10%- Math MSA (Class)

and

30% - LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE

or

Elementary/Middle School Teacher One Content Area

Either

10% - Reading MSA (Class) or
Math MSA (Class)
10% -School Progress Index

or

20% -Reading MSA (Class) or
Math MSA (Class)

and

30% - LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE

or

High School Teacher

LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE; no single measure to exceed 35% .
For tested area teachers, one Student Learning Objective must include an HSA data point.

or

Elementary/Middle School Teacher Non-Tested Subject

LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE; no single measure to exceed 35% .

* MSA/SPI split increases to 15%/5% in 2014-2015 and becomes 20% MSA/PARCC in 2015-2016

Local Principal Evaluation Models 2013-2014*

Professional Practice

50 % Qualitative Measures

Domain percentages proposed by LEA and approved by MSDE

Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework (8)

- School Vision
- School Culture
- Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
- Observation/Evaluation of Teachers
- Integration of Appropriate Assessments
- Use of Technology and Data
- Professional Development
- Stakeholder Engagement

Additional Domains
Based on Local
Priorities

Student Growth

50 % Quantitative Measures

As defined below



Amendment Pending

Elementary & Middle School Principals

Either

- 5 % - Reading MSA (School)
- 5 % - Math MSA (School)
- 10%-School Progress Index

or

- 10%- Reading MSA (School)
- 10%- Math MSA (School)

and

- 30% - LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE

or

High School Principals

LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE; no single measure to exceed 35%. One Student Learning Objective must be targeted at HSAs.

or

Other Principals (e.g., Special Center, PreK-2)

LEA proposed objective measures of student growth and learning linked to state and/or local goals and approved by MSDE; no single measure to exceed 35%. If appropriate, one Student Learning Objective must be targeted at HSAs.

* MSA/SPI split increases to 15%/5% in 2014-2015 and becomes 20% MSA/PARCC in 2015-2016

TPE Amendment #2: To Support Extension of ESEA Flexibility Waiver

Discussion

In seeking an extension to Maryland's ESEA Flexibility Waiver, MSDE must consider how to concurrently satisfy concrete expectations within the one-year extension allowance and intended expectations for TPE beyond the extension. In doing so both USDE and Maryland recognize unknowns that will continue to emerge and be resolved over the next three years. Foremost among these are confidences and proficiencies with Student Learning Objectives as a student growth measure, confidences in the translation and attribution of the PARCC Assessments into student growth measures, and confidences associated with the ability of principals to plan and manage teacher evaluation processes that result in fair effectiveness ratings and effective professional development. All of these must be navigated within Maryland's continued commitment to teacher and principal evaluation that reflects a 50% measure of Professional Practice and a 50% measure of Student Growth; including a 20% application of Student Growth that is attributed to state tests. To reaffirm Maryland's commitment to TPE and to satisfy USDE's conditions for ESEA Flexibility Waiver Extension, Maryland is submitting the attached "Plan for Transitioning Teacher Evaluation from MSA to PARCC Assessments." SY 2013-2014 and SY 2014-2015 demonstrate the one-year extension terms of Maryland's current Flexibility Waiver and includes allowance for not using state test-associated measures in making personnel decisions. SY 2015-2016 and SY 2016-2017 demonstrate how Maryland will respond to remaining unknowns and confidences in completing its intentions for TPE. It is understood, that test measures from 2014-2015 will serve as baseline data and that subsequent data from 2015-2016 will facilitate the norming of the test measures in 2016-2017. Similar norming will occur annually as additional test data is acquired and analyzed. Annual analysis will further support the review and reconsideration of component measures and values within State and Local evaluation models. Maryland's intentions, as evidenced in the amended Maryland Models for Teacher and Principal Evaluation, incorporate changes resulting from the 2013 Statewide Field Test in conjunction with the Plan for Transition, accommodate the two Waivers offered by USDE in June 2013, and facilitate annual adjustments to TPE as unknowns become knowns.

Findings

From inception, it was recognized that the transition to the PARCC Assessments would create a two year hiatus on student growth measures attributed to state testing and this disruption in data would require an interim solution for applying student growth to educator effectiveness. It is further recognized that a great deal of practice, discovery, and learning must still occur to shepherd SLOs to fully effective operational status. While on-going instructional awareness and practice will build ever-increasing alignments between the Maryland College and Career-Readiness Standards and the PARCC Assessments, unknowns remain in regard to the resulting construct and conduct of the assessments. The combined impact of the waiver extension and its amendments binds MSDE through SY 2014-2015; while the architecture for SY 2015-2017 demonstrate Maryland's intentions beyond the Waiver Extension and pending any forthcoming offer of ESEA Renewal. Test measures from 2014-2015 will serve as baseline data and that subsequent data from 2015-2016 will facilitate the norming of the test measures for application in 2016-2017 evaluation processes. Similar norming will occur annually as additional test data is acquired and analyzed. The State believes that the Transition Plan will meet the criteria of full implementation and benefit TPE as follows:

- Provide a substitute methodology for capturing Student Growth during the two year period when MSA expires and PARCC matures
- Provide a three year period for refining the application and increasing confidence in SLOs as a measure of student growth in the evaluation process
- Provide a three year period for principals and LEAs to develop and refine strategies to effectively manage the capacity requirements of the evaluation components
- Provide an annual timeframe for the analysis and validation of TPE data and methodologies

Recommendations

The Maryland State Department of Education requests that USDE approve amending and extending the current ESEA Waiver for an additional year to reflect the following

	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015
50%	<p><u>Professional Practice</u> <i>Four Component measures</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Planning & Preparation</i> 2. <i>Instruction</i> 3. <i>Classroom Environment</i> 4. <i>Professional Responsibilities</i> <p><i>(Counts for personnel decisions)</i></p>	<p><u>Professional Practice</u> <i>Four Component measures</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Planning & Preparation</i> 2. <i>Instruction</i> 3. <i>Classroom Environment</i> 4. <i>Professional Responsibilities</i> <p><i>(Counts for personnel decisions)</i></p>
30%	<p><u>Student Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>One or more SLO</i> • <i>Approved Local measures</i> <p><i>(Counts for personnel decisions)</i></p>	<p><u>Student Growth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>One or more SLO</i> • <i>Approved Local measures</i> <p><i>(Counts for personnel decisions)</i></p>
20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Translation of 2013 MSA assessments to a growth measure by applying MTAI in Sept 2013 for application to Spring 2014 evaluations.</i> <p><i>(Does not count for personnel decisions)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Use of 2014 MSA assessments to inform district or school level SLO for application to Spring 2015 evaluations</i> <p><i>(Informs personnel decisions)</i></p>

The approval of this amendment further increases model alignments and brings all 22 Local Education Agencies into compliance with the state model frameworks, allowing the Maryland State Department of Education to focus the delivery of professional development and technical assistance to districts during the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years. The State further recommends moving oversight of Project 40-15, which focuses on the delivery of professional development services to executive officers, to the greater Teacher and Principal Evaluation project.