

Maryland Teacher/Principal Evaluation System: General Standards

A cornerstone of the teacher and principal evaluation process includes established areas of professional practice and state and local measures of student growth. The intent is to give a more detailed look at educator performance so that targeted and supportive professional development can be provided in a timely manner. The below General Standards are intended to provide a decision-making guide for making a final determination on whether a teacher or principal is highly effective, effective, or ineffective. Maryland wishes to thank other Race to the Top winning states for their thinking in this regard as it has helped shape the Maryland evaluation system.

The standards have two general components that are aligned with the previously discussed Frameworks. The first component is to assign a rating for Professional Practice. This is similar in many ways to the manner in which evaluations are currently completed. The LEA determines the areas of professional practice it considers important (staying within the general structure of the Frameworks). The LEA also develops the guidelines for acceptable evidence in meeting this component of the overall evaluation, and they determine how they will take into consideration complexity factors. Complexity factors do not diminish student expectations, but they may have an extraordinary impact on student growth. They are not weighted with either professional practice or student growth measures.

The second general component is to assign a rating for student growth. This is a two step process because it includes a statewide component and a local component. Each provides a rating of highly effective, effective, or ineffective. Those two ratings of the growth measure (local and State) are then combined into one growth measure of highly effective, effective, or ineffective. The final rating is determined by a combination of the previously assigned Professional Practice rating and the overall growth rating. More specifically, the 4 parts to arriving at a final rating are as follows:

Part I: Determination of Rating for Professional Practice (50%)

Professional Practice (50%)

The evaluator assigns Highly Effective, Effective, or Ineffective in the area of Professional Practice. For teachers, the evaluator uses a combination of four domains (planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional

responsibilities) and any other measures chosen by LEA, following guidelines (e.g. allowable metrics, acceptable evidence) determined by the LEA and approved by MSDE. For principals, the evaluator uses a combination of the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework and any other metrics chosen by the LEA, following guidelines determined by the LEA and approved by MSDE.

Part II: Determination of Rating for LEA Growth Measures 20% and State Growth Measures 30%

1. LEA Growth Measures (20%): The evaluator rates the teacher/principal as Highly Effective, Effective, or Ineffective on the LEA student growth measures. The measures that serve as the basis of the evaluation are chosen by the LEA from a menu of available options. The evaluator follows guidelines (e.g. allowable measures, acceptable evidence) determined by the LEA and approved by MSDE.
2. Statewide Growth Measures (30%): The LEA selects measures from the list of multiple measures with one requirement: if a statewide assessment exists, the LEA must select it as one of the multiple measures between two points in time. State assessments, if available, will be combined with other measures determined by the LEA and approved by MSDE to yield ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, or Ineffective.

Part III: Determination of Overall Student Growth Measure (50%) from the Combination of the State Growth Measure (30%) and the Local Growth Measure (20%)

The two measures of student growth (State and Local) must be combined in a ratio of 3 to 2 for State Growth to LEA Growth. Maintaining the 3 to 2 ratio, LEAs must decide the Overall Student Growth Measure. If both the State Growth and Local Growth are the same, for example effective, then the result would be effective for Overall Student Growth. In the instances where State and LEA measures differ, the LEA must determine what rating for overall student growth (Highly Effective, Effective, or Ineffective) will be assigned.

For discussion with bargaining units, LEAs have flexibility to determine the quantitative measures with the following constraints:

1. The ratio for the State Growth Measure to LEA Growth Measure must be 3 to 2 to maintain and established weight in the overall rating of 30% for the State Growth Measure and 20% for the LEA Growth Measure.
2. All decisions that go into the determination of the rating must be detailed for MSDE to review and approve.

Part IV: Determination of the Overall Evaluation

Once a final rating for Overall Student Growth is determined it must be combined with the rating for Professional Practice, determined at the beginning of this process. If both Professional Practice and Overall Student Growth are the same, e.g., effective, then the result would be effective for the Overall Evaluation. In instances where the Overall Student Growth ratings disagree with Professional Practice ratings, LEAs must develop decision rules that explain the final rating given.

For discussion with bargaining units, LEAs have flexibility to determine the overall rating with the following constraints:

1. A teacher/principal must at least be effective in the student growth component in order to receive an overall rating of Effective or Highly Effective.
2. All decisions that go into the determination of the overall rating must be detailed for MSDE to review and approve.