

Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies (STEP Database and SPEP Database)

3: Selecting Measures

Topic: Measures of Teacher Performance (Observation)

For a list of state references shown in brackets (e.g., [RI-2], [DC-5]), please click the title of the state desired.

Note to user: If the answer to a question is listed as **"Not specified,"** the researcher was unable to locate sufficient information to provide an accurate answer.

| State | E. How is a final rating determined for the various domains measured by the observation rubric? |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Arizona | Not applicable |
| Arkansas | The evaluator uses his or her judgment to determine a final rating [Arkansas Department of Education, personal communication]. |
| Colorado | The final rating on the model rubric is based on a point system [CO-11, p. 32]. |
| Delaware | A teacher is scored as satisfactory on a domain if he or she is deemed to have "acceptable performance" on three out four subcomponents for each domain; two or fewer, and the teacher is rated as unsatisfactory for the domain [DE-2, secs. 106A(6.1.1) and (6.1.2A)]. |
| District of Columbia | During each observation, evaluators select the level (1–4) that "provides the best overall description of the teacher" [DC-13, p. 15] for each standard. The scores for each standard are then averaged together to form an overall score for the Teaching and Learning Framework. At the end of the year, the scores from all five observations are averaged to create an overall score for the Teaching and Learning Framework component [DC-13]. |
| Florida | The evaluator takes a weighted average of the four domain frequency scores to compute the status score. The status score can be translated into a final rating of highly effective, effective, developing, or ineffective [FL-21, p. 12]. |
| Georgia | The final score for observation under the Teacher Keys Evaluation System is called a Teacher Assessment on Performance Measures (TAPS) score. Teachers receive a rating on the standards in the observation rubric (either CLASS Keys or Teacher Keys), which is weighted using points. An "exemplary" rating on a standard is scored at 3 points, "proficient" is 2 points, and so forth. The scores across all standards are then added together to generate a final TAPS score for the teacher. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | Note: The final, summative Teacher Assessment on Performance Measures (TAPS) score (for the Teacher Keys Evaluation System) or the annual summative rating (for the CLASS Keys system) includes both observation and artifacts in determining a teacher's final score on the standards [GA-9, p. 25]. |
| Idaho | Not applicable |
| Illinois | The observer uses professional judgment to determine how the teacher's performance corresponds with the domains and indicators of the rubric [IL-3, sec. 24A-3(b)]. |
| Indiana | For the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, the primary evaluator uses professional judgment to establish a score for domains 1–3 (Planning, Instruction, and Leadership) [IN-15, p. 15]. Teachers receive a score of 1–4 for each domain (highly effective = 4 and ineffective = 1). The scores are then weighted according to the following ratios: Planning, 10 percent; Instruction, 75 percent; and Leadership, 15 percent. A final score, ranging from 1 to 4, is calculated using these weights. For domain 4 (Core Professionalism), if the teacher has not met the criteria, 1 point is subtracted from the final, weighted score. If the teacher meets the criteria for Core Professionalism, the final score does not change [IN-15, pp. 13–15]. |
| Iowa | Not applicable |
| Kentucky | The evaluator uses personal judgment to determine a final rating, which "will be a holistic reflection of performance within each domain" [KY-9, title page]. |
| Louisiana | For districts using the Compass observation instruments, ratings between 1 and 5 on each of the performance standards are averaged to arrive at a final rating between 1.0 and 5.0 [LA-16, p. 25]. |
| Maryland | For districts that choose the state model, the state provides a point- and percentage-based formula for calculating the final score on the Danielson rubric. For LEA-developed observation rubrics, the state will assist the LEA in modifying the Danielson rubric and processes [MD-17, pp. 44–45]. |
| Massachusetts | The evaluator determines an overall rating of educator performance based on the evaluator's professional judgment and an examination of evidence that demonstrates the educator's performance against Performance Standards and evidence of attainment of the Educator Plan goals [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)]. |
| Missouri | Not specified |
| New York | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 25 points: growth or comparable measures • Up to 15 points: locally selected measures of growth or achievement • Up to 60 points: other measures of effectiveness (i.e., observations) <p>[NY-7, pp. 58–59, NY-1, p. 2; NY-14, sec. 2(a)(2)(A-D)]</p> |
| North Carolina | Each element under each standard is scored by the evaluator and combined to determine an individual score on |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | the standard [NC-11, p. 32]. |
| Ohio | Not specified |
| Oklahoma | Not specified |
| Pennsylvania | Not specified |
| Rhode Island | The evaluator uses the data collected via the observation instrument as evidence in determining final scores on the Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities rubrics [RI-21; RI-22, pp. 85, 97]. |
| South Dakota | Not specified |
| Tennessee | Each observation is used to identify areas of growth and accomplishment. The evaluator uses their judgment, based on evidence, to determine a score for each indicator on the rubric. At the end of the year, the scores on the indicators from multiple observations are combined with the responsibility indicators, which are gathered at the end of the year, to create a final Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities (SKR) score. The SKR score is a weighted composite adjusted for the type of teacher being observed (e.g., master, mentor, or career teacher) and the type of evaluator for each observation (e.g., master or mentor teacher or an administrator) [TN-1, p. 11]. |
| Washington | Teachers receive a rating between 1 and 4 for each of the performance evaluation criteria and a final summative rating between 1 and 4. By December 1, 2012, the state will adopt specific rules for calculating the summative rating for each of the preferred instructional frameworks [WA-2, sec.1(2)(c)]. |