

FAQs about Teacher Evaluation Changes Effective September 2015

Ohio House Bill 64, effective September 2015, includes language affecting several aspects of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.

The legislation modifies the alternative framework, one of two models that districts must choose to follow as they conduct teacher and principal evaluations. The Original Teacher Evaluation Framework remains the same.

Because of the transition to new state tests, which offer one means of calculating student growth, the General Assembly also extended and modified safe harbor provisions. That means that districts will not use value-added ratings from state tests for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years as part of educator evaluations or when making decisions regarding dismissal, retention, tenure or compensation – unless they enter into a memorandum of understanding to do so.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

May districts still choose to use the original 50/50 teacher evaluation framework? (#FAQ2074)

Did the bill make changes to the alternative framework for teacher evaluation? (#FAQ2075)

Do student learning objectives (SLOs) still exist as a student growth measure? (#FAQ2077)

Do the legislative changes impact the less frequent evaluation cycles for skilled and accomplished teachers? (#FAQ2076)

How many student learning objectives may teachers have? (#FAQ2078)

Will the eTPES calculation for determining final summative ratings change? (#FAQ2079)

ALTERNATIVE FRAMEWORK

If my district chooses to use the alternative framework, do we still have to identify equal weights for teacher performance and student growth? (#FAQ2080)

In districts following the alternative framework, who selects the additional component(s) used for teacher evaluation? (#FAQ2081)

If my district chooses to use student surveys, teacher self-evaluations, peer review evaluations, and/or student portfolios, must we use the document that was created by the department or can we create our own tools for these alternative components? (#FAQ2084)

If our district's board of education deems "any other component" appropriate, how will my district enter this other component's score in the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES)? (#FAQ2082)

May a teacher receive an exemption from the 15 percent component of the alternative framework if she or he is working with special student populations such as English language learners, low-functioning special education students, fewer than six students or if the component is inappropriate for the student population (such as student surveys)? (#FAQ2086)

Previously in our districts (which uses the alternative framework), all teachers had to use the same option for the additional component that is 15 percent of the evaluation. Is this still a requirement? (#FAQ2083)

What are some possible examples of other components that our district might consider for use? (#FAQ2085)

SAFE HARBOR AND STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES

Does a district have a choice about whether they can use the 2013-2014 value-added data for A-1 teachers rated accomplished or skilled while retaining the less frequent evaluation cycles permitted? (#FAQ2448)

Is the performance-only option gone for A1 teachers who had value-added data in 2013-2014, since there is now a growth measure available for them? (#FAQ2449)

What if a district already has local measures in place for A-1 teachers? (#FAQ2450)

Can districts still choose to include the value-added data in calculating the student academic growth component for teacher and principal evaluations? (#FAQ2089)

If no value-added data is used in calculating teacher and principal student growth, what measures will determine student growth instead? (#FAQ2088)

Is it true that value-added data will not be included in the student growth measure component for both teacher and principal evaluations? (#FAQ2087)

What are district options for evaluating teachers who only teach value-added courses (A1)? (#FAQ2090)

What are the options for Category A2 teachers who will have value-added data available? (#FAQ2091)

Will teachers continue to receive teacher-level value-added reports, including three-year composite data, from the state assessments from the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years? (#FAQ2092)

Our district is creating a memorandum of understanding to continue using value-added data for the purpose of assessing student academic growth for teacher and principal evaluations. Can the memorandum change the manner in which value-added data is used in evaluations, as outlined in either the Original or Alternative Frameworks? (#FAQ2287)

SHARED ATTRIBUTION

Can districts use value-added data for shared attribution? (#FAQ2093)

Last year, our district used a district or building-level value-added score as shared attribution for the full 50 student growth measure rating of all our teachers. If we do this again in 2015-2016, may we now use the teacher performance rating for the full 100% of the evaluation? (#FAQ2094)

VALUE-ADDED DATA

What are the benefits of value-added reports if they are not being used as a component of evaluations? (#FAQ2098)

What impact does House Bill 64 have on the value-added data I receive from a vendor assessment? (#FAQ2099)

Will composite scores continue to be comprised of up to three (3) years of data? (#FAQ2097)

Will high school teachers who teach science and social studies still receive value-added reports? (#FAQ2095)

Will the value-added calculations be different this year? (#FAQ2096)

LICENSE RENEWAL FOR CONSISTENTLY HIGH-PERFORMING TEACHERS

How is the State Board of Education defining "consistently high-performing teachers?" (#FAQ2100)

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Website: www.education.ohio.gov (#FAQ2102)

Contact: SGM@education.ohio.gov (#FAQ2103)

General Questions

May districts still choose to use the original 50/50 teacher evaluation framework?

Yes. Districts have the option to choose the original framework based on 50 percent student academic growth measures and 50 percent performance. The original framework remains unchanged. They also may choose the alternative framework.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Did the bill make changes to the alternative framework for teacher evaluation?

Yes. The alternative framework now requires 50 percent of the teacher's evaluation to be based upon the teacher performance, 35 percent on student growth measures, and the remaining 15 percent on one component, or any combination of the following components:

1. Student surveys;
2. Teacher self-evaluations;
3. Peer review evaluations;
4. Student portfolios;
5. Any other component determined appropriate by the district board or school governing authority.*

*Districts using the Prior Alternative Framework 2014-2015 (with the sliding scale) **may** use this option (#5) but must have a memorandum of understanding with teachers to do so.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Do student learning objectives (SLOs) still exist as a student growth measure?

Yes. The State Board of Education adopted an evaluation framework that still identifies three types of student growth measures: value-added from state assessments, ODE-approved vendor assessments, and local measures that include student learning objectives and/or shared attribution.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Do the legislative changes impact the less frequent evaluation cycles for skilled and accomplished teachers?

No. The majority of teachers on the less frequent cycle must have a student growth measure in the year they are not fully evaluated. Teachers who do not have any type of student growth measure for the school year are NOT eligible for the less frequent evaluation cycle and must be fully evaluated.

There is one exception to this requirement. Districts that had board policies in place before May 10, 2014, regarding less frequent evaluations of accomplished teachers are not required to have student growth measures for the accomplished teachers.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

How many student learning objectives may teachers have?

While the department still recommends a minimum of two student learning objectives, each teacher now may have just one.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Will the eTPES calculation for determining final summative ratings change?

No. The electronic system will continue to use the 600-point formula in calculating the final summative ratings for teachers and principals. However, districts using the alternative framework will need a new Student Growth Measures scale due to the change in the weighting of student growth measures (now 35 percent).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Alternative Framework

If my district chooses to use the alternative framework, do we still have to identify equal weights for teacher performance and student growth?

No. House Bill 64 requires the student growth component of the alternative framework to be set at 35 percent, the teacher performance at 50 percent and the alternative component at 15 percent. If, however, your district's collective bargaining agreement (from before Sept. 29, 2015) established equal weights within the alternative framework for student growth and teacher performance, as previously permitted by Ohio Revised Code, your district can continue this practice until the expiration of your current collective bargaining agreement.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

In districts following the alternative framework, who selects the additional component(s) used for teacher evaluation?

The district will choose the component(s).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

If my district chooses to use student surveys, teacher self-evaluations, peer review evaluations, and/or student portfolios, must we use the document that was created by the department or can we create our own tools for these alternative components?

If your district is using teacher self-evaluations, peer-review evaluations, student portfolios and/or student surveys, the district *may* use the tools created and/or approved by the department. If your district chooses to use any other alternative component, the district will create its own tool and it must be scorable on a four-point scale.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

If our district's board of education deems "any other component" appropriate, how will my district enter this other component's score in the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES)?

The other identified component must be scored on a four-point scale, with one being the lowest possible score. The district administration will enter the name of the other alternative component into eTPES and then enter a rating of one to four for the teacher.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

May a teacher receive an exemption from the 15 percent component of the alternative framework if she or he is working with special student populations such as English language learners, low-functioning special education students, fewer than six students or if the component is inappropriate for the student population (such as student surveys)?

No. With the flexibility districts now have available to select the alternative components, teachers will no longer be able to receive exemptions.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Previously in our districts (which uses the alternative framework), all teachers had to use the same option for the additional component that is 15 percent of the evaluation. Is this still a requirement?

No. Now districts may identify multiple options for the additional component within the district. However, each teacher may only have one alternative component rating. For example, a district might choose to use student surveys for all evaluated teachers in grades 7 through 12 but identify teacher self-evaluation as the alternative component for teachers of pre-kindergarten through grade 6.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

What are some possible examples of other components that our district might consider for use?

When selecting a district-determined component for use with the alternative framework, the district should consider components that produce useful information to advance teacher professional growth and practice. The district also must score the component on a four-point scale, with one being the lowest possible score. Below are examples of components used by other states that Ohio districts might wish to consider.

The Rhode Island Model (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/Rhode-Island-Model-15-16.pdf.aspx>) , page 67, uses professional growth goals to improve teaching practice. See Professional Responsibility 7: Writes and implements a Professional Growth Goal, which addresses personal, school or district needs and aims at improving teacher practice.

The North Dakota Teacher Evaluation Guidelines (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/North-Dakota-Eval-GLs-2014.pdf.aspx>) , page 6, lists several locally developed measures in Figure 3: Multiple-Measure Evidence for Teacher Evaluation.

Nebraska provides a four-level rubric (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/Nebraska-4-level-rubric.pdf.aspx>) (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/Nebraska-4-level-rubric.pdf.aspx>) for rating an Individual Professional Development Plan in accordance with their evaluation guidance document. (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/Nebraska-Eval-Guidance-2013.pdf.aspx>)

District of Columbia Public Schools (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/DC-IMPACT-2014.pdf.aspx>) (</getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/FAQs-for-2015-2016-HB-64/Alternative-Framework/What-are-some-possible-examples-of-other-component/DC-IMPACT-2014.pdf.aspx>) has four-level alternative measures under “Commitment to the School Community” (page 44) and “Core Professionalism” (page 50).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Safe Harbor and Student Growth Measures

Does a district have a choice about whether they can use the 2013-2014 value-added data for A-1 teachers rated accomplished or skilled while retaining the less frequent evaluation cycles permitted?

Yes. This is a local decision, subject to local policies, collective bargaining agreements and whether or not districts have memoranda of agreement to evaluate teachers using value-added data from 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Is the performance-only option gone for A1 teachers who had value-added data in 2013-2014, since there is now a growth measure available for them?

No. Using the 2013-2014 data is optional under safe harbor for districts who do not have a memorandum of understanding in place. Therefore, a district may decide that a teacher rated accomplished may be evaluated solely based on performance. See this Web page for details (<http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Evaluation-Requirements-for-Teachers-Rated-Accompl>).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

What if a district already has local measures in place for A-1 teachers?

Districts may continue to use them.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Can districts still choose to include the value-added data in calculating the student academic growth component for teacher and principal evaluations?

Yes. A school district, educational service center, joint vocational school, community school or STEM school may enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) collectively with its teachers or principals stipulating that the value-added data based on the results of the state assessments from the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years may be used to assess the student academic growth for purposes of teacher and principal evaluations.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

If no value-added data is used in calculating teacher and principal student growth, what measures will determine student growth instead?

If no other student academic growth measure is available, a district could base teacher and principal evaluations solely on teacher or principal performance. It is important to remember, however, that the State Board of Education has adopted an evaluation framework document that clearly outlines other student academic growth measures that are recommended for use when no value-added is available. These include approved vendor assessments and local measures (student learning objectives and shared attribution).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Is it true that value-added data will not be included in the student growth measure component for both teacher and principal evaluations?

House Bill 64 eliminates the use of the value-added progress dimension based on the results of the state assessments to calculate student academic growth for the purpose of conducting teacher and principal evaluations for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years – unless a district enters into a memorandum of agreement to do so.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

What are district options for evaluating teachers who only teach value-added courses (A1)?

Districts can:

1. Have a memorandum of understanding that allows the use of value-added data for teacher evaluation (in other words, data will still be generated and districts can opt-in);
2. Decide locally to use other types of student growth measures for teacher evaluation (ODE-approved vendor assessments and student learning objectives);
3. Use only the teacher performance measures to determine the overall evaluation rating. Note that teachers who do not have any type of student growth measure for the school year are NOT eligible for the less frequent evaluation cycle and must be fully evaluated.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

What are the options for Category A2 teachers who will have value-added data available?

A2 teachers:

Will continue to use the student growth measures currently available to them (measures other than the state assessment value-added data);

May use state value-added if the district has a memorandum of understanding that allows the use of this data.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Will teachers continue to receive teacher-level value-added reports, including three-year composite data, from the state assessments from the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years?

Teachers will continue to receive annual teacher-level value-added reports including composite data. The reports and composite data generated from the 2014-2015 data will reflect a single year only.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Our district is creating a memorandum of understanding to continue using value-added data for the purpose of assessing student academic growth for teacher and principal evaluations. Can the memorandum change the manner in which value-added data is used in evaluations, as outlined in either the Original or Alternative Frameworks?

No. Safe harbor for teachers limits district discretion to determining *only if they will or will not* use value-added data to assess student academic growth for purposes of their teacher or principal evaluations.

Thus, if a district decides to enter into a memorandum of understanding with its teachers or principals to use value-added data, they must continue to comply with these requirements:

- 1) When applicable to the grade level or subject area taught by a teacher, value-added shall be used in the student academic growth portion of an evaluation in proportion to the part of a teacher's schedule of courses or subjects for which value-added is applicable.
- 2) If a teacher's schedule is comprised only of courses or subjects for which value-added is applicable, the entire student academic growth factor of the evaluation shall be based on value-added, unless the student has 45 or more excused or unexcused absences during the full academic year.

Note: These requirements are outlined in Ohio Revised Code section 3319.112(A)(1)(a) and (A)(1)(b) (<http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3319.112>). For details on how teacher evaluation ratings are determined, see the graphic chart for framework your district selected: either the Original Framework or Alternative Framework posted here (<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System>).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Shared Attribution

Can districts use value-added data for shared attribution?

Yes, if the district enters into a memorandum of understanding collectively with its teachers or principals stipulating that the value-added data based on the results of the state assessments from the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years will be used as a measure of student academic growth for the purposes of shared attribution. The exception being that teachers who only teach value-added courses (A1s) must use their individual teacher-level value-added data and teachers with a portion of their schedule with value-added courses (A2s) must use their individual teacher-level value-added data for that proportion of their schedule.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Last year, our district used a district or building-level value-added score as shared attribution for the full 50 student growth measure rating of all our teachers. If we do this again in 2015-2016, may we now use the teacher performance rating for the full 100% of the evaluation?

No. Only A1 teachers (who teach value-added courses exclusively), may be evaluated on performance only per Am. Sub. H. B. No. 64 Section 263.650 (3). They would be required to have two full observations and are not eligible for the less frequent evaluation cycle unless they have a student growth measure rating.

If your district is not entering into a memorandum of understanding to use teacher-level value-added data and you have no approved vendor data, your teachers will be using local measures in the form of student learning objectives and/or shared attribution.

Please remember if your district is using value-added data as a shared attribution measure, a memorandum of understanding must be in effect. Also, districts are not required to purchase vendor assessments.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Value-Added Data

What are the benefits of value-added reports if they are not being used as a component of evaluations?

Teachers can benefit from using value-added data as a diagnostic tool. When combined with other student performance measures, the value-added diagnostic reports provide powerful insight into the impact of curriculum, assessments and instructional practices. Teachers can better identify what is working well, as well as areas for growth. They can use this information to refine or maintain practices that support student learning.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

What impact does House Bill 64 have on the value-added data I receive from a vendor assessment?

Vendor assessment value-added data will still be used in the teacher and principal evaluations for generating student growth measures.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Will composite scores continue to be comprised of up to three (3) years of data?

No, for 2015-2016, the composite will represent one year of data (2014-2015) for both teachers and principals.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Will high school teachers who teach science and social studies still receive value-added reports?

Yes. These teachers will electronically link to their students who are taking state assessments and they will receive teacher-level value-added reports. However, please note:

The science and social studies value-added data for high school courses will not be included on the local report card data.

Physical science teachers are linked for the first time during the 2014-2015 school year;

American history, biology, English language arts II, geometry and integrated math II teachers will link for the first time in the 2015-2016 school year.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Will the value-added calculations be different this year?

Yes, please refer to the technical documents posted here (</Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Ohio-Report-Cards/Value-Added-Technical-Reports-1>).

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

License Renewal for Consistently High-Performing Teachers

How is the State Board of Education defining “consistently high-performing teachers?”

The State Board of Education will adopt rules defining consistently high-performing teachers as well as the process to exempt consistently high-performing teachers from the requirement to complete any additional coursework for the renewal of an educator license, including exemption from any requirements prescribed by local professional development committees.

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

For More Information

Website: www.education.ohio.gov

www.education.ohio.gov (<http://www.education.ohio.gov>) (search key words: teacher evaluation)

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Contact: SGM@education.ohio.gov

SGM@education.ohio.gov (<mailto:SGM@education.ohio.gov>)

[Back to Top \(#top\)](#)

Paolo DeMaria
Superintendent of Public Instruction

State Board of Education of Ohio
Tess Elshoff, President

