

Measuring Teacher Effectiveness: An Overview of State Policies and Practices Related to Pre-K–12 Teacher Effectiveness or Teacher Evaluation

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	<i>Education Week's Quality Counts</i> 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C- • Best Practice State in 2-E Licensure Reciprocity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrators evaluate teachers against state standards by observing classrooms, discussing practices, and documenting other knowledge; teachers complete self-assessment. • Data are used to create a professional learning plan and make decisions about teachers. • Student achievement data are not included. <p>Sources: Alabama Professional Learning Collaborative. <i>Overview of EDUCATE Alabama collaborative teacher evaluation system</i>. Retrieved from http://alex.state.al.us/leadership/evaluations.html</p> <p>Alabama State Department of Education. <i>Alabama quality teaching standards</i>. Retrieved from http://ti_sp.alsde.edu/qt/Shared%20Documents/ALABAMA%20QUALITY%20TEACHING%20STANDARDS.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: F • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ • Best Practice State in 4-G Pension-Neutrality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating under 1996 law (HB 465), requiring development of local evaluation procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – local performance standards based on state standards; – at least two observations of non-tenured teachers per year required; one per year for most other teachers since districts are allowed to evaluate highly-performing teachers less often; – districts must allow student, parent, and community comment on teachers; – evaluators must be trained administrators; and – tenured teachers not meeting standards must undergo improvement plan; if unsuccessful contract may not be renewed. <p>Sources: Department of Education & Early Development. (n.d.) <i>Standards for Alaska Teachers</i>. Retrieved from http://www.eed.state.ak.us/standards/pdf/teacher.pdf</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>Department of Education & Early Development. (n.d.) <i>Evaluation handbook for professional Alaska (HB 465) educators</i>. Retrieved from http://www.eed.state.ak.us/evaluationhandbook.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education (SBE) required to adopt a model framework for a teacher and principal evaluation instrument by December 15, 2011. • Model is to include quantitative data on student academic progress, accounting for 33-50% of the evaluation outcomes and best practices for professional development and evaluator training. • Beginning 2012-2013 districts and charter schools must use an SBE-approved instrument for annual evaluation of teachers/ principals. <p>Sources: Teacher and Principal Evaluations, 15 Ariz. Rev. Stat. §297 (2010) [S.B. 1040]. Retrieved from http://www.azleg.gov/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/legtext/49leg/2r/laws/0297.htm</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: B • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/ subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated on an annual basis. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts required to evaluate teachers but little specific guidance at state level. • Teacher Evaluation Task Force recommends consistent model. <p>Sources: Arkansas Department of Education. (n.d.) <i>Rules for teacher evaluation</i>. Retrieved from http://arkansased.org/educators/pdf/tf_rules_062504.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 1 authorizes districts to use data in the California Education Information System and/or any other data system to evaluate teachers and administrators and to make employment decisions but only if these decisions comply with existing code (Title 1, Division 4, Chapter 10.7 §3540). <p>Sources: S.B. 1, Ch. 2, 5th Ex. Session (Cal. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sbx5_1_bill_20100107_chaptered.pdf National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: B- • Best Practice State in 5-A Licensure Loopholes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education (SBE) and districts required to develop teacher evaluation system by 2013–14 in which at least 50% of the evaluation is determined by the academic growth of the teacher's students. • Evaluation system must include multiple measures of student performance in conjunction with student growth expectations. • At least 50% of a principal's evaluation is to be based on the academic growth of students and the effectiveness or improvement in the effectiveness of his/her teachers. • Expectations of student academic growth must take diverse factors into consideration, including student mobility, special education status and classrooms in which 95% of the student population meets the statutory definition of "high-risk student". • Definition of "effectiveness" is to be standardized by a newly-formed Governor's Council for Educator Effectiveness; state board to adopt rules based on the definition by September 2011. • Executive order establishes Council for Educator Effectiveness to provide a forum for considering options and providing recommendations to ensure that every educator (teachers and principals) is:

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – evaluated using multiple, fair, transparent, timely, rigorous, and valid methods, at least 50% of which is determined by the academic growth of their students; – afforded meaningful opportunity to improve their effectiveness; and – provided means to share effective practices with educators statewide. <p>Sources: S.B. 191, 67th General Assembly, 2d Reg. Sess (Col. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics/clics2010a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/EF2EBB67D47342CF872576A80027B078?open&file=191_enr.pdf Col. Exec. Order No. B 2010-001 (2010, January 13). Retrieved from http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheader=application%2Fpdf&blobheadername1=Content-Disposition&blobheadername2=MDT-Ty pe&blobheadervalue1=inline%3B+filename%3D780%2F593%2FB+2010-001+%28RTT%29+Search.pdf&blobheadervalue2=abinary%3B+charset%3DUTF-8&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1251606172565&ssbinary=true National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C • Expanding the Teaching Pool: B- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: F • Exiting Ineffective Teachers –C- • Best Practice State in 1-C Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction • Best Practice State in 2-A Alternate Route Eligibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Department of Education (SBE) directed to expand the state-wide public school information system on or before July 1, 2013 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – track and report data relating to student, teacher and school and district performance growth and make such information available to local and regional boards of education for use in evaluating educational performance and growth of teachers and students enrolled in public schools in the state; – collect data relating to student enrollment in and graduation from institutions of higher education for any student who had been assigned a unique student identifier, provided such data is available; and – develop means for access to and data sharing with the data systems of public institutions of higher education in the state. (Sec. 3) • SBE directed to adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation program on or before July 1, 2013.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines must provide guidance on the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth in teacher evaluations and include but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> methods for assessing student academic growth; a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system; and minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures. (Sec. 4) Performance Evaluation Advisory-Council established within SBC is responsible for assisting SBE in the development and implementation of the teacher evaluation guidelines and for the data collection and evaluation support system (Sec. 5). <p>Sources: PA 10-111, §§ 3-5 (Conn. 2010) Retrieved from http://www.cgactgov/2010/ACT/Pa/pdf/2010PA-00111-R00SB-00438-PA.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: F Expanding the Teaching Pool: C+ Identifying Effective Teachers: D Retaining Effective Teachers: C- Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D Best Practice State in 4-G Pension Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation with the Delaware Performance Appraisal System II (DPAS II) is required at least yearly. DPAS II must include measures of student improvement, including off-grade assessment if available. Local school boards may administer additional assessments or evaluations. Evaluation considers Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, Professional Responsibilities, and Student Improvement. Process includes classroom observations, pre- and post-observation conferences, and goal-setting. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> define "highly effective" and "effective" based on student growth; use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs;

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use teacher ratings to identify coaches/mentors for developing teachers; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources: Del. Code tit. 14, §§ 1270–1275 (2011). Retrieved from http://delcode.delaware.gov/title14/c012/sc07/index.shtml Delaware Department of Education. (2008, August). <i>Guide for Teachers: DPAS II Delaware Performance Appraisal System</i>. Retrieved from http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/ti/dpasII_TeachDPASIIGuide.pdf National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/ Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
District of Columbia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: D- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IMPACT teacher assessment system evaluates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – individual value-added student data (50% of score when before and after test DC CAS scores are available [currently reading and math in grades 4–8]); – school value-added student data; – teaching and learning framework; – core professionalism; and – commitment to the school community. • When DC CAS scores are unavailable, the TLF component is weighted more heavily and teacher-assessed improvement as determined through other tests are used. • Evaluation normally includes three observations by an administrator and two by a Master Educator (content expert); all but the first will be unannounced; feedback follows; consistent date ranges are specified for each observation. • Final rating affects teacher compensation and employment.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 50% of teacher evaluation to student growth scores; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources: District of Columbia Public Schools. (2010). <i>Impact: The District of Columbia public schools effectiveness assessment system for school-based personnel 2010–2011</i>. Retrieved from http://www.dc.gov/DCPS/Files/downloads/TEACHING%20&%20LEARNING/IMPACT/IMPACT%20Guide-books%202010-2011/DCPS-IMPACT-Group1-Guidebook-August-2010.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C • Expanding the Teaching Pool: B- • Identifying Effective Teachers: C- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C • Best Practice State in 3-A Evaluation of Effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida's Task Force on Excellent Teaching was established to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – review performance appraisal systems and teacher certification systems; – identify initiatives and strategies that honor Florida's quality teachers for dedicating their careers to teaching; – examine the positive impact teachers have on the state's ability to compete in a global economy; – identify methods for establishing differential and performance-based merit pay for classroom teachers; – develop workable measures of student learning gains, including special education students; – formulate strategies for identifying and dealing with low-performing teachers; and – identify successful strategies and initiatives for improving the recruitment, development and retention of quality teachers by:

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reviewing teacher preparation programs; • identifying linkages between teacher merit and student learning; • identifying effective peer-delivered professional development and support and the essential components of new teacher support programs; • identifying, disseminating and replicating effective teaching practices, including strategies for teachers to collaborate; • identifying technologies proven to support teacher productivity, efficiency and effectiveness; • identifying effective working conditions to retain beginning teachers; • examining compensation, benefits and incentive issues; and • examining options to define, recognize and reward effective teachers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Force was directed to provide recommendations by December 2010 to the governor, president of the senate, speaker of the house and State Board of Education that address the goals and objectives of the task force and changes to statute and administrative rule. • Task force must continue in existence until its objectives are achieved but no later than June 2011, unless extended by a subsequent executive order. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 50% of teacher evaluation to student growth scores; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; and • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation. <p>Sources: Flor. Exec. Order No. 10-126 (2010, June 14). Retrieved from http://www.fsba.org/userfiles/File/Executive_Order_Number_10_126.pdf Colodny, Fass, Talenfeld, Karlinsky & Abate. (2010, Sept. 9). Governor Crist appoints education stakeholders to Florida's Task Force on Educational Excellence. <i>Capital to Courthouse Headliners</i>. Retrieved from http://www.cftlawnews.com/index.php?cmd=article&rid=5827</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: B- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C • Best Practice State in 1-E Middle School Teacher Preparation • Best Practice State in 4-E Differential Pay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently developing a Teacher Effectiveness Measure (TEM), a Leader Effectiveness Measure (LEM), and a District Effectiveness Measure (DEM). • The TEM and LEM have four key components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – teacher evaluation system including rubric-based evaluation tool based on Classroom Analysis of State Standards (CLASS) Keys; – value-added student test scores for teachers in tested subjects; – reduction of student achievement gaps; and – other quantitative measures to be developed in collaboration with participating local education agencies. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 50% of teacher evaluation to student growth scores; • define “highly effective” and “effective” based on student growth; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • Will use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources:</p> <p>Learning Point Associates. (2010, May). <i>Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: Emerging Trends Reflected in the State Phase 1 Race to the Top Applications</i>. Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/RttT_Teacher_Evaluation.pdf</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New teachers and those with unsatisfactory ratings are evaluated yearly; satisfactory tenured teachers are evaluated every 5 years. • Evaluators have flexibility in terms of specific requirements. • The results affect employment. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 50% of teacher evaluation to multiple measures of student growth; • plan to phase in use of student growth model; • define "highly effective" and "effective" based on student achievement and growth; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources:</p> <p>Professional Evaluation Program for Teachers (PEPT). Retrieved from http://sp.k12.hi.us/pdf/atc5602manual.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: D+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts required to develop own instruments and procedures for evaluation based on common standards; plans must be approved by the state DOE. • Classroom observation should be included. <p>Sources: State of Hawaii Department of Education. (2010, November). <i>Professional evaluation program for teachers (PEP-T): Manual for evaluators and participants</i>. Retrieved from http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/teacherEval/implementationGuidelines.htm</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: B- • Best Practice State in 5-B Unsatisfactory Evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 mandates comprehensive change in evaluation of school leaders. • Principals are to be evaluated at least once a year and rated as "excellent," "proficient," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory." • Written evaluation must consider specific duties and competence as a principal, identify strengths and weaknesses, and align with research-based standards to be established by administrative rule. • ISBE is to adopt rules incorporating student growth as 60% of performance rating. • Teachers are to be rated "excellent," "proficient," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory." • Teachers rated "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" are to be evaluated at least once a year; professional development plan required for teachers rated "needs improvement" and remediation plan for those rated "unsatisfactory." • Indicators of student growth as a factor of teacher evaluation are excluded as topic of mandatory bargaining. • Evaluators are to be pre-qualified and receiving training.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School boards barred from seeking waivers or modification of evaluation mandates. • ISBE directed to develop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a system to annually collect and publish data by district and school on teacher/administrator evaluation; – a teacher and principal model evaluation template that districts can customize and does not conflict with statutory requirements; – evaluator pre-qualification and training programs based on the model teacher evaluation template; – a superintendent training program based on the model principal evaluation template; – one or more instruments to provide feedback to principals on the school's instructional environment; – a technical assistance system that supports district implementation of teacher/principal evaluation systems; – web-based systems and tools supporting implementation of the templates and evaluator pre-qualification and training; – a process for measuring and reporting correlations between local principal/teacher evaluations and (1) student growth in tested grades and subjects and (2) teacher retention rates; – superintendent training and other support; and – a process for assessing district evaluation systems and a research-based study of district evaluation to be completed by September 2014. • Any alternative provisions established by districts and collective bargaining agents must include provisions whereby student performance data is a significant factor in teacher evaluation and teachers are rated as either "excellent," "proficient," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory." • State policy (2007) requires evaluations to describe teacher standards, include classroom observation, and consider attendance and content competency. • Evaluators required to attend training and teachers to be evaluated from every 30 days (for probationary teachers) to every two years (tenured teachers).

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting requirements specified; teacher evaluations affect employment decisions; and teachers receiving poor evaluations enter remediation plans. <p>Sources: Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010, S.B. 315, 96th Gen. Assem. (Ill. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/96/PDF/096-0861.pdf</p> National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i> . Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/ Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of teachers based on state standardized test scores are prohibited but evaluation plan to be consistent with state academic standards and student improvement levels. • Principals must conduct or provide evaluation. • Evaluations may be used in making employment decisions. • Procedures for reporting results and teacher grievances are specified. <p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts required to form Teacher Quality Committees to ensure that state teacher evaluation standards are followed. • Tenured teachers are evaluated every three years; beginning teachers by the end of their second year. • Evaluations are conducted by licensed administrators. • Teachers and evaluators develop individual professional development plans. • Multiple sources for evaluation are used, including classroom observations, state standards, progress toward individual professional development plans, and documentation from others. • Districts are required to use uniform evaluation tools. • Teachers receiving poor evaluations must participate in intensive assistance or remediation. • Positive evaluations are linked to career advancement/tenure. <p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kansas Educator Evaluation Project developing an evaluation instrument for voluntary adoption by school districts. • Local school boards, school administrators and teachers are charged with developing a school district's teacher evaluation instrument. • New teachers required to be formally evaluated twice a year, teachers in their 3rd and 4th years annually, and after the 4th year once every three years.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New teachers have a three-year probationary period. • Teachers must complete the Kansas Performance Assessment to advance from the initial to professional license. • A year-long, district-administered induction and mentoring program is a prerequisite for the professional license. <p>Sources: Kansas Educator Evaluation Project Retrieved from http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=4400 National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts are currently required to establish KDE-approved formative and summative evaluations, including open classroom observation and post-observation discussion. • Evaluations are conducted by immediate supervisor and with optional assistance from administrative personnel. • Primary evaluations must receive district training and KDE approval. • The teachers may request additional observation; multiple observations are conducted for tenured teachers rated unsatisfactory. • Evaluation system includes professional growth plan, aligned to goals and objectives of school improvement plan to be reviewed annually. • Evaluations occur yearly for non-tenured and minimally every three years for tenured teachers. • Teachers may appeal to KDE when districts are not properly implementing evaluation plans. • New evaluation system is being phased in based on research, field testing, and validity/reliability studies. • Rubric is to encompass instructional practices, learning environment, and leadership/professionalism. • To be approved, district evaluation systems must meet same expectations and validity/reliability standards as the state system.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During phased implementation tools cannot be used to make personnel decisions. <p>Sources: <i>Teacher and Principal Growth and Evaluation System: Phase I Implementation.</i> KASA Conference, July 22, 2010. Retrieved from http://educationcabinet.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/565B939D-C3F9-4A9F-A3F0-F6E196072F4D/0/KASATPEffectiveness-Presentation.pdf 704 Ky. Admin. Regs. 3:345. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.lrc.ky.gov/kar/704/003/345.htm National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.B. 1033 mandates adoption of a value-added assessment model by 2012–13 school year. • Teacher and administrator evaluation are linked to student growth; teachers are to be evaluated annually. • Student growth is to count for 50% of teacher evaluation; remainder to be based on principal observations, peer reviews, and other indicators. <p>Sources: H.B. 1033 [Act 54], 2010 Reg. Sess. (La. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.legis.state.la.us/billdata/streamdocument.asp?did=711248 National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: F • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 704 directs education department to establish evaluation models for teachers and principals. • Models must include multiple measures. • Districts may select and incorporate one or more models but if student assessments included in teacher evaluations a state-developed model must be used. • Models are to be reviewed and approved by specified stakeholder groups by July 1, 2011.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>Sources: An Act To Encourage the Use of Models in the Collection and Use of Student Achievement Data, S.B. 704, 124th Leg., 2d Reg. Sess. (Me. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/bills/bills_124th/chapters/PUBLIC646.asp</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Act permits county boards to suspend or dismiss teachers, principals, and other personnel for cause. • Certificated employees are to have 3 year probationary period. • County boards must annually evaluate non-tenured teachers based on established performance criteria. • Teachers not on track to qualify for tenure are to be assigned a mentor and prove professional development. • Evaluation of teachers and principals must include student growth data as a significant component <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 50% of teacher evaluation to student growth scores; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify coaches/mentors for developing teachers; and • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation. <p>Sources: Education Reform Act of 2010, H.B. 1263, 2010 Reg. Sess. (Md. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://mlis.state.md.us/2010rs/chapters_noln/Ch_189_hb1263E.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: D+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D • Best Practice State in 1-C Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction • Best Practice State in 1-D Teacher Preparation in Mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy specifies teacher evaluation performed by school committee. • Teachers without professional status are evaluated at least once a year and teachers with professional status once every two years. • Trained evaluators use multiple including observation and documentation. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan to phase in student growth model; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings to identify coaches/mentors for developing teachers; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources:</p> <p>603 Code Mass., Reg. 35. Retrieved January 20, 2011 from http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=all</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policy requires two evaluations for beginning/probationary teachers at least 60 days apart including classroom observation and documentation from evaluators, teachers, parents, and students. • Criteria include assessment of progress toward individual development plan. • Poor evaluations result in intervention plans.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 926 establishes Center for Educational Performance and Information, which will create a teacher identifier system that matches individual teachers and students (Sec. 94a[1][i]). • System will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – make accessible annual state assessment records of individual pupils; – enable correlation of individual pupil achievement data to each teacher who has taught the pupil; and – give local board members, teachers and school administrators access data. • S.B. 981 (part of Michigan's Race to the Top legislation) directs local school boards, working with teachers and school administrators, to implement a performance evaluation system that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – evaluates teacher and administrator job performance at least once a year; – uses clear approaches to measuring student growth and provides teachers/administrators with student growth data; – evaluates teachers/administrators using multiple categories with student growth a "significant factor"; – gives teachers/administrators opportunities for improvement; and – uses evaluations to inform promotion, retention, and development. <p>Sources: Mich. Comp. Laws §380.1249 (2011). Retrieved from http://www.legislature.mi.gov/S(23mxag554ep4sn55sdgect45))/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-380-1249</p> <p>S.B. 926, 95th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Mich. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2009-2010/publicact/htm/2009-PA-0203.htm</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.F. 2899 requires Board of Teaching and the DOE to share educational summary data for purposes of program approval, including targeted redesign of teacher preparation programs, improvement of teacher education, and improvement of education administration. • Beginning teachers are evaluated three times a year for first three years • Mandatory peer review is required for non-tenured teachers (usually principal). • Districts voluntarily participate in Quality Compensation for Teachers program, which links teacher evaluations to pay; includes multiple evaluations per year against Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice; and uses instructional observations as well as standards-based assessments. <p>Sources: H.F. 2899, 86th Leg. Sess., Reg. Sess. (Minn. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bin/bldbill.php?bill=H2899.5.html&session=ls86</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs</p>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C • Best Practice State in 5-A Licensure Loopholes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local districts are required to evaluate teachers using the Mississippi Teacher Appraisal System instrument, which measures success in meeting the state's Teacher Performance Standards, but the number of times new teachers or non-probationary teachers receive evaluations is not mandated. • Evidence of student learning is not preponderant criterion.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12-month probationary period exists for new teachers who receive mentoring. • Four renewable certifications are offered that are all valid for five years. • Only teachers at "Priority Schools" who receive unsatisfactory evaluation are placed on improvement plans and eligible for dismissal. <p>Sources: Mississippi Department of Education. Bassham, Judy, French, Russell, Maio, George. (2003, June). <i>Mississippi teacher appraisal system training materials</i>. Retrieved from http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/ACAD/ist/evaluation_instruments/Teacher_Appraisal_Training_Materials.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local districts formulate performance-based teacher evaluation instruments; state provides comprehensive guidelines including descriptors of the performance standards and model evaluation forms. • Five-year probationary period for new teachers. • New teachers are formally evaluated once a year, including a minimum of one scheduled and two unscheduled observations; tenured teachers are evaluated once every five years. • Teachers advance from the Initial Professional Classification to the Career Continuous Professional Classification through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – completion of four years of teaching; – implementation of a professional development plan consisting of at least 30 contact hours and clearly stated goals for improvement and enrichment; – participation in a mentoring program for two school years; – participation in a beginning teacher assistance program; and – participation in the district's performance-based teacher evaluations. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D- • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No state policy in place regarding teacher evaluations. • Three-year probationary period are required for new teachers. • Two renewable certifications offered that are valid for five years: Class 2 Standard Teacher's license requires bachelor's degree and completion of an educator preparation program; and Class 1 Professional Teacher's license requires a master's degree and three years' teaching experience. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts evaluation instruments are based on state criteria and approved by the state; evaluations must include professional and personal conduct, classroom management and organization, and instructional performance. • Three-year probationary period in place for new teachers. • Induction required of new teachers and evaluation at least twice a year; probationary teachers are evaluated once a semester. • Lacks efficient termination process for ineffective teachers. • Districts are required to inform the state of the frequency of teacher evaluations for permanent teachers but frequency is not mandated. <p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>2009 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: Nebraska</i>. Author: New York and Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/reports/stpy_nebraska.pdf National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Nevada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 2 mandates creation of automated system of accountability information with capacity to correlate pupils and teachers and requires districts to provide individual pupil data • Permits use of pupil achievement data for the evaluation and discipline of teachers, paraprofessionals, and

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>others authorized, however this data must not be the sole criterion</p> <p>Sources: S.B. 2, 26th Spec. Sess. (Nev. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://www.leg.state.nv.us/26th2010Special/Bills/SB/SB2_EN.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: D- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local boards set policies for teacher evaluations without state guidance; does not require use of evidence of student learning. • Schools principals have the responsibility to conduct these personnel evaluations. • State does not specify number of times new teachers or non-probationary teachers are evaluated; no policy regarding teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations. • Three-year probationary period in place for new teachers. • Teachers can advance from Beginning to Experienced Educator Certificate after three years of teaching experience. • State has implemented online Educator Information System to enable teachers to renew certification (see http://www.education.nh.gov/certification/eis.htm). <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: B- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ • Best Practice State in 5-A Licensure Loopholes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Order creates New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force for School and District-level Education Professionals to develop recommendations by March 1, 2011 for measuring teacher/leader effectiveness including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – identified measures of student achievement representing at least 50% of evaluation; – demonstrated best practices comprising the remaining basis for evaluation; and – assigning weights to different best practice measures. <p>Sources: N.J. Exec. Order 42 No. 42 (2010, September 28). Retrieved from http://www.state.nj.us/governor/news/news/552010/pdf/EO-42.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: C- • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: B- • Best Practice State in 3-E Licensure Advancement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 111 mandates PED to adopt highly objective annual evaluation standards for licensed school employees. • Teacher professional development plan to be developed at beginning of each school year; must document how teachers who receive professional development incorporates training into classroom. • Evaluation based on principal observation of classroom practice and implementation of development plan; principals to receive department-approved training every two years to improve evaluation, administrative, and instructional leadership skills. • Teachers rating less than satisfactory may be required to undergo peer intervention, including mentoring; those who do not improve may be terminated. <p>Sources: S.B. 111, 2010 Leg., Reg. Sess. (N.M. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://nmlegis.gov/Sessions/10%20Regular/final/SB0111.pdf.</p> <p>H.B. 71, 2010 Leg., Reg. Sess. (N.M. 2010) (enacted) http://nmlegis.gov/Sessions/10%20Regular/final/HB0071.pdf</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i> . Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/
New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D • Best Practice State in 4-G Pension Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education department regulations for annual professional performance review amended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Districts and Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) to include student growth as mandatory criteria when evaluating teachers (defined as positive change in achievement between at least two points in time taking into consideration pupil abilities/disabilities); – Districts and BOCES to use “highly effective,” “effective,” “developing,” and “ineffective” as rating categories; – Districts and BOCES to provide timely and constructive feedback to teachers in professional performance review plans (variance granted when in conflict with collecting bargaining agreements); and – Previous requirement to report efforts to address unsatisfactorily rated teachers eliminated. • A. 11171 was enacted in 2010 to establish phase-in of comprehensive evaluation system for teacher/principal annual professional performance reviews (APPRs). • Evaluations to generate a single composite effectiveness score based on multiple measures and be a significant factor in employment decisions and teacher/principal professional development (including coaching, induction support and differentiated professional development). • As the requirements are phased in evaluations will be required to base 40% of the score on student achievement measures, with the percentage of the 40% based on student growth, increasing as state implements a value-added growth model. • An advisory committee will receive input from practitioners' field as standards are developed for teachers of subjects for which there are no state assessments for multiple years (and their principals).

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D+ • Identifying Effective Teachers: C- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D • Best Practice State in 4-B Compensation for Prior Work Experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers are evaluated based on five standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – demonstrates leadership; – establishes a respectful environment for diverse students; – knows content; and – facilitates learning for students and reflects on practice. • In addition to observation, evaluators may use other relevant sources of performance evidence such as lesson plans, formative assessments and student work. • Probationary teachers are evaluated once a year and new teachers are to be observed three times, with a post-observation conference scheduled after each evaluation; probationary teachers must receive “proficient” rating on all five standards to be recommended for career status, tenure, and licensure advancement. • Certain categories of tenured teachers are evaluated less frequently. • Four-year probationary period in place for new teachers. • Advancement from the initial license to continuing license requires participation in three-year induction period, which includes mentor support and evaluations. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • define “highly effective” and “effective” based on student growth; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>2009 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: Nebraska</i>. Author: New York and Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/reports/stpy_nebraska.pdf Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts conduct teacher evaluations; state does not specify content of the evaluation. • New teachers are evaluated twice a year; non-probationary teachers are evaluated annually. • Two-year probationary period for new teachers. • Advancement from Initial to regular Five-year Renewal license required 18 months of teaching and completion of four semester hours of re-education credit. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: C- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/ subject and state assessment results. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/ rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations are performed by licensed administrators; evaluators must observe teacher for at least two 30-minute periods per evaluation. • Multiple (unspecified) measures used. • Beginning teachers evaluated twice annually. • Evaluation reporting requirements are specified; poor performance may result in termination. • Currently working to extend programs for mentoring of administrators (Ohio Principal Evaluation System) to teacher evaluation. • Educator Standards Board has developed career ladder model on teacher quality. • Some districts establishing new teacher mentoring programs, including formative assessments. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan to phase in student growth model; • define "highly effective" and "effective" based on student growth; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i> . Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D+ • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ • Best Practice State in 3-C Frequency of Evaluations • Best Practice State in 5-B Unsatisfactory Evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 2003 directs State Board of Education (SBE) to establish the Oklahoma Teacher and Leader Effectiveness System (TLE) by end of 2011, a statewide assessment system based on quantitative and qualitative components, requiring remediation plans and coaching for teachers needing improvement. • Districts are authorized to implement pay plans rewarding teachers, principals, assistant principals, and others responsible for supervising teachers. • Annual evaluations conducted by principal, assistant principal, or other trained-certified individual are assigned by district boards using five-tier rating system: "superior," "highly effective," "effective," "needs improvement," and "ineffective." • Local boards to establish evaluation policy no later than the 2013-14 school year based on SBE criteria. • Procedures are specified for termination of teachers and leaders receiving "ineffective" ratings.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>Sources: S.B. 2003, 52nd Leg., 2d Sess. (Okla. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://sde.state.ok.us/Law/Legis/RBletters/2010/Bill/SB2033.pdf</p> <p>Garrett, Sandy. (2010, July 7) .“Red Banner” letter to District Superintendents. Retrieved from http://sde.state.ok.us/Law/Legis/RBletters/2010/Letter/SB2033.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: F • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: D+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts formulate evaluation instruments based on district performance standards and goals. • Improvement plans required for teachers receiving unsatisfactory evaluations but termination not addressed; evidence of student learning not a preponderant criterion. • Three-year probation in place for new teachers, who are evaluated annually and observed twice annually; frequency of evaluation of non-probationary teachers is not specified (9 Or. Rev. Stat. §342.850 [2009]). • Once teachers complete the requirements of the initial certification they may advance to a continuing certification if they earn a master's degree or higher, have taught five years of at least half time or more, and demonstrate minimum competencies, knowledge, and skills by completing one of five options, which include certification by the NBPTS or a commission-approved professional assessment. <p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D+ • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts conduct teacher evaluations using uniform, state-designed ratings assessing four domains: personality, preparation, technique, and pupil reaction. • Three-year probationary period in place for new teachers who are evaluated twice a year; tenured teachers are evaluated annually.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To advance from an Instructional I certification to an Instructional II certification, teachers must complete a department-approved induction program, three years of teaching, and 24 credit hours of collegiate study. • Evidence of student learning is not a preponderant criterion. • Teachers receiving two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations are eligible for dismissal; structured improvement plans are not specified (22 Pa. Code §351.26 [2010]). <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rhode Island Educator Evaluation System Standards were adopted December 2009. • Evaluation rubric is under development; it is to be based primarily on student growth and achievement. • District-based educator evaluation systems must adopt state-provided educator evaluation system or a system that meets state standards. • Districts must ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of ratings; engage principals and teachers in ongoing evaluation system development; and use evaluation results to inform "key human capital decision." <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 51% of teacher evaluation to student growth scores; • plan to phase in student growth model; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>Sources: Rhode Island Department of Education. (2009, December 3). <i>Rhode Island Educator Evaluation System Standards</i>. Retrieved from http://www.ride.ri.gov/EducatorQuality/DOCS/General_Documents/PDF/Educator%20Evaluation%20Standards%20Posted.pdf</p> <p>Rhode Island Department of Education. <i>Rhode Island Educator Evaluation System Standards Rubric</i> [working draft]. (2010, February 24). Retrieved from http://www.ride.ri.gov/educatorquality/DOCS/General_Documents/PDF/Educator%20Evaluation%20Rubric%20final%20posted%202%2024%2010.pdf</p> <p>Learning Point Associates. (2010, May). <i>Evaluating teacher effectiveness: Emerging trends reflected in the state Phase 1 Race to the Top applications</i>. Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/RttT_Teacher_Evaluation.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: C • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C+ • Best Practice State in 4-A Induction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts use statewide evaluation system (ADEPT) to measure teacher success or an equivalent, state-approved instrument. • Two-year probationary period in place for new teachers; formal evaluation twice a year; requires new teacher induction. • Districts determine frequency and type of formal evaluation for non-probationary teachers. • Evidence of student learning is preponderant criterion in teacher evaluation; performance pay initiative is supported. • After completing Initial Certificate, teachers may advance through five-tiered Professional Certificate. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C- • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 24 requires Board of Education to establish professional performance standards for certified teachers and best practices for teacher evaluation to be used by districts. • Certified teachers are to be evaluated annually for first three years and every other year beyond. • Districts are to employ multiple measures in evaluation and provide plan of assistance for teachers in fourth year or later whose performance does not meet district standards. <p>Sources: An Act to Establish Standards for Teaching, to Require Teacher Evaluations, and to Provide for the Development of a Model Evaluation Instrument, S.B. 24, 2010 Leg. Sess. (S.D. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2010/Bills/SB24ENR.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: B- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: C • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F • Best Practice State in 3-A State Data Systems • Best Practice State in 4-E Performance Pay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.B. 7005–H.B. 7010 authorizes Commissioner of Education to assign “persistently lowest achieving” schools and local education agencies (LEA) to an “Achievement School District” (ASD) and to contract with an individual, government entity, or nonprofit entity to manage day-to-day operations. • ASD administrators may apply for waivers of any state rule that hinders the ability to meet adequate yearly progress. • Administrator may determine whether any teacher previously assigned to a school in the ASD will continue teaching at that school. • Schools or LEAs are to remain in ASD until achieving AYP for three consecutive years. • Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC) is to develop and recommend guidelines for annual evaluation of teachers and principals, including a grievance procedure.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student achievement data must make up 50% of evaluation criteria, with 35% on student growth and 15% on other measures of achievement. • Tenured teachers may request hearing prior to termination. <p>The RTT Funded State will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attribute 50% of teacher evaluation to student growth scores; • use teacher ratings in granting tenure status for new teachers; • use teacher ratings to identify professional development needs; • use teacher ratings to identify coaches/mentors for developing teachers; • use teacher ratings for differentiated compensation; and • use teacher ratings for termination of ineffective teachers. <p>Sources: Tennessee First to the Top Act of 2010, S.B. 7005–H.B. 7010, 106th Gen. Assem., 1st Ex. Sess. (Tenn. 2010) (enacted). Retrieved from http://tn.gov/sos/acts/106/pub/pc0002EOS.pdf</p> <p>National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). <i>Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)</i>. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.</p>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C • Expanding the Teaching Pool: B- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C- • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows local districts to use a teacher evaluation instrument designed by the state or one designed by the district that the state approves. • Student performance is a necessary criterion for teacher evaluation. • Requires new teachers to be formally evaluated at least once a year; non-probationary teachers are evaluated annually, however, in some cases they may be evaluated at least once every five years.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-year probationary period for new teachers may be extended by the local board to four years. • Single-tier Standard Certificate is valid for five years; renewal required 150 clock hours of continuing professional education. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USOE is in process of incorporating value-added models in revised teaching standards and guidelines for evaluating principals. • H.B. 264 requires local school boards to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – develop educator evaluation programs; evaluate provisional and probationary educators at least twice annually; and provide ongoing evaluation of career educators; – base evaluation on multiple lines of evidence including self-evaluation, student and parent input, peer observation, supervisor observation, evidence of professional growth, student achievement data, and other indicators; – provide educators rated inadequate or in need of improvement a written plan of action and reasonable assistance to improve; and – assign trained mentors for provisional educators appointed by principal or immediate supervisor. • To date, state office has not made value-added scores for teachers publicly available due to software costs. • Optional "career ladder" program uses student progress as a factor in teacher evaluation and compensation. • New teachers are evaluated twice a year; after three-year probation teachers are evaluated every three to five years. • To advance from a Level 1 license to a Level 2 license, teachers must work with a mentor for three years, undergo a portfolio review, satisfy district/school evaluations, achieve a score of 160 or higher on the Praxis II in educational preparation, and

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>be NCLB highly qualified in at least one license area or endorsement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one of the state's five largest districts currently factors in student achievement data when rating teachers. <p>Sources: Educator Evaluation Amendments, H.B. 264S01, 2009 Gen. Sess. (Utah 2009) (enacted). Retrieved from http://le.utah.gov/~2009/bills/hbillint/hb0264s01.pdf Winter, Rosemary. (2010, December 30, updated 2001, Jan. 1). How best to grade Utah's teachers? <i>Salt Lake Tribune</i>. Retrieved January 19, 2011 from http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/home/50919414-76/teachers-teacher-student-data.html.csp?page=1 National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D- • Identifying Effective Teachers: F • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not require instructional effectiveness to be the <i>preponderant</i> criterion of any teacher evaluation. • Requires local school districts to evaluate school personnel but provides little guidance on content of evaluations. • Does not address the number of times new teachers or non-probationary teachers must be evaluated. • Has a two-year probationary period for new teachers. • Lacks an efficient termination process for ineffective teachers. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ • Best Practice State in 1-C Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • Teacher evaluation is tied to student achievement. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not require instructional effectiveness to be the <i>preponderant</i> criterion of any teacher evaluation. • Districts develop the teacher evaluation instrument. • New teachers formally evaluated once a year but no guidelines are provided on when evaluations should occur. • Non-probationary teachers are evaluated at least once every three years.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-year probationary period for new teachers. • Initial Collegiate Professional license is valid for five years; renewal required completion of 180 professional development points based on an individualized professional development plan. • Lacks efficient termination process for ineffective teachers; does not articulate consequences for teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D+ • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not require instructional effectiveness to be the <i>preponderant</i> criterion of any teacher evaluation. • Districts develop teacher evaluation instruments to assess instructional skills, classroom management, and effort toward improvement, among other domains. • New teachers receive two or more observations annually; non-probationary teachers are evaluated annually. • Two-year probationary period in place for new teachers but no process in place for evaluating cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness required for tenure. • Tenured teachers who move to another district have one year probation before becoming eligible for renewed tenure. • To advance from a Residency to a Professional Certificate, teachers are required to successfully complete a state-approved professional certificate program unless they hold an NBPTS Certificate. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: C- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: C • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: C- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • State publishes pass rates/rankings of teacher-preparation institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not require instructional effectiveness to be the <i>preponderant</i> criterion of any teacher evaluation. • Requires districts are to observe teachers in the classroom and evaluate them on classroom climate, instructional management, student progress, and other criteria. • Three-year probationary period exists for new teachers but no process for evaluating cumulative evidence of effectiveness when granting tenure. • New teachers are evaluated twice a year; observed in classroom at least three times a year. • Non-probationary 4th and 5th year teachers are evaluated once a year; non-probationary teachers with five+ years are evaluated at supervisor's discretion. • Lacks efficient termination process for ineffective teachers. • Teachers must complete six semester hours of college coursework to advance from Initial to Professional Teaching Certificate. • Permanent Professional Teaching Certificate is offered for teachers with five years' experience and master's degree. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D- • Identifying Effective Teachers: D- • Retaining Effective Teachers: C • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D • Best Practice State in 4-G Pension Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requires all evaluators to receive formal training • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. • Teacher preparation programs are accountable for graduates' performance in classroom setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts are allowed to use own evaluation criteria. • Classroom observation and documentation portfolio are required for new teacher evaluation. • Portfolio assessment and approval are required to move from initial to standard teacher license. • Licensed administrators conduct evaluations. • Tenured teachers are evaluated once every three years; observation is required. • Positive evaluations linked to career advancement/tenure.

State	National Council on Teacher Quality 2009 Survey Ratings	Education Week's Quality Counts 2010 Indicators	Other Information about State's Teacher Evaluation/Effectiveness Policies
			<p>Sources: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p> <p>Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). <i>State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region</i> (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs</p>
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers: D- • Expanding the Teaching Pool: D • Identifying Effective Teachers: D • Retaining Effective Teachers: D • Exiting Ineffective Teachers: D- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and student records can be matched by course/subject and state assessment results. • Teacher evaluation occurs on an annual basis. • State requires all teachers' performance to be formally evaluated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not require instructional effectiveness to be the <i>preponderant</i> criterion of any teacher evaluation. • Policy regarding teacher evaluation is minimal. • Districts develop teacher evaluation instruments. • New teachers are required to be formally evaluated twice a year but no guidelines are provided on when these evaluations should occur. • Non-probationary teachers are evaluated annually. • Awards tenure virtually automatically. • Employs single-tier teacher certification; in process of researching tiered licensure. <p>Source: National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). <i>State Teacher Policy Yearbook</i>. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/</p>

References

- Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). *State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest region* (REL Technical Brief 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Education Commission of the States. (2010). *2010 State Policies/Activities*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/ecs/ecscat.nsf/Web2010All?OpenView&Start=1&Count=1000&Expand=287#287>
- Education Week (2010). *State of the states: Holding all states to high standards [Quality Counts 2010]*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/01/14/17stateofstates.h29.html>
- National Council on Teacher Quality. (2009). *State Teacher Policy Yearbook*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nctq.org/stpy09/>
- Thomas, Bridget E. et al. (2010). *Teacher evaluation literature review: A paper commissioned by the CCSSO Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.