Indiana Department of Education
SUPPORTING STUDENT SUCCESS

LEGISLATIVE GUIDANCE: RIGOROUS MEASURES

IC 20-28-11.5 Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.

A school corporation's evaluation system must measure teacher effectiveness in a way that truly distinguishes between varying levels of proficiency. "Rigorous measures" are the components that make up a teacher's evaluation. Together, all of the components, or measures, of a teacher's evaluation are combined to make up his or her final rating (highly effective, effective, improvement necessary or ineffective). There are different types of measures that can be considered rigorous for teacher evaluation.

COMMONLY MEASURED AREAS OF EFFECTIVENESS

Types of Measures	Examples of Data Collected for Measures	How are Measures Rated
Student Learning Measures Linked to Individual Teachers	• Growth Model data • Performance on state-, school- or corporation-wide tests • Performance on individual teacher-created tests or projects • Portfolios of students' work or performance	Some measures of student performance, such as growth model data and value added, are statistical models constructed to capture students' learning growth. Because these models typically do not cover all teachers, some evaluation systems also use locally created assessments as a student learning measure. In these instances, corporations, school administrators, and teachers often must agree on a measure of student growth and/or achievement for a teacher to be rated in each of 4 required categories (an example of this is the RISE Student Learning Objective process). Some evaluation systems may include both individual growth model data (where it exists) and performance measures on locally created assessments in an effort to measure a teacher's performance across multiple subjects.

Student Learning Measures Linked to Entire School	• Growth model data aggregated to the school-level • School-level accountability ratings	Evaluation systems may include a school-level measure of student learning in each teacher's evaluation. This measure is intended to bring faculty together in a common mission of helping students achieve. If you choose to use it, the state will provide a rating of 1-4 to use as a school-wide measure to go along with a school's A-F letter grade to ensure alignment across school, principal, and teacher evaluation. Although there are benefits to using a school-wide measure, putting too much weight on this measure can mask a strong teacher's performance in a weak school or a weak teacher's performance in a strong school. It is recommended this measure be used in conjunction with other student learning measures.
Instructional Practice Measures	• Classroom observations • Planning strategies and materials	In most cases, classroom observations and planning materials are mapped or linked back to a rubric clearly defining what performance levels look like in each of several domains and/or competencies. Corporations should ensure ALL teachers receive feedback on their instruction, not simply new or struggling teachers.
Professionalism Measures	• Attendance • Evidence of respect for students, colleagues, and administrators • Evidence of following procedures and policies	Some evaluation systems use a rubric that delineates what professionalism looks like in different competencies across four performance levels. Other systems make professionalism a pass/fail "non-negotiable" measure.
School and Educational Community Measures	• Evidence of involvement in school-wide professional groups • Evidence of meaningful collaboration with colleagues • Evidence of leadership in multiple arenas, including faculty, external professional groups, and student groups (e.g., club sponsor or program creator) • Engagement with parents	Some evaluation systems use a detailed rubric that indicates what school and community participation looks like in different competencies. This includes what an evaluator should see in the classroom or be presented with as evidence. In some places, surveys of parents and students are used to collect evidence of school and community contribution.

Rigorous measures are not limited to those listed above. Measures span a wide gamut, representing the different ways evaluators can collect information on a teacher's practice. Because teaching is complex work, teacher evaluation systems should not rely on a single measure. Instead, multiple measures

should be collected, rated individually on a scale, and then combined to form an overall rating of a teacher's effectiveness.

HOW TO DEMONSTRATE RIGOROUS MEASURES

By using a variety of rigorous measures in an evaluation system, evaluators can be more confident they are gaining enough information to form a comprehensive picture of a particular teacher's practice.

Corporations are encouraged to choose measures that best assess their teachers' practice and are aligned with their mission and educational philosophy. The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality has published a tool to assist in developing teacher evaluation systems entitled A Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems. It has information on research and best practices in developing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems.

In the State's RISE model, for example, "rigorous measures, including observations and other performance indicators" is demonstrated by using a rubric that measures Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Professionalism through classroom observations and conferences as well as multiple measures of student learning such as: Individual Growth Model data, a School-wide Learning Measure (accountability data A-F), and Student Learning Objectives

1.) **Rubric:** The RISE Teacher Effectiveness Rubric distinguishes between teachers across four domains: Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Professionalism. It comprehensively details indicators that evaluators can look for at four different performance levels. In this way, expectations for each level are set in advance, are clearly described, promote objectivity in evaluation, and demand rigorous instruction for student success.

2.) **Observation Frequency:** In RISE, the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric is informed by the evidence collected from multiple observations and conferences. For this practice, evaluators observe teachers five times during the school year at a minimum – two long observations lasting at least 40 minutes and three short observations lasting 10 minutes. Post-conferences must follow both of the longer observations and serve as a time to discuss feedback as well as collect evidence on Planning and Leadership. Observations can also be used as a formative tool to provide feedback to teachers during the year and they can be used to justify final ratings at the end of the evaluation cycle. It was designed such that the more information available and the more diversity amongst the sources of information, the more accurate and reliable the summative evaluation will be.

3.) **Student Learning Measures:** RISE provides a model for how teachers can fit into different groups based on their teaching responsibilities and how student data can be weighted differently to reflect their influence. The model incorporates Individual Growth Model data, a School-wide Learning Measure (accountability data A-F), and Student Learning Objectives into teachers' summative evaluations. Data from the first two sources are provided by the State. Data from the latter are determined locally through a goal-setting process using the best assessments available for each grade/subject.

Lastly, when implementing an evaluation system, it is worth noting the following are not considered rigorous measures of effectiveness:

- **Checklists**
- **Single observations**
- **Announcing an observation on every occasion**
- **Vague or overly general rubric descriptions**
- **Rubrics that focus only on teacher actions and ignore observation of student actions**
- **Using only one source on which to base decisions**