

Initial Policy Recommendations

Indiana State Board of Education Meeting

December 3, 2014

Agenda



Overview of TNTP and our work with Indiana

Overview of initial policy recommendations

Regulatory Recommendations

Legislative Recommendations

TNTP helps public schools, districts and states advance great teaching in four key areas, so teachers thrive and students excel.

OUR GOAL

Great teaching for every student

FOUR PRIORITIES FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION



SUPPLY

strong new
teachers

Train and hire only new teachers who are consistently effective.



GROW

all teachers

Provide feedback and support that helps all teachers improve.



KEEP

top teachers

Ensure successful teachers stay and unsuccessful teachers leave.



REACH

disadvantaged
students

Prioritize great teaching for high-poverty students.

TNTP currently operates in nearly three dozen cities, including many of the nation's largest.



In many of these engagements, we supported districts and states to design, implement and review teacher evaluation systems.

We're excited to continue our partnership with Indiana to make teacher evaluation in Indiana even stronger

- TNTP supported with the design and implementation of RISE in Indiana from 2010-2012, and Indiana's SBOE recently partnered with TNTP again.
- During this engagement, we will assess the state's alignment to national best practices for teacher evaluation and collect stakeholder feedback on implementation challenges.
- Over the next four months, we will work closely with SBOE staff to identify areas where Indiana's teacher evaluation law, regulations and state model can be improved and make the appropriate recommendations to the Board.



Our work will have 3 phases:



Agenda

Overview of TNTP and our work with Indiana



Overview of initial policy recommendations

Regulatory Recommendations

Legislative Recommendations

At the SBOE's request, we have conducted an initial review of the State's evaluation policies to assess where they can be strengthened



These initial recommendations are limited to policies that can be affected through **legislation** or **regulation**. To that end, the purpose of these policy recommendations is to identify ways Indiana can **create the enabling conditions** for successful implementation.



Our recommendations are based on both **national best practices** as well as our **deep experience** supporting states and districts to design and implement evaluation systems.



Many of our recommendations are **contingent on having adequate resources and personnel** at both the state and district levels.



Other implementation suggestions will be included in our **final recommendations** which will be presented to the SBOE at the February 4, 2015 meeting and **will be informed by the stakeholder engagement** efforts that are currently underway.

To limit the level of prescription in statute, we recommend addressing issues through regulation wherever the SBOE has existing authority.

The following recommendations can be addressed through rulemaking:

- Consider defining “significantly inform”
- Provide additional guidance to support the IDOE in its efforts to ensure corporations’ compensation models meet the State’s criteria
- Augment standards for training evaluators
- Ensure the SBOE is familiar with assessment guidance

There are a few opportunities to strengthen the statutory policies governing evaluation.

The following recommendations will likely require legislative action:

- Create structures to ensure consistency of evaluation plans across the state
- Clarify the role of teachers in developing a corporation's modified or locally-created plan
- Clarify the SBOE's role in making changes to the State's model plan
- Address the perceived negative impact of preventing salary increases for teachers rated "Improvement Necessary"
- Support teachers' understanding of their corporation's evaluation plan

Agenda

Overview of TNTP and our work with Indiana

Overview of initial policy recommendations



Regulatory Recommendations

Legislative Recommendations

Consider defining “significantly inform” to ensure a consistent standard of rigor across all corporations.

Provision to address:

- Although state law requires “[o]bjective measures of student achievement and growth to significantly inform” a teacher’s evaluation, the phrase “significantly inform” is not specifically defined.
- This lack of clarity has reportedly resulted in some corporations under-emphasizing objective measures.



Policy changes to consider:

- Set a standard for “significantly inform” that includes minimum and maximum percentages of the summative evaluation rating that must be based on student achievement and growth.
- It may be necessary to provide multiple ranges to address the scenarios in which individual growth model data is not available.

Provide additional guidance to support the IDOE in its efforts to ensure corporations' compensation models meet the State's criteria

Provision to address:

- Although the IDOE is empowered to ensure corporations' compensation models meet the requirements of state law, there are no specifications for the frequency of the IDOE's review, the standards for that review, or the consequences for non-compliance.



Policy changes to consider:

- Establish standards to guide the IDOE's review and approval of corporations' salary schedules
- Specify how frequently salary schedules should be reviewed and when the IDOE should notify the SBOE of any compensation models in need of improvement
- Create a process for indicating whether a salary schedule has been approved and is in compliance with state law when it is published under IC § 20-28-9-1.5(f)
- Base a corporation's eligibility for grants or other funding related to teacher compensation on the status of its compensation model
- Provide a period of time in which a corporation must correct any aspects of its compensation model that do not meet the State's criteria

Augment standards for training evaluators.

Provision to address:

- Several provisions in statute and regulation address the required training for evaluators.
- However, they lack the specificity needed to inform and guide training content and practices.



Policy changes to consider:

- Enable the SBOE to approve the training content, materials and the evaluator assessment tool for the state's model plan.
- If a corporation makes significant changes to its evaluation plan, ensure the corporation trains all evaluators on the changes before the plan goes into effect.

Ensure the SBOE is familiar with assessment guidance.

Provision to address:

- Because of the prominence of locally developed and procured assessments in all evaluation plans, the SBOE should be familiar with the assessment guidance.



Policy changes to consider:

- Create a regular reporting cycle that provides scheduled updates to the SBOE on any changes or additions to assessment guidance.

Agenda

Overview of TNTP and our work with Indiana

Overview of initial policy recommendations

Regulatory Recommendations



Legislative Recommendations

Create structures that ensure consistency of evaluation plans across the state.

Provision to address:

- Currently, there is no *required* review or approval of modified or locally-developed plans.
- As a result, a number of corporations have adopted plans that do not yet comply with the required elements.



Policy changes to consider:

- Distribute the burden of ensuring compliance by having corporations proactively seek approval of modified and locally-created plans before they are formally adopted.
- Use a similar review process if a corporation makes substantive changes to modified or locally-created plans.
- Audit all modified and locally-created plans before the 2015-16 school year to ensure all corporations are held to the same standard of review.
- Periodically review whether corporations are implementing approved plans with fidelity.
- Provide regularly scheduled reports to the SBOE that highlight the status of any unauthorized plans or implementation variations.

Clarify the role of teachers in developing a corporation's modified or locally-created plan.

Provision to address:

- In order to encourage teacher involvement in designing a modified or locally-created plan, current law requires that 75 percent of voting teachers approve of a corporation's modified or locally-created plan.
- However, a vote of approval does not guarantee that teachers have been involved in the design process.



Policy changes to consider:

- Have corporations that do not adopt one of the pre-approved plans adopt structures and processes that involve teachers in the design of locally-created or modified plans.
- Use a similar teacher engagement process whenever a corporation seeks to make changes to its plan.
- Include a review of the corporation's teacher engagement structures in the approval process for locally-created or modified plans to ensure they are thorough and equitable.

Clarify the SBOE's role in making changes to the State's model plan.

Provision to address:

- Current law intends for the SBOE and IDOE to work together to create a model plan.
- However, it is unclear whether the SBOE must be involved in any subsequent changes to the model plan.



Policy changes to consider:

- Clarify whether approval of any substantive changes to the model plan is required before the revised model plan is introduced to corporations.
- Define “substantive changes” so they are limited to major revisions, such as alterations to the types of measures used, the weights of those measures, and content revisions to the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (excluding minor grammatical edits).

Address the perceived negative impact of preventing salary increases for teachers rated “Improvement Necessary.”

Provision to address:

- There is some speculation that preventing teachers rated “Improvement Necessary” from receiving a salary increase may have contributed to the skewed ratings distribution the state recently reported.



Policy changes to consider (we recommend one of the following):

- Allow teachers to be rated “Improvement Necessary” two years in a row or “Improvement Necessary” followed by “Ineffective” before a salary increase is withheld.
- Allow teachers rated “Improvement Necessary” to receive half of the salary increase they could have received had they been rated “Effective.” Limit their ability to receive this reduced salary increase to two consecutive years.
- Allow teachers rated “Improvement Necessary” to apply for a waiver from the condition that they not be given a salary increase. The waiver can be granted if the teacher demonstrates extraordinary circumstances impacted his or her ability to perform at a level worthy of an “Effective” rating. The SBOE should set standards and processes for reviewing and approving waiver applications.

Support teachers' understanding of their corporation's evaluation plan.

Provision to address:

- There is no explicit requirement that teachers be trained on their corporation's evaluation plan.



Policy changes to consider:

- Amend state statute to require:
 - All teachers be trained on their corporation's plan.
 - The SBOE to set standards for both evaluator and teacher training.
- Issue regulations that:
 - Establish criteria for teacher training
 - Enable the SBOE to approve the training content and materials for the state's model plan.
 - If a corporation makes significant changes to its evaluation plan, ensures the corporation trains all teachers on the changes before the plan goes into effect.

Connect with us.



jessica.conlon@tntp.org



tntp.org



facebook.com/thenewteacherproject



twitter.com/tntp