



New Jersey
Educator Evaluation Review
Task Force

Respectfully Submitted

September 30, 2024

Task Force Members

Dr. David Aderhold, Garden State Coalition of Schools (Chair)

Steve Beatty, New Jersey Education Association (Vice Chair)

Karen Bingert, New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association (Vice Chair)

Karen Bennett, New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association

Michael Iovino, American Federation of Teachers New Jersey

Dr. Michael LaSusa, New Jersey Association of School Administrators

Dayna Orlak, New Jersey Education Association

Jonathan Pushman, New Jersey School Boards Association

Senator Teresa Ruiz, New Jersey Senate Majority Leader *

Joseph Spoltore, New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association

Rebecca Wills, Office of the Governor

Elisabeth Yucis, New Jersey Education Association

Suzana Zeitz, Assembly Speaker's Representative

Diana Pasculli, New Jersey Department of Education, Secretary **

* Senate Majority Leader Ruiz served on the Task Force but abstained from voting on the adoption of the recommendations.

** As Secretary, Diana Pasculli served on the Task Force but was not a voting member.

Acknowledgements

The Educator Evaluation Review Task Force would like to thank Governor Murphy and members of the NJ Senate and NJ Assembly for the passage and enactment of S2082/A3413, which charged this Task Force with analyzing and recommending amendments to our current educator evaluation practices. We would like to thank members of the New Jersey Department of Education, including Diana Pasculli, Cayla Sekuler, and Brittany Benedetti who provided technical assistance throughout this process. During our review we had the opportunity to hear from several guest speakers who offered their insight and guidance to the committee. These guest speakers included Dr. Peter Mazzagatti, NJDOE Director of the Office of Educator Effectiveness; Kim Marshall, Education Researcher and Author; Joel Moore, Assistant Director of State Relationships, Education Commission of the States (ECS); and Ben Erwin, Senior Policy Analyst, Education Commission of the States (ECS). We would like to acknowledge and thank Debra Bradley, NJPSA; Francine Pfeffer, NJEA; Betsy Ginsburg, GSCS; Melanie Schulz, NJASA; and Erika Nava, NJ Senate Majority Leader's Senior Policy Advisor, who, in addition to Task Force members, attended meetings and represented their respective associations in support of the Task Force work. Furthermore, we would like to thank the educators throughout the state who serve our students each day and who offered their insights and guidance to the Task Force through spoken testimony during the public hearing held on August 28, 2024, or written testimony submitted by the August 30, 2024, deadline. We also acknowledge that many educators contributed through their participation and feedback within their respective associations. It is our fervent hope that the Task Force report is reviewed and acted upon by the New Jersey Department of Education and New Jersey State Board of Education. The recommendations contained within will yield a meaningful difference in bringing relevance and relief back to our educator evaluation process and focus our attention on the implementation of integrated best practices in alignment with ensuring we are meeting the learning needs of all of New Jersey's learners.



New Jersey Educator Evaluation Review Task Force Report Letter of Transmittal

September 30, 2024

The Honorable Philip J. Murphy
Governor of the State of New Jersey
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 001
Trenton, NJ 08625

Dear Governor Murphy,

As Chairperson of the New Jersey Educator Evaluation Review Task Force (EERTF), I am pleased to submit the enclosed report as required under P.L. 2024, Chapter 14 (a.k.a. Senate Bill 2082) regarding the educator evaluation process. Our charge required the comprehensive review of the “Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability for the Children of New Jersey (TEACHNJ) Act,” P.L.2012, c.26 (C.18A:6-117 et al.), enacted in 2012, and the subsequent regulatory code, Chapter 10 (AchieveNJ).

The Task Force has outlined specific recommendations in our report which can be addressed through targeted regulatory changes to AchieveNJ, the establishment of an NJDOE educator-led working group, and the issuance of NJDOE Guidance. The EERTF believes that, by recalibrating the requirements of the TEACHNJ Act through regulatory changes and NJDOE guidance, we can enhance student achievement by ensuring instructional quality through a comprehensive educator evaluation system.

We believe that improvements to the educator evaluation system will make a meaningful impact to the interconnectedness of increasing student learning while supporting educators’ professional growth. Furthermore, the recommendations serve the dual purpose of placing a targeted focus on coaching and mentoring new teachers while simultaneously lessening the administrative burden on effective and highly effective educators.


The proposed changes work to ensure that the evaluation system is aligned with its original purpose, to enhance student achievement by improving instructional quality

for the benefit of New Jersey's students. The recommendations alone will not address all challenges and concerns for educators, but, if implemented with fidelity and partnership, they will serve as a blueprint to increase student learning, enhance best practices, support professional growth, and align organizational goals.

Essential to these recommendations is the continued partnership with representatives of the educational community and the New Jersey Department of Education. While noted in the report, the Task Force would like to highlight the support, technical assistance, and partnership with representatives of the New Jersey Department of Education under the leadership of Acting Commissioner Kevin Dehmer.

Thank you for your continued support of the Education Evaluation Review Task Force. Members of the Task Force are committed to continuing to partner to elevate these recommendations. We look forward to your review of our recommendations and the corresponding feedback.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Aderhold". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line above the first few letters.

David Aderhold, Ed.D.
Chairperson of the Educator Evaluation Review Task Force
Superintendent of the West Windsor – Plainsboro Regional School District

Task Force Charge

Senate Bill 2082

a. It shall be the duty of the New Jersey Educator Evaluation Review Task Force to study and evaluate the educator evaluation system established pursuant to the "TEACHNJ Act," P.L.2012, c.26 (C.18A:6-117 et al.), and implemented in New Jersey public schools. The task force shall consider the law in the current context of the State's schools, identify areas for improvement, and make any recommendations regarding any appropriate changes or updates to the law or regulations implementing the law. The task force shall:

- (1) examine the educational value, administrative burden, and impacts on teachers, principals, and vice principals of the use of student growth objectives in annual summative evaluations, and identify potential alternative approaches to the use of student growth objectives in annual summative evaluations;
- (2) examine any unintended consequences of the implementation of the TEACHNJ Act;
- (3) review current educational research on best practices in educator evaluation in order to promote student achievement and success; and
- (4) present any recommendations deemed necessary and appropriate to modify or update the TEACHNJ Act and its implementing regulations to the Governor, the Legislature, the Department of Education, and the public.

b. The task force shall hold at least one public hearing during the course of its work in order to receive public input on the issues being studied by the task force.

c. The task force shall issue a final report of its findings and recommendations to the Governor, and to the Legislature pursuant to section 2 of P.L.1991, c.164 (C.52:14-19.1), no later than September 30, 2024. The department shall make the final report available to the public on its Internet website.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Letter of Transmittal	3
Task Force Charge	5
Executive Summary	7
Introduction	8
Recommendations	12
Theme #1 - Re-Examine the Statutory Requirement for Multiple Objective Measures of Student Learning	12
Theme #2 - Highlight and Expand Existing Flexibilities via Comprehensive Guidance and Regulatory Equivalencies/Waivers	14
Theme #3 - Continue to Engage Practitioners in Implementation in Anticipation of Upcoming Regulatory Timelines	18
Examination of Educational Value, Administrative Burden, and Impacts on Teachers, Principals, and Vice Principals from the Use of SGOs in Annual Summative Evaluations	22
Educational Value	22
Administrative Burden	23
Impact on Annual Summative Evaluations	23
Alternative Approaches	24
Examination of Any Unintended Consequences of the Implementation of the TEACHNJ Act	25
Strengths of TEACHNJ	27
Ineffective Practices Resulting from the Implementation of Regulations and NJDOE Guidance resulting from AchieveNJ	30
Justification for Innovative Approaches in Teacher Evaluation	32
Summary of Current Educational Research on Best Practices in Educator Evaluation	34
Implications of the Literature Review	35
Comparisons to Other States: Legislative Changes around the Nation	37
References	40
Appendices	43
Appendix A - Relevant Statute and Regulations	44
Appendix B - History of Educator Evaluations in New Jersey Since Enactment of TEACHNJ	45
Appendix C - Educator Evaluation System Overview	49
Appendix D - The Evolution of Professional Development Plans in New Jersey	54
Appendix E - Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and New Jersey Tiered System of Support Models	56
Appendix F - Recommended "Commissioner Approved Activities"	61
Appendix G - State Analysis	67
Colorado	67
Connecticut	68
Delaware	69
Louisiana	70
Michigan	72
New Mexico	73
New York	74
Appendix H - Literature Review	76
Appendix I - 6A:9C-3.3 Standards for professional learning	103
Appendix J - Chapter 5. Regulatory Equivalency and Waiver	105
Appendix K - 6A:8-1.1 (Standards and Assessment) Purpose	108
Appendix L - Recommended Changes to N.J.A.C. 6A:10 Educator Effectiveness	110

Executive Summary

The “Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability for the Children of New Jersey (TEACHNJ) Act,” P.L.2012, c.26 (C.18A:6-117 et al.), enacted in 2012, aimed to enhance student achievement by improving instructional quality through a comprehensive educator evaluation system. Over the past twelve years, New Jersey educators have adhered to the requirements of TEACHNJ and AchieveNJ (New Jersey’s administrative code adopted by the State Board of Education), yielding both successes and challenges. Among the achievements are: a robust framework for delivering specific feedback to educators; targeted professional development that aligns with evaluation outcomes; districtwide evaluation rubrics and training to ensure consistency in implementation; amendments to tenure, mentoring, and corrective action plans; and guidelines to tenure charges and arbitration. Despite the successes, several challenges have also been revealed, including: no meaningful review of the evaluative process in twelve years, which spanned a time with six Commissioners of Education and the COVID-19 pandemic; a disconnect between the intent of TEACHNJ and current practices; universal discontent with elements of the evaluation process, notably Student Growth Objectives (SGOs); and an administrative burden that redirects time and energy away from supporting students and coaching teachers as a result of a compliance-driven student growth measure with a very narrow scope. The Educator Evaluation Review Task Force, through specific recommendations outlined in the report which can be addressed through statute, administrative code, and Department of Education guidance, seeks to increase student learning while supporting educators effectively, honoring the interconnectedness of those two goals. With an eye not only on best practices but also on teacher retention and staffing shortages, the proposed changes aim to reduce administrative burdens, enhance coaching and mentoring, and ensure the evaluation system’s alignment with its original purpose to the benefit of New Jersey’s students.

Introduction

Serving as a cornerstone to education is the belief that an effective teacher can have a resounding and lifelong beneficial impact upon the students that teacher encounters. In “The Negative Impact of ESSA on Educational Equity: A Teacher Accountability Perspective,” Naicong Xie states, “A year with an ineffective teacher can cost a student a year and a half of achievement,” whereas “having an effective teacher for five years in a row can almost close the achievement gap” (7, 2023). This begs the question about how one discerns between an ineffective and effective teacher and, more importantly, how one provides the time, individualized support, and interventions to help every teacher move toward more effective practices to support student learning. The only way to kickstart that process is through a meaningful, trusted, and purposeful evaluative process.

The “Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability for the Children of New Jersey (TEACHNJ) Act,” P.L.2012, c.26 (C.18A:6-117 et al.) was signed into law in 2012 with the goal of raising student achievement by improving instruction through adoption of an educator evaluation system that provides specific feedback to educators, gives insight into pathways for aligned professional development, and informs personnel decisions. What the past twelve years of TEACHNJ and the corresponding administrative code requirements, known as AchieveNJ, have revealed is a combination of benefits to be celebrated, as well as areas of concern and consternation that warrant reconsideration.

This report acknowledges the strong statutory framework of TEACHNJ which resulted in educators receiving individualized professional feedback, professional development targeted to the educators’ and/or students’ actual needs, and district selection of an approved evaluative rubric, a new direction in many districts. TEACHNJ further amended language for tenure, mentoring, school improvement panels, corrective action plans for struggling educators, guidelines for tenure charges, and arbitration. These specific provisions have brought clarity and enhancements to which stakeholders have few, if any, objections.

There is, however, a disconnect between the original intent of TEACHNJ and its current operation and implementation of educator evaluations. In the twelve years since its implementation, the educational landscape has changed drastically, notably through transition between six Commissioners (Dehmer, Allen-McMillan, Repollet, Harrington, Hespe, and Cerf), statewide pushback against standardized PARCC assessments, and, most disruptively, the COVID-19 pandemic. The evaluation system and policies have remained largely unchanged, and the Educator Evaluation Review Task Force has identified discrepancies between the original goals of TEACHNJ and the practices that have evolved, largely by necessity and practicality. Emerging research and anecdotal evidence highlight implementation issues that were not apparent at the outset of the reforms. This context underscores the need for a reset and redefinition of TEACHNJ's intentions and the regulations in N.J.A.C. 6A:10. Therefore, it is time to pause and ground ourselves again in the true intentions of the statute and corresponding regulations, as well as what new knowledge has emerged in the interim.

The Task Force finds that key elements of the current evaluation process, including Student Growth Objectives, are universally disliked by all categories of educators (teachers, supervisors, principals, and chief school administrators) as a chasm has formed between intention and implementation. If the purpose of TEACHNJ was to focus attention on multiple objective measures of student learning, the implementation diluted that goal by focusing teacher attention too narrowly on a compliance-based process of Student Growth Objectives (SGOs). The Task Force believes that the purpose of the TEACHNJ statute was to provide an evaluation measure that ensured an intentional focus not just on student learning in general, but a deliberate focus on identifying and supporting students who were struggling to reach success. While TEACHNJ unquestionably fostered greater conversations about student achievement data and the creation of goals, it has failed in implementation and practice. The daunting task of connecting statute to regulation to guidance, instead of streamlining the process, created a paperchase process that silos educators' efforts to make data-driven decisions and plan accordingly to support student learning. Review and clarification is not only requested but

demanded by educators, who, simply but profoundly, only seek to do what is best for their students.

The Task Force for Public School Staffing Shortages ([Executive Order 309](#)), also assembled during Governor Murphy's administration, outlined factors impacting the recruitment and retention of teachers. The result was a resounding call to reduce administrative burdens and tasks that pull teachers away from their classrooms, their preparations, or the valuable feedback they can give their students through consideration of a "reassessment of student growth objectives." The Educator Evaluation Review Task Force also believes that, in addition to reducing administrative burdens, recalibrating the requirements of the TEACHNJ Act would enhance a dual focus of coaching and mentoring new and struggling teachers and would lessen the administrative burden on effective and highly effective educators whose time is better spent addressing their students' needs. In addition, use of student assessment as an evaluative tool does not align with helping teachers improve their practice. Noted educational thought leader Pedro Noguero states, "Assessment is an essential part of education, because you have to know what kids are learning. So you have to assess their growth, their progress. But assessments should be used for that purpose and to diagnose learning needs, not to rank people, which is what we are doing now" (Kaplan, 2020).

Lastly, we have identified redundancies between SGOs and Professional Development Plans (PDPs) which shift time and energy away from student learning. Evaluations have become time-consuming and compliance-oriented, which has undermined their meaningfulness. SGOs, as currently constructed, must be eliminated, and multiple objective measures of learning must be integrated cohesively to stay true to the original intention of TEACHNJ. To accomplish this, we must recalibrate our system to focus on not only student growth but intentional practices focused on identified learners and the strategies and practices leveraged to enhance student learning.

As the Task Force debated the direction of the recommendations, we saw three potential pathways:

1. Pursue changes to statute.
2. Pursue changes to regulation.
3. Pursue clarification to existing legislation and regulation through a series or package of NJDOE Guidance.

The Task Force recommends pursuing a combination of targeted regulatory changes, establishing an NJDOE educator-led working group to review and collaborate towards effectuating the Task Force recommendations, and the NJDOE issuing a series or package of NJDOE guidance to support educators as they make these meaningful and important shifts to their local evaluation systems.

The Educator Evaluation Review Task Force values:

1. The potential within all students to grow and succeed with the right support and opportunities.
2. The importance of professional learning as an integral tool to introduce and reinforce best practices in education;
3. The use of timely, ongoing, frequent, and objective data from a variety of sources to inform educators about the individual needs of their students, enabling them to plan, remediate, support, and challenge learners to succeed;
4. The feedback garnered from standardized assessments that reflect a “moment in time” snapshot of student learning for purposes of statewide analysis and, locally, a broad indication of trends in student performance and the efficacy of the curriculum being delivered; and
5. The critical role that the evaluative process plays in establishing professional standards, providing ongoing feedback and coaching to educators to improve their practice, and ensuring that New Jersey’s students have the best educators possible guiding them in their learning journey.

Recommendations

The recommendations outlined below serve to ensure that New Jersey’s educator evaluation system has educational value, minimizes administrative burden, augments and improves instructional coaching and mentorship, and places an explicit focus on best practices related to ensuring student achievement and success.

The requirements of TEACHNJ and AchieveNJ generally apply to all “teaching staff members,” and the Task Force advises that the implementation of the following recommendations be reviewed in consideration of all certificated roles and differentiated according to position to avoid unintended consequences.

Theme #1 - Re-Examine the Statutory Requirement for Multiple Objective Measures of Student Learning

TEACHNJ states, “Multiple objective measures of student learning means the results of formal and informal assessments of students. Such measures may include a combination of, but are not limited to: teacher-set goals for student learning; student performance assessments, including portfolio projects, problem-solving protocols, and internships; teacher-developed assessments; standardized assessments; and district-established assessments.” In light of this definition, the Task Force recommends that the NJDOE implement the following:

Key - (G) NJDOE Guidance; (R) Regulatory; (S) Statutory

1. **Incorporate the statutory definition of multiple objective measures of student learning into all future NJDOE guidance** and include the definition into the regulatory updates in N.J.A.C. 6A:10, as the current regulation leaves out the definition established in TEACHNJ. **(R)**

2. **Reduce the burden on teachers and administrators by integrating and streamlining the requirements of Professional Development Plans and Student Growth Objectives.** Charlotte Danielson states, “I’m deeply troubled by the transformation of teaching from a complex profession requiring nuanced judgment to the performance of certain behaviors that can be ticked off on a checklist. In fact, I (and many others in the academic and policy communities) believe it’s time for a major rethinking of how we structure teacher evaluation to ensure that teachers, as professionals, can benefit from numerous opportunities to continually refine their craft” (Danielson, 2016). PDPs are required under N.J.A.C. 6A:9C, and SGOs are mandated under N.J.A.C. 6A:10 as the only way to fulfill the statutory requirement for multiple objective measures of student learning for teachers of non-tested subject areas/grades. However, there is potential redundancy in these goal-setting requirements, and the Task Force finds no reason why a high quality PDP could not also fulfill the multiple measures requirement. These processes are duplicative but not aligned or connected. If we are to truly reduce the burden on educators, we must streamline the processes aligned in 6A:9C and 6A:10. The Task Force sees tremendous opportunity to implement a vision for alignment that exists within the recommendations. We believe that integrating, streamlining, and reducing the requirements from creating four goals annually (previously a combination of SGOs and PDPs) to two integrated goals annually would positively impact every educator in New Jersey. Intentionally doing so can serve as a blueprint to increase student learning, enhance best practices, support professional growth, reduce administrative burden, and align organizational goals. **(G or R)**
3. **Intentionally align these reimagined PDPs with language in N.J.A.C. 6A:8-3.1. Standards and Assessment,** stating, “District boards of education shall ensure that curriculum and instruction are designed and delivered in such a way that all students are able to demonstrate the knowledge and skills specified by the NJSL and shall ensure that appropriate instructional adaptations are designed and delivered for students with disabilities, for MLs [multilingual learners], for students enrolled in alternative education programs, and for

students who are gifted and talented.” Consolidating and aligning these regulatory requirements would streamline evaluation processes significantly and would provide an opportunity for educators to do the crucial work of focusing on intentional practices that can impact student growth. **(G)**

4. **Create a new name** for the aforementioned structure, hence redefining a process that would meet all existing regulatory requirements mentioned above. Suggested names include: Best Practice Indicators (BPIs); Student Performance Measures (SPMs); Integrated Growth and Development Plan (IGDP); or Integrated Best Practices (IBPs). **(G or R)**
5. **Plan for a future re-examination of the median student growth percentile (mSGP) component of evaluations.** mSGPs and similarly designed metrics nationwide continue to be successfully challenged, strongly indicating that mSGPs lack utility for their intended purpose. While mSGPs are arguably flawed, **the Task Force does not currently recommend addressing mSGP concerns until N.J.A.C. 6A:10 is opened in its entirety.** Under the current evaluation system, approximately 15% of NJ educators are eligible to receive an mSGP, which accounts for 5% of their summative evaluation score. The Task Force’s current position is that, while problematic, the actual impact of mSGPs is insignificant compared to the significant concerns detailed throughout this report with SGOs. **(S)**

Redefining and rebranding SGOs and PDPs to dually meet the regulatory requirements would support educators in focusing on multiple objective measures of student learning and integrating best practices, which is central to the purpose of the Task Force.

<p>Theme #2 - Highlight and Expand Existing Flexibilities via Comprehensive Guidance and Regulatory Equivalencies/Waivers</p>

As defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:10, an observation means “a method of collecting data on the performance of a teaching staff member’s assigned duties and responsibilities.”

Tenured teachers must be observed twice annually, and, if a tenured teacher earns a highly effective rating, they become eligible for alternative observation practices as approved by the Commissioner. With this in mind, the Task Force believes the NJDOE should:

- 6. Approve and publish an expanded bank of Commissioner-approved practices and broaden eligibility to both Effective and Highly Effective Educators** (based on their most recent summative evaluation), which could fulfill observation requirements for tenured teachers. Outlined in the requirements of 6A:10-4.4(c)3.i is the allowance of “Commissioner-approved activities.” The regulations at N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4(c)3.i specifically state, “If a tenured teacher was rated highly effective on his or her most recent summative evaluation and if both the teacher and the teacher’s designated supervisor agree to use this option, one of the two required observations may be an observation of a Commissioner-approved activity other than a classroom lesson. The Department shall post annually to its website a list of Commissioner-approved activities that may be observed in accordance with this section.”

Currently, Commissioner-approved activities are a scarcely-utilized opportunity. The NJDOE currently has three approved and published activities listed on their website which include the Reflective Practice Protocol, National Board Certification, and serving as a Cooperating Teacher (supporting a student teacher). The Reflective Practice Protocol is modeled after the National Board Certification process as its framework. However, the Task Force asserts the Reflective Practice Protocol is just one path that could support experienced, effective educators to deepen their practice through the evaluation system, and this option is especially burdensome, much more so than a standard observation.

Alternative practices must be considered and to the greatest extent possible should be aligned with student support systems such as the New Jersey Tiered Systems of Support (NJTSS) and/or other similar frameworks (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Intervention & Referral Services (I&RS), Response to Intervention (RTI), etc. These widely-used, research-based, and impactful

systems utilize universal screening, tiered interventions, progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and collaboration, the outcomes of which also inform professional development and support culturally-informed practices. The ultimate goal of teacher evaluation should be to provide educators with actionable feedback that fosters professional development and student achievement. The Task Force believes alignment between professional development and evaluation processes, utilizing known best practices as a bridge, will benefit student learning greatly. Examples of data protocols can be found in [Appendix F](#). This recommendation would bring further alignment between educator evaluation and professional development. **(G and R)**

7. Align “Commissioner-approved activities” with the Standards for Professional Learning to further integrate professional learning and educator evaluation.

The regulations at N.J.A.C. 6A:9C-3.3 aim to enhance educator effectiveness and improve student outcomes via professional development implementation; they provide a framework for professional learning that is rooted in equity, driven by evidence, and focused on continuous improvement. These standards (found in [Appendix I](#)) emphasize the importance of creating a supportive learning environment, fostering collaboration, and leveraging effective leadership to empower educators and ultimately improve student outcomes.

An effective educator evaluation system should be closely tied to the professional learning opportunities offered to educators. While the current system supports utilizing evaluation data to guide professional development planning in schools and districts, further alignment would be even more beneficial towards creating cohesive local systems. The NJDOE can improve upon this system by more intentionally ensuring that teachers are engaging in standards-aligned professional development.

In essence, N.J.A.C. 6A:9C-3.3 provides a framework for professional learning that is rooted in equity, driven by evidence, and focused on continuous improvement, and 6A:10-4.4(c)3.i provides the means for innovative practices

that differentiate evaluation for tenured teachers and emphasizes the importance of best practices and highly effective structures that improve student outcomes. Together, these regulatory frameworks provide an opportunity to explore standards-aligned, teacher-led alternative observation activities for New Jersey's experienced, effective educators. This recommendation directly supports the Task Force's mission to reduce administrative burden and retain our most experienced educators. **(G)**

8. **Develop a process for districts to submit alternative practices for approval as outlined under N.J.A.C. 6A:5-1.3 which outlines a procedure for submission of an equivalency or waiver.** Districts would need to illustrate the way(s) in which the alternative practice is standards-aligned. Once approved, these submissions would be added to the existing bank of alternative practices on the NJDOE's website. To serve this goal, the Task Force recommends expansion of the existing regulatory equivalency and waiver processes as set forth at N.J.A.C. 6A:5, Regulatory Equivalency and Waiver, by publishing all previously approved submissions to make them available to all districts. This should include the creation of guidance to districts that outline the submission process and requirements for equivalencies and waivers by providing exemplars, clarifying criteria, providing targeted assistance and training, and releasing the submission forms in both guidance and on the NJDOE website. **(G)**
9. **Issue guidance on local flexibility within existing evaluation rubrics.** The NJDOE has outlined requirements for districts when selecting an evaluation rubric, but additional clarification is needed in N.J.A.C. 6A:10.1.2, particularly regarding the term "educator practice instrument." Currently, it defines this as "a tool that assesses professional competencies based on scales that reflect practice or research. These scores contribute to the summative evaluation for various staff members." However, more guidance is necessary on the flexibility districts have, including how they assign numerical values, instrument weight, scoring, choice, and utilization. The NJDOE guidance should outline all flexibility including the percentages to evaluation domains, standards, components, and/or

indicators. Once equipped with this guidance, educators can collaborate to establish practices that work best for their communities. **(G)**

Theme #3 - Continue to Engage Practitioners in Implementation in Anticipation of Upcoming Regulatory Timelines

The members of the Task Force sincerely believe that the work of improving educator evaluation in New Jersey is only beginning. Therefore, the Task Force asks the NJDOE to:

10. **Convene an implementation working group** during the 2024-2025 school year to immediately begin exploring, developing, and supporting the implementation of the recommendations of the Educator Evaluation Review Task Force. With the support of the NJDOE, this working group should be educator-led in collaboration with the NJDOE, and inclusive of the educational associations and organizations that served on the Task Force. The initial goal of the working group will be to establish a feedback loop between the NJDOE and educators in developing, informing, and issuing relevant guidance, including implementing guidance laid out in the Educational Evaluation Review Task Force and additional recommendations that arise from the working group itself. As the regulations are opened during the course of the scheduled review cycle, the working group may also be called upon to provide suggestions for additional regulatory changes based upon feedback from implementation of the Task Force and working group's recommendations and subsequent NJDOE guidance. **(G)**
11. **Collaborate with stakeholders towards providing enhanced guidance**, technical assistance, clarification, banks of strategies, drafts of waivers, and examples of best practices and methods identifying innovative approaches to already established statutes and regulations, with the Task Force recommending the rollout of initial guidance commencing by the end of March 2025 to allow districts to plan professional development incorporating changes with adequate notice to prepare for the 25-26 academic year. **(G)**

12. Reimagine Educator Evaluation in New Jersey utilizing some of the lesser known components of existing regulations which support and build upon emerging and existing best practices. Design and utilize iterative processes that foster continuous improvement as stakeholders collaborate to undertake the crucial work of reimagining educator evaluation in New Jersey. As the Task Force has spent an arduous amount of time dedicated to reviewing both TEACHNJ (Chapter 26) and the regulations set forth at N.J.A.C. 6A:10, it is important to ensure that any future guidance highlights some of the lesser known components of existing regulations and builds upon emerging and existing best practices. **(G)**

- a. Formative evaluations (such as classroom observations) are not required to be rated or have numerical scores; only summative evaluations have such a requirement.
- b. Established goals identified within an SGO that reflect student learning objectives do not have to be constructed for a full class or full caseload but can be targeted to ensure that educators are meeting the learning needs of every student in our charge.
- c. For tenured staff, alternative evaluation options (Commissioner-approved) and equivalencies or waivers already exist in current regulations. However, the process is not widely known and could be made more transparent with a menu of options (outlined in [Recommendation #6](#) and [Recommendation #8](#)).
- d. The statutory intention of TEACHNJ was to place an explicit focus on student learning. The goal was to ensure a process that focused on individual student growth. The statute reflected this focus by defining multiple objective measures of student learning as outlined in [Recommendation #1](#).
 1. The terminology of SGOs and SGPs does not exist in TEACHNJ (Chapter 26, 2012). SGOs and SGPs were developed by a former

NJDOE administration and a State Board of Education composition of bygone days, and the Task Force sees opportunities to meet the intentions of TEACHNJ through alternative processes that will require the issuance of either NJDOE Guidance or Regulatory changes.

- e. Redundancies exist between PDPs and SGOs. The working group should recommend an evaluation protocol that eliminates current SGOs as implemented by discarding redundancies in favor of an integrated approach within the PDP framework. This framework would provide a more targeted process that reinforces best practices while leveraging existing structures.
- f. Clarify the existing misnomer in the field that evaluations must only occur within the classroom setting. N.J.A.C. 6A:10-1.2 (regulation) states, “‘Evaluation’ means an appraisal of an individual's professional performance in relation to his or her job description and professional standards and based on, when applicable, the individual’s evaluation rubric.” It is important to reinforce that educators may be evaluated in a multitude of settings that may be outside of a classroom environment as long as the individual is evaluated in alignment with their professional performance, job description, and professional standards.

13. Amend N.J.A.C. 6A:10, Educator Effectiveness, in a targeted manner to address specific areas of clarification which the committee has identified in the attached redlined review of the regulation ([Appendix L](#)). **(R)**

Key Recommendations:

1. Eliminate Student Growth Objectives and integrate multiple objective measures of student learning into Professional Development Plans.
2. Under 6A:10-4.4.c.3.1 add “rated either effective or highly effective.”
3. Incorporate the statutory definition of multiple objective measures of student learning from Chapter 26 directly into Chapter 6A:10.

14. **Revisit the requirement of four rating categories and consider using three instead (Effective, Partially Effective, Ineffective).** Should 18A:6-123 (Review, approval of evaluation rubrics) be opened for future revision, the Task Force recommends that members of the legislature reconsider the mandate for “four defined annual rating categories for teachers, principals, assistant principals, and vice-principals: ineffective, partially effective, effective, and highly effective.” In theory, the presence of a “highly effective” rating should serve as a motivator for excellence, but, in reality, the debates that ensue over ratings and tenth-of-a-point differences misdirect valuable post-observation conference discussions, summative conferences, and other professional growth opportunities toward scoring and away from professional growth, undermining the real purpose of the evaluative process. Another approach is to numerically value effective and highly effective ratings the same, allowing the highly effective designation to serve as acknowledgement of work that is above and beyond but without sustaining a point value that impedes growth discussions. **(S and R)**
15. The Educator Evaluation Review Task Force strongly believes that **addressing the recommendations outlined herein should occur expeditiously**, resulting in the rollout of initial guidance from the NJDOE commencing no later than the end of March 2025, not only to keep at bay the unnecessarily burdensome work of SGOs but also to move from a compliance-centered goal-setting system to one that integrates the best practices of teaching and supporting student learning.

However, **should the targeted regulatory changes that arise from this process not be feasible prior to the start of the 25-26 school year, the Task Force recommends a statutory pause be placed upon SGOs until a new regulatory framework premised on the recommendations of the Task Force can be implemented.** Such a pause should also take into consideration the unintended consequences of the current pause for tenured educators, such as saddling a teacher with a low score with no legally permissible way to improve upon a previously earned SGO score.

During such a regulatory pause, the Task Force recommends that no fewer than a dozen school districts pilot the new protocol that emerges from the recommendations of this Task Force and the subsequent outcomes of the working group, under the guidance and support of the NJDOE who will collect and share feedback with the working group for further consideration in finalizing statutory and guidance language. **(S)**

Examination of Educational Value, Administrative Burden, and Impacts on Teachers, Principals, and Vice Principals from the Use of SGOs in Annual Summative Evaluations

The Task Force was statutorily charged with examining the educational value, administrative burden, and impacts on teachers, principals, and vice/assistant principals from the use of student growth objectives in annual summative evaluations, as well as identifying potential alternative approaches to the use of student growth objectives in annual summative evaluations. Regarding these charges, the members of the Task Force conclude:

Educational Value

As currently constructed and used in practice, **SGOs have limited to no educational value**. In the years that SGOs have been implemented, taking into account the various ways districts have managed them, there has been no demonstrable benefit to student achievement or teaching practices. As SGOs are an artificial construct to ensure that non-tested teachers have a student achievement metric, they have, by and large, been an instrument of compliance and created a false sense of “accountability.” SGOs were not designed on the basis of research or best practices. Indeed, research shows that “an increased focus on summative judgment undermine[s] the intrinsic value of teaching” (Mayger, 2022).

Administrative Burden

SGOs as currently implemented are a **time-intensive process**, and that time could and should be better invested elsewhere. The amount of clerical time spent engaging with the design and organization of SGOs on a yearly basis amounts to many hours and consequently is a huge burden on teachers and administrators. An inordinate amount of time is spent on the administration of SGO assessments and takes away from time that could be spent more meaningfully otherwise, in ways that research has shown to have a positive impact on student learning: preparing engaging lessons, collaborating with colleagues in ways that foster collective efficacy, designing quality learning activities, providing timely and high quality feedback to students, and involving parents in the school community. Indeed, many teachers report spending upwards of 8-10 hours developing their initial SGO and administering a baseline assessment, then several more hours gathering and analyzing data to determine their final SGO score. Nationwide research illustrates that evaluation systems consume as much as 19 total days of work per year (Bleiberg, 2023). In addition, the time spent on the “paperwork” of SGOs seriously detracts from the time needed to prioritize proven and important efforts to increase student outcomes. Although the administrative burden of the SGO process varies from district to district, even in the best of circumstances SGOs require a heavy investment in time that does not yield any educational benefit. As currently constructed and implemented, SGOs do not produce the intended benefit of impacting instructional practices by utilizing multiple objective measures of student learning to drive educational outcomes for students since the focal point of each SGO is often a narrow target by necessity to streamline this onerous process, not a broader scope that enables an educator to consider all aspects of students’ growth.

Impact on Annual Summative Evaluations

Teachers organically monitor student growth throughout the year through a variety of formal and informal measures. However, seamlessly integrating formative assessment into the flow of lessons and units at several key points in order to drive student learning outcomes is both an art and a science. As such, creating structures

that honor professional growth and increase pedagogical skills are essential. While educators are constantly assessing and adjusting as they monitor student growth toward achieving mastery of learning goals, learning how to do so requires dedicated focus and training. **SGOs impose an artificial structure and create an unproductive burden upon them that often distracts from the very intent of the intended process.** The evaluation system causes educators to focus on what their score will be, detracting from practices and structures that are actually helping students. In “How Teachers Perceive the Impact of Teacher Feedback: A Latent Class Analysis,” Choi and Bowers gleaned from their own research that “feedback is the main source of intrinsic motivation and direction, and evaluations are most likely to impact teachers’ instructional practices when high-quality, meaningful feedback teachers can use to improve their practices is provided (Ford et al., 2018; Kraft & Christian 2022; Ridge & Lavigne, 2020)” (2, 2024). Unfortunately, post-observation discussions have devolved into disagreements over scores on an evaluation rubric versus an opportunity for coaching and professional growth. Essentially the evaluation process has become a distraction in many districts, and we must reground ourselves in the true intention of educator evaluation.

Administrators also pointed out the potential disincentive to expectations of rigorous goals when a building principal’s SGO score is dependent on the average score of the staff in their building. Additionally, the Task Force noted that the dynamics involved in applying numerical scores to teachers has created a toxic environment in many districts.

Alternative Approaches

Members of the Task Force agree that, as currently constructed, SGOs must be eliminated and recognize that although the “multiple objective measures” provision exists in statute, SGOs – which originate in regulation, not statute – are not the only structure that could fulfill the requirement. Our conclusion is that the **best alternative to the use of SGOs is to redesign requirements, allowing for local flexibility when determining how districts will comply with the statutory**

requirement for “multiple objective measures.” The Task Force sees an opportunity to integrate Professional Development Plans with practices proven to promote student learning. Focusing on best practices and eliminating ineffective assessment practices will allow educators to target interventions to measure student learning, allowing more accurate growth measurement across the various grade levels and subject areas. The Task Force believes that redesigning such requirements create the conditions for both professional growth and student learning. In the words of Dr. Mayger, Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education at The College of New Jersey, “The question at issue is not whether teachers should be held accountable but what they should be held accountable for and by whom... school administrators should establish climates of reciprocal accountability where districts assume responsibility for creating conditions where students and teachers can thrive and teachers, in turn, assume responsibility for their professional growth” (Mayger, 2022).

Examination of Any Unintended Consequences of the Implementation of the TEACHNJ Act

The Task Force was statutorily charged with examining the unintended consequences of the implementation of the TEACHNJ Act. Although the statute has brought about many benefits to New Jersey’s public school system, the unintended consequences of the enacted statute, corresponding regulations, and guidance documentation must be highlighted.

We agree that the system **disincentivizes educator innovation and can cause both teachers and administrators to place explicit focus on an assessment outcome over improving professional practices.** As such, the current system disincentivizes teachers from setting challenging targets for themselves and their students (Mayger, 2022). The byproduct of tying learning targets to student learning targets is that goals are often set low to ensure that an evaluation score is reached. This disconnect in implemented practice often works counter to intended goals.

One of the most serious consequences of the system is the time and energy spent on paperwork, an **administrative burden which hampers administrators' ability to help teachers improve** professionally. Administrators are unable to dedicate adequate time to the critical work of observing, evaluating, coaching, providing feedback, and mentoring teachers, particularly novice teachers who might require more guidance. Lack of administrative support and ineffective mentoring are often cited as reasons for teachers leaving the profession, and so the inability of administrators to have robust coaching and mentoring support is a contributing factor to teacher turnover and staffing shortages. Removing roadblocks in order to allow administrators to spend an appropriate amount of time mentoring new and struggling staff will more effectively prevent newer teachers from "falling through the cracks."

Effective teaching requires teachers to have adequate time for lesson design and planning, data analysis, engaging in professional learning, collaboration with colleagues, and crafting feedback for students. Under the current system, teachers are forced to spend excessive amounts of time working on compliance paperwork related to SGOs at the expense of meaningful pedagogical activities.

As a Task Force, what we know and believe is that "accomplishing the maximum impact on student learning depends on teams of teachers working together, with excellent leaders or coaches, agreeing on worthwhile outcomes, setting high expectations, knowing the students' starting and desired success in learning, seeking evidence continually about their impact on all students, modifying their teaching in light of this evaluation, and joining in the success of truly making a difference to student outcomes" (John A.C. Hattie, *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning*).

Another unintended consequence of the implementation of TEACHNJ is the **negative effect on relationships between educators**. The tremendous amount of added stress on teachers, the pressure on administrators, and the overall unintended consequences of perceived high stakes assessments creates tension in the evaluation system. The goal of professional growth should be a commitment to engage in meaningful dialogue about improving teaching and learning. Teachers and administrators must work together in our shared commitment to continuous improvement in service to our students, instead of being forced into a system that prioritizes artificial scores and distrusted accountability measures, causing educators to become defensive and resentful. The education system as currently constructed works directly against the collegial relationship that educators want and need in order to provide the best outcomes for students. When combined with the labor-intensive nature of evaluative elements and administrators' sense of fairness toward teachers when reflecting upon their own limitations regarding the quantity and quality of support they can provide struggling teachers, it is hardly surprising that "principals felt as if it was unfair to rate teachers as below proficient if they did not have the capacity to provide these teachers with support" (Kraft & Gilmour, 2017). The byproduct of the current evaluation system is often one of professional barriers and animosity versus collegiality and growth. We owe it to our educators to address the concerns with the evaluation system that is currently in place to refocus the work on student learning and educational outcomes for all learners.

Furthermore, in many cases the educator practice instruments being used were not intended to score teachers but rather to provide growth-oriented feedback and coaching. The Task Force members know that, when educators effectively and openly collaborate, student achievement and morale improve.

Strengths of TEACHNJ

The implementation of TEACHNJ (Chapter 26) and the corresponding regulations promulgated under AchieveNJ (N.J.A.C. 6A:10) were enacted during the 2012-2013

school year. For years, TEACHNJ has been “blamed” for the creation of SGOs and mSGPs. However, it is important to note that the terms and concepts “Student Growth Objectives” or “Student Growth Percentiles” do not exist in the legislation but rather were constructed by the governing regulations under AchieveNJ.

The TEACHNJ legislation created significant benefits for educators:

1. The legislation placed **explicit focus on raising student achievement by improving instruction and leveraging data-driven decision making** in our schools.
2. Prior to TEACHNJ, educator evaluations were not required to be grounded in an approved evaluation instrument (evaluation rubric), such as Danielson, Marzano, Stronge, McREL, Marshall, etc. The **implementation of TEACHNJ increased the overall quality of educator practice instruments.**
3. The legislation created the **definition of “multiple objective measures of student learning”** which means “the results of formal and informal assessments of students. Such measures may include a combination of, but are not limited to: teacher-set goals for student learning; student performance assessments, including portfolio projects, problem-solving protocols, and internships; teacher-developed assessments; standardized assessments; and district-established assessments.” This definition did place a significant focus on student performance data at a time in which many school districts did not pay particular focus on these metrics. As a result, educators in New Jersey have become more data-literate overall.
4. TEACHNJ is credited with **significant changes to several areas of administrative code which govern tenure and employment rights**, including but not limited to:
 - a. N.J.S.18A:6-9 was amended to read as follows: Controversies, disputes arising under school laws; jurisdiction. 18A:6-9. The commissioner shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine, without cost to the parties, all controversies and disputes arising under the school laws, excepting those governing higher education, or under the rules of the State board or of the

commissioner. For the purposes of this Title, controversies and disputes concerning the conduct of school elections shall not be deemed to arise under the school laws. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section to the contrary, an arbitrator shall hear and make a final determination on a controversy and dispute arising under subarticle B of article 2 of chapter 6 of Title 18A of the New Jersey Statutes (C.18A:6-10 et seq.).

- b. N.J.S.18A:6-11 is amended to read as follows: Written charges, statement of evidence; filing; statement of position by employee; certification of determination; notice.
- c. N.J.S.18A:6-13 was amended to read as follows: Dismissal of charge for failure of determination by board. 18A:6-13. If the board does not make such a determination within 45 days after receipt of the written charge, the charge shall be deemed to be dismissed and no further proceeding or action shall be taken thereon.
- d. N.J.S.18A:6-14 was amended to read as follows: Suspension upon certification of charge; compensation; reinstatement.
- e. N.J.S.18A:6-16 was amended to read as follows: Proceedings before commissioner; written response; determination.
- f. N.J.S.18A:28-5 is amended to read as follows: Requirements for tenure. 18A:28-5. a. The services of all teaching staff members employed prior to the effective date of P.L.2012, c.26 (C.18A:6-117 et al.).
- g. N.J.S.18A:28-6 was amended to read as follows: Tenure upon transfer or promotion.
- h. 18A:6-120 School Improvement Panel.
- i. 8A:6-127 Researched-based mentoring program.
- j. 18A:6-128 Ongoing professional development. 15. a. A board of education, principal, or superintendent shall provide its teaching staff members with ongoing professional development that supports student achievement and with an individual professional development plan.
- k. 18A:6-122 Annual submission of evaluation rubrics. 16. a. A school district shall annually submit to the Commissioner of Education, for review and

approval, the evaluation rubrics that the district will use to assess the effectiveness of its teachers, principals, assistant principals, and vice-principals and all other teaching staff members. The board shall ensure that an approved rubric meets the minimum standards established by the State Board of Education.

1. 18A:6-17.5 Determination of certain tenure charges.
 2. 18A:6-125 Evaluation rubric not subject to collective negotiations.
 3. 18A:6-17.1 Panel of arbitrators.
4. TEACHNJ created a **consistent definition of a “Corrective Action Plan”** (CAP) which is defined as a “written plan developed by a teaching staff member serving in a supervisory capacity in collaboration with the teaching staff member to address deficiencies as outlined in an evaluation.” The CAP provides clarity and transparency on what the educator and supervisor will do to improve performance.

<p>Ineffective Practices Resulting from the Implementation of Regulations and NJDOE Guidance resulting from AchieveNJ</p>

Starting in 2013, as the field scrambled to create and implement SGOs in non-tested areas in order to measure student growth while striving to figure out how SGPs would impact educators, **a system of ineffective practices came into being, primarily to illustrate compliance with AchieveNJ.** Over time, as we created systems by which we measure outcomes of arbitrary measures, we shifted focus away from best practices and processes to a system that values compliance over progress and growth. As such, the rush to implement TEACHNJ, New Jersey’s answer to the data-driven metrics encouraged by the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) and the competitive grants under Race to the Top (RTT) funding, resulted in practices that in many school districts remain in effect today. Anecdotal examples include:

- Lack of measurable impact on student learning and effective teaching practices.
- Rigidity in implementation and design of growth objectives that focuses on a one-size-fits all approach which fails to account for the nuance of individual classroom factors and student needs.
- Administrative burden and lack of adequate professional development.
- Inconsistent implementation.
- Inconsistent data reliability and/or availability of easily accessible data and analysis.
- Increased pressure on educators.
- Ineffectiveness in accurately measuring student growth or driving meaningful instructional change.
- Standalone assessments provided to students twice per school year solely for the purpose of achieving an SGO to show growth. An example would be providing 8th graders with the final exam in Social Studies 8 in both September (before any learning) and again in June (after ten months of instruction) in order to have an “SGO” that measured academic growth.
- Administrators being bogged down with the process of scoring every component of the evaluation rubric for every observation, despite local flexibility that allows otherwise. This is a huge investment of time that could be spent better.
- An overemphasis on post-observation debates focused on the evaluation score of “3” vs. “4” vs. instructional coaching and growth. Debates between the evaluated and evaluator over scoring of rubric components, fueled by the dichotomy of effective vs. highly effective ratings, led to lost opportunities for professional growth.

Justification for Innovative Approaches in Teacher Evaluation

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is a complex and multi-faceted challenge that has evolved significantly over the past few decades. Traditional methods, primarily centered around standardized testing and summative assessment results, have faced criticism for their narrow focus and limited ability to capture the full scope of teaching practices. SGOs serve as a prime example of an overly controlled, compliance-based requirement that serves little purpose in the educational landscape. “Compliance refers to when educators adhere to the technical requirements of the policy but do not embrace its spirit. Teachers are not committed to using this system as a tool for improvement nor do they engage in strategic behaviors to distort their ratings” (Choi & Bowers, 2024). Education researchers and policymakers have advocated for more holistic, data-informed, and reflective approaches. Research supports the adoption of innovative approaches in teacher evaluation, emphasizing the need for a more comprehensive, reflective, and data-driven process.

The existing N.J.A.C. 6A:10 regulations allow for innovative approaches in two specific areas:

- N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4(c)3.i specifically states, “Tenured teachers shall be observed at least two times during each school year. Observations for all tenured teachers shall occur prior to the annual summary conference, which shall occur prior to the end of the academic school year... If a tenured teacher was rated highly effective on his or her most recent summative evaluation and if both the teacher and the teacher’s designated supervisor agree to use this option, **one of the two required observations may be an observation of a Commissioner-approved activity other than a classroom lesson.** The

Department shall post annually to its website a list of Commissioner-approved activities that may be observed in accordance with this section.”

- N.J.A.C. 6A:5, Regulatory Equivalency and Waiver, allows the Commissioner to provide **regulatory flexibility** regarding the requirements contained in the New Jersey Administrative Code Title 6A. Equivalencies and waivers cannot be granted for provisions of state or federal law, educator certification rules (N.J.A.C. 6A:9B) or special education rules (N.J.A.C. 6A:14).
 - Equivalency Application - “Equivalency” means approval to achieve the intent of a specific rule through an alternate means that is different from, yet judged to be comparable to or as effective as, those prescribed within the rule.
 - Waiver Application - “Waiver” means approval to avoid compliance with either a specific procedure(s) or a specific rule’s substantive requirements for reasons that are judged educationally, organizationally and fiscally sound.

These methods address the limitations of traditional evaluation systems by incorporating multiple perspectives, promoting continuous professional growth, and focusing on student outcomes. As the education landscape continues to evolve, these approaches provide a robust framework for evaluating and improving educator effectiveness in a way that is both fair and impactful. Most importantly, they build upon one of the successes of TEACHNJ, which raised the focus on educators utilizing data to make informed and intentional instructional decisions that involved systematically collecting and analyzing various data sources to assess pedagogical decisions, focus interventions, and guide professional development.

Recommendations can be found in [Appendix F](#).

Summary of Current Educational Research on Best Practices in Educator Evaluation

This summary of current educational research on best practices in educator evaluation was based upon the research summarized in [Appendix H](#) and was created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/b5a081cd49fb>.

The literature review on educator evaluation systems reveals several high-leverage strategies that can be employed to support effective educator evaluation. The strategies can be broadly categorized into the following areas:

- Design and Implementation of Evaluation Systems:
 - Multiple Measures: The use of multiple measures, such as classroom observations and student growth, is crucial for a comprehensive assessment of teacher effectiveness. This approach helps to mitigate the limitations of relying solely on any single measure and provides a more nuanced understanding of teacher performance.
 - Equity-Centered Approach: The evaluation system should be grounded in equity, acknowledging and addressing systemic inequities in the education system. This involves ensuring representation of marginalized groups in the evaluation process and utilizing assessment tools that focus on equity.
 - Focus on Growth and Development: The evaluation process should prioritize professional growth and development, fostering a continuous learning process for educators. This includes setting clear goals, providing constructive feedback, instructional coaching, and offering opportunities for professional learning that are aligned with individual and collective needs.
 - Fairness and Validity: The evaluation system must be perceived as fair and valid by educators. This involves ensuring that evaluations are

conducted by trained and skilled evaluators, using reliable and unbiased assessment tools. The system should also provide opportunities for educators to offer feedback and engage in dialogue about the evaluation process.

- **Alignment with Goals and Context:** The evaluation system should be aligned with the broader goals of the school or district, as well as the specific context in which educators work. This includes considering factors such as student demographics, school culture, and available resources when designing and implementing the evaluation process.
- **Usefulness and Actionable Feedback:** The evaluation system should provide educators with feedback that is not only specific and timely but also actionable and useful for improvement. This involves offering clear guidance on areas of strength and areas for growth, along with suggestions for professional learning opportunities.

By strategically implementing these high-leverage strategies, educational institutions can develop and sustain effective evaluation systems that support teacher growth, enhance instructional quality, and ultimately contribute to improved student outcomes. It is important to recognize that the process of designing and implementing an effective evaluation system is ongoing and requires continuous collaboration, reflection, and adaptation to meet the evolving needs of educators and students.

Implications of the Literature Review

The literature review on educator evaluation provides insight into the complexities and challenges associated with assessing educator effectiveness. The research:

- Highlights the multifaceted nature of teaching and learning, emphasizing the limitations of relying solely on any single measure to evaluate teacher performance, including standardized test scores.
- Underscores the importance of incorporating multiple measures, such as classroom observations and student growth, to capture a broader range of teaching skills and provide a more nuanced understanding of teacher effectiveness.
- Emphasizes the critical role of equity in educator evaluation.
- Stresses the importance of viewing educator evaluation as a tool for professional growth and development rather than as a perceived high stakes evaluation instrument.
- Reinforces the importance that educator evaluations should foster a continuous learning process for educators, providing them with constructive feedback and opportunities for professional learning that are aligned with their individual and collective needs.

The studies on educator evaluation reveal that despite good intentions, such reforms often fail to produce the desired improvements in student achievement and attainment due to various factors, including but not limited to “political opposition... capacity constraints... and limited generalizability of early successes (Bleiberg, Brunner, Harbatkin, Kraft, & Springer, 5, 2024).

The literature concludes by offering several consistent recommendations, including:

- Utilizing multiple measures to assess educator effectiveness.
- Focusing on professional growth and development.
- Ensuring fairness and validity in the evaluation system.
- Aligning the evaluation system with the broader goals and context of the school or district.
- Providing educators with actionable and useful feedback for improvement and professional development.

By incorporating these recommendations, the literature suggests that educator evaluation systems can evolve into powerful tools for promoting educator growth, enhancing instructional quality, and ultimately improving student outcomes. The review highlights the need for ongoing collaboration, reflection, and adaptation to ensure that evaluation systems remain responsive to the evolving needs of educators and students.

Comparisons to Other States: Legislative Changes around the Nation

Since 2020, seven states have made significant policy changes to educator evaluations, including Delaware, Colorado, Connecticut, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, and New York. These policy changes reflect a broader trend towards more holistic and growth-oriented teacher evaluation systems, with a focus on continuous improvement and professional development. They also highlight the ongoing debate over the use of student growth measures and the role of evaluation ratings in personnel decisions. Current trends demonstrate a decrease in the utilization and weight of standardized test scores in teacher evaluations. This recognizes that student learning is influenced by multiple factors and encourages a more balanced assessment of teacher effectiveness.

With the reduced emphasis on test scores, states are placing greater importance on teachers' instructional skills, classroom management, and overall professionalism. The new systems also prioritize ongoing professional growth and development, encouraging the use of formative feedback and support to help teachers continuously improve. States, such as Louisiana, New Mexico, and New York, are incorporating multiple measures of teacher performance, such as classroom observations and teacher self-reflection, to provide a more comprehensive picture of teacher effectiveness ([Appendix G](#)). Additionally, there is a greater emphasis on teacher participation and ownership in the evaluation process, allowing them to contribute to their professional growth plans and have a voice in their evaluations.

The revised systems shift the focus from punitive measures to providing support and constructive feedback to educators. Observations and evaluations are seen as opportunities for growth and improvement, fostering a more collaborative and supportive environment. New York recently granted districts more flexibility and local control in designing their evaluation systems. In a guidance document to the field from the New York State Education Department, Acting Commissioner Alexander Trikalinos states, “These new Standards-based Educator Evaluation and Professional Support plans (‘NYS STEPS’) should support all educators’ professional growth as a part of a comprehensive, systemic approach to advancing excellence in teaching and learning aligned to our New York State Teaching and Educational Leadership Standards, including the Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Education Framework. Through multiple measures, including observation, educators will receive meaningful feedback on their practice and intentional professional learning and growth opportunities. This allows districts to tailor their evaluations to their specific needs and priorities” (2024).

These changes represent a significant step towards creating more effective and empowering evaluation systems for educators. By focusing on growth, collaboration, and support, these new systems aim to foster a positive and productive teaching and learning environment that benefits both educators and students.

Ultimately, in their analysis, “Making a Difference: Six places where teacher evaluation systems are getting results,” Putnam, Ross, and Walsh outline the goals of teacher evaluation, saying, “Strong teacher evaluation systems, when paired with supports and incentives, are designed to do the following:

1. Provide a more valid measure of teacher quality by distinguishing between teachers at different performance levels;
2. Recognize strong teachers and keep them in the classroom;
3. Encourage consistently less effective teachers to leave the classroom;
4. Help all teachers improve;
5. Recruit more effective new teachers; and
6. Achieve gains in student learning and other positive student outcomes” (2, 2018).

The Education Evaluation Review Task Force considers these factors as core to the purpose of the our charge, providing New Jersey's educators with an evaluative system that is purposeful, actionable, supportive, developmental, and premised upon ongoing and meaningful feedback, professional learning, and coaching that will ultimately improve their craft. In doing so, we believe that integrating best practices and multiple objective measures of student learning into the evaluative elements in ways that have broader and greater impact than the current Student Growth Objective requirement will serve New Jersey's students more meaningfully and help to secure our state's legacy as one of, if not the, strongest educational system in the nation.

References

- AchieveNJ: "AchieveNJ: Educator Evaluation in New Jersey." New Jersey Department of Education. <https://nj.gov/education/code/current/title6a/chap10.pdf>
- ARRA: "The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009." U.S. Government, 2009.
- Bleiberg, J., Brunner, E., Harbatkin, E., Kraft, M.A., & Springer, M. (2024). Taking Teacher Evaluation to Scale: The Effect of State Reforms on Achievement and Attainment. (EdWorkingPaper: 21-496). Retrieved from Annenberg Institute at Brown University:
<https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/Bleiberg%20et%20al.%20Teacher%20Eval%20-%20February%202024.pdf>
- Bleiberg, J., Brunner, E., Harbatkin, E., Kraft, M. A., & Springer, M. G. (2023). Taking teacher evaluation to scale: The effect of state reforms on achievement and attainment. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, 30995. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w30995>. (Same article as above published in two locations.)
- Choi, Y., & Bowers, A.J. (2024). How teachers perceive the impact of teacher feedback: A latent class analysis. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 32(38).
https://drive.google.com/file/d/17XYzOM7GVXD1ikljEEDR80q-ryP8xc-w/view?usp=drive_link
- Common Core: "Common Core State Standards: Implementation Timeline." (2010). New Jersey Department of Education.
- Curriculum Updates: "New Jersey Curriculum Standards Update 2020." (2020). New Jersey Department of Education.
- Danielson, C. (2016) "Charlotte Danielson on Rethinking Teacher Evaluation" Education Week: <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-charlotte-danielson-on-rethinking-teacher-evaluation/2016/04>

ELA and Math Standards: "New Jersey Student Learning Standards Implementation Timeline." (2024). New Jersey Department of Education.

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.

Kaplan, Emily. (2020). "Pedro Noguera: The Work Is Not Yet Done." Edutopia: <https://www.edutopia.org/article/pedro-noguera-work-not-yet-done/>

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional Coaching: A Partnership Approach to Improving Instruction*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Kraft, M.A. & Gilmour, A.F. (2017). Revisiting the Widget Effect: Teacher evaluation reforms and the distribution of teacher effectiveness. *Educational Researcher*, 46(5), 234-239.

Mayger, L. K. (2022). "This is the piece of the pie we can control: Educators' experiences with student learning objectives as performance measures." *Elementary School Journal*, 122(4), 591–615. <https://doi.org/10.1086/719411>

Mayger, L. K. (2022). Evaluating technical and issue bias in teacher evaluation policy briefs and state handbooks. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 44(4), 603–627. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221120578>

National Center on Intensive Intervention. (2016). *Essential Components of MTSS*. <https://mtss4success.org/>

NJSLA: "New Jersey Student Learning Assessments." New Jersey Department of Education, 2019.

NJSLS: "New Jersey Student Learning Standards." New Jersey Department of Education, 2016.

PARCC: "The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers." New Jersey Department of Education, 2015.

Putnam, H., Ross, E., & Walsh, K. (2018, October). *Making a difference: Six places where teacher evaluation systems are getting results*. National Council on Teacher Quality. <https://www.nctq.org/publications/Making-a-Difference>.

Race to the Top: "Race to the Top: Accelerating Student Achievement through State Reforms." (2012) U.S. Department of Education.

SFRA: "School Funding Reform Act of 2008: Policy Revisions." (2008). New Jersey Department of Education.

Trikalikos, A. (2 July 2024). *Implementation of Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems for the 2024-25 School Year and Thereafter Pursuant to Education Law §§3012-d and 3012-e as Amended by Chapter 143 of the Laws of 2024*. The New York State Education Department.

<https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/programs/educator-quality/implementation-teacher-principal-evaluation-systems-2024-25-school-year-and-thereafter-pursuant-to-education-law-3012-d-and-3012-e-amended-chapter-143.pdf>

Xie, N. (2023, October). *The Negative Impact of ESSA on Educational Equity: A Teacher Accountability Perspective*. Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media.
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1lr8JSoTlxrViBo4iOnbnK8vclzvwZPzl/view?usp=drive_link

Appendices

Appendix A - Relevant Statute and Regulations**Senate Bill approved May 17, 2024 – Senate No. 2082**

<https://pub.njleg.state.nj.us/Bills/2024/AL24/14 .PDF>

N.J.A.C 6A:10 – Educator Effectiveness

<https://www.nj.gov/education/code/current/title6a/chap10.pdf>

Chapter 26 - Senate and General Assembly of the New Jersey Statutes

<https://pub.njleg.gov/bills/2012/PL12/26 .PDF>

N.J.A.C. 6A:9C, Professional Development

<https://www.nj.gov/education/code/current/title6a/chap9c.pdf>

N.J.A.C. 6A:8, Standards and Assessment

<https://www.nj.gov/education/code/current/title6a/chap8.pdf>

N.J.A.C. 6A:5, Regulatory Equivalency and Waiver

<https://www.nj.gov/education/code/current/title6a/chap5.pdf>

Appendix B - History of Educator Evaluations in New Jersey Since Enactment of TEACHNJ

Background - History of the System

Several educational policy changes have occurred since 2012. In brief:

1. **Teacher Evaluation Reforms:** New Jersey implemented the AchieveNJ system, which introduced more rigorous teacher evaluations starting in 2013. These evaluations incorporate both classroom observations and student growth measures, significantly altering how teacher performance is assessed. The system was developed in response to the federal Race to the Top initiative and aimed to improve teacher effectiveness through regular assessments and targeted professional development.

Citations:

AchieveNJ: "AchieveNJ: Educator Evaluation in New Jersey." New Jersey Department of Education.

Race to the Top: "Race to the Top: Accelerating Student Achievement through State Reforms." U.S. Department of Education, 2012.

2. **Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Implementation:** New Jersey adopted the Common Core State Standards in 2010, but the most significant push for implementation occurred post-2012. By 2014, these standards were fully implemented across the state, although they were later revised and renamed as the New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSLS) in 2016.

Citations:

Common Core: "Common Core State Standards: Implementation Timeline." New Jersey Department of Education, 2010.

NJSLS: "New Jersey Student Learning Standards." New Jersey Department of Education, 2016.

- 3. PARCC Assessments:** In line with the adoption of CCSS, New Jersey introduced the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) exams in 2015. These standardized tests were designed to assess student performance against the new standards. However, PARCC faced significant pushback from educators and parents, leading to its gradual replacement by the New Jersey Student Learning Assessments (NJSLA) starting in 2019.

Citations:

PARCC: "The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers." New Jersey Department of Education, 2015.

NJSLA: "New Jersey Student Learning Assessments." New Jersey Department of Education, 2019.

- 4. School Funding Formula Revisions:** New Jersey has made adjustments to its school funding formula multiple times since 2012, particularly to address equity issues. The School Funding Reform Act (SFRA) of 2008 underwent modifications to ensure that resources are more equitably distributed, especially to districts serving high-need students. Governor Phil Murphy's administration has made additional efforts to fully fund the SFRA and increase investments in public education.

Citations:

SFRA: "School Funding Reform Act of 2008: Policy Revisions." New Jersey Department of Education.

- 5. Curriculum Updates:** In 2020, New Jersey updated its curriculum standards across various subjects, including health and physical education, social studies, and science. New student learning standards for ELA are being implemented in 2024, and new student learning standards for math will be implemented in 2025.

Citations:

Curriculum Updates: "New Jersey Curriculum Standards Update 2020." New Jersey Department of Education.

ELA and Math Standards: "New Jersey Student Learning Standards Implementation Timeline." New Jersey Department of Education, 2024.

These policy changes reflect New Jersey's ongoing efforts to adapt NJ's educational system to better serve its students, teachers, and communities in a rapidly changing world. Throughout the state, educators continue to refine approaches to education, aiming to help maintain New Jersey's position as a leader in educational outcomes nationwide.

Federal Race to the Top Legislation

Over the past fifteen years, national efforts have been experimented with changes to educator evaluation due to passage of The American Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA), which was designed to issue a series of competitive grants under Race to the Top funding. The ARRA mandated states to develop new ways to evaluate, assess, and hold teacher preparation accountable. Amongst these changes was an explicit focus on teacher evaluation. The federal government poured in over \$5 billion dollars to states to modify evaluation systems using value-added measures to evaluate teachers based upon test scores of their students. In New Jersey, the focus on value added metrics and the utilization of Student Growth Objectives (SGOs) and Student Growth Percentile (SGPs) has clouded the discussion of teacher evaluations and created great distrust in the evaluation system for educators. As the nation and NJ moved to a value-added metric system in the shadow of Race to the Top funding, the overemphasis on standardized tests shifted a focus away from individual student learning in many school communities. Choi and Bowers found that, "when evaluation tools are used simultaneously for development and accountability purposes, teachers are less likely to reveal and acknowledge their weaknesses lest such vulnerability threaten their job security (Popham, 1988)" (5, 2024).

Citations:

ARRA: "The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009." U.S. Government, 2009.

Race to the Top: "Race to the Top Program." U.S. Department of Education, 2012.

Appendix C - Educator Evaluation System Overview

The Task Force extends its gratitude to Pete Mazzagatti, Ed.D., Director of the Office of Educator Effectiveness of the New Jersey Department of Education, who presented a brief but comprehensive overview of the history of educator evaluation to the Task Force on July 17, 2024. The text from relevant slides from the “Educator Evaluation System Overview” presentation is included below.

The TEACHNJ Act and Chapter 10 Regulations

2012: The TEACHNJ Act was unanimously passed by the Legislature and signed into law.

2012-2013: Two-year pilot ensues, as regulations are written based on the findings.

2013: The TEACHNJ Act and chapter 10 regulations go into effect.

2016: Amendments to the chapter 10 regulations go into effect.

2020: Chapter 10 is readopted. 2020-2021: COVID-Impacted Executive Orders.

2024: Law establishing the Task Force is passed.

TEACHNJ Act and Chapter 10 Regulations Purpose

The TEACHNJ Act (“TEACHNJ”) is the bipartisan tenure reform approved unanimously by the legislature and signed into law by Governor Christie on August 6, 2012. The goal of the law is to “raise student achievement by improving instruction through the adoption of evaluations that provide specific feedback to educators, inform the provision of aligned professional development, and inform personnel decisions” (N.J.S.A.18A:6-118-2.a). At its core, TEACHNJ reforms the processes of earning and maintaining tenure by improving evaluations and opportunities for professional growth. Specifically:

- Tenure decisions are now based on multiple measures of student achievement and teacher practice as measured by new evaluation procedures.

- Lengthy and costly tenure hearings are shorter, focused on process only, and less expensive.
- Educator feedback and development is more individualized and focused on students.

Chapter 10 regulations are designed to support a system that facilitates:

1. Continual improvement of instruction;
2. Meaningful differentiation of educator performance using four performance levels;
3. Use of multiple valid measures in determining educator performance levels, including objective measures of student performance and measures of professional practice;
4. Evaluation of educators on a regular basis;
5. Delivery of clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies areas for growth and guides professional development; and
6. School district personnel decisions.

The Components of Teacher Evaluation

Chapter 10 regulations rely on multiple measures of performance to evaluate teachers. These measures include components of both student achievement and teacher practice. The weights in the table below represent the current school year.

Type of Educator	Evaluation Weights
mSGP Teacher	Teacher Practice: 70% SGO: 25% mSGP: 5%
Non-mSGP Teachers	Teacher Practice: 85% SGO: 15%

Teacher Practice Component

Teacher practice is measured by performance on a state-approved teacher practice instrument (e.g., Danielson, Marzano, et al.), which is used to gather evidence primarily through classroom observations.

Teacher Status	Minimum Observations (at least 20 minutes each)	Multiple Observers
Non-tenured	3	Required
Tenured	2	Recommended
Corrective Action Plan	Plus One	Required

- Announced vs. Unannounced: Within the minimum requirements, all teachers must have at least one unannounced and one announced observation with a pre-conference.
- Non-tenured teachers present for less than 40% total school days in an academic year: A minimum of 2 observations are required.
- Post-conferences: Post-conferences between teachers and their supervisors are required following each observation. These conferences must occur within 15 working days of the observation. In addition, these must all be face-to-face for non-tenured teachers and at least one must be face-to-face for tenured teachers.

Student Achievement Components

1. Student Growth Objectives (SGOs) are academic goals for groups of students that each teacher sets with his or her principal or supervisor at the start of the year.

- They shall be specific and measurable, based on available student learning data, aligned to New Jersey Student Learning Standards, and based on growth and/or achievement.
 - Teachers of non-tested grades and subjects are required to set two SGOs.
 - Teachers of tested grades and subjects are required to set one or two SGOs.
2. Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) measure student achievement gains within 4th-8th grade Language Arts and 4th-7th grade Math , referred to as the “tested grades and subjects.”
- Using the state standardized assessment, SGPs compare the change in a student’s achievement from one year to the next to that of all other students in the state who had similar historical results (the student’s “academic peers”).

Corrective Action Plans (CAPs)

- Under the TEACHNJ Act, CAPs are required for all staff members rated Ineffective or Partially Effective on their last annual summative evaluation (defined as a summative score of less than 2.65).
- A teacher may not be lifted out of CAP status until they receive a summative score of 2.65 or above.
- The CAP replaces the typical professional development plan.
- CAPs require an extra observation, a mid year conference and multiple observers at a minimum.

Summative Rating

- This overall evaluation score combines the multiple measures of teacher practice and student growth. All New Jersey teachers earn one of four ratings.
- To earn a standard certification, educators need an effective or highly effective rating in 2/3 years.
- To earn tenure, a new teacher must complete a district mentorship program during their first year of employment. After completion of this program, the

teacher must be rated either effective or highly effective in two of the three subsequent years.

- To lose tenure, a teacher rated ineffective or partially effective in two consecutive years may be charged with inefficiency. Tenure charges must be filed for teachers who earn consecutive ineffective ratings.

Professional Development Planning

- To meet the intent of the law requiring specific feedback to educators and aligned professional development, rules are in place in chapter 10 which require practices such as pre-conferences, face-to-face post conferences which occur within 15 working days of the observation, yearly training for both observers and the observed, transparency in the system, etc.
- Chapter 9C, professional development regulations require that “One area for development of professional practice derived from the results of observations and evidence accumulated through the teacher’s annual performance evaluation.”
- Finally, observation data, while confidential, is recommended to be used in the work of School Improvement Panels, as well as for school and district professional development planning.

Appendix D - The Evolution of Professional Development Plans in New Jersey

The landscape of professional development in New Jersey has undergone significant changes over the years, particularly since the late 1990s. The state has continually sought to refine the process, aiming to enhance teacher practice and, ultimately, student learning outcomes.

Prior to TEACHNJ

In 1998, the New Jersey State Board of Education mandated that all teachers complete 100 hours of professional development every five years. This marked a significant shift towards recognizing the importance of ongoing learning for educators. Local Professional Development Committees (LPDCs) were established to oversee the planning and implementation of these professional development initiatives at the school level.

Refinement and Focus

The year 2007 saw further refinement of the process, with the introduction of five-year cycles, a greater emphasis on collaborative learning through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and the creation of school-level professional development committees. The then-named Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs) were also introduced, requiring teachers to engage in personal professional development planning. These PIPs were later renamed Professional Development Plans (PDPs) in 2008.

Impact of TEACHNJ

The passage of TEACHNJ in 2012, a new tenure and evaluation law, brought about substantial changes to the professional development landscape. The State Board of Education adopted new regulations that revised the ways PDPs were to be developed.

Key Components of PDPs

Under the new regulations, all certified school staff members are required to have PDPs. These plans are developed collaboratively between a school administrator and

the faculty member. They must address areas of growth identified in evaluations, align with school/district goals and professional standards, and focus on student achievement. The PDP should consist of at least 20 hours of learning annually, documented through various means like certificates and attendance logs.

Shift in Perspective

One of the most significant shifts in recent years has been the move away from a purely teacher-centric view of professional development. While earlier regulations focused primarily on refining teacher practice, the current emphasis is on learner outcomes. This shift is evident in the proposed regulations on professional standards for teachers, which highlight personalized learning, application of knowledge, assessment literacy, and collaborative professional culture.

The Role of the School Improvement Panel (ScIP)

Another notable change is the replacement of the democratically elected LPDC with the School Improvement Panel (ScIP), selected by the building principal. The ScIP's primary focus is on personalized professional training driven by individual evaluations. This shift has implications for teacher involvement in the process, particularly concerning confidentiality issues surrounding individual evaluations.

The Evolution of PDPs

The evolution of Professional Development Plans in New Jersey reflects the state's ongoing commitment to improving teacher practice and student learning. While the focus has shifted towards learner outcomes and a more evaluative approach, the core principle remains the same: empowering educators to continually grow and develop in their profession. Overall, these changes reflect a shift in professional development for teachers, becoming less about teacher autonomy and more about meeting specific goals and improving student outcomes.

Appendix E - Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and New Jersey Tiered System of Support Models

NJDOE Website Resources: <https://www.nj.gov/education/njtss> and <https://www.nj.gov/education/njtss/index.shtml/guidelines.pdf>

Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)

A Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) or NJ Tiered Systems of Support (NJTSS) model would typically include the following key components:

- Universal Screening: All students are assessed early in the school year to identify those who may need additional support.
- Tiered Interventions: A continuum of support is provided, ranging from Tier 1 (universal support for all students) to Tier 3 (intensive, individualized support for students with significant needs).
- Progress Monitoring: Student progress is regularly monitored to determine the effectiveness of interventions and make adjustments as needed.
- Data-Based Decision Making: Data is used to inform instruction, interventions, and resource allocation.
- Collaboration: Educators, families, and other stakeholders work together to support student success.

National Center on Intensive Intervention. (2016). Essential Components of MTSS.

<https://mtss4success.org/> - This resource provides a comprehensive overview of the essential components of an MTSS framework, encompassing all the areas mentioned above.

Additional Components:

- Professional Development: Ongoing professional development is provided to ensure staff have the knowledge and skills to implement evidence-based practices.
- Culturally Responsive Practices: Instruction and interventions are culturally and linguistically responsive to meet the needs of all students.

By implementing these components, the NJTSS or MTSS models strive to create a proactive and responsive system that addresses the needs of all students and promotes their academic, behavioral, and social-emotional success.

NJTSS Framework

The below information can be found at <https://www.nj.gov/education/njtss/>

NJTSS is a framework of supports and interventions to improve student achievement, based on the core components of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and the three tier prevention logic of Response to Intervention (RTI). With a foundation of strong district and school leadership, a positive school culture and climate and family and community engagement, NJTSS builds on Intervention and Referral Services (I&RS) and gives schools structure to meet the academic, behavioral, health, enrichment and social/emotional needs of all students

The NJTSS framework includes nine essential components:

Three **Foundational Components**, around the outer triangle of the diagram:


1. Effective district and school leadership
2. Family and community engagement
3. Positive school culture and climate

Six **Instructional Components** to support a continuum of core programs and interventions, as in many RTI models:

1. High-quality learning environments, curricula, and instructional practices
2. Universal screening
3. Data-based decision making
4. Collaborative problem-solving teams
5. Progress monitoring
6. Staff professional development

The essential components of NJTSS are:

- Effective district and school leadership;
- Family and community engagement;
- Positive school culture and climate;
- High-quality learning environments, curricula, and instructional practices;
- Universal screening;
- Data-based decision making;
- Collaborative problem-solving teams;
- Progress monitoring; and
- Staff professional development



Tier 1- Universal Supports Tier 1, represented by the large dark blue section at the bottom of the triangle, focuses on core whole-group and differentiated small group instruction in New Jersey Student Learning Standards in all classroom (including bilingual classrooms and ESL programs), delivered with fidelity by trained teachers with the support of other professionals. In Tier 1, universal screening is conducted where students are screened two or more times a year in literacy, math, and behavior to determine which students in each classroom are on track, which students need additional support and which students may require enrichment activities. Collaborative problem-solving teams, made up of teachers (general education, ESL and special education), the principal, the guidance counselor and other specialists, develop decision criteria, review the screening data and make decisions about the appropriateness of Tier 1 in meeting the majority of students' needs. When less than 80% of students are meeting benchmark expectations, Tier 1 instruction and curricula are altered and/or supplemented. Teachers are provided with strategies and supports to meet the needs of their students based on data.

Tier 2 – Targeted, Small Group Interventions Tier 2, represented by the medium blue section in the middle of the inner triangle, includes additional evidence-based supports and interventions that are provided in small group settings in addition to Tier 1 (a group size of 3 to 5 students is recommended) for students who perform below benchmark expectations on universal screening. These interventions are typically provided 3 to 5 days a week by an interventionist, reading specialist or other staff member, or by classroom teachers during an intervention period scheduled in addition to core instruction. Interventions are focused on developing skills and increase in intensity, frequency and duration based upon the review of data during regular progress monitoring intervals. The focus for Tier 2 interventions are typically determined by diagnostic assessment conducted as a follow-up to universal screening. There may be adaptations of supports and interventions based on an individual student's performance using data that are reviewed during frequent progress monitoring intervals.

Tier 3 – Intensive Interventions Tier 3, represented by the small light blue section at the top of the inner triangle, includes the most intensive level of evidence-based supports

and intervention. Tier 3 interventions are provided for individual students or small student groups (2 to 3 students) who are significantly below benchmark expectations and/or those for whom tier 2 is insufficient in meeting their needs. Tier 3 interventions are more intensive, typically provided more frequently (daily) than interventions at Tier 3. As with Tier 2, Tier 3 interventions are typically provided by an interventionist, reading specialist or other staff member, or by classroom teachers during an intervention period scheduled in addition to core instruction. There may be adaptations of supports and interventions based on an individual student's performance using data that are reviewed during frequent progress monitoring intervals.

Appendix F - Recommended “Commissioner Approved Activities”

The below list of instructional activities are recommended by the Educator Evaluation Review Task Force to be allowed as “Commissioner-Approved Activities.” Examples of Data Protocols can be found [here](#).

Recommended Exemplars for Commissioner Approved Activities:

- 1. Case Study Review** - The case study review process within a K-12 education system involves an examination of a specific student profile, academic intervention or instructional program. Educators select evidence relevant to the selected case study, often focusing on addressing a particular challenge or implementing an innovative approach. The educator would then present several pieces of evidence and work with a supervisor to thoroughly analyze the case study, dissecting the context, objectives, methodology, and outcomes. The focus of the protocol should be on student learning and educator practices. Utilizing a data protocol, the team would identify key takeaways, best practices, and potential pitfalls. These insights would impact future decision-making and continuous improvement.
- 2. Data-Dive Conversations** - To promote the sharing of data and insights among colleagues to foster a culture of continuous improvement, this process includes regular feedback sessions scheduled between teachers and evaluators to discuss data insights and collaboratively set improvement goals. Based upon the data-discussions, suggestions for specific and targeted training or resources can be offered based on identified student’s needs. When possible, instructional coaches or a coaching model should be utilized, which can provide ongoing support in areas highlighted by data.
- 3. Data-Based Decision Making** - This cyclical process involves collecting, analyzing, and interpreting various types of data (e.g., student assessments, attendance records, behavioral observations) to identify strengths, weaknesses,

and areas for improvement. This information is then used to inform instructional strategies, curriculum modifications, and interventions tailored to meet the diverse needs of students. Educators collaborate with supervisors to review data, establish goals, implement evidence-based practices, and monitor progress, continuously evaluating the effectiveness of their strategies and making adjustments as needed to ensure that all students reach their full potential. By leveraging data-driven insights, educators can create a more personalized and responsive learning environment that fosters academic growth, social-emotional development, and overall student success.

a. **Data Disaggregation:**

Break down data by subgroups (e.g., grade level, subject area, student demographics) on screening instruments in order to identify specific areas of strength or need. Educators then build targeted supports for identified learners based upon screening tools and implement interventions to drive student improvement.

b. **Data-Informed Feedback Sessions:**

Meetings can be scheduled between teacher(s) and evaluators to discuss data insights and collaboratively set improvement goals. Discussion should include:

1. **Goal Setting:** Teachers set professional goals and self-evaluate progress throughout the year.
2. **Data Sharing:** Encourage PLCs to use data in their discussions, helping to align instructional practices with student needs.
3. **Collective Inquiry:** Foster a culture of collective problem-solving where teachers collaborate to analyze data and develop strategies for improvement.

4. **Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring** - A well-structured universal screening and progress monitoring process in a K-12 education system involves several key stages. Initially, all students are screened using standardized, evidence-based assessments at regular intervals throughout the school year to identify those at risk for academic or behavioral challenges. Students identified as at-risk then undergo more frequent progress monitoring using curriculum-based measures to track their response to interventions. The collected data informs data-driven decision-making, allowing educators to tailor interventions to individual student needs. This cyclical process of screening, monitoring, and adjusting interventions ensures timely support for all students, maximizing their potential for academic and behavioral success.

a. <https://mtss4success.org/sites/default/files/2023-05/what-is-screening.pdf>

- i. Identification
- ii. Intervention
- iii. Progress Monitoring
- iv. Adjust Interventions

b. Educators will work with their direct supervisor to review assigned students' data by classroom or caseload.

5. **Data-Informed Evaluation: Self-Reflection and Self-Evaluation** - Data-Informed Evaluation is a crucial process in the K-12 education system, acting as a compass, guiding educators towards effective practices and improved student outcomes. This approach involves the systematic collection and analysis of various data points that paint a comprehensive picture of educational effectiveness. The insights gleaned from this data-driven approach empower educators to make informed decisions about curriculum design, instructional strategies, and resource allocation, ultimately leading to more targeted interventions and personalized learning experiences. By leveraging the power of

data with knowledge of students and instructional expertise, educators can transform educational practices from guesswork into evidence-based decision-making, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and ensuring that every student receives the support they need to succeed.

- a. **Evidence-Based Portfolios:** The use of portfolios in teacher evaluation has been supported by Darling-Hammond (2000), who argues that portfolios provide a rich, authentic representation of a student and teacher's work. Portfolios allow teachers to demonstrate their effectiveness through a collection of artifacts, including lesson plans, student work, and reflective essays.
 - i. Portfolios may be digital to allow educators to create digital collections that compile examples of assessment data, lesson plans, student work, and targeted professional development reflections that speak to specific identified actions.
 - b. **Adaptive Learning Analytics:** Leveraging a data-informed teacher evaluation process involves systematically collecting, analyzing, and using various data sources to support and guide professional development. Educators have the ability to utilize real-time data analysis of student learning patterns, which can be used to fine-tune teaching strategies for better outcomes.
6. **Instructional Coaching Mode** - When available, teachers work with instructional coaches who can provide ongoing support in areas highlighted by data.
- a. **Peer Collaboration:** Promoting the sharing of data and insights among colleagues through targeted peer observations and reflection protocols helps foster a culture of continuous improvement.
 - b. **Coaching and Mentoring Models:** Teachers can be paired with coaches who can provide ongoing support in areas highlighted by data. Instructional Coaching (Knight, 2007) provides evidence that instructional

coaching is one of the most effective forms of professional development. Coaches work closely with teachers to implement evidence-based practices, providing personalized support that is directly tied to classroom performance.

7. **Professional Learning Communities (PLCs):** Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) serve as the cornerstone for continuous improvement in K-12 education. These collaborative teams of educators within a school come together regularly to focus on student learning, sharing best practices, analyzing data, and collectively problem-solving to enhance instructional strategies and student outcomes. By fostering a culture of shared responsibility and data-driven decision-making, PLCs empower educators to create a more responsive and effective learning environment for all students.
 - a. **Data Sharing:** PLCs should be encouraged to use data in their discussions, helping to align instructional practices with student needs.
 - b. **Collective Inquiry:** A culture of collective problem-solving can be fostered where teachers collaborate to analyze data and develop strategies for improvement.

Alternative Recommendations:

8. Internships for Masters or Doctoral coursework that is tied to instructional practices.
9. Internship for educational certification that requires professional development or mentoring hours, such as / BCBA, Child Study Member, Counseling, Principal or Supervisor Certificate, etc.
10. Mentor of Non-Tenured Teacher.
11. Serve as a Member of a SCiP Team.
12. Serve as a Cooperating Teacher.

13. Serve on a district-or building-level strategic goal professional development team.
14. Serve as an Instructional Coach.
15. Serve on a district- or school-level data team
16. Prepare and facilitate original professional development opportunities for district colleagues or at a statewide or national conference

Appendix G - State Analysis

Summaries created with Gemini Advanced.

Colorado

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/43148ff117f6>

Colorado's education evaluation system has undergone several significant changes since 2020, with the most notable changes taking effect in the 2023-24 school year due to Senate Bill 22-070.

Key changes to the Colorado education evaluation system include:

1. Reduced Emphasis on Standardized Testing:

The weight of Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (MSLs/MSOs), which often include standardized test scores, has been reduced from 50% to 30% of an educator's overall evaluation. This change aims to provide a more balanced assessment of teacher effectiveness, recognizing that student learning is influenced by multiple factors beyond just test scores.

2. Increased Focus on Professional Practices:

With the reduced emphasis on test scores, the weight of Professional Practices in teacher evaluations has increased from 50% to 70%. This highlights the importance of teachers' instructional skills, classroom management, and overall professionalism in fostering student success.

3. Limitations on Collective Measures:

The use of collective measures (e.g., school-wide performance data) in teacher evaluations is now capped at 10%. This ensures that individual teachers are primarily evaluated based on their own performance and the growth of their students.

4. Emphasis on Growth and Development:

The revised system prioritizes ongoing professional growth and development for educators. It encourages the use of formative feedback and support to help teachers continuously improve their practice.

5. Streamlined Evaluation for High-Performing Teachers:

Teachers who consistently receive high ratings may be eligible for simplified evaluations and less frequent observations. This recognizes the expertise of experienced and effective educators and allows them to focus more on their teaching.

6. Specialized Rubrics:

The Colorado Department of Education is developing specialized rubrics to evaluate educators in specific roles, such as special education teachers or counselors. This ensures that evaluations are tailored to the specific responsibilities and expectations of different positions.

Overall, the changes to Colorado's education evaluation system reflect a broader trend towards more holistic and balanced assessments of teacher effectiveness. By reducing the reliance on standardized testing and emphasizing professional growth and support, the new system aims to create a more empowering and effective evaluation process for educators.

Connecticut

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/726816f44fa2>

Connecticut has introduced new educator evaluation guidelines for the 2024-2025 school year. The key changes in the system include:

1. **Shift in Focus:** The new guidelines prioritize educator growth and development over compliance. This encourages a more supportive and collaborative approach to evaluations.

2. **Reduced Burden:** The evaluation process has been streamlined to reduce the paperwork burden on teachers, allowing them to focus more on their students and classroom instruction.
3. **Individualized Growth:** Evaluations will emphasize discussions between educators and their evaluators to promote reflection and identify personalized growth opportunities.
4. **Research-Based Practices:** The new model is rooted in research-based practices that have proven effective in supporting teacher development.
5. **Flexibility:** While the Connecticut State Department of Education has provided a model plan, districts retain the flexibility to adapt or revise their evaluation systems to meet local needs, as long as they align with the new guidelines.
6. **Implementation Timeline:** The 2023-2024 school year serves as a planning period for districts to prepare for the implementation of the new guidelines in the 2024-2025 school year. Training and support will be provided to educators and administrators throughout this transition.

Overall, the changes to the Connecticut education evaluation system aim to create a more empowering and growth-oriented environment for educators, ultimately benefiting student learning and achievement.

Delaware

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/f288e90e151f>

The most significant change to the Delaware education evaluation system is the replacement of the DPAS-II system for evaluating classroom teachers with the new **Delaware Teacher Growth and Support System (DTGSS)**. This change took effect in the Fall of 2023.

Key Changes:

- **Shift in Focus:** DTGSS moves away from the previous DPAS-II system's emphasis on summative evaluation and standardized testing. Instead, it focuses

on continuous improvement through ongoing observation, feedback, and support for teacher growth.

- **Reflective Practice:** Teachers are encouraged to consistently reflect on their current practices and set new goals within a system of continuous improvement.
- **Benefits for Students:** The ultimate aim of DTGSS is to improve student learning outcomes by fostering a culture of teacher development and support.

Additional Points:

- **Implementation:** During the 2022-2023 school year, select districts and charter schools piloted the DTGSS system. Full implementation began in Fall 2023.
- **Other Educators:** School specialists and administrators remain under the current DPAS-II evaluation system.
- **Alternative Systems:** Delaware also allows some districts and charter schools to use alternative evaluation systems tailored to their specific contexts.

Overall, the changes to Delaware's education evaluation system reflect a broader trend towards more holistic and growth-oriented approaches to teacher evaluation. By focusing on continuous improvement and providing support for teacher development, the state aims to create a system that ultimately benefits students.

Louisiana

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://q.co/gemini/share/3dccb2830e0f>

Louisiana is currently in the process of implementing a major overhaul to its educator evaluation system, transitioning from the existing COMPASS system to the new Louisiana Educator Advancement and Development System (LEADS). The full implementation of LEADS is set for the 2025-2026 school year, with a "learning year" in 2024-2025 where schools can choose to pilot the new system or continue with COMPASS.

Here are the key changes brought about by LEADS:

1. **New Evaluation Rubrics:** LEADS introduces the Louisiana Educator Rubric (LER) for teachers and counselors, and the Louisiana Leader Rubric (LLR) for school leaders. These rubrics provide clearer descriptions of effective practices and facilitate more targeted feedback.
2. **Expanded Rating Scale:** The rating scale is expanding from a four-point scale to a five-point scale, providing more room for growth and differentiation between performance levels.
3. **Reduced Observations for Effective Teachers:** Effective teachers will receive fewer observations, allowing administrators more time to focus on mentoring new and developing teachers.
4. **Emphasis on Evidence-Based Practices:** The new system promotes the use of evidence-based practices to enhance teaching and leadership.
5. **Fairer and More Transparent Process:** LEADS incorporates multiple measures of performance, encourages self-reflection, and gives teachers a greater voice in the evaluation process.
6. **Stronger Connection to Professional Learning:** Evaluation results will be more closely linked to professional development opportunities, supporting individual growth and improvement.
7. **Focus on Growth and Support:** The system aims to provide better feedback and resources to help educators improve and succeed.

Overall, LEADS represents a significant shift in Louisiana's approach to educator evaluation. It moves away from a punitive model towards one that emphasizes growth, support, and professional development. The goal is to create a system that promotes the recruitment and retention of effective educators and ultimately improves student outcomes.

It is important to note that some aspects of the transition, such as the phasing out of the Value Added Model (VAM) for teacher evaluations, are still being debated and finalized. The 2024-2025 learning year will provide valuable feedback and data to inform the full implementation of LEADS in the following school year.

Michigan

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/3193b9178430>

Michigan's education evaluation system has undergone several significant changes recently, with the key updates being:

- **Reduced Emphasis on Standardized Testing:**
 - The weight of student growth and assessment data (which includes standardized tests) in teacher evaluations has been reduced from 40% to 20%.
 - The use of state assessment data is no longer mandatory, allowing districts more flexibility in choosing appropriate assessment measures.
- **Increased Flexibility and Local Control:**
 - Districts now have greater autonomy in selecting the specific assessment measures used for evaluations, subject to collective bargaining.
 - The requirement to include three years of student growth data has been removed, allowing for local decision-making on the number of years of data to be included.
- **Evaluation Frequency Adjustments:**
 - After three consecutive years of effective or highly effective ratings, teachers may be evaluated biennially or triennially instead of annually.
- **Other Notable Changes:**
 - The "highly effective" rating category has been eliminated.
 - The "ineffective" and "minimally effective" categories have been renamed.
 - New principals receive mentoring, and there's a process for appealing evaluations.
 - Individual development plans are required for teachers in their first year or those needing support/developing.
 - Mid-year progress reports are also required for these teachers.

These changes aim to make the evaluation system more holistic, less reliant on standardized tests, and more focused on supporting teacher growth and development.

They also provide more flexibility and local control to districts while ensuring accountability and improvement.

New Mexico

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/0aa1cf1eeafc>

The changes to New Mexico's education evaluation system, primarily implemented through the introduction of "Elevate NM" in the 2020-2021 school year, include:

1. Shift from Standardized Testing:

- **Reduced Emphasis on Test Scores:** The new system moves away from heavily relying on standardized test scores to evaluate teacher effectiveness. While student growth is still considered, it is one of multiple factors and not the sole determinant.

2. Focus on Holistic Evaluation:

- **Multiple Measures:** Elevate NM uses a combination of professional development plans, multiple classroom observations, and surveys from families and students to create a more comprehensive picture of teacher performance.
- **Teacher Growth and Development:** The focus is on providing constructive feedback and support to help educators improve their practice, rather than solely on punitive measures.

3. Increased Teacher Voice and Agency:

- **Professional Development Plans:** Teachers are encouraged to develop individual professional growth plans, demonstrating their commitment to continuous learning and improvement.
- **Reflective Practice:** The system emphasizes the importance of self-reflection and peer collaboration, enabling teachers to take ownership of their professional development.

4. Streamlined Observation Process:

- **Fewer Observation Levels:** The previous five-level performance scale has been reduced to four levels, simplifying the evaluation process and providing clearer feedback.
- **Minimum Observation Requirements:** Each teacher receives at least one formal observation and three walkthroughs during the school year, ensuring regular feedback and support.

5. Pandemic-Related Adjustments:

- **Flexibility and Support:** The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated flexibility in implementing the new system. The focus has been on supporting educators during challenging times and adapting the evaluation process to address the unique circumstances.

Overall, the changes to New Mexico's education evaluation system represent a shift toward a more holistic, growth-oriented, and teacher-centric approach. By incorporating multiple measures and prioritizing professional development, the system aims to create a supportive environment that fosters continuous improvement for all educators.

New York

Created with Gemini Advanced. September 4, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/fe382cefc8ba>

New York's education evaluation system has undergone significant changes recently, primarily aimed at moving away from a test-centric approach and empowering educators with greater agency. The key changes are as follows:

1. **Decoupling from Standardized Tests:** The biggest change is the removal of the requirement to tie teacher evaluations to student performance on standardized tests. This shift recognizes that test scores are just one piece of the puzzle when evaluating teaching effectiveness and aims to reduce the pressure of "teaching to the test."

2. **Local Control and Collective Bargaining:** School districts now have the flexibility to negotiate their own evaluation plans with local bargaining units. This empowers educators to have a voice in the process and create evaluation systems that work best for their specific contexts.
3. **Multiple Measures and Focus on Growth:** Evaluations will now utilize multiple measures aligned with state teaching and leadership standards. This allows for a more holistic assessment of educators, considering factors such as classroom observations, student growth, professional development, and other evidence of effective teaching practices.
4. **Elimination of Punitive Rubric:** The previous one-size-fits-all rubric, which was often seen as punitive, has been eliminated. This enables a more supportive and developmental approach to evaluation, focusing on growth and improvement rather than labeling or penalizing educators.
5. **Phased Transition:** Districts have up to eight years to transition to the new system, providing time for collaboration and thoughtful implementation. However, they can also choose to make the changes faster if they are prepared to do so.

Overall, these changes represent a significant step towards a more fair, just, and supportive evaluation system for New York's educators. By prioritizing professional growth and collaboration, the new system aims to enhance teaching practices and ultimately benefit student learning outcomes.

Appendix H - Literature Review

The below literature review has been collated from a series of sources. For the purpose of this review, summaries have been created utilizing AI technologies for the ease of reading. A shared Google folder with all utilized research articles can be found [here](#) for those with the interest and desire to review the full text.

Taking Teacher Evaluation to Scale: The Effect of State Reforms on Achievement and Attainment

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/1c94571963ff>

The study conducted by Bleiberg et al. (2024) delves into the impact of large-scale teacher evaluation reforms enacted by states in response to federal incentives during the Obama era. The primary objective of these reforms was to bolster teacher effectiveness, with the ultimate goal of improving student achievement and attainment. The researchers employed a robust methodological approach, utilizing data on the timing of state-level reforms in conjunction with extensive student achievement and attainment data.

The study's central finding is that, contrary to expectations, these teacher evaluation reforms did not yield any discernible improvement in student achievement or educational attainment on a national scale. The authors meticulously investigated potential variations in the effects based on factors such as evaluation system design and student characteristics, but found minimal evidence to suggest that the reforms were beneficial for any specific group or context.

The study further explores the potential reasons behind these null effects, drawing insights from political science, organizational theory, and the science of scaling. The authors pinpoint factors such as political opposition, the decentralized nature of the U.S.

education system, capacity constraints at the local level, limited generalizability of early successes, and the implementation of sanctions without corresponding increases in compensation as potential contributors to the reforms' limited effectiveness.

The reference text by Bleiberg et al. (2024) also underscores several pitfalls associated with teacher evaluation reforms, particularly when implemented on a large scale. The authors' findings indicate that these reforms, despite their well-intentioned goals, often fell short of producing the desired improvements in student achievement and attainment. The key pitfalls identified include:

- **Political Opposition:** The reforms encountered substantial resistance from teachers' unions, parent groups, and even some policymakers. This opposition frequently led to legal challenges, protests, and opt-out movements, impeding the effective implementation of the reforms.
- **Decentralization of Education:** The decentralized structure of the U.S. education system presented a challenge in ensuring consistent and effective implementation of the reforms across different states and districts. The flexibility granted to local entities resulted in variations in the design and implementation of evaluation systems, potentially diminishing their overall impact.
- **Capacity Constraints:** Many districts faced financial and logistical limitations in implementing the reforms. The scarcity of resources often led to an excessive burden on principals tasked with teacher evaluation, compromising the quality and depth of feedback provided to teachers.
- **Limited Generalizability:** The initial successes of teacher evaluation reforms in specific districts, such as Washington, D.C., might not have been readily transferable to other contexts. The unique characteristics of these districts, including mayoral control and greater resources, could have played a role in their success, making it challenging to replicate on a broader scale.
- **Sanctions without Increased Compensation:** The reforms frequently introduced heightened accountability and potential sanctions for teachers without corresponding increases in compensation. This fostered a sense of

dissatisfaction and insecurity among teachers, potentially impacting their morale and motivation.

In conclusion, the study by Bleiberg et al. (2024) provides a comprehensive and nuanced analysis of the impact of large-scale teacher evaluation reforms in the U.S. The findings challenge prevailing assumptions about the effectiveness of such reforms and emphasize the complexities and challenges inherent in implementing top-down policy changes within a decentralized system like education. The study's insights carry significant implications for policymakers and practitioners, highlighting the necessity of adopting a more context-sensitive and evidence-based approach to teacher evaluation and improvement.

- Citation: Bleiberg, J., Brunner, E., Harbatkin, E., Kraft, M. A., & Springer, M. G. (2023). Taking teacher evaluation to scale: The effect of state reforms on achievement and attainment. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, 30995. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w30995>

5 Lessons From The Failure Of The Gates Foundation's Teacher Effectiveness Initiative

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/1e10f10e169e>

The article, "5 Lessons From The Failure of the Gates Foundation-Backed School Reform" by Joanne Jacobs, discusses the lessons learned from the unsuccessful attempt to reform schools by the Gates Foundation. The initiative aimed to break down large high schools into smaller ones, improve teacher effectiveness, and link teacher pay to student achievement. However, the project failed to achieve its goals, leading to valuable insights for future educational reforms.

- **The Importance of Community Engagement:** The top-down approach of the initiative, where changes were imposed without sufficient input from teachers, parents, and students, resulted in resistance and lack of ownership. Future

reforms should prioritize community engagement and collaboration to ensure successful implementation.

- **The Need for Realistic Expectations:** The project's ambitious goals and timelines were unrealistic, leading to frustration and disappointment. It is crucial to set achievable goals and allow sufficient time for meaningful change to occur.
- **The Power of Data-Driven Decision Making:** The initiative relied heavily on data to measure progress and inform decisions. However, data alone cannot capture the complexities of education. It is essential to balance data with qualitative insights and consider the broader context.
- **The Importance of Teacher Support:** The project's focus on teacher evaluation and accountability created a stressful environment for educators. Future reforms should prioritize teacher support and professional development to empower them to meet the needs of their students.
- **The Need for Systemic Change:** The initiative focused on individual schools and teachers, neglecting the broader systemic issues that impact educational outcomes. Addressing poverty, inequality, and other social factors is crucial for achieving lasting change in education.

The failure of the Gates Foundation-backed school reform serves as a reminder that educational change is complex and requires a multifaceted approach. By learning from these lessons, future reforms can increase their chances of success and create a more equitable and effective education system for all students.

APA Citation:

Jacobs, J. (2015, April 27). 5 Lessons From The Failure Of The Gates Foundation-Backed School Reform. *Forbes*.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/joannejacobs/2015/04/27/5-lessons-from-the-failure-of-the-gates-foundation-backed-school-reform/?sh=40302f04403d>

Beyond 'Best Practices': Centering Equity in Teacher Preparation Evaluation

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/d8eef2f0f630>

The article "Beyond 'Best Practices': Centering Equity in Teacher Preparation Evaluation" by Cochran-Smith & Reagan (2022) provides a critical analysis of the prevailing approaches to teacher preparation evaluation and advocates for a paradigm shift that prioritizes equity. The authors contend that the current evaluation landscape, while emphasizing rigor and accountability, often overlooks the systemic inequities that persist in education. The article underscores the necessity of integrating equity as a central tenet in the design, implementation, and interpretation of teacher preparation evaluation.

Key Highlights:

- The authors reviewed 19 major policy reports on teacher preparation evaluation published between 2010 and 2020 and categorized them based on their underlying evaluation theories: postpositivist, methods-focused approaches; pragmatic, use-oriented approaches; and transformative, equity-centered approaches.
- The majority of the reports focused on identifying the most effective evaluation metrics using rigorous criteria for accuracy and utility, with little explicit attention to equity. Some reports assumed that equity would naturally result from rigorous evaluation systems.
- The authors argue for an equity-centered approach to teacher preparation evaluation that acknowledges the historical and persistent inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes in the United States.
- The article rejects the notion of "best practices," which are often decontextualized and insensitive to local needs, and instead proposes 11 guiding principles for incorporating equity into teacher preparation evaluation.
- The guiding principles emphasize making equity an explicit goal throughout the evaluation process, working at a systemic level, utilizing equity-focused

assessment models, including all stakeholders (especially those from marginalized communities), and fostering internal professional accountability.

The authors conclude by advocating for the establishment of a task force to develop key equity indicators for teacher preparation evaluation, emphasizing the critical need to prioritize equity in evaluating and improving teacher preparation programs.

APA Citation: Cochran-Smith, M., & Reagan, E. M. (2022). Beyond “best practices”: Centering equity in teacher preparation evaluation. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 30(66). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.7040>

Deconstructing Disinformation on Student Growth Percentiles & Teacher Evaluation in New Jersey.

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 9, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/ad6a5b6453c7>

The attached document, "Deconstructing Disinformation on Student Growth Percentiles & Teacher Evaluation in New Jersey," by Bruce D. Baker and Joseph Oluwole, delves into the complexities and controversies surrounding the use of Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) in evaluating teachers and principals in New Jersey. The authors argue that SGPs, despite being proposed as a major component in teacher evaluations, are fundamentally flawed and not suitable for this purpose. The core of their argument rests on the assertion that SGPs are not designed to isolate the impact of a teacher on student outcomes, as they fail to account for various external factors beyond a teacher's control. The authors contend that the use of SGPs in high-stakes employment decisions is unjust and could lead to the dismissal of competent teachers based on biased metrics. They advocate for a reevaluation of the teacher evaluation system, emphasizing the need for more robust and equitable measures.

In addition to the central theme, the document also touches upon the following key points:

- The distinction between Value-Added Models (VAMs) and Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs): The authors clarify that VAMs and SGPs are distinct measures, with VAMs attempting to estimate a teacher's influence on student growth while controlling for external factors, and SGPs merely providing a descriptive measure of a student's performance relative to their peers.
- The limitations of VAMs: The authors acknowledge the limitations of VAMs, citing research that highlights their instability and wide error ranges when applied to individual teachers.
- The lack of research on SGPs: The authors point out the scarcity of research on the use of SGPs for teacher evaluation, attributing it to the fact that SGPs are not designed for this purpose.
- The potential bias in New Jersey's SGPs: The authors present evidence suggesting that New Jersey's SGPs are significantly biased with respect to student population characteristics and average performance levels.
- The impact of SGPs on teacher incentives: The authors argue that the use of SGPs could disincentivize teachers from seeking employment in schools with high poverty rates, low average student performance, or high proportions of non-proficient special education students.
- The potential misuse of SGPs in rating teacher preparation institutions: The authors raise concerns about the potential use of SGPs to evaluate teacher preparation institutions, which could lead to these institutions avoiding placing their graduates in challenging school environments.

APA Citation:

Baker, B. D., & Oluwole, J. (2013). *Deconstructing Disinformation on Student Growth Percentiles & Teacher Evaluation in New Jersey*. New Jersey Education Policy Forum. <http://schoolfinance101.wordpress.com/2013/05/02/deconstructing-disinformation-on-student-growth-percentiles-teacher-evaluation-in-new-jersey/>

Book I, Chapter 7 - Teacher Evaluation

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/7e1022cb6886>

This chapter delves into the complexities and challenges associated with teacher evaluation, exploring both traditional methods and potential avenues for reform. The chapter emphasizes that the conventional evaluation process, often reliant on infrequent observations and standardized rubrics, frequently falls short in fostering genuine improvements in teaching and learning. The authors and cited researchers advocate for a more nuanced and holistic approach to teacher evaluation, one that acknowledges the multifaceted nature of effective teaching and the diverse contexts in which it occurs.

The text underscores that the ultimate goal of teacher evaluation should be to enhance instructional practices and, consequently, student outcomes. To achieve this, it proposes a shift away from rigid, compliance-driven evaluations toward a system that prioritizes frequent, informal classroom visits, constructive feedback, and ongoing professional development. The authors contend that such an approach, grounded in trust and collaboration, is more likely to empower teachers to refine their craft and create a more conducive learning environment for all students.

In essence, the chapter calls for a reimagining of teacher evaluation, urging educators and policymakers to embrace a model that is not only fair and accurate but also genuinely supportive of teacher growth and development. The authors maintain that by prioritizing meaningful feedback, ongoing professional learning, and a focus on student learning, teacher evaluation can evolve from a perfunctory exercise to a powerful catalyst for educational excellence.

Highlights

- **Challenges of Traditional Teacher Evaluation:** The text highlights the limitations of conventional teacher evaluation methods, including infrequent observations, reliance on standardized rubrics, and a focus on compliance rather than growth.

- **Need for a Holistic Approach:** The authors advocate for a more comprehensive approach to teacher evaluation that considers the multifaceted nature of effective teaching and the diverse contexts in which it occurs.
- **Emphasis on Frequent, Informal Observations:** The chapter proposes a shift toward more frequent, unannounced classroom visits to provide a more accurate and authentic picture of teaching practices.
- **Importance of Constructive Feedback:** The authors stress the significance of providing teachers with specific, actionable feedback that supports their professional growth and development.
- **Focus on Student Learning:** The text underscores that the ultimate goal of teacher evaluation should be to enhance student learning outcomes.
- **Role of Trust and Collaboration:** The authors contend that a collaborative and trusting relationship between teachers and evaluators is essential for fostering meaningful improvement.
- **Call for Reimagining Teacher Evaluation:** The chapter urges educators and policymakers to rethink teacher evaluation, embracing a model that is fair, accurate, and genuinely supportive of teacher growth.

APA Citation

Marshall, K., & David-Lang, J. (2021). *More good teaching in more classrooms more of the time* (pp. 191-224). In *The best of the Marshall Memo, book one: Ideas and action steps to energize leadership, teaching, and learning*.

CALDER Policy Brief 13-1218-1

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/4c3843e2759b>

The research brief by Jackson and Cowan (2018) offers a comprehensive overview of the research on teacher evaluation reforms, highlighting both the progress made and the areas that require further investigation. The authors delve into the complexities of

measuring teacher quality, the impact of evaluation systems on the teaching workforce, and the developmental effects of these reforms. The brief concludes with policy recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of teacher evaluation systems.

- **Teacher Evaluation Metrics:** The study emphasizes that while commonly used metrics like observational ratings and value-added models are linked to student learning, they have limitations. These metrics may not accurately capture the full range of teaching skills, and they can be influenced by factors like student demographics and prior achievement. The authors stress the importance of using multiple measures to get a more comprehensive picture of teacher effectiveness.
- **Impact on the Teacher Workforce:** The research indicates that high-stakes evaluation reforms can lead to increased attrition among low-performing teachers and improved hiring practices. However, the overall impact on teacher effectiveness remains uncertain, and there's a need for more research on the long-term effects of these reforms.
- **Developmental Effects:** The brief highlights evidence suggesting that even low-stakes evaluations can improve teacher performance. However, there's a lack of clarity on the specific components of evaluation reforms that drive these improvements. The authors call for more research on how to best integrate performance evaluations into professional development programs.
- **Policy Recommendations:** The brief concludes with policy recommendations aimed at improving the effectiveness of teacher evaluation reforms. These include aligning evaluation programs with professional development objectives, ensuring that schools have the capacity to use evaluation data for instructional improvement, and addressing the challenges of using evaluations for both formative and summative purposes. The authors also emphasize the importance of considering the potential impact of reforms on the teacher labor market.

APA Citation: Jackson, C. & Cowan, J. (2018). *Assessing the Evidence on Teacher Evaluation Reforms* (CALDER Policy Brief No. 13-1218-1). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

- Citation: Jackson, C. & Cowan, J. (2018). Assessing the Evidence on Teacher Evaluation Reforms (CALDER Policy Brief No. 13-1218-1). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

The Consistency of Composite Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness: Evidence From New Mexico

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/05597912d0d1>

The article "The Consistency of Composite Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness: Evidence From New Mexico" by Doan, Schweig, and Mihaly (2019) investigates the reliability of teacher evaluations, specifically focusing on the consistency of composite ratings in New Mexico's teacher evaluation system (NMTEACH). The authors define consistency as the likelihood that a teacher would receive the same rating if evaluated again in the same school year. The study uses simulation methods to estimate the consistency of these ratings and explores how various policy changes could impact this consistency.

- The authors find that the consistency of NMTEACH ratings is moderate, with roughly 40% of teachers expected to receive a different rating if reevaluated.
- The study highlights that teacher evaluation systems that rely heavily on value-added measures (VAMs), which are based on student test scores, tend to have lower rating consistency.
- The authors suggest that policymakers can improve the consistency of teacher evaluation ratings by focusing on improving the reliability of individual measures, adjusting the weights assigned to different measures, and optimizing the number and placement of rating cut-points.
- The research emphasizes the importance of balancing the need for accuracy in teacher evaluations with the potential for misclassification, particularly when high-stakes decisions are involved.

APA Citation:

Doan, S., Schweig, J. D., & Mihaly, K. (2019). The consistency of composite ratings of teacher effectiveness: Evidence from New Mexico. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(6), 2116–2146. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219841369>

- Citation: Doan, S., Schweig, J. D., & Mihaly, K. (2019). The consistency of composite ratings of teacher effectiveness: Evidence from New Mexico. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(6), 2116–2146.

The Negative Impact of ESSA on Educational Equity: A Teacher Accountability Perspective

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/c1c5adad11f2>

The reference text by Xie (2023) explores the potential negative impacts of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) on educational equity, particularly from the perspective of teacher accountability. The author argues that while ESSA aims to improve educational outcomes, its implementation may inadvertently hinder educational equity by neglecting the crucial role of teacher motivation. The study uses Herzberg's two-factor theory as a framework to analyze the impact of ESSA on teacher motivation and, consequently, educational equity.

- **The two-factor theory** posits that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are influenced by two distinct sets of factors: **motivators** (intrinsic factors like achievement, recognition, and growth) and **hygiene factors** (extrinsic factors like salary, working conditions, and job security). The presence of motivators leads to job satisfaction, while their absence results in a lack of satisfaction. On the other hand, the presence of hygiene factors prevents job dissatisfaction, but their absence leads to dissatisfaction.

- The study contends that **ESSA's emphasis on accountability and performance metrics may inadvertently overlook the intrinsic motivators that drive teacher satisfaction**. The focus on extrinsic factors like standardized test scores and performance evaluations may create a sense of pressure and undermine teachers' sense of autonomy and accomplishment.
- The author suggests that **policymakers and educational leaders should consider incorporating strategies that enhance teacher motivation** to mitigate the potential negative impacts of ESSA on educational equity. This could involve providing opportunities for professional development, recognizing and rewarding teacher achievements, and fostering a supportive and collaborative work environment.
- The study concludes that **addressing teacher motivation is crucial for achieving educational equity under ESSA**. By recognizing and supporting the intrinsic motivators that drive teacher satisfaction, policymakers and educators can create a more equitable and effective educational system.

Citation: Xie, N. (2023). The negative impact of ESSA on educational equity: A teacher accountability perspective. Lecture Notes in Educational Psychology and Public Media, 11, 731-741. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/11/20230731>

Making a Difference: Six Places Where Teacher Evaluation Systems Are Getting Results

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/5d881fff410e>

The reference text, "Making a Difference: Six Places Where Teacher Evaluation Systems Are Getting Results" (Walsh, Putman, & Ross, 2018), delves into the transformative potential of well-implemented teacher evaluation systems in elevating both teacher quality and student outcomes. The report spotlights six educational entities—four districts and two states—that have successfully harnessed their evaluation systems to drive positive change. The authors underscore that the success

of these systems hinges on their adherence to core principles, including the utilization of multiple measures, thoughtful weighting of evaluation components, and the linkage of evaluations to crucial personnel decisions.

Key Highlights

- **The report underscores the necessity of employing multiple measures in teacher evaluations, encompassing student learning, observations, and, in some instances, student surveys.** The integration of diverse perspectives ensures a more comprehensive and accurate assessment of teacher effectiveness.
- **The analysis emphasizes the significance of thoughtfully weighting individual evaluation components.** The specific weights assigned to observations, student achievement or growth, student surveys, and other factors vary across the highlighted systems, reflecting the unique contexts and priorities of each entity.
- **The report advocates for linking teacher evaluations to key personnel decisions, such as compensation, professional development opportunities, and retention.** By attaching meaningful consequences to evaluations, educators and administrators are encouraged to take the process seriously, fostering a culture of continuous improvement.
- **The study highlights the positive outcomes achieved by the six profiled systems, including improved teacher retention rates, increased student achievement, and a more equitable distribution of effective teachers.** These successes serve as compelling evidence of the transformative power of well-designed and thoughtfully implemented teacher evaluation systems.

Citation: Putman, H., Ross, E., & Walsh, K. (2018). Making a difference: Six places where teacher evaluation systems are getting results. National Council on Teacher Quality. <https://www.nctq.org/publications/Making-a-Difference>

State of the States 2022: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/9950d4ab4bd0>

Swisher and Saenz-Armstrong (2022) provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of teacher and principal evaluation policies across the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The report, "State of the States 2022: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies" (Swisher & Saenz-Armstrong, 2022), presents a comprehensive analysis of the current landscape of teacher and principal evaluation systems across the United States. The report highlights the critical role of effective evaluation in supporting educators, recognizing their accomplishments, and fostering growth, particularly in the challenging context of the pandemic's impact on education. The research underscores the potential of robust evaluation systems to enhance teaching practices, retain high-performing educators, and elevate the overall quality of the teaching workforce.

The report reveals that since 2019, there has been a concerning trend of states either retreating or stagnating in their adoption of evidence-based evaluation policies that genuinely support student learning. The authors express concern about the decline in the use of student academic growth and surveys as key evaluation components. The report also notes a lack of progress in measuring meaningful outcomes for principals, with a shift away from incorporating student academic growth and survey results into their evaluations.

The study emphasizes the necessity of employing multiple measures to achieve a fair and accurate assessment of teacher performance. It advocates for the inclusion of formal observations, measures of student academic growth (including state assessments), and student survey data. The report also underscores the importance of annual evaluations for all teachers and the need for multiple observations, particularly for early-career educators.

In conclusion, the report calls for a renewed focus on student growth, multiple observations, regular feedback, and annual evaluations. It stresses the importance of

supporting new teachers, collecting and publishing statewide data, measuring what truly matters for principals, and designing systems with clear consequences. The authors also provide recommendations for states to support high-quality implementation of evaluation systems, including analyzing and acting on statewide data, addressing issues of disproportionate impact, collecting user feedback, focusing on continuous improvement, sponsoring statewide evaluator training, certifying and calibrating observer skills, and linking evaluation to teacher preparation programs. The report serves as a valuable resource for policymakers and educators seeking to enhance evaluation systems and promote excellence in teaching and leadership.

Key Highlights:

- **States are retreating from evidence-based evaluation policies:** There's a decline in the use of student growth measures and surveys in evaluations.
- **Multiple measures are essential for fair evaluations:** The report advocates for using observations, student growth data, and surveys.
- **Annual evaluations and multiple observations are crucial:** These are key elements of effective evaluation systems.
- **New teachers need more support:** States should require more observations and feedback for novice teachers.
- **States should collect and publish data:** This helps understand the distribution of teacher effectiveness and identify inequities.
- **Principals' evaluations should focus on their impact:** This includes measuring their influence on school climate and student outcomes.
- **States need to support quality implementation:** This involves training evaluators, calibrating observations, and collecting user feedback.

APA Citation:

Swisher, A., & Saenz-Armstrong, P. (2022). State of the states 2022: Teacher and principal evaluation policies. National Council on Teacher Quality.

Improving Teaching Effectiveness: Final Report: The Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching Through 2015–2016

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://q.co/gemini/share/0656f35e5300>

The reference text presents the final report on the Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching (IP) initiative, a program funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The initiative aimed to enhance student outcomes, particularly for low-income minority students, by improving the overall quality of the teaching workforce. The core strategy involved developing a robust measure of teaching effectiveness (TE) that combined classroom observations and student achievement growth data. This TE measure was then utilized to inform various human resource policies, such as recruitment, professional development, compensation, and career advancement opportunities.

The initiative was implemented in three school districts and four charter management organizations (CMOs) from 2009-2010 to 2015-2016. The evaluation of the initiative included surveys, interviews, and analysis of school records and student test scores.

Key Findings:

- **Implementation of TE Measures:** All participating sites successfully implemented the composite TE measures and integrated them into their human resource practices. However, the distribution of TE ratings shifted over time, with more teachers receiving higher ratings, potentially indicating rating inflation rather than genuine improvement in teaching quality.
- **Limited Impact on Student Outcomes:** The initiative did not lead to the anticipated dramatic improvements in student achievement or graduation rates. The estimated impacts on student outcomes varied across sites, subjects, and grade levels, with most estimates being non-significant or even negative in some cases.
- **Challenges in Implementation:** The sites encountered challenges in fully implementing some aspects of the initiative, such as providing effective

evaluation-linked professional development and creating structured career ladders for teachers.

- **Positive Teacher Perceptions:** Despite the mixed impact on student outcomes, teachers generally reported positive perceptions of the initiative, particularly regarding the usefulness of the evaluation system in improving their teaching practices.

Conclusion:

The IP initiative led to increased attention to teaching effectiveness and the adoption of more comprehensive teacher evaluation systems. However, it did not result in the expected substantial improvements in student outcomes. The evaluation suggests that the initiative's limited success might be attributed to incomplete implementation of key policies, challenges in utilizing teacher evaluation data for high-stakes decisions, and the influence of external factors such as state policy changes and leadership turnover. The findings highlight the complexity of large-scale education reforms and the importance of considering various contextual factors in their implementation.

Citation: Stecher, B. M., Holtzman, D. J., Garet, M. S., Hamilton, L. S., Engberg, J., Steiner, E. D., Robyn, A., Baird, M. D., Gutierrez, I. A., Peet, E. D., ... Chambers, J. (2018). *Improving teaching effectiveness: Final report the intensive partnerships for effective teaching through 2015–2016*. RAND Corporation.

<https://doi.org/10.7249/RR2242>

<p><i>Measuring Progress in the Classroom: How Do Different Student Growth Measures Compare?</i></p>

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/cac0d2d734ce>

This fact sheet by Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic (2018) offers a comparative analysis of various student growth measures used in educator evaluations. The fact sheet offers insights into various student growth measures used in educator

evaluation systems, emphasizing the importance of selecting appropriate measures that align with the specific context and purpose of the evaluation. The text also highlights the trade-offs associated with different growth measures, aiding education agencies in making informed decisions.

Key Points:

- **Purpose of Student Growth Measures:** Student growth measures aim to quantify the learning gains of a group of students over a specific period, typically a school year. These measures, often derived from changes in test scores, can be integrated with other performance indicators, such as classroom observations, to identify high- and low-performing teachers.
- **Applications of Student Growth Measures:** The results from these measures can be utilized for various purposes, including:
 - Teacher professional development
 - Personnel decisions (in conjunction with other measures)
 - Identifying areas for improvement at the school or district level
- **Considerations for Selecting Growth Measures:** When choosing a growth measure, education agencies should consider factors such as:
 - **Validity:** The measure should accurately reflect teachers' impact on student learning
 - **Calculation Approach:** The approach used to calculate growth and the factors it accounts for can influence the measure's fairness and accuracy
 - **Applicability:** The measure should be calculable for most teachers
 - **Purpose:** The intended use of the measure (developmental or evaluative) should guide the selection
- **Commonly Used Growth Measures and Their Trade-offs:**
 - **Educator Impact Models (Value-Added Models):** These models statistically isolate a teacher's impact on student test score growth from other factors. While validated and rigorous, they can be complex and only applicable to teachers with relevant student test scores.

- **Student Growth Percentiles:** These compare students' test scores to those of similar students, ranking them based on their performance relative to their peers. Though conceptually easier to understand, they may be less valid and accurate than impact models.
- **Student Learning Objectives:** These measure teachers' progress toward self-set goals, offering flexibility and teacher ownership. However, they can be challenging to implement consistently and may not provide a valid measure of a teacher's contribution to student learning.

Conclusion:

The choice of student growth measure involves careful consideration of various factors, including validity, calculation approach, applicability, and purpose. Understanding the trade-offs associated with different measures is crucial for education agencies to make informed decisions that support fair and effective teacher evaluations.

Citation: Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. (2018). Measuring progress in the classroom: How do different student growth measures compare?.

The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers and Principals

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/394cd04c40fc>

The report by Garet et al. (2017) investigates the impact of providing performance feedback to teachers and principals on their practice and student achievement.

The reference text explores the impact of providing performance feedback to teachers and principals on their practices and student achievement. The study involved eight school districts that were provided resources and support to implement three performance measures: a measure of teacher classroom practice, a measure of teacher contributions to student achievement growth (value-added scores), and a measure of principal leadership. The study used an experimental design, randomly assigning

schools within each district to either implement the performance measures (treatment group) or not (control group). The primary goal was to investigate whether providing such feedback, in addition to the districts' existing evaluation systems, would lead to improvements in educator practices and student outcomes.

Key Findings:

- **Implementation:** The performance measures were generally implemented as planned, with treatment teachers receiving more frequent feedback and observations compared to control teachers. Similarly, treatment principals received more instances of oral feedback on their leadership than control principals.
- **Identification of Educators Needing Support:** The performance measures provided some information to identify educators needing support, but limited information to pinpoint specific areas for improvement. For instance, most teachers had high overall classroom observation scores, limiting the ability to signal areas for growth.
- **Positive Impacts:** The intervention showed some positive impacts on teachers' classroom practice, as measured by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), and on principal leadership, particularly in instructional leadership and teacher-principal trust.
- **Impact on Student Achievement:** The intervention had a positive impact on students' mathematics achievement in the first year, but this impact was not statistically significant in the second year. There was no significant impact on reading/English language arts achievement in either year.
- **Educator Experiences:** Treatment teachers and principals reported receiving more frequent feedback with ratings compared to their counterparts in control schools. Moreover, they perceived the study's feedback as more useful and specific than the districts' existing feedback systems.

Conclusion:

The study suggests that providing performance feedback to teachers and principals can lead to some positive changes in their practices and, to a limited extent, student achievement. The findings highlight the potential of performance feedback as a tool for improving the educator workforce, but also underscore the challenges in designing and implementing such systems to achieve substantial and sustained improvements in student outcomes.

Citation: Garet, M.S., Wayne, A.J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., & Manzeske, D. (2017). The impact of providing performance feedback to teachers and principals (NCEE 2018-4001). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

The Mind Shift in Teacher Evaluation: Where We Stand—and Where We Need to Go

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/8d082d8bfe24>

The article, "The Mind Shift in Teacher Evaluation: Where We Stand—and Where We Need to Go" by Angela Minnici (2014), explores the evolution and challenges of teacher evaluation systems in the United States, particularly in the context of recent policy changes and the increasing focus on teacher quality and accountability. The author, a principal researcher at the American Institutes for Research (AIR), provides insights based on her extensive work with states and districts in designing and implementing such systems.

Summary

The article begins by highlighting the contradictions and challenges faced by teachers in the current educational landscape. It underscores the critical role of teachers in student achievement while acknowledging the difficulties in defining and measuring effective

teaching practices. The author then delves into the recent policy changes, driven by federal initiatives and state legislation, that have led to widespread reforms in teacher evaluation systems. The central question posed is whether these systems, as currently designed and implemented, can truly improve teaching practices and foster professional growth.

Minnici discusses the successes and challenges encountered in implementing these new evaluation systems. She emphasizes the importance of establishing a common understanding of effective teaching practices, defining clear measures to assess those practices, and ensuring teacher engagement throughout the design and implementation process. The article also highlights common missteps to avoid, such as viewing teacher evaluation as a standalone solution, excluding educators from the process, and underestimating the time and resources required for successful implementation.

The author concludes by acknowledging the significant progress made in teacher evaluation but also cautions against rushing these reforms and emphasizes the need for continued educator engagement and a comprehensive approach that aligns teacher evaluation with other initiatives aimed at improving teaching quality. The ultimate goal, she argues, is to create systems that support and develop educators, leading to improved student outcomes and greater educational equity.

Highlights

- **The Importance of Teacher Evaluation:** The article emphasizes that teacher evaluation is crucial for improving instructional quality and promoting student achievement.
- **Challenges in Implementation:** It highlights the challenges in defining effective teaching practices, selecting appropriate measures, and ensuring teacher buy-in.
- **Key Success Factors:** The article identifies key factors for successful implementation, such as a shared understanding of effective teaching, clear measures, and teacher engagement.

- Common Missteps: It outlines common mistakes to avoid, including viewing evaluation as a silver bullet, excluding educators, and underestimating the required time and resources.
- Need for a Comprehensive Approach: The article stresses the importance of a comprehensive approach that aligns teacher evaluation with other initiatives aimed at improving teaching quality.

APA Citation:

Minnici, A. (2014). The mind shift in teacher evaluation: Where we stand—and where we need to go. *American Educator*, 38(1), 22-26.

This is the Piece of the Pie We Can Control

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://g.co/gemini/share/1fcddd084ff2>

The article "This is the Piece of the Pie We Can Control": Educators' Experiences with Student Learning Objectives as Performance Measures" by Linda K. Mayger (2022) explores the use of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) in teacher evaluation systems across 17 U.S. states. The author conducted surveys and interviews with teachers and principals to understand their experiences and perceptions of SLOs. The study reveals that while SLOs were intended to offer flexibility and empower educators, their implementation often led to standardization and alienation among teachers. The findings highlight the challenges in balancing accountability and professional growth in teacher evaluation.

Summary

The study investigates the use of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) as a measure of teacher performance. SLOs involve teachers setting learning goals for their students, tracking their progress, and evaluating if the goals were met. The study aimed to

understand how teachers and principals perceived the effectiveness and efficiency of SLOs. The author used a mixed-method approach, collecting data through surveys and interviews. The findings indicate that while SLOs were introduced with the promise of flexibility and empowerment, their implementation often resulted in standardization and alienation among teachers. The author concludes by emphasizing the need to balance accountability and growth in teacher evaluation systems.

Highlights

- SLOs and Teacher Evaluation: SLOs are used in many states as part of teacher evaluation systems, requiring teachers to set and track student learning goals.
- Mixed Perceptions: The study found mixed opinions about SLOs among teachers and principals, with some finding them valuable for motivation and growth, while others saw them as bureaucratic and unreliable.
- Standardization and Alienation: The flexibility intended in SLOs was often replaced by standardization, leading to teacher alienation and disengagement.
- Accountability vs. Growth: The study highlights the tension between using SLOs for accountability purposes and fostering teacher growth.
- Need for Balance: The author concludes by advocating for a balanced approach to teacher evaluation that fosters growth and maintains accountability.

APA Citation

Mayger, L. K. (2022). "This is the Piece of the Pie We Can Control": Educators' Experiences with Student Learning Objectives as Performance Measures. *The Elementary School Journal*, 122(4), 591–615. <https://doi.org/10.1086/719411>

Evaluating Technical and Issue Bias in Teacher Evaluation Policy Briefs and State Handbooks

Created with Gemini Advanced. Published September 5, 2024.

<https://q.co/gemini/share/45491c304b1a>

Dr. Mayger (2022) investigates the presence of technical and issue bias in policy briefs and state handbooks concerning the use of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) in teacher evaluations. The study uses content analysis to examine 43 documents, tracing the origin of evidence and claims made about SLOs. The author also categorizes the contributors to these documents based on their affiliations and motivations. The research reveals that most policy briefs were published after federal policies were established, and the majority were authored by technical assistance providers. The study also finds that although most authors presented a balanced view of SLOs, some misrepresented evidence and promoted an overly optimistic view by offering unproven solutions to implementation challenges. The research concludes that a healthy policy ecosystem requires systems that enable individuals to make informed choices, including critical information literacy skills and the availability of evidence at significant policy stages.

In addition to the main text, the reference text includes an appendix that provides basic information about the SLO policy briefs and cited research organized by policy window. The appendix lists the publication, funder, lead author, publisher, focus, and audience for each document.

Highlights

- The study investigates technical and issue bias in policy briefs and state handbooks related to SLOs.
- Most policy briefs were published after federal policies were established.
- The majority of policy briefs were authored by technical assistance providers.
- Although most authors presented a balanced view of SLOs, some misrepresented evidence.
- The research concludes that a healthy policy ecosystem requires systems that enable individuals to make informed choices.

APA Citation

Mayger, L. K. (2022). Evaluating technical and issue bias in teacher evaluation policy briefs and state handbooks. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *44*(1), 1–29.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221120578>

Appendix I - 6A:9C-3.3 Standards for professional learning

(a) Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and improves results for all students shall be guided by the following standards:

1. Rigorous content for each learner:

i. Equity practices: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators understand their students' historical, cultural, and societal contexts; embrace student assets through instruction; and foster relationships with students, families, and communities;

ii. Curriculum, assessment, and instruction: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators prioritize high-quality curriculum and instructional materials for students, assess student learning, and understand curriculum and implement through instruction; and

iii. Professional expertise: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators apply the NJSLs and research to their work, develop the expertise essential to their roles, and prioritize coherence and alignment in their learning;

2. Transformational process:

i. Equity drivers: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators prioritize equity in professional learning practices, identify and address their own biases and beliefs, and collaborate with diverse colleagues;

ii. Evidence: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators create expectations regarding, and build capacity for, the use of evidence from multiple sources to plan educator learning, and measure and report the impact of professional learning;

iii. Learning designs: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators set relevant and contextualized

learning goals, ground their work in research and theories about learning, and implement evidence-based learning designs; and

iv. Implementation: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators understand and apply research on change management, engage in feedback processes, and implement and sustain professional learning; and

3. Conditions for success:

i. Equity foundations: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators establish expectations for equity, create structures to ensure equitable opportunities for access to learning, and sustain a culture of support for all staff;

ii. Culture of collaborative inquiry: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators engage in continuous improvement, build collaboration skills and capacity, and share responsibility for improving learning for all students;

iii. Leadership: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators establish a compelling and inclusive vision for professional learning, sustain coherent support to build educator capacity, and advocate for professional learning by sharing the importance and evidence of the impact of professional learning; and

iv. Resources: Professional learning results in equitable opportunities and excellent outcomes for all students when educators allocate resources for professional learning, prioritize equity in their resource decisions, and monitor the use and impact of resource investments.

Appendix J - Chapter 5. Regulatory Equivalency and Waiver

Subchapter 1. Equivalency and Waiver Process

6A:5-1.1 Purpose and scope

(a) This chapter's purpose is to provide regulatory flexibility for school districts to meet the requirements of the rules contained in the New Jersey Administrative Code Title 6A. Regulatory flexibility may be granted as a waiver or equivalency to a specific rule so school districts can provide effective and efficient educational programs. The Commissioner, with authority delegated by the New Jersey State Board of Education, may approve on a case-by-case basis a waiver or equivalency to a specific rule.

(b) Entities covered by the chapter include: school districts; charter schools; renaissance schools; county vocational school districts; county special services school districts; educational services commissions; jointure commissions; regional day schools; Marie Katzenbach School for the Deaf; approved private schools for students with disabilities; college-operated programs; and programs operated by the State Departments of Children and Families, Human Services, and Corrections. Agencies and clinics are excluded.

6A:5-1.2 Definitions

The following words and terms shall have the following meanings when used in this chapter, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

“Equivalency” means approval to achieve the intent of a specific rule through an alternate means that is different from, yet judged to be comparable to or as effective as, those prescribed within the rule.

“Waiver” means approval to avoid compliance either with the specific procedures or the substantive requirements of a specific rule for reasons that are judged educationally, organizationally, and fiscally sound.

6A:5-1.3 Criteria for an equivalency or waiver

(a) An equivalency or waiver to a specific rule must meet the following criteria:

1. The spirit and intent of New Jersey Statutes Title 18A, applicable Federal laws and regulations, and the New Jersey Administrative Code Title 6A are served by granting the equivalency or waiver.

i. Certification requirements of N.J.S.A. 18A:26-2 shall not be violated;

2. The provision of a thorough and efficient education to students in the school district is not compromised as a result of the equivalency or waiver; and

3. There will be no risk to student health, safety, or civil rights by granting the equivalency or waiver.

6A:5-1.4 Equivalency process

(a) The Commissioner, with authority delegated by the State Board, may approve an equivalency to a specific rule based on a Department-developed application submitted by a school district.

(b) The application completed by the school district shall describe, at a minimum:

1. How the school district's proposed equivalency meets the spirit and intent of an existing rule;

2. The condition(s) or reason(s) for the proposed equivalency, including reference to the specific rule that necessitates the proposal;

3. The projected measurable results that will provide programs or services at least equal to the current rule; and

4. How the school district's community, including the district board of education, parents, administration, and staff, has been informed of the proposed equivalency to the specific rule and has been provided the opportunity for public comment.

(c) The completed application shall be signed by the chief school administrator and approved by the district board of education.

6A:5-1.5 Waiver process

(a) The Commissioner, with authority delegated by the State Board, may approve a waiver to a specific rule based on a Department-developed application submitted by a school district.

(b) The application completed by the school district shall describe, at a minimum:

1. The waiver sought by the district;
2. The conditions or reasons for the proposed waiver, including reference to the specific rule that necessitates the proposal;
3. The projected measurable results that will demonstrate the waiver is educational-ly, organizationally and fiscally sound; and
4. How the school district's community, including the district board of education, parents, administration and staff, has been informed of the proposed waiver to the specific rule and has been provided the opportunity for public comment.

(c) The completed application shall be signed by the chief school administrator and approved by the district board of education.

Appendix K - 6A:8-1.1 (Standards and Assessment) Purpose

- (a) To prepare students for college and career, success in life, and work in an economy driven by information, knowledge, and innovation requires a public education system where teaching and learning are aligned with 21st century learning outcomes. The outcomes move beyond a focus on basic competency in core subjects and foster a deeper understanding of academic content at much higher levels by promoting critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity through:
1. The New Jersey Student Learning Standards (NJSLs) that specify expectations in nine academic content areas: English language arts; mathematics; visual and performing arts; comprehensive health and physical education; science; social studies; world languages; technology; and 21st century life and careers;
 2. Indicators at benchmark grade levels delineated in the standards that further clarify expectations for student achievement; and
 3. Twenty-first century themes and skills integrated into all content standards areas.
- (b) District boards of education shall ensure that standards, assessments, curriculum, instruction, and professional development are aligned in a local support system that enables all students to achieve 21st century outcomes through the establishment of student-centered learning environments that provide opportunities for academically diverse students to:
1. Learn in meaningful, real-world contexts through rigorous and relevant curriculum that promotes engagement in learning by addressing varying college and career goals;
 2. Access and use quality learning tools, technologies, and resources;

3. Become self directed seekers of knowledge able to evaluate, apply, and create new knowledge in varying contexts; and
 4. Use effective communication, communication technology, and collaboration skills to interact with cultural sensitivity in the diverse local and world community.
- (c) The NJSLS, including indicators, enable district boards of education to establish curriculum and instructional methodologies for the purpose of providing students with the constitutionally mandated system of “thorough” public school instruction that promotes college and career readiness.
- (d) The Statewide assessment system is designed to measure college and career readiness and student progress in the attainment of the NJSLS.
- (e) The results of the Statewide assessments shall facilitate program evaluation based on student performance and shall enable district boards of education, the public, and government officials to evaluate the educational delivery systems of all public schools.

Appendix L - Recommended Changes to N.J.A.C. 6A:10 Educator Effectiveness

N.J.A.C. 6A:10 Educator Effectiveness**Table of Contents****Subchapter 1. General Provisions**

6A:10-1.1 Purpose and scope

6A:10-1.2 Definitions

6A:10-1.3 Applicability of rules on collective bargaining agreements

6A:10-1.4 Educator evaluation data, information, and written reports

Subchapter 2. Evaluation of Teaching Staff Members

6A:10-2.1 Evaluation of teaching staff members

6A:10-2.2 Duties of district boards of education

6A:10-2.3 District Evaluation Advisory Committee

6A:10-2.4 Evaluation procedures for all teaching staff

6A:10-2.5 Corrective action plans for all teaching staff

Subchapter 3. School Improvement Panel

6A:10-3.1 School Improvement Panel membership

6A:10-3.2 School Improvement Panel responsibilities

Subchapter 4. Components of Teacher Evaluation

6A:10-4.1 Components of teacher evaluation rubric

6A:10-4.2 Student achievement components

6A:10-4.3 Teacher practice components

6A:10-4.4 Teacher observations

Subchapter 5. Components of Principal Evaluation

6A:10-5.1 Components of principal evaluation rubrics

6A:10-5.2 Student achievement components of principal evaluation rubrics

6A:10-5.3 Principal practice component of evaluation rubric

6A:10-5.4 Principal, assistant principal, and vice principal observations

Subchapter 6. Evaluation of Teaching Staff Members Other Than Teachers, Principals, Vice Principals, and Assistant Principals

6A:10-6.1 Components of evaluation rubrics

6A:10-6.2 Required observations for teaching staff members

Subchapter 7. Commissioner Approval of Educator Practice Instruments

6A:10-7.1 Educator practice instrument

6A:10-7.2 Teacher practice instrument

6A:10-7.3 Principal practice instrument

Subchapter 8. Evaluation of Chief School Administrators

6A:10-8.1 Evaluation of chief school administrators

Subchapter 9. Procedures for Nontenured Notice of Non-Reemployment

6A:10-9.1 Procedure for appearance of nontenured teaching staff members before a district board of education upon receipt of a notice of non-reemployment

KEY: For the purpose of documenting the Task Force recommendations [bracketed words] will identify changes and _____ (underlined) will identify the recommendation or wording submitted for consideration.

Chapter 10. Educator Effectiveness Subchapter

1. General Provisions

6A:10-1.1 Purpose and scope

- (a) The rules in this chapter are intended to provide minimum requirements for evaluation rubrics for the evaluation of teaching staff members' effectiveness to further the development of a professional corps of State educators and to increase student achievement. Thus, the purpose of the rules is to support a system that facilitates:
1. Continual improvement of instruction;
 2. Meaningful differentiation of educator performance using four performance levels;
 3. Use of multiple valid measures in determining educator performance levels, including objective measures of student performance and measures of professional practice;
 4. Evaluation of educators on a regular basis;
 5. Delivery of clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies areas for growth and guides professional development; and
 6. School district personnel decisions.
- (b) The rules in this chapter shall apply to all public schools, except insofar as they are defined for charter schools in N.J.A.C. 6A:11, Charter Schools. The evaluation system in charter schools is subject to the review and approval of the Office of Charter Schools.
- (c) District boards of education shall ensure evaluations of all teaching staff members and chief school administrators are conducted in accordance with this chapter.

6A:10-1.2 Definitions

The following words and terms shall have the following meanings when used in this chapter, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Announced observation" means an observation in which the person conducting an observation for the purpose of evaluation will notify the teaching staff member of the date and the class period that the observation will be conducted.

"Annual performance report" means a written appraisal of the teaching staff member's performance prepared by the teaching staff member's designated supervisor based on the evaluation rubric for his or her position.

"Annual summative evaluation rating" means an annual evaluation rating that is based on appraisals of educator practice and student performance, and includes all measures captured in a teaching staff member's evaluation rubric. The four summative performance categories are highly effective, effective, partially effective, and ineffective.

"Calibration" in the context of educator evaluation means a process to monitor the competency of a trained evaluator to ensure the evaluator continues to apply an educator practice instrument accurately and consistently according to the standards and definitions of the specific instrument.

"Chief school administrator" means the superintendent of schools or the administrative principal if there is no superintendent.

"Co-observation" means two or more supervisors who are trained on the practice instrument who observe simultaneously, or at alternate times, the same lesson or portion of a lesson for the purpose of training and inter-rater reliability.

"Designated supervisor" means the supervisor designated by the chief school administrator or his or her designee as the teaching staff member's supervisor.

"District Evaluation Advisory Committee" means a group created to oversee and guide the planning and implementation of the district board of education's evaluation policies and procedures as set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.3.

"Educator practice instrument" means an assessment tool that provides scales or dimensions that capture competencies of professional performance and differentiation of a range of professional performance as described by the scales, which must be shown in practice and/or research studies. The scores from the teacher practice instrument or the principal practice instrument are components of the teaching staff member's evaluation rubrics and the scores are included in the summative evaluation rating for the individual. The scores from educator practice instruments for teaching staff members other than teachers, principals, vice principals, and assistant principals may be applied to the teaching staff member's summative evaluation rating in a manner determined by the school district.

"Evaluation" means an appraisal of an individual's professional performance in relation to his or her job description and professional standards and based on, when applicable, the individual's evaluation rubric.

"Evaluation rubric" means a set of criteria, measures, and processes used to evaluate all teaching staff members in a specific school district or local education agency. Evaluation rubrics consist of measures of professional practice, based on educator practice instruments, and student outcomes. Each district board of education will have an evaluation rubric specifically for teachers, another specifically for principals, assistant principals, and vice principals, and evaluation rubrics for other categories of teaching staff members.

"Indicators of student progress and growth" means the results of assessment(s) of students as defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:8, Standards and Assessment.

"Individual professional development plan" means as defined in N.J.S.A. 18A:6-119. "Job description" means a written specification of the function of a position, duties and responsibilities, the extent and limits of authority, and work relationships within and outside the school and school district.

"Observation" means a method of collecting data on the performance of a teaching staff member's assigned duties and responsibilities. An observation for the purpose of evaluation will be included in the determination of the annual summative evaluation rating and shall be conducted by an individual employed in the school district in a supervisory role and capacity and possessing a school administrator, principal, or supervisor endorsement as defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:9-2.1.

“Multiple objective measures of student learning” means the results of formal and informal assessments of students. Such measures may include a combination of, but are not limited to: teacher-set goals for student learning; student performance assessments, including portfolio projects, problem-solving protocols, and internships; teacher-developed assessments; standardized assessments; and district-established assessments.”

"Post-observation conference" means a meeting, either in-person or remotely, between the supervisor who conducted the observation and the teaching staff member for the purpose of evaluation to discuss the data collected in the observation.

"Scoring guide" means a set of rules or criteria used to evaluate a performance, product, or project. The purpose of a scoring guide is to provide a transparent and reliable evaluation process. Educator practice instruments include a scoring guide that an evaluator uses to structure his or her assessments and ratings of professional practice. "Semester" means half of the school year.

"Signed" means the name of one physically written by oneself or an electronic code, sound, symbol, or process attached to or logically associated with a record

and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the record.

["Student growth objective" means an academic goal that teachers and designated supervisors set for groups of students.] Replace or Redefine - There are 24 specific references to Student Growth Objective and one reference to SGO that will need to be updated.

"Student growth percentile" means a specific metric for measuring individual student progress on Statewide assessments by tracking how much a student's test scores have changed relative to other students Statewide with similar scores in previous years.

"Supervisor" means an appropriately certified teaching staff member, as defined in N.J.S.A. 18A:1-1, or superintendent employed in the school district in a supervisory role and capacity, and possessing a school administrator, principal, or supervisor endorsement as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:9B-12.

"Teacher" means a teaching staff member who holds the appropriate standard, provisional, or emergency instructional certificate issued by the State Board of Examiners and is assigned a class roster of students for at least one particular course.

"Teaching staff member" means a member of the professional staff of any district or regional board of education, or any county vocational school district board of education, holding office, position, or employment of such character that the qualifications for such office, position, or employment require him or her to hold a valid, effective, and appropriate standard, provisional, or emergency certificate issued by the State Board of Examiners. Teaching staff members include the positions of school nurse and school athletic trainer. There are three different types of certificates that teaching staff members work under:

1. An instructional certificate;
2. An administrative certificate; and

3. An educational services certificate.

"Unannounced observation" means an observation in which the person conducting an observation for the purpose of evaluation will not notify the teaching staff member of the date or time that the observation will be conducted.

6A:10-1.3 Applicability of rules on collective bargaining agreements

The rules in this chapter shall not override any conflicting provision(s) of collective bargaining agreements or other employment contracts entered into by a school district in effect on July 1, 2013. No collective bargaining agreement entered into after July 1, 2013, shall conflict with the educator evaluation system established pursuant to these rules or any other specific statute or regulation, nor shall topics subject to bargaining involve matters of educational policy or managerial prerogatives.

6A:10-1.4 Educator evaluation data, information, and annual performance reports

All information contained in annual performance reports and all information collected, compiled, and/or maintained by employees of a district board of education for the purposes of conducting the educator evaluation process pursuant to this chapter, including, but not limited to, digital records, shall be confidential. Such information shall not be subject to public inspection or copying pursuant to the Open Public Records Act, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 et seq. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Department or a school district from, at its discretion, collecting evaluation data pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-123.e or distributing aggregate statistics regarding evaluation data.

Subchapter 2. Evaluation of Teaching Staff Members 6A:10-2.1 Evaluation of teaching staff members

- (a) A district board of education annually shall adopt evaluation rubrics for all

teaching staff members. The evaluation rubrics shall have four defined annual ratings: ineffective, partially effective, effective, and highly effective.

- (b) The evaluation rubrics for teachers, principals, vice principals, and assistant principals shall include all other relevant minimum standards set forth in N.J.S.A. 18A:6-123 (P.L. 2012, c. 26, § 17c).
- (c) Evaluation rubrics shall be submitted to the Commissioner by August 1 for approval by August 15 of each year.

6A:10-2.2 Duties of district boards of education

- (a) Each district board of education shall meet the following requirements for the annual evaluation of teaching staff members, unless otherwise specified:
 - 1. Establish a District Evaluation Advisory Committee to oversee and guide the planning and implementation of the school district board of education's evaluation policies and procedures as set forth in this subchapter;
 - 2. Annually adopt policies and procedures developed by the chief school administrator pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.4, including the evaluation rubrics approved by the Commissioner pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.1(c);
 - i. The chief school administrator shall develop policies and procedures that, at a minimum, ensure student performance data on the Statewide assessment is, upon receipt, promptly distributed or otherwise made available to teaching staff members who were primarily responsible for instructing the applicable students in the school year in which the assessment was taken, as well as to teaching staff members who are or will be primarily responsible for instructing the applicable students in the subsequent school year.
 - 3. Ensure the chief school administrator annually notifies all teaching staff members of the adopted evaluation policies and procedures no

later than October 1. If a staff member is hired after October 1, the district board of education shall notify the teaching staff member of the policies at the beginning of his or her employment. All teaching staff members shall be notified of amendments to the policy within 10 working days of adoption;

4. Annually adopt by June 1, Commissioner-approved educator practice instruments and, as part of the process described at N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.1(c), notify the Department which instruments will be used as part of the school district's evaluation rubrics;
 5. Ensure the principal of each school within the school district has established a School Improvement Panel pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-3.1. The panel shall be established annually by August 31 and shall carry out the duties and functions described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-3.2;
 6. Ensure data elements are collected and stored in an accessible and usable format. Data elements shall include, but not be limited to, scores or evidence from observations for the purpose of evaluation and **[student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology** data; and
 7. Ensure that each chief school administrator or his or her designee in the district certifies to the Department that any observer who conducts an observation of a teaching staff member for the purpose of evaluation as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4, 5.4, and 6.2, shall meet the statutory observation requirements of N.J.S.A. 18A:6-119, 18A:6-123.b(8), and 18A:27-3.1 and the teacher member of the School Improvement Panel requirements of N.J.A.C. 6A:10-3.2.
- (b) Each district board of education shall ensure the following training procedures are followed when implementing the evaluation rubric for all teaching staff members and, when applicable, applying the Commissioner-approved educator practice instruments:
1. Annually provide training on and descriptions of each component of the evaluation rubric for all teaching staff members who are being

evaluated in the school district and provide more thorough training for any teaching staff member who is being evaluated in the school district for the first time. Training shall include detailed descriptions of all evaluation rubric components, including, when applicable, detailed descriptions of student achievement measures and all aspects of the educator practice instruments;

2. Annually provide updates and refresher training for supervisors who are conducting evaluations in the school district and more thorough training for any supervisor who will evaluate teaching staff members for the first time. Training shall be provided on each component of the evaluated teaching staff member's evaluation rubric before the evaluation of a teaching staff member;
3. Annually require each supervisor who will conduct observations for the purpose of evaluation of a teacher to complete at least two co-observations during the school year.
 - i. Co-observers shall use the co-observation to promote accuracy and consistency in scoring.
 - ii. A co-observation may count as one required observation for the purpose of evaluation pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4, as long as the observer meets the requirements set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.3 and 4.4, but the co- observation shall not count as two or more required observations. If a co-observation counts as one required observation, the score shall be determined by the teacher's designated supervisor; and
4. Chief school administrators shall annually certify to the Department that all supervisors of teaching staff members in the school district who are utilizing evaluation rubrics have completed training on and demonstrated competency in applying the evaluation rubrics.

6A:10-2.3 District Evaluation Advisory Committee

- (a) Members of the District Evaluation Advisory Committee shall include representation from the following groups: teachers from each school level represented in the school district; central office administrators overseeing the teacher evaluation process; supervisors involved in teacher evaluation, when available or appropriate; and administrators conducting evaluations, including a minimum of one administrator conducting evaluations who participates on a School Improvement Panel. Members also shall include the chief school administrator, a special education administrator, a parent, and a member of the district board of education.
- (b) The chief school administrator may extend membership on the District Evaluation Advisory Committee to representatives of other groups and to individuals.
- (c) Beginning in 2018-2019, the District Evaluation Advisory Committees shall no longer be required and district boards of education shall have the discretion to continue the District Evaluation Advisory Committee.

6A:10-2.4 Evaluation procedures for all teaching staff

- (a) This section's provisions shall be the minimum requirements for the evaluation of teaching staff members.
- (b) Evaluation policies and procedures requiring the annual evaluation of all teaching staff members shall be developed under the direction of the chief school administrator, who may consult with the District Advisory Evaluation Committee or representatives from School Improvement Panels, and shall include, but not be limited to, a description of:
 - 1. Roles and responsibilities for implementation of evaluation policies and procedures;
 - 2. Job descriptions, evaluation rubrics for all teaching staff members, the process for calculating the summative ratings and each component, and the evaluation regulations set forth in this chapter;
 - 3. Methods of data collection and reporting appropriate to each job description, including, but not limited to, the process for student

attribution to teachers, principals, assistant principals, and vice principals for calculating the median and schoolwide student growth percentile;

4. Processes for observations for the purpose of evaluation and post-observation conference(s) by a supervisor;
 5. **[Process for developing and scoring student growth objectives;] Items #5 and #6 will need to be updated based upon clarifications and revisions from Recommendation #2.**
 6. **[The process for preparation of individual professional development plans; and] Items #5 and #6 will need to be updated based upon clarifications and revisions from Recommendation #2.**
 7. The process for preparation of an annual performance report by the teaching staff member's designated supervisor and an annual summary conference between the teaching staff member and his or her designated supervisor.
- (c) The annual summary conference between designated supervisors and teaching staff members shall be held before the annual performance report is filed. The conference shall occur on or before June 30 of each school year and shall include, but not be limited to, a review of the following:
1. The performance of the teaching staff member based upon the job description and the scores or evidence compiled using the teaching staff member's evaluation rubric, including, when applicable:
 - i. The educator's practice instrument; and
 - ii. **[Available indicators or student achievement measures such as student growth objective scores and student growth percentile scores;] Update based upon clarifications and revisions.**
 2. **[The progress of the teaching staff member toward meeting the goals of the individual professional development plan or, when applicable, the corrective action plan; and] Update based upon**

clarifications and revisions.

3. The preliminary annual performance report.
 4. If any scores for the teaching staff member's evaluation rubric are not available at the time of the annual summary conference due to pending assessment results, the annual summative evaluation rating shall be calculated once all component ratings are available.
- (d) The annual performance report shall be prepared by the designated supervisor. The annual performance report shall include, but not be limited to:
1. A summative rating based on the evaluation rubric, including, when applicable, a total score for each component as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4 and 5;
 2. Performance area(s) of strength and area(s) needing improvement based upon the job description and components of the teaching staff member's evaluation rubric; and
 3. The teaching staff member's individual professional development plan or corrective action plan from the evaluation year being reviewed in the report.
- (e) The teaching staff member and the designated supervisor shall sign the report within five working days of the review.
- (f) Each district board of education shall include all performance reports and supporting data, including, but not limited to, written observation reports and additional components of the summative evaluation rating as part of his or her personnel file, or in an alternative, confidential location. If reports and data are stored in an alternative location, the personnel file shall clearly indicate the report's location and how it can be easily accessed. The records shall be confidential and shall not be subject to public inspection or copying pursuant to the Open Public Records Act, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 et seq.

6A:10-2.5 Corrective action plans for all teaching staff

- (a) For each teaching staff member rated ineffective or partially effective on the

annual summative evaluation, as measured by the evaluation rubrics, a corrective action plan shall be developed by the teaching staff member and the teaching staff member's designated supervisor. If the teaching staff member does not agree with the corrective action plan's content, the designated supervisor shall make the final determination.

- (b) The corrective action plan shall be developed and the teaching staff member and his or her designated supervisor shall meet to discuss the corrective action plan by October 31 of the school year following the year of evaluation, except:
1. If the ineffective or partially effective summative evaluation rating is received after October 1 of the school year following the year of evaluation, a corrective action plan shall be developed, and the teaching staff member and his or her designated supervisor shall meet to discuss the corrective action plan within 25 teaching staff member working days following the school district's receipt of the teaching staff member's summative rating.
 2. Teaching staff members rated effective or highly effective shall not be eligible for corrective action plans.
- (c) The content of the corrective action plan shall replace the content of the individual professional development plan required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:9C-4.3(a) and 4.4(a) and shall:
1. Address areas in need of improvement identified in the educator evaluation rubric;
 2. Include specific, demonstrable goals for improvement;
 3. Include responsibilities of the evaluated employee and the school district for the plan's implementation; and
 4. Include timelines for meeting the goal(s).
- (d) The teaching staff member's designated supervisor and the teaching staff member on a corrective action plan shall discuss the teaching staff member's progress toward the goals outlined in the corrective action plan

during each required post-observation conference, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:27-3.1 or N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4. The teaching staff member and his or her designated supervisor may update the goals outlined in the corrective action plan to reflect any change(s) in the teaching staff member's progress, position, or role.

- (e) Progress toward the teaching staff member's goals outlined in the corrective action plan:
 - 1. Shall be documented in the teaching staff member's personnel file and reviewed at the annual summary conference and the mid-year evaluation. Both the teaching staff member on a corrective action plan and his or her designated supervisor may collect data and evidence to demonstrate the teaching staff member's progress toward his or her corrective action plan goals; and
 - 2. May be used as evidence in the teaching staff member's next annual summative evaluation; however, such progress shall not guarantee an effective rating on the next summative evaluation.
- (f) Responsibilities of the evaluated employee on a corrective action plan shall not be exclusionary of other plans for improvement determined to be necessary by the teaching staff member's designated supervisor.
- (g) The School Improvement Panel shall ensure teachers with a corrective action plan receive a mid-year evaluation as required by N.J.S.A. 18A:6-120.c. The mid-year evaluation shall occur approximately midway between the development of the corrective action plan and the expected receipt of the next annual summative rating. The mid-year evaluation shall include, at a minimum, a conference to discuss progress toward the teacher's goals outlined in the corrective action plan. The mid-year evaluation conference may be combined with a post-observation conference.
- (h) The School Improvement Panel shall ensure teachers with a corrective action plan receive one observation, including a post-observation conference, in addition to the observations required in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4 for the purpose of evaluation as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-1.2 and 4.4(a).

- (i) Except where a school district employs only one administrator whose position requires a supervisor, principal, or school administrator endorsement, tenured teachers with a corrective action plan shall be observed by multiple observers for the purpose of evaluation as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4(c)4.
- (j) A chief school administrator, or his or her designee, and the principal, as appropriate, shall conduct a mid-year evaluation of any principal, assistant principal, or vice principal pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-121.c. The mid-year evaluation shall occur approximately midway between the development of the corrective action plan and the expected receipt of the next annual summative rating. The mid-year evaluation shall include, at a minimum, a conference to discuss progress toward the principal, vice principal, or assistant principal's goals outlined in the corrective action plan. The mid-year evaluation conference may be combined with a post-observation conference.
- (k) The chief school administrator shall ensure principals, vice principals, and assistant principals with a corrective action plan receive one observation and a post-observation conference in addition to the observations required in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.4 for the purpose of evaluation, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-1.2 and 5.4.
- (l) The corrective action plan shall remain in effect until the teaching staff member receives his or her next summative evaluation rating.
- (m) There shall be no minimum number of teaching staff member working days that a teaching staff member's corrective action plan can be in place.

Subchapter 3. School Improvement Panel 6A:10-3.1 School Improvement Panel Membership

- (a) The School Improvement Panel shall include the principal, a vice principal, and a teacher who is chosen in accordance with (b) below by the principal in consultation with the majority representative. If an assistant principal or vice principal is not available to serve on the panel, the principal shall appoint an additional member who is employed in the school district in a supervisory

role and capacity, in accordance with N.J.S.A. 18A:6-120.a. The principal may appoint additional members to the School Improvement Panel as long as all members meet the criteria outlined in this section and N.J.S.A. 18A:6-120.a and the teacher(s) on the panel represents at least one-third of its total membership.

- (b) The principal annually shall choose the teacher(s) on the School Improvement Panel through the following process:
1. The teacher member shall be a person with a demonstrated record of success in the classroom. Beginning in school year 2015-2016, a demonstrated record of success in the classroom means the teacher member shall have been rated effective or highly effective in the most recent available annual summative rating.
 2. The majority representative, in accordance with (a) above, may submit to the principal teacher member nominees for consideration.
 3. The principal shall have final decision-making authority and is not bound by the majority representative's list of nominees.
- (c) The teacher member shall serve a full school year, except in case of illness or authorized leave, but may not be appointed more than three consecutive school years.
- (d) All members of the School Improvement Panel shall be chosen by August 31 of each year.

6A:10-3.2 School Improvement Panel responsibilities

- (a) The School Improvement Panel shall:
1. Oversee the mentoring of teachers according to N.J.A.C. 6A:9C-5.3(a)2 and support the implementation of the school district mentoring plan;
 2. **[Conduct evaluations of teachers pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.4 and 4.4;] Remove as the only SCiP member that can conduct evaluations is a certified administrator.**

3. Ensure corrective action plans for teachers are created in accordance to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.5; and ensure mid-year evaluations are conducted for teachers who are on a corrective action plan; and
 4. Identify professional development opportunities for all teaching staff members based on the review of aggregate school-level data, including, but not limited to, educator evaluation and student performance data to support school-level professional development plans described in N.J.A.C. 6A:9C-4.2.
- (b) To conduct observations for the purpose of evaluation, the teacher member shall have:
1. Agreement of the majority representative;
 2. An appropriate supervisory certificate; and
 3. Approval of the principal who supervises the teacher being observed.
- (c) The teacher member who participates in the evaluation process shall not serve concurrently as a mentor under N.J.A.C. 6A: 9C-5.2(a)3.

Subchapter 4. Components of Teacher Evaluation 6A:10-4.1 Components of teacher evaluation rubric

- (a) The components of the teacher evaluation rubric described in this section shall apply to teaching staff members holding the position of teacher and holding a valid and effective standard, provisional, or emergency instructional certificate.
- (b) Evaluation rubrics for all teachers shall include the requirements described in N.J.S.A. 18A:6-123, including, but not limited to:
1. Measures of student achievement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.2; and
 2. Measures of teacher practice pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.3 and 4.4.
- (c) To earn a summative rating, a teacher shall have a student achievement score, including median student growth percentile and/or **[student growth objective(s)] replace or redefine terminology** scores, and a teacher practice score pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4.

- (d) Each score shall be converted to a percentage weight, so all components make up 100 percent of the evaluation rubric. By August 31 prior to the school year in which the evaluation rubric applies, the Department shall provide on its website the required percentage weight of each component and the required summative rating scale. All components shall be worth the following percentage weights or fall within the following ranges:
1. If, according to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.2(b), a teacher receives a median student growth percentile, the student achievement component shall be at least 30 percent and no more than 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation rubric rating as determined by the Department. If, according to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.2(b), a teacher does not receive a median student growth percentile, the student achievement component shall be at least 15 percent and no more than 50 percent of a teacher's evaluation rubric rating as determined by the Department.
 2. Measures of teacher practice described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.3 and 4.4 shall be at least 50 percent and no more than 85 percent of a teacher's evaluation rubric rating as determined by the Department.
- (e) Standardized tests, used as a measure of student progress, shall not be the predominant factor in determining a teacher's annual summative rating.

6A:10-4.2 Student achievement components

- (a) Measures of student achievement shall be used to determine impact on student learning.

The student achievement measure shall include the following components:

1. If the teacher meets the requirements in (b) below, the median student growth percentile of all students assigned to a teacher, which shall be calculated as set forth in (d) below; and
2. **[Student growth objective(s)] replace or redefine terminology**, which shall be specific and measurable, based on available student learning data, aligned to New Jersey Student Learning Standards, and based on growth and/or achievement.

- i. For teachers who teach subjects or grades not covered by the New Jersey Student Learning Standards, **[student growth objectives] replace or redefine terminology** shall align to standards adopted or endorsed, as applicable, by the State Board.
- (b) The median student growth percentile shall be included in the annual summative rating of a teacher who:
 1. Teaches at least one course or group within a course that falls within a standardized-tested grade or subject. The Department shall maintain on its website a course listing of all standardized-tested grades and subjects for which student growth percentile can be calculated pursuant to (d) below;
 2. Teaches the course or group within the course for at least 60 percent of the time from the beginning of the course to the day of the standardized assessment; and
 3. Has at least 20 individual student growth percentile scores attributed to his or her name during the school year of the evaluation. If a teacher does not have at least 20 individual student growth percentile scores in a given school year, the student growth percentile scores attributed to a teacher during the two school years prior to the evaluation year may be used in addition to the student growth percentile scores attributed to the teacher during the school year of the evaluation. Only student growth percentile scores from school year 2013-2014 or any school year after shall be used to determine median student growth percentiles.
- (c) The Department shall periodically collect data for all teachers that include, but are not limited to, student achievement and teacher practice scores.
- (d) The Department shall calculate the median student growth percentile for teachers using students assigned to the teacher by the school district. For teachers who have a student growth percentile score:
 1. District boards of education shall submit to the Department final

ratings for all components, other than the student growth percentile, for the annual summative rating; and

2. The Department then shall report to the employing district board of education the annual summative rating, including the median student growth percentile for each teacher who receives a median student growth percentile.
- (e) **[Student growth objectives] replace or redefine terminology** for teachers shall be developed and measured according to the following procedures:
1. The chief school administrator shall determine the number of required **[student growth objectives] replace or redefine terminology** for teachers, including teachers with a student growth percentile. A teacher with a student growth percentile shall have at least one and not more than four **[student growth objectives]replace or redefine terminology**. A teacher without a student growth percentile shall have at least two and a maximum of four **[student growth objectives] replace or redefine terminology**. By August 31, prior to the school year in which the evaluation rubric applies, the Department shall provide on its website the minimum and maximum number of required student growth objectives within this range.
 2. A teacher with a student growth percentile shall not use the standardized assessment used in determining the student growth percentile to measure progress toward a **[student growth objective.]replace or redefine terminology**
 3. Each teacher shall develop, in consultation with his or her supervisor or a principal's designee, each **[student growth objective.] replace or redefine terminology** If the teacher does not agree with the **[student growth objectives,] replace or redefine terminology** the principal shall make the final determination.
 4. **[Student growth objectives] replace or redefine terminology** and the criteria for assessing teacher performance based on the objectives shall be determined, recorded, and retained by the teacher

and his or her supervisor by October 31 of each school year, or within 25 working days of the teacher's start date if the teacher begins work after October 1.

5. Adjustments to **[student growth objectives] replace or redefine terminology** may be made by the teacher in consultation with his or her supervisor only when approved by the chief school administrator or designee. Adjustments shall be recorded in the teacher's personnel file on or before February 15.
 - i. If the **[SGO] replace or redefine terminology** covers only the second semester of the school year, or if a teacher begins work after October 1, adjustments shall be recorded before the mid-point of the second semester.
6. The teacher's designated supervisor shall approve each teacher's **[student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology** score. The teacher's **[student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology** score, if available, shall be discussed at the teacher's annual summary conference and recorded in the teacher's personnel file.

6A:10-4.3 Teacher practice components

The teacher practice component rating shall be based on the measurement of the teacher's performance according to the school district's Commissioner-approved teacher practice instrument. Observations pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.4 shall be used as one form of evidence for the measurement.

6A:10-4.4 Teacher observations

- (a) For the purpose of teacher evaluation, observers shall conduct the observations pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-123.b(8) and N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.5 and 3.2, and they shall be trained pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.2(b).
- (b) Observation conferences shall include the following procedures:

1. A supervisor who is present at the observation shall conduct a post-observation conference with the teacher being observed. A post-observation conference shall occur no more than 15 teaching staff member working days following each observation.
 2. The post-observation conference shall be for the purposes of reviewing the data collected at the observation, connecting the data to the teacher practice instrument and the teacher's individual professional development plan, collecting additional information needed for the evaluation of the teacher, and offering areas to improve effectiveness. Within a school year, the post-observation conference shall be held prior to the occurrence of further observations for the purpose of evaluation.
 3. If agreed to by the teacher, one required post-observation conference and any pre- observation conferences(s) for observations of tenured teachers who are not on a corrective action plan may be conducted via written communication, including electronic.
 4. One post-observation conference may be combined with a teacher's annual summary conference, as long as it occurs within the required 15 teaching staff member working days following the observation for the purpose of evaluation.
 5. A pre-conference, when required, shall occur at least one but not more than seven teaching staff member working days prior to the observation.
- (c) Each teacher shall be observed as described in this section. For all teachers, at least one of the required observations shall be announced and preceded by a pre-observation conferences(s), and at least one of the required observations shall be unannounced. The chief school administrator shall decide whether additional required observations are announced or unannounced, if applicable. The following additional requirements shall apply:
1. Each observation required for the purpose of evaluation shall be

conducted for at least 20 minutes.

2. Nontenured teachers shall be observed at least three times each school year but not less than once each semester. The observations shall be conducted in accordance with the timeframe set forth in N.J.S.A. 18A:27-3.1.

- i. Except where a school district employs only one administrator whose position requires a supervisor, principal, or school administrator endorsement, nontenured teachers shall be observed during the course of the year by more than one appropriately certified supervisor.

3. Tenured teachers shall be observed at least two times during each school year.

Observations for all tenured teachers shall occur prior to the annual summary conference, which shall occur prior to the end of the academic school year.

- i. If a tenured teacher was rated either effective or highly effective on his or her most recent summative evaluation and if both the teacher and the teacher's designated supervisor agree to use this option, one of the two required observations may be an observation of a Commissioner-approved activity other than a classroom lesson. The Department shall post annually to its website a list of Commissioner-approved activities that may be observed in accordance with this section.

4. Teachers on a corrective action plan shall receive, in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.5(h), one additional observation, including a post-observation conference.

5. Upon receiving a final summative evaluation that necessitates a corrective action plan, in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.5(a), any remaining required observation(s) shall not be conducted until the corrective action plan has been finalized.

6. A written or electronic observation report shall be signed by the

supervisor who conducted the observation and post-observation and the teacher who was observed.

7. The teacher shall submit his or her written objection(s) of the evaluation within 10 teaching staff member working days following the conference. The objection(s) shall be attached to each party's copy of the annual performance report.
- (d) To earn a teacher practice score, a nontenured teacher shall receive at least three observations.
1. If a nontenured teacher is present for less than 40 percent of the total student school days in a school year, he or she shall receive at least two observations to earn a teacher practice score.

Subchapter 5. Components of Principal Evaluation 6A:10-5.1 Components of principal evaluation rubrics

- (a) Unless otherwise noted, the components of the principal evaluation rubrics shall apply to teaching staff members holding the position of principal, vice principal, or assistant principal and holding a valid and effective standard, provisional, or emergency administrative certificate.
- (b) The principal evaluation rubric shall meet the standards provided in N.J.S.A. 18A:6-123, including, but not limited to:
1. Measures of student achievement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.2; and
 2. Measures of principal practice pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.3 and 5.4.
- (c) To earn a summative rating, the principal, vice principal, or assistant principal shall have a student achievement score, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.2 and a principal practice score pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.3 and 5.4.
- (d) Each score shall be converted to a percentage weight so all components make up 100 percent of the evaluation rubric. By August 31 prior to the school year in which the evaluation rubric applies, the Department shall provide on its website the required percentage weight of each component

and the required summative rating scale. All components shall be worth the following percentage weights or fall within the following ranges:

1. If, according to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.2(b), the principal, vice principal, or assistant principal receives a schoolwide student growth percentile score as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.2(c), the score shall be at least 10 percent and no greater than 40 percent of evaluation rubric rating as determined by the Department.
 2. Measure of average [student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology for all teachers, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.2(d), shall be at least 10 percent and no greater than 20 percent of evaluation rubric rating as determined by the Department.
 3. Measure of administrator goal, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.2(e), shall be no less than 10 percent and no greater than 40 percent of evaluation rubric rating as determined by the Department.
 4. Measure of principal practice, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.3(b), shall be no less than 50 percent of evaluation rubric rating.
- (e) Standardized assessments, used as a measure of student progress, shall not be the predominant factor in determining a principal's annual summative rating.
- (f) The Department shall periodically collect principal evaluation rubric data that shall include, but are not limited to, component-level scores and annual summative ratings.

6A:10-5.2 Student achievement components of principal evaluation rubrics

- (a) Measures of student achievement shall be used to determine impact on student learning and shall include the following components:
1. The schoolwide student growth percentile of all students assigned to the principal;
 2. Average [student growth objective] replace or redefine

terminology scores of every teacher, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.2(e), assigned to the principal; and

3. Administrator goals set by principals, vice principals, and assistant principals in consultation with their supervisor pursuant to (e) below, which shall be specific and measurable, based on student growth and/or achievement data.
- (b) The schoolwide student growth percentile score shall be included in the annual summative rating of principals, assistant principals, and vice principals who are assigned to a school as of October 15 and who are employed in schools where student growth percentiles are available for students in one or more grades. If a principal, assistant principal, or vice principal is employed in more than one school, the chief school administrator shall assign to the administrator, as appropriate, the schoolwide student growth percentile from one school and shall notify the administrator at the beginning of the school year of the school student growth percentile assignment.
- (c) The Department shall calculate the schoolwide student growth percentile for principals, assistant principals, and vice principals.
- (d) The average **[student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology** scores of all teachers, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.2(e), shall be a component of the principal's annual summative rating. The average **[student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology** scores for assistant principals or vice principals shall be determined according to the following procedures:
1. The principal, in consultation with the assistant principal or vice principal, shall determine prior to the start of the school year, which teachers, if not all teachers in the school, shall be linked to the assistant principal and vice principal's average **[student growth objective] replace or redefine terminology** score.
 2. If the assistant principal or vice principal does not agree with the list of teachers linked to his or her name for the purposes of this

measurement, the principal shall make the final determination.

- (e) Administrator goals for principals, assistant principals, or vice principals shall be developed and measured according to the following procedures:
1. The designated supervisor shall determine for all principals, assistant principals, or vice principals, the number of required administrator goals which shall reflect the achievement of a significant number of students within the school. By August 31 prior to the school year in which the evaluation rubric applies, the Department shall provide on the Department's website the minimum and maximum number of required goals, which will be at least one goal and no more than four goals.
 2. Principals, assistant principals, or vice principals shall develop in consultation with their designated supervisor, each administrator goal. Each vice principal and assistant principal shall set goals specific to his or her job description or adopt the same goals as his or her principal. If the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal and his or her designated supervisor do not agree upon the administrator goal, the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal's designated supervisor shall make the final determination.
 3. Administrator goals and the criteria for assessing performance based on those objectives shall be determined, recorded, and retained by the principal, vice principal, or assistant principal and his or her designated supervisor by October 31 of each school year, or within 25 working days of the principal's, vice principal's, or assistant principal's start date if he or she begins work after October 1.
 4. The administrator goal score shall be approved by the designated supervisor of the principal, vice principal, or assistant principal. The principal's, vice principal's, or assistant principal's administrator goal score, if available, shall be discussed at his or her annual summary conference and recorded in his or her personnel file.

6A:10-5.3 Principal practice component of evaluation rubric

- (a) Measures of principal practice shall include a measure determined through a Commissioner-approved principal practice instrument and may include a leadership measure determined through the Department-created leadership rubric.
- (b) Principal practice component rating shall be based on the measurement of the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal's performance according to the school district's Commissioner-approved principal practice instrument. Observations pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.4 shall be used as one form of evidence for this measurement.
- (c) Leadership practice shall be determined by a score on a leadership rubric, which will assess the principal, vice principal, or assistant principal's ability to improve student achievement and teaching staff member effectiveness through identified leader behaviors. The rubric will be posted on the Department's website and annually maintained.

6A:10-5.4 Principal, assistant principal, and vice principal observations

- (a) A chief school administrator, or his or her designee, shall conduct observations for the evaluation of principals pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-121 and he or she shall be trained pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.2(b).
- (b) A principal, or a chief school administrator or his or her designee, shall conduct observations for the evaluation of assistant principals and vice principals pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-121.
- (c) For the purpose of collecting data for the evaluation of a principal, assistant principal, or vice principal, an observation, as described in N.J.S.A. 18A:6-119 and N.J.A.C. 6A:10:1- 2, may include, but is not limited to: building walk-through, staff meeting observation, parent conference observation, or case study analysis of a significant student issue.
- (d) Post-observation conferences shall include the following procedures:
 1. A supervisor who is present at the observation shall conduct a post-

observation conference with the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal being observed. A post-observation conference shall occur no more than 15 teaching staff member working days following each observation.

2. The post-observation conference shall be for the purposes of reviewing the data collected at the observation, connecting the data to the principal practice instrument and the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal's individual professional development plan, collecting additional information needed for the evaluation, and offering areas to improve effectiveness.
 3. With the consent of the observed principal, assistant principal, or vice principal, post-observation conferences for individuals who are not on a corrective action plan may be conducted via written communication, including electronic communication.
 4. One post-observation conference may be combined with the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal's annual summary conference as long as it occurs within the required 15 teaching staff member working days following the observation.
 5. A written or electronic observation report shall be signed by the supervisor who conducted the observation and post-observation and the principal, assistant principal, or vice principal who was observed.
 6. The principal, assistant principal, or vice principal shall submit his or her written objection(s) of the evaluation within 10 working days following the conference. The objection(s) shall be attached to each party's copy of the annual performance report.
- (e) Each tenured principal, assistant principal, and vice principal shall be observed as described in this section, at least two times during each school year. Each nontenured principal, assistant principal, and vice principal shall be observed as described in this section, at least three times during each school year, as required by N.J.S.A. 18A:27-3.1. An additional observation shall be conducted pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.5(h) for principals, assistant

principals, and vice principals who are on a corrective action plan.

Subchapter 6. Evaluation of Teaching Staff Members Other Than Teachers, Principals, Vice Principals, and Assistant Principals

6A:10-6.1 Components of evaluation rubrics

- (a) The components of the evaluation rubric described in this section shall apply to teaching staff members other than a teacher, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-4.1, or a principal, vice principal, or assistant principal, as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-5.1.
- (b) Each school district shall determine the components of the evaluation rubric for teaching staff members discussed in this section and shall follow the evaluation procedures as set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-2.

6A:10-6.2 Required observations for teaching staff members other than teachers, principals, vice principals, and assistant principals

- (a) For the purpose of this subsection, observations include, but are not limited to: observations of meetings, student instruction, parent conferences, and case-study analysis of a significant student issue. The observation shall:
 - 1. Be at least 20 minutes in length;
 - 2. Be followed within 15 teaching staff member working days by a conference between the supervisor who made the observation and the nontenured teaching staff member;
 - 3. Be followed by both parties to such a conference signing the written or electronic observation report and each retaining a copy for his or her records; and
 - 4. Allow the nontenured teaching staff member to submit his or her written objection(s) of the evaluation within 10 teaching staff member working days following the conference. The objection(s) shall be

attached to each party's copy of the annual performance report.

- (b) All tenured teaching staff members as described in this section shall receive at least one observation per school year.
- (c) All nontenured teaching staff members as described in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-6.1(a) shall receive at least three observations, as required pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:27-3.1.

Subchapter 7. Commissioner Approval of Educator Practice Instruments

6A:10-7.1 Educator practice instrument

- (a) The Department shall provide and maintain on its website a list of Commissioner- approved educator practice instruments as determined by the criteria in this subchapter.
- (b) For Commissioner approval, an educator practice instrument shall be either evidence- or research-based as it applies to the evaluation of teachers and principals.
 1. To be evidence-based, data collected when using the instrument shall be positively correlated with student outcomes.
 2. To be research-based, studies shall show the degree to which data collected by the instrument is positively correlated with student outcomes. To obtain the correlation, the current form of the instrument shall be applied through rigorous, systematic, and objective observation and evaluation procedures.
- (c) The Department shall periodically review the approved instruments to ensure the instruments continue to meet the criteria set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-7.2 and 7.3.
 1. If the Department determines the instrument(s) no longer meets the criteria set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:10-7.2 and 7.3, the Department shall notify the instrument's sponsors or creators and they shall have 30 calendar days to correct the deficiencies outlined by the Department.
 2. If the deficiencies are not corrected, the Department shall notify the schools using the instrument that it is no longer approved by the

Department. The school shall have 90 calendar days to choose a new educator practice instrument.

6A:10-7.2 Teacher practice instrument

- (a) The teacher practice instrument approved by the Department shall meet the following criteria:
1. Include domains of professional practice that align to the New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:9-3;
 2. Include scoring guides for assessing teacher practice that differentiate among a minimum of four levels of performance, and the differentiation has been shown in practice and/or research studies.
Each scoring guide shall:
 - i. Clearly define the expectations for each rating category;
 - ii. Provide a conversion to four rating categories;
 - iii. Be applicable to all grades and subjects; or to specific grades and/or subjects if designed explicitly for the grades and/or subjects; and
 - iv. Use clear and precise language that facilitates common understanding among teachers and administrators; Rely on, to the extent possible, specific, discrete, observable, and/or measurable behaviors of students and teachers in the classroom with direct evidence of student engagement and learning; and
 3. Include descriptions of specific training and implementation details required for the instrument to be effective.

6A:10-7.3 Principal practice instrument

- (a) The principal practice instrument approved by the Department shall meet the following criteria:
1. Incorporate domains of practice and/or performance criteria that align

to the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders developed by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), incorporated herein by reference, available at http://npbea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Professional-Standards-for-Educational-Leaders_2015.pdf;

2. Include scoring guides for assessing principal practice that differentiate among a minimum of four levels of performance, and the differentiation has been shown in practice and/or research studies. Each scoring guide shall clearly define the expectations for each category and provide a conversion to four rating categories;
3. Rely on, to the extent possible, multiple sources of evidence collected throughout the school year, including, but not limited to, evaluation of a principal's leadership related to:
 - i. Implementing high-quality and standards-aligned curricula, assessments, and instruction; and
 - ii. Evaluating the effectiveness of teaching staff members and supporting their professional growth; and
4. Include descriptions of specific training and implementation details required for the instrument to be effective.

Subchapter 8. Evaluation of Chief School Administrators 6A:10-8.1 Evaluation of chief school administrators

- (a) Each district board of education shall adopt a policy and implement procedures requiring the annual evaluation of the chief school administrator by the district board of education.
- (b) The purpose of the annual evaluation shall be to:
 1. Promote professional excellence and improve the skills of the chief school administrator;
 2. Improve the quality of the education received by the students served by the public schools; and
 3. Provide a basis for the review of the chief school administrator's

performance.

- (c) The policy and procedures shall be developed by the district board of education after consultation with the chief school administrator and shall include, but not be limited to:
1. Determination of roles and responsibilities for the implementation of the annual evaluation policy and procedures;
 2. Development of a job description and evaluation criteria based upon the district board of education's local goals, program objectives, policies, instructional priorities, State goals, statutory requirements, and the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the chief school administrator;
 3. Specification of data collection and reporting methods appropriate to the job description; Provision for the preparation of an individual professional growth and development plan based in part upon any need(s) identified in the evaluation. The plan shall be mutually developed by the district board of education and the chief school administrator; and
 4. Preparation of an annual performance report by a majority of the full membership of the district board of education and an annual summary conference between a majority of the total membership of the district board of education and the chief school administrator.
- (d) The district board of education may hire a qualified consultant to assist or advise in the evaluation process; however, the evaluation itself shall be the responsibility of the district board of education.
- (e) The evaluation policy shall be distributed to the chief school administrator upon adoption by the district board of education. Amendments to the policy shall be distributed within 10 teaching staff member working days after adoption.
- (f) The annual summary conference between the district board of education, with a majority of its total membership present, and the chief school administrator shall be held before the annual performance report is filed. The

conference shall be held in private, unless the chief school administrator requests that it be held in public. The conference shall include, but not be limited to, review of the following:

1. Performance of the chief school administrator based upon the job description;
 2. Progress of the chief school administrator in achieving and/or implementing the school district's goals, program objectives, policies, instructional priorities, State goals, and statutory requirements; and
 3. Indicators of student progress and growth toward program objectives.
- (g) The annual performance report shall be prepared by July 1 by a majority of the district board of education's total membership and shall include, but not be limited to:
1. Performance area(s) of strength;
 2. Performance area(s) needing improvement based upon the job description and evaluation criteria set forth in (c)2 above;
 3. Recommendations for professional growth and development;
 4. A summary of indicators of student progress and growth, and a statement of how the indicators relate to the effectiveness of the overall program and the chief school administrator's performance; and
 5. Provision for performance data not included in the report to be entered into the record by the chief school administrator within 10 teaching staff member working days after the report's completion.
- (h) The provisions of this section are the minimum requirements for the evaluation of a chief school administrator.
- (i) The evaluation procedure for a nontenured chief school administrator shall be completed by July 1 each year.
- (j) Each newly appointed or elected district board of education member shall complete a New Jersey School Boards Association training program on the evaluation of the chief school administrator within six months of the commencement of his or her term of office pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:17-20.3.b.

- (k) Each district board of education shall add to a chief school administrator's personnel file all performance reports and supporting data, including, but not limited to, indicators of student progress and growth. The records shall be confidential and not be subject to public inspection or copying pursuant to the Open Public Records Act, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 et seq.

Subchapter 9. Procedure for Nontenured Notice of Non-Reemployment

6A:10-9.1 Procedure for appearance of nontenured teaching staff members before a district board of education upon receipt of a notice of non-reemployment

- (a) Whenever a nontenured teaching staff member has requested in writing and has received a written statement of reasons for non-reemployment pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:27-3.2, he or she may request in writing an informal appearance before the district board of education. The written request shall be submitted to the district board of education within 10 calendar days of teaching staff member's receipt of the district board of education's statement of reasons.
- (b) The informal appearance shall be scheduled within 30 calendar days from the teaching staff member's receipt of the district board of education's statement of reasons.
- (c) Under the circumstances described in this section, a nontenured teaching staff member's appearance before the district board of education shall not be an adversarial proceeding. The purpose of the appearance shall be to provide the staff member the opportunity to convince board of education members to offer reemployment.
- (d) Each district board of education shall exercise discretion in determining a reasonable length of time for the proceeding, depending upon each instance's specific circumstances.
- (e) Each district board of education shall provide to the employee adequate written notice regarding the date and time of the informal appearance.

- (f) The nontenured teaching staff member may be represented by counsel or one individual of his or her choosing.
- (g) The staff member may present on his or her behalf witnesses who do not need to present testimony under oath and shall not be cross-examined by the district board of education. Witnesses shall be called one at a time into the meeting to address the board and shall be excused from the meeting after making their statements.
- (h) The proceeding of an informal appearance before the district board of education, as described in this section, may be conducted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-12.b(8).
- (i) Within three working days following the informal appearance, the district board of education shall notify the affected teaching staff member, in writing, of its final determination. The district board of education may delegate notification to the chief school administrator or board secretary.