



Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536



Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986

House Bill 5223 (Substitute H-4 as passed by the House)
House Bill 5224 (Substitute H-4 as passed by the House)
Sponsor: Representative Margaret O'Brien (H.B. 5223)
Representative Adam F. Zemke (H.B. 5224)
House Committee: Education
Senate Committee: Education

Date Completed: 6-4-14

CONTENT

House Bill 5223 (H-4) would amend the Revised School Code to do the following:

- Delay until the 2014-2015 school year the implementation of teacher performance evaluation requirements.
- Revise conditions for the use of student growth and assessment data in conducting the evaluations.
- Specify that one of the required classroom observations of a teacher who was not rated "effective" or "highly effective" on the two most recent annual evaluations would have to be unscheduled.
- Require a school district, intermediate school district (ISD), or public school academy (PSA) to ensure that an individual acting as a classroom observer received specific training at least every three years.
- Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to provide feedback to a teacher within 30 days after each observation.
- Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to adopt and implement at least one State-approved teacher evaluation tool or a comparable locally developed tool, beginning in the 2015-2016 school year.
- Require the portion of a teacher's evaluation that was not based on student growth and assessment data to be based primarily on the teacher's performance as measured by the evaluation tool adopted by the district.
- Prescribe factors that would have to be incorporated in the portion of a teacher's evaluation that was not measured using student growth or the evaluation tool.
- Provide that a requirement that a teacher be dismissed after being rated as ineffective on three consecutive evaluations would apply only if the evaluations were conducted using the same framework under the same evaluation system.
- Eliminate an exemption from the Code's teacher and administrator performance evaluation requirements for a school district, ISD, or PSA that meets certain conditions.
- Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to use one of four specified teacher evaluation tools, or a locally developed tool designated as acceptable by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).
- Allow a school district, ISD, or PSA to use a locally developed evaluation tool if the school district, ISD, or PSA provided certain information about the tool on its website.

- Allow a school district, ISD, or PSA to adapt or modify an acceptable evaluation tool, under certain conditions.
- Require the MDE, by August 1, 2018, to report to the Legislature a report on the impact of the teacher and administrator performance evaluation systems.
- Beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, prohibit a school district, ISD, or PSA from assigning a pupil to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by a teacher who was rated ineffective on the two most recent evaluations; and require a school district, ISD, or PSA that was unable to comply with the prohibition to notify a pupil's parent or legal guardian.
- Beginning July 1, 2015, prohibit the Superintendent of Public Instruction from issuing an initial professional teaching certificate to an individual who was not rated as effective or highly effective for three school years.
- Delete a number of provisions related to administrator performance evaluations (which House Bill 5224 (H-4) would reenact in a different section of the Code, as described below).

The bill also would delete provisions regarding the Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness (which is described below, under BACKGROUND).

House Bill 5224 (H-4) would amend the Code to reenact the provisions related to administrator performance evaluation requirements that House Bill 5223 (H-4) would delete, but with several changes. Specifically, House Bill 5224 (H-4) would do the following:

- Delay until the 2014-2015 school year the implementation of administrator performance evaluation requirements.
- Revise conditions for the use of student growth and assessment data in conducting the evaluations.
- Include an administrator's demonstration of effective management and development of instructional staff among the factors that must be considered in the portion of an evaluation that is not based on student growth and assessment.
- Require the portion of an evaluation that is not based on student growth and assessment to be based primarily on an administrator's performance as measured by an evaluation tool adopted by the school district, ISD, or PSA.
- Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to adopt and implement an approved administrator evaluation tool by the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year.
- Require a school district, ISD, or PSA to use one of four specified administrator evaluation tools, or a locally developed tool designated as acceptable by the MDE.

The bill also would include language similar to that proposed by House Bill 5223 (H-4) for teacher evaluations with regard to administrator evaluator training, modification and adaptation of an evaluation tool, and information that a school district, ISD, or PSA would have to post on its website if it adopted a locally developed tool.

The bills are tie-barred.

The Code requires the board of a school district or ISD or the board of directors of a PSA, with the involvement of teachers and school administrators, to adopt and implement for all teachers and administrators a rigorous, transparent, and fair performance evaluation system that does all of the following:

- Evaluates the teacher's or administrator's job performance at least annually while providing timely and constructive feedback.

- Establishes clear approaches to measuring student growth and provides teachers and administrators with relevant data on student growth.
- Evaluates a teacher's or administrator's job performance, using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor.
- Uses the evaluations to inform decisions regarding the effectiveness of teachers and administrators; promotion, retention, and development of teachers and administrators; whether to grant tenure and/or full certification; and removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and administrators.

House Bill 5223 (H-4)

Teacher Evaluations

General Requirements. Under the Code, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the board of a school district, ISD, or PSA must ensure that the performance evaluation system for teachers meets the following conditions:

- The system must include an annual year-end evaluation for all teachers; a mid-year progress report for a teacher who is in the first year of a five-year probationary period for new teachers or who received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on his or her most recent annual evaluation; and classroom observations to assist in the evaluations.
- For the purposes of conducting the annual year-end evaluations, the school district, ISD, or PSA must adopt and implement the State evaluation tool for teachers that is required under legislation enacted after review of the recommendations contained in the report of the Council on Educator Effectiveness, or a local tool that is consistent with the State evaluation tool.
- The system must assign to each teacher an effectiveness rating of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective, based on his or her score on the annual evaluation.
- A school district, ISD, or PSA is encouraged to assign a mentor or coach to each teacher who is subject to a mid-year progress report.
- The system may allow for exemption of student growth data for a particular pupil for a school year upon the recommendation of the school administrator conducting the annual evaluation or his or her designee and approval of the school district or ISD superintendent or his or her designee, or the PSA chief administrator.
- The system must provide that, if a teacher is rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the school district, PSA, or ISD must dismiss the teacher from employment.
- The system must provide that, if a teacher is rated as highly effective on three consecutive evaluations, the school district, ISD, or PSA may choose to conduct a year-end evaluation biennially instead of annually.
- The system must provide that, if a teacher who is not in a probationary period is rated as ineffective on an annual evaluation, the teacher may request a review of the evaluation and the rating by the school district or ISD superintendent or PSA chief administrator, as applicable.

Under the bill, these requirements would apply beginning with the 2014-2015 school year. A school district, PSA, or ISD would be required, rather than encouraged, to assign a mentor or coach to a teacher who was subject to a mid-year progress report. The bill also would revise several of the other requirements, as described below.

(For purposes of the teacher evaluation requirements, the bill would define "teacher" as an individual holding a valid Michigan teaching certificate, endorsement, or authorization to teach in Michigan public schools, or who is otherwise authorized by the MDE to teach in

Michigan public schools, and who is assigned by a public school to deliver direct instruction to pupils in any of grades K to 12.)

Growth & Assessment Data. Under current requirements, a certain percentage of a teacher's annual year-end evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data as follows:

- For the 2013-2014 school year, at least 25%.
- For the 2014-2015 school year, at least 40%.
- Beginning with the 2015-16 school year, at least 50%.

The bill would revise these requirements as follows:

- For the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years, 25%.
- Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, 40%.

Currently, all student growth and assessment data must be measured using the student growth assessment tool that is required under legislation enacted by the Legislature after review of the recommendations contained in the report of the Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness. The bill would eliminate the reference to the legislation and the Council's report. Instead, beginning in 2015-2016, half of the student growth and assessment data for teachers in core content areas in grades and subjects for which student growth data were available would have to be measured using the State student growth assessment tool, which would have to meet the bill's requirements applicable to a local evaluation tool. For teachers in other subject areas, as well as all special education teachers, a school district, ISD, or PSA could use State-provided growth data for up to half of the teacher's student growth and assessment data or could use one or more locally determined student measures and assessments with valid growth measurements for all of the teacher's student growth and assessment data.

The portion of a teacher's data that was not based on State-provided data would have to be based on one or more locally determined student measures and assessments with valid growth measurements, which could include student learning objectives or individualized education program goals. These measures and assessments could be either locally developed or created by a vendor. They would have to be used consistently among the schools operated by the district or PSA so that all similarly situated teachers were evaluated using the same measures and assessments. If there were a reasonable connection of the core content to the teacher's actual teaching assignment, school-level growth goals could be used for an individual teacher's evaluation. These goals, however, could not comprise more than 5% of the individual teacher's overall evaluation.

Classroom Observation. Under the Code, unless a teacher has received a rating of effective or highly effective on his or her two most recent annual evaluations, there must be multiple classroom observations of the teacher each school year. The bill specifies that there would have to be at least two observations, and at least one would have to be unscheduled.

The bill also would require a school district, ISD, or PSA to ensure that an individual acting as an observer received training from the vendor or a training provider that had a contract with the vendor to provide training using a vendor-approved training program for the evaluation tool that was used by the school district, ISD, or PSA. Additionally, a school district, ISD, or PSA would have to ensure that an individual acting as an observer received training in coaching, providing feedback, and rater reliability. The bill provides that the individual should receive the training at least once every three years. The school district, ISD, or PSA also would have to provide information to teachers on the evaluation tool and how it was used.

The school administrator responsible for the teacher's evaluation would have to conduct at least one of the observations. Other observations could be conducted by another observer who was trained in the use of the evaluation tool. The other observer could be a teacher leader.

A school district, ISD, or PSA would have to ensure that the teacher was given feedback within 30 days after each observation.

Evaluation Tool. Under the Code, for purposes of conducting annual teacher evaluations, a school district, ISD, or PSA must adopt and implement the State evaluation tool for teachers that is required under legislation enacted after review of the recommendations contained in the report of the Governor's Council. However, a school district, ISD, or PSA that has a local evaluation tool that is consistent with the State tool may conduct its evaluations using the local tool.

Under the bill, instead, the portion of a teacher's annual evaluation that was not based on student growth and assessment data would have to be based primarily on the teacher's performance as measured by the evaluation tool adopted by the district. By the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year, the school district, ISD, or PSA would have to adopt and implement one or more of the State-approved teacher evaluation tools (described below). A school that had one or more local tools and complied with the bill's requirements could conduct its evaluations using those tools.

The evaluation tools would have to be used consistently among the schools operated by a school district or public school academy so that all similarly situated teachers were evaluated using the same tool.

The portion of a teacher's evaluation that was not measured using student growth or using the district-adopted evaluation tool would have to incorporate at least pupil and parent feedback and criteria enumerated in Section 1248(1)(b)(i) to (iii) that were not otherwise evaluated as specifically required by the Code.

(Section 1248(1)(b) requires the board of a school district or ISD to ensure that the district adopts, implements, maintains, and complies with a policy that provides that all personnel decisions when conducting a staffing or program reduction or any other personnel determination resulting in the elimination of a position, when conducting a recall from a reduction or elimination of a position, or in hiring after a staffing or program reduction, are based on retaining effective teachers. The policy must ensure that a teacher who has been rated as ineffective is not given any preference that would result in that teacher being retained over a teacher who has received a higher rating. Effectiveness must be measured under the performance evaluation system, and the personnel decisions must be made based on (i) individual performance (which must be the majority factor); (ii) significant, relevant accomplishments and contributions; and (iii) relevant special training.)

Ineffective Rating. The Code requires a performance evaluation system to provide that, if a teacher is rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the school district, PSA, or ISD must dismiss the teacher from employment. Under the bill, this requirement would apply only if the three evaluations were conducted using the same evaluation framework and under the same performance evaluation system.

Designation of Evaluation Tools

For the purposes of evaluating teacher performance, the bill would require a school district, ISD, or PSA to use one or more of the following evaluation tools:

-- The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching.

- The R. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model.
- The Thoughtful Classroom.
- 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning.

The MDE could designate at least one other evaluation tool as acceptable for use if it met the requirements for locally developed tools as provided in the bill. If the MDE designated an evaluation tool as acceptable, a school district, ISD, or PSA could use that tool for the purposes of evaluating teacher performance. If at any point the MDE determined that one of the approved tools failed to meet the requirements for locally developed evaluation tools, the Department could revoke the designation of that tool as acceptable for use.

A school district, ISD, or PSA could use one or more adaptations or modifications of an evaluation tool that was acceptable for use for teacher evaluation purposes if the adaptations or modifications met all of the following conditions and the school district, ISD, or PSA provided assurance of all of them on its public website:

- The adaptations or modifications did not compromise the validity of either the evaluation tool or the evaluation process.
- The adaptations or modifications had undergone review by a person with expertise in teacher evaluations and the posted assurances included his or her identity.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA ensured that all evaluators and observers received initial and follow-up training from the vendor of the evaluation tool that was being modified or from a provider that had a contract with the vendor to provide training using a vendor-approved training program for that tool.

Locally Developed Evaluation Tool

The bill would permit a school district, ISD, or PSA to use one or more locally developed evaluation tools to evaluate teacher performance if the school district, ISD, or PSA provided all of the following information about the tool on its public website:

- The research base for the evaluation framework, instrument, and process.
- The author's or authors' identity and qualifications.
- Either evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy or a plan for developing that evidence.
- The evaluation frameworks and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators.
- A description of the processes for documenting classroom observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans.
- A description of the plan for providing all evaluators and observers with initial and follow-up training and the identity and qualification of the training providers.

Report

The bill would require the MDE, by August 1, 2018, to prepare and submit to the Legislature a report on the impact of the teacher and administrator performance evaluation systems. The report would have to contain an analysis of the impact of the implementation of the systems on each of the following and the statistical increase or decrease, statewide and by school district, ISD, and PSA, for each of the following for each of the 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018 school years: third grade reading proficiency, graduation rates, student growth, college entrance examination scores, and scores on the Michigan Merit Examination.

Assignment of Pupils

Under the current law, beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, if a pupil is assigned to be taught by a teacher who has been rated as ineffective on his or her two most recent annual year-end evaluations, the board of the school district or ISD or board of directors of the PSA in which the pupil is enrolled must notify the pupil's parent or legal guardian.

Under the bill, instead, beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, a school district, ISD, or PSA could not assign a pupil to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by a teacher who had been rated as ineffective on his or her two most recent annual year-end evaluations. If a school district, ISD, or PSA were unable to comply with this provision and planned to assign a pupil to be taught by such a teacher, the board of the school district or ISD or the board of directors of the PSA would have to notify the pupil's parent or legal guardian that the board was unable to comply and that the pupil had been assigned to be taught in the same subject area for a second consecutive year by the teacher.

The notice required currently must be in writing and be delivered to the parent or guardian by July 15 immediately preceding the beginning of the school year, and must identify the teacher who is the subject of the notice. The same conditions would apply to a notice under the bill, except it would have to include an explanation of why the board was unable to comply, rather than identify the teacher.

Teaching Certificate

Under the bill, notwithstanding any other provision of the Code or a rule to the contrary, beginning July 1, 2015, the Superintendent of Public Instruction could not issue an initial professional teaching certificate to an individual who did not meet one of the following conditions:

- The individual was rated as either effective or highly effective on his or her annual evaluation for the three consecutive school years immediately preceding his or her application for the certificate.
- The individual was rated as either effective or highly effective on his or her annual evaluation for at least three nonconsecutive school years before applying for the certificate, and submitted a recommendation from the chief administrator of the school at which he or she was employed currently that he or she be issued a certificate.

Exemption from Evaluation Requirements

Under the Code, if all of the following apply for a public school operated by a school district, ISD, or PSA, the school district, ISD, or PSA does not have to comply with the Code's teacher and administrator performance evaluation requirements:

- As of July 19, 2011, the school district, ISD, or PSA had already implemented and is currently using a performance evaluation system for that school that meets certain criteria.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA notified the Governor's Council by November 1, 2011, that it is exempt.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA posts a description of its evaluation system on its website.

If, after July 19, 2011, a school district, ISD, or PSA begins operating a new public school, or implements a new performance evaluation system for a public school it operates, and both of the following apply, the school district, ISD, or PSA does not have to comply with the Code's teacher and administrator evaluation requirements for that school:

- The evaluation system adopted and implemented for that school replicates and is identical to the system of an exempt public school.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA posts a description of the system on its website.

The bill would delete all of these provisions.

Administrator Evaluations

The bill would delete the Code's provisions regarding performance evaluation of administrators. House Bill 5224 (H-4), however, would reenact them in a separate section of the Code, as described below.

House Bill 5224 (H-4)

General Evaluation Requirements; Growth & Assessment Data

Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the board of a school district or ISD or board of directors of a PSA must ensure that the performance evaluation system for building-level school administrators and for central office-level school administrators who are regularly involved in instructional matters includes at least an annual year-end evaluation for all school administrators by the school district or ISD superintendent or his or her designee, or chief administrator of the PSA, as applicable. (A superintendent or chief administrator must be evaluated by the board or board of directors).

In addition, the applicable board must ensure that the administrator evaluation system meets all of the following conditions:

- A percentage of the evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data, as required for teacher evaluations.
- The school district, ISD, or PSA must adopt and implement the State evaluation tool for school administrators, or a local tool consistent with the State tool.
- The system must assign to each school administrator an effectiveness rating of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective, based on his or her score on the evaluation tool.
- The system must ensure that if a school administrator is rated as minimally effective or ineffective, the person conducting the evaluation develops and requires the administrator to implement an improvement plan to correct the deficiencies.
- The system must provide that, if a school administrator is rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the school district, PSA, or ISD is required to dismiss the administrator from employment.
- The system must provide that, if an administrator is rated as highly effective on three consecutive evaluations, the school district, ISD, or PSA may choose to conduct a year-end evaluation biennially instead of annually.

House Bill 5223 (H-4) would delete these requirements from Section 1249 of the Code, and House Bill 5224 (H-4) would reenact them in proposed Section 1249b, which would apply beginning with the 2014-2015 school year. The bill also would make the same changes to the percentages of the administrator evaluation that must be based on student growth and assessment data as proposed by House Bill 5223 (H-4) for teacher evaluations.

Beginning in 2015-2016, half of the student growth and assessment data would have to be measured using the State student growth assessment tool. For a pupil with an individualized education program (IEP), a school district, ISD, or PSA could use State-provided growth data for up to half of the data for that pupil, or use one or more locally determined student measures and assessments with valid growth measurements, including IEP goals, for all of the student growth and assessment data. The balance between the use of State student

growth data from State assessment tools and locally determined student growth measures and assessment for a particular administrator's growth rating would have to be based on the instructional programs under the oversight of that administrator, with State student growth data not to exceed half of the administrator's total growth rating.

The portion of an administrator's student growth and assessment data that was not based on State-provided data would have to be based on one or more locally determined student measures and assessments with valid growth measurements, which could include student learning objectives or IEP goals. These measures and assessments could be either locally developed or created by a vendor. They would have to be used consistently among the schools operated by a school district or PSA so that all similarly situated administrators were evaluated using the same measures and assessments.

If there were student growth and assessment data for an administrator for at least three school years, the annual evaluation would have to be based on the data for the most recent three-consecutive-school-year period. Otherwise, the evaluation would have to be based on all data that were available for that administrator.

Non-Data Portion of Evaluation

Under the Code, the portion of the evaluation that is not based on student growth and assessment data must be based on the administrator's training and proficiency in using the evaluation tool for teachers; the progress made by the school or school district in meeting the goals set forth in the school's school improvement plan or the school district's school improvement plans, as applicable; pupil attendance in the school or school district, as applicable; and student, parent, and teacher feedback, and other information considered pertinent by the superintendent or other administrator conducting the performance evaluation or the school board, ISD board, or PSA board of directors. House Bill 5223 (H-4) would delete these provisions, and House Bill 5224 (H-4) would reenact them. Under the House Bill 5224 (H-4), these provisions would apply to the portion of the evaluation that was not based on student growth and assessment data or the school administrator evaluation tool (described below). Also, the bill would require this portion of the evaluation to be based on the demonstration of effective management and development of instructional staff, unless this criterion was already required in the evaluation tool or tools adopted for school administrators as prescribed in the bill.

The portion of an administrator's annual evaluation that was not based on student growth and assessment data would have to be based primarily on his or her performance as measured by the evaluation tool adopted by the school district, ISD, or PSA. As with teacher evaluation tools, the school district, PSA, or ISD would have to adopt and implement one or more of the approved tools by the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year. The tools would have to be used consistently among the schools operated by a school district, ISD, or PSA so that all similarly situated school administrators were evaluated using the same tool.

The bill would include language applicable to an individual, school board, or board of directors conducting an administrator evaluation similar to that proposed by House Bill 5223 (H-4) regarding the training of individuals conducting classroom evaluations.

For the purposes of evaluating school administrator performance, a school district, ISD, or PSA would have to use one or more of the following evaluation tools:

- The School Advance Administrator Evaluation System developed by P. Reeves and P. McNeil.
- The D. Reeves Leadership Performance Rubric.
- The R. Marzano School and District Leadership Evaluation.

Additionally, the MDE could designate one or more other evaluation tools as acceptable for use if they met the bill's requirements for locally developed evaluation tools, and a school district, ISD, or PSE could use those tools for the purpose of evaluating administrators. The Department could revoke the designation if it determined at any point that the tool failed to meet the bill's requirements.

With regard to administrator evaluation, the bill would include language similar to that proposed by House Bill 5223 (H-4) for teacher evaluation regarding the modification or adaptation of an acceptable evaluation tool and the information that a school district, ISD, or PSA would have to post on its website if it chose to use a locally developed evaluation tool.

MCL 380.1249 & 380.1249a (H.B. 5223)
Proposed MCL 380.1249b (H.B. 5224)

BACKGROUND

Public Act 102 of 2011 amended the Revised School Code to establish the requirements for teacher and administrator evaluations. The Act also created the Governor's Council on Educator Effectiveness as a temporary commission and prescribed its membership. Additionally, the Act required the Governor to appoint an advisory committee for the Council to provide input on its recommendations. The advisory committee had to consist of public school teachers, public school administrators, and parents of public school pupils. The Act required the Council, by April 30, 2012, to submit a report to the State Board of Education, the Governor, and the Legislature. The report had to identify and recommend all of the following, and include recommendations on evaluation processes and other relevant matters:

- A student growth and assessment tool.
- A State evaluation tool for teachers.
- A State evaluation tool for school administrators.
- Parameters for the effectiveness rating categories for teachers and administrators.
- A process for evaluating and approving local evaluation tools for teachers and administrators.

The Council's report also had to recommend changes to be made in the requirements for a professional education teaching certificate that would ensure that a teacher would not be required to complete additional postsecondary credit hours beyond those required for a provisional teaching certificate.

Public Act 102 required the recommended State evaluation tool for teachers to include, in addition to the student growth and assessment tool, instructional leadership abilities, teacher and pupil attendance, professional contributions, training, progress report achievement, school improvement plan progress, peer input, and pupil and parent feedback. The Council had to ensure that the tool would allow all special education teachers to be rated. The Council also had to seek input from school districts, ISDs, and PSAs that already had developed and implemented successful, effective performance evaluation systems.

Public Act 102 required the recommended State evaluation tool for school administrators to include, in addition to the student growth and assessment tool, teacher and pupil attendance, graduation rates, professional contributions, training, progress report achievement, school improvement plan progress, peer input, and pupil and parent feedback.

Public Act 102 added the following statement: "It is the intent of the legislature to review the report submitted by the governor's council on educator effectiveness...and to enact

appropriate legislation to put into place a statewide performance evaluation system taking into consideration the recommendations contained in the report."

The Council submitted its final report in July 2013.

Legislative Analyst: Julie Cassidy

FISCAL IMPACT

The State could see reductions in teacher licensure revenue if the requirement that the Superintendent of Public Instruction not issue initial professional teaching certificates to not-effective teachers (as defined in the legislation) resulted in the issuance of fewer licenses than under the current process.

Local districts would see increased costs associated with the proposed requirement to ensure training for individuals acting as observers, if that training were not provided by the vendor as part of the evaluation tool. Further, there would be additional costs associated with ensuring training for observers in the areas of coaching, providing feedback, and rater reliability. This training would be required every three years, and is estimated to cost between \$7.0 million and \$25.0 million statewide yearly, depending on the evaluation tool chosen, and whether training was provided individually, regionally, online, or in-person.

Local districts would continue to see costs associated with the existing requirement to implement a teacher evaluation tool; under current law, there is supposed to be a single statewide tool, but that is changed to one of four State-approved tools (with an option for a locally determined, rigorous evaluation tool) under this legislation. The estimated cost for the evaluation tool ranges between \$3.0 million and \$11.0 million in the first year, with some savings in later years upon renewal, if an electronic tool were used. In addition, it is estimated that there would be a yearly cost of \$5.0 million for administrator evaluations, which first were required under Public Act 102 of 2011, and would be further refined and specified under this proposal.

The prohibition against schools assigning pupils to be taught in the same subject for two consecutive years by an ineffective teacher could have ramifications for staffing levels and costs at a school, but those are indeterminate.

Fiscal Analyst: Kathryn Summers

S1314\5223sa

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.