



# **Illinois State Board of Education**

**February 2013**

**Guidance Document 13-09**

**Model Teacher Evaluation System**

**Creating a Summative Rating**

*This document is intended to provide non-regulatory guidance on the subject matter listed above. For specific questions, please contact the person(s) identified in the document.*

---

Dr. Christopher Koch, State Superintendent

Printed by AFL-CIO (AFSCME Local #288 and IFSOE Local #3236) Employees



# Model Teacher Evaluation System: Creating a Summative Rating

---

## Subject

Combining teacher practice and student growth ratings to create a teacher’s summative rating under the Model Teacher Evaluation System

## Model System Component

The Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) requires that teacher evaluations “incorporate the use of data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating teaching performance, into its evaluation plan for all teachers” (PERA Sec. 24A-4[b]).

In the Model Teacher Evaluation System, student growth will comprise 50 percent of the performance rating (PERA Sec. 24A-7).

The Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) decided to use a decision matrix for combining teacher practice and student growth ratings into a summative rating in the State Performance Evaluation Model.

## Explanation

In the Model Teacher Evaluation System, districts will use four levels—*excellent*, *proficient*, *needs improvement*, and *unsatisfactory*—to rate both teacher practice and student growth.

In the Model Teacher Evaluation System, districts will provide teachers with an overall teacher practice rating and overall student growth rating. The overall teacher practice rating and the overall student growth rating will be combined to create an overall summative rating using the decision matrix (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Decision Matrix for Teacher Evaluation Model System**

**Instructions:** Use the following matrix to compare the student growth rating with the teacher practice rating and determine a teacher’s summative rating. When the comparison falls in the orange and yellow boxes, the summative rating is rounded up as follows:

- When student growth and teacher practice ratings are one level apart, the summative rating is the higher of the two (see orange boxes).
- When student growth and teacher practice ratings are two levels apart, the summative rating is the rating *in between* the student growth and teacher practice ratings (see green boxes).
- When student growth and teacher practice ratings are three levels apart (i.e., a combination of *excellent* and *unsatisfactory* ratings), additional evidence is required. If the rating is confirmed, the summative rating is *proficient* (see yellow boxes).

|                               |                          | Overall Teacher Practice Rating                                     |                          |                          |   |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
|                               |                          | <i>Excellent</i>  | <i>Proficient</i>        | <i>Needs Improvement</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory</i>   |
| Overall Student Growth Rating | <i>Excellent</i>         | <i>Excellent</i>  | <i>Excellent</i>         | <i>Proficient</i>        | <b>Additional evidence required—if confirmed, <i>Proficient</i></b> |
|                               | <i>Proficient</i>        | <i>Excellent</i>  | <i>Proficient</i>        | <i>Proficient</i>        | <i>Needs Improvement</i>  |
|                               | <i>Needs Improvement</i> | <i>Proficient</i>   | <i>Proficient</i>        | <i>Needs Improvement</i> | <i>Needs Improvement</i>  |
|                               | <i>Unsatisfactory</i>    | <b>Additional evidence required—if confirmed, <i>Proficient</i></b> | <i>Needs improvement</i> | <i>Needs Improvement</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory</i>   |

### Additional Information Needed for Ratings That Are Three Levels Apart

When there is a three-level discrepancy between the teacher practice rating and the student growth rating, the requirement of additional evidence is consistent with the state statute because there is no “middle scoring rating” in these situations; hence, there is no way to break the tie that would be consistent with the statute. A three-level discrepancy clearly shows such a large disconnect that further evaluation should be used to determine the source of that disconnect (e.g., errors in the scoring methodology, ineffective practice observations, students with poor results on testing day).

**If the student growth rating is *unsatisfactory* and the teacher practice rating is *excellent*,** another state-qualified evaluator must review:

- The accuracy of the scoring process
- The appropriateness of the assessments used to measure student growth
- The students included in the calculation of the student growth measure
- The appropriateness of the student growth goal

**If this review:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Confirms</b> the student growth rating as <i>unsatisfactory</i> ...                              | The <b>original growth rating stands</b> , and the teacher receives a summative rating of <i>proficient</i> .  |
| <b>Changes</b> the student growth rating from <i>unsatisfactory</i> to <i>needs improvement</i> ... | The <b>original growth rating is changed to <i>needs improvement</i></b> , and the teacher receives a summative rating of <i>proficient</i> .                                      |
| <b>Changes</b> the student growth rating to <i>proficient</i> or <i>excellent</i> ...               | The <b>original growth rating of <i>unsatisfactory</i> is changed to <i>proficient</i> or <i>excellent</i></b> , and the teacher receives a summative rating of <i>excellent</i> . |

**If the teacher practice rating is *unsatisfactory* and the student growth rating is *excellent*,** another state-qualified evaluator must conduct a classroom observation of the teacher. This observation would consist of 2 formal observations and 1 informal observation for a nontenured teacher or for a tenured teacher who received a summary rating of *needs improvement* or *unsatisfactory* in the previous summative rating; or 1 formal observation and 1 informal observation for a tenured teacher who received a summative rating of *proficient* or *excellent* in the previous summative rating.

**If the combined scores of the additional observations:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Confirm</b> the <i>unsatisfactory</i> teacher practice rating... | The <b>original practice rating stands</b> , and the teacher receives a summative rating of <i>proficient</i> .                                 |
| <b>Score</b> at the <i>needs improvement</i> level...               | The <b>original practice rating is changed to <i>needs improvement</i></b> , and the teacher receives a summative rating of <i>proficient</i> . |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Score at the <i>proficient</i> or <i>excellent</i> level... | The <b>original practice rating is changed to <i>proficient</i> or <i>excellent</i></b> , and the teacher receives a summative of <i>excellent</i> . |
|---|--|

## Frequently Asked Questions

### 1. Does our district have to follow these steps?

The only districts that are required to follow these steps are those implementing the Model Teacher Evaluation System, which occurs when the Joint Committee cannot come to a decision on this aspect of student growth within 180 days of the first meeting of the Joint Committee. See PERA Section 24A-4(b) for more information on the Model Teacher Evaluation System and deadlines for a Joint Committee.