

Overview of the New Formula for Ohio Educator Evaluation System Final Summative Ratings

Sept. 17, 2014 Revised Jan. 23, 2015

Recent legislative changes in Ohio House Bill 362 include an alternative framework for teacher evaluation that allows 15 percent of a teacher's rating to be based on one approved alternative component: student surveys, teacher self-evaluations, peer-review evaluations or student portfolios. Like the original teacher evaluation framework, which districts may still use, the alternative framework assigns teacher performance and student growth an equal weight in determining final summative ratings.

The Evaluation Matrix, or "look-up table," used in the past will no longer be used to calculate teachers' final summative ratings. The alternative framework requires a new structure for scoring teacher evaluations. As such, Ohio is now using a formula-based approach based on a 600-point scale on a consistent basis for all teachers, including those whose districts select the original framework and those who choose the alternative framework of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. Although the alternative framework may not be used in principal evaluations, the 600-point formula will be used with these evaluations.

Many states and districts are working through similar policy decisions regarding multiple performance measures for teacher evaluation. A formula-based approach is best suited for this situation; it accounts for the features of the alternative framework, and research indicates that it is the preferred approach (Hansen, Lemke, & Sorenson, 2013).¹

Likewise, the 600-point scale provides advantages: It accommodates both the 1-to-4 and 1-to-5 rating ladders used as inputs in the evaluation system and allows for minimal use of decimals in summative ratings. In addition, ratings are not confused with a 0-100 percent grading scale with specific built-in connotations (e.g., 75 percent is a letter grade of "C").

Here are the steps for determining a final summative rating

- 1) As they submit data into the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES), districts enter ratings for each measure: teacher performance (from 1-to-4), each student growth measure (from 1-to-5) and, if selected, an alternative component (from 1-to-4).
- 2) eTPES assigns the point value that corresponds to the ratings from each component:
 - **Student growth.** This component may entail multiple measures (Value-Added scores, approved vendor assessments or student learning objectives) each with its own 1-to-5 rating. A most effective (5) rating results in 600 points; above average (4), 400 points; average (3), 300 points; approaching average (2), 200 points; and below average (1), 0 points.
 - **Teacher performance.** A rating of accomplished (4) results in 600 points; skilled (3), 400 points; developing (2), 200 points; and ineffective (1), 0 points.
 - **An approved alternative component.** If selected, an alternative component rating of level 4 results in 600 points; level 3 rating, 400 points; level 2 rating, 200 points; and level 1 rating, 0 points.
- 3) eTPES multiplies the points for each measure by the appropriate weight or percentage. The department will release business rules for how weights will be assigned for student growth measures when multiple measures are employed.

The examples on the following pages illustrate how eTPES will follow these steps to calculate a final summative rating, using the original teacher evaluation framework and the alternative framework.

¹Hansen, M., Lemke, M., & Sorensen, N. (2013). *Combining multiple performance measures: Do common approaches undermine districts' personnel evaluation systems?* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/files/Combining_Multiple_Performance_Measures.pdf.

Original Teacher Evaluation Framework (50 + 50)

Ratings and Points

Student Growth		Performance		Final Summative Rating	
•Most Effective (5)	600	•Accomplished (4)	600	•Accomplished	500-600
•Above Average (4)	400	•Skilled (3)	400	•Skilled	300-499
•Average (3)	300	•Developing (2)	200	•Developing	100-299
•Approaching Average (2)	200	•Ineffective (1)	0	•Ineffective	0-99
•Least Effective (1)	0				

Example #1. Grade 4 A2 Teacher

Mr. Wilson teaches Grade 4 and is an “A2” teacher (who teaches Value-Added courses, but not exclusively). He is using Value-Added and vendor assessments for his student growth measures. He has four different measures that need entered into eTPES (three for student growth and one for performance):

		Scores (examples)	Rating Points	x Subcomponent Weight	÷ Number of Ratings	= Applied Points
Student Growth Measures 50%	A2 Value-Added	1	0	25%	1	0
	Vendor Assessment (Science)	4	400	25%	2	50
	Vendor Assessment (Social Studies)	3	300	25%	2	37.5
	Student Growth Measures Total					88
Performance on Standards 50%	Developing	2	200	50%		100
Final Summative Rating						188 Developing

Using the new formula, eTPES will calculate the final summative rating by multiplying the points for each measure by the percentage, dividing by the number of component ratings and then summing the applied points:

$$(0 \times 25\%) + (400 \times 25\% \div 2) + (300 \times 25\% \div 2) + (200 \times 50\%) = 187.5 = 188$$

Alternative Framework (42.5 + 42.5 + 15)

Ratings and Points

Student Growth		Performance		Alternative Component		Final Summative Rating	
•Most Effective (5)	600	•Accomplished (4)	600	•Level 4	600	•Accomplished	500-600
•Above Average (4)	400	•Skilled (3)	400	•Level 3	400	•Skilled	300-499
•Average (3)	300	•Developing (2)	200	•Level 2	200	•Developing	100-299
•Approaching Average (2)	200	•Ineffective (1)	0	•Level 1	0	•Ineffective	0-99
•Least Effective (1)	0						

Example #2. Middle School Art Teacher

Ms. Reynolds teaches middle school art and is a “C” teacher, meaning she has no Value-Added or vendor assessment data. She is using four student learning objectives, along with an approved student survey (an alternative component). The district must enter six different measures for her evaluation into eTPES.

Student Growth Measures 42.5%		Scores (examples only)				
		Rating Points	x Subcomponent Weight	÷ Number of Ratings	= Applied Points	
	SLO 1 (5 th Grade Art)	5	600	42.5%	4	63.75
	SLO 2 (6 th Grade Art)	4	400	42.5%	4	42.5
	SLO 3 (7 th Grade Art)	3	300	42.5%	4	31.875
	SLO 4 (8 th Grade Art)	2	200	42.5%	4	21.25
Student Growth Measures Total						159
Performance on Standards 42.5%	Skilled	3	400	42.5%		170
Alternative Component		4	600	15%		90
Final Summative Rating						419 Skilled

Using the new formula, eTPES will calculate the final summative rating by multiplying the points for each measure by the measure’s weight, and then summing the applied points. The actual calculation is:

$$\text{SLO 1 } (600 \times 42.5\% \div 4) + \text{SLO 2 } (400 \times 42.5\% \div 4) + \text{SLO 3 } (300 \times 42.5\% \div 4) + \text{SLO 4 } (200 \times 42.5\% \div 4) + \text{teacher performance } (400 \times 42.5\%) + \text{alternative measure } (600 \times 15\%) = 419$$