



Illinois State Board of Education

February 2013

Guidance Document 13-11

Guidance on Creating a Summative Rating in Teacher Evaluation Systems

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

Guidance on Creating a Summative Rating in Teacher Evaluation Systems

Subject

Combining teacher professional practice and student growth ratings to create a summative rating

Type of Guidance

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 teacher performance into the evaluation plan” (PERA 5/24A-4[b]).

Illinois Administrative Code specifies that “significant factor” will be defined as (at minimum) 25 percent of a teacher’s performance evaluation rating during the first two years of implementation of an evaluation system that incorporates student growth and 30 percent of a teacher’s performance evaluation rating thereafter (23 Ill. Adm. Code 50.110 [a]). In the Model Teacher Evaluation System, student growth will comprise 50 percent of the performance rating (PERA Sec 24A-7).

This guidance supports Joint Committees in making decisions related to combining teacher professional practice and student growth ratings into a final summative rating.

Explanation

Although the Model Teacher Evaluation System prescribes that professional practice and student growth be rated using the same labels (*excellent*, *proficient*, *needs improvement*, and *unsatisfactory*), Joint Committees have considerable flexibility in determining how to combine practice and student growth ratings into a single, summative rating. PERA, however, does impose on Joint Committees the requirement that student growth count for 25 percent of the summative rating for the first two years of implementation, increasing to 30 percent in the third year of implementation and thereafter. (See Illinois Administrative Code, Title 23, Part 50, Section 50.110: Student Growth Components, Section a.)

Because PERA requires a percentage weight for student growth, Joint Committees need to develop systems for weighting student growth that meet the minimum requirements. This guidance lays out a few options using a percentage weight for student growth.

Regardless of the process and systems that the Joint Committee prescribes for coming to a summative rating, it is essential that a clear, well-documented process is articulated and shared with teachers and evaluators.

Examples

The following two examples indicate how a district could combine professional practice ratings with student growth ratings to come to a summative rating.

Example 1

Teacher Practice and Student Growth Ratings for Teacher A

Teacher A received a professional practice rating of *proficient* based on the district's four-level system for rating teacher practice. For purposes of calculating summative ratings, the district defines *proficient* as 3 points out of a possible 4.

Teacher A received a student growth rating of *needs improvement* based on the district's four-level system for rating student growth. For purposes of calculating summative ratings, the district defines *needs improvement* as 2 points out of a possible 4.

Calculating the Summative Rating

The professional practice rating is multiplied by .70, since it counts as 70 percent of the summative rating. The student growth rating is multiplied by .30, since it counts as 30 percent of the summative rating.

Professional practice rating: $(3/4 \times .70) = .525$

Student growth rating: $(2/4 \times .30) = 0.15$

The two numbers are added together for a total of .675

The Joint Committee defined the following ranges for each summative rating (see Table 1).

Table 1. Ranges for Summative Ratings

Summative Rating	Range
Excellent	>.9
Proficient	.6–.89
Needs improvement	.4–.59
Unsatisfactory	<.4

According to the decision rule, Teacher A received a summative rating of *proficient*.

Example 2

Teacher Practice and Student Growth Ratings for Teacher B

Teacher B received a professional practice rating of *high proficient* based on the district's system for rating teacher practice. The rating system has four base levels and allows for a *high* or *low* at each level. For purposes of calculating summative ratings, the district defines *high proficient* as 6 points out of a possible 8.

Figure A. District Rating Scale for Professional Practice Rating and Student Growth Rating



Teacher B received a student growth rating of *low needs improvement* based on the district's system for rating student growth. For purposes of calculating summative ratings, the district defines *low needs improvement* as 3 points out of a possible 8.

Calculating the Summative Rating

The professional practice rating is multiplied by .70, since it counts as 70 percent of the summative rating. The student growth rating is multiplied by .30, since it counts as 30 percent of the summative rating.

Professional practice rating: $(6 \times .70) = 4.2$

Student growth rating: $(3 \times .30) = 0.9$

The two numbers are added together for a total of 5.1

The Joint Committee defined the following ranges for each summative rating (see Table 2).

Table 2. Ranges for Summative Ratings

Summative Rating	Range
Excellent	>7
Proficient	5–7
Needs improvement	2.5–4.999
Unsatisfactory	<2.5

According to the decision rule, Teacher B received a summative rating of *proficient*.

As these examples show, Joint Committees need to make several important decisions:

- What is the numerical scale for measuring both professional practice and student growth? (Example 1 and Example 2 show a numerical scale of 4 and 8 respectively, but the total number of points can be any number.)

- How many levels of performance are available, and how many points are assigned to each level?
- What are the relative weights of practice and growth, recognizing that the Administrative Code defines the minimum for weight for growth as 25 percent of the total in the first two years and 30 percent thereafter?
- What ranges of scores correspond to each summative rating category?

Joint Committees also should consider whether to require additional evidence in cases where ratings of practice and student growth are substantially different. For example, if a teacher receives the highest rating for student growth and the lowest rating for practice, the Joint Committee could require additional information to confirm the validity of each rating. Additional evidence could include an additional observation, an additional observation by another evaluator, or consideration of another measure of student growth. There is no requirement that district evaluation systems address discrepancies between growth and practice ratings.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. Does our district have to follow these steps?

No. This is a guidance document. In its development of the teacher evaluation system, the Joint Committee can choose to follow these steps or not. It is important, however, that the Joint Committee articulate a clear, well-documented process for coming to a summative rating.

2. Does our district have to implement one of these examples?

No. This is a guidance document. In their development of the teacher evaluation system, a district and union in collaboration can choose to use one of these examples or develop other systems.