

Education Policy Analysis Archives

Volume 3 Number 4

February 15, 1995

ISSN 1068-2341

A peer-reviewed scholarly electronic journal.

Editor: Gene V Glass, Glass@ASU.EDU. College of Education,
Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287-2411

Copyright 1995, the EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS
ARCHIVES. Permission is hereby granted to copy any article
provided that EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS ARCHIVES is
credited and copies are not sold.

State Actions for Personnel Evaluation: Analysis of Reform Policies, 1983-1992

Carol B. Furtwengler
Wichita State University

cfurtwen@wsuhub.uc.twsu.edu

Abstract: This article is an analysis four major policy issues associated with state actions for personnel evaluation from 1983 to 1992 and provides descriptive information about state policy actions taken during those years. Twenty states enacted their first requirements for performance evaluation, and states assumed new roles for program development, implementation, and staff development. Twenty-nine states passed legislation for performance pay programs, but only five programs remained viable by 1992. States generally avoided the issue of teacher tenure when enacting legislation for teacher evaluation. Thirty-eight states enacted 67 changes in legislation prescribing specific requirements for personnel evaluation. During the early part of the reform movement, state actions focused on accountability; toward the end of the reform movement states actions relinquished control and returned responsibility for evaluation to local school districts. Legislation varied across the states in the purpose for evaluation: improvement, continuing employment, and performance pay. The study found a positive relationship (0.48) between state control over personnel evaluation and state funding of education.

A consistent theme stressed by reform studies during the 1980s was the need to change the way school personnel are evaluated, encouraged, recognized, and rewarded. A Nation at Risk (1983) which became the most highly visible of the reform reports, stated:

Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated.
(p. 30)

This theme was reflected in a myriad of other reform reports (Action for Excellence, 1983; Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools, 1985; Who Will Teach Our Children? A Strategy for Improving California's School, (1985). Concurrently, a study conducted for the Rand Corporation (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein, 1984) reported the dire state of teacher evaluation in public schools and prompted further concern about personnel evaluation.

By the middle of the decade, however, the reform focus encompassed not only personnel evaluation issues but also the need to examine school restructuring and career development options for school personnel. This change in direction is often referred to as the "second wave" of reform (Hawley, 1988). In *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) stressed restructured schools and career ladders for teachers or systems for rewarding teachers based on job function, level of certification, seniority, and productivity.

Policy studies of the 1980s reform movement usually held that the impetus for school reform resided in state governors and legislators. One evidence of state leadership was the National Governors' Association report, *Time for Results* (1986), which addressed several major strands for reform. One call was for a redesign of the structure of the teaching career to promote increased responsibility and compensation for teachers based on "certified professional competence" (p. 39).

Personnel evaluation has long been a prime concern of educational reformers as well as a focus for state-level initiatives during the reform era. A review of state statutes and regulations for teacher evaluation, for example, was conducted by Wuhs and Manatt (1983) prior to the reform movement. This article extends that earlier work. It reports the findings from the conduct of a 50-state survey to determine the changes in state requirements for educational personnel evaluation from 1983 until 1992. Important questions that are answered include: What do state policy trends indicate about state actions for personnel evaluation? What are the provisions in the statutes and regulations for teacher evaluation in each of the 50 states, and how do they differ among states? How many states adopted new statutes or regulations for educational personnel evaluation in response to the reform movement? What purposes have states identified for the conduct of personnel evaluation? What relationships can be studied to predict and understand the variance that exists in state-level involvement in personnel evaluation?

This research project employed written correspondence, structured interviews by telephone, and the review of official written documents to obtain information related to the research questions. The multi-step methodology is described in Appendix A.

Results

The key findings from the analyses of the survey data are reported in the subsequent five sections. The first section discusses the policy trends identified in state actions for personnel evaluation. The next three sections discuss detailed information about state actions for personnel evaluation: (a) status of state regulations for personnel evaluation, (b) changes that have occurred in those regulations since 1983, and (c) purposes identified by states for personnel evaluation. The fifth section identifies possible reasons for variance in state involvement in and regulation of personnel evaluation.

State Policy Trends in Personnel Evaluation during 1983-1992

Thirty-eight states enacted state-level policy for personnel evaluation during the reform movement. Many states passed legislation in successive years with 67 reported instances of enactment of new policies. These legislative actions revealed several trends in state policy during

1983 through 1992.

Initial Requirements for Personnel Evaluation: States Jump on the Bandwagon

Twenty states enacted their first requirements for the evaluation of local school district personnel during the reform movement, and this occurred most often during the period from 1983 to 1985. These actions support the premise that the first "wave" of reform was an accountability movement, and personnel evaluation was one vehicle used by policy makers in an attempt to insure assessment of personnel. Nearly one-half of the states passed policy that required local school districts to evaluate personnel. Other states extended their actions from policy to program implementation. They developed state evaluation systems and mandated their use in local school systems.

In spite of this rush to legislate policy for personnel evaluation, 12 states took no action during the reform movement. The reason reported by states for not legislating requirements for personnel evaluation was the precedence for not imposing state regulations upon local school districts. No definite pattern emerges for why some states refrained from "jumping on the band wagon," although nearly one-half of the states not passing legislation were in the northeast section of the country. This section of the country has historically allowed more autonomy for school districts.

State Involvement in the Specification of Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

Twenty-six states identified specific criteria for teacher evaluation, 19 states identified criteria for the evaluation of special groups of personnel such as media specialists and counselors, and 19 states identified criteria for principal evaluation. States also legislated the procedural aspects of the evaluation process. Examples of this involvement included states that legislated the exact date for the completion of a specific number of classroom observations to states that developed and implemented state-mandated evaluation models for local school systems.

The level of sophistication and procedural detail included in state evaluation systems were a radical departure from state policy used to "guide" local school districts. While 12 states remained apart from the mainstream, other states, particularly those in the southeast, went beyond policy to actual program implementation and operation. As the reform movement advanced, however, Tennessee and North Carolina relinquished their state models for local evaluation and encouraged and supported local school systems in the development of their own systems. These policy trends appear to indicate that states cannot maintain momentum for programs that are intrusive and override the initiative and ownership of local school systems.

Training of Evaluators for Personnel Evaluation

Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, and Michigan required training in personnel evaluation for certification of administrative personnel, and states such as Tennessee, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Florida required and provided state-level training programs for local school districts. States agencies historically directed energy toward the monitoring of programs at the local level and provided some technical assistance to local school systems. The amount of time, effort, and money devoted to training programs for personnel evaluation reflected a shift in policy. State agencies became active participants in staff development and designed and provided extensive training programs for local school personnel.

Performance Pay Programs

State policy for performance pay programs can be classified in three general categories although the program characteristics are not mutually exclusive. Furtwengler (1989) described these categories as:

(a) performance-based ladders, where the individual's progression up the rungs is based upon evidence of increased competence at progressively more difficult and/or complex levels of professional performance; (b) job enlargement ladders, where the individual's rise is based on differentiated job roles and responsibilities that serve the needs of students and the school beyond the teacher's own classroom; and (c) professional development ladders, where individual advancement is based upon the completion of qualifying staff development activities, coursework and/or advanced degrees. (p. 1).

These three categories were found entwined within performance pay programs enacted during the reform movement.

In a previous study, Furtwengler (1994) reported that 21 states did not enact performance pay programs, and six states enacted legislation but did not implement programs. Fourteen states enacted and implemented performance pay programs but later discontinued them. Nine states reported operational performance pay programs in 1992, but of these nine states, only five programs were considered viable and received considerable state funding for their support.

The viable performance pay programs in operation during 1992 showed different policy approaches to personnel evaluation. Tennessee reported a state-controlled system where the state hired and trained evaluators, developed the evaluation system, and determined career ladder status. Texas, on the other hand, created a state evaluation process and provided state funding, but local school personnel conducted evaluations at the local level. (Texas, however, discontinued its program since the collection of data for this study). The other states--Utah, Missouri, and Arizona-- provided funding but allowed local school systems latitude in program design and evaluation procedures. In addition, the performance pay programs have also combined mixed characteristics--pay for performance, job-enlargement, and professional development. No one program design appeared more successful than another.

Performance pay programs--once a clarion cry echoing from governors and state capitols--have been unsuccessful as a reform policy. States reported a myriad of reasons for unsuccessful program implementation: (a) lack of adequate funding, (b) strong opposition from teachers' organizations, (c) lack of participation by local school districts, and (d) haste in implementation without adequate preparation and program support. Cornett and Gaines (1994) reported that programs have been successful in ". . . states, districts, and schools where strong leadership by educators and government officials has been evident" (p. 2). They also reported that performance pay programs provided more comprehensive teacher evaluation systems than existed prior to the reform movement and involved teachers in the evaluation process.

The Tenure Issue

Six states became embroiled with the tenure issue while dealing with personnel evaluation. Arizona, Colorado, and New Jersey repealed their tenure statutes. Tennessee and Missouri required performance evaluation for tenure. Tennessee passed its career ladder legislation in 1984 and extended the granting of teacher tenure from three years of experience to four years of experience. This action was rescinded in 1989, however, when the granting of tenure reverted to the three year standard.

An analysis of the teacher tenure issue and the enactment of regulations for personnel evaluation reveals that while 34 states enacted new policy, only six states directly addressed teacher tenure. Few states tackled this difficult issue when addressing evaluation policy, even though teacher tenure is often viewed as archaic by the public and members of the legislature. A key policy question is, "If policy makers acted in an accountability mode during the early part of the reform movement, why did they not incorporate efforts to eliminate the tenure system?"

The analysis of data from this study identified four major policy trends. It also provided detailed information about state regulations for personnel evaluation, the changes made in each state's regulations during 1983 to 1992, and state purposes for evaluation.

State Regulations for Personnel Evaluation

The 50-state survey identified each state's current requirements for personnel evaluation. Variance exists among states in their requirements related to teacher evaluation and ranges from no legislated requirement to specific requirements based upon the teachers' years of experience. Appendix B provides a state-by-state summary of requirements for teacher evaluation.

No State Requirements or Delegated to Local School Systems

Eight states have no statutes or regulations pertaining to teacher evaluation: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Virginia, Ohio and Michigan. Five states specifically delegate the responsibility for personnel evaluation to local school systems: New York, Iowa, Montana, Colorado and California. The majority of the states with the least regulation for teacher evaluation tend to cluster in the northeast section of the country.

The remaining 37 states have statewide requirements for personnel evaluation that can be classified into three categories. The first category is a generic requirement that local school districts evaluate all personnel annually. The second category requires different evaluation procedures based upon years of experience. For instance, Alabama requires that teachers be evaluated annually during their first three years of teaching. After that time period, teachers may be placed on a three-year evaluation cycle. In addition, four states use the third category and differentiate evaluation requirements even more specifically. Kansas, for example, requires that teachers in their first two years of service be evaluated twice annually; teachers with two to four years of experience be evaluated annually, and, teachers with four or more years of experience be evaluated once every three years. States identified below by their requirement for personnel evaluation based upon these three categories.

Eight states have one requirement for personnel evaluation and, in most instances, it specifies that personnel be evaluated annually: Alaska, Hawaii, South Dakota, Illinois, Georgia, North Carolina, Maryland and Connecticut. Maryland, however, requires evaluation only for non-tenured personnel for certification purposes.

In addition, four states--Kansas, Tennessee, South Carolina, and West Virginia--differentiate by years of experience even further. These states have three different requirements for evaluation based on years of experience in position (see Appendix B). Even though these states require more specific evaluation procedures, only one state (Tennessee) ranks as a state that maintains high control over and involvement in personnel evaluation. Tennessee not only identifies specific criteria for the evaluation of teachers, but also provides an optional state-model instrument for use at the local level, a state-controlled career ladder evaluation system, and training of local administrators for personnel evaluation. Kansas, on the other hand, does not provide criteria, instrumentation, processes, or training for the evaluation of teachers. No logical explanation is apparent for why policy makers require three changes in evaluation requirements based on years of experience.

Twenty-five states--the 50 states less those named above--have two requirements for personnel evaluation. These requirements specify different evaluation procedures based on the teachers' years of experience. These experience levels vary from one year to four years in the position. In all states that have specific requirements based on years of experience, teachers with fewer years of experience have more stringent requirements for evaluation. Three states have more stringent requirements for the first year vs. future years of employment; five states have more stringent requirements for the first two years vs. future years of employment; and 16 states have more stringent evaluation requirements during the first three years vs. future years of employment.

The policy requirements for personnel evaluation revealed no overall consistency among states, but trends emerged from the data. Trends indicated geographical differences. The northeastern states did not "jump on the bandwagon" for reform in personnel evaluation, while states in the southeast were the most active in enacting more stringent requirements. A common pattern among states that required personnel evaluation was more frequent evaluation during the beginning years of teaching and then reduced requirements as teachers reached their fourth year of service. This policy trend--the more years of service, the least amount of evaluation--raises several questions about underlying policy assumptions. Does it suggest that (a) experienced teachers are competent professionals who need less inspection and assistance in their performance?; (b) teachers with more years of experience have tenure and, therefore, personnel evaluation is not worth the time and effort?; (c) beginning teachers have the greatest need for assistance and that time and energy expended for their development is worthwhile? The underlying assumptions policy makers considered as they enacted new personnel evaluation requirements are unclear and provide an area for additional research.

Reported Changes in State Requirements Since 1983: Policy Trends

Thirty-eight states reported a total of 67 changes in state statutes and regulations for teacher evaluation from 1983 until 1992 (see Appendix C). Twelve states did not legislate changes in their personnel evaluation requirements while Arizona, Florida, Missouri, and Tennessee--all states who legislated performance pay programs-- enacted the greatest number of changes.

Trends: 1983-1991

The first wave of 1980s educational reform movement was described as one of accountability; the second wave, beginning with the Carnegie Report in 1986, moved from accountability to increased professionalism in teaching. An examination of legislative activity for personnel evaluation from 1983-1991 (Table 1) reveals increased activity during the accountability years, with the greatest number of policy initiatives for personnel evaluation enacted in 1985.

Table 1
Number of enacted personnel evaluation policy initiatives, 1983-1991.

Year	Number of Initiatives
1983	6
1984	9

1985	10
1986	7
1987	8
1988	8
1989	5
1990	7
1991	5

The trend of state policy activity from 1986 to 1991 is unclear. These data provide support for increased prescriptive activity during the early years of the reform era but also reveal that personnel evaluation remained an issue in state capitols throughout the decade.

Increased State Control Followed by Relaxation of Mandates

Policy initiatives for personnel evaluation reveal several interesting patterns. First, state involvement, as discussed early, moved from policy to controlling procedures and criteria for evaluation. Evaluation criteria became more sophisticated and specific with criteria developed for various positions such as teachers, guidance counselors, media specialists, and special education personnel. States also developed criteria for different administrative positions: superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and central office personnel.

With the enactment of policy and detailed evaluation procedures, many states became involved in training local school personnel and developing state-level evaluation models. Some states that mandated use of local evaluation models later rescinded their actions and returned the responsibility to local school systems. A similar pattern was seen in states that required strict oversight of personnel evaluation. Florida and Virginia removed their mandates for state monitoring of local evaluations and returned responsibility back to local school systems.

States that implemented performance pay programs relaxed requirements throughout the reform period. Tennessee was an example of a state that actually decreased several of its requirements for performance pay and moved from mandated to voluntary program participation for new teachers. These policy changes occurred after the Governor, who championed the career ladder movement, left office and the opposing party was elected to power. The effect of changes in political parties--particularly in states such as Tennessee-- appeared to have significant impact on weakening original accountability plans.

While some states continued to enact policy requiring more state involvement in personnel evaluation, a pattern emerges of strong "top-down" policy initiatives that were not sustained over time. States began returning or assigning responsibility to local school systems, including, in many instances, the recommendations for initial teacher certification based upon results of local school district evaluation.

State Purposes for Evaluation

An issue in personnel evaluation is whether the purpose of evaluation is to improve performance (formative) or to make employment or "high stakes" decisions (summative). Summative decisions can include re-employment, certification, and/or increased salary. The survey requested that states describe the purposes for evaluation that are stated in their statutes and regulations. These responses were classified under three major categories: improvement, certification/re- employment, and increased salary/performance pay.

Twelve states responded that the only stated purpose of evaluation was improvement; nine states responded that the only stated purpose of evaluation was for certification or re-employment. Sixteen other states articulated formative and summative reasons for evaluation. Among these, five states reported increased salary or performance pay as reasons for evaluation, but varied in the inclusion of other reasons for evaluation: one state includes certification and increased salary; one state includes improvement and increased salary; one state includes improvement, certification, and performance pay; and two states include improvement and performance pay. Eight states have no stated purpose for evaluation and, in most instances, these are states in which the state agency has little or no involvement in personnel evaluation.

Again, a pattern of "mixed messages" was seen in state policy for personnel evaluation. States vary in articulated reasons for evaluation regulations ranging from improvement to performance pay. Often, the statutory regulations did not match the stated purposes for evaluation.

State Control in Personnel Evaluation and Relationship to Other Factors

This study examined numerous other aspects of personnel evaluation that are not reported as a part of this article. Topics addressed were: requirements for administrator evaluation; implementation of performance pay programs; beginning teacher programs that involve evaluation for certification; criteria, processes, instruments, and training for evaluation of teachers, special groups of personnel (guidance, media specialists, counselors and others) and administrators; and methods for ascertaining local school system compliance with state requirements for personnel evaluation. States were rank ordered by the criteria applied in the study to determine the extent of state control of and state involvement with personnel evaluation at the local school system level. States with no involvement in personnel evaluation ranked the lowest; states with statutes, regulations, identified criteria, processes, instruments, and training programs for local school systems regarding personnel evaluation were ranked the highest.

A question the study attempted to answer is, "What is the relationship of state control of personnel evaluation to other factors in public school operation?" Two analyses were conducted to answer this question. First, states were rank ordered by their control over and involvement in personnel evaluation. Then, that ranking was compared with the amount of funding the state provides to local school systems for the operation of school districts. This ranking is shown in Table 1. The assumption was that the higher the percentage of state funding of education, the more regulation and control the state exerts on local school systems. Figures (1988-89) available from the U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, that provide the percent of state funding were rank ordered. The two sets of rankings were used to calculate a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient, a measure of association to predict the magnitude and direct relationship of one variable from another. This analysis showed that a positive relationship (0.48) exists between the degree of state regulation of local school system personnel evaluation and the percentage of state funding in district revenue for education.

Table 1
Rankings of States by State Control of Personnel Evaluation by State Funds for School District and by Number of School Districts

State	Control Rank	State Funds %	Funds Rank	School Districts #	School Districts Rank
-------	--------------	---------------	------------	--------------------	-----------------------

NH	1	8.5	1	170	21
NE	11	20.2	2	838	47
OR	22	25.2	3	303	32
SD	25	25.2	3	185	2
MI	1	27.2	5	561	42
IL	43	31.8	6	964	48
VT	1	33.8	7	276	2
VA	5	33.8	7	136	17
NV	20	36.7	9	17	2
MD	17	38.1	10	24	4
CO	11	39.0	11	176	22
MO	40	39.7	12	543	40
WS	22	39.9	13	429	36
MA	5	41.0	14	352	35
PA	19	41.5	15	501	39
NJ	28	42.1	16	603	43
RI	5	43.1	17	37	5
NY	5	43.2	18	721	46
TX	48	43.3	19	1062	49
KS	11	43.5	20	304	33
OH	5	43.9	21	613	45
AZ	26	45.0	22	238	26
CT	24	45.2	23	166	20
TN	50	46.0	24	141	18

ND	18	46.5	25	280	28
MT	19	46.6	26	548	41
WY	20	48.1	27	49	7
IA	11	48.8	28	431	37
SC	38	50.0	29	91	13
FL	46	51.7	30	67	11
LA	34	52.8	31	66	10
ME	4	53.2	32	282	29
GA	40	53.4	33	186	25
MN	27	53.6	34	436	38
IN	28	55.6	35	303	31
OK	47	55.9	36	604	44
AR	31	56.1	37	326	34
UT	37	57.0	38	40	6
MS	45	57.5	39	152	19
ID	11	59.6	40	115	14
AL	44	61.7	41	129	15
AK	5	63.6	42	54	8
WV	33	64.4	43	55	9
NC	49	66.1	44	134	16
CA	31	66.4	45	1074	50
KY	35	68.1	46	177	23
DE	39	68.4	47	18	3
WA	22	70.8	48	296	30

NM	35	73.5	49	88	12
HI	40	87.1	50	1	1
<p>a) 1988-89 data from the U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (funds)</p> <p>b) 1989-90 data from the U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (districts)</p>					

The study tested for a possible relationship between the number of school districts in a state and the extent of state control over personnel evaluation. This premise was provided by a state who exerted high control over personnel evaluation and believed that it was because the state, although large in geographic size, had less than 70 school districts. The assumption was that states with a comparatively low number of school districts exerted greater state control than states with a comparatively high number of districts. The states were rank ordered by the number of school districts according to 1989-90 figures from the U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (see Table 1). A Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient revealed a weak relationship (-0.12) between the degree of a state's control over personnel evaluation and its number of school districts.

Conclusions

What do changes in state policy indicate about the effect of the reform movement of the 1980s on school personnel evaluation? States marched to the tune of the accountability drum: Twenty states enacted their first requirements for personnel evaluation by local school districts, and 38 states enacted 67 policy initiatives related to personnel evaluation. This intense state interest in accountability led states to move from the policy arena into implementation of personnel evaluation systems.

In addition, four states removed their tenure statutes and more than one-half of the states passed legislation for performance pay programs. Most of these programs were never implemented or were later eliminated. By 1992, only five viable performance pay programs were in existence, and these programs varied in design and state control.

Twelve states, however, remained aloof from the winds of policy change and did not address personnel evaluation during the reform movement. This was especially true for states in the northeast region of the country. This study examined relationships that might foster increased requirements for personnel evaluation at the state level. A positive relationship (0.48) was discovered between state control over personnel evaluation and state funding of education. Further investigation into other factors that may be related to state actions for personnel evaluation is needed. One fruitful area for exploration is the potential inverse relationship between state control of evaluation and the degree of collective bargaining in a state.

The initial reform movement placed a premium on accountability of individual staff members in schools to effect a change in student achievement. Arizona and North Carolina reported improved student achievement in their career ladder pilot sites, but the effects of personnel evaluation on school improvement has not been firmly decided. States who exerted the most control over personnel evaluation during the early reform movement later decreased the amount of control and returned many responsibilities to local school districts. This trend indicates that states are unable to sustain prescriptive "top down" mandates over extended periods of time. Conjecture could be made that today's work on team incentives, team awards,

outcome-based education, and site-based management may produce more effective methods of school improvement than further attention to personnel evaluation.

References

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. (1985) Who will teach our children? A strategy for improving California's schools. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on the Teaching Profession.

Carnegie Forum of Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Cornett, L. M. & Gaines, G. F. (1994). Reflecting on ten years of incentive programs: The 1993 SREB career ladder clearinghouse survey. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Furtwengler, C. (1989). Evaluating career ladder/incentive programs. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Furtwengler, C. (1984). The rise and demise of state-level performance pay programs: A 50-state summary of the reform initiative. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hawley, W. D. (1988). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or, why the first and second waves may miss the boat. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24, 416-437.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. (1985). Investing in our children: Business and the public schools. NY: Committee for Economic Development.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). Action for excellence. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

U. S. Department of Education. (1990). Directory of public elementary and secondary education agencies, 1989-90. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

U. S. Department of Education. (1990). Elementary and secondary finances: Common core data. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Wuhs, S. K., & Manatt, R. P. (1983). The pace of mandated teacher evaluation picks up. *American School Board Journal*, 170(5), 28.

Appendix A **Multi-Step Procedures in Methodology**

1. Wrote a letter to each Chief State School Officer (CSSO) explaining the research project and information required. Explained that a telephone call would be placed in two weeks to schedule a time to discuss the project.
2. Developed a 16-question, structured interview protocol. Pilot tested the protocol by having it reviewed by experts in the field and by conducting trial interviews with two state agencies Refined and revised the protocol.
3. Placed initial telephone calls to each CSSO. Discussed the research project, the need to conduct in-depth structured interviews, and the need to obtain written documents for review and analysis (legislation, regulations, personnel evaluation programs, training programs). Obtained names of designated staff members to assist in providing needed information.
4. Conducted structured interviews with identified staff members to answer research questions. Requested available written documents that pertain to legislation, regulations, and personnel evaluation programs.
5. Entered information from structured interviews for each state into study data base.
6. Entered information from review and analyses of written documents for each state into data base.
7. Analyzed data and summarized findings for the research questions.

Appendix B
1992 State Requirements for Teacher Evaluation Based on Years of Experience

State	Probationary Years	Description
Alabama	3	Very broad in statute; 1988 State Board Resolution requires development of research-based criteria for evaluation of all professional personnel; administrator systems are completed; teacher system current is being developed with optional cycle after three years of experience
Alaska	-	Once each year for all certificated personnel
Arizona	3	0-3 years experience - 2 times a year 3+ years of experience - annual
Arkansas	3	0-3 years experience - 3 observations plus pre/post feedback 3+ years experience - 2 observations and feedback
California	2	Local discretion; required to assist probationary employees
Colorado	3	Local discretion; required to specify frequency, duration, met must include observation
Connecticut(a)	-	Annual for all certificated personnel

Delaware	3	0-3 years experience - annual with 3 conferences and final appraisal conference 3+ years of experience - 3 conferences and appraisal conference for two-year cycle or one-year with 2 formative conferences and performance appraisal conference
Florida(a)	-	0-1 year experience (may be extended to 2 years) - 5 observations: diagnostic/screening observation, three formative observations, and one summative observation 2+ years of experience - annual evaluation required; local discretion
Georgia	-	Annual evaluation of all certificated personnel; 3 every three years observations required for teachers, one before Jan. 1
Hawaii	2	Annual evaluation is required for all personnel; however, 0-2 years of experience is initial probationary;
Idaho	3	0-3 years experience - 1 evaluation prior to the beginning of the second semester; 3rd year second evaluation during the school year for obtaining renewable contract status 3+ years of experience - annual prior to June 15
Illinois	2	0-2 years experience - annual; 2+ years of experience - at least every other year
Indiana(a)	-	Periodic-observation by December 31
Iowa	2	Local required to have personnel evaluation for all job descriptions; local discretion
Kansas	2	0-2 years experience - 2 times a year by 60th day of each semester 2+-4 years experience - annual by February 15 4+ years experience - once every three years by February 15
Kentucky	3	0-3 years experience - annual 3+ years experience - once every three years
Louisiana	3	0-3 years experience - two times year 3+ years experience - once every three years (this requirement is

currently on hold)

Maine	-	None
Maryland	2(b)	Locals must conduct evaluation of non-tenured teachers 2 times a year and conduct 4 observations; this requirement is for recommendation for certification
Massachusetts	2	Statute on books but has not been implemented; requires evaluation by school community after two years experience but has never been funded
Michigan(a)		None; code references need for locals to supervise and evaluate instructional staff
Minnesota(a)	3	0-3 years experience annual evaluation and requirement for participation in human relations course 3+ years experience - one observation with no defined time frame
Mississippi	3	0-3 years experience - annual in fall and spring and demonstrate performance of identified teacher competencies 3+ years experience - local discretion
Missouri	3	0-3 years experience - annual. Only reference is to ongoing performance based evaluation; process and time lines are local discretion 3+ years experience - once every three years
Montana	-	None except LEAs must have policies and processes for regular and periodic evaluation
Nebraska	3	0-3 years experience - two times a year, once each semester 3+ years experience - annual
Nevada	1	0-1 year experience - three times a year by December 1, February 1 and April 1. 1+ years of experience - annual
New Hampshire	3	None
New Jersey	-	Probationary - 3 observations a year - must have written evaluation with strengths and improvements, professional development plan, summary indicators of pupil progress and growth, and conference within fifteen days of observation

		Tenured - annual
New Mexico(a)	3	0-3 years experience - annual and include state's six essential teaching competencies, 3+ years experience - once every three year and indepth growth plan
New York	-	None except that LEAs must evaluate educational personnel; LEAs bargain tenure
North Carolina	3	Annual evaluation required for all experience levels; board permits 2 year cycle for professional teachers
North Dakota	3	0-3 years experience - two times a year by December 15 and March 15 3+ years of experience - annual
Ohio(a)	-	Local discretion; only state guidelines if not reemployed, then must be evaluated 2 times a year by February 1 and April 1, two observations are required for each evaluation
Oklahoma	3	0-3 years experience - two times a year by November 15 and February 10 3+ years of experience - annual
Oregon	3	0-3 years experience - annual with multiple observations, locals determine time frame 3+ years experience - once every two years with multiple observations
Pennsylvania	2	0-2 years experience - 2 times a year 2+ years of experience - annual
Rhode Island	-	None - local discretion
South Carolina(a)	2	0-2 years experience evaluated with state instruments (provisional) 2+-4 years experience - annual 4+ years of experience - once every three years
South Dakota	2	0-2 years experience - 2 times a year (evaluated and given notice during each semester)
Tennessee	3	Probationary/apprentice (0-3 years experience) two observations annually. 4+ years experience (non-career ladder) twice in five-year period 4+ years experience (career ladder status) twice in ten-year period.

Texas	2	0 - 2 years experience - Incentive program - career level I requires two evaluations a year with 4 observations 2+ years of experience - (career level II and III) annual evaluation that includes 2 observations
Utah	4	0-4 years experience - 2 evaluations year 4+ years experience - if on probation, two times a year; not specified in statute or regulations if not on probation
Vermont	-	None; local standards boards recommend teachers with two years of experience for second level certificate
Virginia	3	None - state board guidelines but not mandatory; local discretion; LEAs recommend after 3 years experience for continuing contract
Washington	1	0-1 year experience - required 60 minutes of observation a year, 1 observation must be 30 minutes and conducted within first ninety days; use seven state criteria to evaluate (Bill pending to raise probationary status from one year to two years). 1+ years experience - annual 60 minutes of observation, one must be a minimum of 30 minutes; can use a "short" form after 4 years
West Virginia	2	0-2 years experience - evaluated two times a year with two observations for each evaluation 3-6 years experience - annual with two observations 7+ years experience - can have professional growth and development cycle in lieu of evaluation
Wisconsin(a)	1	0-1 year experience evaluated at end of first year 1+ years of experience - evaluated every three years using twenty prescribed standards
Wyoming	3	0-3 years experience - evaluated two times year 3+ years experience - evaluated once every three years

(a) Information has not been verified by written documentation

(b) Local board of education option to make two-year probationary period

Appendix C

Changes in State Statutes/Regulations for Personnel Evaluation Since 1983

State

Year

Change in Statute or Regulation

Alabama

1985

Passed first legislation requiring evaluation of personnel as part of a career ladder incentive program

1988

Repealed career ladder incentive program

1988

Passed State Board of Education resolution directing state superintendent to develop research-based criteria for evaluation of all education personnel

Alaska

1983

Passed requirement that results from evaluation must be approved by a person who has administrative certification

Arizona

1984

Required school districts to use the advice of teachers in developing evaluation system

1985

Removed tenure for basis for increased pay; specified minimum duration of observations and specified other evaluation criteria; required evaluators to be trained in evaluation system and added as rider on certificate

1986

Developed system for teacher compensation based on growth; allowed LEAs to add 5% to local tax base if repeal tenure and have evaluation system approved by SDE

1987

Involved SDE in review of evaluation systems and ability to apply funds; required LEAs to submit evidence that teachers involved in performance evaluation system

1990

Based professional advancement on increasingly higher teaching skills, pupil academic progress and instructional responsibility

Arkansas

1986

Required development of teachers' professional growth plan to provide good teachers a path for improvement and to provide, before termination, six months notice with written feedback and time to improve

1991

Appointed task force to design and implement a licensure system for teachers and administrators based on outcomes

California
1983

Required that LEAs provide training, assistance and evaluations for probationary employees; required certification that personnel assigned to evaluate teacher have demonstrated competence in instructional methodologies and evaluation for teachers they are assigned to evaluate

Colorado
1984

Required LEAs to adopt system of evaluation for all certificated personnel that specifies frequency and duration of evaluation, and must include observation
1985

Passed Educational Quality Act that addressed career ladders, mentor teacher program, and performance incentives

1990

Removed tenure and added two additional purposes for evaluation--measurement of satisfactory performance and documentation for unsatisfactory performance; allowed LEAs to design and implement pilot alternative salary; required persons responsible for evaluation to hold administrative certificate and participate in 30 hours approved evaluation training before certificate renewal practices

Connecticut
1987

Required development of LEA teacher evaluation system and teacher career incentives program with report due on or before June 15, 1989

1990

Passed 19 state board guidelines for evaluation that were more specific and designed to assist LEAs in developing comprehensive plans

Delaware
1985

Passed first requirements for personnel evaluation that required LEAs to be responsible for an accountability system for all personnel

Florida
1983

Required specific criteria for annual evaluation
1986

Adjusted criteria and required each LEA to submit evaluation plan for SBE approval; required superintendent to report names of personnel with two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations to SDE for consideration of removal of certificate

1988

Recommended that only names submitted are those not being reemployed by LEA; required SDE to have process to determine if certification should be removed.

1992

Moved review of evaluation systems from SDE to LEA board of education; supported school improvement plans that address various stages of teaching career and identify areas

needing special instrumentation

Georgia
1985

Required LEA annual evaluation and satisfactory rating to receive salary step increase (prior to 1985 had certification assessment that was no longer funded in 1989-1990)

Hawaii
1984

Required specific criteria for teacher assessment and identification of performance objectives with performance evaluation; included mutually agreed upon professional development plan

1986

Changed evaluation from annual to a multi-year cycle for tenured teachers who are rated satisfactory

Idaho
1984

Defined tenure as occurring after third year

Illinois
1985

Passed first specific requirements for teacher evaluation; required LEAs to develop its own teacher evaluation system in cooperation with teachers and evaluate nontenured personnel annually and tenured at least every other year and have performance ratings and justifications for ratings; required year of remediation if unsatisfactory rating and included failure to complete remedial plan as another reason for dismissal

Indiana
1987

Passed first specific law requiring periodic teacher evaluation that required (a) evaluation format by LEAs with state approval, (b) format lead to improvement of performance of all certificated personnel; (c) format may be used for making personnel decisions; (d) observed by person in authority by December 31 and another by person requested by March 1

Iowa
1986

Changed school approval process and included accountability for LEA personnel evaluation in a comprehensive list as part of accreditation requirements; required LEA to have evaluation system for all staff; identified first two years as probationary with right to waive by LEA board of directors

Kansas

None

Kentucky

1984

Required LEAs to evaluate non-tenured personnel annually and tenured at least once every three years

1985

Required appeals procedures, state training for certification of evaluators

1990

Passed comprehensive reform package that emphasizes curriculum and assessment; delayed evaluation changes until determined what outcomes principals will assess

Louisiana

1988

Required experienced teachers to be assessed by state with performance evaluation system for recertification and professional growth and development; funded teaching internship program for support for beginning teachers for two years prior to certification assessment

Maine

-
-

Maryland

-
-

Massachusetts -

-

Michigan

-

Administrators required for initial certification or renewal to provide evidence of successful completion of training in personnel evaluation.

Minnesota

1988

Required demonstration of basic academic skills in reading & writing; developed outcomes-based performance standards for beginning teacher

Mississippi

1983

Required performance evaluation as part of process of moving from professional to standard license; required SDE to provide assistance in personnel evaluation at the local level

1986

Required LEAS to conduct annual fall and spring evaluation to assess performance of teacher competence; required performance evaluation by state board of education to receive standard certificate

Missouri

1983

Required ongoing teacher performance based evaluation and maintenance of teacher records

1984

SBE approved a model and procedures for comprehensive performance evaluation

1985

Passed Excellence in Education Act establishing career ladder and minimum salary tied to performance based evaluation 1990

Modified tenure requiring performance based evaluation and allowed part-time employees to have credit toward tenure

Montana

1989

Required board of trustees to have policy for regular and periodic evaluation

Nebraska

-

-

Nevada

1989

Required observation 3 times a year for first year teachers & one time a year after that for successful employee; required LEAs to develop form and send to SDE

New Hampshire

-

-

New Jersey

1991

Removed tenure and requested specific evaluation process established in 18 months

New Mexico

1983

Required annual probationary teacher evaluation with multiple observations based on state six essential teaching competencies; required experienced teachers be evaluated on a three-year cycle with an indepth professional growth plan

1988

Required administrators to use staff input as component of evaluation; adjusted teacher competencies to make them more measurable

1989

Developed specific criteria for special groups of personnel (librarians, counselor, audiologist, nurse)

New York

-

-

North Carolina

1987

Changed regulation on observation requirements; allows local board to use two-year cycle and adjust tenure to match evaluation cycle

1989

Allowed LEAs to develop alternative performance evaluation system in lieu of state Teacher Performance Appraisal System for tenured, certified staff

1991

Passed amendment that requires development of local evaluation instruments; required SDE to provide assistance with information about personnel personal growth and development activities and hiring, termination and promotion practices.

North Dakota

-

Required two evaluations annually for probationary teachers and annual for experienced teachers; described reasons for nonrenewal/termination (1985-1989)

Ohio

-

-

Oklahoma

1990

Removed tenured; required additional evaluation criteria; added new rules on teacher dismissal

Oregon

-

-

Pennsylvania

-

-

Rhode Island

-

-

South Carolina

1988

Added requirement for principal evaluation

South Dakota

1990

Added one more requirement for local school boards to include in evaluation policy at local level

Tennessee

1984

Passed career ladder certification system based on performance evaluations with incentive pay supplements; required program participation for all teachers entering after July 1, 1984 (optional for others)

1987

Made career ladder participation optional and reinstated professional teacher license; extended duration of advanced career ladder certifications from five years to ten years; changed probationary (1st year) and apprentice (2-4 years) certificates to licenses

1988

Changed extended contracts from career ladder educators to all educators based on annual needs assessment by LEA with Level II and III career ladder educators having priority

1989

Changed tenure from four years to three years by allowing probationary year to count towards tenure; allowed teachers in private schools with 85% state funding to be eligible to participate in career ladder program

Texas

1984

Changed emphasis from due process and marginal teacher to differentiate performance and identify excellence; required 4 observations a year for Career Level I and 2 observations a year for Career Level II and III

1987

Required focus of evaluation of administrators be on state approved criteria

Utah

1985

Required local boards to evaluate probationary and provisional teachers 2 times a year; required principals to orient teachers to evaluation system before conduct of evaluation process

1990

Required local school boards to develop evaluation program in consultation with joint committee of educators; defined components of evaluation program including a "reasonable" number of observations and use of several types of evidence

Vermont

-

-

Virginia

1991

Removed state administrative team visits to review evaluation procedures and allowed LEAs to self-report

Washington

1987

Required everyone conducting evaluations to be trained; required teachers placed on probation to participate in assistance program; required SDI to develop models for evaluation and allowed alternative formative plan for professional growth that LEAs can adapt

West Virginia
1985

Passed first policy requiring evaluation of tenured and non tenured employees; included was stated purpose for career ladder/incentives

1987

Revoked incentives

1991

Required time frames for observation and allowed after seven years experience, an optional growth and development goal setting

Wisconsin
1986

Required formalization that LEAS must evaluate certificated personnel in written format; required beginning teachers to be evaluated at end of first year; required that 20 personnel standards be used to evaluate experienced personnel every 3 years

Wyoming
1984

Required local board of trustees to evaluate performance of each initial contract teacher in writing at least 2 times annually.

About the Author

Carol B. Furtwengler

cfurtwen@wsuhub.uc.twsu.edu

Associate Professor
Box 142
Wichita State University

Ph.D., George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

Carol Furtwengler is a former teacher and administrator. She served as Assistant Commissioner for Research and Development and Assistant Commissioner of Career Ladder Program for Tennessee Department of Education and then as educational aide for Governor Lamar Alexander. Her academic and research interests include personnel evaluation, applied inquiry, and school choice. Dr. Furtwengler's other published work includes articles on teacher observation and evaluation, (Educational Leadership, Phi Delta Kappan, Education Policy Analysis Archives); career ladder programs, (Educational Leadership), book chapter on cooperative learning in higher education (NEA), administration preparation (Journal of School Leadership)

Copyright 1995 by the Education Policy Analysis Archives

EPAA can be accessed either by visiting one of its several archived forms or by subscribing to the

LISTSERV known as EPAA at LISTSERV@asu.edu. (To subscribe, send an email letter to LISTSERV@asu.edu whose sole contents are SUB EPAA your-name.) As articles are published by the *Archives*, they are sent immediately to the EPAA subscribers and simultaneously archived in three forms. Articles are archived on *EPAA* as individual files under the name of the author and the Volume and article number. For example, the article by Stephen Kemmis in Volume 1, Number 1 of the *Archives* can be retrieved by sending an e-mail letter to LISTSERV@asu.edu and making the single line in the letter read GET KEMMIS V1N1 F=MAIL. For a table of contents of the entire ARCHIVES, send the following e-mail message to LISTSERV@asu.edu: INDEX EPAA F=MAIL, that is, send an e-mail letter and make its single line read INDEX EPAA F=MAIL.

The World Wide Web address for the *Education Policy Analysis Archives* is <http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu/epaa>

Education Policy Analysis Archives are "gophered" at olam.ed.asu.edu

To receive a publication guide for submitting articles, see the *EPAA* World Wide Web site or send an e-mail letter to LISTSERV@asu.edu and include the single line GET EPAA PUBGUIDE F=MAIL. It will be sent to you by return e-mail. General questions about appropriateness of topics or particular articles may be addressed to the Editor, Gene V Glass, Glass@asu.edu or reach him at College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411. (602-965-2692)

Editorial Board

John Covalesskie jcovalles@nmu.edu	Andrew Coulson andrewco@ix.netcom.com
Alan Davis adavis@castle.cudenver.edu	Mark E. Fetler mfetler@ctc.ca.gov
Thomas F. Green tfgreen@mailbox.syr.edu	Alison I. Griffith agriffith@edu.yorku.ca
Arlen Gullickson gullickson@gw.wmich.edu	Ernest R. House ernie.house@colorado.edu
Aimee Howley ess016@marshall.wvnet.edu	Craig B. Howley u56e3@wvnm.bitnet
William Hunter hunter@acs.ucalgary.ca	Richard M. Jaeger rmjaeger@iris.uncg.edu
Benjamin Levin levin@ccu.umanitoba.ca	Thomas Mauhs-Pugh thomas.mauhs-pugh@dartmouth.edu
Dewayne Matthews dm@wiche.edu	Mary P. McKeown iadmpm@asvm.inre.asu.edu
Les McLean lmclean@oise.on.ca	Susan Bobbitt Nolen sunolen@u.washington.edu
Anne L. Pemberton apembert@pen.k12.va.us	Hugh G. Petrie prohugh@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu
Richard C. Richardson richard.richardson@asu.edu	Anthony G. Rud Jr. rud@purdue.edu
Dennis Sayers dmsayers@ucdavis.edu	Jay Scribner jayscrib@tenet.edu

Robert Stonehill
rstonehi@inet.ed.gov

Robert T. Stout
stout@asu.edu