

Process to Obtain Approval for Locally Developed Alternative Multiple Performance Measures

Local educational agencies (LEAs) requesting approval of Locally Developed Alternative Multiple Performance Measures must submit prescribed descriptions and evidence, per the guidelines below. The submission must include a response to all the items in the checklist.

Additionally, LEAs seeking to implement their own Observation & Practice frameworks should respond to Section 7.

Completed proposal, with attachments, should be submitted to RA-PDE-Evaluation@pa.gov.

Overview

Multiple measures for data available classroom teachers and principals/school leaders constitute 30 percent of educators' performance and final ratings, while building level data constitute 10 percent of non-teaching professional employees' performance and final ratings. The percentage factor established by 24 P.S. §11-1138.1 et seq. for each professional employee is as follows:

Professional Employee Evaluated	Observation & Practice	Building Level Data	TSD: Assessments, Growth, IEP Goals Progress	LEA Selected Measures	Performance Goals
Data-Available Teacher	70%	10%	10% All Measures	10%	-
Non-Data-Available Teacher	70%	10%	10% IEP Goals Progress only	10%	-
Teacher without Building Level Data	80%	-	10% IEP Goals Progress only	10%	-
Temporary Teacher	100%	-	-	-	-
Nonteaching Professional with Building Level Data	90%	10%	-	-	-
Nonteaching Professional without Building Level Data	100%	-	-	-	-
Temporary Nonteaching Professional	100%	-	-	-	-
Principal with Building Level Data	70%	10%	-	-	20%
Principal without Building Level Data	80%	-	-	-	20%

The factors listed above are the percentages included in Pennsylvania's rating tools 13-1, 13-2, and 13-3. LEAs may alter the percentage factors; however, the modifications must stay within the above parameters.

Multiple Measure Rating Area	Factor
Building Level Data	Must be greater than 5 percent and meet or exceed measures of effectiveness established by the Pennsylvania School Code (24 P.S. §§1138.3,1138.4,1138.5)
Teacher Specific Data	Must be no less than 10 percent and meet or exceed measures of effectiveness established by Pennsylvania School Code (24 P.S. §11-1138.3)
LEA Selected Measures/ Performance Goals	Must be greater than 5 percent and meet or exceed measures of effectiveness established by Pennsylvania School Code (24 P.S. §§11-1138.3, 1138.4, 1138.5)

Although provisions in the Pennsylvania School Code (24 P.S. §11-1138.6) and the Pennsylvania Code (22 Pa. Code, Chapter 19.1a. et seq.) allow LEAs to submit a locally developed alternative rating tool for their professional employees, the percentage of *all educators'* evaluation that is based on practice/observation/evidence will remain at percentages defined by [Act 13 of 2020](#).

LEAs developing their own alternative multiple measures and educator effectiveness rating tools must:

1. Address all sections of this proposal guidance that correspond to modifications being submitted for PDE action; and
2. Submit a copy of each educator alternative rating tool, the completed guidelines, copies of evidence, research, and/or documents to support alternative measures.

Section 1: Introduction

Purpose, vision, and goals of the LEA's locally developed alternative multiple measures aligned with LEA's strategic plan and/or improvement plan. Description as to how the multiple measures are comprehensive enough to address all subjects and grade levels

Explanation as to why the LEA's locally developed multiple measures are better suited to its needs

Available data to demonstrate how the LEA's multiple measures are as rigorous as the multiple measures applicable to the ones established by Act 13 of 2020 (24 P.S. §1138.1 et. seq.)

Identification of the educators for which the locally developed alternative evaluation tools are being submitted (e.g., classroom teachers, principals/school leaders, and/or non-teaching professionals)

List of stakeholders involved in the development of the alternative multiple measures, rating tool(s)

Copy of approved board minutes with approval vote or affirmation statement of vote alternative multiple measure(s) and alternative rating tool(s) were approved by LEA's governing board

Timeline for implementation and the cycle to review results of professional employee ratings and to revise the alternative multiple measure(s) and rating tool(s) based on data

Section 2: Required Components

Description of changes in the professional employees' rating form(s). Upload copies of all locally developed alternative evaluation tools the LEA will employ for its professional employees.

Confirmation that the LEA will apply the mandatory performance level ratings (i.e., Failing, Needs Improvement, Proficient, or Distinguished) and mandatory final rating (i.e., Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory) when it evaluates each professional employee

LEA's policy provisions for a professional employee receiving a performance rating of Failing. Note: A professional employee who receives two ratings of Needs Improvement within a 4-year period while working for the same employer and under the same certification area will be considered Unsatisfactory for that year.

Confirmation that professional employee(s) whose performance is rated as Failing or Needs Improvement will be required to participate in an improvement plan

Description of each of the LEA's alternative multiple measures and how each measure meets or exceeds the level of effectiveness established by the Pennsylvania School Code (24 P.S. §§11-1138.3, 1138.4, 1138.5) and relevant PDE-approved model evaluations (13-1, 13-2, 13-3)

Process and materials to support the training of stakeholder groups on system goals, implementation procedures, use of rating tools, and system-based results. Note: Response must include timeline related to the development and pilot of training materials.

Section 3: Coherence of Overall Design

Clear overview of how Educator Effectiveness is defined within the proposed alternative system, how this definition differs from that outlined within the PDE-approved model rating tool(s) (i.e., 13-1, 13-2, 13-3), and the rationale for the modification(s):

- Summary of each proposed component directly associated with educator effectiveness (e.g., teaching quality, student learning/achievement);
- Evidence-based rationale for inclusion of your LEA's components; and
- Process for collecting evidence to support the evaluation of each multiple measure (e.g., growth measures, Student Performance Measure).

Clear description of the different evaluation components addressed within the rating tool; process and mechanism by which the components will be measured (if different from that outlined in Pennsylvania's tools); how component-level ratings (or scores) will be calculated, weighted, and combined for a final educator rating; and the rationale behind these decisions.

Differences in processes that will be implemented for each of the employee categories and the performance measures that can be attributed to and included in individual educator's evaluations.

Description of the process and rationale to determine a performance rating of Failing, Needs Improvement, Proficient, or Distinguished; including when data will be available, when ratings will occur, individuals who will be involved in the process, and how the results will be reviewed for accuracy.

Explanation of how the LEA will ensure capacity (fiscal and resource) to develop, implement, and maintain each component of the proposed alternative system for current and future years.

Description of how the quality and functioning of the alternative system and its components will be evaluated during implementation, after one year, and in subsequent years, i.e.,

- a description of the quality control procedures associated with the calculation of each performance measure being modified; and
- studies being considered to determine effectiveness and reliability of the system's measures.

Section 4: Building Level Data

Building level data measures, as defined in 24 P.S. §§11-1138.3, 1138.4, 1138.5 and in 22 Pa. Code Chapter 19.1a. et. seq., include four different measures **as applicable** to a building where the educator provides service: student performance on state assessments, academic growth as measured by PVAAS, attendance, and graduation.

Building level data are intended to reflect the overall performance of the school to which a teacher, principal/school leader, and/or nonteaching professional employee is assigned.

If an LEA elects to use building-level data measures that are different from those incorporated into the PDE-approved classroom teacher, principal/school leader or nonteaching professional employee rating forms (13-1, 13-2, and 13-3), the LEA must clearly address how their measures are defined, the rationale for their inclusion, how they will be used in alternative evaluation tools, and how they will be calculated.

Definition of building level data within the context of the proposed alternative rating form for each professional employee

Explanation of how the data will be used to calculate the building level score in an LEA's alternative rating form for each professional employee

Percentage assigned to building level data measure for each professional employee category

Methodology used to calculate the building level data for LEA's alternative rating form for each professional employee category, including the challenge multiplier adjustment

Building level/student performance percentage factor applied to LEA's alternative rating form(s) for each professional employee category

Chart, per example below, that defines the metrics to convert building level score to a rating scale that will be converted to a zero-to-three-point scale that will be inserted in the LEA's alternative rating forms for each professional employee.

Building Level Score	Conversion	0-3 Scale Score Range

Evidence that the LEA is ensuring its locally developed building level data measures are relevant and appropriate for making inferences about student performance

Belief statement that confirms the locally developed building data measures are appropriate to use in each of its alternative educator evaluation systems

Quality control procedures in place to ensure building level data measures are calculated correctly (e.g., independent replication of all results and calculations, including the application of exemption, scoring, aggregation, and rounding rules).

Section 5: Teacher-Specific Data

Teacher-specific data measures, as defined in 24 P.S. §11-1138.3 and in 22 Pa. Code Chapter 19.2a, consist of measures that include Student Performance (State Assessments), Student Growth (PVAAS), and IEP Goals Progress.

All teacher specific data can be assigned to the nearest tenth percent within the valid ranges and, when totaled, must equal no less than 10.0 percent. In addition to *value added assessment system data*, each of the following teacher specific measures when available and applicable shall be used:

- If PVAAS data are unavailable, the teacher specific data measure for professional employees shall be comprised of the following teacher specific data measures when data are applicable and available:
 - ✓ Student performance on assessments, (not more than 5 percent)
 - ✓ Progress in meeting the goals of student IEPs, (not more than 5 percent)
 - ✓ If teacher specific data are not available, PDE’s model tool uses the LEA Selected Measures rating in lieu of teacher specific data.

Rationale for proposing alternative or additional teacher specific measures and a description of the LEA’s belief that its teacher specific measures are (or will be) fair, valid and reliable.

Percentage assigned to each teacher specific data measure (student performance on state assessments, PVAAS, IEP goals progress)

Additional teacher specific data measures, as applicable

Metrics to calculate teacher specific data for LEA’s alternative rating form

Chart, per example below, that demonstrates how the teacher performance on state assessments is converted to a zero-to-three-point scale for insertion in the LEA’s alternative Classroom Teacher Rating Form

% Students Proficient/Advanced	0-3 Scale Score

Procedure to establish a teacher specific rating and a chart, per example below, that demonstrates how the teacher PVAAS score is converted to a zero-to-three-point scale for insertion in the LEA’s alternative Classroom Teacher Rating Form

PVAAS Score	Conversion	0-3 Scale Score Range

Quality control procedures to ensure additional teacher specific data measures are calculated correctly (e.g., independent replication of all results and calculations, including the application of exemption, scoring, aggregation, and rounding rules). Note: Assessment, Growth, and IEP Goals Progress ratings shall be weighted and summed, providing a single zero-to-three-point scale rating.

Process to establish its additional teacher specific data measures for teachers without eligible PVAAS data

Percentage factor assigned to the teacher specific data measures for non-data available teachers

Methodology to calculate teacher specific data for non-data available teachers

Section 6: LEA Selected Measures

LEAs are required to use an LEA Selected Measure to document and verify quality assurance in validating the process and weight that will be used in establishing a rating for classroom teachers and principals/school leaders' performance goal. Should multiple Student Performance Measures (SPM) be used to meet the elective data requirement, each SPM can be assigned a specific weight culminating in a rating that will be on a zero-to-three-point scale (calculated to two decimal points) and then applied to the overall performance rating (22 Pa. Code Chapter 19.1a(d)(iv)(B)).

If using assessments or performance measures that are different than the examples presented below, the LEA must submit documentation and descriptions that address the items below. Examples of SPMs include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Locally Developed School District Rubrics
- District Designed Measures & Examinations
- Nationally Recognized Standardized Tests
- Industry Certification Examinations
- Student Projects Pursuant to Local Requirements
- Student Portfolios Pursuant to Local Requirements

Copy of the LEA SPM template, with a description of the process to establish the rating; crosswalk between the proposed LEA SPM template and the PDE-approved SPM template

Proposed assessments or performance measures, as applicable

Percentage assigned to the SPM

Methodology for calculating LEA Selected Measures to be applied to teacher's or principal/school leader's (performance goals) overall performance rating for LEA's proposed alternative rating form

Procedure to establish SPM; explanation of how the SPM will be converted to a zero-to-three-point scale that will be inserted into the LEA's alternative rating forms

Quality control procedures in place to ensure SPMs are calculated correctly (e.g., independent replication of all results and calculations, including the application of exemption, scoring, aggregation, and rounding rules)

Section 7: Framework for Observation & Practice

Domains, Weighting, and Performance Calculation

Most or all of the evaluation of the effectiveness of an employee is based on Observation & Practice. To assist LEAs, the Department has three approved³ **Educator Effectiveness Frameworks** for observing and assessing employee practice: [Classroom Teacher, Principal, and Non-Teaching Professional](#). The Principal Framework is designed for use in the evaluation of other school leaders and supervisors, as well; and the Non-Teaching Professional (NTP) Framework offers slight modifications in the embedded practice models to assist in rating NTPs with disparate roles and certifications/licensures.

If using Frameworks other than those provided by the Department, an LEA must submit documentation and descriptions that respond to the items below.

Observation and practice forms to be utilized by the LEA to evaluate a classroom teacher, non-teaching professional, and principal/school leader's performance

Proposed domains for each Framework, including:

- rationale/research for the proposed domains
- description of each domain and domain components, with performance level descriptors for each component
- discussion prompts and evidence of practice for each component
- crosswalk aligning the proposed domains to PDE's domains and components; how each domain differs from the domains included on the tool published by the Department in 22 Pa. Code, Chapter 19.1a et. seq.

Frequency of observations of educator practice

Clear weighting for each domain, rationale for the weighting with maximum points possible for each domain, and the method for calculating the overall observation rating

Description of how LEA will establish the performance rating (e.g., 0, 1, 2, or 3) across the domains (e.g., Failing, Needs Improvement, Proficient, and Distinguished).

Section 8: Training/Professional Development

Training for principals, supervisors, and others who will use the alternative rating system to ensure inter-rater reliability

Training for educators of the process and requirements associated with the alternative rating system

Section 9: Accuracy Certification Statement

Certification via the chief school administrator's signature affirming that the information provided by the LEA accurately describes the alternative classroom rating tool that was developed collaboratively by teachers and approved by the local governing board.

I certify that the information provided by my LEA accurately describes the alternative rating system and tools that were developed collaboratively by educators and approved by the local governing board. I further certify that the guidance provided by PDE was utilized in incorporating multiple student performance measures that I assert meet or exceed the effectiveness established by the Pennsylvania School Code (24 P.S. §11-1138.1 et seq.).

I understand that the LEA locally developed alternative evaluation system, if approved by PDE, is valid for the requested timeframe (five years or less) from the date of final approval of this request or when additional revisions are made.