
News Releases

For more information, contact us:

Joel Fosha
Indiana Institute on Disability and Community
812-855-6508

foshaj@indiana.edu

Education Policy Brief - Indiana's Teacher Evaluation Legislation: Implications and Challenges

[Education Policy Brief - Indiana's Teacher Evaluation Legislation: Implications and Challenges for Policy, Higher Education and Professional Development](#) (August 29, 2013)

[Sandi Cole](#), Director of the Institute's [Center on Education and Lifelong Learning](#), is co-author of a [Policy Brief](#) focusing on the implications of Indiana's teacher evaluation law for policy, higher education, and professional development. The Brief was issued through the [Center for Evaluation and Education Policy](#) (CEEP) at Indiana University. In 2011, the Indiana General Assembly passed a broad and ambitious reform package that significantly altered how teachers and principals are evaluated. Senate Enrolled Act 001 (SEA 1) requires 1) annual evaluation for all certificated employees, 2) objective measures of student achievement and growth, 3) rigorous measures of effectiveness, 4) annual designation of each certificated employee in four rating categories, 5) explanation of the evaluator's recommendation for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected, and 6) a provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of "effective" or "highly effective."

Nearly all school corporations in Indiana are either implementing a new evaluation system for teachers and principals or are in the midst of developing their evaluation systems. From those school corporations that are currently implementing a system, much is being learned about the impact of the new system, as well as areas that will require refinement or change in the coming years. Initial findings include that the role of the principal must change in order to ensure the time and skills necessary to provide quality feedback to teachers and there is a great need for professional growth on assessment literacy. Evaluator training and re-training is critical; the development of assessments and student growth measures for the non-ISTEP+/ECA teachers has been a challenge; and transparency and collaboration in the development and implementation of evaluation systems is imperative.

This [brief](#) is the second in a two-part series on the new era of teacher evaluation in Indiana. In the [first brief](#), the results of a survey of attitudes and beliefs of school corporation superintendents were discussed; the features of quality evaluation plans were highlighted; and the essential elements of a planning process that ensures equitable, effective, and efficient plans for evaluating educators was introduced (Cole, Ansaldo, Robinson, Whiteman, & Spradlin, 2012).

The objectives of this second brief are 1) to provide information and discussion on the implications of the Indiana legislation on teacher and administrator preparation programs; 2) to provide information and

discussion on the implications for educational policy and the procedural challenges that the state, superintendents, and boards should formally address to limit the possibilities for legal challenges and to ensure high-quality plans; and 3) to provide information and discussion on the implications for professional development as it relates to teacher and evaluator training and the use of teacher evaluation data to determine the focus of professional development.

Nearly all school corporations in Indiana are either implementing a new evaluation system for teachers and principals or are in the midst of developing their evaluation systems. From those school corporations that are currently implementing a system, much is being learned about the impact of the new system, as well as areas that will require refinement or change in the coming years. Initial findings include that the role of the principal must change in order to ensure the time and skills necessary to provide quality feedback to teachers and there is a great need for professional growth on assessment literacy. Evaluator training and re-training is critical; the development of assessments and student growth measures for the non-ISTEP+/ECA teachers has been a challenge; and transparency and collaboration in the development and implementation of evaluation systems is imperative.

This [brief](#) is the second in a two-part series on the new era of teacher evaluation in Indiana. In the [first brief](#), the results of a survey of attitudes and beliefs of school corporation superintendents were discussed; the features of quality evaluation plans were highlighted; and the essential elements of a planning process that ensures equitable, effective, and efficient plans for evaluating educators was introduced (Cole, Ansaldo, Robinson, Whiteman, & Spradlin, 2012).

The objectives of this second brief are 1) to provide information and discussion on the implications of the Indiana legislation on teacher and administrator preparation programs; 2) to provide information and discussion on the implications for educational policy and the procedural challenges that the state, superintendents, and boards should formally address to limit the possibilities for legal challenges and to ensure high-quality plans; and 3) to provide information and discussion on the implications for professional development as it relates to teacher and evaluator training and the use of teacher evaluation data to determine the focus of professional development.- See more at:
http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/index.php?pageld=7&newsId=444&newsType=2&utm_source=WhatCountsEmail

[Sandi Cole](#), Director of the Institute's [Center on Education and Lifelong Learning](#), is co-author of a Policy Brief focusing on the implications of Indiana's teacher evaluation law for policy, higher education, and professional development. The Brief was issued through the [Center for Evaluation and Education Policy](#) (CEEP) at Indiana University. In 2011, the Indiana General Assembly passed a broad and ambitious reform package that significantly altered how teachers and principals are evaluated. Senate Enrolled Act 001 (SEA 1) requires 1) annual evaluation for all certificated employees, 2) objective measures of student achievement and growth, 3) rigorous measures of effectiveness, 4) annual designation of each certificated employee in four rating categories, 5) explanation of the evaluator's recommendation for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected, and 6) a provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of "effective" or "highly effective."

Nearly all school corporations in Indiana are either implementing a new evaluation system for teachers and principals or are in the midst of developing their evaluation systems. From those school corporations that are currently implementing a system, much is being learned about the impact of the new system, as well as areas that will require refinement or change in the coming years. Initial findings include that the role of the principal must change in order to ensure the time and skills necessary to provide quality feedback to teachers and there is a great need for professional growth on assessment literacy. Evaluator training and re-training is critical; the development of assessments and student growth measures for the non-ISTEP+/

ECA teachers has been a challenge; and transparency and collaboration in the development and implementation of evaluation systems is imperative.

This [brief](#) is the second in a two-part series on the new era of teacher evaluation in Indiana. In the [first brief](#), the results of a survey of attitudes and beliefs of school corporation superintendents were discussed; the features of quality evaluation plans were highlighted; and the essential elements of a planning process that ensures equitable, effective, and efficient plans for evaluating educators was introduced (Cole, Ansaldo, Robinson, Whiteman, & Spradlin, 2012).

The objectives of this second brief are 1) to provide information and discussion on the implications of the Indiana legislation on teacher and administrator preparation programs; 2) to provide information and discussion on the implications for educational policy and the procedural challenges that the state, superintendents, and boards should formally address to limit the possibilities for legal challenges and to ensure high-quality plans; and 3) to provide information and discussion on the implications for professional development as it relates to teacher and evaluator training and the use of teacher evaluation data to determine the focus of professional development.- See more at:

http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/index.php?pagelId=7&newsId=444&newsType=2&utm_source=WhatCountsEmail