MEMORANDUM



September 22, 2014

"What are the different types of evidence, other than state assessments, used to measure student achievement in states' teacher evaluation systems?"

The contents of this memorandum present the results of the most recent scan of student achievement measures, other than state tests, in state teacher evaluation systems. This scan also includes measures of student-centered outcomes unrelated to achievement.

Across the states, common alternative student achievement measures that can be used in teacher evaluations include student learning objectives (SLOs), district assessments, portfolios, capstone projects, teacher-developed assessments, and other types of student work. Other student-centered outcomes can be measured using student/parent/community perception surveys, graduation rates, attendance, participation rates in Advanced Placement (AP) courses, and a schoolwide learning indicator.

While this memorandum represents the most recent information from states, it is meant to be used as a general summation of states' current systems, and not as a definitive report on any one individual state.

State	Evidence of Student Achievement	Other Student-Centered Outcomes
Alabama	Not specified	Not specified
Alaska	To be determined by districts, but examples of student learning data include NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), pre- and post- curriculum- based tests, and teacher-created school/district common assessments	Not specified
Arizona	SLOs, district/school assessments, benchmark assessments, presentations, capstone projects Note: Any "classroom-level data" or "school- level data" may be considered as evidence of student achievement for teacher evaluation purposes; however, teacher- created assessments are not allowed.	Student survey
Arkansas	Projects, portfolios, classroom pre- and post- tests, district-level assessments	Not specified
California	Student learning evidence (as recommended by the California Department of Education Task Force on Educator Excellence for district-created educator evaluation systems) could include teacher-, department- or school-made pre- and post-tests; student work samples (papers, projects, exhibitions, and portfolios); curriculum-related assessments (AP, International Baccalaureate [IB], or other course- or text-based measures); exhibitions of mastery (e.g., science investigations or arts performances); systems for documenting learning progress (e.g., Developmental Reading Assessment [DRA], Qualitative Reading Inventory, California English Language Development Test, or portfolios tied to Individualized Education Plans [IEPs]); national tests	Student survey
Colorado	SLOs, district assessments, teacher- developed assessments, student work samples	Student perception measures, where appropriate and feasible
Connecticut	Portfolios, teacher-developed assessments, SLOs, other standardized assessments (including but not limited to AP exams, Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT], DIBELS, NWEA MAP, DRA), performances rated against a rubric, performance assessments or tasks	Whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback, which may include surveys
Delaware	Pre-tests, end-of-course tests, student performance on English language proficiency assessments, district assessments, other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms that are approved by the state department of education	Not specified

State	Evidence of Student Achievement	Other Student-Centered Outcomes
Florida	Pre- and post-tests, teacher-developed item banks, measurable learning targets (SLOs), district assessments	Not specified
Georgia	SLOs	Not specified
Hawaii	SLOs/school-system improvement objectives	Tripod Student Survey
Idaho	Pre- and post-tests, SLOs	Student input
Illinois	Type I assessments: NWEA MAP, Scantron Performance Series, ACT	Not specified
	Type II assessments: district- approved or adopted assessments	
	Type III assessments: teacher-selected or - created assessments, performance assessments, SLOs	
Indiana	SLOs	Elementary and middle school: schoolwide student learning measure (new A-F accountability model), based on several metrics of school performance, including the percentages of students passing the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+), Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR), and Indiana Modified Achievement Standards Test (IMAST) in math and English language arts. High school: schoolwide student learning measure based on Algebra 1 and English 10 End-of-Course scores as well as graduation rates and college and career readiness
lowa	Not specified	Not specified
Kansas	Locally created or commercially purchased assessments	School community perception survey, attendance
Kentucky	Student growth goals: local contribution can be from district assessments such as NWEA MAP	Student voice survey
Louisiana	Projects, portfolios, performances, pre- and post-tests, teacher-developed item banks and assessments, student learning targets (SLTs)	Not specified
Maine	Acceptable measures of student learning and growth include school-based assessments, course-based assessments, district-designed assessments, commercial tests, teacher-developed assessments, performance data based on schoolwide or districtwide rubrics, SLOs	Not specified

State	Evidence of Student	Other Student-Centered
	Achievement	Outcomes
Maryland	If a district chooses the state model, measures of student learning include SLOs and results of the School Performance Index (achievement, gap reduction, growth, college and career readiness). If a district chooses to design its own model, it may choose student portfolios.	Not specified
Massachusetts	District-determined measures must be comparable across grade or subject districtwide; these measures may include portfolios, approved commercial assessments, district-developed pre- and post- unit and course assessments, capstone projects	Student feedback
Michigan	Pre- and post-tests selected/adopted by districts, SLOs	Not specified
Minnesota	Student learning goals (locally developed and approved school-/classroom-level assessments may be used), shared performance goal (schoolwide learning)	Student survey, (optional) teacher- created portfolios, including performance assessment and samples of student work (for the student engagement component of the evaluation)
Mississippi	SLOs	Not specified
Missouri	Benchmark data, projects/portfolios, SLOs	Student feedback, observable behaviors
Montana	Student work (e.g., web based, virtual, hard copy), video/audio of student performances, photos of student- generated work Note: Focus of evidence is on teacher behavior, not on student output	Not specified
Nebraska	Not applicable because objective measures of student learning are not required	Not specified
Nevada	Not specified	Attendance, college readiness, failure rates, parent and student input
New Hampshire	SLOs	Measures of student voice and parent opinions
New Jersey	Student growth objectives	
New Mexico	DIBELS, end-of-course evaluations, other assessments from pre-approved providers or district-created assessments	Student surveys, parent surveys, graduation rates, school attendance, "college and career readiness" as defined by "both the participation and [the] success of students in CCR activities"
New York	SLOs, pass rates on Regents tests, schoolwide growth, district-selected test performance	Graduation rates, graduation percentage with advanced designation or honors, credit accumulation
North Carolina	Student work	Discipline records
North Dakota	SLOs	Not specified—locally developed student achievement measures for teachers in non-tested subjects and grades
Ohio	SLOs, portfolios	Student surveys

State	Evidence of Student Achievement	Other Student-Centered Outcomes
Oklahoma	SLOs/student outcome objectives, AP tests, ACT/EXPLORE/PLAN testing, Test of English as a Foreign Language	Oklahoma Report Card components (e.g., school academic performance grade, student growth grade, graduation rates, bottom 25% growth), approved student surveys, student competitions (e.g. science fair, state/national tournaments), IEP goal attainments, third- grade promotion, student learning or community service portfolios
Oregon	Locally developed collections of evidence (e.g., portfolios of student work that include multiple types of performance), student learning and growth goals	Not specified
Pennsylvania	Elective data: projects and portfolios	Building-level data: graduation rate, promotion rate, attendance, AP course participation, PSAT, Pennsylvania Value- Added Assessment System (PVAAS) growth, Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) achievement
Rhode Island	SLOs	Not specified
South Carolina	SLOs or NWEA MAP measures	Not specified
South Dakota	Student Learning Targets	Discipline referrals, student enrollment
Tennessee	Not specified	Graduation rate/career and technical education concentrator graduation rate, postsecondary matriculation/persistence/placement, completion/success in advanced cousework, 9th- to 10th-grade promotion, student perception surveys
Texas	Student learning objectives, portfolios, district pre- and post-tests	Not specified
Utah	SLOs	Not specified
Vermont	Student portfolios	Student learning surveys
Virginia	SLOs, student work	Student surveys
Washington, DC	Projects, portfolios, performances, pre- and post-tests, end-of-course exams, teacher- developed item banks and assessments, district-level assessments (e.g., Teaching Strategies GOLD), SLOs	Not specified
Washington	Student growth goals	Not specified
West Virginia	"Goal setting process" (SLOs)	Not specified
Wisconsin	SLOs	Not specified
Wyoming	SLOs	Student surveys

This document is produced by The Center on Standards and Assessment Implementation (CSAI). CSAI, a collaboration between WestEd and CRESST, provides state education agencies (SEAs) and Regional Comprehensive Centers (RCCs) with research support, technical assistance, tools, and other resources to help inform decisions about standards, assessment, and accountability. Visit www.csai-online.org for more information.

This document was produced under prime award #S283B050022A between the U.S. Department of Education and WestEd. The findings and opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education.