

Legislative Analysis



GROWTH AND ASSESSMENT DATA IN PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bill 5707 as reported from committee
Sponsor: Rep. Aaron Miller

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

House Bill 6401 as reported from committee
Sponsor: Rep. Jeffery R. Noble

Committee: Education Reform
Complete to 12-11-18

BRIEF SUMMARY: House Bills 5707 and 6401 would amend the Revised School Code to prevent the percentage of annual year-end teacher and administrator evaluations that is based on student growth and assessment data from increasing from 25% to 40% in the 2018-2019 school year.

FISCAL IMPACT: The bills would have no fiscal impact on the state or local units of government.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILLS:

House Bill 5707

The Revised School Code specifies that school district and intermediate school district (ISD) boards and public school academy (PSA, or charter school) boards of directors must ensure that student growth and assessment data account for 25% of year-end teacher evaluations for the school years 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018. That percentage is slated to increase to 40% of the evaluation beginning with the 2018-2019 school year.

Under the bill, the percentage would remain at 25% for the 2018-2019 school year and subsequent school years.

MCL 380.1249

House Bill 6401

For school administrators, the percentage of evaluations based on student growth data is also slated to increase from 25% to 40% in the 2018-2019 school year for building-level school administrators and central-office-level school administrators who are regularly involved in instructional matters.

Under the bill, the percentage would remain at 25% for the 2018-2019 school year and subsequent school years.

MCL 380.1249b




Each bill would take effect 90 days after enactment.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, which replaced the No Child Left Behind Act, eliminated the requirement that states adopt an evaluation system significantly based on student growth and prevented the U.S. Department of Education from prescribing

specific measures for evaluations. Under the ESSA, states could determine how much student growth data are used in educator evaluations.

Michigan Public Act 173 of 2015¹ made several changes to the Code, one of which was to adjust the weight of growth data in teacher assessments. Since 2011, a series of bills have proposed an increase to the weight given to growth data but, ultimately, the weight has stayed at 25%. HBs 5707 and 6401 would continue this policy.

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	Going forward
PA 336 of 2010 (SB 1509) ²	No requirement for inclusion of growth data.						
PA 102 of 2011 (HB 4627) ³	25%	40%	50%				
PA 257 of 2014 (SB 817) ⁴			50%				
PA 173 of 2015 (SB 103) ⁵			25%	25%	25%	40%	
HB 5707 of 2018							25%

States have taken varying approaches in accounting for growth data in teacher evaluations. Some states, such as Kentucky, eliminated student growth data as a consideration in teacher evaluations.⁶ In contrast, Tennessee requires that 50% of a teacher's evaluation be based in student growth data.⁷

ARGUMENTS:

For:

Proponents of the bills argue that, while student growth is an important factor to consider when evaluating educator effectiveness, it should not be the determining factor. An increase to 40% would shift the measure too far in favor of a single metric and fail to account for other factors outside of a teacher's control, such as the student's home environment and school attendance. Some have also argued that teachers could be deterred from working with at-risk or remedial students, out of a concern that more challenging students may be less likely to show growth and thus, with more weight given to that growth, poorer teacher evaluations. Proponents believe that a 25% weight in evaluations accurately represents the importance of student growth while also allowing for other factors to be taken into account.

Supporters also pointed to the Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness recommendations from 2013, which stated that "considerable scientific concern exists" regarding the instability and measurement error in using growth and assessment tools, as well as value-added models.

¹ <http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2015-SB-0103>

² <http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2010-SB-1509>

³ <http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2011-HB-4627>

⁴ <http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2014-SB-0817>

⁵ <http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2015-SB-0103>

⁶ <http://www.lrc.ky.gov/reco documents/bill/17RS/SB1/bill.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.tn.gov/education/data/tvaas.html>

Against:

Opponents argue that limiting the impact of growth on evaluations discredits the impact of teachers on a child's learning. No other measure has as much influence on how much a student learns in a given year, they say, and so its impact on a teacher's evaluation should reflect as much. Additionally, opponents argue that student growth data provide the only objective measure available to gauge educator effectiveness.

Moreover, critics argue, if there is a concern that assessments will fail to take into account factors outside teachers' influence, or that teachers would be disadvantaged by evaluations based on objective criteria, the legislature should instead focus on instituting meaningful professional development and teacher preparation measures to better prepare them for the challenges faced in a classroom.

POSITIONS:

The following organizations indicated support for both bills (10-4-18):

- Michigan Department of Education
- West Michigan Talent Triangle
- Grand Rapids Public Schools
- Michigan Association of Superintendents and Administrators
- Michigan Association of School Boards
- Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators
- Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
- Wayne RESA
- ESA Legislative Group
- Barry, Branch, Calhoun, Jackson, Lenawee, and Monroe ISDs

A representative of Collins & Blaha, P.C. testified in support of HB 5707. (9-6-18)

The following organizations indicated support for House Bill 5707 (10-4-18):

- Michigan Education Association
- American Federation of Teachers

Representatives of the following organizations testified in opposition to House Bill 5707 (9-6-18):

- Business Leaders for Michigan
- Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce
- Detroit Regional Chamber
- Education Trust-Midwest

Legislative Analyst: Dana Adams
Fiscal Analysts: Samuel Christensen
Jacqueline Mullen

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.