
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Carol Liu, Chair
2015 - 2016 Regular

Bill No: SB 499
Author: Liu and De León
Version: April 9, 2015
Urgency: No
Consultant: Lenin Del Castillo
Hearing Date: April 22, 2015
Fiscal: Yes

Subject: Teachers: best practices teacher evaluation system: school administrator evaluation

SUMMARY

This bill repeals and replaces various provisions of existing law governing the evaluation of certificated employees and beginning July 1, 2016, requires school districts to implement a best practices teacher evaluation system, as specified. This bill also repeals and replaces provisions of existing law regarding school administrator evaluations.

BACKGROUND

Stull Act

Under existing law, the Stull Act expresses legislative intent that school districts and county governing boards establish a uniform system of evaluation and assessment of certificated personnel. With the exception of certificated personnel who are employed on an hourly basis to teach adult education classes, the Stull Act requires school districts to evaluate and assess teacher performance as it reasonably relates to:

1. Progress of pupils toward district-adopted and, if applicable, state-adopted academic content standards as measured by state-adopted criterion referenced tests;
2. Instructional techniques and strategies used by the employee;
3. The employee's adherence to curricular objectives; and
4. The establishment and maintenance of a suitable learning environment within the scope of the employee's responsibilities. (Education Code § 44660, et. seq.)

Existing law requires an evaluation and assessment of the performance of each certificated employee to be made at least once each school year for probationary personnel, at least every other year for personnel with permanent status, and at least every five years for permanent employees who have been employed with the district at least 10 years and were rated as meeting or exceeding standards in their previous evaluation. Teachers who receive an unsatisfactory rating may be required to participate in a program designed to improve the employee's performance and to further pupil achievement and the instructional objectives of the district. However, if the district

participates in the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program, then the teachers who receive an unsatisfactory rating are required to participate in that program. (Education Code § 44664)

Existing law establishes the PAR program for teachers by authorizing school districts and the exclusive representative of the certificated employees to develop and implement the program locally. The PAR programs are to include multiple observations of a teacher during periods of classroom instruction and sufficient staff development activities to assist a teacher in improving his or her skills and knowledge. The final evaluation of a teacher's participation in the program is made available for placement in his or her personnel file. (Education Code § 44505)

Federal requirements

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) has established a process by which states may request flexibility on behalf of themselves, local educational agencies, and schools, by applying for a waiver from certain requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The waiver is intended to provide educators and state and local leaders with flexibility regarding specific requirements of NCLB (principally, the requirement that all students be proficient in math and reading by 2014 and won't have to identify additional schools failing to meet targets) in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction.

Instructions provided by the DOE indicate that to receive the flexibility, a state's educational agency and each local educational agency must commit to develop, adopt, pilot and implement, with the involvement of teachers and principals, teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that: (1) will be used for continual improvement of instruction; (2) meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels; (3) use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor, data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys); (4) evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis; (5) provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development; and (6) will be used to inform personnel decisions.

The DOE has granted waivers to over 30 states. In June 2012, California submitted a request to set aside specific requirements of the NCLB and requested that the DOE allow the state to use its own accountability system to ensure that all schools improve. California's request differs from those filed by other states that agreed to several additional federally required policies in exchange for the NCLB waiver. The request was denied in December 2012.

ANALYSIS

This bill recasts various provisions of the law governing the evaluation of certificated employees. Specifically, this bill:

1. Makes inoperative as of July 1, 2016, and repeals as of January 1, 2017, the following Stull Act requirements:
 - A. Legislative intent that governing boards establish a uniform system for evaluation and assessment. (EC § 44660)
 - B. The requirement that a governing board, in the development and adoption of evaluation guidelines and procedures avail itself of the advice of the certificated instructional personnel in the district as part of a locally negotiated collective bargaining agreement. (EC § 44661)
 - C. The authorization that a school district may include standards from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) or the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) in its evaluation and assessment guidelines. (EC § 44661.5)
 - D. The requirement that the governing board of each school district:
 - (1) Establish standards of expected pupil achievement at each grade level in each area of study, and
 - (2) Evaluate and assess certificated employee performance as it reasonably relates to the progress of pupils on those standards and applicable state adopted content standards as measured by state adopted criterion referenced assessments and other specified criteria. (EC § 44662)
2. Makes findings and declarations regarding teaching, the characteristics of effective teaching, and the importance of teachers in influencing student academic success. Declares that the primary purpose of an evaluation system is to ensure that teachers meet the highest professional standards of effective teaching, thereby resulting in higher levels of pupil learning. Declares that the attributes of the best practices teacher evaluation system (BPTES) established pursuant to this bill are based on the CSTP and that the system of evaluation for school administrators is based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, as specified.
3. Requires, beginning July 1, 2016, the governing board of each school district to adopt and implement a BPTES. Requires the BPTES to be locally negotiated pursuant to the Educational Employment Relations Act; specifies that if the certificated employees of the school district do not have an exclusive bargaining representative, the governing board must adopt objective evaluation and support components, as applicable.
4. Requires a BPTES to include but not be limited to the following attributes:
 - A. Each teacher is evaluated on the degree to which he or she accomplishes the following objectives:

- (1) Engages and supports all pupils in learning, evidence of which may include, but is not limited to, evidence of high expectations and active pupil engagement for each pupil.
- (2) Creates and maintains effective environments for pupil learning, to the extent that those environments are within the teacher's control.
- (3) Understands and organizes subject matter for pupil learning, evidence of which may include, but is not limited to, extensive subject matter, content standards, and curriculum competence.
- (4) Plans instruction and designs learning experiences for pupils, evidence of which may include use of differential instruction and practices and use of culturally responsive instruction, such as incorporation of multicultural information and content into the delivery of curriculum, to eliminate the achievement gap.
- (5) Uses pupil assessment information to inform instruction and to improve learning, evidence of which shall include, but is not limited to, use of formative and summative assessments to adjust instructional practices to meet the needs of individual pupils. For certificated employees who directly instruct English learner pupils in acquiring English language fluency, the assessment information shall include the results of the English language development test.
- (6) Develops as a professional educator, evidence of which may include, but is not limited to, consistent and positive relationships with pupils, parents, staff, and administrators, use of collaborative professional practices for improving instructional strategies, participation in identified professional growth opportunities, and use of meaningful self-assessment to improve as a professional educator.
- (7) Contributes to pupil academic growth based on multiple measures. Requires multiple measures to include state and local formative and summative assessments in the grade levels and subjects that these assessments are administered and authorizes the inclusion of other evidence such as classroom work, pupil grades, classroom participation, presentations and performances, and projects and portfolios. States the intent of the Legislature that assessments developed by a national consortium and adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) and used for best practices teacher evaluation system (BPTES), meet statistical and psychometric standards. Also requires:
 - (a) Measures used for assessing certificated employees who directly instruct English learner pupils in acquiring English to

include the degree to which pupils acquire the English language development standards adopted by the State Board of Education as specified.

- (b) Pupil data used for purposes of teacher evaluation to be confidential in the same manner as all other elements of a teacher's personnel file.
 - B. Multiple observations of instructional and other professional practices conducted by evaluators who have been appropriately trained and calibrated to ensure consistency and who have demonstrated competence in teaching evaluation, as determined by the school district.
 - (1) Specifies that the multiple observations may include but are not limited to classroom observations, one-on-one discussions, and review of classroom materials and course of study, and requires observations to be conducted using a uniform observational tool that is appropriate to the teacher's assignment.
 - (2) Requires observers to meet with the teacher to discuss the purpose of the observation prior to each formal observation and meet with the teacher after each formal observation to discuss recommendations as necessary, with regard to areas of improvement in the performance of the teacher.
 - (3) Provides that evaluators are not prohibited from conducting unscheduled classroom visits.
 - C. Has at least three performance levels.
- 5. Permits a locally negotiated evaluation process to designate certificated employees to conduct, or participate in, evaluations of other certificated employees for purposes of determining needs for professional development or providing corrective advice for the certificated employee being evaluated; specifies that non-supervisory certificated employees who conduct or participate in an evaluation are not deemed to be exercising a management or supervisory function, as specified.
 - 6. Provides that the best practices teacher evaluation system (BPTES) shall not apply to certificated employees who hold an administrative services credential.
 - 7. Authorizes the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and appropriate education stakeholder groups, to adopt non-regulatory guidance to support the implementation of the BPTES for:
 - A. Model evaluation systems that may be used to inform school districts' implementation of the evaluation system.
 - B. Model processes for implementing observations.

- C. Model processes for defining calibration for the purposes of training evaluators.
 - D. Model processes for developing the observation tool.
 - E. Model processes for determining and defining the performance levels for the evaluation of teacher performance.
8. Repeals and replaces, beginning July 1, 2016, the requirement that school district governing boards establish and define job responsibilities for certificated non-instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, supervisory and administrative personnel, whose responsibilities cannot be evaluated appropriately under the best practices teacher evaluation system; maintains the current requirement that school districts evaluate and assess the performance of non-instructional certificated employees as it reasonably relates to the fulfillment of those responsibilities.
 9. Requires, on or before May 1, 2016, or May 1 of the year that precedes the year in which an existing collective bargaining contract will expire, whichever is later, governing boards to seek comment on the development and implementation of a best practices teacher evaluation system (BPTES) and use the comments received to guide the development and implementation of the BPTES. Requires governing boards to disclose the provisions of the evaluation system at a regularly scheduled public hearing. Requires governing boards to seek public comment by May 1 of each year prior to negotiations on the BPTES. Also requires governing boards to seek public comment on the BPTES both during local negotiations and before the final agreement of local negotiations.
 10. Provides that if, by mutual agreement between a school district and the collective bargaining unit, an intermediate mid-year agreement is reached regarding a BPTES, the negotiation timeline shall allow time for the governing board to hold a public hearing to seek comment.
 11. Requires governing boards to disclose the provisions of the BPTES at a regularly scheduled public hearing, as specified.
 12. Commencing July 1, 2016, provides an unspecified amount to school districts for the purpose of implementing a BPTES, as specified. Requires school districts to use the funds for planning and implementation efforts at the eligible school sites, including training evaluators to ensure calibration and consistency and to development of the uniform observation tool.
 13. Specifies that where a locally negotiated evaluation system is in effect, the evaluation system remains in effect until the parties to the contract negotiate a successor agreement. Provides that memorandum of understanding shall not extend the adoption of a locally negotiated teacher evaluation system that is in effect at the time this requirement becomes operative.

14. Recasts requirements governing evaluation cycles for certificated employees and unsatisfactory performance:
 - A. Maintains existing requirement that probationary personnel be evaluated at least once each school year and that personnel with permanent status be evaluated at least every other year.
 - B. Beginning July 1, 2016, changes the frequency of evaluations for personnel with permanent status who have been employed at least 10 years with a school district who are highly qualified and who were rated as meeting or exceeding standards at the previous evaluation. Specifically, this bill changes the frequency from at least every five years to at least every three years.
 - C. Maintains existing requirements for evaluations:
 - (1) Requires the evaluation to include recommendations, if necessary, as to areas of improvement.
 - (2) Requires the employing authority to notify an employee in writing if the employee is not performing his or her duties in a satisfactory manner and to describe the unsatisfactory performance. Requires the employing authority to confer with the employee and make specific recommendations as to areas of improvement, and requires an annual evaluation until the employee achieves a positive evaluation or is separated from the district.
 - (3) Specifies an employee evaluation that contains an unsatisfactory rating of an employee's performance may include a requirement that the certificated employee participate in a program designed to improve appropriate areas of the employee's performance, as specified, and requires any certificated employee who receives an unsatisfactory rating on an evaluation to participate in a Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers if the district has such a program.
15. Requires the employing authority, if an employee has received an unsatisfactory evaluation, to provide professional development based on the specific recommendations as to areas of improvement in the employee's performance.
16. Maintains the existing requirement that hourly and temporary hourly employees are excluded by the provisions governing the teacher evaluation system, and provides that substitute teachers may be excluded at the discretion of the governing board.
17. Repeals the existing provisions of law governing administrator evaluations effective January 1, 2016, and requires governing boards to establish a new system of evaluation for school administrators to guide their growth and performance with the purpose of supporting them as instructional leaders in order

to raise pupil achievement. Requires the evaluation system to include, but not be limited to, all of the following attributes:

- A. Promoting the success of all pupils by facilitating the development and implementation of a vision of pupil learning, as specified.
- B. Advocating and supporting a safe, nurturing school culture that sustains a quality instructional program conducive to pupil learning and staff professional growth, including, but not limited to:
 - (1) Promoting equity, fairness, and respect among staff, pupils, and members of the school community with acknowledgment of the role cultural attributes have in pupil learning.
 - (2) Supporting professional development opportunities for staff that encourage collaboration and effective instructional practice with the goal of improving outcomes for all pupils.
- C. Ensuring the management, organization, and operation of a safe and successful learning environment as evidenced by the establishment of effective practices for personnel and resource management, campus safety, and school climate, including, but not limited to, supporting curricular and management leadership in all of these areas and successfully implementing the best practice teacher evaluation system proposed by this bill.
- D. Collaborating with parents and the community to establish an inclusive school environment, including, but not limited to, embracing and recognizing that diversity strengthens a learning environment and promoting meaningful parent and community engagement required for the development of the local control and accountability plan, as specified.
- E. Providing ethical and professional leadership that fosters effective instructional practice as evidenced by promoting quality teaching and instructional strategies and providing relevant, effective feedback that leads to student learning. School administrators shall be held accountable for the academic growth of students over time and academic growth shall be based on multiple measures that may include pupil work as well as pupil and school longitudinal data.
 - (1) Multiple measures that include state and local formative and summative assessments. For school administrators who supervise certificated staff that directly instruct English learner pupils acquiring English, assessment information shall include the results of assessments adopted pursuant to Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 60810) of Part 33 of Division 4.
 - (2) Multiple measures may also include, but not be limited to, benchmark, end of chapter, end of course, advanced placement,

international baccalaureate, and college entrance, and performance assessments.

- (3) Pupil data used for purposes of an administrator evaluation shall be confidential in the same manner as all other elements of an administrator's personnel file.

F. Providing professional leadership by understanding, responding and influencing the larger social, political, cultural and legal context with the goal of ensuring student success as evidenced by working in collaboration with the governing board, bargaining units, and local school, district and community leaders.

18. Requires governing boards to identify who will conduct the evaluation of each school administrator.
19. Requires a school administrator to be evaluated annually for the first and second year of employment as a new administrator in a school district and allows the governing board to determine the frequency at regular intervals of evaluations after this period.
20. Provides that additional evaluations that occur outside of the regular intervals determined by the governing board shall be agreed upon between the evaluator and the administrator.
21. Requires evaluators and administrators to review school success and progress throughout the year. This review should include goals that are defined by the school district, including, but not limited, to the goals specified in the local control and accountability plan approved by the school district pursuant to Education Code § 52060.
22. Prohibits the State Board of Education (SBE) from waiving the best practices teacher evaluation system requirements.

STAFF COMMENTS

1. ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author's office, teacher evaluation under the Stull Act is too often inconsistent, unclear, and does little to foster a culture of continuous improvement for teachers. While some districts do incorporate student performance in their evaluation systems, others do not, and in districts that simply rate their employees as "meeting" or "not meeting" expectations, teachers may not receive sufficient feedback during the evaluation process to understand how to improve their practice. According to a 2010 report released by the National Board Resource Center at Stanford University, "While evaluation processes across the state vary widely, many of them look very much the same as they did in 1971..." Comments from Accomplished California Teachers indicate that current approaches to teacher evaluation results in a system that teachers do not trust, that rarely offers clear direction for improving practice, and often charges school leaders to implement without preparation or resources. A January 2011 report by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning notes

that evaluations pay “scarce attention to student learning or do not connect that learning to elements of teacher content knowledge or instructional skills that could be improved.”

This bill requires school districts, beginning July 2016, to establish teacher evaluation systems that evaluate teachers on the degree to which they follow specified objectives (the California Standards for the Teaching Profession), including how they contribute to pupil academic growth. Under the provisions of the bill, school districts would be required to assess a teacher’s contribution to pupil academic growth based on multiple measures, including state and local formative and summative assessment data.

2. **Current research.** Several studies document the correlation between teacher quality and student achievement. According to information provided by the author, research indicates differential teacher effectiveness is a strong determinant of differences in student learning, far outweighing the effects of differences in class size and heterogeneity. Studies have shown that students who are assigned to several ineffective teachers in a row have significantly lower achievement and gains in achievement than those who are assigned to several highly effective teachers.

The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning has recommended making teacher evaluation multi-dimensional, strengthening the training of those who conduct evaluations, and tying evaluation results directly to substantive feedback to teachers. The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality suggests a strong evaluation system must “involve teachers and stakeholders in developing the system; use multiple indicators; and give teachers opportunities to improve in the areas in which they score poorly.” Likewise, the New Teacher Project states “evaluations should provide all teachers with regular feedback that helps them grow as professionals, no matter how long they have been in the classroom. The primary purpose of evaluations should not be punitive. Good evaluations identify excellent teachers and help teachers of all skill levels understand how they can improve.”

3. **Tools to evaluate teacher effectiveness.** The stated purpose of this bill is to strengthen teacher quality and improve student outcomes by improving the state’s teacher evaluation requirements. Specifically, the bill contains the following provisions:
 - A. **Use of assessments:** Requires both state and local formative and summative assessments to be included in teacher evaluations. Formative assessments are developed locally and are used by teachers to continually inform instruction in the classroom throughout the school year. Summative assessments can be developed locally or statewide, including end of course tests or standardized tests, and assess a student's performance at a point in time.
 - B. **Evaluation frequency:** Requires probationary teachers to be evaluated at least every year and permanent teachers to be evaluated at least every other year, and also reduces the authorization for teachers with more than

10 years of experience to be evaluated from every five years, to every three years. This will result in experienced teachers being evaluated more frequently.

- C. **Categories for rating teachers.** Increases the categories for rating teachers from two to three.
 - D. **Multiple measures.** Requires pupil academic growth based on multiple measures to be part of a teacher evaluation.
 - E. **Professional Development:** Requires an employing authority to provide professional development based on the specific recommendations as to areas of improvement in a permanent teacher's performance, if he or she has received an unsatisfactory evaluation. This bill also specifies that teachers who receive an unsatisfactory rating on their evaluation, if a school district has a Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program in place, they must refer teachers who receive an unsatisfactory review to the PAR program for improvement.
4. **Local bargaining.** Existing law enumerates evaluation procedures as a mandatory subject of collective bargaining. By requiring the best practices teaching evaluation system (BPTES) to be negotiated, some argue the bill could have the effect of requiring districts to bargain aspects of the system, such as evaluation criteria. While some districts currently bargain evaluation criteria with their local unions, it is not a mandatory subject of bargaining. While the bill specifies the attributes by which teachers must be evaluated, the criteria for determining whether those objectives are indeed met would be subject to negotiation, which could increase implementation time and costs. On the other hand, the involvement of teachers in the development of the BPTES will help ensure that the system is fair and reflective of the complexity of teaching and learning and also contribute to a more effective evaluation system.

This bill also clarifies that the BPTES does not supersede or invalidate a teacher evaluation system that is locally negotiated and that is in effect at the time this bill becomes operative. If a locally negotiated teacher evaluation system is in effect at the time this bill becomes operative, the teacher evaluation system shall remain in effect until the parties to the agreement negotiate a successor agreement. The bill further clarifies that a memorandum of understanding (MOU) shall not extend the adoption of a locally negotiated teacher evaluation system that is in effect at the time this bill becomes operative.

5. **Parent feedback.** While permissive, this bill provides the ability for school districts to consider the feedback of parents of students as part of the teacher evaluation process. Under existing law, a school district may dismiss a teacher based on performance deemed to be unsatisfactory. Some argue that the use of parent surveys could provide an additional tool in the teacher evaluation process and should be required. However, would it be appropriate for teacher evaluations to incorporate potentially subjective feedback from parents, especially when it could lead to an unsatisfactory rating and ultimately a teacher's dismissal?

6. **Confidentiality of negotiations.** This bill requires public hearings before May 1st of the year preceding local negotiations, as well as public hearings should a mid-year agreement be reached. This process will also require a hearing before negotiations begin, during negotiations, and prior to the final vote on the evaluation system. The intent of these public hearings is to allow for parents to give input on the evaluation system each time it is negotiated. However, it is unclear how much information is legally allowed to be disclosed publicly during negotiations. The Committee may wish to consider whether this mid-negotiation hearing is appropriate.
7. **How will the new evaluation systems be funded?** According to the author, appropriate funding is a key component to achieving a high quality teacher and administrator evaluation system, as well as necessary support programs for beginning teachers and struggling teachers. The bill's provisions would likely create a higher level of service and result in state-reimbursable mandated activities, imposing potentially significant costs on school districts. Additionally, by increasing the frequency of evaluations for teachers, this bill could affect the workload of school administrators. However, it is unclear how many teachers are currently evaluated every five years and thus it is unclear how this bill will affect the ability of administrators to complete the increased number of evaluations. To address these issues, **staff recommends** the following amendments:
 - A. Specify the intent of the Legislature to provide adequate resources to train evaluators, continue robust beginning teacher induction programs, and support struggling educators.
 - B. Remove SEC. 13 from the bill, which provides an unspecified appropriation for purposes of implementing the best practices teacher evaluation system (BPTES).
 - C. Add the BPTES and the system of evaluation for school administrators to the state mandates block grant pursuant to Government Code § 17581.6.
 - D. Shift the operative date of the BPTES to July 1, 2018 and make conforming date changes to the sections proposed to be repealed.
8. **Other Committee amendments.** **Staff recommends** the bill also be amended as follows:
 - A. Modify the administrator evaluation system to:
 - (1) Apply the public hearing requirements of the BPTES to the administrator evaluations.
 - (2) Clarify that the provisions of the administrator evaluation cannot be omitted.
 - (3) Specify that the existing administrator evaluation system is repealed and the new administrator evaluation system is operative on July 1, 2018.

- B. Remove the intent language included in 44662(a)(1)(G)(iii) and create a new subparagraph for the sentence beginning with, "Pupil data..."
- C. In Section 44662 (c), change the code reference from the administrator services credential to Government Code Section 3540.1 (m) and (g).
- D. Add a new subdivision under 44664(a)(3) providing that the evaluator shall conduct at least one unscheduled observation per year during the year when the certificated employee does not receive a formal performance evaluation and assessment.
- E. Clarify in 44664(c)(1) regarding certificated employees that receive an unsatisfactory rating provide that this subdivision applies only to "permanent" certificated employees and provide that for probationary certificated employees, an employing authority may elect to offer a program designed to improve appropriate areas of the employee's performance and to further pupil achievement and the instructional objectives of the employing authority.
- F. Specify that county offices of education are required to implement the best practices teacher and administrator evaluation program.
- G. Clarify that Education Code § 35161.5 also applies to county offices of education.

Staff also recommends that as the bill moves forward, the author consider the implications the bill could have on non-classroom certificated staff such as counselors, nurses, and librarians, and whether there should be specific standards or attributes that should apply to this subset of certificated staff as part of the best practices teacher evaluation system.

9. ***Related and prior legislation.***

AB 575 (O'Donnell & Atkins), which is pending before the Assembly Education Committee, would require school districts to implement teacher and administrator evaluation systems.

AB 1495 (Weber) from 2015, which is also pending before the Assembly Education Committee, would make changes to the certificated employee evaluation system, known as the Stull Act.

AB 1078 (Olsen) would also make changes to the certificated employee evaluation system. This measure is pending before the Assembly Education Committee.

SB 441 (Calderon, 2013) proposed to amend various provisions of existing law governing the evaluation of certificated employees by requiring the evaluations to use multiple measures, including a minimum of four rating levels, increasing the frequency of evaluations for teachers with 10 or more years of experience in a

school district from every five years to every three years, and requiring school districts to consider the findings of sessions, surveys, and specific focus groups by subject matter and grade level from parents of pupils. SB 441 failed passage in this Committee on May 1, 2013.

SB 453 (Huff) would have authorized the governing board of a school district to evaluate and assess the performance of certificated employees using a multiple-measures evaluation system, authorized school districts to make specified employment decisions based on teacher performance, and expanded the reasons districts may deviate from the order of seniority in terminating and reappointing teachers. This bill failed passage in this Committee on April 24, 2013.

Chapter 435, Statutes of 2012, (SB 1292, Liu) authorized the evaluation of school principals based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders as well as evidence of pupil academic growth, effective and comprehensive teacher evaluations, culturally responsive instructional strategies, the ability to analyze quality instructional strategies and provide effective feedback, and effective school management.

AB 5 (Fuentes, 2012), similar to this bill, would have repealed and replaced various provisions of existing law governing the evaluation of certificated employees and required school districts to implement a best practices teacher evaluation system.

SUPPORT

Public Advocates
Superintendent of Public Instruction

OPPOSITION

Association of California School Administrators
California Association of School Business Officials
California Association of Suburban Schools
California Chamber of Commerce
California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
California Democrats for Education Reform
California School Boards Association
Central Valley Education Coalition
Children Now
Education Trust—West
Educators 4 Excellence
EdVoice
Families In Schools
Future Is Now Schools
Kern County Superintendent of Schools
Los Angeles Unified School District
Orange County Department of Education
Parents Advocate League

Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Small School Districts' Association
Students Matter
StudentsFirst
Teach Plus

-- END --