

## Overview of the Formula for Ohio Educator Evaluation System Final Summative Ratings

April 15, 2016

Ohio allows districts to choose between two evaluation frameworks for teacher evaluations. The original framework structure is 50% teacher performance and 50% student growth measures. The alternative framework structure is 50% teacher performance, 35% student growth measures, and 15% alternative component: student surveys, teacher self-evaluations, peer review evaluations, student portfolios, and district-determined component.

Ohio utilizes a formula-based approach based on a 600-point scale on a consistent basis for all teachers, including those whose districts select the original framework and those who choose the alternative framework of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. Although the alternative framework may not be used in principal evaluations, the 600-point formula will be used with these evaluations.

Many states and districts are working through similar policy decisions regarding multiple performance measures for teacher evaluation. A formula-based approach is best suited for this situation; it accounts for the features of the alternative framework, and research indicates that it is the preferred approach (Hansen, Lemke, & Sorenson, 2013).<sup>1</sup>

Likewise, the 600-point scale provides advantages: It accommodates both the 1-to-4 and 1-to-5 rating ladders used as inputs in the evaluation system and allows for minimal use of decimals in summative ratings. In addition, ratings are not confused with a 0-100 percent grading scale with specific built-in connotations (e.g., 75 percent is a letter grade of "C").

### Here are the steps for determining a final summative rating

- 1) Districts enter ratings for each measure: teacher performance (from 1-to-4), each student growth measure (from 1-to-5) and, if selected, an alternative component (from 1-to-4) into the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES).
- 2) eTPES assigns the point value that corresponds to the ratings from each component:
  - **Student growth.** This component may entail multiple measures (Value-Added scores, approved vendor assessments or student learning objectives) each with its own 1-to-5 rating. A most effective (5) rating results in 600 points; above average (4), 400 points; average (3), 300 points; approaching average (2), 200 points; and below average (1), 0 points.
  - **Teacher performance.** A rating of accomplished (4) results in 600 points; skilled (3), 400 points; developing (2), 200 points; and ineffective (1), 0 points.
  - **Alternative component.** If selected, an alternative component rating of level 4 results in 600 points; level 3 rating, 400 points; level 2 rating, 200 points; and level 1 rating, 0 points.
- 3) eTPES multiplies the points for each measure by the appropriate weight or percentage. See [Guidance for Determining Final Growth Measures and Final Summative Ratings](#) for more detail.

The examples on the following pages illustrate how eTPES will follow these steps to calculate a final summative rating, using the original teacher evaluation framework and the alternative framework.

<sup>1</sup>Hansen, M., Lemke, M., & Sorenson, N. (2013). *Combining multiple performance measures: Do common approaches undermine districts' personnel evaluation systems?* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from [http://www.air.org/files/Combining\\_Multiple\\_Performance\\_Measures.pdf](http://www.air.org/files/Combining_Multiple_Performance_Measures.pdf).

**Original Teacher Evaluation Framework (50 + 50)**

**Ratings and Points**

Student Growth		Performance		Final Summative Rating	
•Most Effective (5)	600	•Accomplished (4)	600	•Accomplished	500-600
•Above Average (4)	400	•Skilled (3)	400	•Skilled	300-499
•Average (3)	300	•Developing (2)	200	•Developing	100-299
•Approaching Average (2)	200	•Ineffective (1)	0	•Ineffective	0-99
•Least Effective (1)	0				

**Example #1. Grade 4 A2 Teacher**

Mr. Wilson teaches Grade 4 and is an “A2” teacher (who teaches Value-Added courses, but not exclusively). He is using Value-Added and vendor assessments for his student growth measures. He has four different measures that need entered into eTPES (three for student growth and one for performance):

		Scores (examples)	Rating Points	x Subcomponent Weight	÷ Number of Ratings*	= Applied Points
Student Growth Measures 50%	A2 Value-Added	1	0	25%	1	0
	Vendor Assessment (Science)	4	400	25%	2	50
	Vendor Assessment (Social Studies)	3	300	25%	2	37.5
	<b>Student Growth Measures Total</b>					<b>88</b>
Performance on Standards 50%	<b>Developing</b>	2	200	50%		100
<b>Final Summative Rating</b>						<b>188 Developing</b>

Using the formula, eTPES will calculate the final summative rating by multiplying the points for each measure by the percentage, dividing by the number of component ratings (using equal weights\* for each component rating) and then summing the applied points:

$$(0 \times 25\%) + (400 \times 25\% \div 2) + (300 \times 25\% \div 2) + (200 \times 50\%) = 187.5 = 188$$

**\*NOTE:** When Student Growth Measure ratings are entered in eTPES, they are automatically weighted equally. Custom weights are now available for **SLO/Other** and **Vendor Assessment** components. For details about this option, see the [Custom Weights Directions](#).

**Alternative Framework (50 + 35 + 15)**

**Ratings and Points**

Student Growth		Performance		Alternative Component		Final Summative Rating	
•Most Effective (5)	600	•Accomplished (4)	600	•Level 4	600	•Accomplished	500-600
•Above Average (4)	400	•Skilled (3)	400	•Level 3	400	•Skilled	300-499
•Average (3)	300	•Developing (2)	200	•Level 2	200	•Developing	100-299
•Approaching Average (2)	200	•Ineffective (1)	0	•Level 1	0	•Ineffective	0-99
•Least Effective (1)	0						

**Example #2. Middle School Art Teacher**

Ms. Reynolds teaches middle school art and is a “C” teacher, meaning she has no Value-Added or vendor assessment data. She is using four student learning objectives, along with an approved student survey (an alternative component). The district must enter six different measures for her evaluation into eTPES.

Student Growth Measures		Scores (examples only)	Rating Points x Subcomponent ÷ Number of = Applied Points			
			Rating Points	x Subcomponent Weight	÷ Number of Ratings*	= Applied Points
35%	SLO 1 (5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Art)	5	600	35%	4	52.5
	SLO 2 (6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Art)	4	400	35%	4	35
	SLO 3 (7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Art)	3	300	35%	4	26.25
	SLO 4 (8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Art)	2	200	35%	4	17.5
	<b>Student Growth Measures Total</b>					
Performance on Standards	<b>Skilled</b>	3	400	50%		200
<b>Alternative Component 15%</b>		4	600	15%		90
<b>Final Summative Rating</b>						<b>421 Skilled</b>

Using the formula, eTPES will calculate the final summative rating by multiplying the points for each measure by the measure’s weight, and then summing the applied points. The actual calculation is:  
 $SLO\ 1\ (600 \times 35\% \div 4) + SLO\ 2\ (400 \times 35\% \div 4) + SLO\ 3\ (300 \times 35\% \div 4) + SLO\ 4\ (200 \times 35\% \div 4) + teacher\ performance\ (400 \times 50\%) + alternative\ measure\ (600 \times 15\%) = 421$

**\*NOTE:** When Student Growth Measure ratings are entered in eTPES, they are automatically weighted equally. Custom weights are now available for **SLO/Other** and **Vendor Assessment** components. For details about this option, see the [Custom Weights Directions](#).