The History of Teacher Evaluation

1996 – Charlotte Danielson published “Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching” Domains

NCLB (2001) required proficiency in ELA and math, highly qualified teachers

States proposed reform strategies in order to receive federal grants ($4.35 billion). Strategies focused on four areas:

1. Adopting standards and assessment that prepare students to success in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
4. Turning around the lowest-achieving schools

Focus shifted to output (highly effective teachers) rather than input (highly qualified teachers)
Measure of effectiveness requires some measure of student learning
Pennsylvania received RTTT award on December 23, 2011. Shared $200 million with six other states

- Implement new teacher and principal evaluation tools and processes to ensure effective educators in every classroom and building.
  - Refine and implement teacher and principal evaluation systems that incorporate student performance results as a significant factor.
  - Provide professional development in the use of the new evaluation systems, including how to utilize the information to improve teacher and principal effectiveness.

Teacher Evaluation in Pennsylvania
In 2010, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation awarded Pennsylvania an $800,000 Momentum Grant. The purpose of the grant was to develop an evaluation system that included student achievement as one significant part. The PA Department of Education – along with other stakeholders – revised Charlotte Danielson’s rubric and piloted it in 2011 with four local entities: Allentown School District, Cornell School District, Mohawk School District, and Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit 5. The revised rubric included four domains on which teachers would assess themselves and be assessed by their supervisor:

- Planning and preparation
- Classroom environment
- Instruction
Professional responsibilities

In 2012, the Pennsylvania state legislature passed Act 82, which requires the following:

- 50% of a teacher’s rating is based on his/her evaluation using the revised Danielson rubric.
- 15% is based on building-level data, which include test scores, value-added assessment calculations, graduation and promotion rates, and participation in AP courses.
- For those who teach content areas tested by PSSAs or Keystone exams, 15% is based on teacher-level data. These data are similar to building-level data but only come from students in that teacher’s classroom.
- 20% is based on teacher-level elective data, which can include tests, projects, and portfolios. For those who teach content areas not tested by PSSAs or Keystone exams, the entire 35% of teacher-level data falls into this elective data category.

The implementation timeline identified in the RTTT application sets the end of school year 2013-2014 as the date for 100% participation in the new teacher evaluation system and 2014-2015 as the date for 100% participation in the new principal evaluation system. Pennsylvania chose not to link evaluation to compensation, promotion, tenure, or retention in its application. (pp. 53-54)


145 charter schools currently operate in Pennsylvania. They are not required by law to participate in the new evaluation system. However, the PA Department of Education has invited charter schools to voluntarily adopt the new system.