Using Student Achievement Data in Teacher and Principal Evaluations: A Policy Study*

Jody Piro
Roger Wiemers
Tammy Shutt

Abstract

Tennessee was one of the first states to win Race to the Top funds in 2010, partly based on new state policy which tied student achievement measures to teacher and principal evaluations. Nearly half of state legislatures in the United States have passed similar legislation in the past two years. This article examines recent state legislative policy requiring measures of student achievement to be included in teacher and principal evaluations.

NOTE: This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of education administration. In addition to publication in the Connexions Content Commons, this module is published in the *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*,[1] Volume 6, Number 4 (October - December, 2011), ISSN 2155-9635. Formatted and edited in Connexions by Theodore Creighton and Brad Bizzell, Virginia Tech and Janet Tareilo, Stephen F. Austin State University.

1 Sumario en espanol

Tennessee fue uno de los primeros estados de ganar la Carrera a los fondos Primeros en 2010, en parte basado en nueva política de estado que ató medidas de logro de estudiante al maestro y principales evaluaciones.

*Version 1.2: Sep 26, 2011 12:44 pm GMT-5
†http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/
[1]http://www.ncpeapublications.org

Casi mitad de poderes legislativos del estado en Estados Unidos ha pasado legislación semejante durante los últimos dos años. Este artículo revisa estado reciente la política legislativa que requiere medidas de logro de estudiante para ser incluida en el maestro y principales evaluaciones.

NOTE: Esta es una traducción por computadora de la página web original. Se suministra como información general y no debe considerarse completa ni exacta.

2 Introduction

Teacher and principal evaluation policy is under scrutiny and many have called for student achievement data to comprise part of the evaluation process. Quality teaching is central to student learning and school leadership is frequently described as the key element of a high-quality school. But what constitutes "excellence?" By what criteria do we define the superior teacher and principal? To evaluate teachers and principals, it is necessary to determine the criteria upon which to measure them. "Teacher evaluation polices raise fundamental questions about what constitutes effective instruction and whether those practices can be fairly measured" (Sartain, Stoelinga, & Krone, 2010, p. 1). Recent state legislative acts focused on school accountability have provided an alternative paradigm for measuring teacher and principal effectiveness that includes the use of student achievement data as part of the evaluative formula.

Tennessee's new evaluation policy requires this measure of teacher and principal effectiveness. It is imperative that Tennessee's policy be examined as it impacts future teacher and principal evaluations, and to compare it to other states' policies. This article will examine new legislative changes made in 2010-11 aimed at including measures of student achievement in teacher and principal evaluations.

3 Student Achievement as a Measure of Effectiveness in Educator Evaluations

3.1 Teacher Evaluations

Teacher evaluation and effectiveness have been the focus of increased discussion nationwide. "Most of us believe that good teaching matters" (Goe & Stickler, 2008, p. 1). It is commonly accepted that teacher productivity and effectiveness are the most important aspects of the educational process impacting student achievement (Harris & Sass, 2009; Exstrom, 2010; Wayne & Youngs, 2003; Riven, Hanushek, & Kain, 2001; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). The debate to define what constitutes teacher effectiveness is ongoing among educators (Exstrom, 2010) as teacher evaluation, driven widely by mounting pressure from policy makers (Harris & Sass, 2009), has been under close scrutiny. Characteristics of teacher effectiveness and the methods used to measure that effectiveness have changed over the years (Campbell, Kyriadkides, Muijs, & Robinson, 2003; Cheng & Tsui, 1999; Cruickshank & Haefele, 1990; Muijs, 2006). Some teachers contribute more effectively to student achievement than others, however the characteristics of effective teachers have not been agreed upon (Goe & Stickler, 2008; Harris & Sass, 2009; Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008).

A continuing concern surrounding teacher evaluation systems is that they have not been used to remove ineffective teachers from the classroom. "There has been a growing consensus that the way most states and districts across the country evaluate teachers fails to improve student learning or teacher practice" (Sartain et al., 2010, p. 1). Student achievement must be tied to teacher evaluation if those systems are to improve student learning. "It defies logic that we have not tied student achievement and learning gains to [instructional] improvement" (Arne Duncan, as cited by Rich, 2009, p. 1). Duncan (as cited by Rich) further stated, "How can you defend teacher evaluation that is divorced from student progress? How do you defend that?" (2009, p. 2). Legislation requiring the inclusion of student achievement data in teacher evaluation is being enacted in many states in response to the concerns that teaching is not directly tied to improving student learning.

3.2 Principal Evaluations

Several articles have been published over the last decade that have endeavored to discover how the principal has an effect on student achievement (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003; Hallinger, 2005; O'Donnell & White, 2005). Through a renewed emphasis on the instructional phase of leadership, administrators have had a positive effect on the students' academic progress when the principals' primary concern was for instructional quality (Hallinger, 2005). Waters et al. (2003) demonstrated through a meta-analysis of more than 5,000 studies that there is a substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement. Student academic success and the principal's instructional leadership abilities are interrelated and any increase in either one of these constructs has led to reciprocal increases in the other. O'Donnell and White (2005) completed a study of that relationship and surveyed 325 educators in the middle level schools along with 75 administrators and 250 English and mathematics instructors in those schools. Student test scores were positively influenced when the principal protected time, maintained open communications between themselves and the faculty, addressed discipline issues with the students, emphasized the value of professional development, and readily acknowledged improvement (O'Donnell & White, 2005).

Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) conducted an analysis of 27 published studies to identify the relationship between a principal's leadership style and the students' academic achievement and found that those principals who focused on instructional approaches had a greater influence on student achievement than principals who employed a transformational leadership style. In fact, Robinson et al. argued, "Educational leadership involves not only building collegial teams, a loyal and cohesive staff, and sharing an inspirational vision. It also involves focusing such relationship on some very specific pedagogical work. . . ." (p. 665). Leadership must employ a concerted effort at instructional improvement because that emphasis is far more rewarding than any transformational direction. Principals were advised to guard instructional time against any form of student or administrative interruption for learning to be maximized and the most effective school settings are those in which student and teachers have a feeling of safety (Robinson et al., 2008).

The role of the principal has continually changed, but the job preparation for prospective administrators has been lacking; though accreditation requirements in educational leadership have changed. Prior to 1998 the principal was viewed as a manager and the direction was typically top-down. Knoeppel and Rinehart (2008), in their study of 349 elementary school principals in Kentucky, expressed the belief that principals have a strong indirect effect on learning. The study involved 81 principals who trained before 1988, 207 who received their training between 1988 and 1998, and 61 administrators who received certification after 1998 and who received training that was based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Knoeppel and Rinehart posited that principals who were trained after 1998 "are apparently outperforming their counterparts" (2008, p. 519).

Other researchers (Witziers, Bosker, & Kruger, 2003; Kruger, Witziers, & Sleegers, 2007; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood & Mascall, 2008) have discovered more of an indirect effect in the leadership to student achievement relationship. In a meta-analysis of 36 previous studies, Witziers et al. (2003) found small positive effects which would limit a conclusion on the leader's direct effect on student achievement. Using a path analysis, Kruger et al. (2007) did not find any direct or indirect effects between educational leadership and student commitment; however, strategic leadership did have a relationship with student commitment. Student commitment would play a major role in producing student achievement. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) sought to understand district leaders roles in building collective efficacy among principals, and thus, impacting student learning. Path analysis was utilized to determine that district conditions impacted principals' collective efficacy which in turn, had effects on student achievement. In another path analysis, Leithwood and Mascall (2008) discovered that collective leadership could explain a significant amount of variation in student achievement. Higher achieving schools viewed the influence of all school members, and principals were seen as the highest level of influence on the school and its achievement.

3.3 Statistical Concerns of Using Student Achievement in Teacher and Principal Evaluations

Baker (2010) developed a critical thought about the use of value-added data in teacher evaluations. Unless value-added data measures include controls for non-random assignment of students, then it becomes statisti-

cally unfounded to draw assessment conclusions about teachers' effectiveness with the use of those measures. Inferential statistics by their very nature demand that random sampling and assignment be utilized to ensure generalizability. In concert, schools by their very nature do not have randomly assigned students. They are made up of those students who live within a particular zone, and they usually are made up of students of similar income and ethnic groups. Thus, a certain teacher who is evaluated by value-added data measures that are not controlling for the lack of random assignment may have legal choices if the said evaluation states he/she is ineffective (Baker, 2010).

4 Methodology

Using a content analysis approach (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2008), policy documents from Tennessee and 22 other states were scrutinized beginning January 2010 and continuing through July 2011 to determine the extent that student achievement data are (and will be) required as part of the teacher and principal evaluation process. Descriptive analysis was used to list the mandated requirements and to describe the scope that these student achievement data will have on teacher and principal evaluation. Comparative analysis was utilized when differing states' policies were compared. In addition, all policy analyses were examined in light of the current literature on this topic.

A search of state legislative bills across the United States discovered 23 states that have recently passed laws requiring student achievement growth to be factored into the process of evaluating teachers and principals. Though these bills differ in specifics, they all include student achievement data in the evaluation process. Most of these legislative bills have recently passed state congressional and senate votes. State legislated policies were discovered through a search of state legislation websites and through an examination of the current literature on the topic of teacher and principal evaluation.

Each state legislative bill was considered a separate document for examination using content analysis. Items that were considered in the content analysis were date bill was passed, year that bill was (will be) implemented, whether an advisory group was created to oversee the evaluation process at the state level, if principal evaluation was included in the bill, percentage that student achievement data would hold in the overall evaluation process and whether the bill would reform tenure and hiring. The content analysis process employed the use of a constant comparison (Gall et al., 2008) approach that allowed the policies to be examined at separate, multiple steps.

5 Recent Changes in Tennessee Evaluations

In January 2010, the House and Senate of the Tennessee General Assembly passed a bill that will allow Tennessee's Value Added student achievement data (TVASS) and other student achievement measures to be used as part of principal and teacher evaluations beginning in the 2011-12 school year. In March 2010, the U.S. Department of Education announced that Tennessee, along with Delaware, won the first phase of Race to the Top (RTTT) grant monies. The Department of Education Secretary indicated that both states had statewide buy-in for comprehensive plans to reform their schools and had written new laws to support their policies (U.S. Department of Education, 2010), including the use of student achievement data for principal and teacher evaluations.

Tennessee's First to the Top (2010) law assisted in securing the Race To the Top bid for the grant monies. This law required up to 50% of teacher and principal evaluations be based on student achievement data. The Tennessee First to the Top Act, which began in July 2011, required annual evaluation of all teachers and principals and that personnel decisions – including promotion, retention, tenure and compensation – be based in part on these evaluations. Student achievement data must comprise 50% of the new evaluation, of which 35% will be Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) data or some other comparable measure of student growth. The remaining 15% will be other measures of student achievement (First to the Top, 2010). The 15% based on other measures of student achievement may be selected by the individual being evaluated and his/her evaluator from the list of such measures approved by the Department of Education. The remaining 50% of the evaluation criteria will be based on the educator's summative rating

against a qualitative appraisal instrument approved by the Department of Education, as determined through observations, surveys, or other methods (TN Gov., 2010).

6 Results of Content Analysis - Recent State Legislation Requiring Student Achievement Measures in Evaluations

Whether pursuing policy changes in current evaluation systems or with the hope of winning Race to the Top funds, nearly half of the state legislatures adopted new legislation aimed at including student achievement data in teacher and principal evaluations. The following section summarizes state legislation changes mandating achievement data in educator evaluations in 2010 and in the first six months of 2011.

6.1 Legislative Changes in 2010

6.1.1 *Optional Uses of Student Achievement Data*

California, Maine, and Nevada have included optional uses of student achievement data in current legislation. In one case, student achievement data may not be the sole factor in the evaluations (State of Nevada, 2010). Achievement models may be selected from ones developed by the state (Maine State Legislature, 2010). In addition, structures and processes will be put in place to assist "persistently low-achieving schools" (California State Gov., 2010; Zinth, 2010; National Conference of State Legislatures, 2010).

6.1.2 Required Student Achievement Measures but Did Not Specify Amount

Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, and Michigan all passed legislation requiring some measure of student achievement to be included in future evaluations. However, the amount and type of student achievement measures were not specified by the state legislatures. Multiple measures of student academic growth must be used in the evaluations (State of Connecticut, 2010). In three states, student growth must be "a significant factor" in educator performance ratings (State of Illinois, 2010; State of Maryland, 2010; State of Michigan, 2010). In Maryland, any criterion used in evaluations cannot account for more than 35% of the assessment.

6.1.3 Required 35-50% Student Achievement Data

Arizona's new legislation requires between 35-50% of teacher and principal evaluations to be based on student achievement data (State of Arizona, 2010). However, with Arizona's loss in the Race to the Top competition, it is unclear whether the new legislation will be repealed or be moved forward. New York required that 40% of evaluation outcomes be based on student growth (New York State Education, 2010).

6.1.4 Required At Least 50% of Student Achievement Data

Colorado, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Oklahoma with recent legislation all required 50% or more of teacher evaluations to be comprised by student achievement data as of September, 2010. In Colorado (Colorado General Assembly, 2010), diverse factors of academic growth must be included in the 50%, and local school boards can create their own evaluation systems. Value-added assessment models are specifically required in Louisiana and Tennessee (State of Louisiana, 2010; State of Tennessee, 2010). In both Oklahoma and Tennessee, 35% of this student growth criterion must come from multiple years of statewide standardized tests and 15% from other measures of achievement (State of Oklahoma, 2010; State of Tennessee, 2010). Certain factors must be accounted for in the value-added models (special education status, eligibility for free/reduced lunch, attendance, and discipline ratings). Texas, North Carolina, and Florida already had legislation requiring at least 50% of teacher evaluations to be based of student achievement data (Zinth, 2010; National Conference of State Legislatures, 2010).

6.1.5 States Considering Legislation

In 2011, South Dakota and West Virginia are considering legislative bills that will require changes in the teacher and principal evaluation processes. South Dakota's bill is not slated for discussion and voting until this summer (Capital Journal, 2011). In West Virginia, the bill has passed a House committee, but it is not expected to have support in the state Senate (AFT West Virginia, 2011).

6.2 Legislative Changes in 2011

In the first six months of 2011, eight states mandated changes in teacher evaluation by tying student achievement into the evaluation processes. In Arkansas, House Bill 2778 mandated a value-added measurement system as part of teacher evaluation, with fifty percent of the evaluation being tied to student achievement measures (State of Arkansas, 2011). In Florida, Senate Bill 736 asked administrators to consider teacher effectiveness (as measured partly by student achievement) rather than seniority in the event of layoffs (Florida Senate, 2011). Illinois Senate Bill 7 has required similar considerations in the area of teacher dismissal (Illinois General Assembly, 2011). In Idaho, Senate Bill 1108 tied both teacher and administrator evaluations to student achievement (Idaho State Department of Education, 2011). In Indiana, the Senate Enrolled Act (SEA1) mandated annual evaluations include student achievement data (as defined locally) as "significant factors" in those evaluations (Indiana Department of Education, 2011). Nevada's Assembly Bill 229 and Ohio's Senate Bill 5 tie both teacher and administrator evaluations to student achievement (Education Week, 2011). Utah's Senate Bill 256 required annual evaluations of teachers as measured through student gains of achievement (Utah State Legislature, 2011). The state of Wyoming passed Senate File 146 which based teacher evaluations "in part" on teacher achievement measures (State of Wyoming, 2011).

7 Implications

Principals' and teachers' work has a direct and/or indirect impact on student achievement. To what extent should the school principal and teacher be evaluated by the achievement gains/losses of their students? Recent legislative actions have mandated student achievement be included in performance evaluations of both teachers and principals. In Tennessee, this legislation took effect July 2011. Future implications are unknown. However, the following questions are presented for consideration.

- What is the appropriate role of the state or federal government in creating policy aimed at personnel decisions for educators?
- Are our evaluation systems broken, as suggested by the Gates Foundation and the Widget Effect (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2009; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhurn, & Keeling, 2009)?
- Will including student achievement data in evaluations change this state? Should educator human resource decisions in education mirror other occupations?
- What measures of effectiveness should be used for principals and teachers? Are student achievement measures the best? Should they even be the primary measure?
- Can we use inferential statistical formulas for value added when we cannot generalize due to the inability to randomize student placements in teacher classrooms?
- What are the unintended outcomes of including student achievement in educators' evaluations?

8 References

AFT West Virginia (2011). Legislative Update (February 11, 2011). Retrieved from file:///D:/manuscripts/west%20virg

Baker, B. (2010). Pondering legal implications of value-added teacher evaluation. *School Finance 101.* Retrieved from http://schoolfinance101.wordpress.com/2010/06/02/[2] California State Government (2010). Bill Number: SBX5 1. Retrieved from 0050/sbx5_1_bill_20100107_chaptered.html

[2] http://schoolfinance101.wordpress.com/2010/06/02/

Campbell, R. J., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, R. D., & Robinson, W. (2003). Differential teacher effectiveness: Towards a model for research and teacher appraisal. *Oxford Review of Education, 29*(3), 347-362.
Capital Journal (2011). State board will create teacher evaluations (March 22, 2011). Retrieved from file///D:/manuscripts/updates in state policy and practice.htm
Cheng, Y. C., & Tsui, K. T. (1999). Multimodels of teacher effectiveness: Implications for research. *The Journal of Educational Research, 92*(3), 141-150.
Colorado General Assembly (2010). Senate Bill 10-191. Retrieved from http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/leg_dir/olls/sl
Cruickshank, D. R., & Haefele, D. L. (1990). Research-based indicators: Is the glass half-full or half-empty? *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4*(1), 33-39.
Education Week, 2011. Legislative Highlights. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/media/36teacher-c1.pdf
Exstrom, M. (Sept. 2010). The A+ teacher. Deciding who is effective in the classroom is not as easy as it seems. *State Legislatures, 36*, 20-23.
First to the Top Act. (2010). Pub.ch. No. 2, Senate Bill No. 7005.
Florida Senate. Senate Bill 736. Retrieved from http://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2011/0736/Analyses/muFTDvH
0799/0736/Analysis/2011s0736.bc.PDF
Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R., (2008). *Educational Research: An Introduction.* 8th ed., Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (June, 2008). Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality – Published Report. Retrieved from http://www.tqsource.org/publications/EvaluatingTeachEffectiveness.pdf
Goe, L., & Stickler, L. M. (March, 2008). *Teacher quality and student achievement: Making the most of recent research.* National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality – Research and Policy Brief. Retrieved from http://www.tqsource.org/publications/March2008Brief.pdf
Hallinger, P., (2005). "Instructional Leadership and the School Principal: A Passing Fancy that Refuses to Fade Away." *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(3), 221–239.
Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (September, 2009). *What makes for a good teacher and who can tell?* (Working paper #30). Retrieved from the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research: CALDER, The Urban Institute website: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1001431-what-makes-for-a-good-teacher.pdf
Idaho Department of Education (2011). Senate Bill 1108. Retrieved from http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/publications/w
202011.pdf
Illinois General Assembly (2011). Senate Bill 0007. Retrieved from http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/BillStatus.asp?Doc
Indiana Department of Education (2011). Update on senate enrolled act 1. Retrieved from http://www.doe.in.gov/super
July/15/documents/memo_update_sea1.pdf
Knoeppel, R. & Rinehart, J. (2008). Student achievement and principal quality: Explaining the relationship. *Journal of School Leadership, 18*(5), 501-521.
Kruger, M. L., Witziers, B., & Sleegers, P. (2007). The impact of school leadership on school level factors: Validation of a causal model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 18*(1), 1-20.
Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D., (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 496-528.
Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 529-561.
Maine State Legislature (2010). PUBLIC Law, Chapter 646, LD 1799, 124th Maine
State Legislature. Retrieved from http://www.legislature.maine.gov/legis/bills/bills_124th/chappdfs/PUBLIC646.pdf
Muijs, D. (2006). Measuring teacher effectiveness: Some methodological reflections. *Educational Research & Evaluation, 12*(1), 53-74.
National Conference of State Legislatures, (2010). Educators (teachers/principals) enacted evaluation

[3] http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/leg_dir/olls/sl2010a/sl_241.htm
[4] http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/publications/weekly_newsletter_docs/2011/March%204,%25

legislation. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=21155[5]
National Council on Teacher Quality (2009).Best practices for teacher effectiveness: How districts nationwide are stacking up. Retrieved from http://www.gatesfoundation.org/united-states/Documents/best-practices-teach-effectiveness.pdf
New York State Education (2010). Legislation in Support of Race to the Top Application. Retrieved from http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/application/legislation.html
O'Donnell, R. & White, G. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals'instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*,b*89*(645), 56-71.
Rich, E. (December, 2009). Duncan stresses commitment to teachers. *Teacher Magazine*, 1-2. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org
Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Karin, J. F. (2001). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. Amherst, MA: Amherst College.
Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J., (2008). The Impact of Leadership on School Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types. *EducationalAdministration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–74.
Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future academic achievement.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.
Sartain, L., Stoelinga, S. R., & Krone, E. (June, 2010). Rethinking teacher evaluation – Policy Brief. Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. Retrieved from http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/Teacher%20Eval%20Final.pdf
State of Arkansas (2011). House Bill 2178. Retrieved from http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/assembly/2011/2011R/Bills/H
State of Arizona (2010). Senate Bill 1040. Retrieved from http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/sb1040h.pdf
State of Connecticut (2010). Substitute Senate Bill No. 438, Public Act No. 10111. Retrieved from http://www.cga.ct.gov/2010/ACT/Pa/pdf/2010PA-00111-R00SB-00438-PA.pdf
State of Illinois (2010). Public Act 096-0861. Retrieved from http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/96/PDF/096-0861.pdf
State of Louisiana (2010). House Bill No. 1033. Retrieved from http://www.legis.state.la.us/billdata/streamdocument.a
State of Maryland (2010). Chapter 189, House Bill 1263, Education Reform Act of 2010. Retrieved from http://mlis.state.md.us/2010rs/chapters_noln/Ch_189_hb1263E.pdf
State of Michigan (2010). Enrolled Senate Bill No. 981. Retrieved from http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2009-2010/publicact/htm/2009-PA-0205.htm
State of Nevada (2010), Senate Bill No. 2. Retrieved from http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/26th2010Special/Bills/SB
State of Oklahoma (2010). Enrolled Senate Bill No. 2033. Retrieved from http://www.okcareertech.org/tcs/legislative-is
State of Tennessee (2010). Senate Bill 7005 (House Bill 7010). Retrieved from http://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/106/Bill/
State of Wyoming (2011). Senate File 146. Retrieved from http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2011/Engross/SF0146.pdf
TN.Gov. (2010). Sub-committee minutes. Retrieved from http://www.tn.gov/firsttothetop/docs/Initial_TEAC_Eval_
U.S. Department of Education (2010). Delaware and Tennessee win first race to the top grants. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03292010.html[8]
Utah State Legislature, 2011. State Bill 256. Retrieved from http://le.utah.gov/~2011/htmdoc/sbillhtm/sb0256.htm
Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (Spring, 2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research, (73)*1, 89-122.
Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B., (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhurn, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness.* Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project. Retrieved from http://widgeteffect.org/down-loads/ TheWidgetEffect.pdf

[5] http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=21155
[6] http://www.okcareertech.org/tcs/legislative-issues/sb-2033.pdf/download
[7] http://www.capitol.tn.gov/Bills/106/Bill/SB7005.pdf
[8] http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03292010.html

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). "Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(3), 398-425.
Zinth, J. (2010). Teacher evaluation. New approaches for a new decade. ECS Issue Brief. Retrieved from http://inpathways.net/teacher_new_approaches.pdf[9]

[9] http://inpathways.net/teacher_new_approaches.pdf