

HOUSE BILL REPORT

SHB 2277

As Passed Legislature

Title: An act relating to teacher evaluation.

Brief Description: Changing teacher evaluations for teachers with at least four years of satisfactory evaluations.

Sponsors: By House Committee on Education (originally sponsored by Representatives Jones, Dorn, R. Meyers, Schmidt, Pruitt, Karahalios, Holm, Kessler, Zellinsky, Brough, Mastin, Patterson, Basich and J. Kohl).

Brief History:

Reported by House Committee on:
Education, January 28, 1994, DPS;
Passed House, February 8, 1994, 88-2;
Passed Legislature.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Majority Report: The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 17 members: Representatives Dorn, Chair; Cothorn, Vice Chair; Brough, Ranking Minority Member; B. Thomas, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Brumsickle; Carlson; G. Cole; Eide; Hansen; Holm; Jones; Karahalios; J. Kohl; Patterson; Pruitt; Roland; and L. Thomas.

Staff: Robert Butts (786-7111).

Background: The Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) is responsible for establishing minimum criteria for the evaluation and development of classroom teachers and certificated support staff. SPI has also adopted model evaluation programs.

Under current law, classroom teachers and other certificated support staff must be observed twice during the school year for a total of 60 minutes with a written evaluation following each observation. This evaluation is often referred to as a "summative" evaluation.

After four years of employment, this evaluation procedure is only required every third year. During the other two years, a "short evaluation" is permitted with either a 30 minute observation and a written evaluation, or two observations

for a total of 60 minutes without a written summary. This short evaluation cannot be used to determine if an employee's work is unsatisfactory.

Summary of Bill: After a certificated classroom teacher or certificated support staff receives a satisfactory evaluation for four years, districts are given broad discretion in what type of evaluation to use. Districts may use a "short evaluation," a locally bargained evaluation emphasizing professional growth, or a "summative evaluation."

However, a "summative" evaluation is required every three years, unless this time period is extended by the school district under the bargaining process.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Effective Date: The bill takes effect September 1, 1994.

Testimony For: (Original bill) Many school districts have already adopted the professional growth evaluation option. It is a goal setting model, which creates a new relationship between the employee and the supervisor. More time is needed between summative evaluations to fulfill the professional growth goals, which is why five years is proposed.

Testimony Against: (Original bill) The current system is working. While having a professional growth option available is a good idea, it should not be mandated. We need to give principals more control over evaluations, not less. Evaluation information is an important element in staff development. The information may not be current enough with five years between evaluations.

Witnesses: (Original bill) Ann Randall, Washington Education Association (support); Chuck Talmadge, Association of Washington School Principals (opposed); Dwayne Slate, Washington State School Directors' Association (concerns); and Reuben Kvamme and Al Svinth, Tacoma Public Schools. (opposed).