

Teacher Evaluation Model—Sample Performance Categories

Model	Performance Categories				
Colorado	Ineffective	Partially Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	
Delaware	Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	
Washington, DC	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	
Hillsborough County, FL	1	2	3	4	5
Georgia	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory		
Indiana	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective	
Kentucky	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	
Montgomery County, MD	Below Standard		Meets Standard		
Massachusetts ¹	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary	
	Low		Moderate	High	
Minnesota Principal Evaluation Model	Unsatisfactory	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished	
EMID, Minnesota	Below Standards		Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards	
Edina, Minnesota	No Basis for Observation	Does Not Meet Expectations	Inconsistently Meets Expectations	Consistently Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Maple Lake, Minnesota	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
Minneapolis, Minnesota	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
Minneota, Minnesota	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
North Branch, Minnesota	Concern		Competent	Proficient	
St. Francis, Minnesota	Unacceptable	Does Not Meet Standard	Partially Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
St. Paul, Minnesota	Below Standard	Area for Growth	Solid Performance	Area of Strength	
Wayzata, Minnesota	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
New Jersey	Ineffective	Partially Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	
New York	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	
North Carolina	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Ohio	Ineffective	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	
Tulsa, Oklahoma	Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective	Superior
Rhode Island	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective	
Tennessee	Significantly below Expectations	Below Expectations	At Expectations	Above Expectations	Significantly above Expectations
Wisconsin ²	Developing		Effective	Exemplary	

Model	Performance Categories				
Danielson's Framework for Teaching	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
Kim Marshall's Rubric	Does Not Meet Standards	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective	
Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model ³	Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Applying	Innovating
TAP	Significantly below Expectations	At Expectations		Significantly above Expectations	

¹=Massachusetts teachers receive a "Rating of Educator Practice" (row one) and an "Impact on Student Learning" rating (row two). The two ratings are applied to a matrix to determine the type of growth plan for the evaluated teacher.

²=Proposed.

³=Model only uses classroom observations as measure.