

HOUSE BILL REPORT

HB 1812

As Reported By House Committee On:
Education

Title: An act relating to teacher evaluation.

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

Sponsors: Representatives Jones, Dorn, R. Meyers, Schmidt, Pruitt, Kessler, Karahalios and Carlson.

Brief History:

Reported by House Committee on:
Education, March 2, 1993, DP.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Majority Report: Do pass. Signed by 18 members: Representatives Dorn, Chair; Cothorn, Vice Chair; Brough, Ranking Minority Member; Brumsickle; Carlson; G. Cole; Eide; G. Fisher; Hansen; Holm; Jones; Karahalios; J. Kohl; Patterson; Pruitt; Roland; Stevens; and Vance.

Minority Report: Without recommendation. Signed by 1 member: Representative Thomas, Assistant Ranking Minority Member.

Staff: Shirley Leckman (786-7291).

Background: Studies in the 1980s resulted in a new form of teacher evaluations. The summative form of evaluation which has been in use for some time and is conducted every year, measures minimum competency. The new evaluation form, known as formative or the professional growth option, is a process by which the employee and the supervisor work together to set goals and devise a program to improve teaching or performance over a period of time.

Summary of Bill: Existing law is amended to eliminate the use of yearly short form summative evaluations for certificated teachers and staff who have chosen the professional growth option. Also, for those using the professional growth option, the time between regular summative evaluations is extended from three to five years. By September 1, 1993, school districts are directed to adopt

the formative evaluation form as an option that teachers and staff may choose.

Fiscal Note: Not requested.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Testimony For: 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. The requirement in existing law of a summative evaluation every three years throws those under the professional growth option into a "summative slump." More time is needed between summative evaluations to fulfill the professional growth goals, which is why five years is proposed.

Testimony Against: The professional growth option is a good concept, but five years between evaluations may be too long. Evaluation information is an important element in staff development, and with five years between evaluations, the information may not be current enough.

Witnesses: (Pro): Representative Jones, sponsor; Ann Randall and Dennis Bolton, Washington Education Association; and Allen Hughes and Gail Mathison, South Kitsap School District. (Con): Walter Ball, Association of Washington School Principals.