

South Lyon Community Schools

Plan for the Evaluation of Teaching Personnel

Beliefs:

Research tells us that the role of the teacher is the single greatest factor on student learning. (Sanders, et al)
Instructional practice must continuously improve in order to raise student growth measures/student achievement.

The power of an evaluation system lies in our ability to:

- a) Focus our attention on the importance of teaching and learning for students and teachers.
- b) Provide the means and the incentive to quality assurance based on legitimate teaching standards.
- c) Serve as the catalyst for encouraging and supporting professional learning through focused, collaborative activities.

Danielson

Evaluation Goals should be directly linked to the Goals of the District and/or School Improvement Goals of the school:

- a) Reflection on practice is the most powerful kind of professional learning.
- b) Schon (1983) “We learn not so much from our experiences but from our reflection on our experiences.”
- c) Reflection can be included in evaluation at many places.
- d) Reflection can take place when the teacher considers what he/she intended and whether he/she achieved the goals. It can take place through self-assessment, descriptions and commentaries about learning activities and analysis of student work.

Danielson

Evaluation and Professional Development should be a continuous process:

- a) Information gained through a formal and informal process should be part of the on-going process.
- b) Formative techniques and individual or team self-directed inquiry are also continuous activities.
- c) There should be no time off from growing and developing.
- d) All staff members in the SLCS school district are appraised continuously.

Danielson

Evaluation Systems should emphasize student outcomes.

- a) Student learning is considered one standard for evaluation
- b) The issue of making summative judgments of teachers based on student achievement measures remains problematic; but school staff can certainly learn from how well students perform and incorporate that knowledge into the world of data obtained.
- c) The portfolio for student learning should document through teacher plans, self-directed inquiries, collaborations among peers, collection of evidence of efforts to get students to the goal, work samples, etc. and all be driven by a link to student learning goals and measures of student learning. Measures are used to enhance teaching and learning, not to judge it. The focus on student learning should pervade the language and attitude of the newly designed system.

Danielson

South Lyon Community Schools has the expectation that all teachers can increase their expertise from year to year, which produces gains in student achievement from year to year with a powerful cumulative effect.

Introduction:

Effective January 4, 2010, the Michigan Legislature enacted 2009 PA 205(MCL 380.1249 and 380.1250) requiring yearly evaluations of teacher performance. The legislation required school districts to implement a “rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system” which focused on “student growth as a significant factor” in the evaluation process measured by “national, state, or local assessments and other objective criteria.” Pursuant to that legislative mandate, the District has established an evaluation system to conform to the requirements of 2009 PA205. Effective November 15, 2015, the Michigan Legislature enacted PA 173, amending sections 1249 and 1249a (MCL 380.1249 and 380.1249a), section 1249 as amended by 2014 PA 257 and section 1249a as added by 2011 PA102, and by adding sections 1249b, 1531j and 1531k. The District has updated processes and procedures as appropriate for compliance with these amendments.

Summary of Laws:

Public Act 101 (HB 4612) – Amendments to the Teacher Tenure Act:

- 5 year probationary period before a teacher obtains tenure. A teacher under contract before July 19, 2011 remains on a 4 year track. Cannot increase 4 or 5 year probationary period.
- Period can be “extended” due to gaps in service (Example: child care or FMLA).
- Tenure teachers retain tenure status.
- 2 year probationary period remains, if received tenure in another Michigan Public school district.

Public Act 101 (HB 4625) Amendments to the Teacher Tenure Act Evaluating Probationary Teachers:

- Annual year-end evaluations based on multiple classroom observations. Evaluation must include at least an assessment of progress toward goals of Individualized Development Plan (IDP).
- IDP for all years of probationary period.
- Mid- year progress report for first year probationary teachers. (See requirements below.)
- Teachers must be rated as effective or highly effective on **3 most recent annual year-end performance evaluations** and have been employed at least 5 full school years.
- **“Fast Track Provision”**- If a teacher has been rated as highly effective on 3 consecutive annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 4 full school years of employment in a probationary period, the teacher shall be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period.
- Importance of third year: If rated less than Effective in the 3rd of 5 years, it is impossible to achieve tenure in our district.
- Districts cannot increase probationary period or serve more than one probationary period in any one school district.

Public Act 101 (HB 4625) Amendments to the Teacher Tenure Act Annual Evaluations for Tenured Teachers:

- Annual year-end performance evaluations, based on multiple classroom observations.
- IDP for minimally effective or ineffective rating.
- IDP must identify goals and specify a time limit not to exceed 180 days in which teacher must meet goals.
- Annual year-end performance evaluation, where applicable, must assess progress on IDP.
- Beginning 2013-2014 mid- year progress report for teachers on plans of assistance due to minimally or ineffective rating. (See requirements below.)

Public Act 101 (HB 4625) Amendments to the Teacher Tenure Act Displacing a Probationary Teacher:

- A probationary teacher rated effective or highly effective shall not be displaced by a tenured teacher solely because that teacher has obtained tenure.
- Notice of non-renewal for a probationary teacher is 15 days before the end of the school year or employed for the following year. (Board must take action by June 15.)

- A probationary teacher may be dismissed from his or her employment by the controlling board at anytime

Rating Categories (MCL 380.1249):

- Evaluation ratings shall be:
 - Highly Effective
 - Effective
 - Minimally effective
 - Ineffective

Effectiveness Measurement (MCL 380.1248):

- Effectiveness ratings shall be measured by the performance evaluation system under section 1249, and personnel decisions shall be made on the following factors:
 - Individual performance as “majority factor”
 - Student growth as the “predominant factor”
 - Demonstrated pedagogical skills
 - Classroom management
 - Teacher’s discipline/attendance record
 - Accomplishments/contributions
 - Relevant specialized training

Portion of Annual Year-end Evaluation to be based on Student Growth [MCL 380.1249 (2) (a)(i)]:

- 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018 school years - 25% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
- Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, 40% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.

Student Growth Measurement [MCL 380.1249 (2)(a)(ii) and (b)] :

- Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, for core content areas in grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered, 50% of student growth must be measured using the state assessments, and the portion of student growth not measured using state assessments must be measured using multiple research-based growth measures or alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across schools within the school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy. Student growth also may be measured by student learning objectives or nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards, or based on achievement of individualized education program goals.
- If there are student growth and assessment data available for a teacher for at least 3 school years, the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on the student growth and assessment data for the most recent 3-consecutive-schoolyear period. If there are not student growth and assessment data available for a teacher for at least 3 school years, the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on all student growth and assessment data that are available for the teacher.

Classroom Observations [MCL 380.1249 (2) (e)]:

- The performance evaluation system shall include classroom observations to assist in the performance evaluations.
- All of the following apply to the classroom observations:
 - What is prescribed in the evaluation tool
 - Review of lesson plan and state curriculum standard used
 - Pupil engagement
 - Unless a teacher has received a rating of effective or highly effective on his/her 2 most recent annual year-end evaluations, there shall be at least 2 classroom observations of the teacher each

- school year.
- Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, at least 1 observation must be unscheduled
- Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, the school administrator responsible for the teacher's performance evaluation shall conduct at least 1 of the observations. Other observations may be conducted by other observers who are trained in the use of the evaluation tool.

Mid-year Progress Report [MCL 380.1249 (2) (d)]:

- For a first-year probationary teacher or any teacher who received a minimally effective or ineffective rating on the most recent evaluation
- Shall be used to gauge a teacher's improvement from the preceding school year and to assist a teacher to improve
- Be based at least in part on student achievement
- Be aligned with the teacher's IDP
- May not take the place of the annual year-end evaluation
- Shall include specific performance goals for the remainder of the school year
- Recommended training that would assist the teacher in meeting the goals
- Must be developed by the school administrator conducting the annual year-end evaluation or his/her designee
- At the midyear progress report, the school administrator shall develop, in consultation with the teacher, a written improvement plan that includes these goals and training and is designed to assist the teacher to improve his/her rating.

Year-End Specific Performance Goals [MCL 380.1249 (2) (c)]:

- Shall be included in year-end evaluation
- Developed by school administrator or designee conducting the evaluation in consultation with the teacher
- For first year teachers, an IDP will be developed for the following year.
- Any recommended training will be identified.

Mentor or Coach [MCL 380.1249 (2) (h)]:

- As a part of the evaluation system the district is encouraged to assign a mentor or coach to a probationary teacher or a teacher who received a minimally effective or ineffective rating on his/her most recent annual year-end evaluation.

Biennial Evaluation [MCL 380.1249 (2) (k)]:

- The performance evaluation system shall provide that, if a teacher is rated highly effective on 3 consecutive annual year-end evaluations, the school may choose to conduct a year-end evaluation biennially instead on annually

Mandatory Dismissal [MCL 380.1249 (2) (j)]:

- The performance evaluation system shall provide that, if a teacher is rated as ineffective on 3 annual year-end evaluations, the school shall dismiss the teacher from employment.
- This subdivision does not affect the ability of a school to dismiss an ineffective teacher from employment regardless of whether the teacher is rated as ineffective on 3 consecutive annual year end evaluations.

Procedures:

Yearly teacher evaluation for Probationary Teachers or Tenure Teachers on IDP Plans will include the following:

- Minimum of three (3) observations with a minimum of 30 minutes in the classroom. Two shall be unannounced.
- At least one observation must include a preconference. The preconference allows for discussion and evaluation of the elements in Domain 2- Planning and Preparing.
- Growth/IDP Plan
- A mid-year progress report developed by the school administrator conducting the annual year-end evaluation for a first- year probationary teacher or any teacher who received a minimally effective or ineffective rating on the most recent evaluation with the following requirements:
 - Shall be used to gauge a teacher's improvement from the preceding school year and to assist a teacher to improve
 - Be based at least in part on student achievement
 - Be aligned with the teacher's IDP
 - May not take the place of the annual year-end evaluation
 - Shall include specific performance goals for the remainder of the school year
 - Recommended training that would assist the teacher in meeting the goals
 - At the midyear progress report, the school administrator shall develop, in consultation with the teacher, a written improvement plan that includes these goals and training and is designed to assist the teacher to improve his/her rating.
- By May 1 as a part of the final evaluation, an assessment of teacher's progress in meeting the goals of the growth/ IDP Plan

Yearly teacher evaluation for teachers who are Tenure will include the following:

- Minimum of one (1) unannounced observation with a minimum of 30 minutes in the classroom
- If rating is minimally effective or ineffective an administrator must complete at least one (1) additional observation, **which must be unannounced.**
- Minimum of two (2) walkthroughs with a minimum of 10-15 minutes in the classroom. All walkthroughs are unannounced.

Probationary and Tenure Teacher Observations:

All observations must include a post conference within five working days of observing the teacher. Post conferences provide an opportunity for the teacher to reflect on the lesson and provide evidence for Domain 3. The administrator and teacher will then discuss what was observed in Domain 1– Classroom Strategies and behaviors and Domain 2- Planning and Preparing. Following the conference, the administrator will record the evaluation of Domains 1, 2, and 3 (elements 50 and 51 from post conference).

Administration is not limited to which administrator may observe a teacher, although our goal is to assign each teacher a primary evaluator.

Teachers are encouraged to participate in peer observation; however, specific teacher to teacher feedback will not be included in the evaluation. Peer observation, mentoring and feedback are practices which provide evidence for Domain 3- Reflecting on Teaching and Domain 4- Collegiality and Professionalism.

All of the following apply to the classroom observations:

- What is prescribed in the iObservation evaluation tool, which includes pupil engagement, Domain 1- Classroom Strategies and Behaviors and Domain 2- Planning and Preparing
- Review of lesson plan and state curriculum standard used

All of the following apply to the classroom walkthroughs:

- What is prescribed in the iObservation evaluation tool, which includes pupil engagement, Domain 1- Classroom Strategies and Behaviors
- Evidence for Domain 2- Planning and Preparing – may be requested
- Review of lesson plan and state curriculum standard used

Domain 4 Collegiality and Professionalism Ratings:

Teachers are encouraged to provide evidence for Domain 4 to their building administrator/evaluator in the following areas:

- Promoting a positive environment
- Promoting exchange of ideas and strategies
- Promoting District and School development

Following district and building procedures and policies, including attendance and punctuality will be evaluated within element #59 “Adhering to District and School Rules and Procedures” under Domain 4.

Elements #57 and 58 will be assessed only as appropriate.

Overall Comments

The final evaluation will contain comments documenting a teacher’s attendance and discipline record for the year. Progress for teachers on IDPs will also be addressed.

Effectiveness Rating Weighting

An effectiveness rating will be calculated for each Domain separately according to the following:

For teachers with 3 or fewer years:

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
At least 75% Applying and/or Innovating. No more than 5% at Beginning and 0% at Not Using.	At least 65% at Applying and/or Innovating	Less than 65% at Applying and/or Innovating and Less than 50% at Beginning and/or Not Using.	Greater than or equal to 50% at Beginning and/or Not Using.

All other teachers:

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
At least 80% of scores Applying and/or Innovating, with at least 50% Innovating. No more than 5% Beginning and 0% Not Using	At least 70% of scores Applying and/or Innovating. No more than 10% Beginning/Not Using	Does not meet criteria for effective or higher and no more than 25% of scores beginning or not using.	Does not meet criteria for Minimally Effective or Higher

An overall effectiveness rating will be calculated through a weighted average of the 4 Domains.

For 2016-17, Domains are weighted as follows:

- Domain 1: 60%
- Domain 2: 10%
- Domain 3: 25% - within this Domain, 50% will be based on elements 50 & 51 (scored during post- conference) and 50% will be based on elements 52 & 54 (scored based on Student Growth Plan Data and Reflections). Element 53 is not used.
- Domain 4: 5%

TRAINING

All Building and District Administrators who use this evaluation tool were trained in 2010-2011 (or the year they were hired) by Marzano Learning Science International trainers during sessions lasting multiple days. Included in this training was how to use the system with fidelity. In 2015, all Building and District Administrators who use this evaluation tool received a one day “refresher” course, which included a component on inter-rater reliability. This session was led by Lisa Kudwa and Melissa Baker, central office administrators who had received the required facilitator training from the Marzano Learning Science International trainers. All administrators who use this tool will receive another “refresher” training session in August 2016 from central office administration.

All teachers in the district received training and professional development in the use of this model at the building level during the 2010-2011 school year. As new teachers are hired, they receive training from their building administrator(s) and mentor. All teachers will be given a “refresher” course in September 2016.