

**Meeting State Requirements for
Teacher Evaluation by November 1,
2011**

Michigan Education Association
Summer 2011

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Recent legislation (HB 4627) enacted into law provides for a school district to be exempt from using the new state evaluation tool by submitting proof of a comparable locally developed evaluation system to the Governor's Council on Education by no later than November 1, 2011. The district's evaluation system must meet the following criteria:

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Criteria:
 - Evidence of student growth as a predominant factor in the evaluation rating
 - Demonstration of pedagogical skills:
 - Knowledge of the subject matter to be taught
 - Ability to impart the knowledge to student through the planning and delivery of rigorous content
 - Differentiating instruction in the classroom
 - Maximizing instructional time

Meeting 11-1-11 Deadline

- Criteria:
 - Classroom management, including discipline, rapport with parents and other teachers
 - Ability to withstand the stress of teaching
 - Attendance and disciplinary record
 - Significant accomplishments and contributions to the overall performance of the school
 - Relevant special training

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing the local evaluation system:
 - The development of a local evaluation system begins with an audit of the current system to identify both strengths and areas for improvement.
 - A number of local districts have elected to use some version of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Enhancing Professional Practice as the foundation for the evaluation system. The model lends itself nicely to addressing several criteria: a demonstration of pedagogical skills and classroom management, and are easily observed in the classroom.

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - The greatest challenge to developing an approvable evaluation system lies with addressing the issue of measuring and assessing student growth.
 - Consideration should be given to the following:
 - The assessments to be used---
 - National (NAEP)
 - State (MEAP/MME/ACT, ELPA, MI-ACCESS)
 - Locally developed and other criteria (projects, portfolios, performances)

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - Considerations continued:
 - The weight given to assessment of student growth and to other measurements of educator performance (classroom observation, professional growth plan)
 - The weight each assessments will be given in the whole evaluation-- beginning in
 - 2013-14 at least 25%
 - 2014-15 at least 40%
 - 2015-16 at least 50%

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - Considerations continued:
 - The process to be used for educators teaching a subject not tested by state tests or in an assignment other than a regular classroom.
 - Recognizing that not every educator will be able to demonstrate student growth in the same manner.
 - Defining the parameters for assessing student growth in order to establish highly effective, effective, minimally effective and ineffective rating categories.

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - Considerations continued:
 - The need to state the number of classroom students demonstrating sufficient growth to be considered successful.
 - The circumstances which may warrant the exclusion of an individual students growth measure from the calculation of the classroom student growth score (such as truancy, extended absenteeism, lack of effort).

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - An example of a district model:
 - The model distinguishes between probationary and tenured teachers
 - The model establishes the four evaluation rating categories and accompanying scores
 - The model is aligned to the work of Charlotte Danielson and forms the framework for evaluating the 4 domains.
 - Probationary teachers work on specific domains
 - Tenured teachers develop their professional growth plan from the domains (classroom observation focuses on specific components)

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - A model continued:
 - Both the tenured and probationary teacher are rated in 4 categories with specific point values earned in each.
 - Up to 4 points for implementing a professional growth plan (tenured teachers have more latitude than the probationary)
 - Up to 2 points for using student performance data and developing strategies to impact performance
 - Up to 2 points for student growth data (requires the use of state assessment and one other source)
 - One point for activities which support the building advancement

Meeting the 11-1-11 Deadline

- Developing a local evaluation system:
 - Districts with a history of collaboration between teachers and administrators and have a model of what “good teaching” looks like will find that the adjustment to new state requirements will go along more smoothly as well as less time consuming.
 - The local system should be both rational and defensible.
