



Lake Shore Public Schools Performance Review Process 2011-12

Overview

As a result of new Michigan legislation requiring districts to include student achievement as a “significant portion” of teacher evaluation, the Lake Shore administration and Lake Shore Federation of Teachers have worked collaboratively to create a compliant teacher evaluation tool. The committee included central office and building administrators from elementary, middle and high school, as well as teachers from elementary, middle, and high school who teach a variety of grade levels in various subject areas. It was important to the administration and the Federation that all stakeholders were duly represented.

Throughout the process the committee reviewed information from the Michigan Department of Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, as well as sample evaluation tools from schools throughout the state. The committee also read books by Charlotte Danielson and reviewed materials from Dr. Robert Marzano to help them make informed decisions. These committee members volunteered their personal time throughout the summer and we are grateful for their time, expertise, and dedication. Ultimately, the group agreed to create a system that mirrors the Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation model.

The Process of Teacher Evaluation

While in the past classroom observation has been the largest component of teacher evaluation, this is no longer the case. Public Act 102 requires the following:

- (1) Evaluation of the teacher’s job performance at least annually while providing timely and constructive feedback.
- (2) Establishment of clear approaches to measure student growth and providing teachers and school administrators with relevant data on school growth.
- (3) Evaluation of a teacher’s job performance, using multiple rating categories while taking into account student growth as a significant factor.
- (4) Revise the performance evaluation systems within 60 days after the effective date of the act to include the ratings of teachers as highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective.

While formal classroom observations can be useful in determining a teacher’s effectiveness, other methods of evaluation will be used as well. These may include classroom walk-throughs, observations of meetings, professional development attendance, participation in collaborative groups, parent and student communication, timeliness, ancillary sources of information, and other items as indicated in the evaluation rubric (Appendix A).

Five standards, each with several elements, have been identified for teacher evaluation. They are:

1. Classroom Environment (21% of total evaluation score)
 - a. Creating an environment of respect and rapport
 - b. Expectations for learning
 - c. Trusting environment
 - d. Managing student behavior
 - e. Safe, accessible, and orderly environment
 - f. Managing instructional time

2. Preparation and Planning (21% of total evaluation score)
 - a. Content knowledge
 - b. Knowledge of students
 - c. Differentiated instruction
 - d. Knowledge of resources
 - e. Lesson/assessment development

3. Instruction and Assessment (21% of total evaluation score)
 - a. Communicating expectations, directions, and procedures
 - b. Engagement
 - c. Questioning strategies
 - d. Utilizing structure and pacing
 - e. Providing feedback to students
 - f. Monitoring, adjusting and assessing

4. Communication and Professional Responsibility (21% of total evaluation score)
 - a. Relationships
 - b. Contributions
 - c. Record keeping
 - d. Professional growth
 - e. Professionalism
 - f. Reflecting on instruction

5. Student Achievement Growth (16% of total evaluation score)
 - a. Setting SMART goals
 - b. Monitoring SMART goals
 - c. Reporting SMART goals
 - d. Meeting classroom goal
 - e. Meeting PLC/Team goal
 - f. Supporting building SIP goal

A detailed rubric describing the characteristics of each element is attached (Appendix A), which will be used to score the final evaluation. In addition, we have provided a list of possible methods teachers may use to demonstrate proficiency in each of the elements (Appendix B). Please note that this is not an all-inclusive list. In addition, Appendix C, the Teacher Progress Worksheet, will be used by teachers and administrators to help gauge progress and identify areas of need throughout the course of the year.

The chart below explains the process of evaluation throughout one school year's time. Each teacher will be on one of three tracks, depending upon their tenure status and past evaluation results.

Plan I: Probationary Individual Development Plan	Plan II: Tenure Professional Growth Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher is assigned an appropriate mentor. • Teacher sets and administrator approves classroom SMART goal. • PLC teams set and administrator approves team SMART goal. • Multiple observations include formal observations, walk-throughs, and walk-bys. • Teacher and administrator meet by 1/31 for progress evaluation conference. • Any needed actions for improvement are noted on the teacher progress worksheet. • PLC teams and administrator meet by 2/28 for team progress evaluation conference. • Teacher and administrator meet by 5/15 for final evaluation conference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher sets and administrator approves classroom SMART goal. • PLC teams set and administrator approves team SMART goal. • Multiple observations include formal observations, walk-throughs, and walk-bys. • Teacher and administrator meet by 1/31 for progress evaluation conference. • Any needed actions for improvement are noted on the teacher progress worksheet. • PLC teams and administrator meet by 2/28 for team progress evaluation conference. • Teacher and administrator meet by 5/15 for final evaluation conference.

<p>Plan III:</p> <p>Tenure Assistance Corrective Development Plan</p> <p>(Minimally effective – 2.6 or below)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steps from Plan II are carried out concurrently with Plan III. • Administrator identifies concerns in writing. • Administrator and teacher create a corrective development plan to be implemented immediately. • Multiple observations include formal observations, walk-throughs, and walk-bys and are focused on areas identified as needing improvement. • If the concern is resolved the teacher returns to Plan II (Professional Growth). • If the concern is not resolved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The teacher remains on corrective development plan; and/or ○ Administration may take further action.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Measuring Student Growth

Student growth is the change in student achievement between two points in time. Identifying multiple measures of student growth must be based on objective criteria but are not limited to state standardized tests. In fact, it would be impossible to measure student growth solely by standardized tests because not all teachers instruct in grade levels or content areas that are tested. Classroom assessments are generally a more valid measure of individual teacher impact than standardized tests.

The Macomb County Intermediate School District has taken an inventory of student growth measures already used in Macomb County school districts in order to present options for measuring student growth.

Macomb County Student Growth Measurement Dashboard				
Elementary (Grades K-5/6)		Secondary (Grades 6/7-8/9)		Secondary (Grades 9/10-12)
MEAP Scale Scores (Grades 2-5/6)		MEAP Scale Scores (Grades 6 & 7)		MME Scale Scores (Grades 9/10-11)
MLPP (Grades K-3)		Department Common Assessments (Pre & Post) (Grades 6/7-8/9)		Department Common Assessments (Pre & Post) (Grades 9/10-12)
DIBELS (Grades K-3)		Standardized Test Results (NWEA; Iowa) (Grades 6/7-8/9)		# of Students- Credit Earned (Grades 9/10-12)
Common Assessment/Content Area (Grades K-5/6)		Student Performance Project Based (Grades 6/7-8/9)		AP Test Scores (Grades 10-12)
Standardized Test Results (Grades K-5/6)		Explore/Plan (Grades 6/7-8/9)		Graduation Rates (Grades 9/10-12)
Student Performance Project Based (Grades K-5/6)		# of Students Pass/Fail Rate (Grades 6/7-8/9)		ACT Work Keys (Grades 9/10-11)
Other Teacher Developed Assessments (Grades K-5/6)		Other Teacher Developed Assessments (Grades 6/7-8/9)		Student Performance Project Based (Grades 9/10-11/12)
				Explore/Plan (Grades 9/10)
				Other Teacher Developed Assessments (Grades 9-12)
Special Education	IEP Goals	MI-Access	Brigance Inventory	Woodcock Johnson

Using Teacher Determined SMART goals

One of the most effective ways to ensure flexibility and curricular relevance while producing objective measures of student learning growth is monitoring SMART goals. (SMART = Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-oriented, Time-bound.)

Incorporating SMART goals into an evaluation tool gives teachers a say in what they will be evaluated on and lets them set realistic goals. In practice, this means teachers will fill in goals for certain elements of the domain as part of the evaluation process. (Standard V)

Example: Using a SMART Goal and Pre-Test/Post-Test to Measure Student Growth by Classroom

A teacher gives his/her students a diagnostic test to benchmark student skills near the beginning of the school year. This could be a skills test that accompanies the curriculum, a district wide assessment, or any other task that will provide students the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge or skills. The diagnostic identifies specific content or core standards that will be covered over the course of the trimester. The teacher uses these diagnostic results to determine an area of need and creates a corresponding SMART goal. Throughout the course of the trimester the teacher administers formative assessments to make sure students are on target. At the completion of the trimester, students complete a summative assessment that measures the skills identified in the SMART goal. The difference between student performance on the diagnostic and summative assessment is calculated.

Attached as Appendix D is a SMART Goal Worksheet, intended to help teachers include the necessary components of an effective goal.

Scoring the Evaluation

For the **2011-2012** school year, standards I-IV will carry a weight of 21% each and standard V (Demonstrating Student Growth) will carry a weight of 16%. For the **2012-13** school year, all five standards will carry a weight of 20% each. Following that, the State of Michigan has determined that student achievement data will comprise the following percentages of teacher evaluations:

2013-14: 25%

2014-15: 40%

2015-16: 50%

Attached as Appendix E is a sample Teacher Evaluation Scoring Worksheet. Using the attached sample, the scoring for 2011-2012 would be as follows:

Standard	Total Score	Mean Score	Weight
I. Classroom Environment	14	$14/6 = 2.333$	mean* .21 = .49
II. Preparation and Planning	15	$15/5 = 3$	mean * .21 = .63
III. Instruction and Assessment	19	$19/6 = 3.166$	mean * .21 = .66
IV. Communication and Professional Responsibilities	18	$18/6 = 3$	mean * .21 = .63
V. Demonstrating Student Growth	15	$15/5 = 3$	mean * .16 = .48
			Total = 2.89

Teacher Score

Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
0 <1.5	1.5 <2.5	2.6 <3.5	3.5 <4

In the sample above, the teacher evaluation score indicates that he/she is effective.

Conclusion

The purpose of teacher evaluation in the Lake Shore Public Schools is to improve teaching practices, which leads to improved student achievement. The work that has been done in creating this new evaluation system

was truly a collaborative effort that provides teachers and administrators the opportunity to reflect on instructional strategies, assessment tools, student data, and professional responsibilities.