



Teacher Development and Evaluation (TDE)

Update Presentation
May 2014

Committee Members



- Marcy Doud, Director of Special Programs
- Linda Goers, Director of Human Resources
- Cari Jo Kiffmeyer, Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
- Anne Bolsem, Teacher
- Julie Ching, Teacher
- Diane Thompson, Teacher

Legislative Changes



Minnesota Statute section 122A.40 defines requirements for teacher evaluation. A school board (“school district” or “district”) and an exclusive representative of the teachers (“union” or “teacher’s union”) may collaboratively “develop a teacher evaluation and peer review process for probationary and continuing contract teachers through joint agreement” or they must adopt the state plan.

Districts must begin evaluating teachers under TDE in the 2014-2015 school year.

Legislative Requirements



Minnesota Statute 122A.40 requires the district to have a teacher evaluation model that includes all of the following:

- A joint agreement between school board and teacher union;
- An individual growth and development plan;
- A three-year review cycle;
- Three evaluations annually for probationary teachers;
- It must align with Minnesota Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers;
- The opportunity for teachers to participate in a PLC;

Legislative Requirements



- Coordinated staff development and teacher evaluation;
- Peer coaching/review by trained observers;
- At least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator during a three-year cycle;
- The option for a teacher portfolio;
- A teacher improvement plan (TIP) including goals, timelines, and discipline;
- 35% of evaluation based on growth data from valid, reliable, standards-aligned assessments;
- Longitudinal data on student engagement.

Agreed Upon Beliefs



- Quality instruction increases student achievement, therefore there is an emphasis on Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation, and Domain 3 – Instruction.
- Inter-rater reliability should be part of the process as to ensure reliable and consistent observations.
- As much as possible, we should align with current ATPPS plan to minimize change.
- Use current rubrics, however, minor modifications to some rubrics may be needed to address student engagement requirement and other TDE components.

TDE/ATPPS Comparison



ATPPS

- Possible total stipend of \$1785
- Three observations per year

- Collaborative Teams
- Three year review cycle
- Peer review
- High Cycle
- Framework with four domains used for proficiency
- PGP with Student Achievement Goal
- Pre and Post Observations

TDE

- Portfolio Option
- Teacher Improvement Plan
- Student Engagement Component
- Student Achievement score must be 35% of evaluation
- Discipline for teachers who do not adequately improve
- Three Year Summative Evaluation
- Specific domains used for each observation

Process



Annual Summative Assessment

- Component One – Teacher Practice
- Component Two - Student Engagement
- Component Three - Student Learning and Achievement

Three-Year Summative Evaluation

- Component 1 (65%)
- Component 2 (longitudinal data)
- Component 3 (35%)

Teacher Improvement Process

Portfolio Option

Teacher Practice



- The Teacher Practice component includes teacher activities that impact student outcomes.
- Key Components:
 - Framework of Instruction
 - Point System for Annual Summative Assessment and Three-Year Summative Evaluation

Teacher Practice - Probationary



- The principal/ administrator will observe all 4 Domains in each evaluation.
- One evaluation must be done by a different evaluator for inter-rater reliability
- Proficiency Point System:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
3 points	50%+ Proficient	60% + Proficient	75% + Proficient
2 points	41-49% Proficient	51 - 59% Proficient	51 - 74% Proficient
1 point	0-40% Proficient	0 - 50% Proficient	0-50% Proficient

Teacher Practice – Continuing Contract



	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
<p>Year 1 (non-high cycle)</p> <p>IPC observes all 3 rounds.</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) or Domain 2 (Environment)</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain chosen in Round 1, year 1</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain chosen in Round 1, year 1</p>
<p>Year 2 (non-high cycle)</p> <p>IPC observes all 3 rounds.</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain not chosen in year 1: Domain 1 or Domain 2</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain chosen in Round 1, year 2</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain chosen in Round 1, year 2</p>
<p>Year 3 (high cycle)</p> <p>Rounds 1 and 3 by Principal/Administrator</p> <p>Round 2 by IPC</p> <p><i>*For Special Education Staff, Domain 5 will be observed by Special Ed administrator during 1 round of observations</i></p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) and</p> <p>Domain 2 (Environment)</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation)</p>	<p>Domain 3 (Instruction) and</p> <p>Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) and</p> <p>Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities)</p>



Student Engagement



TDE requires longitudinal data on student engagement; therefore, Domain 3 - Instruction will be evaluated in all observations.

Student engagement will be reviewed at the ELEMENT level of Component 3c. “Engaging Students in Learning”

- activities and assignments
- grouping of students
- instructional materials and resource
- structure and pacing

Student Engagement



	Improvement Needed	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. Activities and Assignments	The learning tasks/ activities, materials, and resources are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses, with only one approach possible.	The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students and little opportunity for them to explain their thinking, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant.	The learning tasks and activities are fully aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible. This technique results in active intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content and with teacher scaffolding to support that engagement.	Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well designed learning tasks and activities that require complex thinking by students. The teacher provides suitable scaffolding and challenges students to explain their thinking.

Student Engagement



	Improvement Needed	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
2. Grouping of students	The groupings of students are unsuitable to the activities.	The groupings of students are moderately suitable to the activity.	The groupings of students are suitable to the activities.	There is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and student contributions to the exploration of important content; students may serve as resources for one another.

Student Engagement



	Improvement Needed	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
3. Instructional Materials and Resources	Instructional materials and resources are unsuitable to the instructional purposes or do not engage students mentally.	Instructional materials and resources are only partially suitable to the instructional purposes, or students are only partially mentally engaged with them.	Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students mentally.	Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional purposes, engage students mentally, and students initiate the choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance their learning.

Student Engagement



	Improvement Needed	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
4. Structure and Pacing	The lesson has no clearly defined structure or the pace of the lesson is too slow or too rushed.	The lesson has recognizable structure; however the pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged or may be so slow that many students have a considerable amount of “downtime”.	The lesson has clearly defined structure, and the pacing is appropriate, providing most students with the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	The lesson has a clearly defined structure, and the pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed not only to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning but also to consolidate their understanding.

Sample Scoring for Student Engagement



Year 1 Observation 1

Overall Component Score	Observation 1	Proficiency
Proficient (3 out of 4 Proficient)	Activities and Assignments	Yes
	Grouping of Students	Yes
	Instructional Materials and Resources	Yes
	Structure and Pacing	No

Sample Scoring for Student Engagement



Year 1 Observation 2

Overall Component Score	Observation 2	Proficiency
Not Proficient (2 out of 4 Proficient)	Activities and Assignments	Yes
	Grouping of Students	No
	Instructional Materials and Resources	Yes
	Structure and Pacing	No

Sample Scoring for Student Engagement



Year 1 Observation 3

Overall Component Score	Observation 3	Proficiency
Proficient (3 out of 4 Proficient)	Activities and Assignments	No
	Grouping of Students	Yes
	Instructional Materials and Resources	Yes
	Structure and Pacing	Yes

Sample Scoring for Student Engagement



Three Year Student Engagement Summary

	Observation 1	Observation 2	Observation 3
Year 1	Proficient	Not Proficient	Proficient
Year 2	Not Proficient	Proficient	Proficient
Year 3	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient

7/9 = 78%, therefore the Student Engagement component is met.

Student Engagement



Due to the prescriptive nature of their work, OT's, Psychologists, Speech Pathologists, Nurses, Counselors and TOSA's will not be evaluated under the student engagement component in Domain 3. However, these positions will be evaluated for engagement as it relates to their constituents.

Student Learning and Achievement



- The student learning and achievement component will comprise 35% of the final summative performance rating for a teacher.
- A teacher will set either an achievement or growth goal.

Defined:

Achievement is defined as meeting a uniform and pre-determined level of proficiency on subject or grade level standards.

Growth is defined as improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade level standard over a period of time.

Whereas achievement sets a “bar” that students must reach, growth differentiates proficiency expectations based on baseline performance.

Student Learning and Achievement



Achievement Goal – meeting a uniform and pre-determined level of proficiency on subject or grade level standards.

Option #1 – Set a goal using MAP, BAS, MCA, ACCESS, IGDI, etc. data.

Option #2 – Set a goal using a classroom assessment.

Option #3 – Set a goal using standards of practice (e.g. nursing, psychologists, counselors, etc.).

Growth Goal – improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade level standard over a period of time.

A growth goal target must be based on a standardized or normed assessment and include baseline data.

Student Learning and Achievement

At the beginning of every school year, each teacher completes a Professional Growth Plan that includes a Student Learning Goal (SLG).

Each SLG includes:

1. Identification – population, assessments, interval of instruction
2. Evidence or baseline data
3. Goal and Alignment – SMART goal and alignment to District or Building CIP
4. Action Plan – steps, timeline, resources
5. Results – summary and evidence

Student Learning and Achievement



1 - Improvement Needed (ATPPS - \$0)	2 - Developing (ATPPS - \$100)	3 - Proficient (ATPPS - \$200)
The teacher has not met the SLG and has not carried out the steps of the action plan.	The teacher has not met the SLG but has carried out the steps in the action plan.	The teacher has met the SLG and has carried out the steps of the action plan.

Student Learning and Achievement Rating Completed Annually

SLG = Student Learning Goal, part of the Professional Growth Plan (PGP)

*Probationary and High Cycle - reviewed by Administrator

**Non-High Cycle - reviewed by Instructional Peer Coach

Annual Summative Assessment



Probationary Teachers - To be proficient, a probationary teacher must have the following percentages of proficient or exemplary ratings when the two highest observations within each domain are combined:

- 1ST year probationary teacher – 50% or more
- 2ND year probationary teacher – 60% or more
- 3RD year probationary teacher – 75% or more

Annual Summative Assessment



Probationary teachers are then given a numerical score based on their proficiency. These scores are used on the Three Year Summative Evaluation.

First Year Teacher (Component One):

- 50%+ Proficient = 3 points
- 41-49% Proficient = 2 points
- 0-40% Proficient = 1 point

Second Year Teacher (Component One):

- 60%+ Proficient = 3 points
- 51-59% Proficient = 2 points
- 0-50% Proficient = 1 point

Annual Summative Assessment



Third Year Teacher and teachers who need only one year to reach continuing contract status (Component One):

- 75%+ Proficient = 3 points
- 51-74% Proficient = 2 points
- 0-50% Proficient = 1 point

Annual Summative Assessment



Continuing Contract Teachers - To be proficient, a continuing contract teacher must have 75% or more proficient or exemplary ratings when the two highest observations for each selected domain area are combined.

Teachers are then given a numerical score based on their proficiency. These scores are used on the Three Year Summative Evaluation.

- 75%+ Proficient = 3 points
- 51-74% Proficient = 2 points
- 0-50% Proficient = 1 point

Sample Scoring on Annual Summative Assessment



Observer/ Evaluator	Domain Observed	Domain Score	Score for Use on 3 Year Summative Evaluation	Received ATPPS Stipend?
Peer Coach	Domain 1 (Planning & Prep)	3 (75+% proficient)	2.5 Calculation (3 + 2 = 5) (5 / 2 = 2.5)	No
	Domain 3 (Instruction)	2 (51 - 74% proficient)		

Three Year Summative Evaluation



At the end of the High Cycle year, there will be a Three Year Summative Evaluation to evaluate the three years of the TDE cycle. A final performance rating will be determined in the Three Year Summative Evaluation.

The Student Learning and Achievement (Component Three) will comprise 35% of the Summative Evaluation, and Teacher Practice (Component One) will comprise 65% of the Summative Evaluation.

A teacher with a Summative Evaluation score of “Improvement Needed” will enter the Teacher Improvement Process.

Three-year Summative Evaluation



Chart to calculate Summative Score

Model Component	Score for Summative Evaluation (3 year average)	Component Weight (multiplier)	Product
Teacher Practice (Component One)		.65	
Student Learning and Achievement (Component Three)		.35	
		Total Summative Score	

Three-year Sample Summative Evaluation



Model Component	Score for Summative Evaluation (3 year average)	Component Weight (multiplier)	Product
Teacher Practice (Component One) *If a portfolio is used, the portfolio will be added here.	Year One: $3+2 = 5$ $(5/2=2.5)$ Year Two: $3+3 = 6$ $(6/2=3)$ Year Three: $3+2 = 5$ $(5/2=2.5)$ Three Year Total: $(2.5 + 3 + 2.5 = 8)$ $(8/3 = 2.7)$.65 $(2.7 \times .65)$	1.8
Student Learning and Achievement (Component Three)	Year One: 3 Year Two: 2 Year Three: 2 Three Year Total: $(3 + 2 + 2 = 7)$ $(7/3 = 2.3)$.35 $(2.3 \times .35)$.8
		Total Summative Score	2.6 Proficient

Three-year Summative Evaluation



Proficiency Rating for Three Year Summative Score

Total Three Year Summative Score	Proficiency Rating (Circle One)
2.6	2.1 - 3.0 Proficient 1.1 - 2.0 Developing 0.0 - 1.0 Improvement Needed**

** A Proficiency Rating score of “Improvement Needed” will result in the teacher entering the Teacher Improvement Process.

Portfolio Option



A teacher has the right to submit a portfolio to the summative evaluator as an additional source of evidence for the Three Year Summative Evaluation.

The portfolio is a collection of evidence and artifacts demonstrating teacher practice, student engagement, and student learning and achievement.

The portfolio is ***optional*** and can be use to enhance the overall score for Teacher Practice under Component One.

The summative evaluator will use the portfolio option as an additional scoring measure, however it will not replace annual classroom observations.

Portfolio Option



A rubric will be used by the Summative Evaluator to evaluate the portfolio and an overall rating will be given (Proficient = 3 points; Developing = 2 points; Improvement Needed = 1 point).

A teacher may request that an additional administrator evaluate the portfolio.

In the event that two evaluations are done, the scores will be averaged.

If a teacher chooses to use the portfolio option, it will be used on the Three Year Summative Evaluation under Teacher Practice as a fourth measure.

Teacher Improvement Process (TIP)



The Teacher Improvement Process in itself is not disciplinary; rather, this process supports teacher improvement for a teacher identified by an administrator/principal as not meeting standards based on the ISD 197 Framework for Effective Teaching.

However, a teacher who does not make adequate progress in the Teacher Improvement Process is subject to discipline.

Teacher Improvement Process (TIP)



The formal Teacher Improvement Process will begin when one of the following occurs:

- A teacher receives written notice to discuss the development of a formal plan if sufficient improvement did not occur during the informal process.
- A teacher receives written notice due to:
 - Two or more “Improvement Needed” ratings in one identified domain; or
 - Three or more “Improvement Needed” ratings across multiple domains.
- A teacher receives an “Improvement Needed” rating on a Three Year Summative Evaluation.

TDE/ATPPS Voting



- Two Questions on Ballot:

1) Do you accept/reject the TDE plan written collaboratively by ISD 197 and the West St. Paul Federation of Teachers?

If yes, this TDE plan will go into effect for the 2014-2015 school year. If no, the Minnesota Department of Education Teacher Evaluation Default Model will go into effect for the 2014-2015 school year.

2) Do you accept/reject the ATPPS plan changes written for the TDE plan?

If yes, the ATPPS plan will align with the TDE plan. If no, there will be two separate coaching and evaluation systems (TDE State plan and ATPPS plan).

Dates for Voting

- May 20th and 21st. Ballots due by 3:30 on May 21st.