OBJECTIVES FOR THIS PRESENTATION

• Update status of Educator Effectiveness legislation and considerations
• Address local district considerations for implementing a quality program around Educator Effectiveness
• Gather questions and comments to incorporate into upcoming guidance and policy on Educator Effectiveness
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PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE MODELS

• MCEE Identified 4 Teacher Evaluation Tools
  • Thoughtful Classroom Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Model
• 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning
• Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching
• Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE CHALLENGES

• Time and capacity (workload) to do observations (to meet frequency and duration expectations)
• Some lack of understanding of processes and who should do observation
• Lack of consistent “look-fors” in categories of the observation process
• Lack of a student focused consideration (pedagogical content knowledge by content area)
• Inter-rater reliability
• No specialized observation tools for select fields
• Poor feedback on observations
• Local bias on observations (and inappropriate choices)
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE QUESTIONS

• Will all schools be required to use one of the MCEE Identified 4 Teacher Evaluation Tools?
• Will training be provided in the models?
• Will modified or alternate models be allowed?
• Will access to the tools of the models be provided?
• Will there be any attention to fidelity of implementation?
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Student Growth Legislation

▪ PUBLIC ACT 102 (PA 102 of 2011)

▪ PUBLIC ACT 257 (PA 257 of 2014)
  ▪ Student Growth--- At least 50% beginning in 2015-2016.

▪ Other Legislative action pending.
STUDENT GROWTH INDICATORS

• M–Step currently should be used for validity
• Student Growth Percentiles will be utilized at the state level in the future
• Local assessments are more likely to gauge student growth if appropriately selected and implemented
STUDENT GROWTH CONSIDERATIONS

• Student growth assessments should be aligned to standards
• Selection of assessments should allow for change in student outcomes measured over time
• Screeners and other diagnostic assessments for students are not appropriate for student growth indicators
• Student growth should be used in a diagnostic manner for supporting educators
Purpose of SLOs

- Support teachers’ instructional development
- Measure student growth
- Driven by individual teachers and teacher teams
- Can be used by ALL teachers, not just those in tested grades and subjects
- Align with Michigan’s school improvement process
What is an SLO?

- An SLO is a measurable, long-term, academic goal informed by available data that a teacher or teacher team sets at the beginning of the year for all students or for subgroups of students.
Why Use SLOs?

- SLOs reinforce evidence-based teaching practices.
- SLOs can be used with all teachers.
- SLOs are adaptable.
- SLOs encourage collaboration.
- SLOs acknowledge the value of educator knowledge and skill.
- SLOs connect teacher practice to student learning.
SLO Approaches

**Type 1**
Set by teacher or teacher team using available assessments

**Type 2**
Set by teacher or teacher team using assessment list or ranking

**Type 3**
Set by teacher or teacher team using common assessments

**Type 4**
Set by local education agency using common assessments and common growth targets

Increasing Teacher Agency

Increasing SLO Comparability
### Use in Districts and States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/State</th>
<th>Required to Use SLOs</th>
<th>Use of SLO Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Teachers and administrators</td>
<td>Compensation &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Teachers in NTGS</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood, MO</td>
<td>All teachers in SIG schools</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>All teachers in the default model</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Teachers in NTGS</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Teachers in NTGS</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville, OR</td>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>Teachers in NTGS</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Teachers in NTGS</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Offered for all teachers and principals</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Does Early Research Indicate?

- Teachers reported increased focus on student achievement and data use and increased use of evidence-based practices as a result of the SLO goal-setting process (Community Training and Assistance Center, 2013; What Works Clearinghouse, 2009).

- Teachers using SLOs valued the opportunity to analyze data and plan instruction as part of the SLO process and reported feeling “empowered” and taking a more active role in their evaluation after SLOs were implemented (Donaldson, 2012; TNTP, 2012).
Limitations of SLOs

▪ Lack of high-quality assessments for all grades and subjects
▪ Difficult to create appropriate growth targets for all students
▪ Challenging to set rigorous but realistic targets
▪ Limits of capacity and resources that make continuous improvement of the SLO process difficult
Culture Change

- SLOs may represent a shift in educator practice.
- Develop teacher confidence in the SLO process.
- Create a coherent vision of the value of the SLO process.
STUDENT GROWTH CHALLENGES

• Not sure of appropriate growth measures
• Lack of analytical understanding of growth data (raw score vs. norm vs. Normed...)
• Not sure how to combine growth and observation data
• Lack of consistent “look-fors” in categories
• Lack of an infrastructure in schools for SLOs
• Public perception of growth (lack of a perfect solution)
• Most likely misdiagnosed for a PD plan
• Confusion about assessment choice results
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Educator Evaluation
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EDUCATOR EVALUATION

- Rigorous, transparent, and fair
- Annual evaluation is required
- 50% based on student growth data
- Dismissal for 3 ineffective ratings
- Biennial evaluation allowed for those receiving 3 consecutive “highly effective” ratings
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PROFESSIONAL LEARNING CHALLENGES

• Time and capacity to create individual PD plans for each educator
• Poor feedback from growth or observation data
• Limited support and resources to implement the actual professional development for individual teachers
• Focus on content vs. breadth
• Lack of connection of data to instructional priorities (i.e. MTSS implementation)
• Personal vs whole school professional development
• Observers may not be most prepared in pedagogy.
WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS?

Please use the evaluation form to provide comments or questions about what is stated here.

Your opinion counts!