

Ten Things to Know about Principal and Teacher Evaluation in Minnesota

1. What is MDE currently doing to support principal evaluation work for local districts?

The VIVA report on principal evaluation written by Minnesota teachers is providing recommendations for the work group.

The example model has been completed is being piloted in the upcoming school year in 17 Minnesota districts. The model will be refined based on pilot feedback.

- Austin Public Schools
- Morris Area Public Schools
- Northfield Public Schools
- Waseca School District
- Farmington Area Public Schools
- Lakeville Area Public Schools
- South St. Paul Public Schools
- Braham Area Schools
- Cass Lake-Bena Schools
- Montevideo Public Schools
- Brooklyn Center Community Schools
- St. Peter School District
- East Central Schools
- Ogilvie Public School District
- Roseville Area Schools
- Red Lake Public School District
- Waubun-Ogema-White Earth School District

A three-part series of district informational meetings are planned for October/November, January/February, and May/June.

2. How does the state example model for principal evaluation meet the requirement for “on the job observations and previous evaluations”?

Evaluators continually observe principal leadership practices and review evidence of performance.

Principals self-assess annually based on previous evaluation results.

Observations, evidence review, and self-assessment are based on five performance measures.

3. Are stakeholder surveys part of the state example model for principal evaluation?

Stakeholder feedback is included as one of the three model components.

No survey is included in the state example model. The choice of the survey strategies and tools is a district decision.

MDE, in collaboration with FHI360 and principals, will offer survey recommendations and resources based on the pilot.

4. How does the state example model for principal evaluation incorporate “data on student academic growth” for 35% of the performance rating and include “district achievement goals and targets”?

The school performance measure component reflects both outcomes (achievement of school goals) and continuous school improvement planning.

The model component is based on school improvement planning priorities and progress towards student academic goals.

MCA results and other measures are used in the model. Results (or goals) and measures are based on school and district priorities.

5. How does the state example model for principal evaluation “implement a plan to improve the principal’s performance”?

Based on the final performance rating, which includes all three model components, one of three types of professional growth plans is developed—a self-directed plan, a jointly-developed plan, or an improvement plan.

The summative evaluation and professional development plan inform the following year's self-assessment and professional goals.

6. What is the role of the state's teacher evaluation work group in districts' teacher evaluation work?

The teacher evaluation work group is made up of appointed stakeholders including teachers, union representatives, principals, district leaders, parents, and business partners.

The work group is developing a default teacher evaluation model which will be adopted by local districts that fail to reach agreement on a model with their local unions. The model will also be available as an example model for districts.

The work group is currently working in six subcommittees—growth and evaluation cycle and activities, performance standards, student achievement data, student engagement data, professional development, and LEA implementation and support.

7. What are the expectations for the required elements of teacher evaluation like “qualified and trained evaluators,” “value-added,” “measures of student growth,” “support to improve,” and “data on student engagement and connection”?

The design or adoption of a teacher evaluation model is a local decision and responsibility. Districts and their local teacher unions must reach “agreement” on a model or adopt the state default model.

The state's default teacher evaluation model will offer guidelines that can be used as examples for meeting the requirements in legislation.

8. What is the Department's timeline for supporting teacher evaluation work in local districts?

Through the VIVA project, teachers will be able to provide input into the design of the default teacher evaluation model. The project will begin at the end of August 2012, and their final report will be completed in October 2012.

Districts will receive a survey in the fall regarding current practices and implementation plans. Districts are asked to complete the survey in collaboration with input from their local teacher unions.

The teacher evaluation work group has a self-imposed deadline of December 31, 2012 for submitting their model to the Commissioner. Components of the model will be piloted and refined in spring 2013, and the full model will be piloted in school year 2013-2014.

A three-part series of district informational meetings are planned for October/November, January/February, and May/June.

A website of planning resources and examples will be posted along with the work group's default teacher evaluation model.

9. What role does educator evaluation play in Minnesota's No Child Left Behind Waiver?

Principal and teacher evaluation is one of four components of our approved NCLB Waiver.

As part of the Waiver, the state must adopt guidelines for principal and teacher evaluation in the state. Our legislation contains the guidelines for districts.

MDE must also support and monitor local districts' adoption and implementation of principal and teacher evaluation models as part of our waiver.

10. What next steps would you recommend as districts move forward with principal and teacher evaluation work?

[Review the legislation and work group resources – Principal Evaluation Work Group](#)

[Review the legislation and work group resources – Teacher Evaluation Work Group](#)

Identify stakeholder group(s) and individuals for collaboration—principals and teachers. (Are there others?)

Establish a district vision and goals for educator evaluation.

Assess current evaluation practices to identify strengths and to determine their levels of compliance with the requirements in legislation.

Research models being used in other Minnesota districts and in other states.