Teacher Collaborative Growth and Evaluation Model

Teacher Evaluation Work Group
Model Approval and Feedback
Thursday, December 13th, 2012

Minnesota Department of
Education

"Leading for educational excellence and equity. Every day for every one."

TEWG Vision Statement

A teacher growth and evaluation system

- **Embeds support and professional learning throughout the system**

- **Includes multiple measures of practice and effectiveness**

- **Is transparent, sustainable, consistent, and sufficiently flexible**

- **Results in increased student learning and success**

Meeting Updates

- **Dec 7th Subcommittee Leads Meeting**
- **Hope Street Group – Networking Site**
- **Approval of Model**
- **January and February Meetings**

Default Model Approval

Agreements

- "The department, in consultation with [the work group], must create and publish a teacher evaluation process that complies with the requirements [in statute]"
- Seeking approval of the MODEL, not the statutes
- Today's model is NOT a final draft
    - Commissioner
    - Pilot Period
    - Ongoing Development
    - Local Revisions

An affirmative vote is agreement…

- That the model is compliant with statute
- That the model is a first step toward our vision and toward state-wide implementation of educator evaluation
- That the model was developed in consultation with this work group
- That I will continue to support this work even if some elements are not currently how I would have personally defined them

Updates to Draft Model Proposals for Revisions and Work Group Decision Points

- **Points of Contact—Number, role of peer reviewer, "formal" and "informal"**

- **Component Weights**

- **Scale for Summative Performance Ratings**

- **Definition of "Summative Evaluator"**

- **Use of student survey data—"Primary" versus one equally "represented" sources of evidence/measures**

- **Training—Standards of effective practice (MN rule 8710.2000) versus only training specific to default model**

- **Year of Summative Evaluation—Year 3 versus year 1**

Minnesota Department of

Education

Points of Contact

- **Original draft** *(See handout.)*
- **Proposals—Number of POCs, role of peer reviewer(s), "formal" and "informal"** *(See handout.)*
- **Subcommittee leads recommendation** *(See handout.)*
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Component Weights

- **Original draft—TP-50%, SLA-35%, SE-15%**
- **Proposals—TP-55%, SLA-35%, SE-10% _and_ TP-45%, SLA-35%, and SE-20%** _(See spreadsheet.)_
- **Subcommittee leads recommendation--TP-50%, SLA-35%, SE-15%**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Scale for Summative Performance Ratings

- **Original draft** *(See at right.)*
- **Proposal—Expand "Effective" and "Development Needed;" Decrease "Unsatisfactory"**
- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

3.5-4.0—Exemplary
2.5-3.49—Effective
1.5-2.49—Development Needed
1.0-1.49—Unsatisfactory

Definition of "Summative Evaluator"

- **Original draft--"The summative evaluator is an individual who holds a valid Minnesota administrative license and who has successfully completed the evaluator training supporting the default model offered by the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE)."**

- **Proposals—Remove requirement for administrative licensure**

- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**

- **Other factors to consider**

- **Discussion**

- **Decision**

Minnesota Department of
Education

Use of Student Survey Data

- **Current draft** *(See handout side 1.)*

- **Proposals** *(See handout side 2.)*

- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**

- **Other factors to consider**

- **Discussion**

- **Decision**

Training

- **Original draft—Training by MDE is specific to default model.**
- **Proposals—Training by MDE also includes teaching standards in rule for all districts.**
- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Year of Summative Evaluation

- **Original draft—Year 3 of professional review cycle**
- **Proposals—Summative occurs in year 1 of cycle**
- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Draft Default Model – Additional Proposals

Student Learning Goals

- Shared goal versus no shared goal
- Three, two or one SLG

- Holistic vs. Numeric Methods
- Weighting Goals

- Proficiency vs. Growth

Shared Performance Goal

- **Original draft—Shared performance is 5% of student learning and achievement component**
- **Proposals—Remove shared performance goal**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

SLG Process: Clarifications

1. **Choose quality assessments**
   - Must choose highest level of commonality and confidence
   - Aligned to state standards (or national/professional)
2. **Determine student starting points**
   - Using available data, including beginning of course diagnostic tests (pre-tests)
   - Assigned groups: low, medium, high level of preparedness
3. **Set student learning goals**
   - Given starting points, where will students end?
4. **Track progress and refine instruction**
5. **Review results and score**
   - To what degree did student performance improve?
   - Did the teacher fall short of, meet or exceed goal?

Number of Student Learning Goals

- **Original draft—3 goals: class, targeted need, shared performance**

- **Proposals—reduce to 2 or 1 goal.**

- **Other factors to consider**

- **Discussion**

- **Decision**

SLGs: Proficiency or Growth

- **Original draft—Goal based on levels of preparedness and mastery (proficiency/growth blend)**
- **Proposals—Goal based on growth**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Minnesota Department of
Education

SLG: Proficiency/Growth Combination

Achievement: meeting a uniform and pre-determined level of mastery on subject or grade level standards. *Achievement is a set point or "bar" that is the same for all students, regardless of where they begin.*

Growth: improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade level standard over a period of time. *Growth differentiates mastery expectations based on baseline performance.*

Pre-Assess: (assign "level of preparedness")

Low = 10 (40%)   Med = 10 (40%)

High = 5 (20%)

Goal: ("To be effective, I will…")

Non-Mastery = 2 (8%)

Partial-Mastery = 11 (44%)

Mastery = 12 (48%)

Results: (How did students do on assessment?)

Non-Mastery = 2 (8%)

Partial Mastery = 10 (40%)

Mastery = 13 (52%)

SLG: Proficiency or Growth?

- **"SLOs may be more effective in measuring *achievement* rather than student growth" ~ EducationCounsel**

- **Colorado, DC, Wisconsin, Indiana, Rhode Island and others all use SLOs and all have ESEA waivers**

- **"True" growth = Pre- and Post-tests that are valid, reliable and (relatively) bias-free**
  - **Do teachers have capacity to develop these?**
  - **Does our work group want the state to develop these?**

SLGs: Proficiency or Growth

- **Original draft—Goal based on levels of preparedness and mastery (proficiency/growth blend)**
- **Proposals—Goal based on growth**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Minnesota Department of
Education

Student Learning and Achievement Component Rating

- **Original draft—Weighted percentages and numerical approach** *(See handout.)*
- **Proposals—Holistic approach** *(See handout.)*
- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**
- **Other factors to consider**
- **Discussion**
- **Decision**

Student Learning and Achievement Component: Numeric (& weighted) vs. Holistic

How should evaluators determine a student learning and achievement component rating? *(See handout.)*

Numeric (current draft)

- Based on student outcome data
- 3 groups of teachers
- Weights for each SLG
  - Weights for each SLG (20%, 10%, 5%) and VA data
  - How to treat each of 3 years?
- Only component based on numeric approach

Holistic (proposal)

- Based on student outcome data
- Groups unnecessary
- Weights unnecessary—Rubric would be applied

- All components based on holistic approach

Student Learning and Achievement Component Rating

- **Original draft—Weighted percentages and numerical approach** *(See handout.)*

- **Proposals—Holistic approach** *(See handout.)*

- **Subcommittee leads recommendation**

- **Other factors to consider**

- **Discussion**

- **Decision**

Minnesota Department of
Education

An affirmative vote is agreement…

- That the model is compliant with statute
- That the model is a first step toward our vision and toward state-wide implementation of educator evaluation
- That the model was developed in consultation with this work group
- That I will continue to support this work even if some elements are not currently how I would have personally defined them