Minnesota Department of
Educatiͦn

Checklist for Evaluation Models

Directions: District teams may use these checklists to assess their evaluation models. Checklists summarize statutory language; districts are required to meet the language in statute.

Principal Development and Evaluation

Is the model designed to
1. Enhance a principal's leadership skills?
2. Support and improve teaching practices, school performance, student achievement?
3. Improve teaching and learning by supporting the principal in shaping the school's professional environment?
4. Improve teaching and learning by supporting the principal in developing teacher quality, performance, and effectiveness?
5. Support and improve a principal's instructional leadership?
6. Support and improve a principal's organizational management
7. Strengthen a principal's capacity in the areas of instruction, supervision, evaluation, and teacher development

The model…

☐ Annually evaluates school principals

☐ Includes both formative and summative evaluations (Does the model include ongoing evaluation of performance and feedback throughout the year as well as a summative evaluation?)

☐ Is consistent with a principal's job description *(Do performance measures and expectations align with the position description?)*

☐ Is consistent with a district's long-term plans and goals and a principal's own professional multi-year growth plans and goals *(Does the evaluation process include a growth plan for principals that aligns with performance measures and supports the district vision and priorities?)*

☐ Includes previous evaluations *(How does the annual evaluation acknowledge and/or consider growth and previous performance?)*

☐ Incorporates district achievement goals and targets

Components

☐ Includes on-the-job observations (Is there a process for ongoing observation of leadership practices?)

☐ Allows surveys to help identify a principal's effectiveness, leadership skills and processes, and strengths and weaknesses in exercising leadership in pursuit of school success *(Does the model include a survey of stakeholders? Does the survey measure a principal's leadership and management process' strengths and weaknesses? Is survey data used for self-assessment, feedback, growth planning, and/or summative evaluation?)*

☐ Uses longitudinal data on student academic growth as 35% of the evaluation

Implementation

☐ Is linked to professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and collaborative professional culture *(Are evaluation results used to plan ongoing professional development?)*

☐ For principals not meeting standards, implements a plan to improve a principal's performance *(Is there an improvement process?)*

☐ For principals not meeting standards, specifies the procedure and consequence if performance is not improved *(If applicable, discipline decisions should align to contract, school board policy, and state statute.)*

Teacher Development and Evaluation

Was the model jointly agreed to by the school board and an exclusive representative of the teachers in the district?

Is the model designed to improve student learning and success?

The model…

For probationary teachers

☐ Provides three evaluations annually

☐ Provides for the first evaluation to occur within the first 90 days of employment

For all teachers

☐ Establishes a three-year professional review cycle

☐ Includes a minimum of one summative evaluation in the three-year professional review cycle

☐ Requires that qualified evaluators (such as school administrators) perform summative evaluations *(Are qualifications defined in the model?)*

☐ Includes evaluation by a peer review in years when a tenured teacher is not evaluated by a summative evaluator (122A.40)

☐ Includes an *option* for a teacher to present a portfolio of evidence for the summative evaluation
- o Reflection
- o Professional growth
- o Self-assessment based on student and teacher work samples

Training for Reviewers

☐ Requires training for observers serving as peer coaches/reviewers

☐ Requires training for summative evaluators

Model Components

☐ Is based on professional teaching standards established in rule (MN Rule 8710.2000) *(Do the evaluation and performance measures align with standards in Rule?)*

☐ Uses value-added data *or* student growth measures as 35% of teacher evaluation results
- o Where available, uses data from an agreed-upon value-added assessment model
- o Uses state or local measures of student growth for the grade levels and subject areas for which value-added data are not available

☐ Includes longitudinal data on student engagement and connection *(Does the model define student engagement/connection? Are measures of student engagement/connection identified? Are data from measures collected longitudinally (at several points in time) in the model? Is the data used for self-assessment, feedback, peer coaching/review, and/or summative evaluation?)*

Implementation

☐ Includes peer coaching/review and/or has teachers participate in professional learning communities

☐ Includes an individual growth and development plan in the three-year professional review cycle

☐ Coordinates staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes *(Are there professional development activities that support evaluation activities? Are evaluation results used to plan ongoing professional development?)*

☐ Identifies teachers not meeting professional teaching standards *(Are expectations for performance explicitly set in the model?)*

☐ Includes a teacher improvement process for teachers not meeting standards

☐ Has established goals in the teacher improvement process

☐ Has established timelines in the teacher improvement process

☐ Disciplines a teacher for not making adequate progress in the teacher improvement process *(Discipline decisions should align to teacher contract, school board policy, and state statute)*

Optionally

☐ Provides time during the school day and school year for peer coaching

☐ Provides time during the school day for teacher collaboration

☐ Includes mentoring and induction programs

Questions for Peer Review Feedback and Reflection

1. What is one question you would offer to the model's developer(s) to stimulate their thinking about the model?
2. If requirements were missing, what advice or planning considerations would you offer to the developer?
3. What practices or aspects of the model have the greatest potential to impact student learning? How?
4. As the model's developer plans for implementation, what do you foresee as potential barriers specific to this model? What advice can you offer for addressing those barriers?
5. How has reviewing this model furthered your thinking about educator development and evaluation? In other words, what have you learned by reviewing the model?