



# 2015 DAS FALL Conferences

for Assessment and Accountability  
Michigan Department of Education


EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS (EVALUATION)




# 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

# THE EFFECTIVE EDUCATOR SYSTEM



# THE EFFECTIVE EDUCATOR SYSTEM



# 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?

# THE EFFECTIVE EDUCATOR SYSTEM





# Student Growth Legislation

---

- PUBLIC ACT 102 (PA 102 of 2011)
  - Student Growth—25% in 2013-2014, 40% in 2014-2015, 50% in 2015-2016.
- 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



# Use in Districts and States

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

Source: Lachlan-Haché, L., Matlach, L., Cushing, E., Mean, M., & Reese, K. (2013). *Student learning objectives: Early lessons from the Teacher Incentive Fund*. Washington, DC: Teacher Incentive Fund Technical Assistance Network.



# 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

# THE EFFECTIVE EDUCATOR SYSTEM




# 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



# THE EFFECTIVE EDUCATOR SYSTEM



# 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!**



2015 DAS FALL  
Conferences

---

for Assessment and Accountability  
Michigan Department of Education

