



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

December 22, 2010

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Local and Intermediate School District Superintendents  
Public School Academy Directors and Authorizers

FROM: Sally Vaughn, Ph.D. *Sally*  
Deputy Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer

Thomas Howell, Director *Thomas Howell*  
Center for Educational Performance and Information

SUBJECT: Educator Performance Evaluation Systems

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) distributed \$1.3 billion to school districts through the federal State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) to implement and conduct several activities, including educator evaluations. The SFSF grant required your district, as a condition of receiving funds, to sign assurances that included providing reports needed to fulfill the state's grant application.

In addition, state law provides that your district adopt and implement an annual performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators. This system is to be developed with teacher and administrator involvement and include state and local measures of student growth as a significant factor. The law also provides that you locally determine the ways in which the results of these evaluations will be used to inform decisions related to the promotion, retention, development, tenure/certification, removal, and compensation of teachers and administrators.

Senate Bill 1509, which is expected to be signed into law by the Governor, provides an effective date of September 1, 2011, for the **new** evaluation systems for teachers and administrators. It also clarifies that if a collective bargaining agreement was in effect as of January 4, 2010, and it prevents compliance with the new evaluation requirements, then those requirements do not apply until after the agreement's expiration. Finally, the bill makes clear that even with the delayed effective date, districts must still submit the data you agreed to submit in your SFSF assurances.

To ensure the security of your SFSF funds, Michigan must demonstrate progress toward meeting SFSF goals by September 30, 2011. To demonstrate your district's progress toward implementation of annual teacher and administrator evaluations,

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
CASANDRA E. ULBRICH • DANIEL VARNER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

December 22, 2010

Page 2

the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) will conduct two data-gathering activities. The first will link teacher and student data through district submission of student course-taking and academic progress data and a reported "teacher of record." The second will add a field to the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) to allow you to report the results of your annual educator evaluations.

For the 2010-2011 school year, data must be reported on the effectiveness ratings of all principals, as required in the SFSF assurances. We understand that you may not have had adequate time to design, bargain, and implement a new principal evaluation system for the current school year. Therefore, we are asking that you report the results of the **most recent evaluation** for all your district principals in the end-of-year 2011 collection of the REP. Data on the results of evaluations for teachers will be collected beginning April 1 through June 30, 2011.

MDE and CEPI will distribute more detailed information in the next several weeks regarding these data collection activities. MDE has developed an overview document to provide you with additional information (see attached "Understanding Michigan's Educator Evaluations"). Additional information is posted on our new educator evaluation webpage. Go to [www.michigan.gov/oeaa](http://www.michigan.gov/oeaa) and click on "Educator Evaluations," under the "Accountability" header. Please check this webpage frequently as we will add new content regularly, including Status Report updates and a collection of educator evaluation "best practices" from around the state.

For more information on educator evaluations, please contact Venessa Keesler, Manager of Evaluation Research and Accountability, in the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability at [MDE-Accountability@michigan.gov](mailto:MDE-Accountability@michigan.gov). Inquiries regarding planned data collection activities to support educator evaluations can be directed to Thomas Howell, Director of the Center for Educational Performance and Information, at [cepi@michigan.gov](mailto:cepi@michigan.gov).

cc: Public School Principals  
Michigan Education Alliance

## **UNDERSTANDING MICHIGAN'S EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS DECEMBER 2010**

Michigan school reform law provides that districts adopt and implement an annual performance evaluation system for teachers and administrators. The federal State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) grant required districts, as a condition of receiving funds, to sign assurances that included agreement to report on the results of these evaluations.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will support districts in their implementation of these evaluations. The purpose of this document is to clarify the roles of districts and MDE and provide a high-level timeline for implementation of educator evaluations.

### **What are districts required to do?**

- Conduct annual educator evaluations.
- Include state and local measures of student growth as a significant factor in those educator evaluations.
- Locally determine the details of the educator evaluations, the consequences, and the timeline for implementation.
  - This includes identifying which measures of student growth and proficiency are appropriate to include in educator evaluations, and the extent to which this varies by educator role.
- Tie these educator effectiveness labels to decisions regarding promotion and retention of teachers and administrators, including tenure and certification decisions.
- Use a performance-based compensation method that evaluates performance based at least in part on student growth data.
- Report an educator effectiveness label for all teachers and administrators, beginning with principals in 2011 and extending to all educators in 2012.

### **What are districts encouraged to do?**

- Use the Framework for Educator Evaluations to guide the development of a system of educator evaluation. This Framework, developed by the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP), Michigan Education Association (MEA), American Federation of Teachers-Michigan (AFT-MI), and the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association (MEMSPA), can serve as a model for educator evaluations.
- Identify ways to measure student growth and progress toward proficiency using local measures and data.
- Include data from multiple sources as measures of educator performance whenever possible.
- Collaborate with each other and with the state to identify "best practices" for evaluation methods, for metrics in currently non-assessed content areas and/or grades, and to identify key data sources.
- Begin reporting educator effectiveness labels for all other school and district administrators at the same time as for principals if the evaluation system is in place.

### **What are MDE and/or Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) required to do?**

- Submit the statewide percentage of educators rated as highly effective, effective, and ineffective beginning with principals in 2011 and for all educators by 2012.
- Link student data with the teacher of record beginning in 2010-2011.
- Provide districts and schools with measures of student growth in reading and mathematics for each.
- Provide districts with measures of student proficiency in writing, science, social studies, and reading and mathematics for each teacher (regardless of subject taught).
- Report the proportion of educators rated as highly effective, effective, and ineffective in the state.
- Report the type of factors used in educator evaluations statewide, and the proportion of evaluations which included student growth as a significant factor.

### **What are MDE and/or CEPI planning to do or currently doing in support of educator evaluations?**

- Collect evaluation data for principals in the end-of-year 2011 Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) submission and for all educators in the end-of-the year 2012 REP submission. Districts can choose to either report the labels from the Framework for Educator Evaluations (exceeds goals, meets goals, progressing toward goals, and does not meet goals) OR to report the three labels required by the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (highly effective, effective, ineffective).
  - MDE will crosswalk with Framework for Educator Evaluation ratings into the required effectiveness ratings as follows:
    - Exceeds goals = Highly effective
    - Meets goals or progressing toward goals = Effective
    - Does not meet goals = Ineffective
- Collaborate with groups to identify and/or develop guidelines and a “toolbox” of possible models and methods for including student growth data in an evaluation system.
- Convene groups to identify reasonable metrics and methods for evaluating educators in currently non-assessed content areas and/or grades, and provide samples of those metrics and methods to districts.
- Collaborate with groups as they develop models of evaluation systems, models of collective bargaining agreements, and models of best practices and assist in making those available to the field.
- Convene groups to discuss the use of state assessment data and state-produced measures of student growth in “value-added models” and develop a recommended model that will be used to generate state-determined measures of educator effectiveness for internal validation studies.
- Collaborate with external researchers to identify how student growth data is being used in evaluations.
- Inventory current practices related to educator evaluations and provide information to stakeholders.
- Participate in nationwide consortia to gain from the experience of other states and to share Michigan’s experience and best practices.

## EDUCATOR EVALUATION TIMELINE

- June 2011: Teacher/student data link is available in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) (End-of-School Year [EOY] collection).
- April - June 2011: Principal effectiveness ratings based on district evaluations are required to be reported in the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) collection
- Under SFSF, only principal evaluations are required to be reported in 2011.
  - Under MCL 380.1249, annual educator evaluations should be conducted for all educators and CAN be reported into the system.
  - This year, principal evaluations should be reported based on the most recently completed evaluation, and in subsequent years, should be based on annual evaluations. MDE and CEPI encourage reporting the results of other administrator evaluations at the same time as principal evaluations.
- April – June 2011: Survey of current practices of each school district related to educator evaluations.
- Early fall 2011: MDE provides the following measures to districts for every educator, regardless of subject taught, based on 2009-10 and 2010-11 data:
- Student growth in reading
  - Student growth in math
  - Percent of students proficient in math
  - Percent of students proficient in reading
  - Percent of students proficient in writing
  - Percent of students proficient in science
  - Percent of students proficient in social studies
  - Foundational measure of student proficiency and improvement (same for each teacher in a school)
- Fall 2011-Winter 2012: Districts implement their locally-determined educator evaluation systems of all educators, using the data provided by MDE when appropriate.
- Spring 2012: Districts conduct educator evaluations.
- End of year 2012: Districts report effectiveness ratings for all principals, administrators, and teachers.