

Building an Improvement-Focused System of Educator Evaluation



Deborah Loewenberg Ball

Presentation on the final recommendations of the
Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)

Joint Education Committee Meeting • September 11, 2013



Michigan Council for **Educator Effectiveness**

Knowing mathematics well enough to teach it

What mathematical steps could have produced these answers?

(a)

$$\begin{array}{r} 49 \\ \times 25 \\ \hline 405 \\ 108 \\ \hline 1485 \end{array}$$

(b)

$$\begin{array}{r} 49 \\ \times 25 \\ \hline 225 \\ 100 \\ \hline 325 \end{array}$$

(c)

$$\begin{array}{r} 49 \\ \times 25 \\ \hline 1250 \\ 25 \\ \hline 1275 \end{array}$$

Making skillful teaching commonplace

- Create evidence-based systems that provide useful feedback for improvement
- Establish and provide targeted professional training, focused on the highest leverage practices of teaching and on content knowledge needed for skilled instruction



Membership of MCEE

- **Deborah Loewenberg Ball** (chair)
Dean, University of Michigan School of Education
- **Jennifer Hammond**
Principal, Grand Blanc High School
- **Joseph Martineau** (non-voting member)
Deputy superintendent for accountability services, Michigan Department of Education
- **Mark Reckase**
Professor, Michigan State University
- **Nicholas Sheltroun**
Director of measurement, research, and accountability, National Heritage Academies
- **David Vensel**
Principal, Jefferson High School (Monroe, MI)



MCEE charge

The MCEE will submit to the State Board of Education, the Governor, and the state legislature a report that identifies and recommends all of the following:

1. A student growth and assessment tool
2. A state evaluation tool for teachers
3. A state evaluation tool for school administrators
4. Changes to the requirements for a professional teaching certificate
5. A process for evaluating and approving local evaluation tools for teachers and administrators that are consistent with the state evaluation tool for teachers and administrators and the act



We took our charge seriously

- We examined research
- We consulted with other states
- We commissioned a pilot study
- We engaged practicing educators
- We requested expert guidance
- We read and questioned and sought advice

These are complex issues and we appreciated the extra time we were given to produce responsible and defensible recommendations for Michigan's system.



Two things to remember

- ① The MCEE's recommendations are grounded in a deep belief in teachers—in the work that they do and in the crucial role that they play in student learning.
- ② Michigan is poised to lead the way in implementing reforms to educator evaluation that put students first, that focus on improvement not punishment, and that contribute to the professional growth of all educators in the state.



MCEE vision

The Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness will develop a **fair, transparent, and feasible** evaluation system for teachers and school administrators. The system will be based on **rigorous standards** of professional practice and of measurement. The goals of this system are to contribute to **enhanced instruction**, improve **student achievement**, and support ongoing **professional learning**.



Design principles

- Expectations should be clear and rigorous
- The system should involve multiple measures
- The system should enhance performance
- The system should be committed to and structured to support ongoing educator learning and development



The challenges

1. Choosing tools that are valid, fair, and feasible
 - Measure the things we actually care about
 - Measure things that are appropriate to try to account for
 - Measure these things validly and reliably
 - Affordable and doable
2. Building a system that focuses on improving practice
 - Provides useful feedback
 - Is linked to effective learning opportunities




Final recommendations

- Maintain our commitments to the core elements of our vision
- Seek to recommend an educator evaluation system that has the greatest probability of improving teaching and learning
- Balance local capacity building with clear, high-quality, and common standards
- Maximize on the cost-benefit ratio and use resources for improvement more than regulation



Framework for evaluating teachers



Observations of practice: Teachers

- Classroom teaching must be observed using one of the four piloted observation tools:
 - Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching;
 - Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model;
 - The Thoughtful Classroom; or
 - 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning.
- One of these tools will be selected to be the state tool, based on a competitive RFP process.
- The state will provide sufficient base funding to support LEAs’ use of the state-selected tool with full fidelity.
- The state will provide the technical support and training for the state-selected tool.



Observations of practice: Teachers (continued)

- LEAs may choose to use one of the other three piloted observation tools instead, but must pay for any expenses above the base funding supplied by the state for the state-selected tool.
- All observers must be trained on the use of their LEA's tool.
- Multiple observations must be conducted across the school year.
- Qualified peers may conduct some of the observations.
- LEAs may use other data that provide evidence about a teacher's practice (up to 20% of the individual teacher's practice component).



Student growth: Teachers

- For teachers in core content areas in grades for which there are growth data available from state-mandated assessments (currently reading and mathematics in grades 4–8, but likely to change over time), at least half of the teachers' student growth component should be based on state-provided VAM scores.
- For teachers of other subject areas, LEAs should have the discretion to adopt state-provided VAM or growth data.



Student growth: Teachers (continued)

- State-provided VAM or growth data in core content areas may be used in a teacher's evaluation using information from that teacher's students, even if the teacher does not teach in one of the core content areas. This may be done as long as the teacher knows that he or she is expected to be contributing to students' growth in core content areas and there is a reasonable connection of the core content to the teacher's actual teaching assignment.




Student growth: Teachers (continued)

- School-level VAMs may be used for individual teachers' evaluations if there is a reasonable connection of the core content to the teacher's actual teaching assignment (up to 10% of the individual teacher's student growth component).
- In content area assignments for which there are no state-provided VAM or growth data available, teachers should be evaluated based on alternate measures of student growth that meet the guidelines for rigorous and appropriate assessment of student growth in the applicable subject area.



Example: Proportion of data



Observations of practice: Administrators

- LEAs must choose from one of two administrator evaluation tools:
 - MASA’s School ADvance Administrator Evaluation Instrument; or
 - Reeves Leadership Performance Rubric.
- One of these tools will be selected to be the state tool, based on a competitive RFP process.
- The state will provide sufficient base funding per administrator to support LEAs’ use of the state-selected tool with full fidelity.
- The state will also provide the technical support and training for the state-selected tool.



Observations of practice: Administrators (continued)

- LEAs may choose to use the other tool instead. An LEA that chooses to use the other tool must pay for any expenses above the base funding supplied by the state for the state-selected tool.
- Administrators must be evaluated by at least the following evidence for each school (or LEA, for superintendents or central office personnel):
 - Proficiency of skill in evaluating teachers;
 - Progress made in the school improvement plan;
 - Attendance rates; and
 - Student, parent, and teacher feedback.



Student growth: Administrators

- At least half the student growth portion of each administrator's evaluation must come from building-level VAM scores where available (currently in reading and mathematics in grades 4–8, but likely to change over time).
- Both reading and math VAM scores must be weighted equally to make up the final building VAM score.



Student growth: Administrators

- The other portion of the student growth component will be determined at an LEA level.
- Other examples of student growth data that could be included in this portion of the student growth component:
 - Student learning objectives;
 - Graduation rates;
 - Local common assessment performance;
 - State-provided assessments in other content areas;
 - Vendor-provided assessments in any content area;
 - Locally developed assessments in any content area;
 - Pass/fail rates; and
 - Percentage of students on track to graduate.



Example: Combining scores

		Practice		
		Professional	Provisional	Ineffective
Student growth	Meets expectations	Professional	Professional	Provisional
	Does not fully meet expectations	Professional	Provisional	Ineffective
	Below expectations	Provisional	Ineffective	Ineffective

Professional rating

- The teacher or administrator being evaluated has exhibited the knowledge and capabilities expected of a skillful educator.
- Educators who are extraordinary—as well as educators who are competent—will fall into this category.
- A professional rating should always be accompanied by specific feedback for development.
- Educators rated as professional for three straight years may pursue opportunities for advanced roles or leadership.
- Educators rated as professional for three straight years may be evaluated on an alternating year basis in subsequent years and receive two-year goals for enhancement.



Provisional rating

- The teacher or administrator being evaluated has exhibited some professional knowledge and skill, but has specific substantial identified weaknesses that should be addressed through feedback and targeted professional development.
- This rating is intended to be a serious signal that the educator's practice requires significant improvement in specific areas.
- A provisional rating should be accompanied by clear feedback about areas that need focused attention.
- A teacher or administrator rated as provisional or below for three straight years should be counseled out of his or her current role.



Ineffective rating

- The teacher or administrator being evaluated has exhibited performance that has specific critical identified weaknesses.
- The educator should be placed on urgent notice that significant improvement must be achieved in the specific areas of underperformance within two years.
- An educator who receives an ineffective rating for two years in a row should be terminated from further employment as a teacher (for teachers) or as an administrator (for administrators) in his or her current LEA.



Professional teaching certificate

- Teachers wishing to move from a provisional to a professional certificate must receive a professional rating for three successive years immediately prior to applying for professional certification.
- Teachers who do not demonstrate three successive years of professional ratings may apply for the renewal of their provisional certification until they either:
 - Achieve three successive years of professional ratings immediately prior to applying for their professional certification; or
 - Have three non-successive years of professional ratings but have the recommendation of their current principal.



Waiver process

- LEAs requesting a waiver must demonstrate that their processes and systems have the same level of quality and rigor as those adopted in LEAs following the state requirements.
- If an LEA submits an adapted form of a commercial evaluation system, the LEA must demonstrate how the adaptations do not threaten the validity of the inferences based on use of the instrument.
- If an LEA is using an evaluation system that does not have available documentation about its validity and reliability, the LEA must submit a plan for how it will gather relevant data on the system's technical soundness.



Implementation recommendations

- July 2013: MCEE submitted final recommendations
- Fall 2013 and winter 2014: Legislature acts on recommendations
- 2013–14 and 2014–15 school years: State and LEAs focus on developing and/or piloting the necessary training, systems, processes, and vendor contracts
- 2015–16 school year: New educator evaluation system launches across the state

This staging is crucial in order to fulfill our charge to build an ethical, transparent, and fair system of evaluating educators, dedicated to educational improvement in the state.



Thank you!

Questions?

Our website: www.mcede.org



Michigan Council for **Educator Effectiveness**