



Lake Shore Public Schools Performance Review Process 2018-19 (Revised 8-31-2018)

The Lake Shore Board of Education has formally adopted the Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson to evaluate teachers (Regular Board Meeting; March 27, 2017). The Framework for Teaching is one of the recommended tools by the Michigan Department of Education for assessing educator effectiveness.

Educator Evaluation Legislation

Public Act 173 of 2015 stipulates that districts implement a rigorous, transparent, and fair performance evaluation system. This Act amended the Revised School Code with regard to teacher and administrator evaluations and is integrated with the Teachers' Tenure Act, Section 1248 and Section 1249. These laws require that the performance evaluation process in Lake Shore have the following:

- Annual evaluations for probationary and tenured teachers 40% of annual year-end evaluations must be based upon student growth and assessment data
- Timely and constructive feedback is provided by the evaluator
- Student growth and assessment data must be derived from the most recent three consecutive school years, if available. If no data is available for a teacher for at least three years, the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on all available data for the teacher.
- Rates and reports the teacher's performance as highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective
- Mandates that layoff and recall decisions be based on retaining effective teachers as measured by their performance evaluation
- Performance evaluations are used to inform decisions on granting tenure and certification

Danielson Framework for Teaching

Domains and Criteria for Effective Teaching	
<p>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogyb. Demonstrating knowledge of studentsc. Setting instructional outcomesd. Demonstrating knowledge of resourcese. Designing coherent instructionf. Designing student assessment	<p>Domain 2: Classroom Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Creating an environment of respect and rapportb. Establishing a culture for learningc. Managing classroom proceduresd. Managing student behaviore. Organizing physical space
<p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Communicating with studentsb. Using questions and discussion techniquesc. Engaging students in learningd. Using assessment in instructione. Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	<p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Reflecting on teachingb. Maintaining accurate recordsc. Communicating with familiesd. Participating in the professional communitye. Growing and developing professionallyf. Showing professionalism

Adapted from *The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instruments*, Danielson (2013).

Evaluation Process:

<p align="center">Plan I:</p> <p align="center">Probationary Individualized Development Plan (IDP)</p>	<p align="center">Plan II:</p> <p align="center">Tenure Professional Growth Plan</p>	<p align="center">Plan III:</p> <p align="center">Tenure Assistance Individualized Development Plan (Minimally Effective or Ineffective on most recent annual evaluation)</p>
<p>Mentor is assigned</p> <p>By November 1, each probationary teacher shall be provided with an IDP</p> <p>Teacher sets and administrator approves Student Learning Objective (SLO)</p> <p>SLO may be developed by the individual teacher, PLC team, and/or department team</p> <p>At least one formal observation</p> <p>At least one unscheduled observation</p> <p>Teacher will complete mid-year and end-year reflection in Frontline, reporting progress on Student Growth and Assessment Data</p> <p>Feedback and areas needing improvement are noted by the administrator in Frontline within 5 days following an observation</p> <p>Teacher and/or administrator may schedule a meeting at any time to discuss observations and final evaluation</p>	<p>Teacher sets and administrator approves SLO</p> <p>SLO may be developed by the individual teacher, PLC team, and/or department team</p> <p>At least two (formal and/or informal) observations</p> <p>Teacher will complete mid-year and end-year reflection in Frontline reporting progress on Student Growth and Assessment Data</p> <p>Feedback and areas needing improvement are noted by the administrator in Frontline within 5 days following an observation</p> <p>Teacher and/or administrator may schedule a meeting at any time to discuss observations and final evaluation</p>	<p>Steps from Plan II are carried out concurrently with Plan III</p> <p>Administrator documents concerns in Frontline</p> <p>Administrator and teacher create an IDP to be implemented immediately</p> <p>At least two observations (formal and/or informal) focused on areas identified as needing improvement and documented by observer in Frontline within 5 days</p> <p>If the concern is resolved the teacher returns to Plan II (Professional Growth)</p> <p>If the concern is not resolved the teacher remains on corrective development plan; and/or administration may take further action.</p>

IDP

IDP's will include a purpose, and a set of goals. The purpose will include the specific rationale for implementation, including statements of concern. The goals will list a detailed plan for the teacher and indicate support that will be provided by the evaluator.

Observations

- Teachers must be observed at least two times per year
- At least one observation must be conducted by the person who is responsible for the teacher's annual yearend evaluation
- At least one observation must be unscheduled
- There is no statutorily required minimum number of observations for a teacher who has received a rating of effective or highly effective on his/her two most recent annual year-end evaluations
- The teacher will receive feedback in Frontline Professional Growth within five days following an observation
- Teachers are encouraged to invite their evaluator into their classroom to observe a specific lesson/activity
- Teachers may request that an observation be redone

Video Observations:

- Teachers may choose to record a lesson and submit it to their evaluator.
- Teachers select a lesson of their choice and record a portion (approx. 15 min) to share with their evaluator.
- Observer watches the video, provides feedback, comments and score in Frontline.
- Both parties may choose to meet for reflection on the lesson and to provide additional feedback.
- Lessons submitted by video would count as an informal observation.
- It is understood that recorded lessons will not be archived, distributed, or shared by the evaluator in any manner without the consent of the teacher.

Student Growth and Assessment Data

District Growth: An overall District Growth score accounting for 20% of the evaluation will be applied annually to all educators (and administrators) in Lake Shore. Using data retrieved from www.mischooldata.org>School Index Growth>Growth Overview>All Students, the combined ELA and Math Proficiency score for “all students” at Masonic Heights, Rodgers, Violet, Kennedy Middle School and Lake Shore High School will be summed and averaged to obtain the District Growth score. This data was selected as it incorporates three years of growth required by law. Provided below is an example using actual data reported in MI School Data in 2016-17:

School	2016-17 Growth Overview Score (Combined ELA and Math) for All Students	
Masonic Heights Elementary	93.73	
Rodgers Elementary	82.57	
Violet Elementary	75.13	
Kennedy Middle School	67.61	
Lake Shore High School	75.45	
	Sum: 394.49 / 5 =	District Growth Score: 78.89

After determining the District Growth Score of 78.89, the following rubric is applied to obtain the effectiveness rating accounting for 20% of each educator’s (and administrator’s) evaluation:

	Ineffective (1)	Minimally Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
District Growth Score	0 – 50	51 – 69	70 – 89	90 – 100

In the sample, the District Growth Score falls in the Effective range.

*For the 2018-19 school year, Lake Shore will use the 2017-18 School Index Growth Overview when it is released in MI School Data.

Student Learning Objectives (SLO): Twenty percent (20%) of the Student Growth and Assessment Data portion of the evaluation is based upon a SLO developed by the teacher in collaboration with PLC and/or department teams. One or more of the following must support SLO outcomes and proficiency:

- Multiple research-based growth measures or alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across grade levels, subject area, and/or departments within Lake Shore.
- Nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards.
- Achievement of individualized education program (IEP) goals.

Educators will submit their SLO’s in Frontline for approval by an administrator. SLO’s and teacher will report their proficiency (Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, or Ineffective) in Frontline. See rubric below when writing SLO’s and reporting outcomes :

	Ineffective (1)	Minimally Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
Percentage of Students Meeting Growth Targets	0 – 50	51 – 69	70 – 89	90 – 100

Further guidance on writing SLO’s is available for review on the Michigan Department of Education website.

Weighting of Student Growth and Assessment Data from Prior Years

The Revised School Code provides that if there is data available, a teacher’s annual evaluation “shall be based on the student growth and assessment data for the most recent three consecutive school year period (MCL 380.1249(2)(b). If three years of data is not available, then data for the years that are available will be used.”

Student Growth and Assessment Data will be weighted as followed:

	District Growth	SLO
Most Recent Year	33.33%	33.33%
Year Previous to Most Recent	33.33%	33.33% *
Two Years Previous to Most Recent	33.33%	33.33% **

**2017-18 Average of “Student Growth Objectives” (Team and Classroom SMART goals) in Frontline*

***2016-17 Average of “Student Growth Objectives” (Team and Classroom SMART goals) in Frontline*

Scoring the Evaluation

Student Growth and Assessment data (District Growth and SLO) will account for 40% of the final evaluation score. Each of the four domains in the Framework for Teaching are weighted equally (15%). Lake Shore recognizes the importance of each of the five evaluation domains in evaluating teacher performance. Therefore, if a teacher receives a rating of Ineffective in any one of the five domains, the teacher shall not receive an overall year-end performance evaluation effectiveness rating other than Ineffective. Teachers rated minimally effective in any one of the evaluation domains shall not receive an overall year-end rating higher than Minimally Effective.

Sample Scoring:

Domain	Total Score	Mean Score	Weight
I. Planning & Preparation (15%)	18 (24 points possible in 6 sub components)	$18/6 = 3$	$\text{mean} * .15 = .45$
II. Classroom Environment (15%)	15 (20 points possible in 5 sub components)	$15/5 = 3$	$\text{mean} * .15 = .45$
III. Instruction (15%)	19 (20 points possible in 5 sub components)	$19/5 = 3.8$	$\text{mean} * .15 = .57$
IV. Professional Responsibilities (15%)	18 (24 points possible in 6 sub components)	$18/6 = 3$	$\text{mean} * .15 = .45$
V. Student Growth and Assessment Data (40%)	7 (2016-17 Team and Classroom Goals) 6 (2017-18 Team and Classroom Goals) 7 (2018-19 District Growth and SLO Goal)	$7/2 = 3.5$ $6/2 = 3$ $7/2 = 3.5$ $3.5+3+3.5/3 = 3.33$	$\text{mean} * .40 = 1.33$
			$.45+.45+.57+.45+1.33 =$ Total = 3.25

In the sample above, the teacher's overall score is 3.25. After determining the numerical evaluation score, the following rubric is applied to obtain the final effectiveness rating:

Final Effectiveness Rating Rubric			
Ineffective 0 – 2.00	Minimally Effective 2.01 – 2.59	Effective 2.6 – 3.5	Highly Effective 3.51 – 4
Calculated Rating falls in the “Ineffective” range AND/OR One (1) or more domain rated “Ineffective”	Calculated Rating falls in the “Minimally Effective” range AND/OR One (1) domain rated “Minimally Effective”	Calculated Rating falls in the “Effective” range AND No domains rated “Minimally Effective” or “Ineffective”	Calculated Rating falls in the “Highly Effective” range AND No domains rated “Minimally Effective” or “Ineffective”

In the sample, the numerical score is 3.25 and the teacher has no domains rated minimally effective or ineffective. According to the above rubric, the teacher would be rated Effective.

Ineffective Teachers (and Administrators)

State law stipulates that teachers (and administrators) rated ineffective on three consecutive annual evaluations must be dismissed from employment. A tenured teacher who receives an ineffective rating on an annual year-end evaluation may request a review of the evaluation and rating by the school district superintendent.

Highly Effective Teachers (and Administrators)

In accordance with state law, teachers (and administrators) who have been rated as highly effective for three consecutive years may be evaluated every two years, rather than every year.

Training for Teachers (and Administrators)

Training on the Danielson Evaluation Framework and how it is used in conjunction with the Lake Shore Performance Review Process is available for teachers, administrators, evaluators and observers. Contact the Lake Shore Department of Student and Academic Services for information on scheduled training.

Conclusion

The Lake Shore Performance review process is subject to modification in accordance to changes in state law. Training on the evaluation system and the development of administrative guidelines to promote the quality and accuracy of this process is ongoing.

Special thanks to the LSFT members, principals, and administrators who offered their input in the development of this process.