

Swartz Creek Community Schools



5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning Instructional Framework & 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric Handbook/Admin Guidelines/IP

- *This evaluation process is subject to revisions based on legislative updates that result in changes in law for teacher evaluation.*

EVALUATION DEFINITIONS

A. Probationary Period -- Teachers without previous tenure from a public school board of education in the State of Michigan shall be required to serve periods of probation as follow:

1. A teacher under contract but not on continuing tenure as of July 19, 2011, shall be in a probationary period during his or her first 4 full school years of employment;
2. A teacher initially contracted after July 19, 2011, shall be in a probationary period during his or her first 5 full school years of employment subject to the following conditions:
 - a. A teacher shall not be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period unless the teacher has been rated as effective or highly effective on his or her 3 most recent annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 5 full school years of employment in a probationary period.
 - b. If a teacher has been rated as highly effective on 3 consecutive annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 4 full school years of employment in a probationary period, the teacher shall be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period.
3. Teachers with previous tenure from a public school board of education in the State of Michigan shall be required to be in a probationary period during his or her first 2 full years of employment.

D. Mentor -- A teacher who has been rated effective or highly effective that is assigned by the district to provide coaching and support to a beginning teachers during their first 3 years of employment or a non-probationary teacher rated minimally effective or ineffective on their previous evaluation, in order to assist the teacher in developing professional competencies and effectiveness.

E. Evaluator -- The principal, assistant principal or other qualified designee of the superintendent that is assigned to conduct observation, provide feedback, and evaluate teachers.

Factors for Determining Teacher Effectiveness

A. Evidence of student growth.

1. 50% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data. This portion of a teacher's evaluation will be measured by a Student Learning Objective (SLO).
 - a. Each teacher's student growth will be rated based on the percent of students who met their growth target as defined below:
 - i. Minimally Effective: Less than 75% of students met their growth target
 - ii. Effective: 75 - 89% of students met their growth target.
 - iii. Highly Effective:
 - b. Each teacher will utilize a Simple Average Growth Calculation for their SLO as recommended by the American Institute for Research (AIR). This model is being used since there is no baseline data and/or trend data from prior years available for this purpose.
 - c. Growth Targets are determined by a common formula, but each student has a different growth target based on his or her pre-assessment score.

- d. Students are expected to reach a score halfway between their baseline score and 100.
- i. *If a student scored 50 on the pre-assessment, his or her growth target is 75. ($100 - 50 = 50/2 = 25$ $50+25 = 75$)*
 - ii. *If a student scored 40 on the pre-assessment, his or her growth target is 70. ($100 - 40 = 60/2 = 30$ $40+30=70$)*
- e. Each teacher will identify 1 or more class rosters and administer a pre-assessment at the beginning of term to establish baseline scores for each student and the amount of growth that should take place. To measure the amount of student growth for the SLO, a post-assessment will be administered with the students at the end of the term or year.
- f. Process for establishing a Student Learning Objective:
- i. All teachers shall complete an electronic Student Learning Objective form and submit it electronically to their evaluator by a date determined by the principal. The SLO will be discussed at part of the Pre-Inquiry Conference. The Student Learning Objective form will include a similar table area as shown the next page:

Student	Pretest (out of 100)	Posttest (out of 100)	Growth	Growth Target	Met Growth Target
Student A	20	55	35	60	NO
Student B	25	68	43	62.5	YES
Student C	40	76	36	70	YES
Student D	50	73	23	75	NO

- ii. The Student Learning Objective form will also include narrative boxes for providing information about:
 - the aligned pre- and post-assessment
 - the course
 - the grade level of students in the course
 - # of students
 - the interval of instruction between the pre- and post-assessment
 - the aligned standards to the SLO / pre- and post-assessment
 - The form will also include an evaluator comments section.
- iii. Once the SLO has been approved by the evaluator, the teacher will retain a copy of the form for final input of post-assessment data. At the end of the course term/year, the teacher will calculate the results and turn in a copy of the completed form to the evaluator and maintain a file of the pre- and post-assessment results. The Student Growth Final Calculation will be determined using the following rubric.

- **Note:** Student Growth is measured and utilized in the framework only for periods of time when a teacher is in attendance for more than one-third of the growth period (e.g. more than 6 weeks for a growth goal period of 18 weeks).
- iv. When a teacher is assigned to multiple buildings, the SLO assessment measure s/he is responsible for is the *one* building that contains the largest portion of the overall teaching assignment within the school year. For example, a teacher who is 40% Building A, 30% Building B, and 30% Building C would only be responsible for the external assessment goal of Building A. If a teacher is officially assigned an equal amount in multiple buildings (e.g. 50%), the external assessment goal will be from the building of the teacher's evaluator.
 - v. Special Education teachers of SXI, SCI, MOCI, CI, ASD, and any non-diploma track student(s) will base their student growth on a Unique Learning System pre- and post-assessment or an alternative assessment as determined appropriate by the student's IEP.

B. Demonstrated Pedagogical Skills

1. Pedagogical skills will be evaluated with the performance language of each of the following indicator in the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric:
 - a. Purpose
 - b. Student Engagement
 - c. Curriculum and Pedagogy
 - d. Assessment for Student Learning
 - e. Classroom Environment and Culture
 - f. Professional Collaboration and Communication
2. The 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric is based on the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D) instructional framework, which is derived from an extensive study of research on the core elements that constitute high quality instruction.
3. The 5D+ rubric is composed of 37 indicators of teacher performance
 - a. 31 related to classroom practice.
 - b. 6 related to professional collaboration and communication.
4. Performance levels within each indicator delineate teaching practice, from unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished. The sophistication of teaching practice and the role of students increase across the levels of performance. The language describing each performance level has been carefully examined by a psychometrician to assure clarity, to avoid the risk of a teacher being rated more than once for similar teaching behavior, and to ensure that each indicator evaluates only one aspect of teaching practice. A careful analysis of instructional practice leads to the determination of the teacher's performance level on each indicator. In general, one's pr

Evaluation Process

- A. The Evaluation Process involves a minimum of two Inquiry Cycles over the course of the school year.

1. The first Inquiry Cycle is typically September through December. A Mid-Year Post-Inquiry Conference shall be held at the conclusion of the first Inquiry Cycle to analyze the impact of the teacher's area of focus on professional practice and student learning, as well as formatively discuss teacher growth using the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, when appropriate. The Post-Inquiry conference is typically in January following the conclusion of the first inquiry cycle. The mid-year post-inquiry conference shall serve as the mid year review for all 1st year probationary teachers and any teacher rated minimally effective or ineffective in the previous year.
 2. The second Inquiry Cycle typically will be framed during the Mid-Year Post Inquiry Cycle, and typically take place between February and April. A end of year post-inquiry conference will be held following the last inquiry cycle of the year to analyze the impact of the area(s) of focus on professional practice and student growth over time.
 3. A final summative evaluation will be written and provided to the teacher following the end-of-year post-inquiry conference, typically in June.
- D. The following represents the steps of an inquiry cycle:
- E.
1. SELF-ASSESS: At the beginning of the year, Teachers will self-assess to identify an area of focus. Teachers shall:
 - a. Examine student work, classroom-based assessment data, feedback from students, etc. What are the learning strengths and learning challenges of your students?
 - b. Consider building and district learning goals and instructional initiatives. *How do these support the learning challenges of your students?*
 - c. Assess your instructional practice using the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D) Instructional Framework and the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, citing evidence from your day-to-day classroom practice to support your assessment for each rubric indicator. (Observe / Collect data). Which indicators are strengths for you? Which are learning opportunities?
 2. DETERMINE A FOCUS (PRE-INQUIRY CONFERENCE): In the fall of each school year, Principals will schedule a Pre-Inquiry Conference with each teacher he/she is evaluating. Teacher and principal analyze evidence to identify an area of focus. Based on the responses in the self-assessment, *what is your area of focus? What kind of evidence will you collect?*
 - a. Ensure Alignment
 - b. Set instructional practice goals and evidence that will demonstrate meeting the goals
 - c. Set student learning goals and evidence that will demonstrate meeting the goals.
 3. IMPLEMENT & SUPPORT: Teacher and principal engage in study and learning around area of focus.
 - a. Formative feedback cycles
 - i. There will be 2 – 3 observations inquiry cycle, in which the principal will script, code, and share not icings and wonderings around teachers area of focus.

- ii. Following a response from teacher, the principal will analyze evidence from the coded script and responses of the teacher to determine formative feedback, including strengths and short-term feedback in area of focus.
 - c. Targeted feedback cycles (optional)
 - d. Professional collaboration (optional)
 - e. Professional development (optional)
4. ANALYZE IMPACT (POST-INQUIRY CONFERENCE): Teacher and principal analyze the results of their work.
Based on your inquiry, what did you learn about your practice as it impacts student learning?
- a. Examine student and teacher data.
 - b. Analyze the impact of the data.
 - c. Formatively discuss teacher growth using the 5D+ rubric
 - d. Decide whether to continue the same inquiry or identify a new area of focus.

Determination of Summative Evaluation Ratings

- A. The summative rating for each indicator within the 5D+ Rubric shall be based on an analysis of evidence. In general, formative evidence is gathered through multiple observations, responses to wonderings, and student work. Based on the preponderance of evidence and growth over time in relationship to the performance language for each indicator, an evaluator will assign a final indicator rating.
- B. The summative rating for each dimension shall be based on the preponderance of evidence for each indicator rating within the dimension and it's probable truth/accuracy, based on the preponderance of evidence.
- C. The summative rating for professional practice shall be based on the preponderance of evidence for each dimension rating.
- D. A final summative "effectiveness" rating will be assigned to each teacher based on their final summative practice rating and student growth rating.
 - 1. The following defines the general levels of performance for each rating assigned:
 - a. Ineffective: Professional practice at Level 1 shows evidence of not understanding the concepts underlying individual components of the indicator and/or dimension. This level of practice is ineffective and inefficient and may represent practice that is harmful to student learning progress, professional learning environment, or individual teaching or leading practice. This level requires immediate intervention.

- b. Minimally Effective: Professional practice at Level 2 shows a developing understanding of the knowledge and skills of the indicator and/or dimension required to practice, but performance is inconsistent over a period of time due to lack of experience, expertise, and/or commitment. This level requires specific support.
 - c. Effective: Professional practice at Level 3 shows evidence of thorough knowledge of this indicator and/or dimension. This is successful, accomplished, professional, and effective practice. Teaching and leading at this level utilizes a broad repertoire of strategies and activities to support student learning. At this level, teaching is strengthened and expanded through purposeful, collaborative sharing and learning with colleagues as well as ongoing self-reflection and professional improvement.
 - d. Highly Effective: Professional practice at Level 4 is that of a master professional whose practices operate at a qualitatively different level from those of other professional peers. To achieve this rating, a teacher would need to have received a majority of distinguished ratings on the dimension scores. A teacher or principal at this level must show evidence of average to high impact on student growth. Ongoing, reflective teaching and leading is demonstrated through the highest level of expertise and commitment to all students' learning, challenging professional growth, and collaborative practice.
2. A final Summative Rating shall be assigned that represents the aggregate of all components of the teacher evaluation system. Component scores are calculated by multiplying the raw score for each component of the evaluation system by the designated percent each component represents. The final summative effectiveness rating for the 2014-15 school year shall be calculated based on the aggregate of professional practice and student growth ratings as defined below:
- **Professional Practice (5D + Rubric): 50%**
 - **Student Learning Objective (SLO): 50%**
3. Once a total raw score is calculated the score ranges below will be used to determine a summative rating of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective or Highly Effective.

Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
0.0 - 1.49	1.5 - 2.49	2.5 - 3.49	3.5 - 4.0

Additional Information

- A. Evaluation Implementation Timeline
1. In the 2015 – 2016 school year, teachers will be evaluated all on the following dimensions/areas:
 - a. Student Engagement
 - b. Classroom Environment and Culture
 - c. Professional Collaboration and Communication
 - *Note: Any teachers with a current IDP will also be evaluated on the goals within their IDP from the tool/domains of the rubric used in during that specific evaluation process.*
 2. In the 2016 – 2017 school year, teachers will be evaluated on the following dimensions/areas:
 - a. Purpose (New)
 - b. Student Engagement
 - c. Curriculum and Pedagogy (New)
 - d. Assessment for Student Learning (New)
 - e. Classroom Environment and Culture
 - f. Professional Collaboration and Communication
- B. Evaluations shall be completed on the designated forms. A Post-Inquiry Conference will be held to analyze the impact of the area(s) of focus during the school year, prior to a final summative evaluation being signed. Once reviewed, the evaluation is to be signed by the teacher and the evaluator and placed in the Personnel File. The teacher's signature signifies they have read and been provided an opportunity to review the evaluation with their evaluator. It does not signify agreement with the ratings of the evaluation. A teacher may attach a letter of reaction to the evaluation within ten school days of receiving the evaluation, if desired.
- C. The Revised School Code 380.1249 also states the following: (j) The performance evaluation system shall provide that, if a teacher who is not in a probationary period prescribed by section 1 of article II of 1937 (Ex Sess) PA 4, MCL 38.81, is rated as ineffective on an annual year-end evaluation, the teacher may request a review of the evaluation and the rating by the school district superintendent, intermediate superintendent, or chief administrator of the public school academy, as applicable. The request for a review must be submitted in writing within 20 days after the teacher is informed of the rating. Upon receipt of the request, the school district superintendent, intermediate superintendent, or chief administrator of the public school academy, as applicable, shall review the evaluation and rating and may make any modifications as appropriate based on his or her review. However, the performance evaluation system shall not allow for a review as described in this subdivision more than twice in a 3-school-year period.
- D. It is generally the District's practice to dismiss teachers who have been rated ineffective regardless of tenure status. However, in the event a teacher that

is rated ineffective has their contract renewed, the teacher will be placed on a corrective action plan

Layoff Procedure

- A. The District will determine areas of reduction, including specific grade level(s) and/or subject areas for reduction of force.
- B. Teachers who are certified and highly qualified to teach in the identified grade level(s) and/or subject area(s) will be sorted for layoff according to the following factors:
 1. Individual performance based as designated by the summative evaluation effectiveness rating will be the majority factor in making decisions about layoff and recall within identified grade level(s) and/or subject area(s) in which reduction is to take place.
 2. Additional Factors that will be used for purposes of determining layoff when overall effectiveness ratings are equal (e.g. Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective and Highly Effective) for teachers certified and highly qualified to teach in the area of reduction, include:
 - a. The teacher's attendance and disciplinary record, if any.
 - b. Significant, relevant accomplishments and contributions. This factor shall be based on whether the individual contributes to the overall performance of the school by making clear, significant, relevant contributions above the normal expectations for an individual in his or her peer group and having demonstrated a record of exceptional performance.
 3. Relevant Special Training. This factor shall be based on completion of relevant training other than professional development or continuing education required by school district or by state law, and is integrated into instruction in a "meaningful way."
 4. Length of service or tenure status shall not be a factor in the above decision. However, if the reduction/recall decision involves two or more employees and "all other factors distinguishing those employees from each other are equal", then length of service or tenure status may be considered as a tie breaker.