



2019-2020

Employee Performance

Michigan Teacher Evaluation and Educator Effectiveness Guide

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

EVALUATIONS

The process	1
Teacher rubric	1
Calibration.....	1
Tips for delivering evaluations.....	2
Competencies	2
Performance rating levels and evaluation scores	3
Quality of student learning.....	3
Teacher reliability and validity process plan	4
Interactive Framework (IF).....	4
What it is	4
How does it work?.....	4
Observation requirements.....	4
Who receives individualized development plans?	5
Training	5
Mentors	5

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

What it is.....	6
Ratings	6
What the ratings mean.....	6
How the ratings are calculated.....	6
Review process	6

OVERVIEW

National Heritage Academies' (NHA) college readiness goal is to have 90% of students who have been with NHA for three or more years meeting or exceeding the college readiness thresholds in both Math and Reading. There are three preconditions to meet this goal: 1) achieve high student attendance, 2) achieve high teacher attendance, and 3) hire and retain teachers, deans, and principals above the talent threshold.

Employee performance plays an integral role in meeting the college readiness goal, and NHA wants to equip its employees to be successful. This guidebook provides information about performance, evaluations, and state educator effectiveness.

EVALUATIONS

The process

NHA teachers are evaluated annually by their assigned dean. The locally developed evaluation rubric and observation protocol uses components from Doug Lemov, Robert J. Marzano and Charlotte Danielson, internationally recognized experts in the area of teacher effectiveness and specializing in the design of teacher evaluations. The NHA teacher evaluation facilitates conversation around clear expectations for performance and fosters continuous development. The evaluation is just one component of a larger process that occurs throughout the year. This process includes:

Ongoing walk-through observations

One-on-one meetings (O3s)

Feedback

Professional development, goal setting, and progress monitoring (including professional development plans)

Full Lesson Observations (at least two per school year, the 2nd is a formal mid-year check-in)

Conversations around continual improvement

Annual performance evaluations

Information from evaluations contribute to decisions regarding promotion, compensation and employment, in addition to providing a platform for ongoing conversation between deans and teachers. The evaluation also informs professional development.

Teacher rubric

Positions assigned to the teacher rubric include, but are not limited to, the following:

Academic Specialist

Reading Specialist

Math Specialist

At Risk Teacher

Teacher in Residence

Library Technology Specialist

General Education Teacher

Special Education Teacher

English Language Learner Teacher

Teach Force Teacher

Calibration

Calibration is important for all evaluators at your school. School leaders review the evaluation rubrics together at the beginning of each school year to ensure that performance measures within each rating level on the rubric means the same thing to everyone. This increases rater reliability and consistency, and helps drive performance results.

Prior to the start of school, teachers also receive training on the evaluation rubric by approved trainers through NHA. All approved trainers are educators that have received in-depth training on NHA's evaluation rubrics.

Tips for Delivering Evaluations

- Make the meeting face-to-face and schedule plenty of time in advance. Clearly explain the agenda and purpose of what will be done during the evaluation meeting.
- Provide sincere, positive feedback for good performance. Do not “sugarcoat” negative behaviors, but provide adjusting feedback on behaviors that should start, stop or continue.
- Use the performance measures on the rubric to determine evaluation ratings, NOT hunches or feelings.
- Schedule a separate time to discuss compensation.

NOTE: An employee does NOT automatically go on a performance improvement plan (PIP) if he/she receives “Ineffective” or “Developing” ratings within his/her performance evaluation. The leader of the employee will determine the best way to address the growth opportunity.

Competencies

NHA teacher evaluations have six competencies: (1) Classroom Culture, (2) Planning, (3) Teaching, (4) Assessing, (5) Quality of Student Learning, and (6) Professional Accountabilities. The first four are referred to as the Classroom Framework. Competencies in classroom management, instructional practices, and professional practices are determined through multiple observations, feedback and coaching.

The annual performance evaluation will include:

Competencies		Indicators
CLASSROOM FRAMEWORK	Classroom Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Positive Relationships • Physical Environment • Routines and Procedures • Student Behavior and Moral Focus
	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and Analyze the Complexity of Standards • Instructional Alignment • Pacing • Differentiated Planning
	Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Rigor • Cognitive Engagement • Use of Time • Personalized Instruction
	Assessing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing Assessment Strategy • Analyze Data • Actionable Feedback
Quality of Student Learning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Impact on Oral Reading Fluency Results <u>OR</u> Positive Impact on M-Step Results <u>OR</u> Positive Impact on Student Learning* • Positive Impact on Additional Student Growth Measures*
Professional Accountabilities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependability • Core Values • Communication • Teamwork

**Dependent upon specific teaching position*

Performance rating levels and evaluation scale

Teachers will receive one of the following performance ratings:

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Exemplary
Below expected performance level	Approaching expected performance level	Meets expected performance level	Model to other staff and shares knowledge

The teacher evaluation rubric has criterion-referenced progressions of performance expectations. Leaders, when evaluating teachers, will individually consider each teacher and review the rubric beginning at the left

“Ineffective” column and progressing to the right “Exemplary” column. Teachers need to fulfill each performance measure in its entirety before progressing to the next level.

The Quality of Student Learning competency is weighted at 40% of the overall evaluation rating, which consists of two equal components: M-Step student growth percentiles (SGP) or Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) and additional evidence of student growth. The Classroom Framework and Professional Accountabilities competencies are each weighted at 30% of the overall evaluation rating. The evaluation scales and corresponding ratings are as follows:

Teachers with less than three years of NHA experience		Teachers with three or more years of NHA experience	
Ineffective	1.00-1.79	Ineffective	1.00-1.89
Developing	1.80-2.34	Developing	1.90-2.49
Effective	2.35-3.49	Effective	2.50-3.49
Exemplary	3.50-4.00	Exemplary	3.50-4.00

Quality of Student Learning

Ratings for the Quality of Student Learning competency are based on individual or schoolwide M-Step SGP, ORF, and/or additional evidence of student growth, depending on the specific teaching position. The table below indicates the data used for each position:

K-3 teachers with oral reading fluency data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% ORF results • 20% additional student growth measures
4-8 teachers with individual M-Step SGP data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% individual M-Step SGP • 20% additional student growth measures
Teach Force teachers or first year teachers without individual M-Step SGP or ORF data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% additional student growth measures
2+ year teachers without individual M-Step SGP or ORF data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% schoolwide M-Step SGP • 20% additional student growth measures

K-3 classroom teachers use student growth in ORF from the current year fall- to-spring assessments. Only students with a goal will be included in the percentage of students on track to meet their goal. If fewer than 15 students have a goal, alternative data should be used to determine the teacher’s rating. For schools utilizing **aimswEBPlus**, the evaluations will provide a hyperlink with the percent of students on track to meet their goal; however, a rating is not automatically calculated within the evaluation. For schools utilizing **DIBELS**, you can use the table below to aid in your evaluation:

	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Exemplary
% of students that have met at least one goal in the school year	Fewer than 35% of students have met (or are on track to meet) their end of year or growth goal.	35-74% of students met (or are on track to meet) their end of year or growth goal.	75-89% of students met (or are on track to meet) their end of year or growth goal.	At least 90% of students met (or are on track to meet) their end of year or growth goal.

Please refer to the tables below for the thresholds that will be used to determine if a student is on track to meet their end of year or growth goal:

Enrolled Grade	Progress Monitoring Measure	Goal/Threshold	Notes
Kindergarten	Letter Word Sound Fluency (LWSF)	On track to meet 46 spm.	End of Year goal
	Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 30 wpm	Students proficient on LWSF at the beginning of the year.
Grade 1	Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 65 wpm	End of Year goal
	Letter Word Sound Fluency (LWSF) and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 30 wpm	Growth Goal
Grade 2	2 nd Grade Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 100 wpm	End of Year goal
	1 st grade Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	Grows at least 58 wpm	Growth goal- enrolled grade expected growth
	Letter Word Sound Fluency (LWSF) and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 30 wpm	Growth Goal

DIBELS

Enrolled Grade	Progress Monitoring Measure	Goal/Threshold	Notes
Kindergarten	Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF-CLS)	On track to meet 28 CLS	End of Year goal
	Oral Reading Fluency* (ORF)	On track to meet 30 wpm	Students proficient on NWF at the beginning of the year. <i>* Utilizing Fresh Reads for Fluency and Comprehension.</i>
Grade 1	Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 65 wpm	End of Year goal
	Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF-CLS) and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 30 wpm	Growth Goal
Grade 2	2 nd Grade Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 100 wpm	End of Year goal
	1 st grade Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	Grows at least 58 wpm	Growth goal- enrolled grade expected growth
	Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF-CLS) and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	On track to meet 30 wpm	Growth Goal

4-8 classroom teachers use state-provided student growth scores based on the previous year M-Step SGP, if available. The evaluations will provide a hyperlink with the state-provided student growth scores for teachers in grades 4-8. This data, along with additional evidence of student growth, will provide guidance to support ratings for Quality of Student Learning and to have conversations with teachers.

Teachers with two or more years of NHA teaching experience who do not have individual student growth data will use schoolwide M-Step SGP and additional evidence of student growth. Teach Force teachers and teachers in their first year at NHA have not had a chance to influence schoolwide M-Step SGP, so they will be rated solely on additional evidence of student growth.

Teacher reliability and validity process plan

NHA demonstrates that our teacher evaluation/observation tool meets the standards considered valid and reliable by:

1. Providing a professional development training for all new deans on using the teacher rubric for evaluations/observations. This initial training will calibrate evaluators on the use of NHA's evaluation/observation tool. This initial training will take place each year by **September 30**.

2. During the training, deans will:
 - Review the evaluation rubric in depth.
 - Write down their ratings during observation of a video watching a teacher in his/her classroom.
 - Have conversations with one another to calibrate their ratings and discuss the reasoning behind why they provided those specific ratings to the teacher.
3. To demonstrate reliability among deans, after the training, deans will watch another teacher video and receive an assessment on their use of the evaluation/observation tool. Deans will watch the video and answer a set of questions about their observation. Each of the deans that participate will receive a score.
4. NHA will analyze the data from the video exercise for reliability and the ratings assigned by different evaluators observing the same lesson to ensure there is at least 70% interrater agreement.
5. NHA will provide similar training to new deans on the evaluation rubric.
6. To guarantee our evaluation rubrics are valid and we are measuring the right thing, we will annually review the correlation of our teachers' evaluation ratings with student growth scores.

If there aren't changes with our evaluation rubrics, we plan to analyze every three years to determine the reliability and validity of NHA's teacher evaluation/observation tool.

Interactive Framework (IF)

What it is

The Interactive Framework (IF) is a tool that aids in the use of the Classroom Framework as a blueprint to grow teachers.

How does it work?

Teachers are observed by their assigned dean on each indicator on the Classroom Framework and rated within the IF based on the evidence the dean has to support the current rating. Some areas leaders observe teachers on are lesson plans, pupil engagement, instructional practice and how they implement their assessment strategy. Teachers receive results of observations via email almost immediately (within a week at the latest) and best practice is that discussions happen in the next scheduled one-on-one (O3) meeting.

Observation requirements

Leaders can observe teachers on any area within the Classroom Framework on a daily basis, and they receive at least two full lesson observations per year. The second full lesson observation is considered a mid-year progress report for all teachers. NHA requires all observations to be at least thirty minutes in duration. The state mandates that one observation is announced. The other observation can be either announced or unannounced.

Who receives an individualized development plan?

All teachers receive an individualized Development Plan within the IF. The plan is created based on the professional development goals that are set by the leader and teacher. Goals are clearly marked in the IF and action steps and progress toward goals are documented within the tool.

Training

NHA offers many opportunities for professional development to help attract, retain and grow our staff. All new teachers hired prior to the start of school will participate in New Teacher Summit (NTS), a multiday immersion program designed to ensure buy-in to the school's mission and vision and to address specific curricular and instructional needs. Roberto Martinez, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Jaclyn Jeffrey, School

Leadership Development Director, Elisa Gibbs, Curriculum and Instruction Manager and Melissa VanKlombenburg, School Leadership Development Specialist provide session trainings. Ongoing coaching and additional training throughout the year actively supports training received during NTS. NHA has developed a collection of effective, industry-leading practices and incorporated them into its college readiness goal. NHA partner schools implement these practices to build a common approach designed to generate outstanding academic results.

To supplement NTS, teachers will participate in additional school-based staff-development days provided by school level leaders and Curriculum and Instruction associates prior to the start of school. These professional instructional processes and procedures provide new teachers with the opportunity to conduct grade-level planning with their colleagues.

Mentors

Leaders assign teachers who are in their first three years of teaching to a mentor who addresses day-to-day questions and concerns. Scheduled meetings with the mentor provide ongoing support in curriculum, instructional practice, and classroom management. Mentors will conduct periodic classroom observations and provide feedback to the teachers immediately after each visit to improve classroom instruction. All new teachers also participate in a Beginning Teacher Support Program established for additional support.

Each classroom teacher works closely with his or her dean to focus on specific development needs. Teachers and deans work collaboratively to establish teacher professional development goals. These goals serve as the basis for differentiated coaching for each teacher, which includes regular observations coupled with coaching conversations and coaching activities.

EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

What it is

Some states, including Michigan, have implemented annual educator effectiveness ratings. The purpose of the ratings is to ensure that school districts review teacher performance on a regular basis, allowing schools to refocus resources. In accordance with Michigan law, the ratings include two components: 1) student growth and assessment data, and 2) teacher performance evaluation rating.

Ratings

The state of Michigan rates educator effectiveness using the following rating levels:

Highly Effective
Effective
Minimally Effective
Ineffective

NOTE: NHA's internal evaluation ratings of Exemplary, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective are in alignment with state standards.

What the ratings mean

Michigan law states that if a teacher receives an overall ineffective or minimally effective rating, he/she must receive an individual development plan. The state mandates termination of a teacher if they receive an overall ineffective rating on three consecutive educator effectiveness scores. This requirement does not dismiss the district's policy regarding at-will employment.

How the ratings are calculated

Michigan law requires that student growth and assessment data account for 40% of the educator effectiveness rating. The remaining 60% of the rating is based on the annual evaluation. To meet this legal requirement, the annual performance evaluation rating serves as the educator effectiveness rating that is reported to the state.

NOTE: Data may change due to NHA and/or state legislative updates.

NHA will provide each educator with his/her educator effectiveness rating at the time the annual performance evaluation is delivered to the teacher.

Each year, NHA reviews state educator effectiveness legislation to ensure we meet any updated state requirements.

Review process

In accordance with Michigan law, a teacher who is not in their first five years full years of school employment and is rated ineffective may request a review of the evaluation. The request must be submitted in writing within 20 days after the teacher is informed of the rating.