



Teacher Evaluation Plan

Handbook



I. Development Process

A. Quality Compensation (Q Comp) Plan

In 2009 a dedicated group of Big Lake teachers and administrators formed an advisory group to develop a viable Quality Compensation (Q Comp) Aid Application that would meet the approval of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) and align with related teacher evaluation, educational planning and professional development statutes. At that time, legislators in Minnesota were in the beginning phases of proposing new principal and teacher evaluation statutes. As the Q Comp advisory group crafted the Big Lake plan, they decided to build in components that not only aligned with Q Comp guidelines, but also ensured that a transition to a new teacher evaluation model in the future would have a strong foundation. With the adoption of the Big Lake Q Comp Plan in October 2011, teachers in Big Lake began to implement professional learning communities (PLCs), peer observation and student growth goals—all integral components of the new teacher evaluation statute, which was required by law to be implemented fully beginning with the 2014-2015 school year.

Initial implementation of the Big Lake Q Comp Plan was not without challenges, but teachers and administrators soon began to see the power of job-embedded professional collaboration on critical school improvement issues such as standards alignment, assessment of student learning and planning of instructional strategies. The use of data to inform instruction grew just as Minnesota moved to a student growth model. Four peer observers were released from their classroom assignments to become highly qualified teacher-leaders with regular training to ensure inter-rater reliability. Teachers received performance pay for meeting student growth and teacher practice goals.

B. Teacher Evaluation Model

During the 2012-2013 school year, training and planning sessions were offered by MDE and attended by a small group of Big Lake representatives. A teacher evaluation plan workgroup met monthly during the 2013-2014 school year to gain an understanding of the statutory requirements and to align existing Q Comp processes to create a Big Lake model compliant with the new state statute.

The MDE “Minnesota Teacher Development, Evaluation and Peer Support Model” was referenced throughout the planning process. In the absence of a locally developed plan, implementation of the state model is required by statute. The Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan workgroup agreed that many of the requirements of the state model were already in practice at Big Lake, and that the state model was a significant departure from current practice. Therefore, decisions made for the Big Lake plan represents elements from the state plan along with locally developed pieces.

The Q Comp Plan will continue to operate as written; the Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan combines existing Q Comp practices with new statutory requirements to ensure compliance.

II. Joint Agreement

Per Minnesota Statute, a school board and an exclusive representative of teachers must “develop a teacher evaluation and peer review process for probationary and continuing contract teachers through joint agreement.” Districts must begin implementing this new plan during the 2014-2015 school year.

Due to the philosophically and financially interdependent nature of the Big Lake Q Comp Plan and the Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan, both plans may require revision in the event that Q Comp aid changes.

Following a review by teachers, administrators and school board members, a joint agreement was signed, which is available in Appendix A.

III. Required Components

Minnesota Statutes, sections 122A.40 and 122A.41 define requirements for teacher evaluation. MDE provided a worksheet, “Comparison of Minnesota Statutory Requirements” (Appendix B) to assist the Big Lake workgroup, when comparing requirements in statute, current Q Comp practice or other models. Significant changes to current practice are highlighted in this document.

The final plan aligns with the 12 statute requirements as outlined below:

1. Must provide the requisite evaluations for probationary teachers;
2. Must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes an individual growth and development plan, peer review, and at least one summative evaluation by a qualified and trained evaluator;
3. Must be based on Minnesota’s Standards of Effective Practice for Teachers in MN Rule 8710.2000;
4. Must coordinate staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes;
5. May allow school time for coaching and collaboration;
6. May include mentoring and induction programs;
7. Must allow teachers to present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth that includes a teacher’s own performance assessments;
8. Must use an agreed-upon teacher value-added model where value-added data are available and use state or local student growth measures where value-added data are unavailable as a basis for 35% of teacher evaluation results;
9. Must use longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures aligned with curriculum for which teachers are responsible;
10. Must require qualified and trained evaluators to perform summative evaluations;
11. Must give teachers not meeting professional teaching standards the support to improve with established goals and timelines;
12. Must discipline a teacher who does not adequately improve.

IV. Three Foundations

The Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan is built upon three foundations: teacher practice, student engagement and student growth.

The Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan (Appendix C) illustrates the three-year cycle of data collection leading up to the three-year formal evaluation.

A. Teacher Practice (60%)

Teacher practice will account for 60 percent of the summative teacher evaluation, which is derived from the teacher's knowledge, skills and professional responsibilities. Teacher practice will be evaluated using the Big Lake Observation Framework, which is adapted from the Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2007) as the definition of good teaching. The framework is a research-based set of instructional components aligned to the Professional Teaching Standards outlined in MN Rule 8710.2000.

The Big Lake Observation Framework describes those aspects of a teacher's practice that have been demonstrated to promote student learning. It divides the complex work of teaching into four major domains: planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction and professional responsibilities. Each of the 22 components consists of several smaller elements, which serve to fully describe the component. Performance is measured on four ratings: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished.

1. Peer Observations

Peer observers will use an abbreviated version of this tool (seven components) to give formative feedback during each round of observation each year. Peer observers will follow the Q Comp Plan to guide their work, and their reports will become a key source for observational data for the seven components.

Teachers must choose at least one set of peer observation documents to include in their online portfolio each year. From these three sets, the teacher will select a minimum of one set of peer observation documents in preparation for their formal evaluation in year three.

2. Learning Walkthroughs

Administrators will conduct regular walkthroughs of each classroom to gather formative data on the domains of planning, classroom environment and instruction. Teachers can choose to use any or all of this data as portfolio evidence.

3. Artifacts

Teachers will add the following artifacts to their portfolio to prepare for their three-year evaluation:

- Lesson or Unit Plan Artifact
- Assessment Artifact
- Parent Communication Log
- Record-keeping Evidence

4. Formal Evaluation

The Big Lake plan requires licensed administrators to perform formal summative evaluations. These may occur at any time with any teacher, but are required every year for probationary teachers and every three years for tenured teachers.

B. Student Engagement (5%)

Student engagement will account for 5 percent of the summative teacher evaluation. Student engagement is defined by a student's commitment to and involvement in academic, behavioral, cognitive and affective learning. It is influenced by rigor, relevance and relationships, and is a pervasive trait in a high-functioning classroom.

1. Student Engagement Walkthroughs

Informally, student engagement is monitored constantly throughout the school day and year. Formally, administrators will conduct regular walkthroughs of each classroom to gather formative data on student engagement using an electronic template. This data will be used as portfolio evidence. In addition, teachers may choose to add their own student survey data as portfolio evidence.

2. Engaging Students in Learning Rubric

Peer observers gather student engagement data during each of their annual rounds. Teachers may choose to use additional data from their peer observations to include in their portfolio as student engagement evidence.

C. Student Growth (35%)

As required by statute, 35 percent of the formal evaluation rating will focus on student learning and achievement, referred to as "student growth" in the Big Lake plan. Student growth is measured by "assessments that have the highest degree of confidence and commonality," such as Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA), Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP), or other agreed-upon assessments of student growth.

1. Participation in Professional Learning Communities

The Big Lake Q Comp Plan relies on measures of student growth through the PLC model. Teachers set site and PLC goals, based on reliable assessment data measures. PLC work focuses on goal setting, job-embedded collaboration and data driven dialogue around strategies and action steps most likely to accelerate student growth and achievement. Each August, PLC facilitators participate in a data retreat where district and site goals are set and entered into a PLC goal-setting template. In September, PLCs analyze their data and set PLC goals with required strategies and action steps.

2. Individual Growth and Development Plan (IGDP)

Each fall, teachers will each complete an individual growth and development plan (IGDP), which will include annual reflections on:

- Student growth goal results from previous school year
- Peer observations
- Student engagement and instructional walkthroughs
- Professional growth and development

3. Student Growth Ratings

At the three-year formal evaluation conference with the principal each year's goal attainment will be discussed, and a rating based on growth will be given. Growth ratings for site, PLC and individual goal attainment over three years will be evaluated for a total of 35 percent of the final overall rating.

V. Three Year Formal Evaluation

The Q Comp Plan utilizes an electronic warehouse (PD360) to store observation records and to deliver professional development. Following an observation, teachers are accustomed to receiving an e-mail verifying that a report has been submitted to their electronic file. Teachers can login and review their observation information at any time.

This system allows Big Lake to develop customized templates for data entry simplifying the evaluation process and keeping all data in a secure, yet central location for teachers, peer observers and administrators. All pre and post observation conference reflections, observation frameworks, walkthrough templates and aspects of the IGDP will be accessed online. Teachers may select any of their electronic documents to add to their electronic portfolio by a simple click and drag operation. Teachers may also upload photos, documents and other files to their portfolio if they choose.

During the three-year evaluation, principals will move toward an evidence-based model instead of the traditional three-year formal observation. Rather than relying only on observation data, they will review teacher-selected peer observation documents, data gathered through walkthroughs and formal observations, teaching artifacts (unit or lesson plan, assessment, record-keeping, communication log) and other data as part of the summative conference. The full Big Lake Observation Framework (22 components) will be utilized for the final ratings. The Three-Year Formal Evaluation Template (Appendix D) provides a summary of evidence considered for each component of the observation framework.

VI. Teacher Supports**A. Mentoring**

Through Q Comp, each teacher new to the district is assigned a building-level mentor. The mentors will guide and support new teacher professional development. The goals of the program include:

- Successful induction of beginning teachers into the profession
- Retention of quality teachers to the district

- Professional development opportunities that will enhance student learning
- Collegial community that focuses on support, encouragement and time for personal reflection

B. Teacher Assistance Track

To provide support for teachers who do not meet the standards of effective teaching, Big Lake uses a Teacher Assistance Track (Appendix E), which is designed to assist teachers who need assistance meeting the standards. Most teachers are able to improve and move out of the assistance phases with the additional support provided by this model.

Appendix A Joint Agreement

JOINT AGREEMENT

Big Lake School District 727 and Big Lake Education Minnesota jointly agree to adopt the mutually developed Teacher Development and Evaluation plan as required under M.S. 122A40. Big Lake School Board 727 agrees to include Big Lake Education Minnesota representatives to create or revise contract language in compliance with Teacher Development and Evaluation M.S. 122A40.

Local EdMN President

Date of Action

Local Board Chair

Date of Action

Appendix B Comparison of Minnesota Statutory Requirements

<p style="text-align: center;">Comparison of Minnesota Statutory Requirements to Big Lake Model</p> <p>The following worksheet assisted the Big Lake workgroup when comparing requirements in statute, current Q Comp practice or other models. Significant changes to current practice are highlighted in yellow. The final plan aligns with statute as outlined below:</p>	
Statutory Requirements	Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan
A school board and exclusive representative of the teachers jointly agree to an annual teacher evaluation and peer review process for probationary and non-probationary teachers (or use the state model by default). Annual teacher evaluations are designed to develop, improve, and support qualified teachers and effective teaching practices and improve student learning and success.	<p>The Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan was developed by a local workgroup whose task was to add to existing Q Comp processes to create a model that complies with the new state statute.</p> <p>This group includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rachel Schultz, Liberty teacher • Sara Edgar, Independence teacher • Brittany Kehn, Independence teacher • Jim VanderHeyden, MS teacher • Adam Pelot, HS teacher • Carla Reeck, Gifted and Talented Teacher • Kelly Jurek, BLEM president • Chad Libby, Q Comp Coordinator • Caryl Gordy, Liberty Principal • Bob Dockendorf, BLHS principal • Bart Appleton, Human Resources Manager • Crys Thorson, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning
Teacher evaluation processes must provide the requisite evaluations for probationary teachers—three evaluations annually with the first within 90 days of employment.	Probationary teachers will have three annual evaluations by their principal and three annual observations by their peer observer—the first peer observation and the first principal evaluation will occur within 90 days of employment.
Teacher evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes a growth and development plan, peer review, the opportunity to participate in a professional learning community, and at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator.	<p>The Big Lake plan annually includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual Growth and Development Plan (IGDP) • 3 Peer Observations • Weekly PLC Meetings <p>Every three years a teacher’s administrator will formally evaluate him or her.</p>

<p>Teacher evaluation processes must be based on professional teaching standards established in MN Rule 8710.2000.</p>	<p>Big Lake continues to use the 22 components of the Big Lake Observation Framework (Charlotte Danielson, 2007) as approved in our original Q Comp plan.</p> <p>Each fall, each teacher will complete a self-assessment using the 22 components. One component will be selected for the IGDP as an area of individual focus for the year.</p> <p>Peer observers will use the same seven components outlined in the Q Comp plan unless the teacher requests a different combination of seven components. Peer observers will provide feedback on the IGDP goal during post-observation conferences, but a formal rating will not be given. Administrators will use the entire Big Lake Observation Framework every three years.</p>
<p>Teacher evaluation processes must coordinate staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes.</p>	<p>Big Lake Schools currently plans and provides professional development aligned to PLC work and facilitation (Critical Issues for Team Consideration), peer observation and other initiatives.</p> <p>Beginning in May 2014, and continuing throughout the 2014-2015 school year, additional training on the teacher evaluation model will occur to ensure that all teachers and evaluators understand the process fully.</p> <p>PLC facilitators will be trained to utilize the electronic portfolio, and PLC time will be allocated for portfolio training and preparation.</p>
<p>Teacher evaluation processes must perhaps allow school time for coaching and collaboration.</p>	<p>Our Q Comp model requires job-embedded processes. We will continue to implement PLCs and peer observation during the school day.</p>
<p>Teacher evaluation processes must perhaps include mentoring and induction programs.</p>	<p>Our current Q Comp plan includes mentoring and induction programming for new teachers. We will continue to utilize this model.</p>

Teacher evaluation processes must allow teachers to present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth that includes teachers' own performance assessment.	<p>Q Comp observations and principal evaluations have utilized an online tool, "Observation360", for three years. To streamline the new evaluation process for teachers, all required data will be stored online within "PD360" in individual teacher portfolios.</p> <p>Teachers will regularly add to their portfolio, selecting from records already loaded (peer observations, IGDP documents, walkthrough data, etc.). Teachers will also be able to upload artifacts (teacher-created assessments, unit or lesson plans, photo or video of an activity, supportive files or documents, etc.) to strengthen evidence for their annual and three-year evaluation with their principal.</p>
Teacher evaluation processes must use an agreed-upon teacher value-added assessment where value-added data are available and state or local student growth measures where value-added data are unavailable as a basis for 35 percent of teacher evaluation results.	<p>35 percent of the annual and three-year principal evaluations will be based on achievement of site, PLC and individual goals.</p> <p>Performance pay will continue to follow the Q Comp plan.</p>
Teacher evaluation processes must use longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures aligned with curriculum for which teachers are responsible.	<p>5 percent of the annual and three-year principal evaluations will include student engagement data, collected during peer observations and administrative walkthroughs.</p> <p>Walkthroughs will be conducted building-wide during each round/trimester. Walkthrough data will focus on research-based factors related to student engagement.</p>
Teacher evaluation processes must require qualified and trained evaluators to perform summative evaluations.	<p>The Big Lake plan utilizes trained peer observers to gather formative data three times a year. At the end of each year, the teacher selects one or more of their peer observations to add to their portfolio evidence.</p> <p>The Big Lake plan requires licensed administrators to perform summative evaluations. Administrators will use portfolio evidence to perform summative evaluations every year for probationary teachers and every three years for tenured teachers. In addition, at any time, a principal may observe and evaluate any teacher.</p>
Teacher evaluation processes must give teachers not meeting professional teaching standards the support to improve with established goals and timelines.	The teacher assistance track will continue to be used in Big Lake to assist teachers in need of improvement.
Teacher evaluation processes must discipline teachers who do not adequately improve.	<p>The teacher assistance track includes three phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness, Assistance, Discipline

Appendix C Big Lake Teacher Evaluation Plan

This chart illustrates the formative and summative aspects of the plan, as well as yearly requirements.

	Years 1-3 Formative Evidence			Year 3 Summative Evidence
TEACHER PRACTICE 60%	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Portfolio Evidence <u>Minimum Required:</u> Peer Observation Reports (1 set) Lesson or Unit Plan Artifact (1) Assessment Artifact (1) Parent Communication Log (1) Record-Keeping Evidence (1) Individual Growth Plan (all) Three Year Formal Evaluation Big Lake Observation Framework 3 year Observation form
	Peer Observation Pre-observation form Peer observation-7 components Post-observation reflection form	Peer Observation Pre-observation form Peer observation-7 components Post-observation reflection form	Peer Observation Pre-observation form Peer observation-7 components Post-observation reflection form	
STUDENT ENGAGEMENT 5%	Learning Walkthroughs Classroom Environment (2a, 2c, 2e)	Learning Walkthroughs Planning (1a,1b,1d)	Learning Walkthroughs Instruction (3a, 3e)	
	Engagement Walkthroughs (Components 2b, 3c)	Engagement Walkthroughs (Components 2b, 3c)	Engagement Walkthroughs (Components 2b, 3c)	
STUDENT GROWTH 35%	Sept-Oct PLC Meeting PLC SMART goals form Individual Growth and Development Plan (IGDP)	Oct-Dec Principal Conference (IGDP approval)	Portfolio Evidence Completion of Yearly evidence selection/uploads	

Appendix D Three-year Formal Evaluation Template

THREE-YEAR FORMAL EVALUATION TEMPLATE						
TEACHER PRACTICE (60%)	PEER OBSERVATION DATA		D	P	B	U
	Peer Observations Lesson or Unit Plan Artifact	Component 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes				
		Component 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction				
		Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior				
		Component 3b: Using Questioning & Discussion Techniques				
		Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction				
	ARTIFACTS					
	Record Keeping	Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records				
	Communication Log	Component 4c: Communicating with Families				
	Assessment	Component 1f: Designing Student Assessments				
	WALK-THROUGH DATA					
	Round 1 Reports	Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect & Rapport				
		Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures				
		Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space				
	Round 2 Reports	Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content & Pedagogy				
		Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students				
		Component 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources				
Round 3 Reports	Component 3a: Communicating with Students					
	Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility & Responsiveness					
STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (5%)	Rounds 1-3 Reports Peer Observations	Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning				
		Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning				
STUDENT GROWTH (35%)	INDIVIDUAL GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT PLAN					
	PLC Meetings	Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community				
	IGDP PD Record	Component 4e: Growing & Developing Professionally				
	Daily Work	Component 4f: Showing Professionalism				
	IGDP Reflections Peer Observations	Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching				
	IGDP	3 Year Growth: Site Goal				
		3 Year Growth: PLC Goal				
		3 Year Growth: Individual Goal				

Appendix E Teacher Assistance Track

1. Awareness Phase:

a. Informal contact

- i. Express concern
- ii. Get teacher response
- iii. Give specific suggestions
- iv. Data collection (observations, walk-throughs, interviews)

b. Written documentation of concern

c. Teacher and principal collaborate and attempt to resolve concern.

If the concern is not resolved or there is a disciplinary issue, the teacher is placed into the assistance or disciplinary phase.

2. Assistance Phase:

a. Review recommendations from the awareness phase

b. Develop a specific plan that includes:

- i. Growth-oriented SMART goals
- ii. Timeline
- iii. Indicators of progress
- iv. Resources and support needed

c. Set specific meeting times to review progress made

Upon reviewing progress one of the following recommendations will be made:

- The concern is resolved
- Sufficient progress is made, so that the timeline is revised, and the teacher remains in the assistance phase
- The concern is not resolved and the teacher is moved into a disciplinary phase

3. Disciplinary Phase:

A teacher may be placed into the disciplinary phase for reasons that may include, but are not limited to:

- Not meeting the standards for effective teaching after being in the assistance phase
- Insubordination
- Specific policy/rule violations

The district will take appropriate disciplinary action, as outlined by Minnesota Statute 122A.40.