

## CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015

*Section 1249(3)* Beginning with the 2016-17 school year, a school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy shall post on its public website all of the following information about the evaluation tool or tools it uses for its performance evaluation system for teachers:

### **Research base for the instructional framework, instrument, and process** [*Section 1249(3)(a)*]

- [Research and Development of 5D Instructional Framework and 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric](#)
- [Research for 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric](#)
- [Teacher Evaluation Research](#)

### **Identify and Qualifications of the Authors** [*Section 1249(3)(b)*]

- The University of Washington's Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) [Teacher Evaluation System](#) provides research-based methods and instruments to:
  - Plan and implement a growth-oriented teacher evaluation system focused on high-quality learning.
  - Develop a common language and shared vision for improving teaching and learning using an instructional framework.
  - Analyze and calibrate evaluation ratings across classrooms, schools and districts using an evaluation rubric.
  - Increase the expertise of school leaders to guide and support the professional growth of teachers.
- [About CEL](#)
- [CEL's History](#)
- [CEL's Team](#)

### **Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy** [*Section 1249(3)(c)*]

- [Research and Development of 5D Instructional Framework and 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric](#)
- There are eight challenges that districts typically face when working to increase the reliability of observation for purposes of teacher evaluation. The following provides an overview of these eight challenges to achieving increased reliability, as well as recommendations/possible solutions for districts to consider.
  - [CEL Rater Reliability Research Overview](#)

### **Evaluation Framework and Rubric** [*Section 1249(3)(d)*]

- [5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning Instructional Framework](#)
- [5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric](#)
  - [Special Learning Environment Guidance](#)
  - [Special Education Guiding Questions](#)



## CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015

**Description of the process for conducting observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans. [Section 1249(3)(e)]**

- CEL's teacher evaluation system engages teachers and principals in the 5D+ Inquiry Cycle. Teachers typically engage in two inquiry cycles during a single school year. Except as permitted by law and District election, each teacher is provided an annual evaluation at the end of the school year, based on an analysis of observation evidence collected during the inquiry cycles, as well as student growth and assessment data, as required by law.
- The 5D+ inquiry cycle has four steps:
  - Step 1 - Self-Assessment
    - A teacher assesses instructional practice using the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D) instructional framework and the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric. A teacher cites evidence from his or her day-to-day classroom practice to support one's assessment for each rubric indicator.
  - Step 2 - Determine a Focus (Developing Performance Improvement Plans)
    - A teacher rated effective or highly effective on their most recent evaluation, or the evaluator, when in consultation with a first year probationary teacher or a teacher rated less than effective on their most recent evaluation, will:
      - Analyze evidence to identify areas of focus (typically 3-4 indicators from 2 or more dimension in the 5D+ rubric).
      - Set specific performance goals (instructional practice and student learning goals); identify action steps to achieve goals, including recommended professional development, instructional support, or coaching; and identify evidence that will demonstrate meeting the goals.
        - Note: Under Michigan Teachers' Tenure Act, time periods for demonstrating progress toward achieving goals in an IDP shall not be greater than 180 calendar days, and should be determined by the evaluator in consultation with the teacher based on the goal and its impact on classroom instruction.
  - Step 3 - Implementation and Support (Conducting Observations/Collecting Evidence):
    - Each teacher is expected to be observed 4-6 times per year (2-3 times per inquiry cycle) in order for an evaluator to have adequate evidence to determine indicator scores for a summative evaluation of professional practice. Each observation should be 15 minutes in length, unless a longer duration is determined necessary by the observer and/or evaluator. Observations are typically unannounced, unless an observer determines a need to pre-conference with a teacher prior to an observation (i.e. providing coaching specific to planning and/or assessing student learning).
      - Note: Michigan law permits districts to allow fewer observations for teachers rated effective and/or highly effective on their two most recent evaluations. Secondly, at least one observation must be

## CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015

unannounced by statute.

- Below are the specific steps for collecting evidence, analyzing evidence, and providing formative feedback for each observation:
  - Script - Collect specific and descriptive evidence.
  - Code - Align evidence from script to specific indicators in the 5D+ Rubric.
  - Notice/Wonder/Response - Identify/highlight evidence and pose questions related to a teacher's area of focus (i.e. IDP performance goals). Collect teacher responses to wonderings.
  - Sort - Analyze evidence of teacher practice to identify a teacher's zone of proximal development in preparation to provide formative feedback.
  - Feedback - Provide teacher with formative feedback that recognizes/affirms practices in place and communicate actionable next steps (short-term coaching points) to improve practice. Feedback should be provided within 48 hours when possible, but not later than 30 calendar days following the observation.
  
- Step 4 - Analyze Impact (Mid-Year and End-of-Year Inquiry Conferences):
  - At the end of the first inquiry cycle (typically in January), each teacher and his/her evaluator will meet for a mid-year inquiry conference. As part of the mid-year review, the teacher and evaluator will:
    - Review the Growth Plan (IDP, PDG, etc.)
    - Examine student and teacher data.
    - Analyze the impact of the data.
    - Discuss teacher growth using the 5D+ rubric.
    - Decide whether to continue the same inquiry and/or identify new area(s) of focus for the next inquiry cycle.
      - Note: For teachers with an IDP, Michigan law requires that the evaluator set specific performance goals for the remainder of the year and write an improvement plan, in consultation with the teacher, that includes any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching to achieve performance goals.
  
  - At the conclusion of the second inquiry cycle (typically in May), evaluators will meet with each teacher for an Evaluation Conference. As part of the end-of-year inquiry conference, the teacher and principal will:
    - Review the Growth Plan (IDP, PDG, etc.)
    - Examine student and teacher data.
    - Analyze the impact of the data.
    - Discuss teacher growth using the 5D+ rubric.
    - Decide whether to continue the same inquiry and/or identify new area(s) of focus for the next inquiry cycle.
      - Note: Michigan law requires that evaluators to draft an IDP for the next school year for a teacher rated ineffective or minimally. This IDP must include specific performance goals and any recom-



## CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015

mended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching to achieve performance goals. This may not be necessary if the evaluator recommends the teacher not continue.

- Developing Performance Ratings
  - Step 1 - Determine an Indicator Score (Process one indicator at a time):
    - Read the rubric performance language for each indicator.
    - Examine formative evidence from observed practice (i.e. coded scripts, answers to wonderings, trends, student work, notes from formative conversations with teachers, teachers' self-assessment, etc.)
    - Determine a rating for each indicator within a dimension by an analysis of evidence from multiple observations. (Note: Evaluators should be able to point to the evidence across observation scripts to support the alignment of evidence to a performance level in the 5D+ rubric.) Make a determination for each indicator based upon the preponderance of evidence and/or growth over time and its probable truth/accuracy, not solely the amount of evidence. More specifically:
      - Start at Basic. Is there evidence to support all parts of the Basic performance level? If no, rate Unsatisfactory. If yes, move to Proficient. Is there evidence to support all parts of the Proficient performance level? If no, rate Basic. If yes, move to Distinguished. Is there evidence to support all parts of the Distinguished performance level? If no, rate Proficient. If yes, rate Distinguished.
        - Note: The teacher's area of focus and the school's professional development focus should inform an evaluator's thinking about whether s/he is looking for a preponderance of evidence or growth over time. Scoring by preponderance of evidence is primarily for scoring indicators that were not directly connected to the area of focus (i.e., IDP, growth plan) during the year's inquiry cycles. Scoring by growth over time is primarily for scoring indicators that were directly part of the teacher's area of focus during the year's inquiry cycles and/or district/building focus. The evaluator should assess whether a preponderance of evidence supports the resulting rating.
  - Step 2 - Determine a Dimension Rating: Examine all indicator ratings within a dimension, consider the key ideas of the dimension, and determine a dimension rating based on the preponderance of evidence at the indicator level.
  - Step 3 - Determine a 5D+ Summative Rating: Examine all of the dimension ratings, and determine a preliminary professional practice rating based on the preponderance of evidence at the dimension level.
  - Step 4 - Determine a Professional Practice Rating: Based on the preliminary professional practice rating, and consideration of criteria enumerated in section 1248 not measured by the 5D+ rubric, an evaluator uses professional judgment to determine whether to



## CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015

maintain, increase or decrease a teacher's preliminary professional practice rating based on the following:

- The teacher's inability to withstand the strain of teaching, attendance and/or disciplinary record, if any, may reduce the professional practice rating.
- Relevant accomplishments and contributions, if any, may increase the professional practice rating.
- Special training, if any, may increase the professional practice rating. This factor shall be based on completion of relevant training other than the professional development or continuing education that is required by the employer or by state law, and integration of that training into instruction in a meaningful way.
- Step 5 - Determine Student Growth Rating: Examine multiple measures of student growth, and derive a student growth rating.
  - Note: If there are student growth and assessment data available for a teacher for at least three school years, the student growth rating shall be based on the student growth and assessment data for the most recent three-consecutive-school-year period. If there are not student growth and assessment data available for a teacher for at least three school years, the student growth rating shall be based on all student growth and assessment data that are available for the teacher.
- Step 6 - Determine Effectiveness Rating: Aggregate Professional Practice (60%) and Student Growth (40%) ratings to calculate a raw score. Use the following scoring band to determine an effectiveness rating:

Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
1.0 - 1.49	1.5 - 2.49	2.5 - 3.49	3.5 - 4.0

Assign one of the following effectiveness ratings:

- Ineffective (1): Professional practice at Level 1 shows evidence of not understanding the concepts underlying individual criteria of the performance evaluation system. 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 practice. This level requires immediate intervention and the development of an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) written by the evaluator that includes specific performance goals, and any recommended professional development, instructional support or coaching that would assist the teacher in meeting these goals. This may not be necessary if a decision is made not to continue the teacher.



## CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015

- Minimally Effective (2): Professional practice at Level 2 shows a developing understanding of the knowledge and skills of the criteria required in practice, but performance may be inconsistent over a period of time due to lack of experience, expertise, and/or commitment. This level may be considered minimally competent for teachers early in their careers but insufficient for more experienced teachers. This level requires specific support through the development of an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) written by the evaluator that includes specific performance goals, and any recommended professional development, instructional support or coaching that would assist the teacher in meeting these goals, unless a decision is made not to continue the teacher.
- Effective (3): Professional practice at Level 3 shows evidence of thorough knowledge of all aspects of the profession. This is successful, accomplished, professional, and effective practice. Teaching 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.
- Highly Effective (4): 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 needs to have received a majority of distinguished ratings on the dimension scores. A teacher at this level must show evidence of average to high impact on student growth. Ongoing, reflective teaching is demonstrated through the highest level of expertise and commitment to all students' learning, challenging professional growth, and collaborative practice.

### **Description of Plan for Providing Evaluators and Observers with Training** [Section 1249(3)(f)]

- CEL's two-stage training program (6 days) is designed to help educators develop their understanding of the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning instructional framework, the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, the 5D+ Inquiry Cycle, and Summative Scoring.
  - Stage I training (1 day) provides an introduction to the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning instructional framework, 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, and 5D+ Inquiry Cycle. The focus is developing participants' understanding of how the 5D instructional framework and the 5D+ rubric connect to inform teaching and learning, as well as how to use the inquiry process during teacher evaluation to support teacher growth.
  - Stage II (5 days) training develops and deepens a participants' knowledge and use of the 5D instructional framework, 5D+ Rubric, and the 5D+ Inquiry Cycle to improve a teacher's practice. Each day has a focus on a new dimension and its connection to other dimensions. Each day provides dimension-specific practice of the formative feedback cycle. In addition, participants learn to use Pivot to facilitate work related to supervision and evaluation. The last day of training introduces participants to the scoring methodology for summative evaluation.



## **CEL Postings & Assurances for MI PA 173 of 2015**

- To meet the PA 173 training requirements, all evaluators and observers participate in both Stage I and Stage II (6 days) training at a regional site or in-district that is facilitated by one or more authorized and licensed CEL trainers who have expertise in the evaluation tool, and who have been trained to train others in the use of CEL's evaluation tool.