

Evaluation Instruments
Byron Center Public School District

Introduction

Byron Center Public School District believes in the responsibility and importance of growing the skill sets and abilities of its certified staff to their fullest potential for the benefit of our students. This document is designed to demonstrate to our parents, students, and community that one way we seek to achieve this goal is through our evaluation process. Three evaluation instruments will be used in our evaluation process:

Michigan Association of School Boards: Superintendent Evaluation

School ADvance: Administrator Evaluation

5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning: Teacher Evaluation

For each of these three instruments, we will describe and/or provide access to the following:

- A. The research base that supports the framework, instrument, and process
- B. Identify the authors and provide the qualifications of the authors
- C. Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy
- D. The evaluation frameworks and rubrics
- E. A description of our process for conducting observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans
- F. The training plan for evaluators and observers

The following resources were used for research and best practices. The district reserves the right to deviate from language on research practices as it pertains to Byron Center Public School evaluations, which is outlined in the procedures and processes below but following Michigan Legislature Section 380.1248 and 380.1249.

Superintendent: <http://www.masb.org/postingrequirements>

Administrator:

http://www.goschooladvance.org/sites/default/files/AssurancesDoc_Michigan_Users_2016_6.pdf?sid=402

Teacher: http://mymassp.com/5D_teacher_evaluation_postings_and_assurances

Michigan Association of School Boards:

Superintendent

A. Research Basis

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research (see the Bibliography for a selection of supporting sources) and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals and American Association of School Administrators were instrumental to this work. The public was also invited to comment on two drafts of the Standards, which contributed to the final product. The National Policy Board for Education Administration, a consortium of professional organizations committed to advancing school leadership (including those named above), has assumed leadership of the 2015 Standards in recognition of their significance to the profession and will be their steward going forward.

Midcontinent Research for Education and Learning (2006). *School District Leadership That Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement*. Denver, CO

B. Authors

The Michigan Association of School Boards has served boards of education since its inception in 1949. In the decades since, MASB has worked hands-on with tens of thousands of school board members and superintendents throughout the state. Evaluation of the superintendent has been a key aspect of that work – MASB developed superintendent evaluation instruments and trained board members in their use nearly half a century before the requirements.

C. Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy

Validity refers to how well an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Construct validity was established for the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Construct validity ensures the assessment is actually measuring superintendent performance. Validity was established using of a panel of experts familiar with the research base and work of the effective school superintendent. The experts examined the research, identified performance indicators for measure and refined the scale for measurement.

Efficacy refers to the capacity of the evaluation instrument to produce the desired or intended results. The MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument has three intended outcomes:

- To accurately assess the level of a superintendent’s job performance
- To improve the superintendent’s professional practice and impact on student learning
- To advance the goals of the school district

- MASB will seek to establish efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument by surveying school board members and superintendents from a representative sample of school districts (see details below). An electronic survey instrument will be used to ascertain the extent to which:
- The district followed the prescribed process for conducting the evaluation, and
- The evaluation instrument and prescribed process supported the stated outcomes

Reliability is the degree to which an evaluation instrument produces stable and consistent results. While there are several types of reliability, MASB will seek to establish the test-retest reliability of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Test-retest reliability is a measure of reliability obtained by administering the same instrument twice over a period of time to a group of individuals. To accomplish this, a representative sample of school districts using the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument will participate in a reliability study. A minimum of 15 school districts (with low board member turnover and no transition in the superintendency) will conduct an evaluation at the midpoint of their evaluation cycle (T1) and again at the end of their evaluation (T2). Scores from the two assessments will then be correlated in order to evaluate the test for reliability. A coefficient of 7.0 or higher will indicate acceptable stability.

D. Evaluation Rubric

The Superintendent Evaluation instrument can be found at this link.

E. Evaluation Process

1. August: Annual Evaluation Conducted and Beginning of New Cycle

- Completed evaluation form reflects Board of Education's assessment of superintendent's performance.

At the beginning of the cycle in which the evaluation is to occur, the Board of Education and Superintendent convene to agree on the following:

- System (tool) to be used
- Timeline and key dates
- Goals, benchmarks and evidence
- How evaluation will be compiled
- How evaluation will be shared with superintendent
- How evaluation will be shared with the community

2. **February:** Mid-Cycle Formal Update

- Board president provides questions from the board prior to meeting
- Superintendent provides update on progress with available evidence
- Board seeks clarification if needed
- Discussion on progress and growth
- Adjustments to course or goals are discussed

3. **July:** Superintendent gives Self Evaluation Review to the Board of Education

- Superintendent performs self-evaluation; presents Board of Education
- Board members review prior to evaluation, seek clarification as needed
- Board president or consultant facilitate evaluation
- Formal evaluation is presented to and adopted by Board of Education
- Board president and Superintendent coordinate public statement regarding Superintendent performance

If a superintendent is rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the Board of Education may choose to conduct an evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if a superintendent is not rated as highly effective on one of these biennial evaluations, the superintendent must again be evaluated annually.

F. Training

Training for the evaluations will be conducted by a trained individual from Michigan Association of School Boards

School ADvance

Administrators

A. The Research Basis

“The six guiding principles for designing performance evaluation and feedback systems that support learning, growth, and adaptation were developed by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Dr. George Aramath, based on a two-year meta-analysis of the literature on performance assessment and feedback.

The administrator evaluation rubrics were developed by Dr. Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill based on a one-year meta review of extant administrator evaluation instruments and research bases.

The work for both were significantly informed by the work of the Wallace Foundation, including two Michigan based Wallace Foundation grant projects focused on school level leadership development. Dr. Reeves served on the grant faculty teams for both of these projects with the late Dr. Van Cooley and Dr. Jianping Shen of Western Michigan University.

Dr. Reeves and Mrs. McNeill are also experienced school administrators who each served for over two decades as school administrators in Michigan.”

B. Authors

School Advance was created by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill.

Dr. Patricia Reeves

Dr. Patricia Reeves is an Associate Professor of educational leadership, research, and evaluation in the College of Education and Human Development at Western Michigan University – Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology. She also serves a contracted MASA Associate Executive Director for Administrator Certification and Development. Dr. Reeves joined the MASA team and the WMU faculty in 2005 with 19 years’ experience as a K-12 assistant superintendent and superintendent. Prior to that, she was a Director of Instruction, a Gifted and Talented Program Specialist, a Reading Specialist, and a classroom teacher.

Mrs. Patricia McNeill

- Executive Director, Michigan ASCD January 2010 - July 2016
- Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction + Professional Development – Holt Public Schools March 1997-December 2009
- Curriculum Director – Waverly Public Schools September 1992-March 1997
- Staff Developer – Waverly Public Schools August 1984 - September 1992
- Waverly High School Special Education (Learning Disabilities) Consultant * Sanilac Career Center Learning Specialist * Sandusky Schools Adult Education Teacher * Cooperative Pre-School Teacher * Harrison Elementary Special Education Teacher * Harrison Elementary 3rd Grade Teacher

C. Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy

The School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is based on Four Assumptions, which are grounded in the work of researchers in the field of educator performance evaluation:

1. The ultimate goal of educator evaluation is to achieve better results for students by fostering improved effectiveness of teachers and leaders.
2. New accountability requirements have enormous implications for administrators' expertise—and for the way they do business and spend their time.
3. High-stakes accountability must be balanced with ongoing feedback and support for continuous improvement.
4. Evaluation should not be something we do to people; rather, it should empower employees to take responsibility for their own learning, growth, and performance.

The School ADvance System holds to **Ten Core Values**, which we believe hold up through many perspectives—community, board, administrator, teacher, student. Those **Ten Core Values** are the following:

1. Growing capacity for better student results
2. Two-way dialogue and interaction
3. A grounding in research supported practice
4. Self-Assessment and reflective practice
5. Authentic feedback
6. Growth targets that really matter
7. Personal ownership
8. Context, conditions, and student characteristics
9. Multiple sources of data/evidence
10. Student results

Moreover, the developers have identified **six research-aligned principles** and critical elements that must be part of any comprehensive educator evaluation system for teachers and administrators.

As a result, the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is:

1. **Authentic**, using evidence-based practices to achieve better student outcomes
2. **Professional**, building personal commitment and efficacy for growth and improvement
3. **Purpose Driven**, focused on measurable improvement targets for student success
4. **Adaptive**, fostering self-assessment, reflective practice, action research, and innovative methods of improving student results
5. **Evidence Based**, data informed, using multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data tied to student achievement and evidence-based practice including achievement and observation data

6. **Inclusive**, serving all, with alignment between student, teacher, administrator, and district improvement goals

By incorporating these elements, School ADvance can assist teachers, administrators, and boards of education in answering the three important questions regarding their own work:

1. *Where am I right now in my learning and performance?*
2. *Where should I focus next to learn, grow, and improve?*
3. *How should I proceed to reach that next level of performance?*

D. Evaluation Frameworks and Rubrics: School Advance

The School ADvance instrument can be found at this link.

E. Evaluation Process: Administrators

1. **Self-Assessment:** Using the School Advance Rubrics, the administrator self-assesses his/her performance
2. **Goal Setting Conference:** The building administrator and the evaluator meet to set performance goals for the upcoming school year.
 - A. **Connection to Self-Assessment:** performance goals are individualized to the growth needs of the administrator.
 - B. **Connection to District Priorities:** performance goals relate to and support district priorities.
3. **Personal Growth Plan:** a set of activities is designed to support the administrator's achievement of his/her goals.
4. **Establish Formative Performance Profile:** the building administrator compiles evidence in an electronic portfolio.
 - A. Evidence has connection to personal growth goals.
 - B. Evidence has connection to district goals.
5. **Mid-Year Conference:** evaluator meets with the building administrator for a reflective conversation.
 - A. Progress made on Personal Growth Plan and artifacts is collected and discussed.
 - B. Barriers to progress being made on the Personal Growth Plan, if any, are explored.
 - C. Any necessary alterations to the plan that are needed to support personal and/or district goals, if needed, are made.
6. **Update Formative Performance Profile:** the building administrator adds to evidence in an electronic portfolio

- A. Evidence has connection to personal growth.
 - B. Evidence has connection to district goals.
7. End of year summative meeting
- A. Update Performance Profile and evaluate the connection to personal and district goals.
 - B. Evaluator shares ratings from the summative rubric as well as overall rating.
 - C. Dialogue on potential goals for the following year is initiated.
8. On-going dialogue: conversation and dialogue is an ongoing process between the evaluator and the building administrator, in addition to beginning, mid-year, and end of year conferences.

F. Training Plan

All administrators received training in the School Advance. Our goal is to increase the administrator's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric.

5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning

Teachers

A. Research Basis

CEL's instructional framework was derived from an extensive five-year effort to mine research on what constitutes quality instruction, informed by the experiences of practitioners identified as possessing demonstrated expertise with observing in classrooms and providing feedback to teachers. CEL's instructional framework was created as part of a research study that asked the following questions: What do expert observers of instruction pay attention to in classrooms? How do experts make sense of what they observe? How do experts use what they see in classrooms to craft feedback to teachers?

Three types of sources were investigated which included (1) empirically based studies of teaching and coaching practice, (2) practitioner-oriented prescriptions and frameworks for instructional and coaching practice, and (3) descriptions of practice from an identified panel of expert observers who included instructional coaches and school administrators working daily with teachers on improving practice. A panel of experts was convened to engage in a multi-stage process of watching videos and visiting classrooms, compiling what they were noticing and wondering about instructional practice.

B. Authors

The University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership (CEL), we believe that *all* students can achieve at high levels. We are nationally recognized experts, with proven results. In school districts across the nation, CEL educators and trainings have helped close the achievement gap by putting knowledge and skills that improve instructional effectiveness into the hands of classroom teachers. We work with the entire system, including the district office, the school level and the classroom, to ensure everyone is working as a team to improve teaching effectiveness.

The Center for Educational Leadership was founded in 2001 as a nonprofit service arm of the University of Washington College of Education, one of the top education schools in the country. Our faculty, staff and consultants come from research institutes, state education offices, school and district administration offices and K-12 and college classrooms.

The research is clear and conclusive. The teacher is the most influential factor on student learning, and students must experience quality teaching consistently from year to year and from classroom to classroom to attain and sustain high levels of achievement.

C. Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy

An instructional framework is a set of descriptions of teaching behaviors, based on research and the work of practitioners, linked to improved student learning. Its purpose is to emphasize

continuous improvement and support teachers and principals to enhance their instructional expertise. The instructional framework creates a common language and vision for high quality instruction that is shared by everyone in a school district.

Address vision and beliefs: all evaluators must be operating under the same vision of instruction in order to yield reliable results. Training for teachers provides an opportunity for evaluators and teachers to interact on the definition of teaching that underlies the performance standards before the actual evaluation

5 D+ ensures the classroom observation framework or instrument is associated with reliable outcomes; using the same tool effectively for both summative and formative purposes.

D. Evaluation Framework and Rubric

The 5 Dimension Evaluation instrument can be found at this link.

E. Evaluation Process: Teachers

Step 1) Goal-Setting:

- Based on self-evaluation in 5D+ (completed in Pivot) to determine areas of focus, teacher develops and submits draft IDP/PGP within the Pivot tool. For probationary teachers and teachers on plan of assistance, this is a process guided by the administrator. The IDP/PGP establishes instructional goals and student performance goals (with specific activities and metrics identified.)
- Principal and teacher meet to finalize IDP/PGP. IDP/PGP is based on areas of focus, SIP goals, and student performance data.
- This IDP/PGP becomes the foundation for the first inquiry cycle.

Step 2) Formative Inquiry Cycle

- Principal observes teacher for multiple 15 minute (minimum) unannounced observations as a part of a targeted, formative feedback process.
- Principal scripts the observation in accordance with 5D+ expectations, codes evidence, and provides “noticings” and “wonderings” within the areas of focus. All of this is done within the Pivot tool within a reasonable amount of time.
- Teacher may respond to “noticings” and “wonderings” within the Pivot tool within 24 hours of the observation.

- After each observation, post-observation feedback is within 10 school days of classroom observation. A conference is held if deemed necessary by the administrator.
- The administrator may request to review pre and post-test data at this conference in accordance with the identified student growth measures for each program.
- Probationary teachers and plan of assistance teachers should be working with their mentors or new teacher support groups to support instructional goals.

Step 3) Mid-Year Conference:

- The administrator provides feedback to date on the IDP/PGP in Pivot.
- Teacher or principal may upload artifacts.
- Teacher and administrator meet to analyze student and teacher performance relative to the IDP/PGP.
- Administrator decides whether to continue with the same inquiry or adopt a new area of focus and develop a new IDP/PGP. In collaboration with the teacher, new IDP/PGP may be developed. The target for performance to consistently perform at the Distinguished level.
- The administrator will review data at this conference in accordance with the identified student growth measures for each program.

Step 4) Formative Inquiry Cycle:

- Principal observes teacher for multiple 15 minute unannounced observations as a part of a targeted, formative feedback process.
- Principal scripts the observation in accordance with 5D+ expectations, codes evidence, and provides “noticings” and “wonderings” within the areas of focus. All of this is done within the Pivot tool within a reasonable amount of time.
- Teacher responds to “noticings” and “wonderings” within the Pivot tool within a reasonable amount of time.
- After each observation, a post-observation feedback is within 10 school days of classroom observation. A conference is held if deemed necessary by the administrator.

- The administrator may request to review pre and post-test data at this conference in accordance with the identified student growth measures for each program.
- Probationary and plan of assistance teachers should be working with their mentors or new teacher support groups to support instructional goals.

Step 5) Year-End Summative Evaluation

- Teacher completes self-assessment of IDP/PGP to date by completing the “Evaluation of Achievements” section of the IDP/PGP within Pivot.
- The administrator provides feedback to date on the IDP/PGP also in Pivot.
- Teacher or principal may upload artifacts.
- Teacher and administrator meet to analyze student and teacher performance data relative to the IDP/PGP.
- The administrator may request to review pre and post-test data at this conference in accordance with the identified student growth measures for each program.
- The administrator prepares the End of Year Evaluation within Pivot. **All** indicators on the 5D+ rubric receive a rating of “Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished”.
- Based on a preponderance of the evidence from each dimension indicator, an overall rating of “Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished” is assigned as a summary rating for each of the 5D+ dimensions.
- Based on a preponderance of the evidence (which include indicator ratings, demonstrated growth, and student growth measures – 40% of the overall evaluation) an effectiveness rating is determined. These ratings, in accordance with Section 1248 of the School Code, are labeled as “Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, or Highly Effective” and are provided to the State of Michigan as per state statute.
- Teacher and principal meet to discuss final summative evaluation.
- IDP/PGP Areas of Focus are discussed/planned for the following year. This may require the teacher to complete the self-assessment in May-June or in August of the following year. For probationary and tenured teachers, any ratings less than “Effective” require the teacher to be placed on an administrator guided growth

plan for the following year with identified performance goals and identified supports.

F. Training

Teachers and Administrators received training in the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning Framework. The goal of Byron Center Public School is to increase the teacher's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric.