

## NCLB Waiver Language for Principal and Teacher Evaluation

### 3.A.i Has the SEA developed and adopted guidelines consistent with Principle 3 through one of the three options below?

#### Option A:

*If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3:*

- i. Is the SEA's plan for developing and adopting guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to result in successful adoption of those guidelines by the end of the 2011–2012 school year?*

During the 2011 Minnesota Legislative Session laws were enacted that provided specific parameters and guidelines for the adoption of teacher and principal evaluation systems ([Minn. Laws 2011 SS Chap. 11](#)). MDE, in consultation with stakeholders, is required to create and publish a new teacher evaluation process that applies to all teachers and require LEAs to implement it.

In fall of 2011, the Commissioner of Education convened a Principal Evaluation Work Group and a Teacher Evaluation Work Group. Each Work Group is charged with developing an evaluation model that ensures continuous growth for both teachers and principals.

Each Work Group includes a broad cross-section of stakeholders, representing diverse viewpoints, expertise and perspectives from the leadership of statewide organizations of teachers, principals, superintendents, school boards, higher education as well as parent, business, and community organizations

Minnesota law requires LEAs to fully implement principal evaluations in 2013-2014. Current legislation allows for a longer timeline for teacher evaluation. LEAs will be required to fully implement teacher evaluation in 2014-15. A plan is in place to ensure high-quality and comprehensive evaluations are in place.

- ii. *Does the SEA's plan include sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?*

#### Stakeholder Involvement in Development of Teacher Evaluation Guidelines

The Teacher Evaluation Work Group which convened in the fall of 2011 includes a broad base representation of Minnesota stakeholders: parents, teachers and administrators appointed by their respective representative organizations, including the Board of Teaching, the Minnesota Association of School Administrators, the Minnesota School Boards Association, the Minnesota Elementary and Secondary Principals Associations, Education Minnesota, and representatives of the Minnesota Assessment Group, the Minnesota Business Partnership, the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, and Minnesota postsecondary institutions with research expertise in teacher evaluation. The purpose of the Work Group is to work in consultation with MDE to create and publish a teacher evaluation process that complies with the guidelines set forth in 2011 teacher evaluation legislation.

Using the 2011 Minnesota teacher evaluation legislation, ESEA waiver expectations and the charge given to the Work Group, emphasis will be given to evaluations systems that are:

- occurring frequently;
- focused on teaching and learning;
- differentiated by years of teaching and area of teaching; and
- a foundation for teacher development and improvement and play an important role in employment decisions (The New Teacher Project, 2009).

This Work Group will develop recommendations for an evaluation model to improve student learning and success. The law requires LEAs to either:

- implement a locally-developed teacher evaluation model and support system that meets the criteria of the state-developed teacher evaluation model; or
- Implement the state-approved model.

#### Stakeholder Involvement in Development of Principal Evaluation Guidelines

During the 2011 Minnesota adopted legislation that provided specific parameters and guidelines regarding principal evaluation. MDE, in consultation with stakeholders, is required to create and publish and a principal evaluation process that applies to all principals and require LEAs to implement it.

The Principal Evaluation Work Group was convened in October 2011, per legislative requirement. A list of required [membership](#) of stakeholders and [schedule](#) of meetings and agenda items can be found in Attachment 18. The membership of the Work Group includes the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Minnesota Association of Elementary School Principals. Additionally, membership includes a group of recognized and qualified experts and interested stakeholders, including principals, superintendents, teachers, school board members, and parents, among other stakeholders.

The charge of the Principal Evaluation Task Force is to develop an evaluation model that will improve teaching and learning by supporting the principal in shaping the school's professional environment and developing teacher quality, performance, and effectiveness.

iii. *Has the SEA checked Assurance 14?*

Yes-Minnesota will submit to the Department for peer review and approval a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

## 3.B Ensure LEAs Implement Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

**3.B Is the SEA’s process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA’s adopted guidelines likely to lead to high-quality local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems?**

### High Quality Teacher Evaluation Models

Currently there are four important teacher effectiveness initiatives occurring statewide that will inform the development of MDE’s teacher evaluation and support model.

- Minnesota’s Q Comp program is aimed at improving teaching and learning through job-embedded professional development. This program connects the dots between teacher observation, professional growth, professional development and student achievement.
- Minnesota’s School Improvement Grant Schools are required to implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluations systems for teachers that take into account student growth and are aligned to professional development.
- The Teacher Support Partnership (TSP) developed New Teacher Induction Guidelines to assist LEAs in implementing comprehensive new teacher programs that include standards-based observations, mentoring, coaching, professional development and teacher growth.
- Minnesota’s teacher preparation institutions have piloted and are now implementing the Teacher Performance Assessment which measures pre-service teachers' ability to support and advance student achievement.

Established legislative requirements for teacher professional development will enhance the development and implementation of a new teacher evaluation model. LEAs are currently required to create and implement plans for professional development that:

- Support stable and productive professional communities achieved through ongoing and school-wide progress and growth in teacher practice

- Emphasize coaching, professional learning communities, classroom action research, and other job-embedded models
- Maintain a strong subject matter focus premised on students' learning goals
- Ensure specialized preparation and learning issues related to teaching students with special needs and limited English proficiency and English Learners
- Reinforce national and state standards of effective teaching practices

### Elements of the Teacher Evaluation Model

The teacher evaluation model will differentiate between new and experienced teachers, contain common elements for all teachers and have the option for alternative measures for teacher performance. It will provide differentiated expectations between teachers new to teaching and those with experience. Probationary teachers are defined as those in their first three years of teaching and do not have a continuing contract. Tenured or continuing contract teachers are defined as teachers having successfully completed their three-year probationary period.

*Probationary Teachers-* Minnesota's teacher evaluation model for probationary teachers will:

- Require at least three formal observations periodically throughout each school year with the first evaluation occurring within the first 90 days of teaching service.
- Promote continuous improvement and collaboration with professional colleagues by having trained peer observers serve as mentors or coaches, and by encouraging participation in professional learning communities to develop, improve, and support effective teaching practices.

MDE will continue to provide guidance and technical assistance to LEAs in designing and implementing mentoring and induction programs for probationary teachers.

*Continuing Teachers-* The teacher evaluation model will be differentiated for teachers in tenured or continuing contract status. The model must:

- Establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes a peer-review process.
- Require at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator. For the years when a tenured teacher is not evaluated by a qualified and trained evaluator, the teacher must be evaluated by peer review.

The Work Group will provide guidance in specifying the frequency of formative observations and various forms of feedback (e.g., coaching, self-assessments, formal/informal walkthroughs, and parent and student surveys) that occur throughout the three-year professional review cycle.

*Commonalities* - Commonalities in the model will exist for both probationary and tenured teachers:

- The teacher evaluation model will be based on Minnesota's professional teaching standards as established in rule ([Minn. Administrative Rule 8710.2000](#)).
- Qualified and trained evaluators will perform summative evaluations.
- 35% of the teacher's evaluation will include results of a teacher value-added assessment.
- Longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures, explicitly aligned with the elements of curriculum for which teachers are responsible, will be included as well.

The model will include an option for teachers to develop and present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth, including the teachers' own performance assessment based on student work samples and examples of teachers' work. It may also include video among other activities for the summative evaluation.

Providing this option for alternative measures of teacher performance via portfolio allows consideration for an equally robust teacher evaluation system that captures the many facets of effective teaching beyond evidence collected during a teacher observation process (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality Research to Practice Brief, 2011).

### High Quality Principal Evaluation Models

Currently there are three important principal effectiveness initiatives occurring statewide that can inform the continuing development of a SEA principal evaluation and support model.

- The Minnesota Principal Academy was established in collaboration with the National Institute of School Leadership. The academy's purpose is to ensure school leaders have the knowledge, skills and tools to offer direction to teachers and design an efficient organization, which helps improve student achievement in low-performing schools or lead good schools to great performance.
- Minnesota's School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools are implementing rigorous, transparent, and equitable principal evaluation systems that take into account student growth and are aligned to professional development.
- Four Minnesota professional organizations collaboratively developed a principal evaluation process that emphasized accountability and was framed around continuous improvement and aligned to Minnesota's K-12 Principal Competencies.

These Minnesota statutes and key initiatives along with a growing body of research as well as examples of national evaluation models will be considered by the Work Group as they make recommendations for designing a principal evaluation model.

### Leadership Skills that Support School, Teacher and Student Performance

Currently, each school district creates its own principal evaluation policies/process. The purpose of the Work Group is to work in consultation with MDE to create and publish a principal evaluation model that complies with the guidelines created by state law. The law requires MDE to do the following:

- Develop a performance-based system model for annually evaluating school principals.
- Consider how principals develop and maintain high standards for student performance, rigorous curriculum, quality instruction, a culture of learning and professional behavior, connections to external communities, systemic

performance accountability, and leadership behaviors that create effective schools and improve school performance.

- Consider whether to establish a multi-tiered evaluation system that supports newly-licensed principals in becoming highly-skilled school leaders and provide opportunities for advanced learning for experienced school leaders.

The Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED) is one of the most widely-used and respected measures in school leadership performance assessment and was considered when Minnesota’s principal evaluation legislation was written. “This assessment empowers administrators to effectively evaluate staff, diagnose strengths and weaknesses, and recommend pertinent professional development.” (Benbow, 2008) As highly-regarded as VAL-ED is, the principal evaluation Work Group also recognizes it has limitations such as the lack of inclusion of actual student-learning gains or graduation rates in their evaluation of principals, and will address these limitations in their recommendations.

The evaluation model will include an annual evaluation to support and improve a principal's instructional leadership, organizational management, and professional development. The model will strengthen the principal's capacity in the areas of instruction, supervision, evaluation, and teacher development through formative and summative evaluations. The model will be consistent with a principal's job description, a district's long-term plans and goals and the principal's own professional multi-year growth plans and goals.

The model ultimately must support the principal's leadership behaviors and practices, rigorous curriculum, school performance, and high-quality instruction. On-the-job observations and previous evaluations will be included as will surveys to help identify a principal's effectiveness, leadership skills and processes, and strengths and weaknesses in exercising leadership in pursuit of school success.

The Evaluation Task Force may also consider whether to establish a multi-tiered evaluation system that supports newly licensed principals in becoming highly skilled school leaders and provides opportunities for advanced learning for more experienced school leaders.

- *Does the SEA have a process for reviewing and approving an LEA’s teacher and principal evaluation and support systems to ensure that they are consistent with the SEA’s guidelines and will result in the successful implementation of such systems?*

#### Approving Locally-developed Evaluation Models

An SEA review/approval process will be established for LEA’s teacher and principal evaluation and support systems to ensure that they are consistent with MDE guidelines and result in the successful implementation of such systems. The process will be determined through Work Group recommendations to MDE and rolled out prior to the pilot and full implementation phases. Each Work Group will define evaluation criteria and develop a rubric for LEA and MDE use to determine if their locally-developed plans meet state guidelines.

#### Continually Reviewing and Refining State Evaluation Models.

MDE will update the models regularly to reflect new knowledge from the field—both nationally and statewide. The process and frequency of review of MDE’s models will be based on recommendations from the Work Groups.

- *Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that an LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements its teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with the involvement of teachers and principals?*

Evaluation models must have capacity for individual input and personal decisions to fully garner support of teachers and principals. Minnesota has taken on the task of developing evaluation guidelines and models that incorporate professional growth and is aligned with personal decision making.

#### Teacher Evaluation Aligned with Professional Growth

The Teacher Evaluation Work Group will be expected to provide guidance in how LEAs:

- Coordinate the results of teacher evaluations with LEA and school professional development plans
- Use individual professional development plans for professional growth and improvement that are driven by student achievement data

### College- and Career-Ready Standards

The Work Group will be required to incorporate within the evaluation model strong links to Minnesota's college- and career-ready standards and classroom applications to standards-aligned curriculum, research-based and rigorous instruction, formative and summative assessments, use of technology, etc. In addition, the model will incorporate multiple measurements related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance ensuring that every teacher is highly effective in helping students achieve at high levels.

Priority Schools will be required to implement a rigorous and comprehensive teacher evaluation system to ensure that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by:

- Reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort
- Preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools
- Providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs

Priority Schools will receive additional targeted support in implementing teacher evaluation systems through Minnesota's Statewide System of Support.

### Teacher Evaluation Aligned with Personal Decisions

The Work Group will include in their recommended model, teacher quality and current tenure practices that are linked with teacher evaluation, retention and dismissal decisions (Center for American Progress, 2010). Tenured teachers not meeting professional teaching standards will be provided support to improve through a teacher improvement process that includes established goals and timelines. Teachers not making adequate progress in the teacher improvement process will follow disciplinary steps that may include a last chance warning, termination, discharge, nonrenewal, transfer to a different position, a leave of absence, or other discipline a school administrator determines is appropriate. A probationary teacher's contract may be terminated at any time by mutual consent of the board and the teacher.

### A Principal Evaluation Model with Multiple Measures

The principal evaluation Work Group will provide recommendations regarding the use of longitudinal data and school-wide student academic growth data as an evaluation component. District achievement goals and targets will be incorporated into the evaluation process. It will be the task of the Principal Evaluation Work Group to determine how student growth measures will be incorporated into MDE's Principal Evaluation model. Work Groups will lean upon other state principal evaluation models and research that include a value-added assessment component.

### Principal Evaluation Aligned with Professional Growth

Principal evaluation must be linked to professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and a collaborative professional culture. The model will include implementation of a plan to improve the principal's performance and specify the procedure and consequence if the principal's performance is not improved. The Work Group will provide more guidance regarding principal professional development as it relates to the principal evaluation process.

### College- and Career-Ready Standards

As the instructional leader, the principal must ensure the teaching occurring in the school is:

- linked to Minnesota's college and career ready standards;
- using standards-aligned curriculum;
- research-based and rigorous;
- utilizing regular formative and summative assessments; and
- encouraging 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning.

Principals will be using a teacher evaluation model that will address areas noted above and use multiple measurements of student academic achievement and school performance to ensure that every teacher is highly effective. The Work Group will be required to incorporate these key features within the evaluation model.

Priority Schools will be expected to implement rigorous and comprehensive principal evaluation models. The results of principal evaluations at Priority Schools

will guide the LEAs decision to dismiss or retain the principal. The results of principal evaluations at Priority Schools will also be used to develop effective supports for leadership within Priority Schools that align with the turnaround principles.

#### Principal Evaluation Model Used for Personnel Decisions

As part of the design of the evaluation model, performance levels and/or evaluation rubrics will be developed and used in developing a principal's professional development plan and to inform personnel decisions. The Work Group will be asked to provide guidance to clarify specific procedures and consequences for principals not meeting standards of professional practice or other criteria to inform personnel decisions.

- *Did the SEA describe the process it will use to ensure that all measures used in an LEA's evaluation and support systems are valid, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA?*

#### A Teacher Evaluation Model that Includes Multiple Measurement

The Teacher Evaluation Work Group will define a process for ensuring that all measures that are included in determining performance levels are valid and meaningful measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA. Statute requires three measures in the teacher evaluation model:

- Observations based on professional teaching standards
- Value-added performance measures
- Longitudinal data on student engagement and connection

Historically, most states and LEAs have used classroom observations as the primary tool to assess teacher performance (Brandt, Thomas, & Burke, 2008; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009). Although classroom observations – in combination with student growth measurements – provide multiple data points on teacher performance, additional alternative measures such as graduation rates

should also be considered to ensure a rigorous teacher evaluation system will capture the multiple facets of effective teaching. New research and studies provide insights into how student achievement data can be incorporated into a credible evaluation system. Research has shown that the involvement of teachers in deciding how to account for student learning and other relevant outcomes in evaluation using a combination of measures so teachers feel they are being evaluated comprehensively and fairly is essential (NEA Teacher Evaluation Systems: The Window for Opportunity and Reform, 2009).

MDE will incorporate student growth into its performance-level definitions with sufficient weighting to ensure that performance levels will differentiate among teachers who have made significantly different contributions to student growth or closing achievement gaps. Statute requires that 35 percent of the teacher's evaluation will include results of a teacher's value-added assessment. The model will use longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measurements aligned with elements of curriculum for which the teacher is responsible.

When developing the value-added assessment component of the model, work groups will lean upon other state teacher evaluation models and research that includes value-added assessment components for use with all teachers, particularly those subjects or grade levels where state assessments are not in place.

### Student Growth

As outlined in Principle 2, student growth will play a larger role in Minnesota's new accountability system. The teacher evaluation model will lean on the growth score used in the Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR). This score is based on the average individual student growth achieved by students in each school. Student growth is measured on a normative basis by predicting second-year student scores based on the first-year scores and measuring a student's growth based on their actual performance relative to that prediction. Predicted student growth is established by finding the mean scores of students at each score point using two cohorts of students. In the MMR, student growth is used to measure schools' ability to achieve high student growth. The same principle can be applied to teacher evaluation systems that measure a teacher's ability to achieve high student growth.

- *Is the SEA’s plan likely to be successful in ensuring that LEAs meet the timeline requirements by either (1) piloting evaluation and support systems no later than the 2013-2014 school year and implementing evaluation and support systems consistent with the requirements described above no later than the 2014-2015 school year; or (2) implementing these systems no later than the 2013-2014 school year?*

MDE has established a schedule for development and implementation which is outlined below.

| Type of Evaluation | 2010-11             | 2011-12                                      | 2012-13         | 2013-14                          | 2014-15                          |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Principal          | Legislation enacted | Work Group convenes; model completed         | Pilot year      | Full implementation at LEA level |                                  |
| Teacher            | Legislation enacted | Work Group convenes; model under development | Model completed | Pilot year                       | Full implementation at LEA level |

### Pilot Sites, Feedback and Model Refinement

The piloting process will be broad enough to gain sufficient feedback from a variety of educators, schools, and classroom settings to inform full implementation of the LEA’s evaluation and support systems. Pilot sites will include:

- LEAs identified with Priority Schools and those receiving federal school redesign grants are required to use evaluation systems that “differentiate performance by at least three levels” and “use student growth as a significant factor in evaluation.”
- Other sites to ensure a representative sample across the state.

MDE’s Division of School Support will work with key stakeholders from LEA pilots to refine the evaluation models before full implementation occurs statewide.

- *Do timelines reflect a clear understanding of what steps will be necessary and reflect a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to implement evaluation and support systems consistent with the required timelines?*

The Principal Evaluation Work Group has a rigorous meeting schedule intended to result in a formal report to be reviewed and adopted in January 2012. The Work Group is addressing critical issues such as review of information at the Federal level and information from other national and state sources. They are presenting to key stakeholder groups including the Minnesota Principals Academy. By early December they will have a draft that includes core indicators, descriptors, and required evidence. See the current schedule below:

|                        |             |               |   |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------|---|
| Monday,<br>October 24  | 1:00 – 4:00 | TIES Building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• Charge to the group</li> <li>• Review of legislation</li> <li>• Presentations by BOSA and MESPA &amp; MASSP of work completed</li> <li>• Next Steps</li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>   |
| Monday,<br>November 7  | 1:00 – 4:00 | TIES Building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of information at federal level-NCLB Waiver Principles</li> <li>• Review of models from state and national sources (NC, IL, IA &amp; Other)</li> <li>• Compare and contrast models</li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>  |
| Monday,<br>November 14 | 1:00 – 4:00 | TIES Building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation: MN Principals Academy</li> <li>• Presentation: New Leaders for New Schools</li> <li>• Terminology &amp; structure of model</li> <li>• Begin development of model, recommendations &amp; report</li> <li>• Issues: <b>Proficiency categories &amp; Core Competencies</b></li> <li>• Set calendar and agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul> |
| Monday,<br>December 5  | 1:00 – 4:00 | TIES Building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation by Val-Ed</li> <li>• Legal Implications</li> <li>• Continue development of model, recommendations &amp; report</li> <li>• Issues: <b>Indicators/Descriptors; Evidences</b></li> <li>• Set calendar and agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>   |
| Monday,<br>December 12 | 1:00 – 4:00 | TIES Building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare &amp; discuss questions for January meeting on assessment &amp; longitudinal data</li> <li>• Continue development of model, recommendations &amp; report</li> <li>• Issues: <b>Timelines, process, forms &amp; developmental expectations</b></li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>                          |
| Thursday<br>January 19 | 1:00 – 4:00 | MDE           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint meeting with teacher evaluation working group on issues related to testing, assessments and longitudinal data</li> <li>• Review outline of draft report; discussion and revisions</li> </ul>   |
| Monday,<br>January 23  | 1:00 – 4:00 | TIES Building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and Adopt Final Report</li> </ul>   |

➤ The Teacher Evaluation Work Group has a similar work schedule with monthly meetings scheduled through August of 2012:

| Date          | Time           | Location           | Agenda   |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|--|
| November      | 4:00 – 6:30 PM | Room               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• Charge to the group</li> <li>• Review of legislation</li> <li>• Review of information at federal level (NCLB—Federal Legislation)</li> <li>• Other teacher evaluation processes in law—Q Comp, SIG</li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>   |
| December      | 4:00 – 6:30 PM | Room               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Board of Teaching professional teaching standards established in rule</li> <li>• Identification of terms that need agreement</li> <li>• Prepare questions for January meeting on assessment/growth, longitudinal data, etc.</li> <li>• Legal implications</li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul> |
| January<br>19 | 1:00 – 4:00 PM | Room<br>CC 15 & 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint meeting with Principal Evaluation Working group for presentation from MDE on what assessment, value-added, longitudinal data is available.</li> <li>• Discussion of information from presentation</li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>   |
| February      | 4:00 – 6:30 PM | Room               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of terms and agreement of terminology</li> <li>• Requirements and role of “trained evaluators”</li> <li>• Review of models from local, state and national sources</li> <li>• Compare and contrast models</li> <li>• Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings</li> </ul>   |
| March         | 4:00 – 6:30 PM | Room               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin development of model</li> <li>• Issues:</li> </ul>  |
| April         | 4:00 – 6:30 PM | Room               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of model</li> <li>• Issues:</li> </ul>  |
| May           | 4:00 – 6:30 PM | Room               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of model</li> <li>• Issues:</li> </ul>  |
| June          |                |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of model</li> <li>• Issues:</li> </ul>  |
| July          |                |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of model</li> <li>• Issues:</li> </ul>  |
| August        |                |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of model</li> <li>• Issues:</li> </ul>  |
| TBD           |                |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review outline of draft process; discussion and revisions</li> </ul>  |
| TBD           |                |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and Adopt Final Work Product to present to Commissioner</li> </ul>   |

- *Is the SEA plan for providing adequate guidance and other technical assistance to LEAs in developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to lead to successful implementation?*

### Implementation plans, resources and technical assistance

The Principal and Teacher Evaluation Work Groups will develop an implementation plan for LEAs that reflects a clear understanding of what steps will be necessary and a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to implement evaluation and support systems consistent with the required timelines.

The design of the implementation plan will be informed by the National Center for State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP). In developing a plan needed attention will be given to:

- Understanding educational practices and developing the capacity to support those practices system-wide (Fixsen, Blase, Horner & Sugai, 2009).
- Awareness that implementation occurs in stages underscores an understanding that change is a process (not an event). By attending to each of the stages of implementation, we will increase the likelihood of sustained implementation of the evaluation model.
- Training in core implementation components for improving and ensuring competence and confidence of individuals (e.g., teachers, coaches, administrators) and for aligning and improving organizational and systems support (e.g., school, district, state policies, regulations, funding).
- Use of Competency drivers to systematically attend to professional development to build competence and confidence and include: staff selection, training, consultation and coaching, and evaluation of staff related to implementation of the educational practice to ensure fidelity.
- Use of Organization drivers to promote hospitable environments for evidence-based educational programs and innovations and include: data-based decision-making, which includes collecting and using reliable and valid process data (fidelity) and outcome data (student academic and

behavioral outcomes) to make decisions; facilitative administration to create policies and procedures at the school and district level that promote high-fidelity implementation; systems intervention processes to create a hospitable state education system (e.g. policies, procedures, and funding streams) designed to support, improve and sustain the literacy programs and practices.

MDE will be taking full advantage of our partnership with SISEP for the next two years as we continue to build knowledge and work to develop a thoughtful plan for implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation models.

Implementation resources will be required to promote successful use of meaningful evaluation systems. Features of the state models may include:

- Contract language describing process, timelines and collection of evidence
- Rubric for standards, indicator and/or competencies that describe performance vividly and clearly for at least three levels of performance
- Templates for self-assessments and growth plans
- Guidelines for developing and using measures of student learning and growth
- Examples of ways to collect and use student, staff and parent feedback

MDE will use recommendations from the Work Group in providing statewide training for teacher and principal evaluation processes such as:

- Understanding the components of the state evaluation models. These components may include guideline components, processes, rubrics, growth plans and templates
- Training evaluators in the evaluation process for consistent and effective application with all educators (WestED, 2011)

Support to LEAs can be provided through regional networks and accessed through webinars or e-learning opportunities. Future MDE support and technical assistance will be driven by feedback from pilot sites and from all LEAs during the first year of implementation.

### Technical assistance for implementation of Teacher Evaluation Models

Once the teacher evaluation model for Minnesota is established, the teacher evaluation Work Group will design an implementation framework for ensuring all districts are implementing an effective teacher evaluation process with their teachers. The framework will include:

- Attention and to staff training
- Coaching
- Evaluation
- System intervention
- Leadership at all levels
- Coherent alignment of policies and practices

Support to LEAs implementing a comprehensive teacher evaluation process will be delivered through the statewide system of support's regional model of assistance.

### Technical Assistance for Implementation of Principal Evaluation Models

Once the principal evaluation model for Minnesota is determined, the principal evaluation Work Group will design an implementation framework to ensure that all LEAs are implementing a successful evaluation process for their principals. Included in the framework will be stage-based implementation, attention to staff training, coaching, evaluation, system intervention, leadership at all levels and coherent alignment of policies and practices.

Support to LEAs implementing a comprehensive principal evaluation process will be delivered through the statewide system of support's regional assistance model.