

Teacher Growth and Evaluation Model Task Force

Recommendations for the “35%” of evaluation based on student growth data for teachers in non-tested subjects and grades

A study group at MDE was charged to develop recommendations for the task force's consideration regarding how teachers in non-tested subjects and grades should have 35% of their evaluation based on student growth. The study group consisted of MDE staff who work with teachers in all K-12 subject areas, teachers of students with special education needs, early childhood teachers and parent educators, school librarians and media specialists, gifted education specialists, and school counselors.

The following are the study group's recommendations:

1. The evaluation model developed for teachers in non-tested subjects and grades should meet the accountability requirements identified in law, promote the growth of teacher knowledge and skills, and provide flexibility for adaptation to various school contexts and teaching assignments. Collaboration among educators should be considered a high priority in the evaluation.
2. State law requires that teachers in non-tested subjects and grades will have 35% of their evaluation based on “student growth data.” We recommend that, wherever possible, the components of the evaluation model that comprise the “35%” be based on three kinds of student growth data. Data will be collected for the following categories of students:
 1. a specific group of students who is struggling, such as a small group of students in a classroom who is achieving below grade level in reading,
 2. a broad group of students, such as all students in a classroom, and
 3. all students in the school.

The first two categories are appropriate because teachers directly impact the achievement of groups of students within the classroom and the classroom as a whole. An individual teacher's impact on schoolwide performance is difficult to assess but the inclusion of this component addresses the variety of teaching assignments by using agreed upon measures for which schools or groups of teachers share responsibility. Greater collaboration is expected as teachers work together to improve schoolwide results.

3. All teachers will create goals that address the three kinds of studentⁱ growth data as follows:
 - A. *Specific Goal:* a long-term academic achievement goal or learning objective aimed at a specific group of learners within a teacher's class, course or program who is achieving below expectations (such as six students in a teacher's third grade class who are struggling to read, or three students in a counselor's caseload who are failing high school algebra, or two adults in a parenting class who are having difficulty disciplining

their children). If all learners are achieving at or above expectations, the goal should be aimed at a group of students who shares a similar need and is at risk of not developing to its full potential. The specific goal must: a) address one or more achievement goals or state standards (or local standards where state standards do not apply) taught by the teacher for that class, course or program, b) reflect the identified student needs, c) be specific and measureable, and d) be based on available baseline student learning data. The specific goal is determined by the teacher and evaluator.

B. *Common Goal*: a long-term academic achievement goal or learning objective aimed at a broad group of learners (such as third grade social studies, seventh grade arts, 4th period English, or a counselor's caseload). The Common Goal must: a) address all standards covered by the teacher for that class, course or program; b) reflect the identified learner needs, c) be specific and measureable, and d) be based on available baseline data for the learners. The Common Goal is determined by the teacher and evaluator.

C. *Collective Performance Goal*: an academic achievement goal for the whole population of learners (such as all students in a school or district) in a subject for which there is a statewide standardized assessment. The goal will address the school's progress in improving learner achievement overall or closing achievement gaps among subgroups of learners. The Collective Performance Goal is determined by the school or district.

4. The weighting or percentage that each of the three goals (Specific Goal, Common Goal, and Collective Performance Goal) should play in the "35% of the teacher's evaluation based on student growth data" is identified in Attachment A "Recommended Weighting of Evaluation Components by Teaching Assignment." The weighting scheme accounts for the wide variety of teaching licensure assignments in non-tested grades and subjects by categorizing licensed personnel into three categories:

- A. Licensed personnel who address academic standards in one subject for one or more classes,
- B. Licensed personnel who address academic standards in multiple subjects, and
- C. Licensed personnel who serve the entire school(s) or district.

5. The assessments chosen to measure student growth should: a) be aligned to content standards, b) assess student growth across a wide range of performance levels; c) be valid, reliable, and specific; d) capture true mastery of skills, including higher-order thinking skills; d) provide data that can, as much as possible, be attributed directly to teacher efforts; and e) include the potential for accommodations and modifications when appropriate. *Assessment plans should include opportunities for teachers to collaboratively examine student work on a regular basis.* Assessments for measuring student growth for each goal are determined as follows:

- A. *Specific Goal*: assessments that are collaboratively developed and annually reviewed.

B. *Common Goal*: assessments that are collaboratively developed and annually reviewed. (See the flowchart in Attachment B “Choosing Quality Assessments” as a guide for selecting assessments that address Common Goals.)

C. *Collective Performance Goal*: high-stakes, standardized assessments, such as the MCAs

- Whenever possible, districts should use common assessments as defined below. Common assessments may be available at the state/district/school levels but should be selected from the highest level available. For example, if common assessments exist at the state level, these should be chosen instead of district or school level assessments. Where common assessments aren’t available, districts should develop their own.

Common assessments: Measures of student learning that are consistent from one teacher to the next in a particular grade or content area, and are developed and administered by multiple teachers based on commonly defined and agreed upon criteria. Examples: Pre and post-tests, end-of-course exams, projects, and portfolios of student work, performance tasks and research papers.

- The rubric that is used for rating teachers’ performance based on this process should be collaboratively developed and have multiple criteria including criteria related specifically to student academic outcomes. The following rubric is a slightly modified version of the criteria utilized in Indiana’s Student Learning Objectives process to evaluate teachers based on student academic outcomes.

	Exemplary (4)	Effective (3)	Developing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Specific Goal	The teacher has surpassed expectations described by the Specific Goal and/or demonstrated an outstanding* impact on learning.	The teacher has met expectations described by the Specific Goal and/or demonstrated a considerable* impact on learning.	The teacher has not fully met the expectations described by the Specific Goal but has demonstrated some* impact on learning.	The teacher has not met the expectations described by the Specific Goal and/or has not demonstrated adequate* impact on learning.
Common Goal Based on Students’ starting Point:	The teacher moved an exceptional* number of learners to achieve content mastery.	The teacher moved a significant* number of learners to achieve content mastery.	The teacher moved less than a significant* number of learners to achieve content mastery.	The teacher moved few learners to achieve content mastery.
* Terms such as “outstanding,” “considerable,” “some,” “adequate,” “exceptional,” “significant,” etc. should be defined to limit their subjectivity.				

The rubric also should reflect the priorities of the evaluation model including the use of common assessments, collaboration, appropriateness of goals to targeted students' needs, etc.

8. This evaluation model, although intended for teachers in non-tested grades and subjects, should be considered for adoption for teachers in tested grades and subjects as well.

ⁱ Although the legislation uses the term “student growth,” our preferred term is “learners” since it is a more inclusive term that covers a broader range of teaching assignments. (For example, parent educators tend to refer to their adult “learners” rather than their adult “students.”)