

Agenda...

9:00-9:30 - Website, Code and ISBE Updates
Gail & Patrick

9:30-10:30 - PERA Implementation
Group Collaboration

10:30-11:00 - Best Practices, Issues and Roundtable Q&A
Whole Group

PERA Implementation & Student Growth Component Part 50 Rules

Sept. 19, 2014 Principals Workshop

**You have a big
responsibility...**



And then there's evaluation



Website, Code and ISBE Updates



Ok, on to PERA and Part 50 Rules...



**36 pages into 5 slides.
Tah Dah!**



Joint Committee (JC)

- *Agree on Performance Evaluation Plan* - % student growth, assessment types, student groups, rubrics, etc.
- Student growth into evaluation in 16-17 (for most)
- Sept. 1, 2016 implementation date
- *Informal* discussions until JC decides first meeting date
- Recommend: 1st official JC meeting around, but not after, Nov. 1, 2015 (for those starting 16-17)
- Clock starts ticking on 1st official - 180 days to agree and complete plan or default to State model (50%)
- Made up of equal representation - admin and union/teachers
- Consider how certain student groups (IEP, ELL, low income, etc.) to best measure impact on academic achievement
- Decide if some students won't count due to a teacher not having *Significant Educational Impact* (miss 20 days?)

Performance Evaluation Plan

- “...plan to evaluate a teacher, principal or assistant principal that includes data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in judging performance, measures the individual’s professional practice...”
- “Performance Evaluation Rating” - final *summative* rating
- “Student Growth” - demonstrable change in student or group’s knowledge or skills - 2 or more points in time

Seems simple on the surface, but...

Assessments...

- One Type I or Type II, AND
- One Type III
- For Teachers not using I or II - need two Type IIIs

Type I - statewide or nationwide - MAP, PARCC, ITBS, STAR, EPAS, etc.

Type II - adopted and used district-wide by all in a grade level or subject area

Ex: District curriculum tests, publisher tests

Type III - align to your specific curriculum and measure learning in that course or grade level content area

Ex: Teacher created, publishers, portfolios, student performance tasks

Type I & II could be considered a Type III if they align to your curriculum and measure student learning in the subject

If 2 Type 3s - may delay 2nd Type III until second year of implementation

State tests can be Type I, II, or III - problem is determining student growth

What % Is Used for Student Growth in Teacher Evaluation?

- Up to the Joint Committee
- First 2 years can use 25% if you wish
- After that - 30% - 50% (IL default = 50%)
- Important to establish & understand rationale for % you choose as a committee
- Practice this year and next year - see how it impacts different teachers' evals

Minimum Observations

Tenured (Excellent or Proficient):

- 2 - one must be formal

Tenured (NI or Unsat):

- 3 - two must be formal

Non-tenured

- 3 - two must be formal

Formals require pre & post conferences

Group Collaboration:

Group 1

Jeff Ekena
Pat Minasian
Darren Lowery
Terri Armstrong
Heather Bowman

Group 2

Angela Ludlum
Brian Hoelscher
Jon Smith
Jason Warner
April McLaughlin

Group 3

Chris Kolowski
Brad Wood
Jennifer Dietrich
Jennifer Lindsay
Michele Jacobs

Group 4

Bob Ketcham
Frank Reliford
Becky Hansen
Jeremy Garrett
Lee Hoffman

Group 5

Karen Stevens
Mary Lanier
Sean Berry
Matt Gordon

Where are You In the Discussion, Development & Implementation Process?



Click the link below and add the group responses.

Response Sheet

What % would you recommend for the first 2 years (and why)?



[*Click here for new Response Sheet.*](#)

What would you use as Types I and/or II assessments for...

- Core Teachers
- Specials (PE, Fine Arts, VoTech, Sped, etc.)
 - *Not SSPs or Type 73s*

JC MUST identify specific I's or II's for groups

[Click here for new Response Sheet.](#)

What challenges do you foresee in
the choosing and developing
assessments?

[Click here for new Response Sheet.](#)

Assessment Challenges...

- It seems fairly simple on the surface, but...
- Do we use all or part of a Type I to determine score?
- Which Type IIs and IIIs do we choose... Pre-Post written, SLOs, Portfolios, etc.
- Developing or adopting IIs & IIIs for each grade level/content area, including non-core
- What constitutes a 1, 2, 3, or 4 regarding a student growth rubric? It has to translate into a 1, 2, 3, or 4 for that portion (%) of teacher evaluation.
- Are our assessments valid & reliable? If not there's another set of probs...
- Which student groups do we use for each teacher's evaluation?
- Significant Educational Impact - Do we "throw out" some students?
- Having baseline data to establish adequate growth
- Do we go Spring-Spring or Fall-Spring with data? Oops, what about semester courses w/ HS?

Other Assessment Considerations...

- Data *IS* important. But how you use it is more important!
- Be fair and accurate
- Each assessment rating is equal value for student growth portion of eval (Ex. if 30%, they are worth 15% each)
- Assessments must have validity, reliability and integrity
- Must measure 2 points in time (multiple tests) - PLUS a mid-term evaluation to adjust targets if necessary
- Do you want to be punitive or use to learn from and grow?
 - If punitive, results could have high impact on a teacher's summative.
 - If design is for learning (growth of teachers), results could have less impact on a teacher's summative eval
- Remember... it's a Joint Committee process and decision. To be effective you need buy-in from all.

Required Workshop Evaluation

Click or enter this link to complete the required ISBE evaluation as required by new rules. Thanks!

<http://goo.gl/u3iOGF>