

# PERA Implementation & Student Growth Component Part 50 Rules

Patrick Durley

Assistant Regional Superintendent ROE 53

# *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

*State template is in the works*

# *Joint Committee (JC)*

- Agree on elements and metrics of Performance Evaluation Plan - Teacher Practice and Student Growth combined
- Equal representation - admin and union/teachers
- Consider the impact and growth measures of certain student groups (IEP, ELL, low income, etc.)
- Decide if some students won't count due to a teacher not having *Significant Educational Impact*
- Determine assessment types and teacher categories for assessment types

# *JC Timeline for Student Growth*

Sept. 1, 2015 implementation date for IL lowest 20%

Sept. 1, 2016 implementation for others

Have *Informal* discussions until JC decides first meeting date  
- 1st official JC meeting before Nov 1 prior to implementation

Clock starts ticking on 1st official meeting - 180 days to agree and complete plan

Things not completed or agreed default to State model

*ISBE Joint Committee Guidebook*

<http://goo.gl/1dZSJ8>

# *Assessment Requirements*

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

*If using two Type IIIs - may delay second Type III until year two of implementation*

*State tests may be Type I, II, or III if curriculum is aligned*

# Assessments Defined...

**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 - *District developed curriculum tests, publisher tests*

**Type III** - align to your specific curriculum and measure learning in that course or grade level content area - *Teacher created, publisher tests, portfolios, student performance tasks, SLOs, PBAs*

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

## *Student Growth % in Teacher Evaluation*

- Up to the Joint Committee
- First 2 years can use 25% if JC agrees
- After that... 30% - 50% (IL default = 50%)

### **Think it through...**

- Establish & understand rationale for % you choose as a committee
- What will be the overarching impact of the % you choose on summative evals?

# *State Default Ratings: Student Growth Targets*

1. Unsatisfactory: Less than 25% of students meet Growth Target
2. Needs Improvement: 26-50% of students meet Growth Target
3. Proficient: 51-75% of students meet Growth Target
4. Excellent: 76-100% of students meet Growth Target



## *Observations (minimum)*

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**

# *What will be your Type I or II assessment?*

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

## ***Joint Committee MUST...***

- ***Identify specific I's or II's for teacher groups***
- ***For Type III's - describe process & criteria the evaluator and teacher will use to develop them***

# Assessment Challenges...

- Many layers:
  - Different types for different teacher categories
  - Determine student groups
  - Determine growth targets for different grade levels or subjects
  - Determine cut scores to assign teacher ratings
  - How to handle new teachers (no previous year data)
- Do you use all or part of a Type One to assess student growth?
- Does everyone get same score or differentiate?
- Developing or adopting IIs & IIIs for each grade level/content area, including non-core
- Managing all the different assessments and rubrics for a district

# Assessment Challenges...

- **How to assign teacher rating to growth data**
  - What constitutes a 1, 2, 3, or 4 regarding a student growth rubric? It translates into a 1, 2, 3, or 4 for that portion (%) of teacher evaluation.
- Are assessments valid, reliable and consistent?
- What are some special considerations - teachers & students?
  - *Joint Committee Guidebook p. 29* - <http://goo.gl/1dZSJ8>  
*(Significant Educational Impact)*
- Getting baseline data to help determine adequate growth
- Do we go Spring-Spring or Fall-Spring with Type I/II's?
- What about semester courses w/ HS?
- Tenure vs. non-tenured
- Mid-point review with teachers to see if adjustments are warranted

## *Other Considerations...*

- How to combine %'s for Practice & Growth
- How simple or complex a system you want to implement
- Fairness and accuracy
- Each assessment rating is equal value for student growth portion of eval (Ex. if 30%, Type I & III are worth 15% each)
- Measure 2 points in time (multiple tests)
- What is your goal - punish, or develop and grow teachers?
- Need consensus and buy-in
- It is a Joint Committee process and decision
- TIME & ORGANIZATION
- If you don't do it right and have to release a teacher/s...

## *More Considerations...*

Do you want to offer choice for teachers?

- Samples of assessments to choose from for growth  
(p.12 Sample Growth Guide - <http://goo.gl/BFPBfI>)
- Or is it predetermined for everyone?

# *District Planning & Discussion...*

Performance Evaluation Plan Outline  
Starting point for JC discussions

MS Word - <http://goo.gl/l4Mwqd>



## *If SLOs...*

Process creates a measurement model for evaluator to analyze scores from a Type III and identify whether pre-established goals have been met.

- If using a Type I or II - need 1 SLO
- If no Type I or II - need 2 SLOs (can wait until year two to implement second SLO)
  - One set by evaluator
  - One set by teacher or group of teachers sharing



# *SLO Pros & Cons*

## Recommended as a Type III

- align directly w/ classroom instruction
- teachers and admin select assessments and goals
- process builds collaboration and communication

## BUT...

- significant time commitment to develop and implement
- can easily become burdensome
- tougher to comparably assess students - need inter-rater reliability which needs practice

## *SLO Prep*

- A. Teacher provides documented rationale for Each SLO growth target
- B. Develop review process for SLOs to ensure rigor and teacher comparability
- C. Develop scoring method (rubric)
- D. If two SLOs - system for combining or weighting them
- E. Training, Training, Training!

## *SLOs In Action*

1. Teachers set SLOs and assess for baseline data to begin year
2. Place into groups (tiers) based on baseline data (general, ELL, Intellectually Disabled, Emotionally Disabled, Autistic, etc.)
3. Determine growth targets
4. Meet w/ teacher @ mid point of cycle to assess progress and adjust targets if necessary
5. Teacher scores and sees how many met growth goal

## *SLO Resources*

ISBE Guidebook on Student Learning - <http://goo.gl/dfcYoJ>

Objectives for Type III Assessments - <http://goo.gl/dfcYoJ>

ISBE Measuring Student Growth Using Type III Assessments - <http://goo.gl/kK8us7>

SLO Development Template - <http://goo.gl/1sgnME>

Sample Growth Guide - <http://goo.gl/BFPBfI>)

Also found @ [www.roe53.net](http://www.roe53.net) under PERA/SB7 link