Transforming Educator Evaluations in Illinois

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)
Illinois Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)
Why This Matters

- We all want students to succeed
- We know that teachers matter
- We know that principals matter
- We know that current evaluations can be improved
- We know that the legislature has mandated changes
The Basics

- 2010 PERA law mandated major changes
- New evaluations address both practice and student growth
- Two choices for districts: Use General Rules to create your own system or use State Model (all or parts)
- Teachers: If no local agreement on student growth after 180 days, must default to growth section of State Model
- Chicago: Slightly different process and timelines
Soon the proposed rules will be reviewed by the Joint Committee on Rules (JCAR) [http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/](http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/).

Pending the Joint Committee on Rules approval, become effective immediately thereafter based on the timelines in the rules/legislation.
Key Dates: Developing & Implementing the Systems--Training

By Sept. 2012: ALL Evaluators trained – no longer required to have a Type 75 certification to be an evaluator, but must have completed/passed evaluation training.

Training is online and self-paced.

- Teacher Evaluator Training is approximately 32 hours
- Principal Evaluator Training is approximately 20 hours
Key Dates: Developing & Implementing the Systems—Training Guiding Principles

- Identify and disseminate *minimum state requirements*, performance standards and best practices
- Facilitate a *common language* and dialogue around performance
- Encourage collaboration, learning and alignment amongst stakeholders
- *High-quality*, scalable, sustainable, and *user-focused content* and delivery model
# Principal Evaluation Training Design and Delivery Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Reflect Measure</th>
<th>Measure Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>Module 1 Online Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 2 Online Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 3 Online Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 4 Online Self-paced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (Approximate)</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation (2 tiers)</td>
<td>Instructor-led and Face to Face and Online Assessment</td>
<td>Instructor-led and Face to Face and Online Assessment</td>
<td>Instructor-led and Face to Face and Online Assessment</td>
<td>Face to Face Module and Online Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Teacher Training Design and Delivery Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Validate</th>
<th>Collaborate Reflect</th>
<th>Measure Evaluate</th>
<th>Student Growth (if required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1 Online Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 2 Teachscape Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 3 Online Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 4 Online Self-paced</td>
<td>Module 5 Online Self-paced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (Approximate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>15-18 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>2 Online Assessments</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
<td>Online Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td>Online, Instructor-led and Online Assessment</td>
<td>Face to Face and Online Assessment</td>
<td>Face to Face and Online Assessment</td>
<td>Face-to-Face Training and Online Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key Dates: Developing & Implementing the Systems

- 2012-2013: All principals & assistant principals evaluated following new rules

- 2012-2013: All teacher *summative* evaluation ratings will reflect one of the four categories: Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory

- 2012-2013: Teacher evaluations following new rules phased in, starting with 300 Chicago schools and all SIG schools
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Key Dates: Developing & Implementing the Systems

- 2013-2014: Teacher evaluations following new rules for the remaining CPS schools

- 2015-2016: The lowest performing 20% of schools in the state

- 2016-2017: All other districts in state implement PERA, Part 50 of administrative rules.
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Key Dates: SIG 1003(g) Schools: Developing, Piloting, and Implementing Systems

- A school that began implementing in 2010-2011 (Cohort 1)
  - 2010-2011 – Develops Evaluation System
  - 2011-2012 – Pilots Evaluation System
  - 2012-2013 – Fully Implements Evaluation System

- A school that began implementing in 2011-2012 (Cohort 2)
  - 2011-2012 – Develops Evaluation System
  - 2012-2013 – Pilots Evaluation System
  - 2013-2014 – Fully Implements Evaluation System

- A school that will begin implementing in 2012-2013 (Cohort 3)
  - 2012-2013 – Develops Evaluation System
  - 2013-2014 – Pilots Evaluation System
Key Dates: SIG 1003(g) Schools With Waiver: Developing, Piloting, and Implementing Systems

Transformation Model Only:

- A school that began implementing in 2010-2011 (Cohort 1)
  - 2010-2011 – Develops Evaluation System
  - 2011-2012 – Develops Evaluation System
  - 2012-2013 – Pilots Evaluation System
  - 2013-2014 – Fully Implements Evaluation System

- A school that began implementing in 2011-2012 (Cohort 2)
  - 2011-2012 – Develops Evaluation System
  - 2012-2013 – Pilots Evaluation System
  - 2013-2014 – Fully Implements Evaluation System
Key Dates: SIG 1003(g) Schools: Developing, Piloting, and Implementing Systems

Key Highlights

- **2012-2013**
  - All Cohorts 1 & 2 & 3 Teachers’ summative ratings will reflect one of the four categories: Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory
  - Cohort 1 & 2 - All teachers pilot use of growth targets as part of the evaluation (*under waiver*)

- **2013-2014**
  - Cohort 1 & 2 Teachers’ evaluations follow new rules
  - Cohort 3 – All teachers pilot use of growth targets as part of the evaluation

- **2014-2015** – Cohort 3 Teachers’ evaluations follow new rules
Key Benefits

- Consistent standards…clearer, more objective feedback
- Improved professional development
- Multiple measures of student growth
- Improved student learning
About PEAC

- 32 educators, union and association leaders from K-12 and higher education
- 2-year process … and counting
- 3 subcommittees: teachers, principals, training
- 8 Educator Forums and online survey, with input from more than 2,300 educators around the state
- Regular scheduled meetings open to the public
- Comprehensive website: www.isbe.net/PEAC
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Recommendations

- Each district will convene a PERA joint committee of equal representation of teachers and administrators
- Use of General Rules (minimum standards) to draft own district system
- Or use of State Model
- On student growth only, if district PERA joint committee cannot come to consensus then the teacher evaluation must default to State Model after 180 days
- Chicago: Does not default to State Model. PERA legislation allows CPS to impose “its last best offer” if joint committee of teacher-administrator cannot agree
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Recommendations

General rules

State model

Teachers

Practice

70% proportional

>25% (first two yrs)

≥30% (third yr+)

Student growth

Principals

Practice

≥50% proportional

>25% (first two yrs)

≥30% (third yr+)

Student growth

Practice

50%

50%

Student growth

Practice

50%

50%

Student growth

Training

5/10/2012
Districts must adopt instructional framework aligned with the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards

http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/pdf/IL_prof_teaching_stds.pdf with four performance levels for the summative rating:

- unsatisfactory
- needs improvement
- Proficient
- excellent
Formal classroom observations

- District PERA joint committee defines characteristics of a formal observation with the total number of observations.
- Evaluator required to meet with the individual in a pre-conference to preview the lesson.
- Required post-conference providing feedback of evidence collected.
TEACHERS: Practice Recommendations (General Rules)

- Informal classroom observations
  - District PERA joint committee defines informal classroom observations
  - May or may not be announced
  - No requirement of a pre-conference
  - Does not have to include immediate feedback
  - Not subject to a time requirement

- Post-conference meeting with self-reflection and written evaluator feedback, with relevant evidence
TEACHERS: Practice Recommendations (General Rules)

- Non-probationary teachers: at least 2 observations (1 formal)

- Probationary teachers: at least 3 observations (2 formal)

- Professional development must align to National Staff Development Council standards
TEACHERS: Student Growth Recommendations (General Rules)

- “Demonstrable change in a student’s learning between two or more points in time”

- Need data from at least 2 assessments:
  - At least one Type III assessment
  - And at least one Type I or II assessment (not ISAT or PSAE)
  - Or two Type III assessments

- District PERA joint committee decides metrics and targets, including for different student groups (ELL, etc.)

- Must comprise at least 25% of final rating in 2012-13 and 2013-2014, 30% thereafter
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Assessments shall be defined according to three distinct types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I</th>
<th>Type II</th>
<th>Type III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment that measures a certain group of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is widely administered beyond Illinois</td>
<td>An assessment developed or adopted and approved by the school district and used on a district-wide basis that is given by all teachers in a given grade or subject area</td>
<td>An assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the course’s curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) MAP tests, Scantron Performance Series

Examples: Collaboratively developed common assessments, curriculum tests, assessments designed by textbook publishers

Examples: teacher-created assessments, assessments of student performance

5/10/2012
Teachers: Recommendations (State Model)

- Generally the same as General Rules, except:
  - 3 conferences (start, middle, end of year)
  - Student Growth: Counts for 50% of final rating
PRINCIPALS:
Recommendations (General Rules)

- Same rules apply for assistant principals
- Annual evaluations required
- Principal will complete a self-assessment against the standards of practice no later than February 1. The evaluator will use the information provided in the self-assessment as one input to the overall evaluation of principal practice
- Practice framework must align to new state Standards for Principal Evaluation found in the proposed rules
Final, written summative evaluation by March 1 (July 1 for CPS)

Rate in one of four performance levels (Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory) with clear indicators and written evidence that identifies specific strengths/weaknesses

District use of General Rules by PERA joint committee to develop own system or use State Model … but no mandated default to State Model as for teachers

Practice: Counts for at least 50% of overall evaluation
PRINCIPALS: Practice
Recommendations (General Rules)

- At least 2 formal site observations
  - Observing school and/or principal practice, scheduled in advance, feedback within 10 days
  - Time spent in the school site observing school practices, that may also include direct observation of principal action
  - Scheduled in advance with at least one specific observation objective (reviewing classrooms, observing a leadership team meeting, etc)
  - Followed within 10 principal work days by feedback on the observation shared from evaluator to the principal, either in writing or verbally
  - The evaluator may conduct additional formal observations as needed
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The evaluator may conduct as many informal site observations as needed, and information from informal site visits may also be included in the summative evaluation as long as it is documented in writing.

By October 1: Evaluator and principal set student growth measures and targets, plus PD goals.

Principal and evaluator together define how data will be used, with specific weights for each assessment and target.
“Measurable change in a student’s or group of students’ knowledge or skills between two or more points in time”

Growth: Counts for at least 25% of final evaluation in 2012-13 and 2013-14, 30% thereafter

Use of standardized tests (including ISAT and PSAE) and district-developed tests; only in special circumstances will Type III tests developed by teachers/evaluators be used
PRINCIPALS: Student Growth Recommendations (General Rules)

- When available from PARCC, state value-added score must comprise most of growth rating

- District, evaluator, and principal will decide how to account for certain student characteristics (ELL, SPED, etc.)
Assessments for Principals

Assessments shall be defined according to three distinct types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I</th>
<th>Type II</th>
<th>Type III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment that measures a certain group of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is widely administered beyond Illinois</td>
<td>An assessment developed or adopted and approved by the school district and used on a district-wide basis that is given by all teachers in a given grade or subject area</td>
<td>An assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the course’s curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) MAP tests, Scantron Performance Series

Examples: Collaboratively developed common assessments, curriculum tests, assessments designed by textbook publishers

Examples: teacher-created assessments, assessments of student performance
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Minimum Weight for Principal Practice - the “principal practice” portion of the principal evaluation must comprise at least 50% of the overall principal evaluation.

Requirements for Principal Evaluation Instruments

Every district must align the instruments for evaluation of principal practice to the revised Illinois Standards for Principal Evaluation (drafted by sub-committee and included in proposed rules).

Every district must create or select a rubric that has clear indicators for each standard and clear descriptions of at least 4 performance levels for each indicator.

For any district not adopting the default rubric, the district must create a training process to build shared awareness and understanding of the rubric and principal practice expectations with all principals and principal evaluators.
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Rules for Gathering Data on Principal Practice are same as the General Recommendations for Principal Practice

Rules for the Summative Rating of Principal Practice

- In the summative evaluation, the evaluator must identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each standard
- The summative evaluation must identify the strengths and growth areas of the principal
- The district must define how the data gathered against the principal practice standards will be used to determine a summative practice rating
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Selecting Assessments and Setting Targets - No later than October 1 of every calendar year, the evaluator must inform the principal which assessments, data, and targets will be used to judge student growth for the year, and specify the weights of each outcome and target.

Including Students in Growth Calculation - A student will be included in the student growth metric as long as the student has been assigned to the school long enough to have at least two data points on a comparable assessment (e.g. 2012 ISAT and 2013 ISAT, or a beginning of year assessment and mid-year assessment within an aligned interim assessment system.)
Definition of Student Growth - A measurable change in student outcomes at the school level. Totaling 50% of Summative Evaluation

Maintain all general guidelines for 30% of the principal evaluation:

- The student growth portion of the principal evaluation must be based on academic assessments - “Academic” is defined as any instructional area for which Illinois state standards exist
- Require the use of multiple academic assessments
- The state model uses assessments that meet the definition of Type 1 and Type 2 for principal evaluation, including state assessments
PRINCIPALS: Student Growth Recommendations (State Model)

- **Definition of Student Growth** - A measurable change in student outcomes at the school level. Totaling 50% of Summative Evaluation

  Remaining 20% of the student growth portion of state model can focus on similar academic assessments of growth, or on a broader set of student outcome measures.
### PRINCIPALS: Student Growth (State Model) Elem/MS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Assessment/Outcome</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30% Academic Assessments</strong></td>
<td>20% based on growth on ISAT from previous year*</td>
<td>Increase in % meets standards AND increase in % exceeds standards – looking at same students from grade to grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% based on interim assessment with a normed prediction of performance for each student based on baseline</td>
<td>% of students meeting or exceeding predicted growth OR average growth over predicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20% Other Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>10% based on attainment measures on ISAT (Given timing of state test data and the March 1 evaluation completion requirement, these measures will not be available for first year principals and districts will need to use an additional interim assessment in place of the ISAT data.)</td>
<td>% of students exceeding expectations OR % of students meeting expectations (if a school has a low % of students meeting expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% based on:</td>
<td>• Increase in average daily attendance/decrease in total unexcused absences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing attendance and reducing unexcused absences</td>
<td>• AND/OR another non-test measure selected by the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AND/OR other non-test measures aligned to the school improvement plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Assessment/Outcome</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30% Academic Assessments</strong></td>
<td>20% based on growth in EPAS sequence (from previous year—given timing of state test data and the March 1 evaluation requirement, these measures will not be available for first year principals and districts will need to use an additional interim assessment in place of the EPAS data.)</td>
<td>% of students meeting or exceeding predicted growth OR average growth over predicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% based on interim assessment with a normed prediction of performance for each student based on baseline</td>
<td>% of students meeting or exceeding predicted growth OR average growth over predicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20% Other Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>20% based on: Cohort graduation rates, grade-to-grade progression, or “on track” rates AND/OR other student outcomes aligned to the school improvement</td>
<td>% increase in graduation rate or increase in % of students that progress from grade to grade, OR AND/OR another student outcome measure selected by the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/2012</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining Student Growth Performance Levels

- **Exceeds Goal** - Exceeds the target for a majority of the student growth measures; meets all targets

- **Meets Goal** - Meets or exceeds the target for a majority of the student growth measures; does not have negative growth on any measures

- **Minimal Growth** - Meets only 1 or 2 student growth targets; has no more than one measure with negative growth results

- **No Growth or Negative Growth** - Does not meet any student growth targets; demonstrates negative growth on one or more measures
### Rating of Principal Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Student Growth</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Goal</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>Gather further information – supervisor judgment determines rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Goal</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>PROFICIENT</td>
<td>Gather further information – supervisor judgment determines rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Growth</td>
<td>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY (unless first year principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Growth/Negative Growth</td>
<td>Gather further information – supervisor judgment determines rating</td>
<td>Gather further information – supervisor judgment determines rating</td>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY (unless first year principal)</td>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY (unless first year principal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Further General Information & Rules

- Proposed rules can be viewed at [www.isbe/rules](http://www.isbe/rules) or [http://www.cyberdriveillinois.com/departments/index/register/home.html](http://www.cyberdriveillinois.com/departments/index/register/home.html)

- More information at [www.isbe.net/PEAC](http://www.isbe.net/PEAC)
More Information on Training

www.growththroughlearningillinois.org

Links providing additional information

- Advisory Committee
- Principal Evaluation
- Teacher Evaluation
- Contact - form for asking question here!
- Timeline
- PEAC