

Evaluation Instruments: Research Base, Authors and Training Plans

West Ottawa Public Schools

Introduction

West Ottawa believes in the importance of growing the skills and abilities of its certified staff to their fullest potential so that our students are well served. This document is designed to show our community one way we seek to achieve that goal through our evaluation process. Below, we describe the following two evaluation instruments:

The Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson: Teacher evaluation

School Advance: Administrator evaluation

For each of these two instruments, we will describe and/or provide access to the following:

- a. The research base that supports the instrument
- b. Identity and qualifications of its authors
- c. Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy
- d. The actual evaluation frameworks and rubrics
- e. A description of our process for conducting classroom observations, gathering evidence, completing evils, etc.
- f. Our training plan for evaluators and/or observers

The Charlotte Danielson Model (Teachers)

Research Base (from communication with a representative of the Danielson group, used by permission):

First published by ASCD in 1996, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* was an outgrowth of the research compiled by Educational Testing Service (ETS) for the development of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments, an observation-based evaluation of first-year teachers used for the purpose of licensing. The Framework extended this work by examining current research to capture the skills of teaching required not only by novice teachers but by experienced practitioners as well.

Authors (from communication with a representative of the Danielson group, used by permission):

The Framework for Teaching was developed by Charlotte Danielson, an internationally-recognized expert in the area of teacher effectiveness. Her work focuses on the use of a framework, a clear description of practice, to promote professional learning. She advises State Education Departments and National Ministries and Departments of Education, both in the United States and overseas.

Charlotte Danielson graduated from Cornell with a degree in history, and earned her master's in philosophy, politics and economics at Oxford University. In 1978, she earned another master's from Rutgers in educational administration and supervision. After college, she worked as a junior economist in think tanks and policy organizations. While working in Washington, D.C., she got to know some of the children living on her inner-city block – and that's what motivated her to choose teaching over economics. She obtained her teaching credentials and worked her way up the spectrum from teacher to curriculum director, then on to staff developer and program designer in several different locations, including ETS in Princeton. She has developed and trained extensively in the areas of teacher observation and assessments.

Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy:

The authors provide the following website where they list studies that support the reliability, validity and efficacy of The Framework: <https://www.danielsongroup.org/research/>

Studies include the following:

Teaching to the Core: Practitioner perspectives about the intersection of teacher evaluation using the Danielson Framework for Teaching and Common Core State Standards (2015)

Measure of Effective Teaching (MET) Project Releases Final Research Report (2013)

Assessing the Relationship Between Student Achievement and Teacher Performance (2006)

Several others are listed at the referenced link.

The Actual Evaluation Frameworks and Rubrics: The Framework for Teaching

A copy of The Framework can be requested at the following site:

<https://www.danielsongroup.org/download/?download=448> or by clicking [here](#).

The West Ottawa Evaluation Process: Summary

West Ottawa Teacher (Track I and Track III: Needing Experience)

Goal-Setting Forms and Conference

- Teacher develops and submits draft IDP (referred to Professional Growth Goal in Frontline).
- Principal and teacher meet to finalize IDP.
- Teacher may submit Goal Setting Artifacts. This is optional.

Announced Observation: Domains 1-3

- Teacher completes and submits Pre-Observation Form at least one day prior to observation.
- Teacher uploads lesson plan at least one day prior to observation.
- Teacher may upload other artifacts related to the lesson. This is optional.
- Principal observes teacher.
- Teacher completes and submits self-assessment within 2 days of classroom observation. The teacher scores him/herself on each component of the rubric.
- Teacher completes and submits Teacher Lesson Reflection form within 2 days of classroom observation.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of the observation.
- Post-Observation Conference is held within 5 days of classroom observation.
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts after completion of the lesson. This is optional.

Unannounced Observation: Domains 1-3

- Principal observes teacher.
- Principal may require teacher to upload lesson plan.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of observation.
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts related to the lesson. This is optional.

Mid-Year Forms and Conference (First Year Teachers on Track I and Track III)

- Teacher completes and submits Self Reflection of Goals.
- Teacher and principal meet to discuss teacher's progress on IDP.
- Principal adds mid-year progress report on IDP and updated goals if needed.
- Teacher or principal may upload mid-year artifacts. This is optional.

Domain 4 Evidence

- Teacher submits evidence to principal by April 1st. Evidence may be submitted in binder or uploaded in Frontline.
- Principal will provide feedback to teacher using the rubric for Domain 4.

Year-End Forms and Evidence

- Teacher completes self-assessment of IDP by completing the Year-End Summative Review.
- Teacher or principal may upload year-end artifacts. This is optional.

Year-End Summative Evaluation

- Teacher and principal meet to discuss final summative evaluation.
- Principal uploads signed summative evaluation.
- IDP or Professional Growth Goal is developed for the following year.

West Ottawa Teacher (Track II)

Goal-Setting Forms and Conference

- Teacher enters Professional Growth Goal in Frontline.
- Principal and teacher meet to discuss Professional Growth Goal.
- Teacher may submit Goal Setting Artifacts. This is optional.

Announced Observation: Domains 1-3

- Teacher completes and submits Pre-Observation Form at least one day prior to observation.
- Teacher uploads lesson plan at least one day prior to observation.
- Teacher may upload other artifacts related to the lesson. This is optional.
- Principal observes teacher.
- Teacher completes and submits self-assessment within 2 days of classroom observation. The teacher scores him/herself on each component of the rubric.
- Teacher completes and submits Teacher Lesson Reflection form within 2 days of classroom observation.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of the observation.
- Post-Observation Conference is held within 5 days of classroom observation.
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts after completion of the lesson. This is optional.

Unannounced Observation: Domains 1-3

- Principal observes teacher.
- Principal may require teacher to upload lesson plan.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of observation.
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts related to the lesson. This is optional.

Domain 4 Evidence

- Teacher submits evidence to principal by April 1st. Evidence may be submitted in binder or may be uploaded in Frontline.
- Principal will provide feedback to teacher using the rubric for Domain 4.

Year-End Forms and Evidence

- Teacher completes self-assessment of Professional Growth Goal by completing the Year-End Summative Review.
- Teacher or principal may upload year-end artifacts. This is optional.

Year-End Summative Evaluation

- Teacher and principal meet to discuss final summative evaluation.
- Principal uploads signed summative evaluation.
- Professional Growth Goal is developed for the following year.

Training Plan

Teachers will receive training in the Danielson Evaluation System in the 16-17 school year. Our goal is to increase the teacher's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric.

The School Advance Model (Administrators)

The Research Base

“The six guiding principles for designing performance evaluation and feedback systems that support learning, growth, and adaptation were developed by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Dr. George Aramath, based on a two year meta-analysis of the literature on performance assessment and feedback.

The administrator evaluation rubrics were developed by Dr. Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill based on a one-year meta review of extant administrator evaluation instruments and research bases.

The work for both were significantly informed by the work of the Wallace Foundation, including two Michigan based Wallace Foundation grant projects focused on school level leadership development. Dr. Reeves served on the grant faculty teams for both of these projects with the late Dr. Van Cooley and Dr. Jianping Shen of Western Michigan University.

Dr. Reeves and Mrs. McNeill are also experienced school administrators who each served for over two decades as school administrators in Michigan.”

Source: <http://www.goschooladvance.org/Research-and-Development>

Authors

School Advance was created by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill. Their full biographies follow from <http://www.goschooladvance.org/Who-Created-School-ADvance>

Dr. Patricia Reeves

Dr. Patricia Reeves is an Associate Professor of educational leadership, research, and evaluation in the College of Education and Human Development at Western Michigan University – Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology. She also serves a contracted MASA Associate Executive Director for Administrator Certification and Development. Dr. Reeves joined the MASA team and the WMU faculty in 2005 with 19 years' experience as a K-12 assistant superintendent and superintendent. Prior to that, she was a Director of Instruction, a Gifted and Talented Program Specialist, a Reading Specialist, and a classroom teacher.

Dr. Reeves played a key role in researching state administrator credentialing systems, developing policy recommendations, drafting legislation, and working with the Michigan Department of Education to establish policies and rules for Michigan's Administrator credentialing system. Dr. Reeves' major contribution to this work was the conceptualization and design of Michigan's three-tiered administrator credentialing options and, specifically, the introduction of specialty and enhanced endorsements. In conjunction with her work at the policy and legislative level, Dr. Reeves also co-developed the Courageous Journey programs for superintendent specialty and enhanced endorsements and the MASA DISC system of developing, inducting, supporting, and credentialing K-12 district leaders.

Other policy level work contributed by Dr. Reeves include chairing the MASA Legislation Committee, co-chairing the MASA/MAISA insurance sub-committee, coordinating the MASA/MAISA Adequacy and Equity study, and most recently, facilitating and writing the MASA Lead Forward policy paper on comprehensive redesign of Michigan's K-12 public education system.

Dr. Reeves is also co-principal investigator and co-author of the School ADvance Educator Evaluation System, developed through collaboration between MASA, MIASCD, and the WMU Educational Leadership and Research Department.

Dr. Reeves' teaching and research focus includes principal and superintendent practice, data informed school improvement, performance based educator evaluation and credentialing models, measurement of educator effectiveness, and qualitative research methods. Dr. Reeves scholarship includes articles in peer reviewed and nationally recognized publications, book chapters, research and policy reports, contributions to legislation and administrative rule, both peer reviewed and invited national and state presentations, and co-creation of research based tools for educator evaluation, data-informed decision making, and systemic change processes.

Mrs. Patricia McNeill

Education

MA Grand Valley State University

B.S. Central Michigan University

Administrative Experience

- * Executive Director, Michigan ASCD January 2010- present
- * Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction + Professional Development – Holt Public Schools March 1997-December 2009
- * Curriculum Director – Waverly Public Schools September 1992-March1997
- * Staff Developer – Waverly Public Schools August 1984- September 1992

Teaching Experience

- * Waverly High School Special Education (Learning Disabilities) Consultant * Sanilac Career Center Learning Specialist * Sandusky Schools Adult Education Teacher * Cooperative Pre-School Teacher * Harrison Elementary Special Education Teacher * Harrison Elementary 3rd Grade Teacher

College Instructor:

- * Michigan State University Instructor – Learning Disabilities Practicum
- * Western Michigan University – Off Campus Courses (Effective Instruction, Classroom Management, Instructional Supervision, Cooperative Learning)

Staff Development Consultant/Trainer:

- * Effective Instruction
- * Clinical Supervision
- * Cognitive Coaching
- * Cooperative Learning
- * School Improvement
- * Classroom Management

Professional Development

Response to Intervention; Failure is Not An Option; Differentiated Instruction; Dimensions of Learning; Understanding By Design; Assessment + Grading; Brain + Learning; Effective Teaching + Learning; Cooperative Learning; Cognitive Coaching; Clinical Supervision; Classroom Management; School Improvement

Affiliations/Memberships

- * Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1985-present
- * Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1998-present
- * Phi Delta Kappa International
- * Michigan Assessment Consortium 1984-present 2010-present
- * Learning Forward
- * Learning Forward: Michigan
- * Other: Reading Recovery Council of America, Michigan Council of Teachers of Mathematics: Michigan Science Teachers Association; Michigan Reading Association: Council for Exceptional Children

Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy:

Source: <http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/97>

The School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is based on Four Assumptions, which are grounded in the work of researchers in the field of educator performance evaluation:

- The ultimate goal of educator evaluation is to achieve better results for students by fostering improved effectiveness of teachers and leaders.
- New accountability requirements have enormous implications for administrators' expertise—and for the way they do business and spend their time.
- High-stakes accountability must be balanced with ongoing feedback and support for continuous improvement.
- Evaluation should not be something we do to people; rather, it should empower employees to take responsibility for their own learning, growth, and performance.

The School ADvance System holds to **Ten Core Values**, which we believe hold up through many perspectives—community, board, administrator, teacher, student. Those **Ten Core Values** are the following:

1. Growing capacity for better student results
2. Two-way dialogue and interaction
3. A grounding in research supported practice
4. Self-Assessment and reflective practice
5. Authentic feedback
6. Growth targets that really matter
7. Personal ownership

8. Context, conditions, and student characteristics
9. Multiple sources of data/evidence
10. Student results

Moreover, the developers have identified **six research-aligned principles** and critical elements that must be part of any comprehensive educator evaluation system for teachers and administrators.

As a result, the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is:

1. **Authentic**, using evidence-based practices to achieve better student outcomes
2. **Professional**, building personal commitment and efficacy for growth and improvement
3. **Purpose Driven**, focused on measurable improvement targets for student success
4. **Adaptive**, fostering self-assessment, reflective practice, action research, and innovative methods of improving student results
5. **Evidence Based**, data informed, using multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data tied to student achievement and evidence-based practice including achievement and observation data
6. **Inclusive**, serving all, with alignment between student, teacher, administrator, and district improvement goals

By incorporating these elements, School ADvance can assist teachers, administrators, and boards of education in answering the three important questions regarding their own work:

- *Where am I right now in my learning and performance?*
- *Where should I focus next to learn, grow, and improve?*
- *How should I proceed to reach that next level of performance?*

The Actual Evaluation Frameworks and Rubrics: School Advance

A request to review the actual rubrics can be made at this web site:

http://www.goschooladvance.org/request_to_review_rubrics_and_guides

Or by clicking [here](#).

The West Ottawa Evaluation Process: Administrators

- I. Self-Assessment: Using the School Advance Rubrics, the administrator self-assesses his/her performance
- II. Goal Setting Conference: The building administrator and the evaluator meet in the beginning of the year to set performance goals for the upcoming school year.
 - A. Connection to Self-Assessment: performance goals are individualized to the growth needs of the administrator.

- B. Connection to District Priorities: performance goals relate to and support district priorities.
- III. Personal Growth Plan: a set of activities is designed to support the administrator's achievement of his/her goals.
- IV. Establish Formative Performance Profile: the building administrator compiles evidence in an electronic portfolio.
 - A. Evidence has connection to personal growth goals.
 - B. Evidence has connection to district goals.
- V. Mid-Year Conference: evaluator meets with the building administrator for a reflective conversation.
 - A. Progress made on Personal Growth Plan and artifacts is collected and discussed.
 - B. Barriers to progress being made on the Personal Growth Plan, if any, are explored.
 - C. Any necessary alterations to the plan that are needed to support personal and/or district goals, if needed, are made.
- VI. Update Formative Performance Profile: the building administrator adds to evidence in an electronic portfolio
 - A. Evidence has connection to personal growth.
 - B. Evidence has connection to district goals.
- VII. End of year summative meeting
 - A. Update Performance Profile (portfolio) and evaluate the connection to personal and district goals.
 - B. Evaluator shares ratings from the summative rubric as well as overall rating.
 - C. Dialogue on potential goals for the following year is initiated.
- VIII. On-going dialogue: conversation and dialogue is an ongoing process between the evaluator and the building administrator, in addition to beginning, mid-year, and end of year conferences.

Training Plan

Administrators received training in the School Advance in the summer of 2016, and this will be revisited throughout the 16-17 school year. Our goal is to increase the administrator's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric.

Conclusion

The goal of this document is to provide clarity and transparency for the community served by West Ottawa Public Schools. Should a reader have questions about any part of this, please contact us by clicking [here](#).