

MICHIGAN EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS AT-A-GLANCE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

About This Document	3
Purposes of Educator Evaluation	4
A Brief Overview	5
Public Act 173 of 2015	5
Background	5
Overview	5-6
Public Act 173 of 2015 Analysis	7-11
Description of PA 173	7
Requirements for Teacher Evaluations	7-8
Requirements for Administrator Evaluations	8
Responsibilities of Teachers	9
Responsibilities of Lead Building Administrators	9
Responsibilities of School District Superintendent, ISD Superintendent, or Chief Administrator of a PSA	9
Responsibilities of the Boards of School Districts, ISDs, or PSAs	10
Responsibilities of School Districts, ISDs, or PSAs	10
Responsibilities of the Michigan Department of Education	11
Implementation Timeline for Key Requirements	12-13

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

In November 2015, Public Act 173 was signed into law. This legislation governs educator evaluations for teachers and administrators in the State of Michigan. The legislation provides important clarity to the ongoing policy discussions about the direction of educator evaluations in Michigan.

The purpose of this document is to provide general guidance to educators in the field about both the content of the legislation and how the law interfaces with the efforts of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) to improve educator evaluations statewide as a key component of our stated goal of becoming a top ten performing state in ten years.

The document is divided into three main sections. The first section highlights some of the main purposes for our focus on improving educator evaluations. The second section provides a high-level overview of the public act, including some of the local, state, and federal factors that played a role in the content of the legislation. The third section provides more detail about the content of Public Act 173. This includes descriptions of the requirements for teacher and administrator evaluations, the time in which different facets of the law become mandatory, and the responsibilities of the MDE and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in relation to educator evaluations.

Those with additional questions may find the companion Frequently Asked Question document to be a useful resource.

PURPOSES OF EDUCATOR EVALUATION

Implementing Michigan’s educator evaluation law with fidelity is a key strategy in our efforts to see Michigan become a top ten education state within the next ten years. Educator evaluations are implicitly linked to the MDE’s Strategic Goal #3, to “develop, support, and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce.”

Excellent educators are essential to improving student outcomes. High quality educator evaluations support both student learning as well as educator well-being. High quality evaluations provide teachers with critical feedback on how they can improve their own practice to impact the lives of students.

In addition to facilitating educators’ personal pursuits of excellence, systematic improvements to educator evaluations in schools and districts play an essential role in providing targeted professional development responsive to the needs of educators. When valid, reliable evaluation systems are adopted and implemented with fidelity, districts can use evaluations to identify trends, develop data-driven strategies, and coordinate professional development aligned to the local needs of educators.

Implementing the law with fidelity can also help foster a positive, productive, and fair environment for educators. Rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluations provide objective, actionable feedback and document ways to improve educational practice. Quality evaluations also provide platforms to recognize excellent educators for their best practices, which has been shown to improve retention rates for effective teachers.

In districts with high quality educator evaluation systems implemented with fidelity, staffing decisions can be informed by quality observational and student data. Under the new legislation, evaluations also impact teacher certification. Consistently high-quality evaluations provide fairness for teachers and protections for districts.

In short, educator evaluations can serve as the mechanism to establish coherence connecting student achievement, school improvement, professional development, and staffing decisions.

A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Public Act 173 of 2015

This section provides context for educator evaluation legislation in Michigan and a high-level overview of components of the law. Each component highlighted here is explained in further depth in the next section.

Background

Many factors played a role in the development of Public Act 173, which is the legislation that governs educator evaluations in Michigan. Notably, it expands and clarifies the legislative work initiated in Public Act 102 of 2011, which first laid the groundwork for educator evaluation requirements in Michigan. Michigan is one of many states that have turned their attention to improving the quality and consistency of educator evaluations.

In this context and connected to PA 102, the Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE) was established to develop Michigan-specific recommendations for educator evaluations that were research-based, reached high standards of reliability and validity, and matched the contextual needs in the state.

Public Act 173 has components specifically informed by the MCEE final recommendations – specifically the recommendations of four state-approved observation tools for teachers and two state-approved observation tools for administrators.

Overview

The legislation requires that the board of a school district, Intermediate School District (ISD), or the board of directors of a Public School Academy (PSA) adopt a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system for teachers and administrators.

The legislation requires that evaluations be conducted annually, and that they incorporate student growth as a significant component, beginning at 25% in the 2015-2016 school year and growing to 40% in 2018-2019. Teachers and administrators with three consecutive highly effective ratings may receive biennial reviews in place of annual reviews.

The law also includes certain additional requirements in circumstances where teachers or administrators receive minimally effective or ineffective ratings.

The legislation tasks the MDE with maintaining a list of state-approved observation/evaluation tools which initially includes the models recommended by the MCEE. For teachers, these observation tools are

- Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching,
- the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model,
- the Thoughtful Classroom, and
- the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning.

For administrators, these evaluation tools are

- MASA’s School Advance Administrator Evaluation Instrument, and
- Reeves Leadership Performance Rubric.

Districts that wish to use tools modified from the approved observation tools or tools not included on the state-approved list are permitted to do so, provided the tools meet requirements outlined in legislation and the district meets transparency and public reporting guidelines specified in the law.

The legislation stipulates that the Professional Education Certificate and Advanced Professional Education Certificate be tied to effectiveness data collected at the state level.

PUBLIC ACT 173 OF 2015 ANALYSIS

This section includes a more detailed analysis of the content of Michigan's educator evaluation law. This analysis is meant to summarize, but not supersede the content of the legislation. Educators and other administrators can access the full text of Public Act 173 of 2015 here <https://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2015-2016/publicact/pdf/2015-PA-0173.pdf>.

Description of PA 173

- PA 173 requires the board of a school district or ISD or the board of directors of a PSA, with the involvement of teachers and school administrators, to adopt and implement for all teachers and administrators a rigorous, transparent, and fair performance evaluation system that does all of the following:
 - Evaluates the teacher's or administrator's job performance at least annually while providing timely and constructive feedback.
 - Establishes clear approaches to measuring student growth and provides teachers and administrators with relevant data on student growth.
 - Evaluates a teacher's or administrator's job performance, using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor.
 - Uses the evaluations to inform decisions regarding the effectiveness of teachers and administrators; promotion, retention, and development of teachers and administrators; whether to grant tenure and/or allow progression to the Professional Education Certificate; and the removal of ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and administrators.

Requirements for Teacher Evaluations

- The performance evaluation system shall include at least an annual year-end evaluation for all teachers.
- For the 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018 school years, 25% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
- Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, 40% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
- Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, for core content areas in grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered, 50% of student growth must be measured using the state assessments. Districts may choose to use state assessment data prior to 2018-19, but are not required to do so. The MDE will provide student growth percentiles (SGPs) as the state measure of student growth starting with the 2015-16 state assessments. More information about SGPs can be found here www.michigan.gov/mde-evals.

- Student assessment and growth data not based on the state measure must be measured using multiple research-based growth measures or alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across schools within the school district, ISD, or PSA. They may include student learning objectives (SLOs) or nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards or based on achievement of individualized education program goals.
- The portion of a teacher's annual year-end evaluation that is not based on student growth and assessment data shall be based primarily on a teacher's performance as measured by the observation tool developed or adopted by the school district, ISD, or PSA.
- The system must assign to each teacher an effectiveness rating of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective.
- Midyear progress reports are required for teachers who are (a) in the first year of the probationary period or (b) received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on the most recent annual evaluation.
- Teachers who are rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual evaluations may be evaluated biennially instead of annually
- Unless a teacher has received a rating of effective or highly effective on his/her two most recent annual year-end evaluations, there must be at least two classroom observations of the teacher each school year. Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, at least one observation must be unscheduled. The school administrator responsible for the teacher's performance evaluation shall conduct at least one of the observations. Within 30 days after each observation, the teacher must be provided with feedback from the observation.
- Teachers who are rated ineffective on three consecutive annual year-end evaluations must be dismissed from employment by the district.

Requirements for Administrator Evaluations

- The performance evaluation system shall include at least an annual year-end evaluation for all administrators regularly involved in instructional matters.
- For the 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018 school years, 25% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
- Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, 40% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
- The student growth component of the evaluation must be an aggregate of all of the student growth and assessment data used in teacher evaluations in the school or district.

- The portion of the evaluation that is not based on student growth data and the district's adopted evaluation tool must be based on the administrator's proficiency in using the observation tool for teachers; the progress made by the school or district in meeting the goals set forth in the school or district improvement plan as applicable; student attendance in the school or school district; and student, parent, and teacher feedback.
- The system must assign to each school administrator an effectiveness rating of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective.
- An improvement plan is required for a school administrator who is rated as minimally effective or ineffective.
- Administrators who are rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual year-end evaluations may be evaluated biennially instead of annually.
- Administrators who are rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual year-end evaluations must be dismissed from employment by the district.

Responsibilities of Teachers

- As part of the annual, year-end evaluation, teachers consult with the building principal or evaluator to develop performance goals and recommend training/professional development for the next school year.
- For a teacher in the first year of probationary status, or who received an ineffective or minimally effective rating on his/her most recent evaluation, consult with the building principal or evaluator to develop an individualized development plan.

Responsibilities of Lead Building Administrators

- Conduct, or designate another person to conduct, at least annual evaluations of all teachers.
- Develop specific performance goals in the annual year-end evaluation and identify training to help meet those goals, in consultation with the teacher.
- Develop an individualized development plan for any teacher in the first year of the probationary period (first full year of employment) or who received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on his/her most recent annual year-end evaluation.

Responsibilities of School District Superintendents or Chief Administrators

- Conduct, or designate another person to conduct, at least annual evaluations of all building administrators and district administrators who are regularly involved in instructional matters.

Responsibilities of the Boards of School Districts, ISDs, or PSAs

- Conduct at least annual evaluations of the district superintendent or chief administrator.
- By the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year, adopt and implement one or more observation tools for teachers and evaluation tools for administrators.

Responsibilities of School Districts, ISDs, or PSAs

- Beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, provide training to teachers on the observation tool or tools used in the performance evaluation system and how each observation tool is used. Training shall also be provided to all evaluators and observers.
- Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, post the following on the district website for each adopted observation or evaluation tool:
 - The research base for the evaluation framework, instrument, and process.
 - The identity and qualifications of the author or authors.
 - Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy or a plan for developing that evidence.
 - The evaluation framework and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators.
 - A description of the processes for conducting classroom observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans.
 - A description of the plan for providing evaluators and observers with training.
- Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, ensure that a student is not assigned to be taught the same subject area for two consecutive years by teachers who have been rated ineffective on their two most recent annual year-end evaluations. If the district is unable to meet this requirement, it must notify affected students' parent(s) or legal guardian(s) and explain the district's inability to comply with this requirement.

Responsibilities of the Michigan Department of Education

- The MDE shall establish and maintain a list of approved teacher and administrator observation tools. The list shall include at least the evaluation models included in the final recommendations released by the Michigan Council on Educator Effectiveness (MCEE) in July 2013. School Districts, ISDs and PSAs are not required to use a tool on the state-approved list.
- Beginning July 1, 2018 the State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall not issue an Professional Education Certificate to an individual unless s/he meets the following criteria:
 - The individual has successfully completed at least three full years of classroom teaching.
 - The individual meets either of the following:
 - Was rated effective or highly effective on his/her annual year-end performance evaluations for three consecutive years preceding the application for the Professional Education Certification OR,
 - Was rated effective or highly effective for at least three nonconsecutive years preceding the application for Professional Education Certification and submits a recommendation from the chief school administrator of the school at which s/he is currently employed.
- Beginning November 5, 2015, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall not issue or renew an Advanced Professional Education Certificate to an individual, unless the individual:
 - Has been rated as highly effective on his/her annual year-end evaluation for three out of five most recent school years.
 - Has not been rated ineffective on his/her annual year-end evaluation within the five most recent school years.
 - Meets additional criteria established by the MDE.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE FOR KEY REQUIREMENTS

Activity	Reference	Date
PA 173 Effective Date	PA 173	November 5, 2015
Superintendent of Public Instruction shall not issue an initial or renew an existing Advanced Professional Education Certificate unless the individual meets statutory requirements	1531k	November 5, 2015
Board of a district, ISD or PSA shall adopt and implement for all teachers and administrators a rigorous, transparent, and fair performance evaluation system	1249(1)	2015-2016
Board of a district, ISD or PSA shall ensure that the performance evaluation system for teachers meets statutory requirements	1249(2)	2015-2016
Board of a district, ISD or PSA shall ensure that the performance evaluation system for administrators meets statutory requirements	1249b(1)	2015-2016
25% of annual year-end evaluations for teachers and school administrators must be based on student growth and assessment data	1249(2)(a)(i) 1249b(1)(b)	2015-2016
District, ISD or PSA shall adopt and implement one or more of observation tools for teachers and evaluation tools for administrators	1249(2)(f) 1249b(1)(e)	2016-2017
District, ISD or PSA shall provide training to teachers on the adopted observation tool(s)	1249(2)(m)	2016-2017
District, ISD or PSA shall provide training to all evaluators and observers on the adopted observation and evaluation tool(s)	1249(2)(n) 1249b(1)(l)	2016-2017
District, ISD or PSA shall post required information about the adopted observation tool(s) it uses for teacher performance evaluation on its website	1249(3)	2016-2017

Activity	Reference	Date
The portion of a teacher's annual year-end evaluation not based on student growth and assessment data shall be measured by the observation tool	1249(2)(a)(iii)	2016-2017
The administrator responsible for a teacher's performance evaluation shall conduct at least one of the required observations	1249(2)(a)(iv)	2016-2017
District, ISD or PSA shall ensure that a teacher is provided with feedback from an observation within 30 days	1249(2)(a)(v)	2016-2017
The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall not issue an initial Professional Teaching Certificate to an individual unless the individual meets statutory requirements	1531j	July 1, 2018
District, ISD or PSA shall not assign a student to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by teachers rated as ineffective for two consecutive years and must notify affected students' parent(s) or legal guardian(s) if the district is unable to comply with this requirement	1249a(1) 1249a(2)	2018-2019
40 % of the annual year-end evaluation for teachers and administrators must be based on student growth and assessment data	1249(2)(a)(i) 1249b(1)(b)	2018-2019
For teachers of subjects and grades assessed by state assessments, 50% of the student growth portion of the annual year-end evaluation must be measured using state assessments	1249(2)(a)(ii)	2018-2019



Office of Educator Talent and Policy Coordination
Phone: 517-373-9661
Website: www.michigan.gov/mde-evals
Email: MDE-EdEvals@michigan.gov