Grand Rapids Public Schools
Evaluation Instruments: Research Base, Authors, and Training Plans

PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

In compliance with the reporting requirements of Public Act 176 (Enrolled Senate Bill 103) of November 5, 2015, the Grand Rapids Public School District is posting the following information regarding our evaluation system for educators.

Introduction

Grand Rapids Public Schools believes in the responsibility and importance of growing the skill sets and abilities of its certified staff to their fullest potential for our students’ benefit. This document is designed to demonstrate to our parents, students, and community one way we seek to achieve that goal through our evaluation process. The following evaluation instruments will be used in our evaluation process:

MDE State Approved Evaluation Tools Used by Grand Rapids Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Evaluation</td>
<td>To Be Determined. Pursuant to MCL 380.1229, the superintendent will not be evaluated until the 2017-2018 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Evaluation</td>
<td>School ADvance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>Danielson Framework for Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a. The research base that supports the framework, instrument, and process
b. Identity the authors and provide the qualifications of the authors
c. Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy
d. The evaluation frameworks and rubrics
e. A description of our process for conducting observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans
f. The training plan for evaluators and observers
ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION - THE SCHOOL ADVANCE MODEL

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.”

To go to the School Advance Research and Development Website click here Source

Authors

School Advance was created by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill., for full biographies

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.

Mrs. Patricia McNeill

* Executive Director, Michigan ASCD January 2010- July 2016
* Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction + Professional Development – Holt Public Schools March 1997-December 2009
* Staff Developer – Waverly Public Schools August 1984- September 1992
* 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
Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy

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?
GRPS School Advance Rubric

The GRPS School Advance Rubric can be accessed via the following link

[Insert Link to the Rubric]

Evaluation Process: Administrators

I. 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. Goals are individualized to the growth needs of the administrator.
   B. Connection to District Priorities: performance goals relate to and support district priorities.

II. Mid-Year Conference: evaluator meets with the building administrator for a reflective conversation.
   A. Progress made on goals and artifacts are collected and discussed.
   B. Barriers to progress are explored.
   C. Any necessary alterations to the plan that are needed to support personal and/or district goals, if needed, are made.

III. End of year summative meeting
   A. Evaluator shares ratings from the summative rubric as well as overall rating.
   B. Dialogue on potential goals for the following year is initiated.

IV. 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 starting in the 2015-16 school year and continued throughout the 2016-2017 school year. Components and dimensions of the rubric are explored during the monthly Leading the GRPS Way professional development training. 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.

School Advance Assurances

Further information can be found at [www.gomasa.org]
TEACHER AND CERTIFIED EDUCATORS - FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING

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.

Each component of the Framework for Teaching has been validated by the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study. The Framework for Teaching has been found to have predictive validity. Further research around the FfT can be found on The Danielson Group’s website. See the Chicago and Cincinnati studies.

Authors
The Framework for Teaching was developed by Charlotte Danielson, a 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 conversations and 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 for 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.

Research Base for the Evaluation Framework, Instrument, and Process [Section 1249(3)(a)]

Below is the link to the research studies regarding the validity and reliability of the Danielson Framework for Teaching Tool

https://www.danielsongroup.org/research/

Grand Rapids Public Schools Teacher Evaluation Process: Summary
An evaluation process is determined by local guidelines and decisions. Cambridge Education trains and certifies all observer and evaluators to collect non-biased, quality evidence that is aligned to FfT components. Observers examine the evidence against critical attributes that distinguish levels of performance. This collaborative process supports the determination of a rating based on the preponderance of evidence. The Danielson Group promotes the use of evidence in collaborative pre- and post-observation conferences focused on growth.

The complete evaluation process can be found in the GRPS Educator Evaluation Guidebook

Insert link to the Guidebook here
Training Plan
Grand Rapids Public Schools have used a version of the Danielson Framework for Teaching Rubric since the 2000-2001 school year. Throughout the years teachers have been trained on the various dimensions of the rubric. The District provides training on the evaluation process every year to all teachers including in 2016-17. The District’s new teacher training is designed around specific domains and components of the Danielson Rubric.

Free resources can be found on The Danielson Group website.