ACGC Teacher Growth Model

Leading Forward is providing this document as a resource to demonstrate how the Minnesota Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model brings districts into compliance with the MN State Statutes for Teacher Evaluation and correlates with the work done in the Collaboration, Growth, and Evaluation Model: the MN State Model for Teacher Evaluation.

**Timeline:**
- March 31, 2014: Presentation to ACGC Education Association (ACGC EA)
- April 1, 2014 - April 7, 2014: ACGC EA Reviewing Time
- April 8, 2014 - April 10, 2014: ACGC EA Voting Period
- April 14, 2014: EA Approved ACGC Teacher Growth Model
- April 28, 2014: ACGC School Board Approval
Contents

Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model for MN Schools, MN Statutes, & Dr. Marzano Model .................. 2
Marzano Teacher Evaluation as it Correlates to The Teacher Collaboration, Growth & Evaluation Model … 7
Definition & Measurement of the 3 Components with the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model ............. 8
Component One: Teacher Practice ...................................................................................................... 9
Scales and Evidences of Teacher Practice .........................................................................................12
Component Two: Student Engagement .............................................................................................13
Component Three: Student Learning and Achievement ...................................................................14
Three-Year Professional Review Cycle ............................................................................................15
Teacher Growth and Evaluation Activities in the Process ...............................................................18
Description of the Growth and Evaluation Process ........................................................................19
Training for Teachers and Observers ............................................................................................20
ACGC Teacher Growth Model

The system described in this resource is the Minnesota Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, offered as a comprehensive approach to teacher evaluation that is coordinated and compatible with the Minnesota Teacher Evaluation Statute and the Minnesota Teacher Evaluation Default Model.

The **Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model** presents a number of advantages to districts:

- Focuses evaluations on instructional elements shown by research to impact student achievement
- Incorporates data from a variety of sources for a well-rounded assessment
- Encourages continual improvements in instruction through deliberate practice
- Integrates Dr. Marzano’s Casual Teacher Evaluation Model to build up evidence of effective instruction

The model presented here follows many of the procedures outlined in the MN State Default Model for Teacher Evaluation while using Dr. Marzano’s domains, rubrics, scales, and evidences along with the iObservation Technology Tool.

This document intends to describe how the **Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model** meets the state requirements and to assist districts in implementing the model.

**MINNESOTA STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS**

Minnesota’s teacher evaluation requirements are contained in Minnesota Statute, section 122A.40 and 122A.41.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the evaluation is to improve student learning and success and to improve and support qualified teachers and effective teaching practices.

The evaluation is designed to improve teaching and learning by supporting the teachers in deliberate, instructional practices that improve student achievement. The evaluation process supports evaluators and peers in providing feedback that supports growth that is identifiable, consistent, and measurable. It supports growth through reflection in learning designs such as professional learning communities and/or professional portfolios.
The evaluation must satisfy the requirements set forth by the State of Minnesota regarding the Teacher Evaluation Model. A school board and exclusive representative of the teachers jointly agree to an annual teacher evaluation and peer review process for probationary and non-probationary teachers (or use the state model by default). This document addresses how the Marzano Model meets and supports the requirements where applicable.

1. **The teacher evaluation processes must provide the requisite evaluations for probationary teachers-three evaluations annually with the first within 90 days of employment.**

Annual teacher evaluations are designed to develop, improve and support qualified teachers and effective teaching practices and improve student learning and success.

The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is based on clearly defined protocols, scales and rubrics in a process that supports growth through refining practice, data from teacher and student evidence, and reflection by the teacher with peers and administration. The iObservation tool supports the efficiency of observation, calculation and sharing of data, development of growth plans, and reflections.

2. **Teacher evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes**
   - An individual growth and development plan,
   - Peer review,
   - The opportunity to participate in professional learning communities, and
   - Include formative and summative assessments with at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator.

The entire Marzano Model was developed with the focus of developing a teacher who can provide effective, deliberate instruction that will have a positive impact on student achievement. To do this, a teacher needs to be given feedback in all of the areas described in the 4 domains and elements which make up the model.

Dr. Marzano’s Teacher Evaluation Model is designed to be a formative AND summative system. The goal is continuous improvement of a teacher’s deliberate practice, and this can only be accomplished through accurate, timely, and specific feedback throughout the year.

3. **Teacher evaluation processes must be based on professional teaching standards established in MN Rule 8710.2000.**

Dr. Marzano’s Model is the causal model that identifies the effect that instructional practices have on student achievement. These practices align with the practices that make up the professional teaching standards.

4. **Teacher evaluation processes must coordinate staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes.**

The Marzano Model was designed as a growth model which occurs with ongoing, collaborative conversations and feedback integral in professional learning communities, peer coaching settings, and other forms of reflective professional learning designs. Specific outcomes in the model will be supported by professional resources and training from the Marzano Center, Learning Sciences International directly, and working through service cooperatives within the state.

5. **The teacher evaluation processes must allow school time for coaching and collaboration.**
The goal of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is continuous improvement of a teacher’s skills, and this can only be accomplished through accurate, timely, and specific feedback throughout the year that a teacher can use to practice and improve his/her skills. The protocols for each element define the deliberate practices serving as a guide for coaching and collaboration in lesson planning and reflection. The model includes reflective prompts for coaching to move teacher practice to the next level of growth. Training in inter-rater reliability scoring and feedback supports effective coaching practices as well.

This requirement is left to the local district decisions to create systems of support for coaching and collaboration with learning designs such as instructional rounds and professional learning communities. This provides purposeful practice time for teachers to deepen understanding, improve practice, and increase accuracy through collaboration.

6. **Teacher evaluation processes must include mentoring and induction programs.**

Although mentorship and induction programs will be defined by local district decisions, (ACGC recognizes that LSI will provide training and support) as stated above, systems of support for coaching and collaboration with learning designs such as instructional rounds and professional learning communities provide purposeful practice time for teachers to deepen understanding, improve practice, and increase accuracy through collaboration. Additional professional development is available through Learning Sciences International directly and working through the peer coaching and mentorship/induction programs offered through regional service cooperatives within the state.

7. **Teacher evaluation processes must allow teachers to present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth that includes teachers’ own performance assessment.**

In the MN Marzano Teacher Evaluation, the self-reflection begins the process with the teacher’s own self-assessment survey tool for guiding goals for development of the individualized Professional Growth Plans (PGP) within iObservation. The system connects data from multiple sources, from self-assessment and classroom observation results to information from student learning and achievement projects. Teachers use this data to inform their planning and analysis. As teachers identify explicit goals, iObservation recommends short, on-demand professional development resource items mapped directly to address the focus of the plan.

8. **Teacher evaluation processes must use an agreed-upon teacher value-added assessment where value-added data are available and state or local student growth measures where value-added data are unavailable as a basis for 35 percent of teacher evaluation results.**

Any district using Dr. Marzano’s model in Minnesota is required to use student academic growth as 35% of the evaluation as outlined in the statute. The state has outlined a recommended way to do this which is detailed in the MN Model for Teacher Evaluation.

The key is that the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is focused on giving teachers the skills they need to impact student achievement through becoming highly effective teachers. Domains 1 and 2 are specifically relevant to growth in this area.

9. **Teacher evaluation processes must use longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures aligned with curriculum for which teachers are responsible.**
The Marzano Student Self-Reflection Survey may be used as one source of data to determine student engagement. Domain 1, Elements 24-32 and 36-38 are directly related to student engagement. However, it is important to consider that every element in Domain 1, when taught deliberately for evidence of student achievement, should demonstrate observable evidence of student engagement.

10. **Teacher evaluation processes must require qualified and trained evaluators to perform summative evaluations.**

Training in certification for inter-rater reliability scoring and feedback to support effective coaching practices as well as accurate summative evaluations is provided by Learning Sciences International. The iObservation technical tool supports the efficiency of collecting and sharing data, development of growth plans, coaching prompts for teacher reflections, efficiency of observation, sharing of data, and calculation of summative data. Additional professional development and ongoing support through the Leadership Academy will lead to initial certification. Prior to the inter-rater reliability training, the evaluators must have completed the Domain 1 training and year-long implementation of deliberate practice. Competencies will be assessed throughout the professional development process.

The goal of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is continuous improvement of a teacher’s skills, and this can only be accomplished through accurate, timely, and specific feedback throughout the year used by the teacher to improve practice. The clearly defined protocols accompanied by scales for each element serve as a transparent guide for coaching and collaboration in providing feedback. The model includes reflective prompts for coaching to move teacher practice to the next level of proficiency.

11. **Teacher evaluation processes must give teachers not meeting professional teaching standards the support to improve with established goals and timelines.**

This requirement falls to the local district decisions to ensure that an improvement plan is in place for any teacher not meeting minimum expectations as well as ensuring procedures and consequences are in place that meet Minnesota statutes should the teacher fail to improve performance. ACGC will provide professional development on key instructional strategies, Marzano/iObservation and data collection in order for teachers to work at the applying level and provide additional support to teachers not at the applying level. At the end of the three year cycle, teachers not at the applying level are eligible for termination.

12. **Teacher evaluation processes must discipline teachers who do not adequately improve.**

This requirement falls to the local district decisions to ensure that an improvement plan is in place for any teacher not meeting minimum expectations as well as ensuring procedures and consequences are in place that meet Minnesota statutes should the teacher fail to improve performance. ACGC will provide professional development on key instructional strategies, Marzano/iObservation and data collection in order for teachers to work at the applying level and provide additional support to teachers not at the applying level. At the end of the three year cycle, teachers not at the applying level are eligible for termination.
1) Support and professional development to improve a teacher’s deliberate practice, planning and preparation, reflection on teaching, and professionalism
   a. See attached 2014/2015 Professional Development Plan

2) District’s long-term plans and goals
   a. See attached AC GC Obtainable Goals Document

3) Teacher’s professional multiyear growth plans and goals, all of which must support the teacher’s deliberate practice, student learning and achievement, planning and preparing of instruction, reflecting on teaching, and professionalism
   a. April, 2014 Teacher Self-Assessment
   b. May 24, 2014 Teacher Goal

4) Professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and a collaborative professional culture
   a. 2014/2015 PD reflects
      i. PLC’s to determine strategies in the following areas:
         1. K-12 ELA, K-12 Math, 6-12 Literacy
      ii. STAR training
      iii. Marzano PD

5) A plan to improve the teacher’s performance and specify the procedure and consequence if the teacher’s performance is not improved
   a. AC GC will provide professional development on key instructional strategies, Marzano/Observation and data collection in order for teachers to work at the applying level and provide additional support to teachers not at the applying level. At the end of the three year cycle, teachers not at the applying level are eligible for termination.

Research on the Marzano Casual Teacher Evaluation Model

The research base for the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is found in a number of works: What Works in Schools (Marzano, 2003), Classroom Instruction that Works (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001), Classroom Management that Works (Marzano, Pickering, & Marzano, 2003), Classroom Assessment and Grading that Work (Marzano, 2006), The Art and Science of Teaching (Marzano, 2007), and Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). The Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model does not require a new set of skills or strategies; instead it is aligned to the professional teaching standards established in MN rule 8710.2000 and the MN Collaboration, Growth & Evaluation Default Model.

The Marzano Evaluation Model was designed using thousands of studies conducted over the past five or more decades and published in books that have been widely used by K-12 educators. In addition, experimental/control studies have been conducted that establish a direct causal linkages with enhanced student achievement than can be made with other types of data analysis. Correlation studies (the more typical approach to examining the viability of a model) have also been conducted indicating positive correlations between the elements of the model and student mathematics and reading achievement. Research documents that were provided include: Research Base and Validation Studies on the Marzano Evaluation Model (2011), Instructional Strategies Report: Meta-Analytic Synthesis of Studies Conducted at Marzano Research Laboratory on Instructional Strategies (August, 2009). Additional information is provided at www.marzanoevaluation.com.
Marzano's Teacher Evaluation Model as it correlates to The Teacher Collaboration, Growth, and Evaluation Model

The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is based on the *Art and Science of Teaching Framework* and aligns with the three major components in the state statute and in the MN Default Model: teacher practice, student engagement, and student learning and achievement. **Figure 1** illustrates the three components and how they relate to one another, to teacher professional development and learning, and to district priorities.

![Figure 1: Principles and Foundations of Teaching Practices](image)

The triangle formed by teacher practice, student engagement, and student learning and achievement represents a relationship between teacher actions and student outcomes. Teacher practice, student engagement, and student learning and achievement are the major components of this model. Teachers, peer reviewers, and summative evaluators measure teacher practice and student outcomes in order to help teachers improve their craft and to evaluate teacher effectiveness.

**Performance Levels**

Ratings in these three components, when combined, will determine a teacher’s summative evaluation and performance rating according to the MN Teacher Evaluation Default Model. The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model contains four summative performance categories for rating in accordance with the Minnesota requirements: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, and Unsatisfactory.
Table 1 defines each of the three model components, identifies model activities used to measure each component, and shows the weighting of each component in a teachers’ final performance rating. The Marzano Framework has been substituted for the framework used in the MN Default Model. Other than the 35% requirement for value-added data based on student growth measures, the district can determine the weight of the other two components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Component</th>
<th>How is this component defined?</th>
<th>How is this component measured?</th>
<th>How is this component weighted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Practice</td>
<td>Element 1: Clear Learning Goals and Scales Element 2: Tracking Student Progress Element of teacher choice based on area of need from self-assessment *average of the three scores</td>
<td>Marzano’s rubric &amp; scale provide teacher &amp; student evidence during: Observations Self-Assessment and Peer Review Teacher Portfolio (Optional)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Students will take an annual survey that provides teachers with feedback on the Marzano elements.</td>
<td>Marzano Survey’s for Reflective Practice *Top 5 and Bottom 5 will be thrown out</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning and Achievement</td>
<td>Defined as student outcomes as measured by the assessments that have the highest levels of confidence and commonality</td>
<td>05% STAR Data and Results 10% MMR Data and Results 20% Teacher Choice with Administrative Approval</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: How the MN Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model aligns to the Statute and the Components of the MN Collaboration, Growth, and Evaluation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovating</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Not Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Teachers</td>
<td>Combine score of 81%-100% on performance scores</td>
<td>Combine score of 71%-80% on performance scores</td>
<td>Combine score of 61%-70% on performance scores</td>
<td>Combine score of 51%-60 on performance scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Teachers</td>
<td>Combine score of 71%-100% on performance scores</td>
<td>Combine score of 61%-70% on performance scores</td>
<td>Combine score of 51%-60 on performance scores</td>
<td>Combine score of 41%-50% on performance scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Component One: Teacher Practice- 50%**

In the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model the teacher practice component is defined by Domain 1, Elements 1-41 in the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework.

This framework includes four domains that are broken into lesson segments, design questions (DQ’s), and elements. Domain 1 consists of the classroom strategies and behaviors that support the components of the state model for deliberate, instructional practices that will increase student achievement. Domains 2-4 support the teachers, peer reviewers, and evaluators in developing growth plans while addressing the intentional planning, and professional and collaborative practice required in the statute.

**Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework Learning Map, page 1**
Learning Map for Non-Instructional Personnel

Audiologists, Behavior Specialists, Diagnosticians, District Staffing Specialists, Mental Health Counselors, Psychologist & Social Workers.
Each of the elements in the Marzano Framework, is supported with a protocol and scale which define the skills and expectations in each instructional strategy by identifying teacher and student evidence of success. These are used by the teacher, peer reviewers, and summative evaluator in several evaluation activities including points of contact, the Individual Growth and Development Plan, and the self-assessment and peer review to document evidence and offer feedback. The teacher uses the framework and supporting protocols and scales related to each element in the Learning Map to guide lesson planning and reflection. (See the Art and Science of Teaching Observation and Feedback Protocol for specific scale.)

### Developmental Scale Construct*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovating</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Not Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher gets 100% of students to the desired effect of the strategy by adapting/creating new strategies for unique student needs and situations</td>
<td>The teacher uses the strategy correctly, and monitors the majority of students to determine if the strategy has the desired effect</td>
<td>The teacher uses the strategy correctly</td>
<td>The teacher uses the strategy incorrectly or with parts missing</td>
<td>Strategy was called for but not exhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended proficiency scale is calculated based on a **status score** and a **deliberate practice score** in the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. The proficiency scale breakdowns into four levels which equate to the developmental/growth continuum of the elements in the Marzano Model: Innovating is a 4, Applying is a 3, Developing is a 2, Beginning is a 1 and Not Using is a 0.

It is the expectation that a teacher is effective and continually improves practice. A teacher with a final summative performance rating of “Developing(2)” should be supported to improve through a rigorous Individual Growth and Development Plan and through the three-year professional review cycle. A teacher with final summative performance rating of “Unsatisfactory(1)” must be supported through the teacher improvement process and potentially disciplined as outlined in Minnesota Statutes §122A.40 and §122A.41 for not making adequate progress to improve by the local district decision indicates. ACGC will provide professional development on key instructional strategies, Marzano/iObservation and data collection in order for teachers to work at the applying level.
Component Two: Student Engagement- 15%

Student engagement is an organizing framework for examining a student’s commitment to and involvement in learning, which includes academic, behavioral, cognitive, and effective dimensions. It is influenced by the context of family, peers, community, and school. Within the classroom, a teacher can influence student engagement through relationships with students and the relevance and rigor of instruction.

![Student Engagement Diagram]


**Figure 2: Definition of Student Engagement**

If teachers build positive relationships with students, make content relevant to students, and plan and facilitate rigorous instruction, then students will be engaged at high levels. Evidence from a student engagement survey and other evidence of student engagement from observational data collected in Design Question 5 could make up the student engagement component. Marzano’s Student Self-Reflection Survey (specifically elements 24-32, 36-38) may be used for this survey. The summative evaluator uses longitudinal data from a student engagement survey and other evidence of student engagement with survey results at a rate determined by the district (MN State Model uses a weight of 20%).
**Component Three: Student Learning and Achievement- 35%**

Marzano’s Causal Teacher Evaluation Model shows a high probability for increasing student achievement when research-based instructional strategies, defined in the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework Domain 1, Elements 1-41, are used effectively. This domain consists of the classroom strategies and behaviors that support the components of the state model for deliberate, instructional practices that will increase student achievement. The Marzano Model was designed as a growth model that would drive teacher instruction by the student evidence necessary to demonstrate student learning and achievement. In the Marzano Model, teachers continually assess student achievement against standards and use the results to modify their practice, to intervene when students struggle, and to differentiate instruction.

*Minnesota Statutes §122A.40 and §122A.41 require that a minimum of 35% of a teacher’s evaluation be based on student achievement data, so the student learning and achievement component is 35% of the final summative performance rating for a teacher. Statute also requires that this will be a local district decision requiring an agreed-upon, value-added model to be used in grade levels and subject areas where that data is available. In the grade levels and subject areas where value-added data is not available, districts must use state or local measure of student growth. See ACGC Teacher Growth and Evaluation Three Year Professional Review Cycle (Figure 3).*

The MN State Model provides a value-added model using student learning goals to measure student learning and achievement in grade levels and subject areas where value-added data are not available. In addition, a shared performance goal is incorporated for all teachers.

Because the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is a causal model, it clearly guides teachers providing clearly-stated learning goals and tracking student progress in the research-based instructional strategies for increasing student achievement. Again, it will be the local district decision to determine the value-added model to be used.

ACGC recognizes that the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model needs to be approved by the ACGC Education Association.
Three-Year Professional Review Cycle

The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model can be applied to a continuous three-year professional review cycle similar to the MN Model, or by the local district decision. A professional review process which complies with the MN State Statute is provided, but the final process is a local district decision. Each year of the three-year cycle has defined roles, ongoing activities, and a continuous review of data. There is an ongoing series of annual events in which a teacher engages:

- The process begins with a self-assessment and collaborative, planning conversations with peer and instructional coaches to develop the Individual Growth and Development Plan. This is the recognition that all teachers can improve their practice by addressing areas of desired growth. Teachers may work individually, in professional learning communities, in instructional rounds, and/or with instructional coaches to address their professional development based on the data. The plan connects individual professional learning to the cycle. The Individual Growth and Development Plan is intended for the following purposes:
  - guide individual learning strategies and peer review throughout the three-year cycle,
  - empower a teacher to plan her own individual professional learning,
  - focus individual professional development on outcome-based goals connected to student learning and engagement.

- Evidence of teacher practice is collected during each of the three years through self-assessment and peer review (instructional rounds), walk throughs, formal and informal observations. Throughout the process, all roles in the process are aware of teacher growth: the teacher, peer observer, and summative evaluator. This engagement and awareness is available through the individual teachers’ Individual Growth and Development Plan, through individual conferencing, attendance at professional learning communities or team meetings, tracking of teacher progress through iObservation data, and end-of-the-year conferencing.

- Self-assessment and peer review at the end of each year will inform Individual Growth and Development Plan revisions in years one and two and connect each year to the previous year in the three-year cycle.

- At the end of the three-year cycle, the assigned summative evaluator conducts a summative evaluation and determines a final summative performance rating. The summative evaluation updates a new Individual Growth and Development Plan for the next three-year cycle.

- The local district decision will determine the value-added model to be used as a part of the final performance ratings (which is outlined in Table 1 and supported with a Ribric).

ACGC recognizes that the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model needs to be approved by the ACGC Education Association.
### ACGC Teacher Growth & Evaluation Three Year Professional Review Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured (minimum):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Revision of individual growth and development plan&lt;br&gt;2. Formative self-assessment Peer review (instructional rounds) <strong>or</strong> Summative evaluation by summative evaluator (however year three must be a summative evaluation)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Non-Tenured (minimum):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Revision of individual growth and development plan&lt;br&gt;2. 3 Summative evaluation by summative evaluator&lt;br&gt;3. 3 Formative self-assessment Peer review (instructional rounds and/or walkthroughs)</td>
<td><strong>Tenured (minimum):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Revision of individual growth and development plan&lt;br&gt;2. Formative self-assessment Peer review (instructional rounds) <strong>or</strong> Summative evaluation by summative evaluator (however year three must be a summative evaluation)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Non-Tenured (minimum):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Revision of individual growth and development plan&lt;br&gt;2. 3 Summative evaluation by summative evaluator&lt;br&gt;3. 3 Formative self-assessment Peer review (instructional rounds and/or walkthroughs)</td>
<td><strong>Tenured (minimum):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Formative self-assessment Peer Review Summative evaluation by summative evaluator&lt;br&gt;2. New individual growth and development plan&lt;br&gt;<strong>Non-Tenured (minimum):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. New individual growth and development plan&lt;br&gt;2. 3 Summative evaluation by summative evaluator&lt;br&gt;3. 3 Formative self-assessment Peer review (instructional rounds and/or walkthroughs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of teacher practice is collected over the three years through self-assessment and peer review (instructional rounds), walk throughs, formal and informal observations, and the optional teacher portfolio.**

The teacher receives a rating for teacher practice based on all evidence. 50%

**Evidence of student engagement is collected over the three years through an annual student survey, as well as self-assessment and peer review (instructional rounds), walk throughs, formal and informal observations, and the optional teacher portfolio.**

The teacher receives a rating for student engagement based on three years of survey data. 15%

The teacher receives an annual rating based on value-added data, a shared performance goal, and/or results of student learning goals.

The teacher receives an annual rating based on value-added data, a shared performance goal, and/or results of student learning goals.

The teacher receives an annual rating based on value-added data, a shared performance goal, and/or results of student learning goals.

The teacher receives a rating for student learning and engagement based. 35%

---

**Figure 3: The Three-Year Professional Review Cycle and the Components of the Final Performance Rating**
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As shown in Figure 3, the final performance rating is based on evidence from all three model components required in the statute. A performance rating is determined for each year of the three-year cycle for the student learning and achievement component. Put together, the three components are used to determine a final summative performance rating. Evidence is collected during all years of the three-year professional review cycle for the teacher practice and student engagement components. For the summative evaluation, evidence from the entire cycle is reviewed to determine a rating for each of these two components.
Teacher Growth and Evaluation Activities in the Process

Opportunities for a peer reviewer(s) and summative evaluator to gather evidence to provide feedback and for evaluation for the teacher’s growth and development will be collected yearly for review and continuation in the three year process. Every opportunity offers feedback in the areas of teacher practice as well as the impact of those practices on student learning and engagement. Opportunities for classroom observations and other activities that support a teacher’s growth and evaluation may include actual classroom visit with follow-up feedback conferences, instructional rounds, lesson study, etc. Every year of the three-year professional review cycle, a teacher defines the opportunities that would support their Individual Growth Plan.

In addition, there are required classroom observations for a summative evaluator during the three-year cycle. A summative evaluator must conduct at least one formal observation cycle in the summative year of a teacher’s three-year cycle. A summative evaluator is encouraged to define and conduct additional classroom observations beyond the required minimums to gather additional evidence and offer additional feedback.

For a continuing contract/tenured teacher the required types of points of contact and minimum number of points of contact during the three-year professional review cycle are a local district decision as defined in Figure 3

To support the mentorship/non-tenured/induction of a probationary teacher into the profession or new district, he/she has a greater number of formal classroom observations. For a probationary teacher, there is a minimum number of three observations within the first 90 days of employment. In total, a summative evaluator conducts a minimum of three observations annually with a probationary teacher. (Other specifications of the process are the local district decisions as defined in Figure 3). A possible description of the Growth and Evaluation Process is offered in Figure 4.
For the purpose of the Marzano MN Teacher Evaluation Model, there are three types of observations (available on iObservation): walkthroughs, informal and formal.

### The Informal Observation for Non-Tenured Teachers
- The first informal observation may be used as a practice observation unless the teacher requests that it be used in the evaluation process
- Can be announced or unannounced as preferred by teacher
- May or may not include an observation of the full class period **Walkthroughs are about 10 minutes**
- Performed by a trained observer
- No planning or reflection conference required
- While planning and reflection conferences are not required, observers should provide **timely and actionable feedback (can be via email in iObservation)** to teachers regarding these observations.
- An informal, announced observation may be scheduled prior to the actual observation while an unannounced informal observation is not scheduled
- The informal observations are useful for providing additional feedback to non-tenured teachers, acknowledging professional growth and collecting evidence to further inform the annual evaluation process
- A classroom walkthrough and informal observation remain to be defined by local district decision (as stated above)

### The Formal Observation for Tenured and Non-Tenured Teachers
- Primary method for collecting evidence that will be used as a source of data for the summative evaluation
- **25 minutes in length**
- Performed by an evaluating administrator
- Includes a planning and reflection conference with the teacher
- These conferences provide a rich opportunity for teachers to reflect upon their practice, engage in a collaborative decision-making process and help administrators clarify expectations
- Both the planning conference and the reflection conference should be **scheduled at the same time the observation is scheduled** and should be conducted in a timely manner (1-2 weeks preceding and following the observation.)

The number and type of evaluation each teacher will receive is defined by local district decision, shown in Table 1, Figure 3 and below. The chart below lists the **minimum** number of formal and informal observations required.

- **Non-Tenured Teacher:**
  - 3 Formative/Informal Observations per year
  - 3 Summative Observations per year
- **Tenured Teacher:**
  - 1 required Summative in 3\(^{rd}\) year of 3 year cycle
  - Summative or Formative in year 1 and 2

**Figure 4: Description of the Growth and Evaluation Plan**
Training for Teachers and Observers

Domain 1 Training
All teachers, observers and evaluators will receive training through Learning Sciences International in the Art and Science of Teaching Framework for Domain 1. Further intensive training by the regional service cooperatives will include:

- On-going training for Leadership Teams to support effective implementation of the Art and Science of Teaching Framework for Domain 1 in the school system. This includes understanding how beliefs and assumptions about principal, teacher, and student learning have an impact upon achievement and using the Marzano Framework to deepen our understanding of deliberate practice for instructional effectiveness
- Training in the use of iObservation for teachers, Leadership Teams, observers, and evaluators
- On-site professional development for the effective implementation of the Art and Science of Teaching Framework for Domain 1 in the classroom and with the support of external consultants, the Leadership Team, instructional coaches, and administrators for the teacher implementation of the model in the classroom.

Inter-rater Reliability and Scoring and Inter-rater Reliability and Feedback Training
All evaluators will be trained and certified to evaluate teachers in the system according to the MN Statute. The district will monitor teacher evaluations for consistency between Performance Scores and Student Growth Scores, and where discrepancies exist, additional training will be provided to the evaluator.

Additional Information and Resources for the Implementation of the MN Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model

Additional Information and Resources for the Implementation of the MN Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model will be available during the district’s process of writing their District Teacher Evaluation Plan by contacting their regional service cooperative.

This information will include the following topics:

- Student Learning Goals
- Individual Growth and Development Plan
- Self-Assessment and Peer Review
- Surveys
- Teacher Portfolio
- Summative Evaluation
- Roles in the Process
- Value-added Measures
- Other

Leading Forward has provided this document as a tool to use in developing the District Teacher Evaluation Plans. It has taken the MN Statutes §122A.40 and §122A.41 for Teacher Evaluation and integrated the requirements with the application of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. ACGC understands that local district decisions will need to be applied to finalize this document for individual use in district after approved by ACGC EA.
Student Learning Goals

A student learning goal is a measurable, long-term student academic growth target that a teacher sets at the beginning of the year. These goals demonstrate a teacher’s impact on student learning within a given interval of instruction based upon baseline data gathered at the beginning of the course. Each goal includes:

- The student population or sample included in the goal
- The standards the student learning goal will align with
- The assessments that will be used to measure student progress and goal attainment
- The period of time covered by the goal
- The expected student growth (or outcomes)
- The rationale for the expected student growth

The student learning goal process formalizes what an effective teacher already does. A teacher determines where her students are at in the beginning of the term, teaches content, builds skills, offers formative and summative assessments, and determines student growth and proficiency at the close of the term. A teacher who knows her standards well, who collaborates around lessons and methods to meet the needs of the kids as they seek to meet the standards, and who uses assessments that measure student growth and achievement of the standards, is a highly effective teacher.

The student learning goal process meets the statutory requirement for “state or local measures of student growth for the grade levels and subject areas for which value-added data are not available as a basis for 35 percent of teacher evaluation results.”

For the Collaboration, Growth and Evaluation Model, a teacher in a non-tested area sets one to two student learning goals—a class goal and/or a targeted need goal, depending on the teacher group—for the student learning and achievement component. A teacher in a tested area with value-added data does not set a student learning goal. More information about teacher groups is in the handbook for the model.

All teachers will have a shared performance goal set by the school leadership team and principal. This goal measures the student outcomes of the entire building or program.

A class goal is a long-term academic achievement goal or learning objective aimed at a broad group of learners (such as third grade social studies, 4th period English, or a counselor’s caseload).

A targeted need goal is a long-term academic achievement goal or learning objective aimed at a specific group of learners within a teacher’s class, course, or program who are achieving below expectations (such as six students in a teacher’s third grade class who are struggling to read, three students in a counselor’s caseload who are failing high school algebra, or two adults in a parenting class who are having difficulty disciplining their children). This goal allows a teacher
to focus on the type of content or skill that these targeted students need most. Unlike the class goal, which applies to all learners across multiple levels of preparedness, a teacher chooses a single goal for learners at a low level of preparedness and is evaluated to the extent to which she meets this goal. The class and targeted need goals must

- Address one or more state standards (or local standards where state standards do not apply) covered by the teacher for that class, course, or program
- Reflect the identified student needs
- Be specific and measureable
- Be based on available baseline student learning data

The class and targeted need goals are designed to measure a teacher’s direct impact on the achievement of groups of students within the classroom and the classroom as a whole.

A shared performance goal is a student outcome goal for a *whole student population* (such as all students in a school or program). This goal is meant to directly align with school-wide goals developed by the leadership team and principal of a building. The shared performance goal must do the following:

- Support one or more state standards including common core standards or college-career readiness standards
- Reflect student needs
- Be specific and measureable
- Be based on available baseline student data

This must be a student-outcome goal (i.e. our graduation rates will increase from $x$ to $y$ or our school performance on the MCA will increase from $x$ to $y$), and may not be a teacher-outcome goal (i.e. teachers will begin implementing RTI).

An individual teacher’s impact on school-wide performance is difficult to assess, but the inclusion of a shared performance goal addresses the variety of teaching assignments by using a measure for which schools or groups of teachers share responsibility. Greater collaboration is expected as teachers work together to improve school-wide results.

**High-Quality Student Learning Goals**

High-quality student learning goals must state which students are included in the learning goal, the standards assessed, how growth will be measured over what time period, and why that level of growth should be expected of those students. High-quality student learning goals include the following:

*The student population or student subgroup included.* As much as possible, every student should be covered by at least one goal to ensure that no group of students is overlooked.

*The standards the goal addresses.* Goals should link to specific state standard(s) for the grade or content area. If state standards are not available for a teacher’s grade or content area, then national or professional standards must be used.

*The assessment(s) used.* The goal should include assessments both to track student progress and make midcourse corrections (formative), and to indicate if the goal was achieved or to what extent the goal was achieved (summative). Guidance for choosing
and approving assessments is provided to ensure that all teachers utilize assessments that to the greatest extent possible. Appropriate assessments

- Are aligned to content standards
- Assess student growth across a wide range of performance levels
- Are valid, reliable, and specific
- Capture proficiency as well as true mastery of skills, including higher-order thinking skills
- Provide data that can, as much as possible, be attributed directly to teacher efforts
- Include the potential for accommodations and modifications when appropriate

*The period of time covered by the goal.* The goal should note the period of instruction used to meet the goal (i.e., quarter, semester, entire year); this period of instruction would typically be the length of the course or time with the group of learners. Depending on the length of the instruction period, a teacher also should include time frames for mid-year assessments of progress so that he can adjust instruction or, in some cases, modify goals as needed.

*The expected student growth within that period.* The target for student growth should be realistic yet challenging. It also should include how growth will be measured.

*The rationale for the expected student growth.* High-quality goals include strong justifications for why the goal is important and achievable for this group of students. Rationales should draw upon baseline assessment data, student outcomes, and curriculum standards.

High-quality student learning goals specify measurable goals that are ambitious, yet attainable. Student learning goals should be broad enough to represent the most important learning or overarching skills, but narrow enough to measure. When possible, goals should align with Minnesota Academic Content Standards or the Common Core State Standards. If the neither apply to the subject area, teachers should use applicable national or professional standards. Student learning goals should align with and support school and/or district goals and priorities.

This model identifies three student learning goals—class, targeted need, and shared performance. Table 2 shows how each of the three types of goals meets the requirements of a high-quality student learning goal.

**Individual Growth and Development Plan**

An evidence-based Individual Growth and Development Plan is an organized way for a teacher to set and pursue professional growth goals and plan connected learning activities as part of the three-year professional review cycle. The plan connects individual professional learning to the cycle. The Individual Growth and Development Plan is intended to

- Guide individual learning activities and peer review throughout the three-year cycle
- Empower a teacher to plan her own individual professional learning
- Focus individual professional development on outcome-based goals connected to student learning and engagement

The Individual Growth and Development Plan is developed at the beginning of the three-year
cycle and revised by a teacher annually. A teacher consults her peer reviewer(s) during development and revision of the plan, and her assigned summative evaluator must approve the plan and revisions annually. Whenever possible, a teacher is encouraged to develop a plan that reflects goals and activities shared by members of her professional learning community so that members can collaborate to implement their plans as much as possible.

As part of plan development, a teacher identifies

Areas for growth
At least one professional goal based on the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice for areas for growth
Activities for professional development, resources needed to meet goals, and evidence that will be used to evaluate goal achievement

In addition, a teacher’s peer reviewer(s) is identified in the Individual Growth and Development Plan.

Professional growth goals reflect what a teacher hopes to accomplish professionally and are measured by adult outcomes and actions. Goals also impact student learning and engagement. Goals should be aligned with and support district, school, and Professional Learning Community goals to streamline processes.

In the Individual Growth and Development Plan a teacher also defines annual points of contact with her summative evaluator and peer reviewer(s). During each year, a teacher has a minimum number of specific points of contact through which evidence of practice and impact on students is gathered and feedback is offered. The intent is to have a teacher help define the role of the summative evaluator in her evaluation as well as require the summative evaluator to offer feedback in every year of her career. Points of contact defined for the peer reviewer(s) in the plan clarify the role of the peer reviewer(s). All points of contact should support the focus and goals of the plan.

Throughout each year of the professional review cycle, a teacher, her peer reviewer(s), and her summative evaluator collaborate to implement the activities in Individual Growth and Development Plan and to collect evidence of plan implementation and evidence of the impact on teacher practice and students. The peer reviewer(s) and summative evaluator specifically must facilitate points of contact articulated in the plan to collect evidence and provide feedback. The teacher must continually revisit the plan to ensure that plan activities and goals are having the intended impact on teacher practice and students. The teacher should revise goals and activities as appropriate.

At the end of each year of the three-year professional review cycle, a teacher collaborates with her peers to self-assess and engage in peer reviews of teacher practice and impacts on students. As part of the review process the Individual Growth and Development Plan’s implementation and results are discussed. This self-assessment and peer review should inform annual revisions of the plan between years of the three-year professional review cycle. Other areas to consider when revising the plan are
Areas of need identified in formative and summative evaluations
Goals and activities of the teacher’s professional learning community
District and school goals and priorities
Areas that are important for meeting the needs of students
The Performance Standards for Teacher Practice

Self-Assessment and Peer Review
In the spring of every year of the three-year professional review cycle, a teacher will complete a self-assessment based on evidence in each of the three model components. This self-assessment will be shared with a peer reviewer(s) as a prompt for a reflective, coaching conversation about the teacher’s current practice, student outcomes, and growth over time. Following this conversation, the peer reviewer(s) will add comments on the self-assessment, share those comments with the teacher, and share the results with the assigned summative evaluator. The teacher may, at his discretion, invite the assigned summative evaluator to this conference.

The self-assessment form in the complete model handbook includes areas for a teacher to reflect on practice. Teachers are prompted to name areas of strength and areas for growth from the evidence tied to the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice. The self-assessment also asks the teacher to reflect on the evidence of student learning—tied to value-added data and results of student learning goals—and evidence of student engagement—tied to longitudinal data from a student survey. Finally, the teacher summarizes the implementation of the individual growth and development plan and reflects on the results. Peer reviewers add comments to these reflections on the same form.

An assigned summative evaluator uses this document to remain informed about the professional growth of the teacher during the years where a summative evaluation is not completed. This documentation also helps the assigned summative evaluator make informed suggestions concerning the teacher’s Individual Growth and Development Plan, selection of a peer reviewer(s), and points of contact.

Teacher Portfolio (Optional)
The teacher portfolio is a collection of evidence demonstrating teacher practice, student engagement, and student learning and achievement. Portfolios also collect reflections on that evidence and reflections on professional growth. The portfolio option is a teacher’s individual right to use as a source of evidence submitted to the assigned summative evaluator. A summative evaluator must consider portfolio evidence, if submitted, when determining component ratings for a summative evaluation.

Portfolios may contain evidence such as the following:

  Reflective statements
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Evidence of participation in professional learning activities
Evidence of leadership
Evidence of collaboration with other educators and with families
Sample communications to families and other stakeholders
Self-Assessment and Peer Review forms
Student work samples
Examples of teacher work such as lesson plans
Videos of lessons
Student data including results of student learning goals

A portfolio is a way for a teacher to submit evidence of practice that may not have been gathered through other activities. For example, a teacher may have received feedback from a peer reviewer(s) or summative evaluator that students rarely work in groups. That teacher may respond to that feedback by providing lesson plans documenting when, how often, and the effect of students working groups. Or, the teacher could offer a reflection stating, “As a result of your feedback about students not working in groups, I intentionally planned activities in each unit where group work took on a greater role. I also revised my Individual Growth and Development Plan to include learning more about how to facilitate effective peer groupings.”

In this example, evidence of existing lesson plans must be considered by the assigned summative evaluator in the “planning” domain of the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice. The evidence of reflection and growth must be considered in the “professional responsibilities” domain.

Evidence of many practices, especially professional development and leadership activities, may not be collected using points of contact and other activities in the Collaboration, Growth, and Evaluation model. A teacher is encouraged to collect and submit evidence in such areas.

A teacher choosing to submit a portfolio should align the evidence collected with the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice and the Individual Growth and Development Plan.

**Summative Evaluation**
At least once in the three-year professional review cycle, a teacher must receive a summative evaluation from an assigned summative evaluator. The summative evaluation is based on all evidence collected through activities in the process as shown in Figure 4 on page 15. A summative evaluation results in a teacher receiving one of four summative performance ratings
as outlined above. But also, and more importantly, a summative evaluation should include specific feedback to a teacher that will inform the Individual Growth and Development Plan for the next three-year cycle. Both the summative performance rating and feedback are recorded on the Summative Evaluation form in the complete model handbook.

Minnesota Statutes §122A.40 and §122A.41 require at least one summative evaluation for a teacher as part of the three-year professional review cycle. In typical instances, the summative evaluation will happen at the end of the three-year cycle. However, a teacher may receive a summative evaluation from an assigned summative evaluator at any time in response to performance concerns. In cases where a summative evaluator has determined that there are performance concerns that warrant a summative evaluation before the final year of a teacher’s three-year cycle, the following guidelines should be considered:

The teacher should be informed that the summative evaluator is collecting and reviewing evidence to conduct a summative evaluation and of any performance concerns.

The summative evaluator should collect evidence sufficient to measure teacher practice, student engagement, and student learning and achievement. A minimum of three formal observation cycles or extended observations as defined in the Points of Contact section on page 15, other available evidence of teacher practice, available evidence of student learning and achievement, and available evidence of student engagement should all be considered for a summative evaluation conducted in response to performance concerns.

Based on summative evaluation results as outlined on page 13 a teacher either develops an Individual Growth and Development Plan or enters the teacher improvement process.

Grievability
The parties agree this Agreement and items incorporated herein will be processed in accordance with the grievance process of the collective bargaining agreement between the parties.

Statement to Opt Out
ACGC Education Association may request a different growth model at least 6 months before the start of the next school year. The school district may implement a new growth model, with union approval, at least 6 months before the start of the school year.

Roles in the Process

Teacher
Teachers, as defined in Minnesota Statutes §122A.40 and §122A.41, include classroom teachers and any other professional employee required to hold a teaching license from the state department. Teachers are not school principals or superintendents for the purposes of the Collaboration, Growth, and Evaluation Model. A teacher must demonstrate competencies of professional practice as well as positive impacts on student learning and engagement outcomes as part of an evaluation.

For this model, a teacher
Demonstrates professional teaching standards established in rule 8710.2000 and evaluated through the Performance Standards for Teacher Practice
Creates, revises, and uses an Individual Growth and Development Plan to support ongoing learning
Collaborates with a peer reviewer(s) and/or a professional learning community in growth and evaluation activities. A teacher may identify one or more members of his
professional learning community as a peer reviewer(s), provided the peer reviewer(s)
are trained. A teacher may identify one peer reviewer or a team of peer reviewers.
Creates student learning goals and monitors student learning if a group 1 or group 2
teacher. As outlined in the Student Learning Goal Handbook, this includes choosing
quality assessments, determining student starting points, setting the student learning
goal(s), tracking progress and refining instruction, and reviewing results and scoring.
Defines points of contact for the summative evaluator and peer reviewer(s). These
teacher-defined points of contact should come from a teacher’s Individual Growth and
Development Plan.
Reviews survey results of student perception data annually
Completes a self-assessment annually and shares that assessment with a peer
reviewer(s)
May compile a portfolio of practice and professional growth as evidence for the
summative evaluation

Peer Reviewer(s)
A peer reviewer(s) role as outlined meets the requirement in Minnesota Statutes §122A.40 and
§122A.41 that plans for evaluation “must include having trained observers serve as peer
coaches or having teachers participate in professional learning communities,” that teachers’
three-year review cycle include “a peer review process,” and that processes “may include
induction and mentoring programs.”

A peer reviewer is a peer who collaborates with a teacher to evaluate practice and impact on
students by assisting with implementation of the Individual Growth and Development Plan,
conducting points of contact, offering feedback, and reviewing progress with the teacher
annually. The peer reviewer must be a trained observer of teacher practice and be approved by
the assigned summative evaluator. Where possible, a peer reviewer(s) may also be in the
teacher’s professional learning community, and new teachers may use their mentors.

A peer reviewer(s) is a non-probationary individual who holds a valid Minnesota teaching
license and who has completed the peer coaching training supporting the state model offered by
the Minnesota Department of Education. The Department will provide training to all peer
reviewers in school districts choosing to use the state model (or a variation of the state model).

The peer reviewer(s) is identified annually in a teacher’s Individual Growth and Development
Plan. Teachers may identify one peer reviewer or a team of peer reviewers. The assigned
summative evaluator reviews and approves the identified peer reviewer(s) as part of review of
the teacher’s Individual Growth and Development Plan.

For this model, a peer reviewer(s)

Assists a teacher with development and implementation of the Individual Growth and
Development Plan, including peer observations
Documents points of contact
Assists a teacher with development and implementation of student learning goals and associated assessments, and supports student learning goals progress and outcomes
Facilitates the self-assessment and summary of the peer review process and documents a summary report
As a member of the teacher’s evaluation team, attends meetings between the teacher and assigned summative evaluator as requested by the teacher and provides input and feedback as requested by the assigned summative evaluator.

**Summative Evaluator**
The assigned summative evaluator facilitates the summative evaluation. This role meets the requirement in statute that teachers “receive at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator such as a school administrator” in the three-year professional review cycle. The assigned summative evaluator is identified annually in a teacher’s Individual Growth and Development Plan.

A summative evaluator must hold a valid Minnesota education license to be qualified. To be trained, a summative evaluator must have *successfully* completed the evaluator training supporting the state model. The Minnesota Department of Education will provide training to evaluators in school districts choosing to use the state model (or a variation of the state model). To successfully implement this model, districts must ensure that all administrators and staff in supervisory roles successfully complete the Department training.

Districts may consider using a lead teacher as a summative evaluator, provided he successfully completes training. However, if an administrator (or direct supervisor) has performance concerns about an individual teacher (the teacher has been or could be rated as “Unsatisfactory” on a summative evaluation), the assigned summative evaluator should be a school administrator (or the teacher’s direct supervisor).

The role of the assigned summative evaluator in the process is key to a teacher’s ongoing development and to a teacher receiving a fair and accurate summative evaluation. For this model, an assigned summative evaluator

- Reviews and approves the Individual Growth and Development Plan, including identified peer reviewer(s), annually
- Reviews and approves the Student Learning Goals form and associated assessments, and evaluates student learning goal progress and outcomes annually
- Documents points of contact annually
- Reviews the self-assessment and summary of the peer review process annually
- Completes the summative evaluation and assigns a final performance rating at least every three years

In many instances, a school or district may have multiple summative evaluators working as a team to coordinate and complete model activities with a teacher and the responsibilities outlined above. Summative evaluators should ensure that their roles and responsibilities are
coordinated so that evaluation activities are facilitated in a timely manner, a teacher has a fair and transparent evaluation, and each teacher has one “assigned” summative evaluator identified on the Individual Growth and Development Plan. The assigned evaluator would be a contact for the teacher, should collect and maintain all evidence generated by activities, and completes the teacher’s summative evaluation as outlined on page 24.

Districts implementing the state model are should provide extra support for any new principal, especially in his role as a summative evaluator. Districts should consider a principal’s implementation of teacher development and evaluation practices as part of the principal’s annual evaluation.

Professional Learning Community
A professional learning community is a group of educators committed to working collaboratively in ongoing processes of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. The group of peers operates under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous, job-embedded learning for educators. Where possible, a teacher’s peer reviewer(s) and/or mentor may be a member of his professional learning community. Membership in a professional learning community is organized by a district, building leadership, or teachers themselves typically based on grade level, subject area, district/building priorities, flexible teaming, or common preparation periods

For this model, a professional learning community

Drives ongoing, job-embedded professional development
Collaborates in the development of student learning goals, including creating common assessments, establishing mastery scores, and interpreting student achievement data, where applicable and appropriate
Assists in the creation or revision of a teacher’s Individual Growth and Development Plan

District
For this model, a school district

Collaborates with the exclusive representative of teachers in the district for professional development and evaluation system design, implementation, and revision
Identifies administrators, supervisors, and/or teachers as summative evaluators and supports them in successfully completing Minnesota Department of Education training
Encourages teachers to serve as peer reviewers and complete Department training
Supports evaluators and peer reviewers by creating a structure for managing evaluation activities and documents
Pre-approves assessments and determines mastery scores to be used for student learning goals
Coordinates staff development activities with evaluation processes and evaluation outcomes