Key Points about the MCEE Interim Progress Report and Michigan's Developing Educator Evaluation System

A pilot study is essential to creating a good evaluation system

- Done in most states
- Allows for selection of tools that work
- Educators can see how evaluation works and gain confidence and familiarity with the system
- Provides evidence that evaluation is reliable

More work needed to complete student growth component

- What qualifies as growth—one year's growth, reaching a particular threshold, growth compared to similar classrooms?
- Linking students to the correct teacher in the database
- What about subjects with no tests: social studies, art, music, etc.
- How many years of student growth data should be used for evaluation?

Data collected in the pilot on student growth and teacher observations should be analyzed by researchers not connected to vendors of products

- Provides solid evidence of how evaluation works to give credibility to system
- Ensures that tools will be selected without bias, based on evidence
- Builds political support among Michiganders who value fairness

Combining observations and growth data to get an evaluation rating

- Educators have many questions about this -- and it should be tested and validated to build confidence and understanding of the new system
- Different states use different methods of doing this
- Because there are different methods, these should be tested in the pilot study

Michigan's application for an ESEA waiver requires a pilot study of educator evaluation

- The waiver requires districts to adopt state guidelines for teacher evaluation and pilot educator evaluations

Staff accountable to MCEE needs to supervise the pilot study to ensure pilot districts use the tools properly

Oversee training of those conducting observations

Make sure student assessments are administered on time and properly

Off-the-shelf observation tools require training and resources

Administrators must be trained to use observation tools

Outside observers or master teachers may be needed to conduct the observations, because of the time required to observe all teachers multiple times per year

Observation tools require funding to pay for their use and for their training materials

Estimated Timeline for MCEE's Completion of Evaluation Recommendations

Month/Year	Recommendation
June 2012	Observation tool(s) Details regarding the 2012-2013 pilot year
July 2012	Other components of teacher evaluation systems
October 2012	Student growth model
November 2012	Evaluation tool for school administrators Details regarding the pilot of administrator evaluations District waiver processes and principles
April 2013	Professional certificate
June 2013	Review all recommendations and adjust based on new data and information

Further Details on Pilot study:

Three observation tools piloted in 4 districts; total of 12 districts. At least two student growth models piloted

Student tests include MEAP, ACT, PLAN, Explore, and Computer Adaptive Test

Pilot districts help create and test assessments in non-tested subjects. Pilot districts also receive training in use of observation tools

Outside contractor (not a vendor of any tool) analyzes all data and combines data using different formulas

Pilot study of administrator tool in second half of school year, in pilot districts

State-based staff of four supervises pilot, data collection, data analysis; accountable to MCEE

Total cost: $6 million for 2012-13 school year

Pilot study completed in time for final recommendations prior to 2013-14 school year, the first year evaluation is required by state law