

Bemidji Teacher Evaluation Process

District representatives (Dr. Hess, Kathy Palm, Brian Stefanich, Ami Aalgaard, Jason Koester, and David Gooch) have attended three MDE trainings. These meetings provided detail about the new MN Teacher and Principal Evaluation Statutes.

Dr. Hess appointed a District Teacher Evaluation Committee to recommend a teacher evaluation model. This committee includes:

- Ami Aalgaard, Horace May/EIC Principal
- Renaë Donaghue, Lincoln Special Education Teacher
- David Gooch, BHS Industrial Technology Teacher
- Meredith Kehoe, BMS Reading/English Teacher
- Jason Koester, BHS Science & BEA President
- Kathy Palm, Director of Curriculum & Administrative Services
- Gregg Parks, BMS Assistant Principal
- Lisa Schussman, Lincoln Grade 1 Teacher
- Brian Stefanich, BHS Principal

The committee met March 6, April 3 and 17, and June 4, 2013, to look at the State Statute and the State Teacher Evaluation Model and discuss what Bemidji’s model should be. We also looked at our current evaluation policy and forms and discussed creating our own model. Our current policy contains many of the pieces required in State Statute, but we need to add some items such as: Peer Review, Value-Added, and 35% based on student achievement. On the left below is the State Statute and on the right is our progress in each area:

Statutory Requirements	Current Practice
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). Annual teacher evaluations are designed to develop, improve, and support qualified teachers and effective teaching practices and improve student learning and success.	We plan to design our own Teacher Evaluation Model that meets State Statute requirements. We would like to pilot this model next year for the third of teachers who are designated for formal review.
Teacher evaluation processes must provide the requisite evaluations for probationary teachers—three evaluations annually with the first within 90 days of employment.	Current Teacher Evaluation Policy provides for three formal evaluations of probationary teachers, and we need to add that the first evaluation is completed within the first 90 days of employment.
Teacher evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes a growth and development plan, peer review, the opportunity to participate in a professional learning community, and at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator.	It is no problem to design a three-year review cycle, and our current system includes a Growth Plan. We need to design what the Peer Review will look like. We already provide Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). We would incorporate one summative evaluation by the principal in the third year.

Statutory Requirements	Current Practice
Teacher evaluation processes must be based on professional teaching standards established in MN Rule 8710.2000.	We plan to incorporate the Professional Teaching Standards into our summative evaluation
Teacher evaluation processes must coordinate staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes.	Staff Development activities are already aligned to our State Standards, district and school goals. We also will incorporate staff development activities in the teacher Growth Plans.
Teacher evaluation processes must perhaps allow school time for coaching and collaboration.	The four early release days scheduled in next year's calendar will allow time for coaching and collaboration.
Teacher evaluation processes must perhaps include mentoring and induction programs.	The committee thinks it would be good to designate some district staff development funds for mentoring and training new teachers.
Teacher evaluation processes must allow teachers to present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth that includes teachers' own performance assessment.	We will build the choice of using a Portfolio into our Teacher Evaluation Model.
<p>2013 Legislative Changes:</p> <p>Must use data from valid and reliable assessments aligned to state and local academic standards and must use state and local measures of student growth that may include value-added models or student learning goals to determine 35 percent of teacher evaluation results.</p>	<p>This is our most challenging area. Value-Added is an involved process for including student demographics, attendance and achievement with teacher contributions to arrive at the value a teacher adds to the class. This prevents teachers from being penalized for having a challenging group of students. The State is still developing their Value-Added Model, so we are waiting to see what that looks like.</p> <p>We have discussed requiring 10% of ALL teachers' evaluation based on school/district achievement data similar to the State's Model. The other 25% would use assessments that show growth such as: NWEA MAP, AIMSweb, special education assessments, course assessments, etc. Because of special teaching situations, the assessments each teacher uses would be subject to the approval of their principals. We would like to incorporate what we already do instead of adding more.</p>

Statutory Requirements	Current Practice
<p>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.</p>	<p>We are considering incorporating the use of longitudinal data on student engagement into the Peer Review process. Surveys would also be a possible option to measure student engagement. Jason Koester is developing one that focuses on student accountability.</p>
<p>Teacher evaluation processes must require qualified and trained evaluators to perform summative evaluations.</p>	<p>The district will provide training for all administrators completing summative evaluations. We also will need to provide training for teachers for Peer Review.</p>
<p>Teacher evaluation processes must give teachers not meeting professional teaching standards the support to improve with established goals and timelines.</p>	<p>This is already part of our district procedures.</p>
<p>Teacher evaluation processes must discipline teachers who do not adequately improve.</p>	<p>This is already part of our district procedures.</p>