STATUS REPORT ON THE MINNESOTA STATE TEACHER DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION, AND PEER SUPPORT MODEL
AUGUST THROUGH DECEMBER 2013

EVALUATION PRESENTATION TO THE TEACHER EVALUATION WORKING GROUP
OVERVIEW

- Minnesota Legislature: Teacher evaluation is required
- Minnesota Department of Education: Developed the Model
- Joyce Foundation: Funded an evaluation of the Pilot
- CAREI:
  - Contracted to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Pilot
  - Interim evaluation report for formative feedback to MDE
COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL

Whole Model

Teacher Practice
• Individual Growth and Development Plan
• Points of Contact

Student Engagement

Student Learning and Achievement
• Student Learning Goals
• Value-added
KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

- What revisions to the model are necessary as the work shifts from pilot to full implementation?
- What are the lessons learned from the pilot implementation?
- What are the unintended consequences of implementing the model?
PILOT SITES

A  Caledonia
B  Deer River
C  Detroit Lakes
D  Granada Huntley
E  Lester Prairie
F  Montevideo
G  New Ulm
H  North Shore Community School
I  Orono
J  Perpich Arts High School
K  Pine Island
L  Pine River-Backus
M  Prior Lake/Savage
N  Redwing
O  Saint James
P  Saint Peter
Q  Wabasha-Kellogg
## DATA COLLECTION METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Beliefs Survey</td>
<td>N=897</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Aug-Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluator Implementation Survey</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Implementation Survey</td>
<td>N=293</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluator Interviews</td>
<td>N=14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Beliefs Survey

Research Questions

Method

Examples of Questionnaire Items

- Student surveys will provide me with feedback that will enable me to identify strengths and weaknesses in my teaching methods.
- I am in favor of using feedback from student surveys to evaluate my teaching.
- I am concerned that students will use the survey to get back at teachers.

Report in Summer 2014
DATA COLLECTION METHODS

- Summative Evaluator and Teacher Implementation Surveys
  - Research Questions
  - Method
  - Questionnaire Items
DATA COLLECTION METHODS

- Summative Evaluator and Teacher Interviews
  - Research Questions
  - Method
  - Interview Questions
Summative evaluators and teachers were, overall, very satisfied with the quality of MDE training.

The majority of teachers (77%) referenced the Handbook while working on their Individual Growth and Development Plans and reported it provided adequate guidance.
### INITIAL FINDINGS

#### Summative Evaluators’ Attendance at Sessions Related to the Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>% Attending (n = 23)</th>
<th>Median Hours Spent Attending*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDE information and/or planning sessions</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE summative evaluator training sessions</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE teacher training sessions</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building-sponsored sessions related to the Pilot</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC and/or grade-level meetings related to the Pilot</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The median was calculated excluding respondents who reported zero hours.*
### INITIAL FINDINGS

**Time Spent by Summative Evaluators on Pilot Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% Spending Time on Activity</th>
<th>Median Hours Spent on Activity*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing materials to inform teachers about the Pilot (e.g., memos, announcements)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and approving IGDP’s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on points of contact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on teachers’ Student Learning Goals forms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The median was calculated excluding respondents who reported zero hours.*
- Half of summative evaluators had *planned/scheduled* their Points of Contacts by December. Significantly fewer had *completed* any by this time.

- Concerns were expressed about the number of Points of Contact required and time it would take to complete them.

- Nearly two-thirds of teachers had planned and begun Points of Contact with their peer reviewers by December.
INITIAL FINDINGS

• Summative evaluators reported that the Model is generally good or very good for evaluating mid-career teachers (83%) and late-career teachers (78%).

• Fewer reported it was good or very good for evaluating probationary (65%), specialist (30%), and part-time teachers (43%) or teachers who teach in more than one school in the district (48%).
INITIAL FINDINGS

- Nearly half (48%) of teachers indicated that preparing their Individual Growth and Development Plan was either *difficult* or *very difficult*.

- However, most (77%) teachers reported that formulating professional goals helped them reflect on their instructional practice.
Teachers’ and Summative Evaluators’ Ratings of the Model’s Ability to Provide a Valid Assessment of a Teacher’s Performance
INITIAL FINDINGS

- Sites that aligned their Student Learning Goals with an overarching district or school goal found the goal-setting process to be clear and straightforward.

- Summative evaluators found that specialist teachers and non-teaching staff (e.g., nurses, counselors) struggled much more than did classroom teachers to adapt the Student Learning Goals to their situations.
Teachers view the evaluation process and this Model as an effective form of professional development.

Teachers and summative evaluators alike expressed hopes for increased collaboration through peer reviewer relationships.

Sustainability of the Model over time was a repeated concern of teachers and summative evaluators – especially with the factors of cost and time.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM TEACHERS AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATORS

- Provide samples of completed Individual Growth and Development Plan forms, Student Learning Goals forms, and Points of Contact documentation.

- Clarify the relationship between goals on the Individual Growth and Development Plan and Student Learning Goals.
INITIAL FINDINGS

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM TEACHERS AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATORS

- Provide additional training and technical assistance on Student Learning Goals for specialist and non-classroom teachers.
- Shorten the length of training sessions and include fewer topics.
- Make training available online and on demand.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM TEACHERS AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATORS

- Consider a reduction in the number of Point of Contacts required by summative evaluators.

- Articulate how the Model can align with a district’s existing programs, initiatives, and policies.

- Establish a helpline that teachers and summative evaluators can contact when they have questions about implementation.
NEXT STEPS IN THE CAREI STUDY

- Follow up interviews and surveys with teachers and summative evaluators during spring semester
- Re-administer Teacher Beliefs Survey during spring semester
- Report to Minnesota Department of Education by July 2014
- Value-added Report to Joyce Foundation by December 2014
QUESTIONS

CONTACT:
Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement
carei@umn.edu
612-624-0300