



Informational Memo: 2016-2017 Performance Summary (Teachers)

To: School Board

Trisha Kocanda, *Superintendent*

From: Daniel P. Ryan, *Assistant Superintendent, Professional Learning & HR*

June 7, 2017

Background

By State law, the District is required to formally evaluate non-tenured teachers every year and tenured teachers every other year. The building principal or the assistant principal evaluates the teachers. Non-tenured teachers must receive their evaluation by March 1st of the school year. Tenured teachers must receive their evaluation by May 15th of the school year.

For the 2016-17 school year, one hundred twenty one (121) teachers were evaluated. The remaining teachers were either on leave or were tenured teachers evaluated in the previous 2015-16 school year.

The District's evaluation system requires evaluators to determine a final summative rating from one of four categories: Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. This aligns to the requirements in the State's Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA).

This is the first year that the District has instituted the Student Growth Measures into the evaluation rubric, as required by PERA. As a result, the summative evaluation includes two rankings. There is the Professional Practice evaluation (70%), based upon the [Danielson Model](#).

This model includes a review of a teacher's skills in four domains: Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities.

There is also the Student Growth Measure (30%), which is based upon two student growth assessments. These assessments are mutually agreed upon between the teacher and the administrator and involved multiple meetings to establish the assessment tools, areas to measure, a mid-year check-in and final review of student data. An example of student growth goal for a grade 3 teacher is:

Student Learning Target(s):

Reading

Each student will grow 2 reading levels by April 1, 2017.

Student Growth Assessment:

Describe assessment to be used:

I will utilize the standardized assessment, Teacher's College, to determine each child's independent reading level. Independence is determined by 3 factors, including % accuracy, correct words per minute (fluency) and reading comprehension.

Pre-test date administration and scoring:

October, 2016

Date of midpoint check-in (optional):

Week of February 6, 2017

Date of post-test administration and scoring:

March, 2017

Number of students assessed: **18**

Overall, each building principal dedicated at least 2 additional hours per teacher to discuss, set up and review PERA Student Growth Data. On average each principal evaluated 17 teachers which amounted to an additional 34 hours of time devoted to the PERA Student Growth Data component of the evaluation document. It should be noted that PERA exempts certain teachers from collecting Student Growth Data. This group, "is included but not limited to school counselor, school psychologist, nonteaching school speech and language pathologist, school nurse, and social worker". This group is often associated with non-teaching responsibilities. There are 6 tenured and 16 non-tenured teachers who were exempt from student growth measures.

As required by the state, the District established a PERA Committee to oversee the manner in which our District would collect Student Growth Data. The State provided guidelines which the PERA Committee used to determine data collection processes for the evaluation tool.

For non-tenured teachers: at least one pretest and posttest or both pre-tests completed no later than November 15 and both posttests completed and scored no later than February 1.

For tenured teachers: at least one pretest and posttest or both pre-tests completed no later than December 15 and both posttests completed and scored no later than April 1. If mutually agreed upon between evaluator and teacher, electronic reporting of assessment information acceptable. Below are two samples of student growth data collected by teachers:

Below is an overview of the evaluations conducted with both Tenured and Non-Tenured faculty during the 2016-17 academic year:

Winnetka Public Schools District 36
Tenured Evaluations
June 2017

School	Practice				Student Growth				Summative						
	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	TOTAL	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	TOTAL	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	TOTAL
Crow Island	12	2	0	0	14	11	2	0	0	13	14	0	0	0	14
Greeley	11	0	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	9	11	0	0	0	11
Hubbard Woods	7	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	7
Skokie	8	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	8
Washburne	18	4	0	0	22	18	1	0	0	19	20	2	0	0	22
TOTAL	56	6	0	0	62	53	3	0	0	56	60	2	0	0	62
Percentage	90%	10%				95%	5%				97%	3%			

Non-Tenured Evaluations
June 2017

School	Practice					Student Growth					Summative				
	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	TOTAL	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	TOTAL	Excellent	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	TOTAL
Crow Island	9	3	0	0	12	7	1	0	0	8	10	2	0	0	12
Greeley	5	1	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	6
Hubbard Woods	4	7	0	0	11	9	0	0	0	9	10	1	0	0	11
Skokie	10	9	2	0	21	16	0	0	0	16	15	4	2	0	21
Washburne	5	4	0	0	9	4	1	0	0	5	8	1	0	0	9
TOTAL Percentage	33	24	2	0	59	41	2	0	0	43	49	8	2	0	59
	55%	41%	3%			95%	5%				83%	14%	3%		

Summary

For the 2016-17 school year, one hundred twenty one (121) teachers were evaluated. The remaining teachers were either on leave or were tenured teachers evaluated in the previous 2015-16 school year.

As a result of the inclusion of PERA Student Growth Data, the Summative Evaluations for each teacher were shifted to a more elevated evaluation. As noted in the chart above, there were 4 tenured teachers who had received a Proficient in their Performance rating and an Excellent in their Student Growth Rating, which provided them with a summative rating of Excellent. There were 16 non-tenured teachers that received a Proficient in the Performance rating and an Excellent in their Student Growth Rating, with provided them with a summative rating of Excellent.

The shift in evaluation data was not the intent of the PERA Committee. It should be noted that this shift in summative ratings is not singular to Winnetka. Other North Shore Districts have experienced a similar shift and are re-examining their PERA evaluation rubrics as well. Per State mandates, the integration of Student Growth into our Professional Evaluation tool is a collaborative process. As a result of the summative shift due to PERA Student Growth Data, the PERA Committee has reconvened to examine possible adjustments to the rating system. We are actively reviewing the use of Student Growth Data and will have a recommendation for adjustments for the 2017-18 school year by this fall that will be reviewed and discussed with WEA Leadership and the District PERA Committee.