



CENTER *for* EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON • COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D)  
Instructional Framework  
&  
5D+™ Rubrics  
for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation

adopted by



**OAKRIDGE**

*PUBLIC SCHOOLS*

Handbook for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation

Version Created September 13, 2017

5D, 5D+, “5 Dimensions for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation” and other logos/identifiers are trademarks of the University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership.

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION .....   | 1  |
| DEFINITIONS .....  | 2  |
| ANNUAL EVALUATION .....  | 4  |
| FACTORS and PROCESS for DETERMINING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS.....   | 5  |
| 5D+ INQUIRY CYCLE .....  | 9  |
| APPEAL PROCESS (Effectiveness Rating) .....  | 12 |
| DISMISSAL/DISCHARGE of TEACHER.....  | 12 |
| LAYOFF/RECALL .....  | 12 |
| TRAINING.....  | 15 |
| APPENDIX .....   | 16 |
| Guidance for Use of CEL 5D+ Rubric for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation in Specific Learning Environments ..... | 16 |
| Oakridge Assessments Matrix - Eligible for Use in Growth Plans and Individualized Development Plans (IDP).....             | 18 |

## INTRODUCTION

Oakridge Public Schools has adopted the University of Washington's Center for Educational Leadership's (CEL) 5D+™ Rubrics for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation System. With CEL's approach to redesigned teacher evaluation systems, school districts gain research-based methods and instruments to:

- Plan and implement a growth-oriented teacher evaluation system focused on high-quality learning.
- Develop a common language and shared vision for improving teaching and learning using an instructional framework.
- Analyze and calibrate evaluation ratings across classrooms, schools and districts using an evaluation rubric.
- Increase the expertise of school leaders to guide and support the professional growth of teachers.

Evaluation goes hand-in-hand with deepening the expertise of teachers to engage students in high-quality learning while simultaneously increasing the expertise of school leaders to guide and support teachers in this improvement process. Two foundational ideas guide this work:

- quality teaching matters: if students are not learning, they are not being afforded powerful learning opportunities.
- quality instructional leadership matters: if teachers do not afford students powerful learning opportunities, this is ultimately an issue for school leaders.

We know that building the capacity of teachers will lead to better instruction and greater learning for all students. Helping educators understand what good teaching looks like is at the heart of the Center for Educational Leadership's 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning™ instructional framework, and 5D+™ Rubrics for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation – a growth-oriented tool for improving instruction.

CEL's redesigned evaluation system contributes to and supports the formative development of expertise for teachers and instructional leaders, in order to improve the quality of teaching, which ultimately impacts the quality of education for all students.

## DEFINITIONS

- A. **5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning**: Instructional framework that summarizes the research on the core elements that constitute quality instruction.
- B. **5D+ Inquiry Cycle**: 4-step growth process for engaging teachers and principals as co-learners around a teacher's area of focus - self-assessment, determine a focus, implement and support, and analyze impact.
- C. **5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric**: A growth-oriented tool for improving instruction. Performance language within the 4-tier performance levels for each indicator are used to delineate teaching practice, from unsatisfactory to basic, proficient, and distinguished.
- D. **Continuing Tenure**: A teacher who has satisfactorily completed a probationary period and has been employed continuously by the controlling board under which the probationary period has been completed.
  - 1. A teacher on continuing tenure shall be provided an annual year-end performance evaluation.
  - 2. If the teacher has received a rating of ineffective or minimally effective on an annual year-end performance evaluation, the school district shall provide the teacher with an individualized development plan developed by appropriate administrative personnel in consultation with the individual teacher. The individualized development plan shall require the teacher to make progress toward individual development goals within a specified time-period, not to exceed 180 days. The annual year-end performance evaluation shall be based on multiple classroom observations conducted during the period covered by the evaluation and shall include, at least an assessment of the teacher's progress in meeting the goals of his or her individualized development plan
  - 3. Continuing tenure does not apply to an annual assignment of extra duty for extra pay or in any capacity other than a classroom assignment.
- D. **Efficacy**: capacity to produce a desired result or effect; effectiveness.
- E. **Evaluation**: the annual summative rating of an educator based on the 5D+ Rubric, student growth and assessment data, observation data, and Michigan Revised School Code ("MRSC") Section 1248 factors not addressed by the 5D+ rubric, and the teacher's progress on any identified goals.
- F. **Evaluator**: The principal, assistant principal or designee of the superintendent who has completed framework training and been assigned to conduct observation, provide formative feedback, and evaluate teachers.
- G. **Growth Plan**: A formalized plan that enables teachers who have been rated effective or highly effective on their most recent year-end evaluation to be more strategic about professional goals — or areas of focus, in order to have a greater impact on student learning. A growth plan includes specific indicators from the rubric the teacher wants to refine their practice and receive coaching, anticipated impact on student learning, and action steps to implement.
- H. **Individualized Growth Plan (IDP's)**: A performance improvement plan *for probationary teachers and teachers who were rated ineffective or minimally effective on their most recent year-end evaluation*, that is developed by appropriate administrative personnel in consultation with the teacher. An IDP shall include specific performance goals, and any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching to achieve performance goals.

- I. **Mentor**: A teacher who has been rated effective or highly effective that is assigned by the district to provide coaching and support to a teacher new to the profession (during his/her first 3 years of employment), or a teacher new to the district that received tenure in another Michigan district (during his/her first year of employment), or a teacher rated minimally effective or ineffective on their most recent year-end evaluation (duration as determined necessary by evaluator), in order to assist the teacher in developing professional competencies and effectiveness.
- J. **Observation**: the collection of evidence (i.e., classroom, conversation, perception, artifacts, PD/meeting).
- K. **Observer**: A person who has completed CEL's framework training, been designated to collect evidence of a teacher's practice (including the review of lesson plans, state standards and student engagement), and provide formative feedback. While there is one evaluator, there may be more than one observer.
- L. **Probationary Period**: Teachers new to the district shall be required to serve a period of probation as defined in the Teacher Tenure Act:
  - 1. A teacher shall be in a probationary period during his or her first 5 full school years of employment.
  - 2. A teacher shall not be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period unless the teacher has been rated as effective or highly effective on his or her 3 most recent annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 5 full school years of employment in a probationary period.
  - 3. Exceptions:
    - a. If a teacher was on continuing tenure in a previous district, the teacher shall serve a probationary period during the first 2 full years of employment in the district.
    - b. If a teacher has been rated highly effective on 3 consecutive annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 4 full school years of employment in a probationary period, the teacher shall be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period.
    - c. *Each probationary teacher shall be provided an individualized development plan* developed by appropriate administrative personnel in consultation with the individual teacher and provided an annual year-end performance evaluation. The annual year-end performance evaluation shall be based on classroom observations and shall include at least an assessment of the teacher's progress in meeting the goals of his or her individualized development plan.
    - d. Before the end of each school year, the controlling board shall provide the probationary teacher with a definite written statement as to whether or not his or her work has been effective.
    - e. A probationary teacher or teacher not on continuing contract shall be employed for the ensuing year unless notified in writing at least 15 days before the end of the school year that his or her services will be discontinued.
- F. **Reliability**: the degree to which an assessment tool produces stable and consistent results.
- G. **Student Growth**: the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time.
- H. **Student Growth Measure**: district approved instrument used to evaluate/measure the extent of student growth.

- I. **Teacher:** For purposes of PA 173, a teacher is defined by the MDE as an individual holding a valid Michigan teaching certificate or authorization and who is employed (or contracted) and assigned by an ISD, LEA, or PSA to deliver direct instruction to K-12 students as a teacher of record, including general (core and elective) and special education teachers (self-contained, resource and co-teaching).
- J. **Teacher of Record:** a teacher who holds a valid MI teaching certificate who, where applicable, is endorsed in the subject area and grade of the course; and is responsible for providing instruction, determining instructional methods for each pupil, diagnosing learning needs, assessing pupil learning, prescribing intervention strategies, reporting outcomes, and evaluating the effects of instruction and support strategies.
- K. **Tested Grades and Subjects:** Grades and subjects that the Michigan Department of Education requires administration of state assessments (M-STEP and MME)
- L. **Validity:** the accuracy of an assessment -- whether or not it measures what it is supposed to measure.

## ANNUAL EVALUATION

Teachers are evaluated annually based on classroom observation data, conversation data, documents/artifacts, student growth and assessment data, as well as consideration of MRSC §1248 factors that aren't measured by the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric. The year-end, annual evaluation shall be used, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding:

- A. The effectiveness of teachers, ensuring that they are given ample opportunities for improvement.
- B. Promotion, retention, and development of teachers, including providing relevant coaching, instructional support, and/or professional development.
- C. Whether to grant tenure or full certification, or both, to teachers using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.
- D. Removing ineffective teacher(s) on continuing tenure or teacher(s) during a probationary period, after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that these decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.
  - Note: If a teacher is rated as highly effective on 3 consecutive annual year-end evaluations, the district may choose to conduct a year-end evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if a teacher is not rated as highly effective on 1 of these biennial year-end evaluations, the teacher shall again be provided with annual year-end evaluations.

## FACTORS and PROCESS for DETERMINING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

### A. Student Growth and Assessment Data

1. For the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years, 25% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
2. Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, 40% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data. For teachers of tested grades and subjects, 50% of the student growth rating shall be determined based on the state assessments. The portion of student growth not measured using state assessments shall be measured using multiple research-based growth measures or alternative assessments that are rigorous and comparable across schools within the school district.
3. Student growth shall be measured by 2 or more of the state provided, nationally normed, and/or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards, or based on achievement of individualized education program goals.
  - See Appendix – Oakridge Assessments Matrix for a list of State and locally adopted assessments eligible for use in growth plans and individualized development plans (IDPs).
4. Teachers are expected to identify student growth measures selected from the Oakridge Assessments Matrix and/or approved by the evaluator. Each teacher needs to establish 2 or more student growth goals.
5. Student growth measures shall be administered within the District established Progress Monitoring Windows.
6. Each teacher will submit their student growth goals as part of their growth plan in Pivot by November 1 of the school year. Beginning in the 2018-19 school year, this due date will change to October 1 to allow the Inquiry Cycle to begin earlier. Teachers may add evidence of achievement to their approved growth plan in Pivot prior to mid-year and end-of year post-inquiry conferences. (Evidence may include reflections, links to student achievement data, and/or files.)
7. The district may allow for exemption of student growth data for a particular pupil for a school year upon the recommendation of the evaluator conducting the year-end evaluation and approval of the superintendent (or designee). A teacher shall communicate the name(s) of any pupil(s) and reason for requested exemption within the “Evidence of Achievement” section of an approved growth plan prior to the mid- and/or end-of year inquiry conference, in order for a pupil’s student growth data to be considered for exemption.
8. The student growth rating for a teacher shall be based on the three most recent years of student growth and assessment data. If there are not student growth and assessment data available for a teacher for at least 3 school years, the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on all student growth and assessment data that are available for the teacher.
9. To determine the student growth rating, the teacher and/or evaluator in consultation with the teacher will review the available growth data for the teachers’ assigned students. Utilizing a preponderance of evidence methodology, the evaluator will assign a student growth rating.

## B. Professional Practice (Evaluation Rubric and 1248 Factors)

1. For the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years, 75% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on professional practice, as measured by the 5D+ rubric, and consideration of additional factors defined in section 1248.
2. Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, 60% of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on professional practice, as measured by the 5D+ rubric, and consideration of additional factors defined in section 1248.
3. Performance levels within each indicator are used to delineate teaching practice, from unsatisfactory, basic, proficient and distinguished. The sophistication of teaching practice and the role of students increase across the levels of performance. The language describing each performance level has been carefully examined by a psychometrician to assure clarity, to avoid the risk of a teacher being rated more than once for similar teaching behavior, and to ensure that each indicator evaluates only one aspect of teaching practice. A careful analysis of instructional practice leads to the determination of a teacher's performance level on each indicator.
4. The following procedure is used to determine a professional practice rating:
  - a. Determine an Indicator Score (Process one indicator at a time.):
    - 1) Read the rubric performance language for each indicator.
    - 2) Examine formative evidence from observed practice (i.e., coded scripts, answers to wonderings, trends, student work, notes from formative conversations with teacher, teacher's self-assessment, etc.)
    - 3) Determine a rating for each indicator within a dimension by an analysis of evidence from multiple observations. Evaluators should be able to point to the evidence across observation scripts to support the alignment of evidence to a performance level in the 5D+ rubric. Make a determination for each indicator based upon the preponderance of evidence and/or growth over time and its probable truth/accuracy, not solely the amount of evidence. A performance level will be assigned for each indicator that the evidence supports using the following protocol:
      - i. Start at Basic. Is there evidence to support all parts of the Basic performance level? If no, rate Unsatisfactory. If yes, move to Proficient.
      - ii. Is there evidence to support all parts of the Proficient performance level? If no, rate Basic. If yes, move to Distinguished.
      - iii. Is there evidence to support all parts of the Distinguished performance level? If no, rate Proficient. If yes, rate Distinguished.
  - Note: The teacher's area of focus and the school's professional development focus should inform an evaluator's thinking about whether s/he is looking for a preponderance of evidence or growth over time. Scoring by preponderance of evidence is primarily for scoring indicators that were not directly connected to the area of focus during the year's inquiry cycles. Scoring by growth over time is primarily for scoring indicators that were



directly part of the teacher's area of focus and/or district/building focus during the school year.

- b. Determine a Dimension Rating: Examine all indicator scores within a dimension, consider the key ideas of the dimension, and determine a dimension score based on the preponderance of evidence at indicator level.
- c. Determine a 5D+ Summative Rating: Examine all of the dimension ratings, and derive a preliminary professional practice rating based on the preponderance of evidence at the Dimension Level.
- d. Determine a Professional Practice Rating: Based on the 5D+ Summative rating, and consideration of criteria enumerated in section 1248 not measured by the 5D+ rubric, an evaluator shall use professional judgment to determine whether to maintain, increase or decrease a teacher's preliminary professional practice rating.
  - 1) The teacher's inability to withstand the strain of teaching, may reduce the professional practice rating. An evaluator should consult with central office administrator(s) about this factor to determine if accommodations may be required.
  - 2) Attendance and/or disciplinary record, if any, may reduce the professional practice rating.
    - Note: Teachers will not be penalized for absences or leaves required by law (i.e., FMLA, ADA, military, "excused"). Attendance violations or failure/refusal to comply with absence/leave procedures (e.g., reporting requirements, lesson plans, etc.) will negatively impact a rating.
  - 3) Relevant accomplishments and contributions, if any, may increase the professional practice rating.
    - Note: This factor shall be based on clear, significant, relevant contributions above the normal expectations for an individual in his/her peer group, and who has demonstrated a record of exceptional performance.
  - 4) Relevant special training, if any, may increase the professional practice rating.
    - Note: This factor shall be based on completion of relevant training other than the professional development or continuing education that is required by the employer or by state law, and integration of that training into instruction in a meaningful way.

#### C. Final Summative Effectiveness Rating:

1. Aggregate the student growth and assessment data (25%) and professional practice (75%) ratings.
  - a. Evaluator enters the Final Professional Practice Rating: (1) Unsatisfactory, (2) Basic, (3) Proficient, or (4) Distinguished.
    - Note: If the professional practice rating was changed based on consideration of 1248 factors, note reason for increase or decrease of rating in the "Comment" text box below the Professional Practice rating.

- b. Evaluator enters the Student Growth and Assessment Data Rating(s):  
 (1) Unsatisfactory, (2) Basic, (3) Proficient, or (4) Distinguished.
2. Determine a final effectiveness rating of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, or Highly Effective using the following rating bands:

| Ineffective | Minimally Effective | Effective | Highly Effective |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|
| 1.0-1.49    | 1.5-2.49            | 2.5-3.49  | 3.5-4.0          |

3. Select the effectiveness level from the drop down menu.

- Note: Michigan law requires that evaluators draft an IDP for the next school year for a teacher rated ineffective or minimally effective. This IDP must include specific performance goals and any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching to achieve performance goals. This may not be necessary if the evaluator recommends the teacher not continue.

D. The Final Summative Evaluation is to be signed by the teacher and the evaluator and placed in the individual teacher's personnel file. The teacher's signature signifies they have read and been provided an opportunity to review the evaluation with their evaluator. It does not signify agreement with the ratings of the evaluation. A teacher may attach a letter of reaction to the evaluation within ten school days of receiving the evaluation.

E. Effectiveness Ratings (General descriptions of each effectiveness rating.)

1. Ineffective: Professional practice shows evidence of not understanding the concepts underlying individual criteria of the performance evaluation system. This level of practice is ineffective and inefficient and may represent practice that is harmful to student learning progress, professional learning environment, or individual teaching practice. This level requires immediate intervention and the development of an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) written by the evaluator that includes specific performance goals, and any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching that would assist the teacher in meeting these goals. This may not be necessary if a decision is made not to continue the teacher.
  - a. Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year, a student will not be assigned to be taught in the same subject area for two consecutive years by a teacher who has been rated ineffective on his or her 2 most recent year end evaluations.
  - b. If the district is unable to comply and plans to assign a pupil to be taught in the same subject area for 2 consecutive years by a teacher who has been rated as ineffective on his or her 2 most recent annual year-end evaluations the board shall notify the pupil's parent or legal guardian. The notification shall be in writing, shall be delivered to the parent or legal guardian not later than July 15 immediately preceding the beginning of the school year for which the pupil is assigned to the teacher, and shall include an explanation of why the board or board of directors is unable to comply.
3. Minimally Effective: Professional practice shows a developing understanding of the knowledge and skills of the criteria required in practice, but performance may be inconsistent over a period of time due to lack of experience, expertise, and/or commitment. This level may be considered minimally competent for teachers early in their careers, but insufficient for more experienced teachers. This level requires specific support through the development of an Individualized Development Plan

(IDP) written by the evaluator that includes specific performance goals, and any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching that would assist the teacher in meeting these goals, unless a decision is made not to continue the teacher.

4. Effective: Professional practice shows evidence of thorough knowledge of all aspects of the profession. This is successful, accomplished, professional, and effective practice. Teaching at this level utilizes a broad repertoire of strategies and activities to support student learning. At this level, teaching is strengthened and expanded through purposeful, collaborative sharing and learning with colleagues as well as ongoing self-reflection and professional improvement.
5. Highly Effective: Professional practice is that of a master professional whose practices operate at a qualitatively different level from those of other professional peers. To achieve this rating, a teacher needs to have received a majority of distinguished ratings on the dimension scores. A teacher at this level must show evidence of average to high impact on student growth. Ongoing, reflective teaching is demonstrated through the highest level of expertise and commitment to all students' learning, challenging professional growth, and collaborative practice.

## 5D+ INQUIRY CYCLE

- A. Each teacher is expected to engage in a minimum of two inquiry cycles annually. The first Inquiry Cycle is typically September through January. The second Inquiry Cycle typically takes place between February and May. A final summative evaluation shall be written and provided to the teacher, typically in June.
  - Note: These timelines are guidelines only and may vary in application depending upon a variety of factors, such as teacher and evaluator attendance, and observer availability.
- B. Teachers shall engage in the following 4-step growth process with their observer and/or evaluator, as co-learners around a teacher's area of focus.
  1. **Self-Assessment**: Teachers shall self-assess in Pivot by October 1 to assist in identifying areas of focus. As part of self-assessment, the teacher shall:
    - a. Examine student work, classroom-based assessment data, feedback from students, etc.
    - b. Consider building and district learning goals and instructional initiatives.
    - c. Assess instructional practice using the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D) instructional framework and the 5D+ Rubric for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation, citing evidence from day-to-day classroom practice to support rating for each rubric indicator.
  2. **Determine a Focus** (Growth Plans, including IDP's and PGP's): A teacher rated effective or highly effective on their most recent evaluation, or the evaluator, in consultation with a probationary teacher or a teacher rated less than effective on their most recent evaluation shall establish or revise a growth plan in Pivot by November 1 (Beginning in the 2018-19 school year, this due date will change to October 1 to allow the Inquiry Cycle to begin earlier) of a school year that includes:
    - a. **Summary** of teacher's analysis of evidence from a self-assessment, student learning strengths/needs, and building/district initiatives in the opening "*Growth*

*Plan General Comments*" text box.

- b. **Performance goals:** Select 3-5 specific indicators from the 5D+ rubric from 2 or more dimensions to focus learning. In the "*Comments*" text box for each area of focus, specify the specific performance goals, reason for selecting indicators, and/or vision statements and guiding questions.
  - c. **Student growth goals:** Articulate the anticipated impact of areas of focus during inquiry on student learning in the "*Goal*" text box. Each teacher shall have two or more student growth goals based on district adopted student growth measures identified in the Oakridge Assessments Matrix. Effectiveness in reaching student growth goals will be measured by a preponderance of evidence.
  - d. **Action Steps:** Articulate the specific teacher action steps grounded in the instructional framework and rubric, administrative support, as well as recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching that would assist the teacher in meeting these goals in the "*Action Steps*" section of the Growth Plan.
3. **Implement and support** (including observation and feedback): Teacher and principal engage in study and learning around teacher's areas of focus.
- a. **Formative Feedback Cycle:** The principal will conduct 2-3 observations per inquiry cycle, as needed, that includes collecting evidence, analyzing evidence, and providing formative feedback, as defined:
    - 1) **Script** – Evaluator collect specific and descriptive evidence.
    - 2) **Code** – Evaluator aligns evidence from script to specific indicators in the 5D+ Rubric.
    - 3) **Noticings/Wonderings** - Evaluator identifies/highlights evidence (noticings) and poses questions (wonderings) related to a teacher's selected areas of focus (i.e., 3-5 specific 5D+ indicators in Growth Plan).
    - 4) **Response** - A teacher shall add responses to evaluator wonderings in Pivot within 2 business days of receiving notification from Pivot that the observation has been finalized.
    - 5) **Feedback** – Evaluator provides teacher formative feedback that recognizes/affirms practices in place from across the rubric, and communicates actionable next steps (short-term coaching points) specific to the teacher's area(s) of focus.
      - Note: Michigan law requires feedback be provided within 30 days of each observation.
  - b. Observations during a formative feedback cycle are typically unannounced, unless an observer determines a need to pre-conference with a teacher prior to an observation.
  - c. Each observation is typically 15 minutes in length, unless a longer duration is determined necessary by the observer and/or evaluator.
  - d. Each observation shall include, at minimum, a review of lesson plans, the state curriculum standard being used in the lesson, and pupil engagement.
    - Note: At least one observation must be unannounced by statute.
- c. Additional support may be provided a teacher, as determined by the teacher's observer or evaluator, including:

- 1) Targeted feedback cycles
- 2) Professional collaboration
- 3) Professional development
- 4) Release time to observe and reflect
- 5) Mentor

- Note: A mentor shall be assigned to teachers during their first 3 years of probation and may be assigned to any teacher rated ineffective or minimally effective on their most recent evaluation, or any other teacher in need of support. Teachers that are new to the district that received tenure in another Michigan district shall be assigned a mentor during their first year.

4. **Analyze Impact** (Mid-Year and End-of-Year Post-Inquiry Conferences)

- a. At the end of the first inquiry cycle (typically in January), each teacher and his/her evaluator shall meet for a mid-year inquiry conference. As part of the mid-year inquiry conference, the teacher and evaluator:

- 1) Review the Growth Plan (IDP, PGP, etc)
- 2) Examine student and teacher data.
- 3) Analyze the impact of the data.
- 4) Discuss teacher growth using the 5D+ rubric.
- 5) Decide whether to continue the same inquiry and/or identify new area(s) of focus for the next inquiry cycle.

- For teachers with an IDP, Michigan law requires that the evaluator, in consultation with the teacher, provides a mid-year progress report that includes specific performance goals for the remainder of the year, a written improvement plan, and any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching to achieve performance goals.

- b. At the conclusion of the second inquiry cycle (typically in May), evaluators meet with each teacher for an evaluation conference. As part of the end-of-year inquiry conference, the teacher and principal:

- 1) Review the growth plan (IDP, PGP, etc.)
- 2) Examine student and teacher data.
- 3) Analyze the impact of the data.
- 4) Discuss teacher growth using the 5D+ rubric.
- 5) Decide whether to continue the same inquiry and/or identify new area(s) of focus for the next inquiry cycle.

- Note: Michigan law requires that evaluators draft an IDP for the next school year for a teacher rated ineffective or minimally effective. This IDP must include specific performance goals and any recommended professional development, instructional support and/or coaching to achieve performance goals. This may not be necessary if the evaluator recommends the teacher not continue.

## APPEAL PROCESS (Effectiveness Rating)

- A. If a teacher, who is not in a probationary period prescribed by section 1 of article II of 1937 (Ex Sess) PA 4, MCL 38.81, is rated as ineffective on an annual year-end evaluation, the teacher may request a review of the evaluation and the rating by the superintendent or his/her designee, as applicable.
- B. The request for a review must be submitted in writing within 20 days after the teacher is informed of the rating.
- C. Upon receipt of the request, the superintendent or his/her designee shall review the evidence used for the evaluation and rating(s).
- D. Following a review of evidence, the superintendent or his/her designee may make any modifications, as appropriate, based on his or her review.
- E. A teacher is limited to two appeals in a 3-school-year period.

## DISMISSAL/DISCHARGE of TEACHER

- F. A teacher who is in a probationary period may be dismissed from his or her employment by the board of education at any time for reasons unrelated to instructional practice or pedagogy.
- G. Discharge or demotion of a teacher on continuing tenure may be made only for a reason that is not arbitrary or capricious and as provided in the Teacher Tenure Act.
  - Note: The rights of a teacher on continuing tenure are subject to sections 1230d(4) and 1535a(4) and (5) of the revised school code, 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.1230d and 380.1535a. For the purposes of dismissal/discharge or demotion, a conviction of a violation of section 1230d of the revised school code, 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.1230d, or a violation of 1 of the crimes listed in section 1535a(1) of the revised school code, 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.1535a, is considered to be reasonably and adversely related to the ability of the person to serve in an elementary or secondary school and is sufficient grounds.
- H. Any teacher rated as ineffective on 3 consecutive annual year-end evaluations shall be dismissed from his or her employment.
  - Note: This subdivision does not affect the ability of the school district to dismiss a teacher from his or her employment regardless of whether the teacher is rated as ineffective on 3 consecutive annual year-end evaluations.

## LAYOFF/RECALL

- A. In making program and staffing decisions, the Board of Education shall retain the most effective teachers who are certified and qualified to instruct the courses within the established curriculum, academic levels and departments.
- B. The Board of Education, on the Superintendent's recommendation, shall determine the size

of the teaching staff in response to curricular, fiscal, and other operating conditions and retains the exclusive right to do so.

I. The Board of Education shall have no obligation to transfer staff to retain the most senior teachers, however, the District reserves the right in its sole discretion to transfer, re-assign, and/or post for teaching positions in order to retain and/or recruit the most effective teachers in the event of personnel reduction.

J. Decisions involving reduction of staff shall be guided by the following:

1. Retaining the most effective teachers who are certified (or otherwise approved or authorized) and qualified to instruct the courses within the established curriculum, academic level(s), and department(s).
2. Only retaining teachers who are properly qualified, certified, approved, or authorized for all aspects of their assignments.
3. Making reduction and recall decisions based on the teacher's certification and qualifications, as reflected in the District's records, at the time that such decisions are made.

E. Procedures for reduction of staff

1. If one or more teaching positions are to be reduced, the Superintendent shall first determine the area(s) of reduction, including specific grade level(s) and/or subject areas for reduction of force.
2. Among those teachers who are certified, approved, or authorized and qualified to instruct within the identified area(s) of reduction, selection of a teacher for layoff shall be based upon each teacher's year-end effectiveness rating.
3. Teachers within the affected academic level(s) or department(s), who are certified and qualified for the remaining positions and who have the highest effectiveness ratings shall be retained and the teachers within the affected academic level(s) or department(s) who have the lowest effectiveness ratings shall be laid-off.
4. When a teaching position has been identified for reduction and there exists a concurrently vacant teaching position for which the incumbent teacher in the position to be reduced is both certified and qualified, and if that teacher has received an overall rating of at least "effective" on his/her most recent year-end performance evaluation, that teacher may be assigned to the vacant position unless the Superintendent determines that the educational interests of the District would not be furthered by that assignment.
5. If more than one teacher whose position has been identified for reduction is certified and qualified for a concurrently vacant teaching assignment, the teacher with the highest year-end evaluation effectiveness rating under the performance evaluation system shall be afforded priority for the assignment unless the Superintendent determines that the educational interests of the District would not be furthered by that assignment.
6. If layoff and recall decisions involve two or more teachers with the same overall effectiveness rating, the following factors will be used for purposes of determining layoff/recall, provided that there are a sufficient number of effective teachers certified and qualified to perform the remaining work:
  - a. The number of Unsatisfactory Dimension ratings on the most recent year-end evaluation.
  - b. The number of Basic Dimension ratings on the most recent year-end evaluation.

- c. Progress toward achieving specific performance goals identified in an IDP due to an ineffective or minimally effective rating on most recent year-end evaluation.
  - d. The teacher's ability to withstand the strain of teaching subject to input from central office administration.
  - e. The teacher's attendance and disciplinary record, if any.
    - Note: A district may consider attendance over a period of up to three years and how the teacher's attendance compares to peer data.
  - f. Significant, relevant accomplishments and contributions. This factor shall be based on whether the individual contributes to the overall performance of the school by making clear, significant, relevant contributions above the normal expectations for an individual in his or her peer group and having demonstrated a record of exceptional performance.
  - g. Relevant Special Training. This factor shall be based on completion of relevant training other than professional development or continuing education required by school district or by state law, and is integrated into instruction in a "meaningful way."
  - h. The scope and nature of a teacher's recent experience in a subject, grade, area or level.
  - i. The number of certifications and/or endorsements provided the teacher has also demonstrated the ability to effectively teach in such areas within a relevant period of time.
  - j. Any other legitimate non-discriminatory factor the District has identified given the facts and circumstances of the staffing reduction.
7. If the reduction/recall decision involves two or more employees with the same effectiveness rating, and all other factors distinguishing those employees from each other are equal, as defined in sub-point 6a-i, then length of service or tenure status may be considered as a tiebreaker." (1248)(D)(iii)(c)
- a. a tenured teacher has priority over a probationary teacher and, among tenured teachers, the teacher's seniority (as established by the most recent seniority list for the bargaining unit to which the tenured teachers belong) will determine preference for reduction and recall.
  - b. if tenure status and length of service are equal, the teacher whose last four digits of their social security number is lower shall be retained/recalled.
- E. The District shall strive to provide at least 14 days' notice of layoff, and may provide greater notice. The District shall determine the method for notice of layoff and recall.
- F. Teachers should update their contact information, certification and highly qualified status, when applicable, to ensure accuracy. The District's decisions shall be made based upon the information in the teacher's official personnel file at time of layoff or recall.
- G. A laid off teacher with continuing tenure shall be eligible for recall for up to 3 years following the effective date of layoff. A probationary teacher shall be eligible for up to 1 or 2 year(s) as determined by the District. The teacher must respond to recall within the time limit established by the District in the notice or offer of recall. If a teacher declines recall, s/he shall generally be removed from the recall list; exceptions may be delineated by the District.
- H. A teacher is not eligible for automatic recall unless the teacher was rated Effective or Highly Effective on their most recent year-end evaluation and the teacher has demonstrated



effective teaching in the grades, subjects, areas or levels being retained or filled, following a reduction in staff.

- I. Teachers rated Minimally Effective shall be invited to interview for any open positions for which they are otherwise certified and/or highly qualified, as applicable, rather than automatically recalled.
- J. Teachers rated Ineffective may only be recalled if required by law or in the District's sole discretion.

## TRAINING

- A. CEL's two-stage training program (6 days) is designed to help educators develop their understanding of the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning instructional framework, the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, the 5D+ Inquiry Cycle, and Summative Scoring.
  - 1. Stage I (1 day) training provides an introduction to the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning instructional framework, 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric, and 5D+ Inquiry Cycle. The focus is helping participants develop an understanding of how the 5D instructional framework and the 5D+ rubric connect to inform teaching and learning, as well as how to use the inquiry process to support teacher growth.
  - 2. Stage II (5 days) training further develops and deepens a participants' knowledge and use of the 5D instructional framework, 5D+ Rubric, and the 5D+ Inquiry Cycle to improve a teacher's practice. Each day has a focus on a new dimension and provides applied practice of the formative feedback cycle within Pivot to facilitate work. The last day of training introduces participants to the scoring methodology for completing summative evaluations.
- B. To meet the PA 173 training requirements, all evaluators and observers participate in both stages of training (6 days) at a regional site or in-district that is facilitated by one or more authorized and licensed CEL trainers who have expertise in the evaluation tool, and who have been trained to train others in the use of CEL's evaluation tool.
- C. CEL consultants and/or other personnel identified by the district, intermediate school district or public school academy, shall provide training to teachers specific to the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning instructional framework, the 5D+ Rubric for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation, and the 5D+ Inquiry Cycle.

## APPENDIX

### Guidance for Use of CEL 5D+ Rubric for Instructional Growth and Teacher Evaluation in Specific Learning Environments

#### A. General Guidance

1. Districts must determine which positions should be evaluated using the 5D+ Rubric, and which positions should not. Just because an employee is a certificated teacher and is on the teacher salary schedule for the district does not mean the employee should be evaluated using the 5D+ Rubric. If the certificated teacher creates his/her own lesson plans either individually or with a collaborative team, instructs students, and assesses students both formatively and summatively, then the instructional framework should be used to evaluate the employee. If, however, the employee is a certificated teacher whose assigned job does not require instructional practice, that certificated employee should be evaluated using an evaluation tool designed for that position. Possible examples of roles that would not be evaluated using the 5D+ Rubric, include: a certificated teacher who serves as a guidance counselor, a media specialist who does not teach students, and an instructional coach. It is appropriate for these employees to engage in multiple inquiry cycles around the standards of professional practice established for their position.
2. The population of students a teacher is working with should not influence the summative evaluation rating that describes the teacher's instructional practice performance level during a specific school year. For example, a teacher who works with severely medically involved students should have the same opportunities to grow their instructional practice to the point where an analysis of the instructional practice data results in a distinguished performance level rating as a teacher working with academically gifted students.

#### B. Specific Learning Environment Guidance

##### 1. Online Learning

- a. If a certificated teacher of online learning plans, instructs, and assesses students then the 5D+ Rubric is appropriate for evaluating the teacher. Use the full 5D instructional framework and 5D+ rubric for growing teaching practice and summative evaluation; the framework does not need to be adjusted. Instructional practice evidence would be observed and collected from the online environment.
- b. If a certificated teacher monitors progress, including calculating grades and communicating with students and parents/guardians without planning lessons and units, instructing and assessing those students, then the 5D instructional framework and 5D+ Rubric is not the appropriate tool to evaluate that employee. This is most likely to occur when the district contracts with a vendor/another school district to provide online learning to its students.

##### 3. Juvenile Justice System

- a. Teachers of Short Term Students. It is up to the district to determine the most appropriate evaluation tool for teachers who work with students who are assigned to temporary juvenile justice placements while awaiting legal decisions. The 5D+ Rubric was not designed to evaluate teachers of students

in settings where the majority of students are in attendance for a short period of time (1-15 days). The use of the 5D instructional framework can be used to grow the teacher's instructional practice, but their evaluation for high-stakes accountability shouldn't be based on the 5D+ Rubric.

- b. Teachers of Long Term Students. The full 5D instructional framework and 5D+ rubric is an appropriate evaluation tool for teachers who work with students who are incarcerated for extended periods of time. No adjustments to the 5D instructional framework or 5D+ rubric are necessary nor should they be made.

### 3. Home School:

- a. Staff members who monitor materials and progress only should be evaluated using a different tool and process. Their role is not a teacher role.
- b. Staff members who develop learning and engage in the learning (plan, instruct and assess) with their students should be evaluated using the full 5D instructional framework and 5D+ rubric, even if they see their students once per week.

### 3. Pre-School / Kindergarten Learning Environments:

- a. The full 5D instructional framework and 5D+ rubric is an appropriate evaluation tool for teachers who work with pre-school and kindergarten students.
- b. Developmentally appropriate expectations and evidence apply across the 5D instructional framework and 5D+ rubric. For example, content-driven student-to-student talk will look and sound different for kindergarteners than it does for high school seniors, but it should occur.

## C. Special Education

1. Resource and inclusive learning: The full instructional framework and rubric is an appropriate evaluation tool for teachers who work with students on an Individual Learning Plan (IEP) in a resource or an inclusive educational setting. This includes students who receive their core instruction from a special education teacher and their elective instruction from a general education teacher.
2. Multiply impaired self-contained: The evidence for the 5D instructional framework and 5D+ rubric indicators is identified based on student learning needs for classrooms where students are on an IEP and have significant and/or multiple impairments. Principals and teachers collaboratively identify the questions to adapt the teacher/student evidence that pertain to the learning needs of students for each indicator. For example, a student who is non-verbal may be communicating through eye blinks or via computer with a paraprofessional. Evidence that shows the teacher's growth in developing this practice would apply to the indicator for student-to-student talk (SE6).

## Oakridge Assessments Matrix - Eligible for Use in Growth Plans and Individualized Development Plans (IDP)

| Assessment Type   | GSRP | TK | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|
| <b>Accelerated Reader</b><br><i>AR Diagnostic Report</i><br><i>AR Summary Report</i>    |      |    | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>Early Indicators of Literacy</b><br><i>District Dashboard</i>                        |      | ●  | ● |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |
| <b>Fountas and Pinnell BAS</b><br><i>Growth Reports in IGOR</i>                         |      | ●  | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |   |    |    |    |
| <b>Common Math Assessments</b>  |      | ●  | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>Common Reading Assessments</b>   |      | ●  | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>Common Writing Assessments</b>   |      | ●  | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>Common Science Assessments</b>   |      |    | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>Common Social Studies Assessments</b>  |      |    | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>DIBELS Next</b>  |      | ●  | ● | ● | ● | ● |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |
| <b>DELTA Math</b><br><i>Standard Summary</i>  |      | ●  | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |    |    |    |
| <b>Kindergarten Screener</b>  |      | ●  | ● |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |
| <b>M-Step ELA</b><br><i>Summary Report</i>  |      |    |   |   |   | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |   |    |    |    |
| <b>M-Step Math</b><br><i>Summary Report</i>   |      |    |   |   |   | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |   |    |    |    |
| <b>M-Step Science</b><br><i>Summary Report</i>  |      |    |   |   |   |   | ● |   |   | ● |   |   |    | ●  |    |
| <b>M-Step Social Studies</b><br><i>Summary Report</i>                                   |      |    |   |   |   |   |   | ● |   |   | ● |   |    | ●  |    |
| <b>M-Step/ACT/ Work Keys</b><br><i>Summary Report</i>                                   |      |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | ●  |    |
| <b>PSAT</b>   |      |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | ● | ● | ●  |    |    |
| <b>SAT</b>  |      |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | ●  |    |
| <b>STAR Math</b><br><i>Growth Proficiency Chart</i><br><i>Student Growth Reports</i>    |      |    |   | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>STAR Reading</b><br><i>Growth Proficiency Chart</i><br><i>Student Growth Reports</i> |      |    |   | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ●  | ●  | ●  |
| <b>STAR EARLY LITERACY</b>  |      | ●  | ● | ● |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |
| <b>TS Gold</b>  | ●    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |

**The MME in Grade 11 Includes:**

The SAT, including an essay portion

The ACT WorkKeys

M-Step Science: fixed form online assessment

M-Step Social Studies: fixed form online assessment

| Assessment Schedule |                    |  |                    |                |
|---------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|
|                     | Year-Round Testing |  | Year-Round Testing |                |
|                     | 3 Times Per Year   |  | As needed          |                |
|                     |                    |  |                    | Spring Testing |