



Dr. Bruce Law
*Superintendent
of Schools*

Pamela Bylsma
*Assistant Superintendent
for Academics*

Tammy Prentiss
*Assistant Superintendent
for Special Education*

Domenico Maniscalco
*Director of
Human Resources*

Bill Eagan
*Chief Financial
Officer*

TO: Dr. Bruce Law
FROM: Pam Bylsma
Assistant Superintendent for Academics
DATE: October 29, 2014
RE: District 86 Professional Evaluation Plan Update

At the upcoming Board of Education meeting, I will discuss the progress that has been made on the creation of a new Hinsdale Township High School District 86 Professional Evaluation Plan. As you are aware, the revision of our current plan was necessitated by mandates set forth in recent legislation. This memo and accompanying documents will serve as a quick overview of the following:

- What the legislative mandates are
- How the District is complying with those legislative expectations
- Which evaluation instrument has been selected and the rationale behind that decision
- What specific work has been completed to help us reach our established goals
- What future action steps are required for the District to be on track to meet mandated timelines

Summary of Legislative Mandates

The Hinsdale Township High School District 86 Teacher Evaluation Study, Steering, and Working Groups along with the PERA Joint Committee recognize the importance of student growth and teacher effectiveness in the evaluation process. These various groups reviewed all pertinent legislation (Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010 or PERA, Senate Bill 7, 2012 Illinois School Code) enacted in the State of Illinois that calls for increased emphasis on teacher performance evaluation ratings, which have the potential to impact teachers' continued employment.

The law requires that each district develop an evaluation plan that will rate its teachers based on two major components: professional practice and student growth. Due to the number of decisions that need to be made and the professional development that must occur, the state has established a process by which the full evaluation plan is phased in over two years. By the beginning of the 2015-16 school year, the Hinsdale Township High School District 86 Professional Evaluation Plan must comply with the requirements of the professional practice component only. By the onset of the 2016-17 year, the student growth component must be added to the calculation of a teacher's final summative rating. As of October 15, 2014, the Illinois State Board of Education shared its revised rules, regulations, and recommendations regarding student growth (Part 50: Evaluation of Educator Licensed Employees under Articles 24A and 34 of the School Code). These revisions are awaiting legislative approval. Our PERA Joint Committee is tracking these changes closely to ensure that District 86 will be compliance as it develops its student growth model.

PERA legislation gives the PERA Joint Committee, which must be comprised of equal numbers of HHSTA members and administrators, 180 days to complete its work. If the group cannot reach consensus on the specifics of the full evaluation plan, District 86 will default to the state's model, which mandates the use of the Danielson Framework for Teaching instrument as its Professional Practice Component tool. The Danielson rating would count for 50% of the teacher's overall summative rating in 2016-17. The other 50% of the summative performance rating that year would come from the Student Growth Component, which the state model stipulates must come from the use of Student Learning Objectives.

In addition, Senate Bill 7 mandates that each district must establish a Reduction in Force (RIF) committee to address four decisions. They must meet before December 1 and be completed by February 1 of the year prior to implementation of the district's new teacher evaluation plan.

Danielson Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument

The 2013 Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument by Charlotte Danielson was selected by the Illinois State Board of Education and is listed in the legislation as the tool districts must use if their PERA Joint Committee cannot reach consensus on what teacher evaluation model to use. The Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of components of instruction that is grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching while incorporating instructional implications for the New Illinois Learning Standards (NILS), which are based on the Common Core State Standards. The Framework is a valuable tool to be used as the foundation for professional conversations among educators as they enhance their skills in the complex task of teaching. The Framework for Teaching is based on the Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessment criteria developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS), National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), is compatible with Interstate New Teacher Assessments and Supports Consortium (INTASC) standards, and aligned with 2010 Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument has been validated as a reliable and valid measurement tool when measuring teaching practice in both the 2011 Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) study and the 2012 Measuring Effective Teaching (MET) study.

Since the state's evaluation model uses Charlotte Danielson's "Framework for Teaching" and because the 2005-2011 D86 Instructional Improvement Task Force partially used this same framework to guide the creation of our current evaluation plan's Characteristics of Professional Practice (CPPs), a gap-analysis was completed to compare the Danielson framework to the D86 CPPs. Upon reviewing data generated from the CPP/Danielson gap-analysis, the Working Group concluded that the Danielson framework directly aligns with the vision set forth by the D86 CPPs. In addition, the group found the following additional strengths to Danielson's model:

- There is a clear and direct focus on student learning and student outcomes;
- Danielson's rubrics outline research-based critical attributes that specifically align to the required professional performance levels of "Excellent," "Proficient," "Needs Improvement," or "Unsatisfactory."
- Danielson's rubric is capable of evaluating a greater number of non-teaching certified personnel (i.e. school counselors, psychologists, social workers, and speech pathologists).

Therefore, the Working Group selected the Danielson's framework as the basis for the Hinsdale Township High School District 86 Professional Evaluation Plan. The framework will anchor Hinsdale Township High School District 86's recruitment and hiring, mentoring, coaching, professional development, and teacher evaluation process. The goal is to link all of these activities to help educators and evaluators become more thoughtful practitioners.

Evaluation PERA Timeline

A draft of a three-year timeline was shared with the Board in June. An updated version of this timeline has been provided in order to highlight the extensive work that has been accomplished over the summer and the first quarter of this school year. The chart indicates that the District is on track with its plan to implement the Professional Practice Component and to pilot the Student Growth Components of PERA at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year if we complete all action steps as outlined in the coming months.

The work summarized on this chart represents the dedication of a large number of passionate, collaborative leaders, who are identified in the attached document. These teacher leaders, certified specialists, department chairs, assistant principals, and administrators demonstrate the commitment to excellence that this District is known for.

In conclusion, it will be my pleasure to discuss this important topic with you and the Board of Education at the upcoming Committee of the Whole meeting on November 3.

EVALUATION PERA TIMELINE

Updated for November 3, 2014

KEY	
	= Professional Practice Component
	= Student Growth Component
	= PERA/SB7 Joint Committee

2014-15	
Decision Making, Implementation Planning, and Initial Implementation	
June	Provided the Steering Committee with the Services of a Professional Consultant (Pam Rosa of Danielson Group) to assist with developing the new D86 Professional Evaluation Plan
	Danielson Consultant worked with the Steering and Rubric Groups for three full days on 6/10, 25, and 30 to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - build an understanding of the Danielson Framework for Teaching components - create Informal and Formal Observations Process Steps - develop Non-Tenured and Tenured Plan Charts - establish a Performance Evaluation Rating System - align all forms with the teacher evaluation process
July	Investigated potential technology tools to use with evaluation plan and student growth component
	Steering Group worked with ECRA consultant on 7/31 to examine the Local Growth Model (LGM) in comparison to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) as Student Growth Component measurement model.
August	Finalized the Draft of the Professional Evaluation Plan Process and Forms to use for training
	Provided half-day training for 38 Qualified Evaluators on 8/19 to prepare for Institute Day/Department Mtgs
	Danielson Consultant assisted 16 specialists in personalizing the rubrics to their work on 8/13 and 15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Counselors, Social Workers, Psychologists, Speech Pathologists, Sp Ed LBS1 teachers, Department Chairs & Librarians
	Steering Group and Danielson Rubric Group provided in-service presentation at Institute Day on 8/21
	Department Chairs reviewed the presentation and encouraged opt-in participants during department meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 196 certified staff opted into the pilot program
	Specialists completed their rubrics and documents and submitted them to the consultant for review
September	Established a Technology Tool Group comprised of the Assistant Principals for Operations (APOs), Assistant Superintendent for Academics (ASA), Dir. of Technology, & volunteers from the Assessment & Steering Groups
	Sought building feedback from all departments and educator groups regarding Type III course-level common assessments to be that could be used to Measure Student Growth
	Assessment and Steering Groups met with ECRA consultant to further consider the LGM on 9/17 and to discuss a more robust district-wide assessment program with the discontinuation of Explore and Plan tests.
	Danielson Consultant provided a full day of training on 9/24 and 9/25 for all 38 qualified evaluators and for 139 of the 221 educators who opted into the practice group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Danielson Framework's Philosophy, Research, Rubrics, and Artifacts - Reflective Practices for educators and students - Review Hinsdale 86 the draft of the Professional Evaluation Plan
	Assistant Principals for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (APCIAs) provided training for opt-in educators unable to attend the consultant training due to limitations: 54 people at HC on 10/2 and 28 at HS on 10/8
October	Technology Tools Group went on site visit to Nequa Valley to see TeachScope in use on 10/1
	ASA, Assistant Superintendent for Special Ed, District Dir. of Student Services, and building administration researched more effective district-wide assessment tools for reading and math, selecting STAR and MAP
	APCIAs provided additional Danielson Opt-In Group training during 10:00 Start time on 10/8
	Danielson Consultant provided a half day skill-building session for 38 qualified evaluators on the Formal Observation Process on 10/14
	Technology Tool Group listened to vendor presentations for Evaluwise, Edivation, and TeachScope on 10/22
	Convened the PERA Joint Committee on 10/22 [must be completed in 180 days, which is 4/20/15] and reviewed ISBE's revisions to PERA Part 50 (Evaluation of Educator Licensed Employees under Articles 24A and 34 of the School Code), shared at the October 15 State Board of Education meeting. Started discussions to . . . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish a summative rating based on a percentage of student growth and a percentage of professional practice for mandated educators within 180 days or default to the state's system - 70/30% recommended & selected - Select the student growth model (LGM or SLO) - in progress - Determine which types of assessments will be used for each educator - in progress - Establish rules regarding which students are eligible for consideration in the student growth model - in progress - Identify guidelines for growth targets that will translate into the four rating categories - in progress

- CONTINUED -

10/30/2014, 10:58 AM

November	Technology Tool Group listened to vendor online presentation for TalentEd on 11/3
	Technology Tool Group will have a final vendor presentation from PowerEval on 11/6
	Technology Tool Group volunteers will use a free 60 day trial of the Evaluwise tool & at least one other
	APCIAs will provide additional Danielson Opt-In Group training during 10:00 Start time on 11/12
	PERA Joint Committee will meet on 11/12 to continue with their mandated decisions
	Representatives from the Assessment and Steering Groups will meet with ECRA statisticians to discuss LGM
	Specialists rubrics and documents returned from the consultant will be vetted by each specialist group
Select RIF Committee to address the four SB7 Decisions [must meet before Dec 1 and be completed by Feb 1]	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must consider and may agree whether to establish criteria for excluding from Group 2 and placing into Group 3 a teacher whose last two performance evaluations include a "Needs Improvement" and either a "Proficient" or "Excellent" - Must consider and may agree whether to establish an alternative definition for Group 4, which must take into account prior performance evaluation ratings and may take into account other factors that relate to the school district's or program's educational objectives. An alternative definition for Group 4 may not permit the inclusion of a teacher in the grouping with a "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory" performance evaluation rating on either of the teacher's last two performance evaluation ratings. - May agree whether to include within the definition of a performance evaluation rating administered by a school district or joint agreement other than the school district or joint agreement determining the sequence of dismissal. - If a school district administers performance evaluation ratings that are inconsistent with SB 7, the school district must consult with the joint committee on the basis for assigning a rating that complies with SB 7. 	
December	APCIAs will provide additional Danielson Opt-In Group training during 10:00 Start time on 12/3
	PERA Joint and RIF Committees will meet on 12/3 to continue with their mandated decisions
	Course teams will continue creating Type III common assessments Student Growth Component
	Purchase STAR and MAP district assessments to provide more robust student attainment and progress data
Danielson Consultant will provide half day skill-building session for 38 qualified evaluators on Informal Observations and Reflective Practices on 12/2	
January	Personalize Danielson rubrics for each curricular department during Institute Day on 1/16
	Teachers of singleton courses will begin work with ECRA on creating valid, reliable Type III assessments
	Begin implementation of STAR and MAP assessments and train teachers and administrators on their use
	RIF Committee must complete its work by the end of the month; final meeting date will be 1/28
	APCIAs will provide additional Danielson Opt-In Group training during 10:00 Start time on 1/28
Collaborate on Department-Specific Rubrics during the Institute Day on January 16	
February	Danielson Consultant will provide half day skill-building session for 38 qualified evaluators on Summative Evaluation Rating Process and Facilitating Performance Evaluation Conversations on 2/3
	Course teams and teachers of singletons continue creating Type III common assessments
	PERA Joint will meet on 2/11 to continue with their mandated decisions
	District-wide "Cross Pollination" work on departmental rubric personalization during 10:00 Start time on 2/11
Finish Practice Group's Summative Evaluations by March 1	
March	APCIAs will provide additional Danielson Opt-In Group training during 10:00 Start time on 3/11
	Course teams and teachers of singletons continue creating Type III common assessments
	Gather feedback from the Opt-in Group and qualified evaluators regarding observation and summative process and forms, data collection tool, observation guidesheets, and rating scales
Technology Tool Group compares pilot feedback and selects final tool for use during the 2015-16 formal pilot	
April	Provide formal review of pilot feedback to PERA Joint Committee for consideration of plan revision
	Conclude the Work of the PERA Joint Committee, adjusting the Professional Evaluation Plan as needed by 4/20
May	Share the finalized Professional Evaluation Plan with all educators before summer break
	Purchase the chosen technology tool software to use with the finalized Professional Evaluation Plan

2015-16	
Implementation of Professional Practice and Piloting of Student Growth Component	
June-July	Provide Updated Qualified Evaluator Training on Danielson Framework and Certified Evaluation Plan
	Finalize the Student Growth Component of the Professional Evaluation Plan
August	Implement Danielson Observation and the Professional Evaluation Plan with all Educator Groups
	Prepare Assessment and Student Growth Component Professional Development Materials
September	Provide Professional Development for Required Educator Groups: - <i>Assessment Practices</i> - <i>How to Create Reliable and Valid Assessments</i> - <i>How to Effectively Use Data to Improve Student Growth</i>
	Finalize Common Assessments to be Used
October	Collect Baseline Data for Bands of Learners to Set Learning Targets
	Pilot Student Growth Component, following the PERA Joint Committee's Draft Plan
February	Finish Student Growth Pilot Group's Summative Evaluations by March 1
March	Gather Feedback from the Pilot Group and Evaluators
April	Provide Summary of Feedback to the On-going Evaluation Committee for consider of plan revision
May	Share the Finalized Professional Evaluation Plan which includes Student Growth Component with Educators

2016-17	
Full Implementation of the Teacher Evaluation Plan	
June-July	Provide Updated Qualified Evaluator Training on Student Growth Component
August	Implement Student Growth Component for all Mandated Educator Groups
February	Complete Summative Evaluations by March 1
March	Gather Feedback from the Educators and Evaluators
April	Provide Summary of Feedback to the On-going Evaluation Committee for consideration of plan revision

PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION PLAN CONTRIBUTORS

2013-14 and 2014-15

PERA Joint Committee

John Bowman, Central Math, Association President
John Bruesch, Central Assistant Principal
Pam Bylsma, Assistant Superintendent for Academics
Lisa Fernandez, Central Science D.C.
Jared Friebel, Central English
Mark Kolkman, Central Principal
Dave Lapetino, South Science, Association President
Stephanie Palmer, South Principal
Emily Polacek, South Social Studies
Arwen Pokorny Lyp, South Assistant Principal
Tammy Prentiss, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
Matt Swedko, South Business/FACS/Technology Education D.C.

Steering Group

Mary Biniewicz, Interim Assistant Superintendent (2013-14)
John Bowman, Central Math, Association President
John Bruesch, Central Assistant Principal
Pam Bylsma, Assistant Superintendent
Lisa Fernandez, Central Science D.C.
Jared Friebel, Central English
Greg Gardner, South Fine Arts D.C. (2013-14)
Mark Kolkman, Central Principal
David Lapetino, South Math, Association President
Stephanie Palmer, South Principal
Emily Polacek, South Social Studies
Arwen Pokorny Lyp, South Assistant Principal
Tammy Prentiss, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
Kathy Saylor, South Library (2013-14)
Matt Swedko, South Business/FACS/Technology Education D.C.

Assessment Work Group

David Anderson, South English D.C.
John Bowman, Central Math, Association President
Lisa Fernandez, Central Science D.C.
Greg Gardner, South Fine Arts D.C.
Paul Hoel, South PE, Health, Drivers Ed. D.C.
Dave Lapetino, South Science, Association President
Deborah Trujillo, Central World Language
Laura Sievers, Central Art
Matt Swedko, South Business, Tech Ed, FACS D.C.

Technology Tool Group

Pam Bylsma, Assistant Superintendent for Academics
Tim Hohman, District Director of Technology
Mark Kolkman, Central Principal
David Lange, Central English D.C.
Eric Martzolf, South Assistant Principal
John Richerson, South Math
Matt Swedko, South Business/FACS/Technology Education D.C.
Deborah Trujillo, Central World Language
Bill Walsh, Central Assistant Principal

Specialists Work Group

David Anderson, South English D.C.
Karly Bartolucci, South Speech/Language
Jenifer Cochran, South Psychologist
Deanne Doherty, Central Psychologist
Lisa Fernandez, Central Science D.C.
Alyssa Gunderson, Central Special Education D.C.
Mike Holland, South Guidance Director
Tina Kinsey, Transition Center Asst D.C.
Kate Kokenes, South Social Worker
Ellen Lawrence, South LMC D.C.
Katie Lennox, South Counselor
Dana McPherrin, Central Speech/Language
Fran Mirro, South World Lang D.C.
Kerrin Riley, Central LMC D.C.
Heather Stomberg, South Spec Ed
Donna Wheeler, Central Counselor

Characteristics of Professional Practice/Rubric Development Work Group

Jared Friebel, Central English
Lynn Hatzikostantis, Central Physical Education, Health
Jessica Hurt, Central Social Science D.C.
Fran Mirro, South World Language D.C.
Arwen Pokorny Lyp, South Assistant Principal
John Richerson, South Math
Kerrin Riley, Central Library D.C.
Laura Sievers, Central Art

Professional Growth Plans, Self-Assessment, Student Feedback Group

John Bruesch, Central Assistant Principal
Mike Ivancich, Central Business, Tech Ed, FACS D.C.
Emily Polacek, South Social Studies
Kathy Saylor, South Library
Kristin Kaduk, South Science
Heather Stomberg, South Special Education
Kurt Vonnahme, Central Math D.C.