## North Branch Area Schools Teacher Evaluation <br> Focusing on Teaching and Learning



# 2013-2014 School Year 

Board of Education
Approved
August 26, 2013
Aligned with MCL 380.1249

## North Branch Area Schools Teacher Evaluation Rubric 2013-2014

## Teacher Evaluation Rubric



## Student Growth - 25 points

## 2013-2014 School Year

http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?mcl-380-1249
-Student growth shall be measured by national, state, or local assessments and other objective criteria. (MAP, PLAN, EXPLORE, MEAP, MME, ACT, local assessments)
-For the annual year-end evaluation for the 2013-2014 school year, at least $25 \%$ of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
-For the annual year-end evaluation for the 2014-2015 school year, at least $40 \%$ of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.
-Beginning with the annual year-end evaluation for the 2015-2016 school year, at least $50 \%$ of the annual year-end evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data.

## Student Growth -25 points Proficiency Targets 2013-2014

|  | Exceeds Target 8.334 points | Meets Target 6.667 points | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below Target } \\ 5 \text { points } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| mimamm |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {cumman }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\square / 2$ | ints |  |

# North Branch Elementary Student Growth - Proficiency Targets 2013-2014 

Growth scores are based on the targets which were set using data from the 2011-2012 school year. Data was reviewed and targets were set based on the achievement made by students during the 2011-2013 school years.

| Kindergarten Fourth Grade | Exceeds Target $8.334 \text { points }$ | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target <br> 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mathematics <br> Envisions <br> Pre/Post Assessment Benchmark - 70\% Correct | $>50 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring <br> or <br> > $70 \%$ class average in spring | $46 \%$ to $50 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring | $41 \%$ to $45 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring | < $41 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring |
| Writing <br> Grade Level Prompt Rubric Benchmark <br> Gr. K-2 - 3/4 <br> Gr. 2-4-4/6 | $>50 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring <br> or <br> > 70\% class average in spring | $46 \%$ to $50 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring | $41 \%$ to $45 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring | < $41 \%$ increase of students meeting benchmark from fall to spring |
| Reading <br> MAP RIT Scores | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to 100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<$ 75\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |

## Ruth Fox

## Student Growth - Proficiency Targets 2013-2014

Primary sources of data will be taken from Language Arts and Math scores which will include QRI, STAR, MAP, and Cumulative Tests. Teachers will be assigned a growth score in eithe language arts or math if they teach in that area. Teachers who teach in both areas will be measured in their "main" instructional area. If a teacher does not teach language arts or math, they will use a growth score in science for the 2013-2014 school year.

Growth scores are based on the targets which were set using data from the 2011-2012 school year. Data was reviewed and targets were set based on the achievement made by students during the 2011-2013 school years.

| ELA | Exceeds Target <br> 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STAR <br> Reading | Student Growth Percentile $\geq 65 \%$ | SGP $=45 \%$ to < $65 \%$ | SGP $=35 \%$ to $<45 \%$ | SGP < 34\% |
| QRI - NT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5th Grade } \\ \geq & 75 \% \text { Growth } \\ & \text { 6th Grade } \\ \geq & 65 \% \text { Growth } \end{aligned}$ | 5th Grade <br> $70 \%$ to < $74 \%$ Growth <br> 6th Grade <br> $60 \%$ to < $64 \%$ Growth | 5th Grade <br> $65 \%$ to $<70 \%$ Growth <br> 6th Grade <br> $55 \%$ to <60\% Growth | 5th Grade <br> $60 \%$ to < $64 \%$ Growth <br> 6th Grade <br> $50 \%$ to < $55 \%$ Growth |
| MAP <br> Reading | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to $100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |

## Ruth Fox

## Student Growth - Proficiency Targets 2013-2014

| MATH | Exceeds Target 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STAR Math | Student Growth Percentile $=\geq$ 65\% | SGP $=45 \%$ to $<65 \%$ | SGP $=35 \%$ to $<45 \%$ | SGP $=<34 \%$ |
| Pre/Post Assessment | $>70 \%$ Growth $\quad$ or class average of $\geq 80 \%$ | 60\% to < $70 \%$ Growth | 50\% to < $60 \%$ Growth | < $50 \%$ Growth |
| MAP Math | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to $100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |
| SCIENCE | Exceeds Target 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| Pre/Post Assessment | > 40\% Growth or the class average is $80 \%$ or above | 35\% to 40\% Growth | 30\% to 34\% Growth | 25\% to < $30 \%$ Growth |
| QRI - IT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5th Grade } \\ &> 80 \% \text { Growth } \\ & \\ & \text { 6th Grade } \\ &> 65 \% \text { Growth } \end{aligned}$ | 5th Grade $73 \%$ to $80 \%$ Growth <br> 6th Grade $60 \%$ to $65 \%$ Growth | 5th Grade $64 \%$ to < $73 \%$ Growth 6th Grade $55 \%$ to $<60 \%$ Growth | 5th Grade $59 \%$ to $<64 \%$ Growth <br> 6th Grade <br> $50 \%$ to < $55 \%$ Growth |
| MAP Science | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to $100 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall percentage of students } \\ & \text { who met or exceeded } \\ & \text { projected RIT }=40 \% \text { to }<75 \% \end{aligned}$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < $40 \%$ |

# Middle School Student Growth - Proficiency Targets 2013-2014 

Primary sources of data will be taken from Language Arts and Math scores which will include EXPLORE, MAP, and Cumulative Tests. Teachers will be assigned a growth score in either language arts, reading or math if they teach in that area. Teachers who teach in both areas will be measured in their "main" instructional area. If a teacher does not teach language arts or math, they will use the growth targets for EXPLORE reading or MAP reading.

Growth scores are based on the targets which were set using data from the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. Data was reviewed and targets were set based on the achievement made by students during the 2011-2013 school years.

| EtA | Exceeds Target $8.334 \text { points }$ | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target <br> 5 points | Significantly Below <br> Target <br> 0 points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPLORE ELA | Student Growth Percentile $\begin{aligned} & \text { (SGP) } \\ & \geq 62 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{SPG}=51 \%$ to $<62 \%$ | $\mathrm{SPG}=40 \%$ to $<51 \%$ | SPG < 40\% |
| Pre/Post Assessment | Student growth percentile $>70 \%$ <br> or <br> Class average of $80 \%$ or above | SGP $=60 \%$ to $69 \%$ | $\mathrm{GP}=50 \%$ to $59 \%$ | SGP $=<49 \%$ |
| MAP <br> Reading | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to $100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |



## Middle School Student Growth - Proficiency Targets 2013-2014

| Reading | Exceeds Target $8.334 \text { points }$ | Meets Target $6.667 \text { points }$ | Below Target 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXPLORE Reading | Student growth percentile $>50 \%$ | $\mathrm{SGP}=45 \%$ to $50 \%$ | $\mathrm{SGP}=34 \%$ to $<45 \%$ | SGP < 34\% |
| Pre/Post <br> Assessment | Student growth percentile $>70 \%$ <br> or <br> Class average of $80 \%$ or above | SGP $=60 \%$ to $69 \%$ | SGP $=50 \%$ to $59 \%$ | SGP $=<49 \%$ |
| MAP <br> Reading | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to $100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < $40 \%$ |


| Primary sources of data will be taken from Language Arts, Math and Science scores which will include PLAN, MAP, and Pre \& Post Tests. If a teacher does not teach language arts, math, or science they will use a growth score in Reading for the 2013-2014 school year. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELA | Exceeds Target 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| Pre-Post <br> Assessments | Student growth percentile $>70 \%$ <br> or <br> class average of $\geq 80 \%$ | 60\% to $70 \%$ Growth | 50\% to < $60 \%$ Growth | < $50 \%$ Growth |
| PLAN ELA <br> (9 \& 10) <br> MME/ACT ELA <br> (11) | Student Growth Percentile $\begin{aligned} & \text { (SGP) } \\ & \geq 62 \% \end{aligned}$ | SPG $=51 \%$ to $<62 \%$ | SPG $=40 \%$ to $<51 \%$ | SPG < 40\% |
| MAP Reading | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%$ to $100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { High School } \\ \text { Student Growth - Proficiency Targets } \\ \text { 2013-2014 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MATH | Exceeds Target <br> 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target <br> 5 points | Significantly Below Target 0 points |
| PLAN $(9$ \&10) MME/ACT $(11)$ | Student Growth Percentile $(\mathrm{SGP})>50 \%$ | SPG $=46 \%$ to50\% | SPG $=40 \%$ to $<46 \%$ | SPG < 40\% |
| Pre-Post Assessments | Student growth percentile $>70 \%$ <br> or <br> class average of $\geq 80 \%$ | 60\% to 70\% Growth | 50\% to < $60 \%$ Growth | < $50 \%$ Growth |
| MAP Math | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT > $100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%<100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |


| $2013-2014$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCIENCE | Exceeds Target <br> 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target <br> 5 points | Significantly Below <br> Target <br> 0 points |
| Pre-Post Assessments | Student growth percentile $>70 \%$ <br> or <br> class average of $\geq 80 \%$ | 60\% to 70\% Growth | 50\% to < $60 \%$ Growth | < $50 \%$ Growth |
| PLAN Science <br> ( 9 \& 10) <br> MME/ACT Science <br> (11) | Student Growth Percentile (SGP) $>50 \%$ | SPG $=40 \%$ to $50 \%$ | SPG $=35 \%$ to $<40 \%$ | SPG < 35\% |
| MAP Science | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%<100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { High School } \\ \text { Student Growth - Proficiency Targets } \\ 2013-2014 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> Elective Courses | Exceeds Target <br> 8.334 points | Meets Target <br> 6.667 points | Below Target <br> 5 points | Significantly Below <br> Target <br> 0 points |
| Pre-Post Assessments | Student growth percentile $>70 \%$ <br> or <br> class average of $\geq 80 \%$ | 60\% to 70\% Growth | $50 \%$ to < $60 \%$ Growth | < $50 \%$ Growth |
| PLAN Reading ( 9 \&10) MME/ACT <br> (11) | Student Growth Percentile $\begin{aligned} & \text { (SGP) } \\ & \geq 62 \% \end{aligned}$ | SPG $=51 \%$ to $62 \%$ | SPG $=40 \%$ to $<51 \%$ | SPG < 40\% |
| MAP Reading | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT >100\% | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=75 \%<100 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT $=40 \%$ to $<75 \%$ | Overall percentage of students who met or exceeded projected RIT < 40\% |

## Evaluation Chart - 50 points

The district continues to use the Marzano Art of Science and Teaching Framework. In the framework, Dr. Marzano outlines 10 critical areas of instructional practice, along with specific strategies for each area.

The Framework, with its Four Domains and ten Design Questions, is shown on the next two pages.

During the first year of implementation, administrators primarily worked with/evaluating teachers on Design Questions 1, 6, and 5. For the 2013-2014 school year, Design Questions 2, 7 \& 8, Domain 3 elements 53 \& 54 and Domain 4 are included. Full implementation is planned for the 2014-2015 school year but no later than 2015-2016.

Staff has access to iObservation and to the resource library contained within which provides access to videos, etc., that demonstrate the instructional strategies within the Framework.

Teacher evaluations will consist of walkthroughs, informal, and formal observations. Administrators will be using the iObservation software from Learning Sciences International.

## Evaluation Chart - 50 points

## Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors

Learning SciencesInternational<br>

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors
Domain 1 is based on the Art and Science of Teaching Framework and identifies the 41 elements or instructional categories that happen in the classroom. The 41 instructional categories are orgarized into 9 Design Questions (DQ) and further grouped into 3 Lesson Segments to define the Observation and Feedback Protocol.

## Lesson Segments

Involving Routine Event:

DQ1: Communicating Learning Goals and Feedback

1. Providing Clear

Learning Goals and
Scales (Rubrics)
2. Tracking Student Progress
3. Celebrating Success

## DQ6: Establishing

Rules and Procedures
4. Establishing Classroom Routines
5. Organizing the Physical Layout of the Classroom

Note: OQ referrers to Design Questions in the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework. The nine (9) Oas orga nize the 41 elements in Domain 1.

The final Design Question, 0010: Developing Effective Lessons Organized into a Cohesive Unit is contained in Domain 2: Planning and Preparing.


## Lesson Segments

Enacted on the Spot

## DQ5: Engaging 5tudents

24. Noticing When Students are Not Engaged
25. Using Academic Games
26. Managing Respense Rates
27. Using Physical Movement
28. Maintaining a Lively Pace
29. Demonstrating Intensity and Enthusiasm
30. Using Friendly Controversy
31. Providing Opporturities for Students to Talk about Thentelves
32. Presenting Unusual or Intriguing Information

## DQ3: Helping Students Practice and Deepen

 New Knowledge14. Reviewing Content
15. Organizing Students to Practice and Deepen Knowledge
16. Using Homework
17. Examining Similarities and Differences
18. Examining Errors in Reasoning
19. Fracticing 5kills, Strategies, and Processes 20. Revising Knowledge

## DQ4: Helping Students Generate and Test

 Hypotheses21. Organizing Students for Cognitwely Complex Tasks
22. Engaging Students in Cognithely Complex Tasks Involving Hypothesis Generation and Testing
23. Providing Resources and Guidance

## Dq7: Recognizing Adherence to

Rules and Procedures
33. Demenstrating "withitness"
34. Applying Consequences for Lack of Adherence to Rules and Procedures
35. Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures

## DQ8: Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships

 with Students36. Understanding Students' Interests and Background
37. Using Verbal and Nonverbal Behaviors that Indicate

Affection for Students
33. Displaying Objectivity and Control

## DQ9: Communicating High Expectations for

All Students
39. Demonstrating Value and Respect for Low Expectancy students

02011 Robert J. Marzano. Can only be digitized in iObservation.
40. Asking Questions of Low Expectancy Students
41. Probing Incorrect Answers with Low Expectancy Students

Domain 2: Planning and Preparing


## Planning and Preparing for

Use of Resources and Technology
45. Use of Available Traditional

Resources
46. Use of Available Technology

## Planning and Preparing for the

## Needs of English Language Learners

47. Needs of English Language Learners

Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching


## Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

## Collegiality and Prefessionalism

Promoting a Positive Environment
55. Promoting Positive Interactions with Calleagues
56. Promoting Positive Interactions
about Students and Parents

Promoting Exchange of
Ideas and Strategies
57. Seeking Mentorship for Aress of Need or Interest
58. Nentoring Other Teachers and Sharing Ideas and Strategies

Promoting District and School Development
59. Adhering to District and School

Rules and Procedures
60. Participating in District and

School Initiatives

## Volunteers for Building Activities - 5 points

| Teacher volunteers for 10 hours | 5 points |
| :---: | :---: |
| Teacher volunteers for 9 hours | 4.5 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 8 hours | 4 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 7 hours | 3.5 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 6 hours | 3 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 5 hours | 2.5 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 4 hours | 2 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 3 hours | 1.5 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 2 hours | 1 points |
| Teacher volunteers for 1 hour | .5 point |

Activities must be selected from the approved building activity list or be pre-approved by the building administrator.

Building Activities that I have volunteered for:

| Activity | Date |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Teacher Professional Development - 10 points

| Teacher attends $\mathbf{1 0}$ hours of PD | 10points |
| :--- | :--- |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{9}$ hours of PD | 9 points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{8}$ hours of PD | 8 points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{7}$ hours of PD | $\mathbf{7}$ points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{6}$ hours of PD | $\mathbf{6}$ points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{5}$ hours of PD | 5 points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{4}$ hours of PD | 4 points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{3}$ hours of PD | 3 points |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{2}$ hours of PD | 2 point |
| Teacher attends $\mathbf{1}$ hour of PD | 1point |

## Note:

Professional development ideas could include such things as a book study group in your building after school, webinars, Learnport, conferences, etc. Classes taken for credit toward advancement on the salary scale could be used. Other ideas for professional development should be agreed upon with the administrator before completion. The dates for the professional development will be from June 1 until the following June 1 (the same as the REP report that is turned in to Central Office at the end of the school year).

## 2013-2014

Professional Development that I have participated in:

| Activity | Date |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Teacher Observations - 10 points

| Teacher observes $\mathbf{5}$ or more (30 minute minimum) lessons <br> in another classroom (not including teammates if in <br> teaming situation) during the school year. | $\mathbf{1 0}$ points |
| :---: | :---: |
| Teacher observes $\mathbf{4}$ (30 minute minimum) lessons in <br> another classroom (not including teammates if in teaming <br> situation) during the school year. | $\mathbf{8}$ points |
| Teacher observes $\mathbf{3}$ (30 minute minimum) lessons in <br> another classroom (not including teammates if in teaming <br> situation) during the school year. | $\mathbf{6}$ points |
| Teacher observes 2 (30 minute minimum) lessons in <br> another classroom (not including teammates if in teaming <br> situation) during the school year. | $\mathbf{4}$ points |
| Teacher observes 1 (30 minute minimum) lesson in <br> another classroom (not including teammates if in teaming <br> situation) during the school year. | $\mathbf{2}$ points |

## Important Note:

In order to receive credit for this category, the teacher needs to turn in a sheet containing the date and time (beginning and ending) of the observation and the signature of the teacher they observed as well as their own. Administrators may provide guidance in scheduling teacher observations.

The teacher is encouraged to discuss the lesson with the teacher they observed and provide any helpful feedback or observations noted.

## 2013-2014

Teacher Observations that I have completed:

| Class Observed | Date | Signature of Teacher Being <br> Observed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

