

Maryland Educator Effectiveness Council
Working Draft for Definitions
March 15, 2011

From Executive Order 01.01.2010.12

The Council shall submit to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the Maryland State Board of Education recommendations for the development of the model evaluation system for Educators required by the Chapter 189 of the 2101 Laws of the General Assembly of Maryland – Education Reform Act of 2010

The recommendations shall address:

- The definitions of “effective” teachers and principals
- The definitions of “highly effective” teachers and principals
- The relationship between the student learning component of educator evaluations and the other components of the evaluations

The Council’s recommendations should seek to ensure that every educator is:

- Evaluated using multiple, fair, transparent, timely, rigorous, and valid methods
- Afforded a meaningful opportunity to improve their effectiveness, and
- Provided the means to share effective practices with other educators statewide

Definitions for Teachers

Teacher (*which school personnel are evaluated as teachers*)

From February 28th Meeting:

- As defined in existing regulations and codes
- Bargaining unit employees who work with students, either part of or all day.

K-3 Sub Group:

Follow COMAR's examples.

4-8 Non-Tested Sub Group:

We started to discuss the possibility of only using the evaluation system for those under “teacher” and some other format for those in the “specialist” category.

Effective Teachers

From February 28th Meeting:

- Are able to use all of the resources to advance student achievement.
- Have high expectations for all students and help them learn as demonstrated on multiple measures, contribute to positive academic outcomes by building relationships and using school level resources, use a variety of instructional resources to meet the needs of students, and contribute to developing well-rounded students through collaboration with peers.
- Demonstrate adequate growth in student learning, demonstrate reflection and development of goals based on state assessments and school improvement goals. They demonstrate reflective thinking and problem solving practices with their grade level team.

K-3 Sub Group:

In addition to Charlotte Danielson Framework- demonstrates reflection and development of personal goals based on State Assessments and School Improvement goals; demonstrates reflection and problem solving of student needs with school team members.

4-8 Tested Areas Sub Group:

General categories

- Evidence of student growth measures (Student Growth Competency)
- Planning and preparation (Content Knowledge)
- Classroom environment
- Instruction (Pedagogy)
- Professional Responsibilities

For March 21, 2011 Meeting

These choices were made to align with the definitions we had put forth last time. They also go along with what the consensus of the whole group has been thus far. Although we felt there is much to be gleaned from all the components of the frameworks we looked at, we considered these to be the power standards, if you will.

4-8 Non-Tested Sub Group:

“Teaching standards” to use for the basis for defining effective and highly effective teachers.

The 5 general statements below are intended to be general and inclusive of the Charlotte Danielson domains.

These are put forth as “general standards” for the model. Our intent is not to force local jurisdictions to abandon their own teaching standards and evaluation system for these standards. Instead our goal is to have locals view these as a guide and to serve as the standards for the model evaluation system if the local parties cannot agree on the evaluation system. We believe for the model, examples of evidence for each standard are needed, as well as descriptors to differentiate between highly effective and effective.

- Effective teachers have high expectations for all students and help students learn, as measured by multiple growth measures. (modified from Laura Goe) (Charlotte Danielson 1c, 1f, 2b, 3b, 3d, 3e, 4b)
- Effective teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to all students. (National Board standards) (Charlotte Danielson 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f, 4a, 4e)
- Effective teachers use diverse resources to plan and structure engaging learning opportunities; monitor student progress formatively, adapting instruction as needed; and evaluate learning using multiple sources of evidence. (Laura Goe) (Charlotte Danielson 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4a, 4f)
- Effective teachers are committed to continuous improvement through professional development and actively participate in the professional community. (modified from National Board) (Charlotte Danielson 1a, 1b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f)
- Effective teacher collaborate with other teachers, administrators, parents, and education professionals to ensure student success, particularly the success of students with special needs and those at risk for failure. (Laura Goe) (Charlotte Danielson 1b, 1c, 1d, 1f, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f)

Highly Effective Teachers

From February 28th Meeting:

Same as effective teacher (Adequate growth in student learning, they demonstrate reflection and development of goals based on state assessments and school improvement goals. They demonstrate reflective thinking and problem solving practices with their grade level team) PLUS collaboration with all stakeholders beyond their own grade level team

K-3 Sub Group:

In addition to criteria for an effective teacher, demonstrates collaborative reflection and problem solving as well as planning with stakeholders beyond your school team members (example: reading/math specialist)

Effective, Highly Effective, and Ineffective Teachers Considered Together

High School Sub Group:

The High School group used the Danielson model as the framework for our definition of HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE Teachers. Within these definitions there is much more work that must be done to determine how to classify a teacher in any of the above categories.

Principals

Principal (*which school personnel are evaluated as principals*)

From February 28th Meeting:

As defined in existing regulations and codes

K-3 Sub Group:

Follow COMAR's examples.

Effective Principals

From February 28th Meeting:

Lead with a sense of urgency to ensure student success, build organizational capacity by developing leadership in others, have foundational knowledge of pedagogy and actively monitor instruction in classrooms, develop support structures for staff with the ultimate goal of maximizing student performance, actively involve the community in supporting stated school goals, establish and maintain a healthy school culture of high expectation where actions support the common values and beliefs of the school.

K-3 Sub Group:

In addition to the MD Instructional Leadership Framework Indicators- will monitor the alignment of teacher goals with the School Improvement goals ; will provide evidence of professional development that impacts student learning.

4-8 Tested Areas Sub Group:

Taken from the Maryland Leadership Framework, although we feel that those in the framework are all important, we felt as if it would be difficult to include all components and may become unwieldy.

- Outcome 2-Align all aspects of a school culture to student and adult learning
- Outcome 3-Monitor the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Outcome 4-Improve instructional practices through the purposeful observation and evaluation of teachers
- Outcome 7- Provide staff with focused, sustained, research-based professional development
- Outcome 8 -Engage all community stakeholders in a shared responsibility for student and school success.

These choices were made to align with the definitions we had put forth last time. They also go along with what the consensus of the whole group has been thus far. Although we felt there is much to be gleaned from all the components of the frameworks we looked at we considered these to be the power standards if you will.

4-8 Non-Tested Sub Group:

Our group started to work on principal standards as a basis to identify highly effective and effective. We believe the principal/assistant principal standards must align with the teaching standards.

We examined the Maryland Leadership framework with the 8 standards as well as the National Board statements and those from Indiana. We just started working to combine these into 5-6 meaningful general standards.

Highly Effective Principals

K-3 Sub Group:

In addition to criteria for effective principals, will demonstrate collaboration with the school administration team and content supervisors in achieving the School Improvement goals

Effective, Highly Effective, and Ineffective Teachers Considered Together

High School Sub Group:

We used the ISLIC standards for our definition of a HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE Principal. Within these definitions there is much more work that must be done to determine how to classify a principal in any of the above categories.

Use of Master Plan for State-District Communication

4-8 Non-Tested Sub Group:

We did not come to consensus on whether the evaluation standards should become part of the Master Plan. The concern is to not lose sight that locals need flexibility and autonomy to create or continue with what they have created, while “gently” working to make sure major components of a good evaluation system aren’t missing. We didn’t complete this discussion.

High School Sub Group:

In terms of using the frameworks as the default models for Teacher and Principal Evaluations we discussed using the Yearly Master Plan Review process to allow MSDE to provide feedback to local systems. An advisory panel with representation from teachers could be used to review evaluation systems. The point of this process was to not allow for evaluation systems to become static and to allow for changes and growth over time.

Student Growth

4-8 Non-Tested Sub Group:

On the topic of growth and measuring growth, our group has not come to a recommendation and is still discussing and looking at feedback from the “think tanks.”

Student Growth Model

- Need definition

Professional Development and Advancement Opportunities for Teachers and Principals

- Need definition