



Donna Jones, President
Dawn Bentley, Past President
Eric Hoppstock, President-Elect
Andrew Claes, Vice President
503 Mall Court, Suite 322
Lansing, MI 48912
517-410-7065

Date: August 24, 2015

RE: House Substitute for SB 103: Performance Evaluation System for Teachers & School Administrators

Background

Michigan schools have attempted to fully implement the components of MCL 380.1249 without full direction from the legislature or the Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness. To implement the self-developed/vendor evaluation tools to meet teacher and administrator evaluation requirements, districts have provided extensive training. A robust educator evaluation system is essential to ensuring our students have the strongest teachers and administrators in order to determine the current level of student performance in Michigan.

There has been debate over which tool to utilize in the performance evaluation process and how much student performance data should be included in the year-end summative evaluation. To further complicate matters, newer educational standards have been implemented, the student assessment system has been completely revised in both content and reports, and teacher shortages are an issue.

The Data

The current use of performance evaluations for teachers and administrators has increased the percentage of teachers and administrators who are highly effective:

School Year	Teachers/ Administrators Rated Ineffective	Teachers/ Administrators Rated Minimally Effective	Teachers/ Administrators Rated Effective	Teachers/ Administrators Rated Highly Effective
2011-12	0.8% / 0.7%	2.04% / 1.76%	74.6% / 74%	23% / 23%
2012-13	0.6% / 0.5%	2.41% / 2.24%	64.4% / 68%	33% / 29%
2013-14	0.5% / 0.3%	2.26% / 2.37%	59.3% / 66%	38% / 32%

(Source: MDE/CEPI Website Staffing Reports)

Current Needs/Recommendation

MAASE supports, with modification, House Substitute for SB 103 as an essential first step in addressing the issues around the performance evaluation of teachers and administrators. Modifications submitted for consideration:

- **Sec. 1249(1)(d)(iii)** “rigorous standards” clarify meaning of this language. Each evaluation instrument reviewed by the Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness utilizes slightly different standards to

evaluate the art and science of teaching. Without further clarity, this will result in a range of teaching and administrative standards across Michigan.

- **Sec. 1249(2)(a)(i)** dictates districts attribute 20% of an evaluation to student growth and assessment data. MAASE supports maintaining an emphasis on student growth data. However, the state tool to measure this growth does not currently exist. Growth measurement requires both starting *and* ending student scores derived from a common, stable tool. Modify this language to allow more flexibility in the use of a locally-determined valid and reliable measure to assess student growth. Additional guidance and study is needed to support the development of evidence-based evaluation measures for educators responsible for teaching students with the most significant impairments.
- **Sec. 1249(4)- Delete this section.** Serves no meaningful purpose. With the allowance of local development this section is inconsistent with the remainder of the bill.
- **Sec. 1249(5)- Delete this section.** With the deletion of Section (4) section becomes moot.
- **Sec. 1249B(3)- Delete this section.**
- **Sec. 1249B(4)- Delete this section.**

Overall, MAASE appreciates that the House Substitute for SB 103 has a strong emphasis on student outcomes. We support a system where educators are fairly and reliably evaluated by skilled and knowledgeable administrators and encouraged to improve through the use of solid goal setting and high quality, targeted professional learning.

MAASE welcomes additional dialogue around this bill, particularly around its impact on students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and programs/services for students with IEPs.