CPS Teacher Evaluation Plan

CPS FINAL PROPOSAL

March 29, 2012
Section I: Overview
INTRODUCTION:
JOINT GOALS & PURPOSE

- To create a culture of continuous improvement among teachers, school leaders, system administrators and students
- To build principals’ and/or teachers leaders’ expertise in observing and analyzing instruction and supporting teacher development
- To engage teachers in reflection and self assessment regarding their own performance
- To differentiate support and accountability for teachers based on their experience and/or performance
- To provide teachers with information and guidance to inform their development.
- To establish a common definition of teaching excellence

NOTE: Opinions among both teams varied on the order of priority for these goals.
SUPPORTS: INFRASTRUCTURE

CPS will contract for a technology solution to facilitate the following aspects of effective performance evaluation:

- Data collection and reporting related to teachers’ performance;
- Collection and delivery of evidence and evaluator feedback to teachers, based both on elements that are included as part of the teacher evaluation process as well as other recommended practices (e.g., goal-setting and reflection);
- Interim and final scoring on performance measures;
- Summative ratings; and
- Other related activities.
To ensure evaluator quality, inter-rater reliability and to identify evaluator professional development needs, CPS will employ a cadre of administrators (Instructional Effectiveness Specialists) who have been certified and trained as evaluators to:

- Conduct joint classroom observations with evaluators
- Review and norm evidence and component scores based on joint observations
- Provide feedback to evaluators following calibration sessions (feedback provided is specific to the framework, evidence and ratings)
- Deliver professional development to evaluators, specific to the Framework (observations and evidence gathering)
- CPS will employ one calibrator per network

*NOTE: Calibration reports will not be provided to teachers. They are designed for evaluators’ learning, development and continuous improvement.*
SUPPORTS:
MENTOR TEACHERS
(Requires CTU Agreement)

- CPS will provide up to 40 Mentors Teachers to conduct observations for PAT1’s in SY12-13
- Mentor Teachers are assigned to coach PAT1s
- Mentor Teachers can conduct formal observations of PAT1s. Evidence and component level scores from observations – pending CTU approval – can be included in the final summative performance level ratings.
- Mentor Teachers will be CPS employees. They must hold a valid teaching certificate. They must be qualified State evaluators (i.e., must pass the State certification assessment.)
- Mentor Teachers who meet the requirements, may also serve as consulting teachers if they have:
  - at least 5 years teaching experience AND rated excellent or higher on the last evaluation
- Mentor Teachers who are currently school-based, will have the right of return to their position for one year
- CPS intends to contract with NTC to provide support in developing Mentor teachers
- Instructional Effectiveness Specialists may be transitioned in the future to Mentor Teacher positions as reliability is established and maintained in the future
**SUPPORTS:**
**ORIENTATION ON EVALUATION PLAN**

CPS will provide orientation to CPS teachers as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Understanding all performance measures in Evaluation Plan</td>
<td>Online/ILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce the Framework for Teaching with an emphasis Domain 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Understanding CPS Framework for Content Standards in literacy</td>
<td>Teacher Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop Quarter 1 unit plans for literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unpack content standards in Math Bridge plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior to 2012</strong></td>
<td>• Orientation sessions, review of evaluation plan system and supporting technology</td>
<td>ILT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Goal setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand implementation of new district assessments (NWEA/ Performance Tasks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construct/review units planned for the school year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn key CCSS concepts embedded in the CPS Framework for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use Domain 2 to plan classroom environment and Domain 3 to plan instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The table above highlights key orientation activities. This list is not exhaustive and may be modified to ensure orientation is comprehensive.*
In 2012-13, CPS will provide the following on-going professional development for teachers tied to performance expectations in the CPS Framework for Teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Proposed Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1 PD  | • Analyze data from the 1st quarter and reflect on teaching practice and student learning (Domain 4)  
• Use analysis to plan units of instruction  
• Develop instructional practices aligned to CCSS and the CPS Framework for Teaching | ILT/Teacher Leaders |
| Q2 PD  | • Analyze data from the 2nd quarter and reflect on teaching practice and student learning (Domain 4)  
• Use analysis to plan units of instruction  
• Develop instructional practices aligned to CCSS and the CPS Framework for Teaching | ILT/Teacher Leaders |
| Q3 PD  | • Analyze data from the 3rd quarter and reflect on teaching practice and student learning (Domain 4)  
• Use analysis to plan units of instruction  
• Develop instructional practices aligned to CCSS and the CPS Framework for Teaching | ILT/Teacher Leaders |
| Q4 PD  | • Analyze data from the 4th quarter and reflect on teaching practice and student learning (Domain 4)  
• Use analysis to plan units of instruction  
• Develop instructional practices aligned to CCSS and the CPS Framework for Teaching | ILT/Teacher Leaders |

**NOTE:** The table above highlights professional development activities. This list is not exhaustive and may be modified based on need to ensure training is comprehensive.
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In addition a quarterly PD, teachers will have:

- Weekly teacher team collaboration time for data analysis and lesson planning aligned to Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
- Online professional development resources aligned to the CPS Framework for Teaching and CCSS, including videos, resources for teachers, and instructional materials
- Mentoring for new teachers, aligned to the implementation of CPS teacher effectiveness and CCSS

Finally, CPS is interested in partnering with the CTU Quest Center to offer ongoing PD related to teacher effectiveness and CCSS

NOTE: This list highlights additional professional development activities. It is not exhaustive and may be modified based on need to ensure training is comprehensive.
To ensure quality of student learning data, CPS will contract with Battelle for Kids to help implement:

- Roster verification system for teachers to validate their student rosters

  Benefits:
  - Higher level of accuracy on linking individual students to teachers, even with complex classroom models (i.e. push-in/pull-out services, etc.)
  - More credibility in published student learning data linked to teachers because teachers verify their rosters

- Training and communications related to roster verification system

  Benefits:
  - Fewer CPS staff spent on training for a non-instructional system
  - More coherent communications and messaging related to the system
CPS will monitor observation scores provided both by principals and by Instructional Effectiveness Specialists (calibrators) and will take the following steps to ensure fair teacher practice scores:

- If scores are radically different following a **single observation**, the Instructional Effectiveness Specialist will follow protocol and work with the principal to calibrate based on the joint observation, providing feedback specific to the framework, evidence and scores.

- In the event that **trend analysis** shows a radical difference in scores **over time** (for multiple teachers and multiple data points), CPS will take the following steps:
  - Identify this discrepancy (based on rules and a threshold to be developed)
  - Notify the Principal and the Chief who will begin to engage in a review process
  - Immediately assign another evaluator
CPS will monitor summative performance level ratings and when there is an extreme disparity between teacher practice and student growth scores, will take the following steps to ensure fairness:

Extreme disparity between teacher practice and student growth scores will trigger a review by Central / Network Offices.

- If a teacher receives a 3.5 to a 4 in teacher practice and a 1 to a 1.5 in individual value-added, individual expected gains or performance task scores, an evaluator from central / Network office will review the evaluation and scoring

- 3.5 to a 4 in individual value-added, individual expected gains or performance task and a 1 to a 1.5 in teacher practice , an evaluator from central / Network office will review the evaluation and scoring

- The review process may result in a no rating or a revised rating
To ensure efficacy of the plan:

- CPS and CTU will jointly explore a measurement validation study
- CPS and CTU will jointly agree on the scope of the study
- CPS and CTU will jointly discuss the outcomes and make decisions about next steps
- CPS and CTU will jointly seek funding or share the cost of the study
- The study will be publically shared
The PERA Joint Committee will continue to be engaged on issues that arise during the implementation of the plan, including but not limited to:

• Criteria recommended for value-added

• School and classroom level controls for value-added

• Criteria recommended for teacher roster verification

• Development of performance tasks and protocols

• A process that clearly acknowledges teachers’ additional case management responsibilities

• Development of guidelines for local criteria

• Discuss what Review Process (Slide 5) when triggered might include.
# IMPLEMENTATION

## Five Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SY12-13</th>
<th>SY13-14</th>
<th>SY14-15</th>
<th>SY15-16</th>
<th>SY16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elementary School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elementary School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elementary School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elementary School Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested Grades/Subjects:</td>
<td>Tested Grades/Subjects:</td>
<td>Tested Grades/Subjects:</td>
<td>Tested Grades/Subjects:</td>
<td>Tested Grades/Subjects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice – 75%</td>
<td>- Practice – 65%</td>
<td>- Practice – 60%</td>
<td>- Practice – 55%</td>
<td>- Practice – 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type III – 10%</td>
<td>- Type III – 10%</td>
<td>- Type III – 10%</td>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice – 75%</td>
<td>- Practice – 65%</td>
<td>- Practice – 60%</td>
<td>- Practice – 55%</td>
<td>- Practice – 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SVAM – 10%</td>
<td>- SVAM – 10%</td>
<td>- SVAM – 10%</td>
<td>- SVAM – 10%</td>
<td>- SVAM – 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
<td>- Type III – 20%</td>
<td>- Type III – 20%</td>
<td>- Type III – 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Survey (no stakes)</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SY12-13</th>
<th>SY13-14</th>
<th>SY14-15</th>
<th>SY15-16</th>
<th>SY16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>High School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>High School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>High School Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>High School Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Subjects:</td>
<td>Core Subjects:</td>
<td>Core Subjects:</td>
<td>Core Subjects:</td>
<td>Core Subjects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice – 90%</td>
<td>- Practice – 65%</td>
<td>- Practice – 60%</td>
<td>- Practice – 55%</td>
<td>- Practice – 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type III – 10%</td>
<td>- Type III – 10%</td>
<td>- Type III – 10%</td>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual expected gains (no stakes)</td>
<td>- Individual expected gains – 15%</td>
<td>- Individual expected gains – 20%</td>
<td>- Individual expected gains – 20%</td>
<td>- Individual expected gains – 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Survey (no stakes)</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
<td>- Survey – 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-core Subjects:</td>
<td>Non-core Subjects:</td>
<td>Non-core Subjects:</td>
<td>Non-core Subjects:</td>
<td>Non-core Subjects:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Practice – 100%</td>
<td>- Practice – 65%</td>
<td>- Practice – 60%</td>
<td>- Practice – 60%</td>
<td>- Practice – 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School expected gains (no stakes)</td>
<td>- Type III – 15%</td>
<td>- Type III – 20%</td>
<td>- Type III – 20%</td>
<td>- Type III – 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Survey (no stakes)</td>
<td>- School expected gains – 10%</td>
<td>- School expected gains – 10%</td>
<td>- School expected gains – 10%</td>
<td>- School expected gains – 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Frequency of Performance Evaluations

- For SY12-13 and SY13-14 CPS will maintain the biennial summative rating schedule for tenured excellent and superior teachers.
  - That is, these tenured teachers rated excellent and superior will not be rated in SY12-13, they will be rated in SY13-14 and each year thereafter

- Beginning in SY12-13, tenured unsatisfactory and satisfactory teachers as well as Probationary teachers will receive an annual summative rating.

- Middle of the Year Summative Rating:
  - In 2012-13, a principal may issue a MOY or end of year Summative Rating to a Teacher who is not scheduled to be rated, based on the Framework scores, only if the teachers’ performance on the Framework would result in an unsatisfactory rating. (NB: CPS and CTU will consult with ISBE about whether growth data is required)
  - In SY 2014-15 and thereafter, a principal may issue a MOY Summative Rating to a Teacher, using prior year student learning data, if the teacher’s performance on the Framework would result in an unsatisfactory rating

- In SY14-15, all teachers receive an end-of-year summative rating.
Section II: Evaluation of Classroom Teachers
### Classroom teachers include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood teachers</td>
<td>Pre-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary grades teachers</td>
<td>K to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate elementary grade teachers</td>
<td>4 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle grades teachers</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teachers</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary &amp; middle school teachers (physical education, music, art, computer science, librarians, etc)</td>
<td>K to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school teachers (physical education, music, art, computer science, librarians, etc)</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary special education teachers</td>
<td>Pre-K to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle grades special education teachers</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school special education teachers</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order for every CPS student to graduate college- and career-ready...

• All CPS teachers are expected to perform their roles with integrity, responsibility, and dedication to students

• At a minimum, each CPS teacher—whether classroom or non-classroom—is expected to maintain a proficient performance rating or better, as defined under this plan

• All CPS teachers should strive to improve their instructional practice continually and to improve the learning opportunities and educational experiences of all students
### TEACHER PRACTICE

#### CPS FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING*

- CPS Framework for Teaching provides a common definition for effective instruction for CPS classroom teachers
- Basis for Teacher Practice ratings is evidence that is aligned to the CPS Framework for Teaching and the performance level continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</td>
<td>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</td>
<td>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c: Selecting Instructional Outcomes</td>
<td>2c: Managing Classroom Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d: Designing Coherent Instruction</td>
<td>2d: Managing Student Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e: Designing Student Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 3: Instruction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a: Communicating With Students</td>
<td>4a: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</td>
<td>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</td>
<td>4c: Communicating with Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</td>
<td>4d: Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</td>
<td>4e: Demonstrating Professionalism (Attdce considered)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching and approved by Charlotte Danielson

---
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Description:

- These components, in Domain 4 of the CPS Framework for Teaching, comprise the Professional Responsibilities portion.
- Define teachers’ role outside classroom, including professional growth, contributions made to school, district, and profession.
- Demonstrated through interactions with colleagues, families, and the broader school community.
- Evidence may be collected by teacher and/or evaluator throughout the school year and submitted in a portfolio of evidence to be reviewed at the middle of the year and end of the year.

Ratings:

- Evaluators issue performance levels for components 4b-4e based upon evidence included in component scores delivered at the end of the year and the middle of the year (MOY) (if a MOY summative rating is issued).
Goal-setting by teachers about their own professional growth is a best practice, especially when done in consultation and/or collaboration with a school administrator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal setting</th>
<th>Middle of the Year (MOY)</th>
<th>End of Year (EOY) Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning of the Year (BOY)</strong></td>
<td>Conference <em>mandatory</em> for probationary teachers &amp; all teachers receiving MOY rating</td>
<td>Conference <em>mandatory</em> for ALL teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-faculty meeting outlines expectations &amp; guidance for goal setting</td>
<td>Conference <em>recommended</em> for Needs Improvement teachers</td>
<td>For tenured teachers rated Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory, the EOY conference is followed by a professional development plan or remediation plan, respectively, for the following school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goals for teacher practice (including professional responsibilities) submitted electronically after baseline assessments</td>
<td>Principal discretion to have MOY conferences with tenured proficient and excellent teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify student learning data for mid-year reflection</td>
<td>Teachers to reflect on data specific to student learning and may seek advice on ways to adjust and improve instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principals may choose to have individual goal setting meetings; it may be combined with pre-conference meeting</td>
<td>Evaluator to review evidence on Professional Responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Formal Observations

- Evaluators issue component level scores for Domains 1, 2, 3 and 4a
- Announced
- Must include pre- and post-observation conference
- Observation within five (5) school days of the pre-conference, if possible, but in no event after the teacher has concluded the unit of lessons that were discussed with the evaluator in the pre-observation conference.
- The evaluator and the teacher shall have a post-observation conference within five (5) school days of the classroom observation, if possible, but no more than 10 days following the observation.
  - The post-observation conference includes improvement recommendations, including professional development, as appropriate.
- Length of class / lesson, or after 45 minutes
- Included in component scores delivered at EOY and MOY (when applicable)

### Informal Observations

- Evaluators issue performance levels for components in Domains 2 and 3 only
- Unannounced
- No pre-observation conference required
- Should be for a minimum of 15 minutes approximately
- Must include delivery of post-observation feedback (can be in-person or electronic)
  - May request in person feedback
- Included in component scores delivered at EOY and MOY (when applicable)
# Probationary Teachers

*Number and timing of observations are best practice.

## NOTE: Observations may begin at the start of the 5th week of school

## Probationary Teacher (PATs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY12-13</strong></td>
<td>2 formal observations</td>
<td>2 formal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> The first formal observation can be a practice. Teachers may elect to include in the final summative rating, election must be made shortly after receiving score.</td>
<td><strong>An informal observation is required if the teacher opts for the first formal observation to be considered a practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY13-14 &amp; SY14-15</strong></td>
<td>2 formal observations</td>
<td>1 formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 informal observation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PATs may be observed by a Mentor Teacher (pending CTU agreement). At least 2 observations MUST be conducted by an administrator at the school.
**TEACHER PRACTICE**  
**CLASSROOM OBSERVATION - CYCLE**

**TENURED** with current rating of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory

* Number and timing of observations are best practice.

**NOTE:** Observations may begin at the start of the 5th week of school

### Tenured Teacher with current rating of Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY12-13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 formal observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 formal observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The first formal observation can be a practice. Teachers may elect to include in the final summative rating, election must be made shortly after receiving score. If first informal is a practice, a repeat must be done so that the tenured teacher has 2 formal observations included in rating.

2 informal observations

*(NOTE: If the first formal observation is a practice. Only 1 informal will be necessary)*

| SY13-14 & SY14-15      |               |                 |
| 1 formal observation   |               | 1 formal observation |

2 informal observations
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### TEACHER PRACTICE
### CLASSROOM OBSERVATION - CYCLE

#### TENURED with current rating of Excellent or Superior

*Number and timing of observations are best practice.

#### NOTE: Observations may begin at the start of the 5th week of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenured Teacher with current rating of Excellent or Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Semester</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY12-13 Biennial evaluation plan (off year)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal observations are discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY13-14 Biennial evaluation plan (on year)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY14-15 Annual evaluation plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 informal observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Informal observations are NOT required for teachers with a summative rating of excellent in previous year.*
TEACHER PRACTICE
EVALUATORS OF CLASSROOM PRACTICE

- CPS evaluators are administrators, department chairs and Mentor Teachers who have successfully completed an ISBE-provided or approved pre-qualification program and who maintain statutory credentials.

- In 2012-13, CPS evaluators may include:
  - School principals
  - School assistant principals
  - Chiefs of Schools
  - Deputy Chiefs of Schools
  - Central Office Managers
  - Mentor Teachers
    - Mentor teachers may conduct formal observations and provide component level scores for first year PATs, contingent on agreement (required by 24A-3)

- Only supervisors, or designees, can be provide summative MOY and EOY ratings

- CPS will bargain with CTU about impact of using Department Chairs as evaluators, including how that may be accomplished in 2013-14 and on what scale.
• Following each observation, evaluators issue a performance level score for each component in domains 1, 2, 3 and in domain 4, only component 4a.

• For scoring, each performance level is attributed a point value:
  - Distinguished = 4
  - Proficient = 3
  - Basic = 2
  - Unsatisfactory = 1

• Performance level scores—including formal and informal observations for components 1a-4a and scores for components 4b-4e are averaged to come to a numeric Domain score;

• Weighted average of Domain scores (according to weightings displayed on graphic) equals the Teacher Practice score.

Weightings for CPS Framework for Teaching Domains:

- Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
- Domain 2: Classroom Environment
- Domain 3: Instruction
- Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

Illustrative example on the following slide
## TEACHER PRACTICE

### SCORING OF TEACHER PRACTICE - Example

Data from all observations (formal and informal) are averaged by component and by Domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Data</th>
<th>Scoring Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Formal Obs. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1b</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1c</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1d</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1e</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Formal Obs. 1</th>
<th>Formal Obs. 2</th>
<th>Formal Obs. 3</th>
<th>Informal Obs. 1</th>
<th>Component Avg.</th>
<th>Domain Avg.</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Weighted Domain Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 2a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Formal Obs. 1</th>
<th>Formal Obs. 2</th>
<th>Formal Obs. 3</th>
<th>Informal Obs. 1</th>
<th>Component Avg.</th>
<th>Domain Avg.</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Weighted Domain Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 3a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence collected over time**

### Chicago Public Schools – Final Proposal – 03-29-2012

**Initial**: 3-2-12  
**Update**: 3-7-12  
**TA**: 3-19-12

**Distinguished = 4; Proficient = 3; Basic = 2; Unsatisfactory = 1**

**Total Teacher Practice Score**: **2.81**

**Sum of all 4 weighted domains equals overall teacher practice score**

**Domain average multiplied by the weighting for each domain = weighted domain score**
# MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING

## VALUE-ADDED

### Why Value-added?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Value-added?</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Measures student achievement most fairly—it isolates the effect of instruction by controlling for factors that affect achievement but are not within the teacher’s control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Most precise measure available – credits teachers with all student gains, large or small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Validation</td>
<td>Most widely used student growth methodology with the largest research base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Produced through an algorithm, making it accurate, consistent, and available to teachers soon after student assessments are taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value-added characteristics include:

- Use of beginning of year (BOY) and end of year (EOY) NWEA assessment data
- Is modeled separately for each grade level but are comparable across grade levels
- Considers of students’ time enrolled in different teachers’ classrooms, known as dosage effects
- Application of shrinkage methodology for increasing precision
- Excludes students whose IEPs indicate that they should take the Illinois Alternative Assessment (IAA)
- Excludes ELLs with ACCESS scores lower than 3.5 in the previous year
- Excludes of students who attend more than 3 schools in a single school year
- Includes a single year of data in 2012-13 and potentially two years of data where available starting in 2013-14

Student-level controls for (a) prior reading and math scores, (b) gender, (c) race/ethnicity, (d) free/reduced lunch status, (e) ELL program participation, (f) students with disabilities, (g) students in temporary living situations program participation, and (h) mobility

- CPS will collaborate with its value-added provider to investigate school- and classroom-level controls as needed and appropriate
MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING
INDIVIDUAL VALUE ADDED

Description:

- Value-added Modeling is a statistical method that measures teachers’ impact on student learning over time.
- Value-added measures will be based upon beginning of the year (BOY) and end of the year (EOY) administrations of the Northwest Education Association’s Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test.
  - **Subjects**: Reading and Math
  - **Grades**: 3-8

- Teachers responsible for Reading and/or Math instruction in grades 3-8 will receive individual value-added scores (*exceptions are listed in Data Controls section*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects Taught</th>
<th>Individual Value-added scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading and / or English language Arts teacher 3-8</td>
<td>NWEA reading assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Teacher Grades 3 to 8</td>
<td>NWEA math assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and/or English language Arts &amp; Math teacher Grades 3-8</td>
<td>Composite of NWEA reading and math assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING
SCHOOL VALUE-ADDED LITERACY

Description:

- School value-added for Literacy is identical to Individual value-added; it measures teachers’ impact on student learning over time. The unit is all teachers in the school.

- Value-added measures will be based upon multiple administrations of the Northwest Education Association’s Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test
  - Subjects: Reading
  - Grades: Aggregation of results from grades 3-8

- All K-8 classroom teachers that do NOT receive an Individual Value-added score as part of their evaluation will receive a School Value-added Literacy score (all teachers in a school will receive the same score for this measure)

Why School-wide Literacy:

- CPS students perform significantly lower than the national average on literacy measures.

- Integration of literacy (reading, writing, thinking about the written and / or spoken word) into all subject areas is critical to boosting these essential skills.

- Use of a school-wide literacy component reinforces the collaboration needed from all teachers to improve literacy at all grade levels.
Individual Value-added scores are calculated using a normalized scale that is expressed in standard deviation units (Step 1)

CPS will convert standard deviation scores (z-scores) to a 1-4 scale for simplicity

**Step 1**

- Run VAM model using student growth in NWEA RIT scores
- Output: Z-scores expressed in standard deviation units

**Step 2**

- Rescale Z-scores on a range from 1 to 4 – the common scale for all aspects of the evaluation
- Output: Results expressed on 1-4 scale
MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING
INDIVIDUAL EPAS EXPECTED GAINS

Description:

- EPAS Expected Gains measure will be tested in 2012-13 and used in 2013-14.
- EPAS Expected Gains measures the percentage of a teacher’s students that progress equal to or more than the average (based on a large norm sample) between pre (beginning of the year) and post (end of the year) administrations of EPAS college readiness assessments.
- EPAS Expected Gains is based upon the EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT assessments.
- Each test twice per year using one retired version.
  - **Subjects**: Reading, English Math, Science & Social Studies
  - **Grades**: 9-11
- Teachers responsible for instruction in the following subject areas (in grades 9-11) will receive an individual Expected Gains score as part of his/her evaluation (**exceptions are listed in Data Controls section**)
  - Reading
  - English
  - Math
  - Science
  - Social studies (based on Reading EPAS)
EPAS Expected Gains characteristics include:

- Use beginning of year (BOY) and end of year (EOY) EPAS assessment data (i.e. EXPLORE, PLAN, and/or ACT)
- Excludes students whose IEPs indicate that they should take the Illinois Alternative Assessment (IAA)
- Excludes of ELLs with ACCESS scores lower than 3.5 in the previous year
- Excludes students who attend more than 3 schools in a single school year
- Includes a single year of data in 2012-13 and potentially two years of data where available starting in 2013-14

Why EPAS?

- As a skills-based assessment, EPAS aligns with college and career readiness priorities
- EPAS is more closely aligned to scope and sequence of instruction than any adaptive growth assessment
- CPS teachers are familiar both with the EPAS exam and the College Readiness Standards

Why Expected Gains?

- A panel of experts, the technical advisory committee and CPS staff all concluded that the district cannot currently build a valid value-added model based on EPAS data
- Expected Gains model enables teachers to set growth targets and track progress toward targets throughout the year
- Expected Gains model is highly transparent and easy to understand
MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING
SCHOOL EXPECTED GAINS READING

Description:

- EPAS Expected Gains measures the percentage of a teacher’s students that progress equal to or more than the average (based on a large norm sample) between pre (beginning of the year) and post (end of the year) administrations of EPAS college readiness assessments.

- EPAS Expected Gains is based upon the EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT assessments.

- Each test twice per year using one retired version.
  - **Subjects:** Reading, English Math, Science
  - **Grades:** 9-11

- All 9-12 classroom teachers that do NOT receive an Individual Expected gains score as part of their evaluation will receive a School Expected Gains Reading score (*all teachers in a school will receive the same score for this measure*)
Expected Gains scores are expressed as percentage of students meeting or surpassing anticipated growth.

Percentages of students making anticipated growth will be converted to a 1-4 scale.

Scoring is subject to review after test year.
In collaboration with District partners and technical advisory committee, CPS will:

For Value-added:
1. Set a minimum number of students for whom NWEA data is available in order for teachers to receive value-added scores;
2. Establish a maximum confidence interval size above which a value-added score will not be included in a teacher’s evaluation;
3. Continue exploring viable school- and classroom-level variables that substantially improve precision of value-added model; and
4. Partner with CTU to determine other exceptions and controls in the future.

For EPAS Expected Gains:
5. Set a minimum number of students for whom EPAS data is available in order for teachers to receive Expected Gains scores.
Definition: Type III Assessment
- ISBE: “An assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the course’s curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measure student learning in that course.”

Definition: Performance Task
- A written or hands-on demonstration of mastery, or progress towards mastery, of a particular skill or standard.
- Focused on a standards set, or Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)
  - Standards-like descriptions of what students know and can do
  - SLOs identify desired long-term, key outcomes
- Beginning of the year and end of the year administration measures student mastery of identified SLOs over the course of an academic year on a few skills (depth over breadth).
Performance Tasks will be designed by subject-specific teams made up teachers from across the district and CPS content leads.

- Application process to identify teacher participants

Subject-specific and / or grade-level groups composed of teachers (in addition to CPS content lead) will collaboratively design the performance task.

- Team composition will depend on the grade level and subject area
- Development of the performance task will be based on instructional priorities

Performance Tasks will contain the following components, at minimum:

- **Standards**: What students should know and be able to do
- **Task Description**:
  - The activity in which a student will engage to demonstrate level of proficiency with respect to the standards
  - Student directions to define guidelines and expectations for each activity
- **Task materials**: What students need to engage in the specified activities
- **Rubrics**: The tool for scoring student work products

Initial: 3-9-12
Joint Subcommittee

Finalization of the Type III design will be based on a recommendation by the Joint committee to the CEO
MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING
PERFORMANCE TASK ADMINISTRATION

- Performance Tasks will be designed to be completed in one class period (approximately 30 minutes minimum and 60 minutes maximum).

- All students sharing a common subject/grade level/classroom should receive the same task with the same directions.

- Neither teachers nor parents should assist the student in completing the performance task. The performance task should be a pure reflection of the student’s work.

- Teachers grade (score) the performance tasks of their own students
  - Additional scoring and proctoring procedures to be determined by the Joint subcommittee

- Guidelines will be provided for performance task administration by grade level, subject area and / or course section to help teacher and principals identify which performance tasks should be used and how many. Guidelines will consider:
  - Grade levels, subject areas and courses taught by teachers
  - Students’ specific student learning needs

Finalization of the Type III administration guidelines will be based on a recommendation by the Joint committee to the CEO
The performance task and standard(s) assessed will be common across pre-test (beginning of the year) and post-test (end of the year)
- Task materials may change

Student scoring will be based on a 4-category rubric with associated point values
- 0 is lowest score; 3 is highest score
- The highest score (3 points) means mastery of a particular grade-level standard

Student Growth from pre-test (BOY) to post-test (EOY) will be measured with a common rubric
- Simple growth measure = post-score minus pre-score

Growth metric accounts for growth magnitude and direction
- Teacher-level metric is based on an average: Total # of rubric slots moved / # of students
- Business rules will be applied to special cases
  - Negative growth will count for 0 – student didn’t grow
  - Students who max out both tests will receive a ‘1’
  - Must determine how to deal with students who come in below lowest rubric category
### MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING
PERFORMANCE TASK SCORING & GROWTH

#### Student Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Score Mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mr. B’s Classroom – 6 Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre-Score on PT</th>
<th>Post-Score on PT</th>
<th>Raw Growth</th>
<th>Adjusted Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted growth / number of students = Score

Mr. B – \(\frac{7}{6} = 1.2 + 1 = 2.2\)

**Special Case:** Negative growth counts as ‘0’ in aggregation for teacher rating

**Special Case:** Maxing out rubric in both pre- and post- counts as ‘1’ in aggregation for teacher rating

In normal cases, growth is just simple arithmetic: \(\text{post} < \text{minus} > \text{pre}\)

Students receive a score at both pretest and post-test

---

*Chicago Public Schools – Final Proposal – 03-29-2012*
Surveys will be included as part of the EOY summative rating starting in SY13-14. Prior to SY13-14, CPS will

- Implement a no-stakes survey in SY12-13
  - The survey provider is to be determined
- Intention is that the survey will be weighted at 10 percent of the overall summative evaluation
- Intention is that the Survey will be administered in grades 4-12 (assuming validation)
- Data from the first year of implementation will be shared with the Joint Committee prior to implementation in SY13-14
Teachers will receive a numeric score on a scale that ranges from 100 to 400

- A 100-400 point scale increases precision
- Allows growth to be seen from year to year within performance levels (i.e. allows “low” Proficient versus “high” Proficient)

Performance ratings are associated with particular summative score ranges (see scale on following page)

Performance ratings will **not** be issued for each individual measure of teacher performance. Instead, the summative performance rating is based on all relevant measures of performance for an individual teacher.
# Summative Performance Level Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure*</th>
<th>Natural Scale</th>
<th>Adjusted Scale</th>
<th>Weight*</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Practice</td>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>1 to 4 (min to max)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth VAM</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
<td>(normal curve)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance measures and weights identified for demonstration purposes.

### Performance Level Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Evaluation of Non-Classroom Teachers
### III.A EVALUATION OF NON-CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Non-classroom teachers include the following teachers and school support personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Classroom Teachers</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Counselors</td>
<td>Pre-K to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Counselors</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Nurses</td>
<td>Pre-K to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Workers</td>
<td>Pre-K to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologists</td>
<td>Pre-K to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Language Pathologists</td>
<td>Pre-K to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches, curriculum specialists &amp; other specialists who do not provide direct students services</td>
<td>Pre-K to 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation cycles will be conducted in accordance with state regulations.

CTU and CPS to work jointly through ISBE and PEAC to clarify observation cycle regulations for non-classroom teachers.
For Non-classroom teachers (see slide 48), a modified, discipline-specific Danielson Framework will be used for observations and teacher practice ratings.

Basis for Teacher Practice ratings is evidence that is aligned to the discipline specific Danielson Framework and the performance level rubrics.

For counselors and classroom teachers who take on additional case management responsibilities, a draft addendum has been provided that outlines expectations for case managers and can be used to discuss the teacher’s additional responsibilities.

- Case managers are staffed in a variety of positions, which adds complexity.
- A thoughtful process requires continued development of guidance; this will continue to be collaborative (e.g., work of the Joint Committee, CPS case managers).
III.A EVALUATION OF NON-CLASSROOM TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Student Learning</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Counselors</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Workers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Nurses</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologists</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech language Therapists</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches/Curriculum Specialists</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In SY12-13, neither student growth measures nor surveys will be included in the overall summative performance rating for non-classroom teachers.
- Because, non-classroom teachers also play an important role in the student’s school experience, CPS will identify student learning measures and appropriate surveys instruments for non-classroom teachers during SY2012-13.
- CPS will strive to include student learning measures and surveys non-classroom teacher summative performance rating for non-classroom teachers in SY2013-14 and will work with the Joint Committee to establish appropriate weightings.
Section IV: Professional Development Plans
IV. PD PLANS FOR NEEDS IMPROVEMENT TENURED TEACHERS

- Within 30 school days of a “needs improvement” performance rating to a tenured teacher, the evaluator shall develop a professional development plan (“PD Plan”) to help the teacher improve performance on framework components on which the teacher scored less than “proficient.”

- The Board in cooperation with the Chicago Teachers Union shall develop a catalog of professional development opportunities from which evaluators and teachers may draw and include in professional development plans.

- If, at the next rating cycle, the teacher has improved his/her overall rating to proficient or better, the PD Plan shall terminate.

- If the teacher has not improved his/her overall rating to proficient or better at the next rating, the evaluator shall issue a unsatisfactory rating to the teacher.

*NOTE: The PD plan requirement is a statutory requirement.*
Section V: Remediation Plans
V. REMEDIATION OF TENURED TEACHERS

- **Remediation assistance**: Within 30 school days of an unsatisfactory rating, appoint consulting or mentor teacher (meeting 105 ILCS 5/24A-5 qualifications and Board selection criteria) to assist teacher and the evaluator in developing and implementing a remediation plan.

- **Remediation plans**: Remediation plan must identify Framework components on which the tenured teacher lacks proficiency or is unsatisfactory and include a description of proficient performance on those components.

**NOTE**: The Remediation process is a statutory process.
V. REMEDIATION OF TENURED TEACHERS (cont.)

- **Feedback during remediation**: An evaluator shall rate the teacher’s practice using the Framework at the mid-point of and the end of the remediation period. Evaluations during remediation shall be based upon one formal observation cycle. The consulting teacher may participate in any post-observation conference.

- **Termination of the remediation plan**: If the tenured teacher has achieved proficiency at the conclusion of the remediation plan, the remediation shall be terminate and the teacher will be evaluated at the next rating cycle. If the tenured teacher is rated below proficient at the conclusion of the plan, the evaluator shall refer the teacher for a due process hearing under 105 ILCS 5/34-85.

*NOTE: The Remediation process is a statutory process.*
Section VI: Collective Bargaining Caveat
Mandatory Subjects

- The Illinois School Code required CPS to develop a new Teacher Evaluation Plan with the Chicago Teachers Union for implementation in SY2012-13 and further required that student growth be incorporated as significant factor into that plan.

- The Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act suggests that some issues related to teacher evaluation may be mandatory subjects of bargaining.

- In collective bargaining for a successor collective bargaining agreement, CTU has indicated that all mandatory subjects related to evaluation must be discussed in the context of successor bargaining though it has declined to identify what those subjects are.

- CPS has advised CTU that implementation of its new performance evaluation plan will not preclude bargaining in the context of successor bargaining for supplemental provisions on any aspect of the plan that may present a mandatory subject of bargaining.