# Chisago Lakes School District, ISD #2144
# Teacher Development and Evaluation Plan

5-1-25

# TDEP Background

**Mission:**

**The Chisago Lakes Teacher Development and Evaluation Plan is designed to provide direction and purpose to teacher development and allow a process for evaluation and feedback that empowers teachers to grow in their profession.**

**Purpose:**

To develop, improve, and support qualified teachers and effective teaching practices and to improve student learning and success, the Chisago Lakes School District, ISD #2144 has developed this Teacher Development and Evaluation Plan.

**The Process:**

A district team, "Teacher Development and Evaluation Plan (TDEP) Committee," was created in the fall of 2013 to study the legislative changes to the Minnesota teacher evaluation laws and to create and implement a proposal to meet these changes.

The following plan this group created was jointly agreed upon by the employees represented by Chisago Lakes Education Minnesota (CLEM) and District 2144. After adoption by the exclusive representatives of both groups, the TDEP committee will continue to oversee the implementation of the plan. This committee will meet at least three times during each year and will also review the plan annually for recommended changes and adjustments that must be agreed upon between the exclusive representatives above before being implemented anew.

**Roles:**

Teacher Development and Evaluation Plan Team (TDEP): The district team is composed of educators appointed by the Superintendent and the representatives of CLEM. The union president appoints six representatives from the Chisago Lakes Education Minnesota union, which would include one representative from Taylors Falls Elementary, Primary School, Lakeside Elementary, Chisago Lakes Middle School, and Chisago Lakes High School and the union president him or herself. Three representatives - a principal, the Director of Teaching and Learning and the Q-Comp Director are appointed by the Superintendent. This nine member district team will create, facilitate, implement, and monitor the plan. They will recommend alterations (if any) annually to CLEM and the Superintendent. Neither the union president appointed or superintendent appointed representatives may unilaterally alter the TDEP plan.

Administrative Evaluator: For all employees on the teacher contract, the supervising administrator will conduct the administration evaluations. In most instances, this person will be a building principal. The administrator assigned to the employees being evaluated will be identified at the beginning of the school year.

**The Plan:**

This plan will become the way we evaluate all personnel employed under ISD #2144 Teachers' Master Agreement and represented by CLEM. For purposes of clarity, the plan will be presented in three categories: Tenured Employees, Probationary Employees, and finally Staff Development Practices.

# TDEP Plan for Tenured Employees

**Standards of Practice**

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must include a rubric of performance standards for teacher practice that: (i) is based on the standards of effective practice in MN Rules 8710.2000; (ii) includes culturally responsive methodologies; and (iii) provides common descriptions of effectiveness using at least three levels of performance;" To comply, ISD #2144 convened the TDEP committee to examine, evaluate, and create an effective evaluation rubric that meets the legislative requirements. The final rubrics are outlined in this plan and available in the appendix.

**3-Year Review Cycle**

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher." To comply, ISD #2144 will continue the three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes the following characteristics:

1) Teachers will receive a summative evaluation by an administrator no less than once every three years. This will be known as Year C.

2) The other two years (Known as Year A and Year B) the teacher will design an Individual Growth and Development Plan (IGDP), in which the teacher will set goal(s) and will meet with the administrator annually to review progress on their goals. ISD #2144 requires evaluation by a peer review in years when a continuing contract teacher is not evaluated by a summative evaluator.

## Individual Growth and Development Plans

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes a growth and development plan." To comply, ISD #2144 teachers will implement their Individual Growth and Development Plan (IGDP). The IGDP includes three parts:

1. Professional Growth Plan
2. Student Engagement
3. Student Learning Goal

**1. Professional Growth Plan**

The Professional Growth Plan (PGP) is a staff development tool that provides a clearly articulated plan of study that, when completed, results in the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that improve the professional proficiency of those using the plan (Appendix A). The plan must be aligned with District and building goals. The teacher's Professional Growth Plan will be discussed in the fall between the teacher and the administrative evaluator with final approval by the administrative evaluator. In the spring, the administrative evaluator and teacher meet again to review the PGP. The administrative evaluator will determine if the PGP is proficient or not.

- Proficient: teacher met with administrator and reflected on the PGP
- Not Proficient: teacher did not meet with administrator OR did not reflect on the PGP

Historical review of a teacher's PGP will be documented during the year C evaluation.

**2. Student Engagement**

Legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must use longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures aligned with curriculum for which teachers are responsible." To comply, ISD #2144 will assess student engagement through the Administrator Evaluation and the IGDP.

1) Administrator Evaluation - teachers in Year C of the 3-year cycle will be assessed on engagement.

2) IGDP - A separate reflective question regarding student engagement will be on the IGDP to be completed annually and discussed with the administrative evaluator in the fall and spring (Appendix B).

The Engagement component will be determined as proficient or not by the administrative evaluator.

- Proficient: teacher met with administrator and reflected on engagement
- Not Proficient: teacher did not meet with administrator OR did not reflect on engagement

Historical review of a teacher's Engagement Goal will be documented during the year C evaluation.

**3. Student Learning Goal**

The legislation requires that, "Teacher Evaluation must use data from valid and reliable assessments aligned to state and local academic standards and must use state and local measures of student growth and literacy that may include value-added models or student learning goals to determine 35 percent of teacher evaluation results." To comply, staff will choose a valid assessment (or multiple assessments) that measure student growth and/or proficiency as aligned to Minnesota academic standards (Appendix N).

In the fall of each school year, the administrative evaluator will meet and discuss the Student Learning Goal (SLG) developed by the teacher. Teachers will complete the Student Learning Goal (Appendix C) and share it with the administrative evaluator at the fall meeting, who will approve the Student Learning Goal.

In the spring of each school year, the administrative evaluator and teacher will meet to discuss if the Student Learning Goal was met. If the goal was not met, the teacher and administrative evaluator will discuss reasons the goal may not have been met and formulate a plan of action for the fall, which may include adding a goal in the PGP section of the IGDP. Student learning goals will be determined as proficient or not proficient:

- Proficient: teacher met or exceeded goal OR didn't meet the student learning goal but adequately reflected on goal and provided a rationale
- Not proficient: teacher did not provide a rationale for not meeting the goal

Historical review of a teacher's SLG will be documented during the year C evaluation.

## Peer Coaching

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each teacher that includes peer review." To comply, ISD #2144 requires evaluation by a peer review in years when a continuing contract teacher is not evaluated by a summative evaluator.

## Professional Learning Communities

The legislation requires that, “Teacher evaluation processes may include job-embedded learning opportunities such as professional learning communities.” To comply, ISD #2144 requires all teachers to participate in a Professional Learning Community as part of their professional responsibilities as monitored by their administrator.

## Summative Evaluations

The legislation requires that, “Teacher evaluation processes must include at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator.” To comply, for all continuing contract employees on the teacher contract, the supervising administrator will conduct the summative evaluation no less than every third year and will assess teacher competence on the evaluation rubric corresponding to their position as identified by the Chisago Lakes School District. “Qualified and trained evaluators” are defined as building administrators who hold a valid MN admin license.

Tenured teachers will have a choice between a formal, announced observation that includes pre and post observation questions or a walkthrough model (see Appendix D for the walkthrough process).

Rubrics

- Appendix E - Teacher Evaluation rubric
- Appendix F - Library/Media Center specialists rubric
- Appendix G - Technology Integration specialists rubric
- Appendix H - School nurse rubric
- Appendix I - School counselor rubric
- Appendix J - Dean of students rubric
- Appendix K - Instructional Coach rubric
- Appendix L - Wildcat Academy Coordinator rubric

Special education teachers will use the Teacher Evaluation Rubric for their classroom observation. Additionally, there will be an observation of an IEP meeting facilitation and teaming. See Appendix M for the Special Education Teacher Evaluation Process.

At the conclusion of the administrative evaluator’s summative evaluation a determination of proficiency will be made. Conclusions could be:

1) Teacher is proficient and remains on a continuing contract
   - Proficiency goal is reached when a teacher earns proficient or distinguished ratings in all eight power components.
   - Minimal expectations will allow for one rating of a Developing and no ratings of Unsatisfactory
   - If a teacher receives one score of Developing, they will revise their existing Professional Growth Plan to include this area.
2) Teacher needs self-correction phase to address concerns observed in the evaluation
3) Teacher may be Disciplined

**Self-Correction Phase:**

If the administrative evaluator's summative evaluation contains one or more scores of Unsatisfactory OR two or more scores of Developing (or any combination of either), a teacher will enter the self-correction phase. The purpose of the self-correction phase is for the tenured teacher and principal to collaborate and attempt to resolve the concern as noted by the administrative evaluation.

The following specific outcomes of the collaboration plan will be documented in writing:

1. What data will be collected to document resolution of the problem.
2. How data will be collected to document resolution of the problem.
3. An agreed timeframe will be established.
4. Follow up/check-in meetings may be scheduled throughout the timeframe.
5. Final meeting will coincide with the end of the timeframe to evaluate and review completion of all expectations laid out in improvement plan.
6. This document will be placed in the teacher's personnel folder.

At the end of the time frame, there will be a meeting in which the principal will review with the teacher observations, data, and documentation related to completion of expectations. The principal/supervisor will document the meeting, performance improvement and a copy will be placed in the personnel file.

The document must contain a final recommendation based on one of the following:

1. The teacher has shown growth and is performing at acceptable levels in the targeted areas and remains in the three-year professional review cycle.
2. The teacher remains in the three year-professional review cycle with added goal(s) within relevant domains to the teacher's Professional Growth Plan in the IGDP.
3. The teacher is performing below standard and requires assistance to be performing at standard, the teacher will be assigned to Chisago Lakes-Teacher Improvement Process (TIP). This document will be placed in the teacher's personnel folder.
4. The teacher's performance is judged to be so severely below standard that the progressive discipline article of the contract will apply, and the disciplinary phase will commence.

## Portfolios

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must allow teachers to present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth that includes teachers' own performance assessment." To comply, ISD #2144 will allow teacher portfolios. The portfolios may contain peer reviews, self reflections, self-assessment pertaining to professional growth goals, artifacts of teacher's work including lesson plans, student data including results of student learning goals and artifacts relating to individual building initiatives. The portfolio must demonstrate evidence of reflection and professional growth including the teacher's own performance assessment. The portfolio must be presented one week before the pre-conference with the administrative evaluator in Year C of the three-year cycle.

# Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) and Discipline

Minnesota Statutes, sections 122A.40 and 122A.41, state that the teacher evaluation model "must give teachers not meeting professional teaching standards…support to improve through a teacher improvement process that includes established goals and timelines; and must discipline a teacher for not making adequate progress in the teacher improvement process…"

The teacher improvement process is not discipline; rather, this process supports teacher improvement for a teacher identified by a summative evaluation as not meeting standards. A teacher who does not make adequate progress in this teacher improvement process is subject to discipline.

A teacher who receives one or more scores of Unsatisfactory OR two or more scores of Developing (or any combination of either), following the self-correction phase on a summative evaluation must enter the teacher improvement process. The purpose of the teacher improvement process is to provide support and assistance to teachers who are not meeting standards of performance. A teacher remains in the teacher improvement process until:

- The teacher improves in all areas identified in the improvement plan, or
- The teacher has had sufficient time and resources to meet performance standards and has not done so. [Note: The sufficiency of time and resources is intended to be flexible based on the plan established and the needs of the teacher. Should a district ultimately seek to terminate a teacher based on performance, arbitrators' decisions based on case law and statute (primarily M.S. 122A.40, Subdivision 9) have typically determined that sufficient time for improvement is a minimum of six months.] A district must discipline a teacher for not making adequate progress in a teacher improvement process.

In the case of improved performance, the teacher exits the teacher improvement process, re-enters the three year professional review cycle on Year C, and completes an individual growth and development plan.

## Roles and Responsibilities

**Role of the exclusive representative of teachers**
Constitutional, statutory, and contractual language ensures that due process is followed. The district is responsible for determining whether a teacher's performance is not meeting professional teaching standards and that the teacher must enter a teacher improvement process. A teacher retains his or her right to appeal being placed on the Teacher Improvement Process.

**Role of the district**
The district administration, on behalf of the board/school board, must assign or approve the summative evaluator who will lead the teacher improvement process.

**Role of coaching**
Licensed teachers, especially ones who are qualified and trained summative evaluators or peer reviewers, may play a role in supporting and coaching a teacher in the teacher improvement process.

A teacher may request, as part of his or her teacher improvement plan, the support of a coach during the teacher improvement process. This coach may serve in a coaching role. The identified coach may not be assigned this duty and will be compensated per local bargaining agreements. Should a coach be named, that coach may be involved in any meetings between the teacher and summative evaluator at the teacher's request. The coach will not evaluate the teacher or the teacher's progress in the teacher improvement process.

## Stages of TIP

### Awareness

Minnesota Statutes §122A.40 and §122A.41 require at least one summative evaluation for a teacher as part of the three-year professional review cycle. In this Model, a summative evaluation occurs once every three years. However, a district may conduct a summative evaluation at any time.

In cases in which a summative evaluator has determined that performance concerns warrant a summative evaluation before the final year of a teacher's three-year cycle, the teacher must be informed that the summative evaluator is collecting and reviewing evidence to conduct a summative evaluation and of any performance concerns.

If a summative evaluator has performance concerns about a teacher, that teacher must be made aware of those concerns. Summative evaluators must document concerns and share those concerns via a face-to-face meeting. Performance concerns should be documented and communicated as they occur and should not wait for summative conversations.

### Entrance

*Prerequisite:* A teacher who receives one or more scores of Unsatisfactory OR two or more scores of Developing (or any combination of either), following the unsuccessful self-correction phase on a summative evaluation

### *Step 1: Identify and communicate the area(s) of performance concern*

As follow-up to a teacher receiving one or more scores of Unsatisfactory OR two or more scores of Developing (or any combination of either), on the summative evaluation, the summative evaluator must make face-to-face contact with the teacher and document the performance concern(s) in writing, including

- An explanation of concerns identifying specific standards of teacher practice or student outcomes
- An outline of evidence supporting the concerns and the teacher's summative evaluation
- A request for a follow-up face-to-face meeting to discuss the concerns addressed above and the teacher improvement process, and to develop an improvement plan. The proposed meeting time should be within five school days of this notification. This request includes notification that the teacher may bring evidence related to the stated concern(s) to the meeting.

This written communication will also be placed in the teachers' personnel records.

The plan will specify the processes for how the teacher improvement process is implemented if the notified teacher is reassigned to another teaching assignment.

### *Step 2: Meet to set goals and time lines and to develop an improvement plan*

During the face-to-face meeting requested in step 1, the teacher and summative evaluator will collaborate to resolve identified performance concerns. The teacher may request a peer to actively participate in the development of the improvement plan. The following information must be documented in the plan:

- Area(s) of concern related to teacher practice and/or student outcomes
- Specific teacher actions or practices that will result in the teacher meeting standards
- Improvement goals. These goals must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-based, and time bound.
- Support strategies, which may include but are not limited to
    - Professional workshops or conferences
    - Books
    - Peer coaching, mentoring, or other forms of peer support
    - Teacher Assistance Teams
    - Additional evaluator or peer reviewer points of contact
    - Curriculum resources
    - Videos of classroom teaching
    - Targeted professional development
- Method(s) the summative evaluator will use to gather evidence of improvement. These may include specific activities as described in the evaluation model or others as described during this meeting.
- The type, form, and frequency of feedback the teacher will receive during this phase (e.g., regular meetings with the summative evaluator, regular written communications, evaluation observations, points of contact documentation, etc.)
- A time frame for formative feedback on progress as well as a summative assessment of progress. The summative assessment of teacher improvement results in a decision to exit the teacher from the teacher improvement process, modify the teacher improvement plan, or discipline a teacher. A meeting between the teacher and summative evaluator where the summative assessment of teacher improvement results will take place.

This document will be placed in the teacher's personnel record.

### *Step 3: Engage in the improvement plan*

While implementing the improvement plan, there are expectations for both the teacher and the summative evaluator.

*Expectations of the teacher*

- Participate in the activities identified in the plan developed in step 2
- Participate in the collection of evidence related to the measurable goals identified in step 2
- Be open and flexible in implementing different and/or refined strategies to improve his/her performance
- Maintain a proactive stance in his own professional improvement
- Engage in professional reflection ascertaining what is effective practice and what practice(s) need improvement
- Be responsible for maintaining anecdotal notes (if desired)
- Ask for clarifications from the principal, direct supervisor, an exclusive representative, or superintendent or designee when needed
- Be responsible for meeting deadlines, appointments, scheduled observations, and other agreed upon timelines

*Expectations of the summative evaluator*

- Provide feedback and support opportunities identified in step 2
- Give encouragement and informal support for improvement of performance
- Be open and available for clarification at the teacher's requests
- Monitor the teacher's performance for improvement

### *Step 4: Assess results of the improvement plan*

At the end of the plan and the time frame established in step 2, the teacher, the summative evaluator, and any peer named in the process will meet to assess progress of the teacher toward resolving the area of concern. The assessment of progress will be documented in writing, following the plan and goals developed in step 2. The summative evaluator has authority to make a final determination in the event the parties disagree.

This document will be placed in the teacher's personnel record.

*Evidence to review*

- Teacher's personnel file
- Agreed upon improvement plan with measurable goals in the assistance and support phase
- Documentation of the measures of progress aligned with the goals
- Additional evidence that the teacher wants considered
- Documentation of meetings with the Teacher Assistance Team, if established (see optional support strategies below)
- Description of the recommendations and support provided by the Teacher Assistance Team, if established
- Evidence collected by the summative evaluator
- Evidence collected at the discretion of the summative evaluator
- Past summative evaluations may be considered

*Criteria for decision-making*

- Progress toward meeting the goals identified for improvement in the improvement plan
- Current performance level (consideration for past performance may be given)

At the conclusion of the meeting, one of the following determinations will be made by the summative evaluator about the teacher's status:

- Exit the teacher improvement process. The teacher writes an individual growth and development plan and re-enters the three-year professional review cycle at Year C; the teacher must receive a summative evaluation within three years of his or her last summative evaluation.
- Revise or begin a new improvement plan, repeating steps 1-4 in the assistance and support phase. This could include discipline for a teacher for not making adequate progress, at the district's discretion, under Minnesota statutes 120A.40, subdivision 8, clause 12 and 122A.41, subdivision 5, clause 12.
- Discipline a teacher for not making adequate progress in the teacher improvement process. Discipline may include a last chance warning, termination, discharge, nonrenewal, transfer to a different position, a leave of absence, or other discipline a school administrator determines is appropriate.

**Discipline**

MN Statutes 120A.40 and 120A.41 state that discipline "may include a last chance warning, termination, discharge, nonrenewal, transfer to a different position, a leave of absence, or other discipline a school administrator determines is appropriate."

Should a district discipline a teacher for failing to make adequate progress in the teacher improvement process, the district must follow board policies and teacher contract language established in the school district as well as state statutes.

# Non-Tenured/Probationary Employees

Probationary employees will follow the same parameters of evaluations as above except as noted here. (Probationary teachers are not eligible for TIP).

## Probationary Review Cycle

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must provide the requisite evaluations for probationary teachers—three evaluations annually with the first within 90 days of employment." To comply, ISD #2144 will continue its past practice of conducting three evaluations each year of probationary staff, with the first taking place within 90 calendar days of employment. Probationary teachers will be evaluated on the Teacher Evaluation Rubric for all three years. Probationary teachers will be evaluated with the formal observation model and will not have a choice for a walk-through observation.

## Mentoring

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes may include mentoring and induction programs." To comply, ISD #2144 will mentor probationary staff according to the Chisago Lakes Mentoring Handbook.

# Staff Development Practices

The legislation requires that, "Teacher evaluation processes must coordinate staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes." To comply, ISD #2144 will support the continuation of the District Improvement Team to identify district instructional goals. These goals will be shared with each School Improvement Team for building level implementation.

# Conclusion

The legislation has provided the opportunity for the administrators and staff of ISD #2144 to work collaboratively to define the terms of evaluation. It is the hope of TDEP committee that the principals and teachers will work collaboratively to implement this new evaluation plan with the overall goal being an increase in student achievement from year to year.

# Appendices

Appendix A: Professional Growth Plan (PGP)

Appendix B: Engagement Goal

Appendix C: Student Learning Goal (SLG)

Appendix D: Walk-Through Model

Appendix E: Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Appendix F: Library/Media Center Specialists Rubric

Appendix G: Technology Integrationist Specialists Rubric

Appendix H: School Nurse Rubric

Appendix I: School Counselor Rubric

Appendix J: School Dean Rubric

Appendix K: Instructional Coach Rubric

Appendix L: Wildcat Academy Coordinator Rubric

Appendix M: SPED Evaluation Process

Appendix N: MN Academic Standards