

PA 173: Educator Evaluation

On-line Reporting Requirements: What You Need to Know

PA 173 requires all school districts and public school academies to post certain information about their educator evaluation practices on their websites. The Michigan Department of Education has stipulated that the required postings should be placed behind the “transparency mitten” at or near the bottom of the transparency page.

By law, districts/PSAs are required to post the following information and assurances for teacher and administrator evaluation tools:

- The name of the evaluation tool; its framework and rubrics
- Research base for the evaluation framework, instrument, and process
- Identity and qualifications of the author
- Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy
- Description of processes for conducting observations, collecting evidence conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans
- Description of the plan for providing evaluators and observers with training

Section 1249, subsection 5 of the legislation lists four approved teacher evaluation models and two approved administrator evaluation models that meet the requirements for efficacy required under the law. They are:

For teachers:

- Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching
- The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model
- The Thoughtful Classroom
- The 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning

For administrators:

- MASA’s School Advance Administrator Evaluation Instrument
- The Multidimensional Leadership Performance System (formerly known as The Reeves Leadership Performance Rubric)

Districts/PSAs are permitted to use locally approved tools or modifications of the above tools but must then post the required information and assurances for these tools. Along with the assurances, the identity and credentials of the author(s) or reviewer with expertise is needed.

To aid districts/PSAs, MDE has worked with the vendors of the six approved tools and has made available links that, if posted on a district’s/PSA’s website, satisfy the requirements of the law. (Exceptions are noted below.) These links can be found here:

[PLEASE NOTE MDE DIRECTIONS FOR LINKS. SOME REQUIRE ADDITIONAL STEPS TO ACCESS THE ACTUAL LINK TO THE ASSURANCES.](#)

State-approved Teacher Evaluation Tools

- [Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching](#) (refer to right hand navigation bar and scroll to the very bottom for link to Michigan’s assurances...download the assurances document...this is the document that needs to be posted)
- [The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model](#)
- [The Thoughtful Classroom](#)
- [The 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning](#)

State-approved Administrator Evaluation Tools

- [MASA's School Advance Administrator Evaluation Instrument](#) **(must complete on-line request to access assurances link.)**
- [Multidimensional Leadership Performance System](#) (formerly known as Reeves Leadership Performance Rubric) **(Click on red "Postings and Assurances" button...complete and post that document.)**

For other models or modified models, MDE has provided templates districts can use to post their assurances. Those templates can be found here:

- [Michigan Educator Evaluation Postings and Assurances, Teacher Evaluation Tool: Blank Template for District-Approved Tool](#)
- [Michigan Educator Evaluation Postings and Assurances, Administrator Evaluation Tool: Blank Template for District-Approved Tool](#)

Please note that the MASB Superintendent Evaluation tool has not been approved by MDE. A link to their assurances, however, can be found here:

<http://masb.org/postingrequirements>

Required Posting for: LEA Evaluation Process and LEA Training Plan

MDE has determined that if posted correctly, four of these six links satisfy all of the requirements to meet the letter of the law, including the description of the process used for evaluations and the training plan because they are included in the links as the generalized processes and training requirements. The exceptions are Marzano and the Multidimensional Leadership System (Reeves). The information in the Marzano link refers to an "accompanying district document" for that information and the former Reeves model is missing the information on training. Districts will need to add this information to their website posting.

While posting these links (with the exceptions above) meets compliance, MDE recommends that districts also post a more localized document describing their evaluation processes and their training plans.

Here are some examples where districts have incorporated localized evaluation process and training plans into their on-line postings:

<http://www.westottawa.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/West-Ottawa-Evaluations-for-Teachers-and-Administrators.pdf>

http://www.godfrey-lee.org/uploads/6/1/2/2/6122679/teacher_evaluation_disclosures.pdf

https://www.munetrix.com/app_assets/docs/school_transparency/Process%20for%20Teacher%20Evaluations%20-%20LCS-1154-1481650528-3752.pdf

Posting the ISD-wide training plan approved by all districts for purposes of securing the educator evaluation grant funding is another way of satisfying the localized training plan posting for the first year. Your ISD should be able to provide the link.

Here's an example:

<http://www.alleganaesa.org/cms/lib07/MI01908021/Centricity/Domain/26/EdEvalCost10.5.16.pdf>

For Marzano districts, here's an example of how one district posted its evaluation process:

http://www.oaisd.org/downloads/human_resources/evaluation_process.pdf

For Marzano and Multidimensional Leadership System districts, here's an example of how one district posted its training plan:

http://www.oaisd.org/downloads/human_resources/educator_evaluation_training.pdf

But if the more localized LEA evaluation process and LEA training plan are only recommendations, why should a district/PSA post them?

If a school district/PSA ever intends to use PA 173 as the basis for a personnel action, it will want to make sure it has crossed every "t" and dotted every "i" in terms of compliance with the law. In a legal challenge, a district/PSA will likely need to defend that all teachers/administrators understood when and how they would be observed and evaluated, that all evaluators had received training in that process from qualified trainers and that all those being evaluated were also trained in the model. A district will likely have to verify dates and times for that training and how it shared the model and process with teachers and administrators/superintendents being evaluated. By posting the required assurances, local evaluation processes and training schedule, districts have created at least one easy and verifiable access to the information.