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Administrative Code

The most important document in this training is the Administrative Code. Please print these and bring them with you to your PERA Committee meetings.

The code, or “rules,” covered in this training can be found here:


Click [here](http://www.ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/023/023000500C02300R.html) for the full rules for PERA
Compliance Checklist

Some districts have been required to implement the new rules earlier than others. The following checklist has been developed as a guide to help districts through this process.

**PERA Evaluation Compliance Evidence Checklist**

*Based On: Illinois Administrative Code Subpart B: Performance Evaluation Plans*

[http://www.isbe.state.il.us/rules/archive/pdfs/50ARK.pdf](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/rules/archive/pdfs/50ARK.pdf)
Introduction to PERA and SB 7

See the ISBE Website for the following:

- An overview of the law and its implementation
- Latest news
- Implementation guidance
- Additional resources
Mandatory Bargaining

- Existence, number and timing of formative evaluations
- Number of summative evaluations above minimum and timing of such evaluations
- Existence, number, length and timing of informal observations
- Existence and timing of post-informal observation feedbackconference, including whether feedback provided in writing.
- **Prior to a district's PERA implementation date, there is no legal requirement that a formal observation be of any particular length. However, beginning with the district's PERA implementation date, a formal observation must involve either: a) observation of the teacher in his/her classroom for a minimum of 45 minutes at a time; b) observation of the teacher during a complete lesson; or c) observation of the teacher during an entire class period.
- Number of formal observations above minimum, length and timing
- Existence, length and timing of conference prior to formal observation
- Existence and timing of opportunity for teacher to submit lesson plan, etc. and recommend areas for evaluator to focus upon prior to pre-formal observation conference
- Existence, length and timing of post-formal observation conference
- Videotaping of observations
- **Potential Illinois Student Records Act, FERPA (if identification of students is a possibility) and Eavesdropping Act issues.
- When, within the 30 school day period, the Professional Development Plan (PDP) is developed
- Length or range of lengths for PDPs
- Whether a formative or summative evaluation occurs at the end of a PDP or within x days/weeks/months of its completion
- What, if any, observations occur during a PDP
- List of possible supports for teacher on a PDP, including funding for supports
- Modification of teacher's on-going professional responsibilities while on a PDP
- Existence and substance of professional development plans (PDP) for non-tenured teachers who receive needs improvement rating (NI)
- Remediation evaluations in addition to mid-point and final
- Longer than 90 day remediation period
- Internal appeal of evaluation ratings
- Earlier PERA implementation date
- Informal meetings of PERA joint committee
Permissive Bargaining

- Who evaluates
- Using bargaining unit members to do peer evaluations **Unlike other permissive subjects of bargaining, using bargaining unit members as peer evaluators cannot be implemented by an employer unless agreed to in writing by the union.
- Instructional framework for assessing teacher practice, i.e., Danielson, etc.
- Areas in which teacher rated above those already set forth in law, i.e., attendance, planning, classroom management, etc.
- Rubric or criteria used in rating teacher practice
- How overall teacher performance rating is determined
- Application of contractual grievance/arbitration procedure to substantive evaluation issues
- Expanded role for the joint PERA committee, including role once new evaluation process implemented
What Leaders Need to Know

• This is NOT traditional bargaining.
• This is a chance (and it is required) for associations to put their voice in the room.
• Collaboration is required and in districts where this is argued or where the administration believes they can seek outside help “first” or do some work without the association “before” official committee work begins please ask for a discussion of the Administrative Code Part 50 and then seek help from IEA, ROE, and/or ISBE.
• Teachers know best what constitutes student growth – don’t be afraid to embrace that.
• Make it simple.
• You can use parts of the state default model without using all of it, but if you use that as your base be careful – it will be easy for districts to just use the whole thing.
• Your association has a president who is the conduit to the student growth committee. A district does not get to choose other association committees – why would they choose this one?
• Once chosen, this committee will make the final decisions concerning how student growth will affect teacher evaluation. This is not subject to Board of Education approval. This is important.
Using Consensus

Decision Making Methods and Results
• Majority Vote = May Split Group
• Consensus = Unity, Feedback and Builds Support

Consensus Guidelines
• Don’t Trade or Bargain
• Don’t Vote
• Don’t Compete for Individual Ideas
• Treat Differences as Strengths

Consensus Summary
• Get All Ideas Out
• Allow Time for Discussion
• Listen with an Open Mind
• Share Information

Consensus Ladder
AGREE COMPLETELY
CAN LIVE WITH THE DECISION
DO NOT AGREE AND WILL BLOCK
Consensus Activity

Here’s a great activity to use with your PERA Committee.

Worksheet

Answers
Joint Committees Related to Teacher Evaluation

There are four functions of joint administration/union committees that relate to teacher evaluation. Two of these—bargaining the substance of evaluation plans and bargaining procedures for evaluation and remediation plans—have been permitted since the IELRA became effective in 1984. The other two—incorporating student growth into evaluation plans and setting criteria to determine reduction in force order based partially on final evaluation ratings—are required by recent changes to the School Code.

This chart shows the four functions of joint evaluation-related committees and the different concepts that must be applied in order to differentiate each of the functions.
PERA Joint Committee: What it is and What it is Not

The center of this chart outlines the work that the PERA Joint Committee is responsible for.

The work of this committee is not to be confused with the parallel work that is going on with other committees, which is displayed on the outside of the chart.

IEA Lombard UniServ directors came up with a trifold table tent to illustrate that you may have the same people sitting on different committees or there may be different people. All the while, everyone must be thinking what is subject to bargaining.
## Multiple Measures

### Ratings with Multiple Measures

#### Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type I / II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category A:</strong> Elementary Grades 3-8 English, Reading and/ or Math</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category B:</strong> Elementary PreK-Grade 2</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category C:</strong> Elementary Grade 3-8 of non-tested Type I subjects (science, social studies, fine arts, physical education, technology, librarians, instructional coach)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category D:</strong> High School English, Math, Science, Social Studies</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category E:</strong> High School not English, Math, Science, Social Studies</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category F:</strong> Counselors, Psychologists, Social Workers, Speech and Language Pathologists</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurement Models

This training is not designed to go deep into each and every measurement model that is available. The Lombard UniServ directors found the following training from ISBE to be helpful in providing information on the various measurement models available to you.

**Student Growth Conversation:**  
**Various Models of Measuring Student Growth**  
IEA PERA Workgroup Roundtable  
Bloomington, IL  
May 13, 2014  
Diana Zaleski, Ph.D.
Teacher Growth and Professional Practice Cycle

Teachers will be evaluated on different cycles, depending upon whether they are tenure or non-tenure.

The following charts illustrate what each of these cycles look like.
CEC’s Approach to Joint Committee Work

The Consortium for Educational Change is working with all stakeholders on PERA implementation.

The following document was devised in order to assist the Committee with its work in order to gain a clearer understanding both the scope and the sequence of the PERA Committee’s work.
ITED’s Breakdown of Issues and Decision Points

Another group working to assist with the implementation of PERA, is ITED.

You can register on the ITED Site to receive the full guidebook.

An extract of the guidebook was provided at our training. It provides deeper insight into the issues and decision points that should be considered as you are developing your evaluation plan.
Getting Started: The Committee

• The committee must decide on at least 2 types of assessments (Type I, II or III) for each category of teacher.

• The decision must include at least 1 Type I or II and at least one Type III.

• The committee may determine that 2 Type III’s can be used by a specific teacher (or category of teachers) if no Type I or II is identified.

• Identify the process/criteria for specific Type III assessment – this will include how the evaluator or colleagues will oversee the assessment.
# Example of Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class/Teacher Assessments</th>
<th>Type I State Assessments given state-wide</th>
<th>Type II District assessments give district-wide</th>
<th>Type III Classroom assessments created by the teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blake/4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>District assessment on 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade math indicators from Envision Math</td>
<td>Division test following two weeks of practice on division facts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Understanding Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I Assessment</th>
<th>Type II Assessment</th>
<th>Type III Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment that:</td>
<td>Any assessment that:</td>
<td>Any assessment that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures a certain group or groups of students in the same manner with the same</td>
<td>• Is developed or adopted and approved for use by the school district.</td>
<td>• Is rigorous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential assessment items.</td>
<td>• Is used on a district-wide basis by all educators in a given grade or subject</td>
<td>• Is aligned to the courses’s curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is scored by a non-district entity.</td>
<td>area.</td>
<td>• The qualified evaluator and educator have determined measures student learning in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is administered either statewide or beyond Illinois.</td>
<td></td>
<td>that course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Type I or Type II assessment may qualify as a Type III assessment if it aligns to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the curriculum and measures student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Examples of Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I Assessment</th>
<th>Type II Assessment</th>
<th>Type III Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWEA, Scantron Performance Series, STAR Reading, SAT, AP and IB, ACTs EPAS System.</td>
<td>Collaboratively developed common assessments, curriculum tests, or those designed by textbook publishers.</td>
<td>Educator-created assessments, those designed by textbook publishers, student work samples or portfolios, assessments of student performance, assessments designed by staff who are subject or grade-level experts that are given commonly across a grade or subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** While the current state assessments (ISAT, PSAE, IAA) may be used as a Type I assessment, the State Board and ISBE highly recommend that it not be used as it is not a test designed to measure student growth. Also, while SAT is noted in the law as a Type I assessment, it is an aptitude test and not meant to be used to measure growth.
A Staircase of Users and Uses for Assessment Tools

USER: STATE/NATION
TYPE I ASSESSMENT: SUMMATIVE
EXAMPLES: STATE TEST, NATIONAL TESTS
DEVELOPED BY: VENDOR
PURPOSE: HIGH STAKES COMPARISONS

USER: DISTRICT/SCHOOL
TYPE I OR TYPE II ASSESSMENT: SUMMATIVE
EXAMPLES: BENCHMARK, END-OF-UNIT
DEVELOPED BY: VENDOR OR DISTRICT COMMITTEES
PURPOSE: EVALUATE CURRICULUM AND PROGRAMS, MONITOR GRADE LEVEL AND SUB-GROUP PROGRESS, ADDRESS STRATEGIC GOALS/DISTRICT TARGETS

USER: TEAM/DEPARTMENT (TEACHER, STUDENT, PARENT)
TYPE II OR TYPE III ASSESSMENT: SUMMATIVE AND FORMATIVE
EXAMPLES: COMMON UNIT AND/OR DIAGNOSTIC, PRE/POST
DEVELOPED BY: TEAM/DEPARTMENT, TEXTBOOK PUBLISHER
PURPOSE: MONITOR GRADE LEVEL/DEPARTMENT PROGRESS, DETERMINE INTERVENTION NEEDS, BUILD COMMON EXPECTATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS ACROSS THE TEAM/DEPARTMENT, EVIDENCE OF STUDENT GOALS ACHIEVEMENT

USER: CLASSROOM (TEACHER, STUDENT, PARENT)
TYPE III ASSESSMENT: SUMMATIVE AND FORMATIVE
EXAMPLES: UNIT TESTS, CHAPTER TESTS, QUIZZES, OBSERVATIONS, DISCUSSIONS ANECDOTAL NOTES, CONFERENCES, PRE/POST TESTS, DIAGNOSTIC, QUICK WRITES, EXIT SLIPS, OTHER QUICK LESSON CHECKS
DEVELOPED BY: TEACHER, TEXTBOOK PUBLISHER
PURPOSE: MONITOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AND CLASS PROGRESS, INSTRUCTIONAL DECISION MAKING (i.e., focused lessons, reteach, extend, instructional grouping, etc.)
Discussion: Opportunities and Risks

The attendees of the training broke out into small groups to discuss both the **opportunities and the risks** of the different types of assessments.
Student Learning Objectives (SLO)

This training was designed to provide a general overview and examples of SLOs.

The following templates and examples were provided.

SLO Blank Template
SLO Completed (4th Grade Math)

For more information on SLOs, including completed templates for other categories of teachers, please visit the ISBE website. (scroll down to the “student growth” category)
The State ‘default’ Model

We strongly recommend that you refer to the actual statute throughout the process of making decisions in your committee.

If at any point the committee cannot come to a consensus about a particular part of your plan, the state ‘default’ model will be in effect.

The following sections apply:

Administrative Code_50.220 (SLO PROCESS)
Administrative Code_50.210 (COMPONENTS OF THE STATE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MODEL)
Administrative Code_50.230 (PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING)
## SAMPLE FINAL RATING

IF NO JOINT COMMITTEE AGREEMENT ON OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING

- **State Default Model**
  - 50% Professional Practice
  - 50% Student Growth

### Performance Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratings Explained:
- **Unsatisfactory**
- **Needs Improvement**
- **Proficient**
- **Excellent**
## SAMPLE FINAL RATING

75% Professional Practice  
25% Student Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25% Student Growth</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE FINAL RATING
70% Professional Practice
30% Student Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30% Student Growth</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Proficient</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Excellent</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calculating a Summative Rating – Example #1

In this example, the teacher receives an overall Professional Practice rating of “Needs Improvement” and a Student Growth rating of “Proficient”. The final Summative Rating is “Needs Improvement.”

70% Professional Practice

2 Needs Improvement

2 x .70 = 1.40

30% Student Growth

3 Proficient

3 x .30 = .90

SUMMATIVE RATING

2.0 Needs Improvement

1.40 + .90 = 2.30

Since 2.30 is less than 2.50, you round down to 2.0.

RATINGS SYSTEM

Unsatisfactory = 1    Needs Improvement = 2    Proficient = 3    Excellent = 4
Calculating a Summative Rating – Examples #2

Unsatisfactory = 1  Needs Improvement = 2  Proficient = 3  Excellent = 4

In this example, the teacher receives an overall Professional Practice rating of “Needs Improvement” and a Student Growth rating of “Proficient.” The final Summative Rating for a teacher with a 3.0 is “Proficient.”

50% PROFessional PRACTICE

\[
\frac{2 \text{ Needs Improvement}}{2.0 \times 0.50 = 1.0}
\]

50% STUDENT GROWTH

\[
\frac{3 \text{ Proficient}}{3 \times 0.50 = 1.50}
\]

SUMMATIVE RATING

\[
1.0 + 1.50 = 2.50
\]

You round up from .50 and above, so 2.50 becomes 3.0.
Calculating a Summative Rating Worksheet

These examples are provided in a worksheet, along with spaces on the second page to provide you with an opportunity to practice with your plan.

Please remember to either round up or down! 😊
3 Scenarios

The training attendees broke out into groups to review and discuss the following scenarios, using a worksheet to guide the discussions.
Master Links List

Senate Bill 7
Trailer Bill
Administrative Code (see sections 50.110, 50.210, 50.220, 50.230)
Educator License Information System (ELIS)
Growth through Learning Illinois
Illinois State Board of Education
Illinois Teacher Evaluation and Development (ITED)
Performance Evaluation Advisory Council
Education Reform in Illinois
Illinois Professional Teaching Standards
Decision Points Timeline

**Decision Points** for Student Growth Committee

**August 2015**

- **Committee**
- **Statute**
- **Skills Processes Functions**

**October**

- **Assessments**
  - Type
  - Student Characteristic
  - Learning goal

**November**

- **Calculations**
  - Student Growth
  - Teacher Evaluations

**Winter Break**

- **Communication**

**March**

- **Student Growth**

**June**

- **Summative Rating**
  - E
  - P
  - NI
  - U

**August 2016**

- **Roundtable**
  - Sept 24
  - Feb 22
  - April 19

All decisions are made by consensus.
Questions? Concerns?

For any additional questions or concerns, please contact your UniServ director.