



**MILWAUKEE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**Educator Effectiveness:
*System Guide for Teachers***

Start. Stay. Succeed.
Comienza. Quédate. Triunfa.

2020-21

Table of Contents

Educator Effectiveness Mission and Vision.....	2
Purpose of the Educator Effectiveness System.....	2
From Evaluation to Effectiveness.....	2
Continuous Improvement	2
Overview of the Educator Effectiveness System.....	3
The EE System: Teacher Groups Included.....	3
Other Roles in the Effectiveness System.....	3
The Effectiveness Cycle.....	4
The Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP).....	5
Reflection and Goal Setting.....	5
Professional Practice Goal (PPG).....	5
Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)	5
Cloud-Based Platforms.....	6
Frontline Education.....	6
Single Sign-on.....	6
EE Google Site	6
Identifying the Effectiveness Cycle	6
Embedded Collaboration	7
Announced Observations.....	7
Pre-Observation Conference.....	7
Classroom Observations	8
Post-Observation Conference	9
A Year at a Glance	10
Educator Effectiveness System Timelines	10
Beginning of the Year.....	10
Mid-Interval Review.....	10
End of the Year.....	10
Supporting Year.....	10
Summary Year	11
Systems of Support	12
When a Teacher’s Practice Is Unsatisfactory	14
Appeal Process – Unsatisfactory Evaluation – MPS Employee Handbook Complaint Procedure.....	15
Appendix A — Working Glossary Educator Effectiveness.....	16

Educator Effectiveness Mission and Vision

Educator Effectiveness Team Mission

The Educator Effectiveness team serves to help teachers and administrators to develop, grow, and strengthen their skills, knowledge, and abilities as educators to maximize learning and achievement for all students within the Milwaukee Public Schools district.

Educator Effectiveness Team Vision

The Educator Effectiveness team seeks to build a system to strengthen professional practices to increase the impact of those practices on student achievement. Bolstered by a transformative coaching model, our priority is to help educators grow and develop through a comprehensive system of support and collaborative partnerships to maximize the culture of adult inquiry and learning.

Purpose of the Educator Effectiveness System

Effective teachers and school leaders have proven to be the most influential factors in student learning. The district is improving educator effectiveness through a system of support to cultivate professional practices for improving student outcomes. The Educator Effectiveness (EE) System is the result of a long-standing collaboration between the district and the Milwaukee Teachers' Education Association.

From Evaluation to Effectiveness

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System requires all educators, teachers, and administrators alike to make a shift to engage in a continuous cycle and systematic professional growth. This shift transformed compliance-based evaluation processes that were periodic and offered little in the way of increasing an educator's capacity. The EE System highlights include the following:

- ▶ A system focused on teachers taking responsibility for growing professional practices to meet the needs of their students
- ▶ Annual participation in a self-review of practices, goal setting, and assessment of progress
- ▶ A collaborative culture grounded in trust where administrators and teachers commit to be side-by-side learners

Continuous Improvement

Teaching is complex. The EE System respects this complexity, and the design of this model aims to involve educators meaningfully in a process of reflection and assessment of teaching practices, supporting teachers as they continue to grow throughout their careers. The EE System relies on information resulting from processes such as self-review, classroom observational data, and student assessments, and is grounded in the common language found in the narrative descriptions and rubrics of The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013). These, coupled with professional conversations, help teachers grow in their day-to-day instructional practices as a part of school and district continuous improvement.

The Educator Effectiveness System is:

- ▶ designed to support continuous improvement for all teachers at every stage of their careers;
- ▶ differentiated in its approach;
- ▶ defined by a common definition of quality teaching as described in The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013);
- ▶ aligned to district improvement efforts;
- ▶ grounded in self-reflection and meaningful professional conversations; and
- ▶ focused on practices over the course of time and the impact of

Overview of the Educator Effectiveness System

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) includes both professional practices and student outcomes when considering educator effectiveness (see Figure 2 – Educator Effectiveness Plan [EEP], page 5). [The Framework for Teaching, \(Danielson, 2013\)](#) provides the criteria upon which the DPI assesses professional practices. The basis for student outcomes relies on teacher-developed Student Learning Objectives (SLO). The purpose of the EEP process is to emphasize the importance of the goal-setting process, implement a balanced assessment system, and develop the ability of teachers to stretch and measure student progress toward the identified goal.

The EE System: Teacher Groups Included

The EE System, legislated by Wisconsin Act 166 in 2011, addresses both principals and teachers. The DPI recognizes that teacher roles may look different in various local contexts, allowing districts to decide which roles it defines as “teachers.” For the purposes of the Wisconsin EE System, and established under §118.40, a teacher is any employee engaged in the exercise of any educational function for compensation in public schools, including charter schools.

The following teacher roles **WILL** be in the Educator Effectiveness System (2020-21):

- ▶ Regular and special education teachers
- ▶ Art, music, and physical education specialists
- ▶ ELL or bilingual teachers
- ▶ Coaches (SSTs, AGRs, teacher leaders, teacher mentors) *
- ▶ Speech and language pathologists *

** Will follow a Wisconsin Evaluation Framework that articulates best practices for their specific roles but that parallels the EE System for teachers.*

The EE System, in its current design, does not align to all teachers in specialized roles. The district will continue to work with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction in exploring the application and use of frameworks developed for teachers in specialized roles.

The following teacher roles **WILL NOT** be in the Educator Effectiveness System (2020–21):

- ▶ Itinerant teachers and substitute teachers
- ▶ Transition coordinators

Other Roles in the Effectiveness System

Several other roles are in the effectiveness system, including social workers, school psychologists, guidance counselors, occupational and physical therapists, library media specialists, and school nurses. They will follow a Wisconsin Evaluation Framework that articulates best practices for their specific roles but that parallels the EE System for teachers. Responsibility for evaluation lies with the supervisors of the respective departments. School-based administrators are invited to observe and give feedback for these specialist roles. However, principals are responsible for conducting one Mini-Observation for social workers.

The Effectiveness Cycle


In the EE System, teachers are either in a Supporting Year or a Summary Year. The EE System goes beyond an evaluation process to assist professionals in developing professionally through inquiry and learning-focused conversations in both Supporting and Summary Years.

In a Supporting Year, colleagues develop goals for the Educator Effectiveness Plan, and they self-assess their progress. In a Summary Year, teachers develop goals collaboratively with principals or a designated evaluator who will ultimately develop both Teacher Practices Scores and a Student Learning Objective Holistic Score at the end of the Summary Year. Final scores include data from the Supporting Years (when available) and the Summary Year to triangulate multiple measures throughout an Effectiveness Cycle.

MPS teachers will be in a Summary Year each of their first three years of employment and every third year thereafter. Teachers identified by Human Resources as intern or permit teachers will be in a Provisional License, one-year cycle evaluation type.

Educators planning to resign or retire at the end of a year must still complete their EEP processes. Educators will remain in front of students for the remainder of the year and, as such, must focus on continuous improvement for the duration of that year.

Figure 1 - The Educator Effectiveness Cycle - Supporting Years and Summary Years




Note: Teachers hired on or after January 1 of the current school year will be assigned a mid-year evaluation type in Frontline Education. These teachers must complete a Self-Review in Frontline and Principals (or a designee) are expected to conduct a Mini-Observation to gather data on teaching practices and to inform coaching conversations.

The Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP)

The Educator Effectiveness Plan is composed of two goals: A Student Learning Objective (SLO) and Professional Practice Goal (PPG). These two goals work together in the Educator Effectiveness System to connect ways that will strengthen professional practices for improving student outcomes.

Reflection and Goal Setting

The Educator Effectiveness System is grounded in reflection, goal setting, and professional growth. At the beginning of every school year, all teachers complete the **Teacher Self-Review** to identify areas of strength and focus in developing goals for professional practices and student learning. Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013) provides the foundation for both the self-review and the PPG. Student baseline data is the foundation for developing an annual SLO. Teachers should consider how the PPG will support the students in reaching the target goal identified in the SLO (see Figure 2 – Educator Effectiveness Plan, below) when developing the EEP.



Professional Practice Goal (PPG)

The self-review, based on the domains and components of The Framework for Teaching, provides focus for the PPG. In addition to the goal itself, the PPG includes strategies and actions to support professional growth toward this goal. The planned professional growth could be evidenced through an academic SLO reliant on teacher practices and demonstrated by student achievement. The PPG will help teachers focus their efforts in structuring future professional learning and growth.

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

Student Learning Objectives are rigorous, achievable **academic goals** developed collaboratively (teachers with colleagues in Supporting Years and teachers with their evaluators in Summary Years). It is recommended the SLO interval reflect the duration of time an educator is responsible for planning, instructing, and/or assessing students. The interval includes time to administer and review the results of the assessments. Intervals are typically year-long or semester-long. Rationale must be provided for instances of shorter intervals. Teachers will develop a minimum of one SLO annually.

Cloud-Based Platforms

Through the use of cloud-based platforms, the EE System seeks to increase transparency, provide two-way communication, and offer timely feedback. When using the web-based application, Frontline Education, be sure to use Google Chrome as your browser for increased functionality.

Frontline Education



Educators and evaluators complete all activities and tasks for the Educator Effectiveness System in a cloud-based platform. All teachers in the EE System will use Frontline Education to complete the Educator Effectiveness Plan, as well as all other activities of the EE System that align to their Effectiveness Cycles and the assigned evaluation types. Frontline Education is a secure data management system where teachers and administrators upload classroom observation data, artifacts, and evidence to demonstrate current practice, as well as provide artifacts and evidence of the process and progress and toward the SLO. All data stored in Frontline Education is confidential and password protected.

Single Sign-on

A current MPS username and password (Office 365) is needed to log into Frontline Education. You will never a need to change a password in Frontline Education. If you change your district password, Frontline Education will integrate your new password automatically.

EE Google Site

Teachers and administrators can access the EE Google site to find a single source of information, access professional development materials, and find timely updates concerning the EE process and the Frontline platform. Staff must have an MPS Google account to access the site. Staff should use Google Chrome to access the link: <https://sites.google.com/milwaukee.k12.wi.us/eeresources/mps-ee-home>

Identifying the Effectiveness Cycle

All teachers (Summary and Supporting Year) can determine quickly where they are in an effectiveness cycle by logging into Frontline Education, opening the evaluation displaying the current date (e.g., Evaluation 08/01/2020 – 06/30/2021), and reviewing the Evaluation Type.

The following evaluation types are Summary Year:

- Teacher – Provisional License
- New Teacher Year 1 – Summary Year
- New Teacher Year 2 – Summary Year
- New Teacher Year 3 – Summary Year
- Teacher – Summary Year

The following evaluation types are Supporting Year:

- Supporting Year 1
- Supporting Year 2

Evaluators may decide that teachers should be placed into an additional Summary or Evaluation Year. Note that this will not alter the new Evaluation Cycle in the Frontline platform.


Embedded Collaboration

Announced Observations

The Announced Observation provides information and an opportunity to individualize the Educator Effectiveness System. It can also support a culture of trust and transparency among staff and administrators through collaboration, coaching conversations, and professional inquiry. The pre-observation conference and the post-observation conference exemplify these essential structures.

Professional learning hinges upon accurate and meaningful conversations about teaching practices. For this reason, the Collaborative Observation Process is central to the Educator Effectiveness System. These conferences build a mutual understanding and provide an appropriate environment for constructive dialogue in which both verbal and written communication are ongoing. The assigned evaluator will schedule and host both a pre-observation conference and a post-observation conference for all Announced Observations.

Figure 3 - Collaborative Observation Process



Pre-Observation Conference

The pre-observation conference is a critical step to help inform the evaluator and to frame the observation with more detail. The conference provides the teacher with the opportunity to offer valuable input on the observation and participation in the EE System. The opportunity to identify the context of the classroom, the specifics of the lesson, and intended outcomes are critical for meaningful reflecting and coaching conversations. The pre-observation conference also provides an opportunity for teachers to describe their professional practices relative to Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) and some of the components of Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities) in Danielson’s The Framework for Teaching.

The completed Announced Observation Teacher Planning form and the discussion during the conference are important sources of data and evidence indicating current planning and preparation practices. Components from The Framework for Teaching are highlighted in each of the questions included on the Announced Observation Teacher Planning form.

In preparation for a pre-observation conference, teachers must complete and submit the **Announced Observation Teacher Planning form** in Frontline Education. Teachers are also invited to upload artifacts into the Frontline Education artifact portfolio or to the form itself to support a discussion of current practice. At the conference, teachers can share additional artifacts; however, uploading artifacts prior to the pre-conference will help to make the conference more valuable and efficient.

Classroom Observations

As the DPI reports:

Classroom observations to collect evidence, paired with regular and ongoing feedback, are one of the most valuable processes for educator professional growth. It is ideal and best practice that an evaluator or other trained observer provide ongoing feedback within each mini-improvement cycle across the annual Educator Effectiveness (EE) process, regardless of year within an Effectiveness Cycle. The evaluation of the System has proven that teachers receiving more frequent observations and feedback

- view their principals as better leaders and as instructional coaches;
- are more satisfied with their job; and
- are more likely to stay in the position.

<https://dpi.wi.gov/ee/revised-minimum-requirements-ee-observations-teachers>

Figure 4 – Represents the Minimum Number of Classroom Observations for 2020–21*observations over the Effectiveness Cycle (this includes Supporting and Summary Years):

Figure 4 - Minimum Number of Classroom Observations for 2020-2021		
Evaluation Type	Required Announced Observations	Required Mini-Observations
Provisional License Teachers	One Announced	2 Mini-Observations
New Teachers – Summary Year 1	One Announced	3 Mini-Observations
New Teachers – Summary Years 2 and 3	One Announced	2 Mini-Observations
Summary Year Teachers	One Announced	4 Mini-Observations total (1 must take place in each of the previous supporting years)
Supporting Year Teachers – Years 1 and 2	Optional	1 Mini-Observation in each of the Supporting Years

The evaluator or observer collects data and evidence during an observation by noting what students are saying and doing in response to what the teacher is saying and doing. Additionally, observations may include student and teacher behaviors and information about the classroom environment. The evaluator or observer is collecting data and evidence primarily as it relates to Domain 2 (Classroom Environment) and Domain 3 (Instruction) during the observation.

However, observers may also collect evidence for Domain 1 (Demonstrating Knowledge of Content

and Pedagogy) and Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities) if they observe such in the classroom.

Evidence will include details, be quantitative when possible, and avoid statements and observations that indicate interpretation, professional preference, or bias. The observer shares data collected during a classroom observation in Frontline Education after the evaluator aligns the evidence to one or more components in The Framework for Teaching. The aligned component data can then be reviewed through the lens of the levels of performance rubrics for both reflective and summary purposes. Educator Effectiveness encourages teachers to analyze this data prior to meeting for a post-observation conference. The data collected is used formatively to guide professional conversations. ***Individual observations are not scored***; rather, they contribute to a broad body of data collected throughout the effectiveness cycle, which points to preponderance of evidence that is scored in a Summary Year.

A Summary Year (2020-21) requires a minimum of one Announced Observation and at least two Mini-Observations. If no Mini-Observations have taken place prior to the Summary Year, the requirement is four Mini-Observations during that year. A recommendation is that evaluators complete a Mini-Observation prior to the Announced Observation, then follow up with the second Mini-Observation after the Announced Observation.

- ▶ **Announced Observation** – The Announced Observation follows the Collaborative Observation Process (see Figure 4 – Minimum Number of Classroom Observations). Data and feedback from an Announced Observation should be shared in writing within one week of the observation.
- ▶ **Mini-Observation** – In a Mini-Observation, the observer collects data in Frontline Education and uses the data to inform professional conversations and feedback. Data and feedback from a Mini-Observation should be shared in writing within 48 hours of the observation. Mini-Observations are often unannounced, and therefore will not be scheduled.

Post-Observation Conference

The post-observation conference allows for critical reflection on teaching practices and collaborative analysis of the collected data. As in the pre-observation conference, the post-observation form and the discussion during the conference are important sources of data and evidence indicating current practices, particularly Component 4a, Reflecting on Teaching.

Teachers must complete and submit the **Announced Observation Teacher Reflection** in Frontline Education prior to meeting for the post-observation conference. The design of the Announced Observation Teacher Reflection is to allow teachers to reflect on their own practice and student learning as a result of the instruction. Teachers' reflections, along with the evidence collected by the classroom observers, help guide the coaching conversation during the post-observation conference. At the conference, teachers are encouraged to share additional artifacts to enhance the discussion of the observation, such as:

- ▶ student work samples;
- ▶ follow-up activities; and
- ▶ assessment results.

Artifacts uploaded to Frontline Education prior to the pre-conference will help to make the conference more valuable and efficient by providing time for a review of the artifacts before the conference.

The post-observation conference should occur within one week of the Announced Observation, and it must take place within 10 working days of the Announced Observation except under extenuating circumstances.

A Year at a Glance

Educator Effectiveness System Timelines

An overview of the year for both Supporting and Summary Years, including key dates for all calendars, can be accessed through the Frontline–My File Library, the EE Google site, or mConnect.

Beginning of the Year

In the beginning of the year, all teachers complete the Teacher Self-Review form in Frontline Education. Following the self-review, they develop a PPG based upon analysis of teacher practices and align their SLO (see Figure 3 – Collaborative Observation Process, page 7). Both the PPG and SLO are part of the same **Beginning of the Year EEP Form**. The form must be completed and submitted in Frontline Education prior to meeting for a planning conference. In a Summary Year, the evaluator schedules and hosts the planning conference. In Supporting Years, the planning conference is scheduled and completed with a colleague. Teachers and evaluators review and discuss the Educator Effectiveness Plan during the planning conference. As a result of the planning conference, teachers may decide to make adjustments and revisions to ensure that they are implementing an SLO process that will have the greatest impact on student outcomes. The “SLO Outcome and Summary Process Guide” (found in Frontline–My File Library) should be in use during the planning conference to assist the evaluator (or colleague in a Supporting Year) when providing feedback.

Mid-Interval Review

At the midpoint of the SLO interval (typically in January–February), all teachers meet for a formative review of their progress toward meeting the PPG and SLO goals. In a Summary Year, the evaluator schedules and hosts the mid-interval conference. In Supporting Years, the mid-interval conference is scheduled and completed with a colleague. Teachers must complete and submit the **Mid-Interval SLO and PPG Form (EEP form)** in Frontline Education prior to meeting for the mid-interval conference. During the mid-interval

In a *Summary Year*, teachers meet with their **evaluator** at the beginning, mid-interval, and again at the end of the year to review the progress of the EEP.

In a *Supporting Year*, teachers meet with a **colleague** at the beginning, mid-interval, and again at the end of the year to review the progress of the EEP.

conference, the teacher offers documentation regarding the status of the goals, evidence of progress, and any barriers to success. As a result of the mid-interval conference, teachers may decide to make adjustments and revisions to ensure that they are implementing an SLO process that will have the greatest impact on student outcomes. The “SLO Outcome and Summary Process Guide” should serve during the mid-interval conference to assist the evaluator (or colleague in a Supporting Year) when providing feedback.

End of the Year

Supporting Year

Teachers – Near the end of the school year, teachers submit final evidence for both their SLO and professional practices in Frontline Education. Teachers self-score the SLO using the SLO scoring rubric four-point scale as they complete the End-of-Year Review SLO in Frontline Education. In Supporting Years, the end-of-year conference is scheduled and completed with a colleague. The **End-of-Interval Review SLO and PPG Form (EEP Form)** must be completed and submitted in Frontline Education prior to meeting for the end-of-year conference. During the end-of-year conference, the teacher offers

documentation regarding the status of the goals, evidence of progress, and any barriers to success. As a result of the end-of-year conference, teachers consider future areas of focus as well as ways they may implement an SLO process to have the greatest impact on student outcomes in the future. The “SLO Outcome and Summary Process Guide” should be used during the end-of-year conference to assist the colleague when providing feedback in a Supporting Year.

In both a Supporting Year and Summary Year, teachers self-score the SLO as a part of end-of-year activities.

Evaluators – Evaluators may review teachers’ self-review and teachers’ SLO and PPG in Frontline Education but will not submit any SLO or teacher practice scores in Supporting Years.

Summary Year

Teachers – Teachers finishing a Summary Year, similar to teachers in a Supporting Year, submit final evidence for both their SLO and professional practices in Frontline Education. Teachers self-score the SLO using the SLO scoring rubric four-point scale as a part of completing the End-of-Year Review SLO in Frontline Education. In a Summary Year, the end-of-year conference is scheduled and completed with the evaluator. The following forms must be completed and submitted in Frontline Education prior to meeting for the end-of-year conference: **End-of-Interval Review SLO and PPG** and **Teacher End-of-Cycle Reflection**. During the end-of-year conference, the teacher offers documentation regarding the status of the goals, evidence of progress and process, and any barriers to success. As a result of the end-of-year conference, teachers consider future areas of focus as well as ways they may implement an SLO process to have the greatest impact on student outcomes in the future. Evaluators (or colleagues in a Supporting Year) should use the “SLO Outcome and Summary Process Guide” during the mid-interval conference to assist them when providing feedback.

Evaluators – Prior to meeting for the end-of-cycle conference, the evaluator completes the **End-of-Cycle Summary** form in Frontline Education, then schedules and hosts the end-of-cycle conference to review all data and scores, recognize and celebrate accomplishments, and discuss possible future goals.

End-of-Cycle Summary Year Scores

SLO Holistic Score – In a Summary Year, evaluators review all SLOs completed during the Effectiveness Cycle to identify and assign a level of performance for each of the six criteria included in the SLO rubric. Then one holistic SLO score is assigned using the SLO scoring rubric four-point scale.

Data, artifacts, and the teacher’s self-scoring of the SLO(s) provide the basis of the holistic score on all SLOs. Teachers completing a three-year Effectiveness Cycle (see Figure 1 – The Educator Effectiveness Cycle – Supporting Years and Summary Years, page 4) will have no fewer than three SLOs included in the holistic score. If the Effectiveness Cycle is only one year, as is the case for teachers in their first three years in the district, the SLO holistic score is based on that school year only.

The Holistic SLO Score is a separate score and does not average with the Teacher Practice Summary Score.

Teacher Practice Summary Scores – In a Summary Year, the evaluator scores each of the 22 components using the rubrics included in The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument. Evidence such as observational data, descriptions, rationales, and artifacts collected throughout the Effectiveness Cycle substantiate component scores. Teacher Practice Scores are based on the average of the components within each domain. The average of the four domain scores determines one final practice score rounded to the nearest decimal.

Systems of Support

The Educator Effectiveness System is individualized to support teachers as they build expertise through experience, professional inquiry, and professional development. Over the course of a school year/Effectiveness Cycle, teachers may use classroom observation data, coupled with their own evidence and artifacts, to discuss with colleagues and evaluators their progress toward goals outlined in the Educator Effectiveness Plan. In addition, principals and school leaders must provide deliberate strategies for any teacher performing below the proficient level. The EE Multi-Level System of Support outlines a tiered approach for administrators for responding to various teacher needs with differentiated support (see Figure 5 – Educator Effectiveness Multi-Level System of Support, below).

Figure 5 – Educator Effectiveness Multi-Level Systems of Support		
Tier 3: Intensive		
<p>Essential Questions: High Quality Teaching: “Is the educator's understanding of high-quality teaching aligned to that of the district?” Assessment: “How will educators know when teaching is proficient?” Collaboration: “What data will educators use to reflect on teaching?” Intervention: “How will the district ensure continuous improvement of practice for all educators?”</p>	<p>Documentation of Practice: High Quality Teaching: EEP, self-reflection Assessment: pEEr Interim and summary reports (mentor, teacher, and principal) Collaboration: Observations, evidence submitted by teacher, Intervention: Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), pEEr Goal Agreement</p>	<p>Resources (in addition to Tier 1 Universal Resources and Tier 2 Selected Resources): Professional Educator Effectiveness Resource (pEEr)</p>
Tier 2: Selected		
<p>Essential Questions: High Quality Teaching: “Is the educator's understanding of high-quality teaching aligned to that of the district?” Assessment: “How will educators know when they are successful?” Collaboration: “What data will educators use to reflect on teaching?” Intervention: “How will the district ensure continuous improvement of practice for all educators?”</p>	<p>Documentation of Practice: High Quality Teaching: EEP, self-reflection Assessment: Reflecting on progress toward Performance Improvement Plan Goals, calibrating conversations with supervisor Collaboration: Observations, evidence/artifacts, planning documents Intervention: Performance Improvement Plan, coaching and calibrating, and conferencing</p>	<p>Possible Resources (in addition to Tier 1 Universal Resources): COMP, Frontline Education, SST support, Love & Logic, Restorative Justice program, Employee Assistance, Trauma-Informed teaching, Teach Like A Champion, building-based mentoring and support, exemplar classroom observations, personalized violence prevention services (team-building skills, room design, behavior management assistance, GOTAGS, CHAMPS), and others.</p>

(Table continues on next page)

Tier 1: Universal

<p>Essential Questions: High Quality Teaching: “Is the educator’s understanding of high-quality teaching aligned to that of the district?” Assessment: “How will educators know when teaching is proficient?” Collaboration: “What data will educators use to reflect on teaching?” Intervention: “How will the district ensure continuous improvement of practice for all educators?”</p>	<p>Documentation of Practice: High Quality Teaching: EEP, self-reflection Assessment: Reflecting on teaching, comparing current practice to Danielson's Proficient Level of Performance Collaboration: Observations, evidence/artifacts, planning documents Intervention: Perseverance in teaching and learning, coaching and conferencing</p>	<p>Possible Resources: Framework for Teaching (FfT), standards-based grading, PBIS/BIT, MPS data warehouse (assessment data), RtI Framework, CCSS, NG Science Standards, Wisconsin State Standards (for other content areas), Infinite, Campus, service learning, district professional development, Frontline Education, PLCs, Culturally Relevant Teaching Practices, School Improvement Plan (SIP), CLP, CMSP, and others.</p>
--	---	---

When a Teacher's Practice Is Unsatisfactory

First-Year Teachers

If, at any point in time, an evaluator observes a first-year teacher (newly licensed) performing at an unsatisfactory level, the evaluator will meet with the new teacher to inform him/her of the unsatisfactory level of professional practice observed. It is strongly recommended that the evaluator include the new educator's induction specialist (first-year teachers only) in the meeting if the teacher is comfortable with this recommendation. At the meeting, the evaluator will discuss with the teacher, and those present, the need to develop a **Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)** in Frontline targeting the professional practice that is unsatisfactory. The purpose of the PIP is to provide structured school-based guidance to the teacher to ensure improvement. The PIP, as indicated on the EE Multi-Level Systems of Support (Figure 5, page 12), is "selected" Tier 2 support.

If by the end of their first year the teacher has not made sufficient progress, this may result in an Overall Level of Performance that is unsatisfactory. This may lead to a recommendation for a continuation of the Performance Improvement Plan, separation from the district, or other interventions such as a referral to pEEr (professional Educator Effectiveness resource), a mandatory professional development program (see EE Multi-Level System of Support, Tier 3 interventions and resources in Figure 5, page 12).

Teachers with More than One Year of Experience

If at any point in time an evaluator observes teachers with more than one year in the district performing at an unsatisfactory level, the evaluator will meet with teachers to inform them that an unsatisfactory level of professional practice has been observed. At the meeting, the evaluator will discuss the need to develop a Performance Improvement Plan targeting the professional practices that appear to be unsatisfactory. The teacher may have a representative of his or her choosing attend the meeting.

If by the End-of-Cycle Summary conference the teacher has not been able to make sufficient progress with the assistance provided, the teacher will receive an unsatisfactory practice score, which may lead to a recommendation for a continuation of the Performance Improvement Plan or separation from the district. All returning teachers with an overall summary score of unsatisfactory must participate in pEEr the following school year.

Rights and Responsibilities

Teachers

Teachers are responsible for engaging in self-reflection and goal setting for the purpose of continuous growth. Continuous, professional growth drives the Educator Effectiveness System. While the EE System is a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers at the end of Summary Years, the design of this system is to support teachers throughout an effectiveness cycle at all stages of their careers to grow teaching practices.

Evaluators

Administrators' responsibility is to provide teachers with fair, accurate, and objective summary scores for both teacher practices and the Student Learning Objectives. All administrators are responsible for adhering to, and implementing with fidelity, a collaborative observation process. Administrators' responsibilities also must adhere to minimum requirements as described in the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System.

Appeal Process – Unsatisfactory Evaluation – MPS Employee Handbook Complaint Procedure

Any teacher who has received an unsatisfactory evaluation may request a meeting with the evaluator to review the unsatisfactory rating and discuss the supporting evidence. The teacher may have a representative attend the meeting. This meeting will follow the End-of-Cycle Summary conference, when the educator receives end-of-cycle practice and SLO scores.

If the educator is not satisfied with the outcome of the meeting, the educator may access the MPS Employee Handbook Complaint Procedure (Part VI). Refer to the [MPS Employee Handbook](#) for complete information about the complaint procedure.

This process requires the educator to contact the Office of Human Resources, Employment Relations Department, at 414-475-8280, or via email at 564@milwaukee.k12.wi.us, and [file a written complaint](#) about the unsatisfactory evaluation. An appropriate designee will contact the teacher, hear the complaint, review all documentation, and conduct an investigation. The evaluator will be contacted as part of the investigation to provide the evidence in support of the unsatisfactory determination. The designee's disposition will be the final resolution of the complaint.



Appendix A — Working Glossary Educator Effectiveness

Announced Observation: A formal, scheduled observation preceded by a pre-observation conference and followed by a post-observation conference with verbal and/or written feedback.

Artifacts: A tangible document, or media sample, uploaded into the Artifact Portfolio in Frontline Education. Examples may include lesson plans, samples of student work with teacher feedback, professional development activities, or logs of contacts with families and others. Artifacts represent current professional practices and/or progress toward a Student Learning Objective (SLO).

Charlotte Danielson’s 2013 Framework for Teaching: A research-based model designed to assess and support effective instructional practice.

Components: The descriptions of the aspects of a domain. There are 22 components in The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013). *Note: Frontline Education uses the term “component” when referencing structures such as Principal School Learning Objective. That component in Frontline is made up of the beginning, mid-interval, and end-of-interval “elements” (forms).*

Domains: There are four domains, or broad areas, of teaching responsibility included in The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013): (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) Classroom Environment, (3) Instruction, and (4) Professional Responsibilities. Under each domain, specific components describe the distinct aspects of a domain.

Educator Effectiveness Implementation Coaches (EEICs): Individuals who support school-based leaders in the implementation of the EE System. At times, EEICs may conduct Mini-Observations as a part of their role. These observations offer multiple perspectives of teaching practices, in turn improving the reliability of summary practice scores.

Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP): A document that lists the School/Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), Professional Practice Goals (PPGs), professional growth strategies, and support for an educator. The EEP also defines the activities required to attain these goals, along with the measures necessary to evaluate the progress made toward achieving those goals.

Educator Effectiveness (EE) System: The Wisconsin state model for teacher and principal evaluation, built by and for Wisconsin educators. Its primary purpose is to support a system of continuous improvement of educator practice, from pre-service to in-service, that leads to improved student learning. The Educator Effectiveness System is legislatively mandated by 2011 Wisconsin Act 166.

Effectiveness Cycle: A cycle of either one or multiple years that completes a summary of effectiveness and a rating of both professional practices and student outcomes.

End-of-Cycle Summary: The teacher and his/her evaluator meet to discuss achievement of the Professional Practice Goal (PPG) and Student Learning Objective (SLO) goal, review collected evidence, and discuss results and scores for the components included in The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013) and the SLO(s).

Evidence Collection: The systematic gathering of evidence that informs the assessment of an educator’s practice. In the Educator Effectiveness System, multiple forms of evidence are required.

Evidence (Statements): Statements that document data related to, or describing, professional practices and/or progress toward goals included as a part of the Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP).

Frontline Education: The online evaluation/observation management system used by the Educator Effectiveness System to create transparency and two-way communication among teachers and evaluators.

Indicators: Observable pieces of information for observers or evaluators to identify or “look-for” during an observation or other evidence gathering. Indicators for each of the 22 components of The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013) are included in The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument (Danielson, 2013).

Levels of Performance: The level of educator performance based on the rubric descriptions included in The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013). The four levels are Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished.

Mid-Interval Review: A formal meeting scheduled by the evaluator (in a teacher’s Summary Year) at the midpoint of the Student Learning Objective (SLO) interval. During this meeting, the evaluator and teacher may discuss adjustments of the expected growth specified in an SLO based upon clear rationale and evidence of need. Additionally, progress on a teacher’s Professional Practice Goal (PPG) and the impact of the PPG is considered.

Mini-Observation: An observation that is not scheduled in advance. No pre-conference is held prior to a Mini-Observation, but written or verbal feedback is expected within one week.

Planning Conference: A conference (in the fall of a Summary Year) during which the teacher and his or her primary evaluator discuss the teacher’s self-assessment and Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP). The identified Student or School Learning Objective (SLO), Professional Practice Goal (PPG), and actions needed to meet goals are discussed. In a Supporting Year, this session is completed with a colleague.

Post-Observation Conference: A conference that takes place after a formal observation during which the evaluator or observer provides feedback verbally and in writing to the teacher.

Pre-Observation Conference: A conference that takes place before a formal observation during which the evaluator or observer and teacher discuss important elements of the lesson or class that might be relevant to the observation.

Professional Practice Goal (PPG): Establishing practice-related goals is an important part of professional practice. Goals are monitored by the educator throughout the year.

School Support Teacher (SST): A classroom-released teacher who assists with the implementation of Educator Effectiveness at the building level.

Self-Review: Teachers will complete a self-review at the beginning of the year. This self-review will ask educators to reflect on their past performance using The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2013).

Student Learning Objective (SLO): Rigorous yet attainable academic goal for student growth aligned

to appropriate standards set by individual educators. Educators must develop an SLO annually. The ultimate goal of an SLO is to promote student learning and achievement while providing for pedagogical growth, reflection, and innovation.

Summary Year: A year in which educators meet directly with their evaluator throughout the year to plan, review/revise, and summarize the Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP) as well as discuss classroom observations. In a Summary Year, scores for both professional practices and the holistic SLO are submitted.

Supporting Year: A year in which educators meet with a colleague throughout the year to plan, review/revise, and summarize the Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP).

Notes