Fresno Unified School District

# Inc luding Student Achievement \& Growth Into the Fresno Unified Teacher Evaluation System 

## Supervision and evaluation process is a leaming focused system

- Tiesto professional standards(CSTP's and Continuum)
- Values and supports collaboration
- Provides a system that is fair and focused on leaming to improve student lea ming and growth
- Utilizes information from a variety of sources, including relia ble measures of educator practice and student leaming and growth


## Tea cher Evaluation Model: Basic

 DesignTied to the CSTPS

- Student leaming informs teacherpractice and teacher practice informs student leaming
- $100 \%$ of evaluation is based on CSTP's
- Indicators and examples have been added to the CSTP Continuum
- 4 ratings replacing the current 3 ratings per standard


## Student Growth

- Teachers set goals/targets for students
- Select a minimum of 4 assessments from menu of choiceswhich are predominately teacher designed (multiple measures)
- $20 \%$ of evaluation is based specific ally on student growth

4 Teacher Evaluation Model: Basic Design

## $100 \%$ of evaluation is based on the CSTP's with 20\% within CSTP 5 Student growth (multiple measures)

## Teacher Evaluation Model: Basic

 DesignHaving $100 \%$ based on the CSTPs, with 20\%student growth embedded in CSTP 5 means the following weights are established:


2,3, 4, and 6
(70\%)

```
70%CSTP 1, 2, 3, 4, }
30%CSTP 5
```



## 6. Teacher Evaluation Model: Basic Design

| CSIP Area | Rating |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| CSTP 1 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 2 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 3 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 4 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 5 Practice/St. G rowth | Meets |  |
| CSTP 6 Meets |  |  |

## How an Assessment Fits into the Model



Less than $50 \%=$ Short of
Goal/Target

"Demonstrates Expertise" 75\%+ of a ssessments
"Meets Standards" if 50\%t o 74\%
"Growth Expected" if $25 \%$ to $49 \%$
"Does Not Meet Standards < 25\%

Supervisor provides
CSTP 1, 2, 3, 4, 5-Practice, and 6 ratings

| CSIP | Rating |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Meets |
| 2 | Meets |
| 3 | Meets |
| 4 | Meets |
| 5- Practice | Meets |
| 5- Student Growth | Meets |
| 6 | Meets |

Overall Rating: Meets Sta ndards

## 8 Incorporating Student Achievement/ Growth: The Process

Teacher- Principal Select Assessments

Teacher Sets Student G oals/Ta rgets-Pre-Assesses

Tea cher Assesses- Mea suring Change/ Achievement

Ratings Computed-Evaluation
Completed

## Teacher Evaluation Model: Basic Design

- Student growth scores will come from multiple measures (4 or more) which are predominantly teacherdesigned.
- A teacherwho teachesa grade level orcontent area subject to the SBAC shall identify a minimum of three (3) teacher-designed mea sures of student growth/a chievement and SBAC
- A teacherteaching a non-SBAC tested grade level/content a rea shall identify a minimum of four (4) teacher-designed mea sures of student growth/a chievement


## Teacher Evaluation Model: Basic Design

- Some examples of potential Summative Assessments included:
- Pre-post unit assessments from Accountable Community level
- Pre-post portfolios of student work (scored on common rubric)
- Academic Grades
- Collection of weekly (or bi-weekly) common assessments
- Where common district pre-post assessments are established, these may be included (FUSD teachers will help develop these assessments)
- Where State assessment is established, it must be included (current Federal requirement)- SMARTER Balanced


## Samples of Assessments a Teacher Could Choose in the 20\% Multiple Measure Model

## Grade 4 Teacher <br> - AC Common Core ELA Unit 2 test <br> - AC Common Core Math Unit 3 test

- Academic Grades
- SMARTER Balanced ELA/ Math Assessment (Required)
- Weekly Common Assessments in ELA for Unit 4


## High School History Teacher

- AC Modem World History Unit 4 test (Periods 1 and 2)
- AC Modem World History Unit 6 test (Periods 1 and 2)
- AC U.S. History Unit 5 test (Periods 3 and 5)
- Weekly Common Assessments for U.S. History Unit 5
- Academic Grades


## Incorporating Student Growth and Achievement

- $100 \%$ of the evaluation is based on the CSTP's and the $20 \%$ spec ific ally from predominately teacher designed a ssessments are used for part of the overall rating of CSTP.
- How will the $20 \%$ play out in the evaluation if 5 a ssessments with va rious outc omes a re selected?


## 13 <br> Incorporating Student Growth and Achievement: Assessment Exa mple



School District

## Incorporating Student Growth and Achievement: Assessment Exa mple

| Assessment | Status |
| :--- | :---: |
| AC Common Core ELA Unit 2 test |  |
| AC Common Core Math Unit 3 test |  |
| Academic Grades |  |
| Weekly Common Assessments in ELA for <br> Unit 4 |  |
| SMARTER Balanced ELA/Math (Required) |  |

Rating for student achievement/growth:

- "Demonstrates Expertise" 75\%+ of assessments
- "Meets Standards" if 50\% t o74\%
- "Growth Expected" if 25\% to 49\%
- "Does Not Meet Standards < 25\%

|  | 2 of 5 Assessments Meet Goal/Target (40\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSTP Area | Rating |  |
| CSTP 1 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 2 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 3 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 4 | Meets |  |
| CSTP 5 Practice/St. Growth | Meets Gr . |  |
| CSTP 6 | Meets |  |

## When SMARTER Bala nced Results Anive After May 15....

Prior yearscores (if available) will be used forthe May 15 evaluation

- Current year SMARTER Balanced scores replace prior year scores over the summer
- Evaluation ratings adjusted upward if scores improve overall rating

No changes will be made to the overall rating if scores are lower, and new scores will populate the ensuing evaluation

