



A Community of Learners

Information Memo: Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA)

April 19, 2016

TO: School Board
Trisha Kocanda, *Superintendent*

FROM: Maureen Hager, *Director of Human Resources*

Background of PERA

In response to the requirement to prepare for the 2016 implementation of the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA), the District established the Joint Committee that was required to convene no later than November 1, 2015. The Committee is charged with amending the Teacher Evaluation Process to comply with the Act's language on teacher evaluation. Early in the process, we agreed that any change would need to reflect our beliefs about quality instructional experiences for our students and professional practices in concert with our progressive norms.

The most defining aspect of PERA is the requirement to include measures of student growth that minimally constitute 30% of the performance evaluation criteria for the evaluation of teachers. Professional practice must represent *at least* 50% of the performance evaluation rating but can represent up to 70% of the performance evaluation rating. As with all other aspects of the Act, the District's Joint Committee has determined the specific percentages and parameters of the plan. The Joint Committee has the sole responsibility to amend teacher evaluation.

Measures of student performance are defined as assessments that are classified as Type I (nationally normed), Type II (used across the district at a grade or department level), or Type III (developed and used by an individual teacher). Each district's Plan must identify a Joint Committee charged with identifying those assessments that will be available to measure student achievement.

Work of the PERA Committee to Date

The PERA Committee has met six times in the current year and will conclude this year's work at its final May meeting. The Committee is comprised of five teachers and an equal number of Superintendent appointees who must agree to amendments to the Teacher Evaluation Process. The necessary changes must be implemented no later than the start of the 2016-17 school year. Should a district's PERA Committee be unable to reach consensus regarding its plan, a district must then revert to the State designed plan to evaluate its teachers.

Early in the process, to familiarize all who will be subject to the requirements of PERA, the District's teaching staff was introduced to the PERA requirements. When changes to the Plan are finalized, the staff will again be brought together to review the changes agreed to by the District 36 PERA Committee.

Agreements Reached by the PERA Committee

To date, the following agreements have been reached by members of the Joint Committee:

What percentage of our evaluation will we devote to student achievement data?

- Agreement to 70% of the evaluation based on the four domains of the Danielson model/and 30% based on student achievement data

What types of assessments (I,II, and/or III) will be used for student achievement data?

- Agreement to use a Type II and Type III or two Types III measures

On what timeline will student achievement data be gathered?

- For non-tenured teachers: at least one pretest and posttest or both pre-tests will be completed no later than November 15 and both post-tests will be completed and scored no later than February 1;
- For tenured teachers: at least one pretest and posttest or both pre-tests will be completed no later than December 15 and both post-tests will be completed and scored no later than April 1; if mutually agreed upon between evaluator and teacher, teachers can report their pre- and post-test scores electronically

What % age of students need to show growth to reach benchmarks?

- This continues to be under discussion and will be resolved after the Committee members have more time to consider different growth bands.
- For example, the Committee will look at a structure for benchmarking four bands of growth that may look something like this example:

❖ Excellent growth x% - 100% of students will show growth

- ❖ Proficient growth x% - x% of students will show growth
- ❖ Needs Improvement x% - x% of students will show growth
- ❖ Unsatisfactory 0% - x% of students will show growth

These agreements will be now be inserted into the District's teacher evaluation process with the revised plan being shared with staff at the conclusion of the current school year. Documentation reflective of these changes will again be shared with staff as part of the distribution of evaluation materials that occurs at the opening of each school year.

Joan Elliott, 2nd Grade Teacher, Crow Island School
Maureen Hager, Director of Human Resources
Trisha Kocanda, Superintendent of Schools
Steve Mann, Related Studies Teacher, Carleton Washburne School
Daniel Ryan, Principal, Hubbard Woods School
Joshua Swanner, Assistant Principal, The Skokie School
Niki Tottingham, Spanish Teacher, Hubbard Woods School
Tony Venetico, Assistant Principal, Carleton Washburne School
Steve Vowles, Instrumental Music Teacher, The Skokie School & Carleton Washburne
Sam Yusim, Math Teacher & Facilitator, Carleton Washburne School