Memorandum of Understanding

Between

White Bear Lake Teachers' Association and
White Bear Lake Area School District No. 624

With Attached Addendum

The purpose of this addendum is to add clarity to the work of the White Bear Lake
Teachers' Association, White Bear Lake Principals and District Administration.
The substance of the work has not changed from the original MOU.

WHEREAS, The White Bear Lake Teachers' Association ("WBLTA") is the bargaining unit recognized by the School District as the exclusive representative of educators employed by the School District; and

WHEREAS, the terms and conditions of employment for educators of the School District are governed by the 2013-2015 Collective Bargaining Agreement ("CBA"); and

WHEREAS, the 2011 Minnesota Legislature required every district to develop and agree upon an Educator Development and Evaluation Plan for implementation by the fall of 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Educator Development and Evaluation ("EDE") Plan must meet the requirements of Minnesota Statutes 122A.40 Subd. 8, and Minnesota Rule 8710.2000; and

WHERAS, a committee of representatives from the School District and the WBLTA have met and jointly developed a plan as required.

NOW THEREFORE, the parties agree to the following:

1. The School Board of White Bear Lake Area School District 624 and the White Bear Lake Teachers' Association jointly agree to implement the attached EDE Plan in accordance with M.S. 122A.40.

2. The EDE Plan will take effect on July 1, 2014. This Agreement will remain in effect until the parties agree to modifications or until one party notifies the other party of its intent to withdraw from the Agreement at the beginning of the next school year. Such notice must be given prior to April 1 of the school year prior to withdrawal. The Agreement will end on June 29th following the notification of withdrawal. Both parties understand that the state plan created and published by the Minnesota Department of Education pursuant to Minn. Stat. §122A.40, Subd. 8(c) will be implemented at that time unless the parties agree on a successor process.

3. A joint WBLTA and District EDE Oversight Committee ("EDE Oversight Committee" or "Committee") shall be responsible for overseeing implementation of the EDE Plan including the process to move from the current educator development, evaluation or peer review process used in the District.

1

a. Members: The Committee will consist of a total of no more than twelve representatives: six representatives of the Union appointed by the Union President, and six representatives of the District appointed by the School Board or its designee.

b. Meetings: The Committee must meet at least four times during each school year. Summer meetings may be scheduled if necessary. If a meeting is scheduled during a school day, the District shall pay the cost of any necessary substitutes.

c. Additional Duties:

   i. The Committee will work to ensure that communications about the EDE Plan to educators and administrators occurs in a timely and consistent manner.

   ii. The Committee will make recommendations to the District and Union on modifications to the EDE Plan.

   iii. The Committee will review any statutory changes to the requirements in Minn. Stat. § 122A.40, Subd. 8 and any changes to the State Plan, if applicable, and make recommendations to the District and Union on modifications to the EDE Plan.

   iv. The Committee will discuss and address any inquiries regarding the EDE Plan by the MOE.

4. Any modifications to the EDE Plan will be made by mutual written agreement. Neither party may unilaterally modify the EDE Plan. The EDE Plan will remain in effect until proposed modifications have been adopted through the ratification and adoption process.

WBLTA   White Bear Lake Area School District 624

_____

WBLTA President   Board Chair

ADDENDUM

Educator Development and Evaluation Summary

A Document Summarizing the Work of the

White Bear Lake Teachers' Association,

White Bear Lake Principals &
District Administration

August 27, 2014

1. Annual Evaluations and Peer Review Process

Statutory Requirement:

A school board or designee and exclusive representative of the teachers' association will jointly agree to an annual educator evaluation and peer review process for probationary and non-probationary educators. Annual educator evaluations are designed to develop, improve, and support qualified educators and effective teaching practices and improve student learning and success.

Status:

This document summarizes the work of a team of administrators and representatives of the teachers' association completed in order to meet the statutory requirements and improve the educator evaluation process. Each of these areas has been reviewed and found acceptable by both parties.

2. Probationary Educator Evaluations

Statutory Requirement:

Educator evaluation processes must provide the requisite evaluations for probationary educators-three evaluations annually with one happening during the first ninety (90) days of employment.

Status:

This is consistent with our current practice for probationary educators.

3. Educator Evaluation for Tenured Educators

Statutory Requirement:

Educator evaluation processes must establish a three-year professional review cycle for each educator that includes a growth and development plan, peer review, and at least one summative evaluation performed by a qualified and trained evaluator. The process may include the opportunity to participate in a professional learning community.

- The district has modified our current three-year evaluation process to include Student Learning Goal Plans, growth plans and peer review. See attached.

- PLCs are defined as an opportunity to collaborate with other colleagues in order to improve student results. At the elementary level, educators collaborate in grade level teams or building determined structures. At the middle school level, educators meet as a department and by grade level. At the high school level, educators meet with a building determined group and by department. PLCs may choose to set shared Student Learning Goals (see section 9). All of these meetings should be scheduled to happen monthly at a minimum. Many employee groups do not currently participate in PLC meetings but may ask to create a professional group.

4. Educator Evaluation Standards

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must be based on professional teaching standards established in MN Rule 8710.2000.

Status:
Evidence regarding educator practice will be collected during educator observations using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). An observation consists of two-20 minute cycles. Some licensed staff may be evaluated using a tool leveraging a modified Charolette Danielson model when the CLASS tool is not the most appropriate tool.

5. Evaluation Coordination with Staff Development Activities

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must coordinate staff development activities with the evaluation process and outcomes.

Status:
- All educators will have training on the evaluation tool prior to the implementation of the evaluation tool.
- The CLASS educator evaluation tool allows the district to look at trends among educators. The district will use this data to inform future staff development needs.
- Each year that this agreement is renewed, both parties are encouraged to suggest staff development relevant to educator's needs.

6. Coaching and Collaboration During School Time

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes may allow school time for coaching and collaboration. Through the two peer reviewers, the district will pilot a coaching model for educators. Educators are also allowed to select a peer for the optional peer review process that will lead to additional coaching and collaboration opportunities.

7. Mentoring and Induction Programs

Statutory Requirement:

Educator evaluation processes may include mentoring and induction programs.

Status:

A. White Bear Lake's current process includes:
- Educators new to White Bear Lake Area Schools will have at least two (2) days of new educator training prior to the start of the school year. The focus of this training includes:

  An introduction to the District

  An overview of the mentoring program

  Human resources protocols

  Educator Evaluation training

  Technology Resources

  Educator Evaluation

B. Educators new to the district participate in a series of sessions throughout the school year dedicated to instructional improvement and student achievement.

C. Mentorship
- Educators in their first year in White Bear Lake Area Schools are assigned a mentor.
- Non-probationary educators are to be chosen as mentors.
- Mentors are expected to have quarterly formal interactions and weekly informal interactions with their assigned new educator.
- Mentors complete 4 problem solving conversation outlines along with two sets of pre-observation and reflection outlines to accompany their peer observations.
- Mentors receive training prior to the school year on cognitive coaching. A refresher session follows later in fall.
- Site-based mentors receive a stipend which includes their quarterly interactions with new educators, two (2) district sessions, conversation outlines and weekly interactions.
- Mentors and participants receive additional compensation for training prior to the school year as provided in the contract.

D. Principal / Mentor Relationship:
- Mentors are not part of the evaluation process and will not be asked to share information about the mentor with building administration.
- Mentees are encouraged to discuss any concerns that surface during the evaluation process with their mentor.

8. Educator Portfolio

__Statutory Requirement:__
Educator evaluation processes must allow educators to present a portfolio demonstrating evidence of reflection and professional growth that includes educators' own performance assessment.

__Status:__
There is no current portfolio process consistently used in White Bear Lake. Both parties agree to make recommendations for the portfolio process during the 2014-2015 school year.

9. Student Growth Measurements

__Statutory Requirement:__
Educator evaluation processes must use an agreed-upon educator measurement for student growth as a basis for 35 percent of educator evaluation results.

__Status:__*

A. All educators will be expected to set annual Student Learning Goals ("SLG"). The goal will be in the SMART goal format (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-based). The five parts of creating a SMART goal include: being **S**pecific, having a concrete set of criteria for **M**easuring progress, making the goal **A**ttainable, making the goal **R**elevant, and, grounding the goal within a **T**imeframe. This goal will be used to meet the Minnesota Statute 122A.40 Subd. 8(b)(8) requirement for a measurement of student learning.

B. The goal must be developed and submitted to the educator's assigned evaluator no later than September 30. The educator and evaluator should discuss the goal and the educator's rationale for the goal as part of the approval process.

C. The assigned evaluator will review the submitted goal and either (1) approve it or (2) return it to the educator with suggestions for revisions. This revision process must be completed by October 20.

D. SLGs may either be growth goals or proficiency goals:

   a. Growth goals use (pre-) assessment data to determine where students are relative to the focus of the goal. The educator then establishes a goal that tracks the learning growth of students from the pre-assessment to the final assessment. These goals should measure student growth over a minimum of 45 days of instructional time. A growth goal is more focused on the individual growth/improvement of students.

*We would like to acknowledge that the Edina Educator Evaluation Plan was leveraged to finalize our language in this section.

      i. **Example of a growth goal:** The percent of all students in Ms. Johnson's third grade class at Olson Elementary who achieve or exceed individual RIT score growth target on the Mathematics NWEA MAP will increase from 62% in the Fall of 2014 to 70% in the Spring of 2015.

b. Proficiency goals identify a level of performance that students would be expected to meet by the conclusion of the instruction. A standards-based, proficiency goal is more focused on the final expected level of performance/learning.

      i. **Example Goal:** The percent of students in Ms. Johnson's third grade classroom at Olson Elementary who earn achievement levels of Meets the Standards or Exceeds the Standards on the Mathematics MCA-III will increase from 80% in 2014 to 85% in 2015.

E. SLGs may either be targeted or whole-group:

a. Targeted SLGs allow an educator to focus on those students who need the most development relative to the standards-based instruction chosen for the SLG. Targeted students often require additional support or more intensive instruction. Targeted goals must encompass at least 60% of students instructed/served and may reflect more than one subgroup.

b. Whole-group SLGs involve an educator selecting all students in a class or set of classes who are working on the standard chosen for the SLG.

F. An SLG will have the following components:

a. A SMART goal statement

b. Identification of growth-focused or standards-focused, proficiency goal (check box)

c. Identification of targeted or whole-group goal (check box)

d. Implementation overview (Should include identification of the standard on which the goal/student performance is based (note – these goals may be Minnesota academic standards or national organization standards)

e. Means of assessment (e.g., common assessment, MAP, etc.)

G. By the last day of school, the Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.

SLG Evaluation Rubric

	High Range- Exceeds Expectations	Middle to High Range- Meets Expectations	Low to Middle Range- Developing	Low Range- Needs Improvement
SLG Implementation	The complete SLG is implemented with fidelity, with modifications for improvement being made as appropriate throughout the year	The complete SLG is implemented with fidelity	Key components of the SLG are implemented	Significant elements of the SLG are not implemented
SLG Results	All student results meet or exceed the goal	Most student results meet the goal	Some student results meet the goal and/or demonstrate growth/improvement	Most student results do not meet the goal or there is little evidence of student growth
SLG Reflection	Reflection on implementation and results demonstrates intentional planning and instruction/ delivery of service as well as how to finesse implementation in the future	Educator reflection on implementation and results clearly identifies reasons for student results and suggests means to improve the implementation and/or student results in the future	Educator reflection on implementation and results identifies possible reasons for student results and/or requires prompting from the evaluator to identify reasons; plan to improve future implementation is limited/basic	Educator reflection on implementation and results is minimal or focused on issues not germane to the goal or there is no plan to improve future implementation

Building Goals.

Building goals will be established by the Principal/Supervisor.

Educator Group	SLG	SLG Building Goal
Early Childhood Educators	A growth goal, mutually agreed upon with your principal and/or supervisor that demonstrates student improvement based on age appropriate norms and abilities. 35%	
Elementary Core Educators	Math Improvement 12.5% Reading Improvement 12.5%	Building Reading 5% Building Math 5%
Elementary Specialists	Subject Area Growth Measure 25%	Building Reading Improvement 5% Building Math Improvement 5%
Special Education Educators	A growth goal, mutually agreed upon with your principal and/or supervisor, related to the disability area of the majority of your students: social/emotional, behavioral, academics, functional skills, communication, artic, transition, motor. 25%	Building Reading Improvement 5% Building Math Improvement 5%
Elementary Intervention Staff	Intervention Group Performance 25%	Building Reading Improvement 5% Building Math Improvement 5%

Non-Instructional Staff (Nurse, Social Worker, SLP, Psychologist, School Counselor, etc.)	Student Growth Measures mutually agreed upon with supervisor 25%	Building Reading Improvement 5% Building Math Improvement 5%
Middle School Math	Math Improvement 25%	Building Reading Improvement 5% Building Math Improvement 5%
Middle School Language Arts / Reading	Reading Improvement 25%	Building Math Improvement 5% Building Reading Improvement 5%
Middle School Subject Area Educators	Student Growth Measures mutually agreed upon with supervisor 25%	Building Reading Improvement 5% Building Math Improvement 5%
High School Educators	Student Growth Measures mutually agreed upon with supervisor 25%	Building Reading Related Goal 5% Building Math Related Goal 5%

10. **Longitudinal Data on Student Engagement**

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must use longitudinal data on student engagement and connection and other student outcome measures aligned with curriculum for which educators are responsible.

Status:
Where appropriate, educator evaluation data will include student engagement including data from the educator evaluation tool, walk-throughs and other sources. The indicators used as evidence on the CLASS tool will be used to create the walk-through documents. The EDE Oversight Committee will work to develop the process and

evaluation for walk-through data collection during the 2014-2015 school year. Engagement measures for non-instructional staff will be developed during the 2014-2015 school year.

11. Summative Evaluations Completed by Trained Evaluators

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must require qualified and trained evaluators to perform summative evaluations.

Status:
This is consistent with our current practice.

12. Support for Improvement

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must give educators not meeting professional teaching standards the support to improve with established goals and timelines.

Status:
The school district currently has a process in place to provide support for educators not meeting professional teaching standards. WBLTA and the school district are in agreement on this.

13. Discipline for Inadequate Improvement

Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must discipline educators who do not adequately improve.

Status:
This is consistent with our current practice.

Probationary Educators Evaluation Process

Year 1*	Year 2	Year 3
By September 30 Student Learning Goals (SLG) established and agreed.	**By September 30** Student Learning Goals (SLG) established and agreed upon.	**By September 30** Student Learning Goals (SLG) established and agreed upon.
Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year Site administrator will perform 3 evaluative CLASS observations.	**Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year** Site administrator will perform 3 evaluative CLASS observations.	**Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year** Site administrator will perform 3 evaluative CLASS observations.
Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year Peer Reviewer will perform 2 non-evaluative CLASS observations.	**Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year** Peer Reviewer will perform 1 non-evaluative CLASS observation.	**Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year** Peer Reviewer will perform 1 non-evaluative CLASS observation.
Ongoing Student engagement data will be collected by site administrators in ongoing walk-throughs.	**Ongoing|** Student engagement data will be collected by site administrators in ongoing walk-throughs.	**Ongoing** Student engagement data will be collected by site administrators in ongoing walk-throughs.
Results of student learning goals will be shared with site administrator.	Results of student learning goals will be shared with site administrator.	Results of student learning goals will be shared with site administrator.
By the last day of school Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.	**By the last day of school** Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.	**By the last day of school** Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed. Summative Evaluation Completed.

*Educators' tenured in another Minnesota district and new to White Bear Lake Area Schools will have observations consistent with year 1 for probationary educators. Once tenured, the educator will move to the tenured educator evaluation process timeline.

Tenured Educators Evaluation Process

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
By September 30 Student Learning Goals (SLG) established and agreed upon with site administrator.	**By September 30** Student Learning Goals (SLG) established and agreed upon with site administrator.	**By September 30** Student Learning Goals (SLG) established and agreed upon with site administrator.
Ongoing Student engagement data will be collected by site administrators in ongoing walk-throughs.	**Ongoing** Student engagement data will be collected by site administrators in ongoing walk-throughs.	**Ongoing** Student engagement data will be collected by site administrators in ongoing walk-throughs.
Final data from the SLG final assessment will be shared with site administrator.	**Beginning After October 1** Peer Reviewer will perform 1 non-evaluative CLASS observation.	**Beginning on or about October 1 and occurring throughout the school year** Site administrator will perform 1 evaluative CLASS observation.
By the last day of school Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.	Final data from the SLG final assessment will be shared with site administrator.	Final data from the SLG final assessment will be shared with site administrator.
	By the last day of school Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.	**By the last day of school** Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed. Summative Evaluation Completed.

Educator Measurement for Student Learning

Student Learning Goals Documentation
Draft from EDE Oversight Committee
To be Finalized by Principals the week of September 8

<u>**(Language from the MOU)**</u>
Statutory Requirement:
Educator evaluation processes must use an agreed-upon educator measurement for student growth as a basis for 35 percent of educator evaluation results.

Status:

A. All educators will be expected to set annual Student Learning Goals ("SLG"). The goal will be in the SMART goal format (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-based). The five parts of creating a smart goal include: being **S**pecific, having a concrete set of criteria for **M**easuring progress, making the goal **A**ttainable, making the goal **R**elevant, and, grounding the goal within a **T**imeframe. This goal will be used to meet the Minnesota Statute 122A.40 Subd. 8(b)(8) requirement for a measurement of student learning.

B. The goal must be developed and submitted to the educator's assigned evaluator no later than September 30. The educator and evaluator should discuss the goal and the educator's rationale for the goal as part of the approval process.

C. The assigned evaluator will review the submitted goal and either (1) approve it or (2) return it to the educator with suggestions for revisions. This revision process must be completed by October 20.

D. SLGs may either be growth goals or proficiency goals:

   a. Growth goals use (pre-) assessment data to determine where students are relative to the focus of the goal. The educator then establishes a goal that tracks the learning growth of students from the pre-assessment to the final assessment. These goals should measure student growth over a minimum of 45 days of instructional time. A growth goal is more focused on the individual growth/improvement of students.

      i. **Example of a Growth goal:** The percent of all students in Ms. Johnson's third grade class at Olson Elementary who achieve or exceed individual RIT score growth target on the Mathematics NWEA MAP will increase from 62% in the Fall of 2014 to 70% in the Spring of 2015.

   b. Proficiency goals identify a level of performance that students would be expected to meet by the conclusion of the instruction. A standards-based, proficiency goal is more focused

on the final expected level of performance/learning.

      i. **Example of a Proficiency Goal:** The percent of students in Ms. Johnson's third grade classroom at Olson Elementary who earn achievement levels of Meets the Standards or Exceeds the Standards on the Mathematics MCA-III will increase from 80% in 2014 to 85% in 2015.

E. SLGs may either be targeted or whole-group:

    a. Targeted SLGs allow an educator to focus on those students who need the most development relative to the standards-based instruction chosen for the SLG. Targeted students often require additional support or more intensive instruction. Targeted goals must encompass at least 60% of students instructed/served and may reflect more than one subgroup.

    b. Whole-group SLGs involve an educator selecting all students in a class or set of classes who are working on the standard chosen for the SLG.

F. An SLG will have the following components:

    a. A SMART goal statement

    b. Identification of growth-focused or standards-focused, proficiency goal (check box)

    c. Identification of targeted or whole-group goal (check box)

    d. Implementation overview (Should include identification of the standard on which the goal/student performance is based (note – these goals may be Minnesota academic standards or national organization standards)

    e. Means of assessment (e.g., common assessment, MAP, etc.)

G. By the last day of school, the Principal and Educator will sign Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.

<u>Setting Student Learning Goals</u>
Completed by the Educator

1. Educator: _____

2. Educator Group (Select one):

Early Childhood Educators	
Elementary Core Educators	
Elementary Specialists	
Special Education Educators	
Elementary Intervention Staff	
Non-Instructional Staff (Nurse, Social Worker, SLP, Psychologist, School Counselor, etc.)	
Middle School Math	
Middle School Language Arts / Reading	
Middle School Subject Area Educators	
High School Educators	

3. School: _____

4. SMART Goal statement for SLG 1:

   _____

   _____

   a. Growth Focused Goal

       OR

       Standards-based/Proficiency Focused Goal   _____

   b. Targeted Goal
       (Target goals must encompass at least 60% of students instructed/served and
       may reflect more than one subgroup of students.)

       OR

       Whole-group Goal   _____

c. Implementation overview:

_____

_____

_____

d. Means of Assessment:

_____

5. SMART Goal statement for SLG 2 (*Applicable for Elementary Core Educators only.*):

_____

_____

a. Growth Focused Goal

OR

Standards-based/Proficiency Focused Goal   _____

b. Targeted Goal
(Target goals must encompass at least 60% of students instructed/served and may reflect more than one subgroup of students.)

OR

Whole-group Goal   _____

c. Implementation overview:

_____

_____

_____

d. Means of Assessment:

_____

Student Learning Goal Approval
Completed by Principal/Supervisor

The Principal/Supervisor will ensure clarity of the priority of content, quality of assessment, and rigor of goal.

1. SMART Goal statement _____Approved _____Requires additional info

    SMART Goal format

    _____**S**pecific

    _____**M**easurable

    _____**A**ttainable

    _____**R**elevant

    _____**T**ime-based

2. Type of Goal: Growth or Proficiency _____Approved _____Requires additional info

3. Targeted or Whole-group Goal _____Approved _____Requires additional info
    (60% of Students Served)

4. Implementation overview _____Approved _____Requires additional info

5. Means of Assessment _____Approved _____Requires additional info

Feedback:

_____

_____

_____

_____

The educator and principal/supervisor will sign the Student Learning Goals Documentation to indicate that the Student Learning Goal has been reviewed and agreed to.

Educator: _____Date:_____

Principal/Supervisor: _____Date:_____

<u>Results of Student Learning Goals</u>
Completed by the Educator

Students achieved the following results on the approved assessment.

Results:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Reflection:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Were there any changes to the number of students in your class or significant student attendance issues that should be considered when evaluating your student learning goals?

Additional Information:

_____

_____

_____

_____

SCORING

Completed by the Principal/Supervisor

SLG Evaluation Rubric

	High Range- Exceeds Expectations	Middle to High Range- Meets Expectations	Low to Middle Range- Developing	Low Range- Needs Improvement
SLG Implementation	The complete SLG is implemented with fidelity, with modifications for improvement being made as appropriate throughout the year	The complete SLG is implemented with fidelity	Key components of the SLG are implemented	Significant elements of the SLG are not implemented
SLG Results	All student results meet or exceed the goal	Most student results meet the goal	Some student results meet the goal and/or demonstrate growth/improvement	Most student results do not meet the goal or there is little evidence of student growth
SLG Reflection	Reflection on implementation and results demonstrates intentional planning and instruction/ delivery of service as well as how to finesse implementation in the future	Educator reflection on implementation and results clearly identifies reasons for student results and suggests means to improve the implementation and/or student results in the future	Educator reflection on implementation and results identifies possible reasons for student results and/or requires prompting from the evaluator to identify reasons; plan to improve future implementation is limited/basic	Educator reflection on implementation and results is minimal or focused on issues not germane to the goal or there is no plan to improve future implementation

Student Learning Goal:

_____ **High Range-Exemplary**

_____ **High to Middle Range-Effective**

_____ **Middle to Low Range-Development Needed**

_____ **Low Range-Unsatisfactory**

Principal/Supervisor Feedback:

_____

_____

_____

The educator and principal/supervisor will sign the Student Learning Goals documentation to indicate that the results and scoring have been reviewed.

Educator: _____   Date:_____

Principal/Supervisor: _____   Date:_____

The purpose of the addendum is to add clarity to the work of the White Bear Lake Teachers' Association, White Bear Lake Principals and District Administration. The substance of the work has not changed from the original MOU. Provided below is an overview to the content that has been clarified:

Terminology/Format: Replaced the word "teachers" with "educators" throughout the documents.

Replaced the word "evaluator" with "principal/supervisor" throughout the documents.

Replaced Teacher Development and Evaluation ("TOE") Plan with Educator Development and Evaluation ("EDE") Plan throughout the documents.

Acronyms are clearly identified.

Added page numbers.

ADDENDUM

4. Education Evaluation Standards (page 4):

Added reference to CLASS = Classroom Assessment Scoring System.

9. Student Growth Measurements (pages 6-7):

We expanded on the language related to Student Learning Goals ("SLG"), which will be in the SMART goal format. We articulate the five parts to creating a SMART goal and that the SMART goals may be growth goals or proficiency goals.

Examples of both the Growth Goal and a Proficiency Goal have been provided.

Expanded on SLGs

The Edina Educator Evaluation Plan was leveraged to finalize our language in this section.

SLG Evaluation Rubric (page 8):

Includes SLG Implementation, SLG Results, and SLG Reflection

Building Goals (pages 9 - 13):

> Edited the Chart to identify SLG Goals and SLG Building Goals.

> Revised the Probationary Educators Evaluation Process Chart to include Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3

Building Goals continued (pages 9 - 13):

> Revised the Tenured Educators Evaluation Process Chart to include Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3

Educator Measurement for Student Learning – Student Learning Goals Documentation (pages 1 – 2)

> Language from MOU

Setting Student Goals (pages 3 – 4):

> This form is to be completed by the educator.

> #9 on this form is SMART Goal Statement for SLG 2 (applicable for Elementary Core Educators only).

Student Learning Goal Approval (page 5):

> This form is to be completed by the principal/supervisor.

Results of Student Learning Goals (page 7):

> This form is to be completed by the Educator.

Scoring (page 8-9):

> The SLG Evaluation Rubric is to be completed by the Principal/Supervisor.

> Educator and Principal/Supervisor will be required to sign/date forms.

> Once the form is finalized/approved, we will turn into a PDF, tab delineated form for ease of use by the educators.