

*Race to the Top Round 2 Webinar Presentation
Monday, May 10, 2010*

Submitted Questions

- 1. If the school board took action supporting the Race to the Top application in the first, does the board have to take specific action this round? Or will the resolution from last fall suffice?**

The Wisconsin Race to the Top Round 2 MOU has changed, and therefore districts must re-sign the new MOU. However, it is a local decision whether or not the board takes a formal action to endorse the application, or whether the superintendent simply signs on behalf of the district.

- 2. Is the Wisconsin Race to the Top Round 2 application different from Round 1 concerning the formative evaluation section which provides districts with the option of career ladders, compensation alternatives, etc. instead of those items being required?**

Yes, these activities are optional for districts. Districts should check the relevant boxes under either of the following scenarios:

- If a district already has the activity in place, they should check the box for that activity.
- If a district does not currently have the activity in place, but is interested in using RTTT funds to implement the activity, they should check the box for that activity of interest.

- 3. Do the teachers' unions support the Round 2 MOU?**

WEAC and AFT state leaders were actively involved in the Round 2 MOU creation process. Their input and support has been essential.

- 4. Who must sign the MOU? Do the Superintendent and School Board Rep have to sign, and the Union is suggested to sign?**

At a minimum, either the superintendent or board president must sign. The State strongly prefers that all three sign the new Round 2 MOU, since the Race to the Top competition awards additional points for securing signatures from all relevant parties.

- 5. Are the Race to the Top funds part of funding already received, or are they separate?**

The Race to the Top grant funds are in addition to and separate from state or other federal funding allocations. Under Race to the Top grant, participating districts will get an additional \$70,000 per district, or an additional \$100 per pupil, or the additional share under the Title formula distribution, whichever of the three is greater.

6. **Will this webcast be available for board members and union leadership to view afterwards to understand better what they are being asked to sign?**

Yes, you can access the webinar at

<http://doamedia.wi.gov/main/Viewer/?peid=e484a5f7384e4443a25d6694a91052e5>

7. **Is a district required to conduct both formative and summative evaluations of ALL teachers and principals in the first year of the grant? What are the requirements for subsequent years?**

Under the Round 2 MOU, LEAs are required to conduct annual formative and summative evaluations for probationary teachers as determined locally by applicable collective bargaining agreements, and for probationary principals.

LEAs are required to conduct annual locally-determined formative evaluations for non-probationary teachers and principals, a summative evaluation in the first year a teacher or principal becomes non-probationary, and a summative evaluation at least every third year thereafter for non-probationary teachers and principals. (Wis. Stat. § 121.02(1)(q))

Depending on local bargaining conditions, the formative evaluation process should be implemented no later than August 2011. Specifics on implementation will need to be addressed in the district work plan.

Definitions

Formative Evaluations: Are not intended for disciplinary purposes but can inform professional development activities and may lead to the implementation of individual plans designed to improve performance and instruction. Formative evaluations include the following as significant factors:

- Student growth and achievement data that result from assessments in core academic subjects administered to pupils under Wis. Stat. § 118.30 and 20 USC 6311 (b) (3), provided the school board has developed a teacher evaluation plan through collective bargaining that includes all of the following:
 - 1) A description of the evaluation process.
 - 2) Multiple criteria in addition to examination results.
 - 3) The rationale for using examination results to evaluate teachers.
 - 4) An explanation of how the school board intends to use the evaluations to improve pupil academic achievement
- Evidence of student growth and achievement from locally developed assessments, portfolios of student work, grades, rigor of coursework (including dual enrollment, honors, AP or IB courses), and other measures deemed by the State to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
- Portfolio of teacher's work or instructional artifacts
 - Classroom observations

Summative Evaluations: Per Wis. Stat. § 121.02(1)(q), conduct an evaluation in the first year and at least every third year thereafter to assess overall employment performance, which may be used for disciplinary purposes. This should include:

- A classroom observation
- A review of compliance with action steps created under the formative evaluations process.
- A review of compliance with district personnel policies
- Any other criteria allowed by State law.
- Multiple rating categories, which must include at a minimum “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory.”

If performance is unsatisfactory, then an improvement plan shall be implemented. Progressive disciplinary measures may be taken pursuant to district policy.

- Performance improvement plans must clearly articulate: the specific areas of improvement, time frame for the plan, and defined outcomes. Opportunities for improvement shall be offered, which may include ongoing observation, mentoring, ongoing conferences, modeling, and professional development. Career transition benefits may be offered to employees that voluntarily choose to leave their positions.