

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Pilot

Report to the Legislature



Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction

July 2011

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at (360) 725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION PILOT

Prepared by
Michaela W. Miller, Program Director

K-12 Education/Teacher and Principal Evaluation
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Michaela W. Miller, Program Director

Randy I. Dorn
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Alan Burke, Ed.D.
Deputy Superintendent, K-12 Education

July 2011

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	V
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Legislative Background	
1. Summary of E2SSB 6696	
2. Timeline/System Development	
3. Foundation of the Evaluation Systems	
a. Revised Teacher and Principal Criteria	
b. Four-Level System	
i. Teachers	
ii. Principals	
c. Using Student Growth Data in Evaluations	
4. TPEP Steering Committee	
5. TPEP Pilot Districts	
a. TPEP Pilot Site Overview	
II. Process	8
A. Evaluation System Implementation Status	
1. Evaluation System Overview	
2. Major Components Common to all Pilots	
a. Common Statewide Revised Criteria Definitions	
b. Common Statewide Tier Labels	
c. Common Statewide Tier Summative Statements	
d. Common Statewide Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory Delineation	
3. District Determined Components	
a. Instructional and Leadership Framework	
b. Multiple Measures of Teacher and Principal Performance	
III. Findings	16
A. Research and Reports	
B. Blueprint for Changing and Implementing the Washington State Evaluation System	
IV. Next Steps.....	19
A. TPEP Pilot Sites	
B. State-level Taskforce Committees	
V. Recommendations	20
A. Superintendent Dorn’s Recommendation	
1. One or Multiple Models	
2. Evaluation System Components	
3. State-Approval Process	
4. Challenges to a State Evaluation Approval Process	

VI.	Conclusion.....	22
VII.	Bibliography.....	22
VIII.	Appendices	24
	A. Teacher Evaluation Model Visual Diagram	
	B. Principal Evaluation Model Visual Diagram	
	C. Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot Cross-Case Analysis	
	○ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/washington_tpep_cross_case_analysis.pdf	
	D. Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot Case Studies and Evaluation Models	
	1. Anacortes	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-anacortes_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/asd-eval-models/	
	2. Central Valley	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-central-valley_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/cvsd-eval-models/	
	3. Kennewick	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-kennewick_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/ksd-eval-models/	
	4. NEWESD 101 Consortium	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-newesd-consortium_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/consortium-eval-models/	
	5. North Mason	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-north-mason_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/nmsd-eval-models/	
	6. North Thurston	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-norththurston_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/ntps-eval-models/	
	7. Othello	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-othello_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/osd-eval-models/	
	8. Snohomish	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-snohomish_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/ssd-eval-models/	
	9. Wenatchee	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/0390-wenatchee_casestudy.pdf	
	▪ http://tpep-wa.org/wsd-eval-models/	
	E. Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Statewide Data Analysis Report	
	○ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/washington-tpep-statewide-data-report.pdf	
	F. OSPI Practitioner Panel Review	
	○ Practitioner Workgroups Proposal April 2011	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/practitioner-workgroups-proposal-april-2011.pdf	
	○ TPEP Model Review Templates	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/tpep-model-review-templates-compiled.pdf	
	○ TPEP Practitioner Panel Participants	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/tpep-practitioner-panel-participants.pdf	
	○ TPEP Practitioner Panels System & State Feedback	
	▪ http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/tpep-practitioner-panels_system-state-feedback.pdf	
	G. OSPI School Employee Evaluation Survey Summary and Data	
	1. OSPI School Employee Evaluation Survey PDF Summary	

- http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/SEES_Summary_PDF_SY2009-10.pdf
- 2. OSPI School Employee Evaluation Survey Data File
 - http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/SEES_Summary_Data_SY2009-10.xlsx
- H. Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot Site Interview Compilation (Video)
 - <http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/tpep-site-interviews.m4v>

List of Tables

Table 1	Comparison of Existing Evaluation Requirements and Revised E2SSB 6696 Components
Table 2	TPEP Pilot District and Statewide Implementation Timeline
Table 3	Revised Teacher and Principal Criteria
Table 4	TPEP Steering Committee Members and Organizations
Table 5	Participating TPEP Pilot Districts
Table 6	TPEP Pilot Site Overview
Table 7	Evaluation System Overview Glossary
Table 8	Common Statewide Revised Teacher Criteria Definitions
Table 9	Common Statewide Revised Principal Criteria Definitions
Table 10	Draft Common Statewide Tier Labels
Table 11	Draft Common Statewide Tier Summative Statements - Teacher
Table 12	Teacher Instructional Frameworks by District
Table 13	Measures Under Consideration by District - Teacher
Table 14	Measures Under Consideration by District - Principal
Table 15	State-level Taskforce Committees

Executive Summary

Background

The Teacher & Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP), which was created in Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6696 (E2SSB 6696) in the 2010 Legislative Session, offers Washington State the opportunity to identify the measures of effective teaching and leading. The new Washington State evaluation system must both hold educators accountable and be leverage for authentic professional growth. This emerging system, built on the foundation of the new teacher and principal criteria and developed by Washington State educators, provides a direction that will empower teachers, principals and district leaders to meet the needs of students in Washington State. The new evaluation system sets high expectations for what teachers and principals should know and be able to do, values diversity, and fosters a high commitment to teaching and leading as professional practice.

Setting the Context

According to the Joyce Foundation, by the end of 2010 twelve states had passed new state teacher/principal evaluation laws. Washington State is included in this bold group of states that embarked on a journey of creating a new system for measuring teacher and leadership performance. The research over the past 10 years establishing the critical importance of quality teachers and leaders (Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kane, 2005; Rockoff, 2004) prompted policymakers to look to evaluation as a lynchpin to education reform. It is important to note that the other areas impacting teacher and leadership quality should not be overlooked and are inextricably linked to evaluation. "Such areas include these components of the educator career continuum: traditional certification, alternative certification, mentoring and induction, professional development, evaluation, compensation, equitable distribution, and tenure." (Behrstock, Meyer, Wraight, & Bhatt, 2009).

Educators in Washington State overwhelmingly agree, the current evaluation system requires a much needed overhaul. During the 2010-11 school year, OSPI conducted a survey and ten forums with nearly 7,000 educators outside of the TPEP pilot sites and found that 80 percent indicated the primary purpose of the current evaluation system was compliance. Practitioners in and out of the TPEP pilot sites "want tools for improvement and growth." (Fetters, J., & Behrstock-Sherratt, E., 2011). All indications are that Washington State took the right step to enact E2SSB 6696 and the strong belief that the evaluation changes will produce positive results for our students.

Summary of E2SSB 6696

The new law requires Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to work in collaboration with organizations representing teachers, principals, district administrators, and parents to develop new evaluation models for both classroom teachers and principals. Representatives of the following organizations serve on the TPEP Steering Committee:

- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Washington Education Association
- Association of Washington School Principals
- Washington Association of School Administrators
- Washington State Parent-Teacher Association
- Washington State School Directors' Association (May 2011)

The Legislation also:

- Revised the evaluation criteria for both classroom teachers and principals;
- Created a four-level rating systems;
- Required OSPI to create a pilot with school districts in the 2010-11 (development) and 2011-12 (pilot implementation) school years;
- All districts to adopt new systems in the 2013-14 school year;
- Increased the length of the provisional status for new teachers; and
- Requires school districts to send OSPI information on the current evaluation system for all employee groups beginning in 2010-11 school year.

TPEP Funding

In the 2010 Supplemental Operating Budget, the Legislature provided \$1.9 million in funding for the pilot project and statewide implementation activities for Fiscal Year 2011. More than half of the allocation was distributed in grants to the selected pilot districts and consortium. The allocation chart can be found on our OSPI website.

<http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/PressReleases2010/PrincipalTeacherEvaluationAllocations.pdf>

TPEP Pilot Districts

Districts that are participating in the pilot program include:

- Anacortes
- Central Valley
- Kennewick
- North Mason
- North Thurston
- Othello
- Snohomish
- Wenatchee
- Almira
- Davenport
- Liberty
- Medical Lake
- Pullman
- Reardan-Edwall
- Ritzville
- Wilbur

Development Year

During the 2010-11 school year, the TPEP project studied the current evaluation research, worked with national experts, and relied heavily on the practitioners in the pilots to guide the design of their new evaluation systems. Over the course of the year, with the guidance of the

TPEP districts, common evaluation components were identified. These components will translate to a more consistent evaluation system of teacher and principal performance state-wide. At the same time, decision-making regarding specific local or regional factors was honored. The key to Superintendent Dorn's final recommendations will be finding the delicate balance that will maintain a rigorous state-wide evaluation system and value the local differences. Case studies were written that captured each of the pilot site development (Appendix D). In addition, a cross-case analysis was produced (Appendix C) that looked at the work of the TPEP districts as a whole.

The TPEP evaluation models will be piloted in the 2011-12 school year, and results analyzed in the summer of 2012.

TPEP Communication

OSPI took deliberate steps during the 2010-11 school year to create a transparent development process. In August 2010, OSPI launched the TPEP website (<http://tpep-wa.org/>). This website allowed the project to update and provide resources to both the pilot sites and the larger stakeholder community. The website currently houses all of the meeting agendas and materials the project used throughout the year for the development. Most importantly, the website contains the teacher and principal evaluation systems for each participating TPEP district and the consortium.

Superintendent's Recommendations

E2SSB 6696 requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to make recommendations in this report regarding whether a single statewide evaluation model should be adopted, whether modified versions developed by school districts should be subject to state approval, and what the criteria would be for determining if a school district's evaluation model meets or exceeds a statewide model. The report also is to identify challenges posed by requiring a state approval process.

Summarized below are the Superintendent's recommendations, which are on the work of the TPEP Pilot sites and TPEP Steering Committee input. Please see the recommendation section for more details.

1. Districts should be encouraged to select from a limited number of state-approved teacher and principal evaluation models. However, it is recommended that a state approval process be developed for those districts not wanting to select from the state-approved models.
2. The Superintendent will require that all systems have specified components. These components will include, but not limited to:
 - Research-based instructional and leadership frameworks which utilize rubrics based in a four-tiered evaluation system.
 - State-adopted evaluation criteria, definitions, tier labels, summative statements, and a common satisfactory/not satisfactory delineation.
 - Multiple measures for determining effective teacher and principal performance.
 - Professional learning for principals and classroom teachers that will include training for all evaluators on the components of an evaluation system.

3. At the conclusion of the pilots, the Superintendent shall finalize the components and requirements that must be included in the evaluation systems. All school districts will be required to include all of the components as specified by the Superintendent.

During the 2012-13 school year, school districts should be required to submit a description of their proposed evaluation systems that they intend to use beginning in the 2013-14 school year. The description of the system shall include how they will address each of the required components, which will be subject to a thorough, rigorous state review process conducted by OSPI with the assistance of principals, teachers, and administrators.

4. The challenges to a state review process rest in two areas: time and resources. The capacity over the next two years to approve all models will be time consuming and require state-level expertise and consultation to remain intact and be enhanced. If the system is to be functioning at a high level during the 2013-14 state-wide implementation year, serious consideration will need to be given to providing targeted resources to prepare all the districts in an intentional way for the new teacher and principal evaluation system.

I. Introduction

The acts of teaching and leading are incredibly complex tasks involving multiple and varied skills and knowledge. Research has established the critical importance that school leaders and classroom teachers have in impacting student learning (Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kane, 2005; Rockoff, 2004). Research also has demonstrated that teacher evaluations are often sporadic and poorly designed and, as a result, provide little useful information on teacher effectiveness (Brandt, Thomas, & Burke, 2008; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009). To this end, the Washington State Legislature enacted E2SSB 6696 in the spring of 2010 to overhaul a generation-old evaluation system for both certificated classroom teachers and principals.

A. Legislative Background

1. Summary of E2SSB 6696

The significant shifts in requirements from the existing evaluation system to the new one envisioned in E2SSB 6696 cannot be understated. Nearly eight of ten administrators surveyed this year felt that the current evaluation system is used only for compliance. The table below identifies four of the most significant changes in the existing evaluation law.

Table 1

Comparison of Existing Evaluation Requirements and Revised E2SSB 6696 Components		
Component	Existing Evaluation System	Revised E2SSB 6696 Evaluation System
Tiers	Binary (Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory)	Four-tiered Professional Growth and Development System
Criteria	Criteria developed more than 25 years ago.	Criteria that describes effective teaching and leading developed by organizational stakeholder groups in the 2010 legislative session.
Provisional Status	2 years (prior to 2009/10 SY)	3 years
Educator Evaluation Data	No existing requirement	Requires evaluation data submitted to OSPI for all employee groups beginning 2010-11 SY

2. Timeline/System Development

Over the course of the two-year pilot, the district participants have three main tasks as outlined in E2SSB 6696. First, the pilots are to create models for implementing the evaluation criteria. Second, they are to create models for student growth tools. Finally, the pilots are to create professional development programs and evaluator training for teachers and principals.

Within those three tasks, there are seven specific responsibilities the districts are required to develop and pilot:

- Development of rubrics for evaluation criteria and ratings;
- Development of appropriate evaluation system forms;

- Identification of, or development of, appropriate multiple measures of student growth;
- Submission of data that is used in evaluations and all district-collected student achievement, aptitude and growth data (regardless of whether it is used in evaluations);
- Participation in professional development opportunities for principals and classroom teachers regarding the content of the new evaluation system;
- Participation in evaluator training; and
- Participation in activities to evaluate the effectiveness of the new system and support programs.

Timeline

Table 2 describes the timeline for both the TPEP pilot sites and the proposed timeline and activities generated for districts outside of the pilot districts. These proposed activities were developed after careful consideration and analysis of best practice generated from our TPEP pilots. Further information about the pilot development and state-wide implementation plan can be found on our OSPI external website (<http://tpep-wa.org/>), which contains updated information about the constantly evolving world of educator evaluation in Washington State. The site contains information about our TPEP 2010-11 meetings/agendas, district evaluation models and background information about the national and state landscape of educator evaluation. This resource is one OSPI intends to maintain and enhance as the project develops.

Table 2

TPEP Pilot District and Statewide Implementation Timeline	
Pilot Districts	
2010-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Models/Tools/Rubrics <i>(OSPI Report due July 1, 2011)</i>
2011-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Pilot Models/Tools/Rubrics <i>(OSPI Report due July 1, 2012)</i> • Pilot Districts engage in professional development, including inter-rater reliability training, instructional framework training for teachers/principals, and leadership training for teacher leaders, principals and district administration
2012-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refine models, participate in evaluation professional development and evaluator training
All Districts	
2010-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation of Pilot Development <i>Resource: TPEP website: http://tpep-wa.org/</i> • Stakeholder engagement and communication • Participation in Educator Evaluation Regional Forums (2010 -11)
2011-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation of Pilot Implementation <i>Resource: TPEP website: http://tpep-wa.org/</i> • Stakeholder engagement and communication • Participation in Educator Evaluation Regional Academies (2011-12) • TPEP Implementation Consortium Grants <i>(information provided in July 2011)</i>

2012-13

- Identification of Evaluation Models (*upon conclusion of TPEP pilot recommendations in June 2012*)
- Participate in Evaluation Professional Development and Evaluator Training

2013-14

- Full state-wide implementation of new teacher and principal evaluation systems
- Participate in Evaluation Professional Development and Evaluator Training

3. Foundation of the Evaluation Systems

The foundation of “what we know for sure” about Washington State’s new teacher and principal evaluation systems rest in two important sections of the new evaluation law. First, Washington State has revised teacher and principal evaluation criteria that will apply to all school districts beginning in the 2013-14 school year. Second, Washington State is moving from a required binary summative rating of satisfactory/not satisfactory to a four-level professional growth and development model. These two revisions in the law form the underpinnings of the work of the TPEP pilots in 2010-11. In addition, much attention nationally has focused on the issue of student growth data in evaluations and the project took steps to ensure that all aspects of a complex new evaluation system were considered by providing research, resources and national experts regarding multiple measures.

a. Revised Teacher and Principal Criteria

Washington State has not had new evaluation criteria for certificated classroom teachers and principals in more than 25 years. Educators and stakeholders involved in the project agree that the change to the new criteria sets a clearer definition of effective teaching and leading. In some cases, the revised criteria lack the definitions needed to clearly distinguish one from another. Table 3 includes the current and revised teacher and principal evaluation criteria.

Table 3

Revised Teacher and Principal Criteria	
<u>Current</u> Teacher Evaluation Criteria	<u>Revised</u> Teacher Evaluation Criteria
1. Instructional skill	1. Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement
2. Classroom management	2. Demonstrating effective teaching practices
3. Professional preparation and scholarship	3. Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs
4. Effort toward improvement when needed	4. Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum
5. Handling of student discipline and attendant problems	5. Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment
6. Interest in teaching pupils	6. Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning
7. Knowledge of subject matter	7. Communicating and collaborating with parents and school community
	8. Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning

Current Principal Evaluation Criteria	Revised Principal Evaluation Criteria
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Knowledge of, experience in, and training in recognizing good professional performance, capabilities and development 2. School administration and management 3. School finance 4. Professional preparation and scholarship 5. Effort toward improvement when needed 6. Interest in pupils, employees, patrons and subjects taught in school 7. Leadership 8. Ability and performance of evaluation of school personnel 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creating a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching for students and staff 2. Demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap 3. Providing for school safety 4. Leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements 5. Assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local district learning goals 6. Monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices 7. Managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities 8. Partnering with the school community to promote student learning

b. Four-Level System

According to a School Employee Evaluation Survey coordinated by OSPI (required by section 4 (d) of E2SSB 6696), 209 of the 289 reporting districts in Washington State used a binary (satisfactory/not satisfactory) summative system for evaluating certificated classroom teachers in 2009-10. Although many districts appear to use a tiered approach during the evaluation cycle, none used it in 2009-10 as a final summative evaluation. According to the survey data collected for the Department of Education as a requirement of State Fiscal Stabilization Funding (SFSF), 99 percent of our certificated classroom teachers were deemed satisfactory. (See <http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/FiscalStabilization.aspx>). This is consistent with findings from other national reports on this issue, specifically the 2009 report “The Widget Effect” from The New Teacher Project (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009).

According to our OSPI School Employee Evaluation Survey, 196 out of 295 school districts in Washington State used a binary (satisfactory/not satisfactory) summative system for evaluating principals in 2009-10. Although not as widely scrutinized at a national level, the same data appears to hold true when OSPI surveyed districts regarding the principal evaluation system. In the required SFSF reporting from the 2009-10 SY, 98 percent of all principals were deemed satisfactory on their summative evaluations in Washington State.

For both classroom teachers and principals, E2SSB 6696 requires a four-level evaluation rating system that must describe performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded.”

c. Using Student Growth Data in Evaluations

The Obama Administration, influential national organizations, and others have advocated that student growth data be an integral component in the evaluation of teachers and principals. The Washington Legislature, after considering the technical challenges of measuring student growth and other factors, chose to include an evaluation criterion regarding the teacher's use of student data to inform instruction and a principal's use of multiple student data points, but did not require that student growth data be included in the evaluation of teachers or principals to increase student achievement. However, E2SSB 6696 does state that "...when student growth data, if available and relevant to the teacher and subject matter, is referenced in the evaluation process, it must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools. As used in this subsection, "student growth" means the change in student achievement between two points in time." Similar language also was included regarding using student growth data in the evaluation of principals.

The issue of student growth and the new teacher and principal evaluation system is multi-faceted and hinges on many other parts of a district or state instructional and human resource system. It also requires an extensive pre- and post assessment system in multiple disciplines and detailed information regarding which teacher or teachers actually taught the student the content area being assessed. Every district and state engaged in this work across the country has wrestled with these complex questions and there are very few definitive answers to such high stakes propositions.

TPEP districts have worked throughout the year, with the guidance of the E2SSB 6696 language, to decide what best fits their district that would be valid measures of student growth and how to attribute this growth accurately to individual teachers. The TPEP districts have and continue to tackle both formative and summative growth measures. All TPEP participants agree that student learning plays a significant role in the development of these new evaluation systems and that a focus on teacher and leader professional growth will only further impact student learning. According to national experts at the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, "Multiple measures of teacher outcomes allow for a more comprehensive view of a teacher's effectiveness based on a variety of evidence. Although summative student achievement data are relevant, data on teacher performance are most useful for targeting professional development and specifically addressing areas in which growth is needed."

Because of the complexity of the topic, during the next seven months OSPI will directly address the issue of using student growth data in evaluations by bringing together experts and practitioners from Washington State to identify specific recommendations for using growth data in evaluations. This Student Growth Taskforce will be one of three committees that TPEP will form by August 2011, which will make recommendations in February 2012. The other two committees will make recommendations regarding evaluator training, inter-rater reliability and the use of perception survey data.

4. TPEP Steering Committee

The legislation requires OSPI, in collaboration with state associations representing teachers, principals, administrators, and parents, to create models for implementing the evaluation system criteria, student growth tools, professional development programs, and evaluator training for certificated classroom teachers and principals. OSPI created the TPEP steering committee to oversee and monitor the policy direction and decisions of the TPEP Pilot work. Members of the Steering Committee are listed in Table 4.

Table 4

TPEP Steering Committee Members and Organizations	
Jonelle Adams	Washington School Directors Association (WSSDA) <i>added May 2011</i>
Alan Burke	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Bob Butts	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Judy Hartmann	Office of the Governor
Ramona Hattendorf	Washington State Parent Teacher Association (WSPTA)
Jim Koval	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Gary Kipp	Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)
Michaela Miller	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Scott Poirier	Washington Education Association (WEA)
Paula Quinn	Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)
Ann Randall	Washington Education Association (WEA)
Leslie Rose	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Paul Rosier	Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA)
Bill Williams	Washington State Parent Teacher Association (WSPTA)
Lucinda Young	Washington Education Association (WEA)

(In alphabetical order)

One of the key elements of the success of the TPEP work thus far has been the intentional collaboration among the stakeholders outlined in the legislation. The collaboration at the state-level was a model for the expectation of the pilot districts to work as a team to ensure the work is done with stakeholder involvement. The TPEP Steering Committee met 15 times during the 2010-11 year to make joint policy decisions about the direction of the project. All members approved the final version of this report.

5. TPEP Pilot Districts

The pilot consists of eight districts and one consortium of smaller districts working with the TPEP steering committee organizations to develop nine new and innovative teacher and principal evaluation systems that comply with the legislation and lead to better teaching and learning.

II. Process

A. Evaluation System Implementation Status

1. Evaluation System Overview

This overview was developed with the TPEP pilot sites to create an understanding of the system changes required in order to fully implement the new evaluation law. The 2010-11 school year was considered a development year with the focus on learning, understanding system changes and detailing the operations of the new evaluation systems. The work was divided into two descriptors: “The What” and “The How.”

Table 7

Evaluation System Overview Glossary	
Teacher	Principal
The What	
Describes the development of the components of the new evaluation system. These pieces must be developed in order to implement the new evaluation, but are not the only pieces of the system. The “what” components are illustrated in Visual “A” (teachers) and Visual “B” (principals).	
Revised Teacher Evaluation Criteria	Revised Principal Evaluation Criteria
The Legislature passed E2SSB 6696 and Governor Gregoire signed the bill into law (RCW 28A.405.100) on March 29, 2010. The criteria formed the backbone of the new evaluation system. The TPEP districts have used the evaluation criteria language and existing or new instructional frameworks to develop the rubrics. According to the RCW, “the four-level rating system used to evaluate the certificated classroom teacher must describe performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded.”	The Legislature passed E2SSB 6696 and Governor Gregoire signed the bill into law (RCW 28A.405.100) on March 29, 2010. The criteria formed the backbone of the new evaluation system. The TPEP districts have used the evaluation criteria language and resources such as AWSP’s document “Evaluating Principal Leadership in a Performance-Based School” to develop the rubrics. According to the RCW, “the four-level rating system used to evaluate the principal must describe performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded.”
Criteria Definitions	Criteria Definitions
Based on feedback from experts and our TPEP districts, we have created definitions for each of the new teacher criterion. Each of the TPEP districts submitted definitions and we synthesized those into one brief sentence. This is intended to delineate the criteria in order to minimize the overlap between the criteria and create more consistency across the state in setting clear evaluation targets for teachers and principals as we move to statewide implementation.	The Criteria Definitions for the state’s principal criteria are being developed by AWSP and will be available soon. The research-based definitions are an extension of the AWSP document “Evaluating Principal Leadership in a Performance-Based School.”
Comprehensive Instructional Framework	Leadership Framework
The comprehensive instructional framework (common language/model of instruction) provides districts with a way to talk about instruction that is shared by everyone in the district/ESD. Dr. Robert Marzano states that teachers and principals use the instructional framework “to converse about effective teaching, give and receive feedback, collect and act upon data to	Districts in the pilot relied heavily on the work done by AWSP that culminated in the document “Evaluating Principals Leadership in a Performance-based School”. Districts also reported using the standards from the national organizations for principals, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Val-Ed and the work of Dr. Robert Marzano and Doug Reeves.

<p>monitor growth regarding the reasoned use of the strategies, and align professional development needs against the framework.” There are several instructional frameworks being utilized by the TPEP districts. Because the new teacher criteria are unique to Washington, the TPEP districts have aligned the instructional frameworks (and subsequently the rubrics) to the new state criteria.</p>	<p>Unlike an instructional framework for teachers, the leadership frameworks are not tied to a classroom experience and therefore have content beyond that of the classroom that reflect the varied work of the school principal.</p>
<p>Rubrics</p>	<p>Rubrics</p>
<p>The rubrics (based on the instructional frameworks) are the clearly defined continuum that describes unsatisfactory through effective teaching practice based on the 8 teacher criteria. The rubrics should be used to train principals to identify strengths and weaknesses in practice, based on clearly defined evidence and measures. These rubrics could take into account the variations of novice to expert teachers.</p>	<p>The rubrics are the clearly defined continuum that describes unsatisfactory through effective leading based on the 8 principal criteria. The rubrics should be used to train district administrators to identify strengths and weaknesses in practice, based on clearly defined evidence and measures. These rubrics could take into account the variations of novice to expert principals.</p>
<p>Measures and Evidence</p>	<p>Measures and Evidence</p>
<p>The measures and evidence are used to determine the “teacher’s performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded.” The measures used in the evaluation system should have strong correlation to the criteria being evaluated. There are four areas under the “measures and evidence” section: classroom observation, teacher self-assessment, student growth data, other measures/evidence. This section should represent the district’s system for determining final summative evaluation score.</p>	<p>The measures and evidence are used to determine the principal’s performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded.” The measures used in the evaluation system should have strong correlation to the criteria being evaluated. There are four areas under the “measures and evidence” section: observation, perception data, student achievement growth data, and other measures/evidence. This section should represent the district’s system for determining final summative evaluation score.</p>
<p>Final Summative Evaluation</p>	<p>Final Summative Evaluation</p>
<p>The final summative evaluation is a critical definition in order to increase consistency across the state as teachers are evaluated and data is submitted in aggregate. In the late fall 8 of the 9 TPEP sites and WASA submitted a summative evaluation statement for each of the 4 tiers. Similar to the standards-based system for students, clear targets for both the distinct criteria and the final summative evaluation will drive principals and teachers to an evaluation system that promotes growth and prevents stagnation.</p>	<p>The final summative evaluation is a critical definition that increases consistency across the state as principals are evaluated and data is submitted in aggregate. Similar to the standards-based system for students, clear targets for both the distinct criteria and the final summative evaluation will drive districts to an evaluation system that promotes growth and prevents stagnation.</p>
<p>The How</p>	
<p>Equally important to the new components of the system are the policies, procedures and culture surrounding the design and implementation of the new evaluation models.</p>	
<p>Stakeholder Engagement:</p>	
<p>The TPEP project has been a collaborative process from the beginning. Successful development and ultimately implementation has and will require looking at this process through multiple lenses. Please include any documents your district/consortium has used to incorporate authentic stakeholder engagement through the pilot development year. (This will include the norms and protocols you used in setting up your district’s TPEP steering committee.)</p>	

Communication:
Communication is a key component to successful development and implementation of the new evaluation system. The collaborative approach at both the state and district levels is critical. Include the plan and documents that would explain your communication process.
Professional Development:
Looking at this new evaluation system as a process in continuous improvement, professional development to train the staff involved in the pilot will be key. Please include your district's plan for ongoing professional development for your teachers, principals and district administrators involved in the 2011-12 TPEP pilot year.
Data:
Many aspects of the new teacher and principal evaluation system will depend heavily on the acquisition and use of data. Include a description of resources your district already uses relating to instructional data and any additional resources you will need to implement the new evaluation system. (Include any technology, databases related to teacher, student, and/or principal data.)
Forms & Tools:
Many parts of the new evaluation system will require changing the forms and tools used in the evaluation process. Please include and forms and tools developed for the new evaluation process. (Please note which ones are electronic and which are paper-based.) Examples: Principal observation tools (pre, during and post), MOUs, artifact collection and observation tools, parent or student surveys, etc.

2. Major Components Common to all Pilots

In addition to the state required common components (new criteria and four-level system), the Superintendent recommends the additional common state-level components. In order to create a performance-based evaluation system with meaningful aggregated state data, some common components will need to be established across all district evaluation systems.

a. Common Statewide Revised Criteria Definitions

Tables 8 and 9 list the draft definitions for the revised teacher and principal criteria. Nationally recognized evaluation experts have provided advice and guidance to the TPEP project during the 2010-11 development year. These advisors encouraged the state to more clearly articulate and distinguish the criteria. In order to establish a consistent performance-based evaluation system, a common set of agreed upon definitions are critical to the new evaluation system.

In collaboration with the TPEP pilot sites, OSPI and the TPEP Steering Committee organizations developed the following definitions, which are in draft form. The TPEP pilot sites may be using slightly different definitions connected to their rubrics. We will continue working over the course of the pilot year to refine the following definitions and establish the final version at the conclusion of the 2011-12 TPEP pilot.

Table 8

Common Statewide Revised Teacher Criteria Definitions	
Revised Teacher Evaluation Criteria	DRAFT Criteria Definitions
1. Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement.	PLANNING: The teacher sets high expectations through instructional planning and reflection aligned to content knowledge and standards. Instructional planning is demonstrated in the classroom through student engagement that leads to an impact on student learning.

2. Demonstrating effective teaching practices.	INSTRUCTION: The teacher uses research-based instructional practices to meet the needs of ALL students and bases those practices on a commitment to high standards and meeting the developmental needs of students.
3. Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs.	REFLECTION: The teacher acquires and uses specific knowledge about students' individual intellectual and social development and uses that knowledge to advance student learning.
4. Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum.	CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: The teacher uses content area knowledge and appropriate pedagogy to design and deliver curricula, instruction and assessment to impact student learning.
5. Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment.	CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: The teacher fosters and manages a safe, culturally sensitive and inclusive learning environment that takes into account: physical, emotional and intellectual well-being.
6. Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning.	ASSESSMENT: The teacher uses multiple data elements (both formative and summative) for planning, instruction and assessment to foster student achievement.
7. Communicating and collaborating with parents and school community.	PARENTS AND COMMUNITY: The teacher communicates and collaborates with students, parents and all educational stakeholders in an ethical and professional manner to promote student learning.
8. Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving.	PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE: The teacher participates collaboratively in the educational community to improve instruction, advance the knowledge and practice of teaching as a profession, and ultimately impact student learning.

Table 9

Common Statewide Revised Principal Criteria Definitions	
Revised Principal Evaluation Criteria	DRAFT Criteria Definitions
1. Influence, establish and sustain a school culture conducive to continuous improvement for students and staff.	CULTURE: Simply put, culture is the way things get done. Principals influence the culture of a school in many ways. Exemplary principals assure that all classroom cultures maximize learning; they also impact all non-classroom areas and non-class time, with teacher and student leaders, to establish healthy norms which support learning.
2. Lead the development and annual update of a comprehensive safe-schools plan that includes prevention, intervention, crisis response and recovery.	SAFETY: The principal is ultimately responsible for the safe operations of the school. This includes both classroom and school-wide procedures. Principals in Washington are required to have and monitor a school plan that would provide for the safest operations possible.
3. Lead the development, implementation and evaluation of the data-driven plan for improvement of student achievement.	PLANNING: Today's principal leads using plans which are supported by evidence. Whether it is student achievement data, discipline data, school climate perception data, or other measures of school success, using data in planning is crucial. Data provides both the rationale and target for concerted action to move the school forward.

4. Assist instructional staff in aligning curriculum, instruction and assessment with state and local learning goals.	ALIGNMENT: Principals monitor and assist teachers, not just in the “how” of teaching, but also the “what.” Aligning the curriculum, instruction and assessment within each class increases the likelihood that alignment from class to class happens, and students’ learning experiences are connected.
5. Monitor, assist and evaluate staff implementation of the school improvement plan, effective instruction and assessment practices.	SUPERVISION: Principals assist and support teacher professional development through the evaluation process. They ensure that all students have teachers with strong instructional skills and dedication to the achievement of each student, by leading the hiring, evaluation and development of each teacher.
6. Manage human and fiscal resources to accomplish student achievement goals.	MANAGEMENT: Principals make resource decisions to achieve learning, safety, community engagement and achievement gap goals. These decisions include hiring and firing staff, maximizing financial resources, and organizing time, facilities and volunteers.
7. Communicate and partner with school community members to promote student learning.	COMMUNITY: Principals link the school to the community and visa versa. They assist teachers in connecting their students’ learning to parent and community support.
8. Demonstrate a commitment to closing the achievement gap.	THE GAP: Principals monitor gaps between various populations in the school. They channel resources to reduce the gaps to ensure that all students have the maximum opportunity to achieve at high levels.

b. Common Statewide Tier Labels

Table 10 identifies the tier labels each TPEP district submitted during the development year to describe each level of the new four-tiered system.

Table 10

Draft Common Statewide Tier Levels				
Pilot site	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Anacortes	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Proficient	Exemplary
Central Valley	Not Demonstrated/ Unsatisfactory	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished
Kennewick	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Proficient	Exemplary
North Mason	Unsatisfactory	Basic/Emerging	Proficient	Distinguished
North Thurston	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Othello	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Innovative
Snohomish	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Proficient	Exemplary
Wenatchee	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Consortium	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished

c. Common Statewide Tier Summative Statements (Teacher)

The teacher draft summative statements for the new teacher evaluation system were developed in collaboration with the TPEP Steering Committee organizations and the TPEP

Pilot Sites. At the conclusion of the pilot, Superintendent Dorn will make the final summative statement recommendations in the report completed July 1, 2012. The summative statements for principals are still being finalized and will be added as an addendum to the report before the start of the 2011-12 TPEP pilot year.

Table 11

Draft Common Statewide Tier Summative Statements - Teacher	
1	Professional practice at Level 1 does not show evidence of understanding or demonstration of the concepts underlying individual components of the criteria. This level of practice is ineffective and may represent practice that does not contribute to student learning, professional learning environment, or effective teaching practice. This level requires immediate intervention and specific district support. Failure to show adequate growth is grounds for dismissal/nonrenewal.
2	Professional practice at Level 2 shows a developing understanding and demonstration of the concepts underlying individual components of the criteria but performance is inconsistent. This level may be considered minimally competent for teachers early in their careers or experienced teachers in a new assignment, but insufficient for more experienced teachers. This level requires specific and relevant support.
3	Professional practice at Level 3 shows evidence of thorough knowledge of all aspects of the profession. This is successful, accomplished, professional, and effective practice. Teachers at this level thoroughly know academic content, curriculum design/development, their students, and a wide range of professional resources. Teaching at this level utilizes a broad repertoire of strategies and activities to support student learning. At this level, teaching is strengthened and expanded through purposeful, collaborative sharing and learning with colleagues as well as ongoing self-reflection and professional improvement.
4	Professional practice at Level 4 is that of a master professional whose practices operate at a qualitatively different level from those of other professional peers. Teaching practice at this level shows evidence of learning that is student directed, where students assume responsibility for their learning by making substantial, developmentally appropriate contributions throughout the instructional process. Ongoing, reflective teaching is demonstrated through the highest level of expertise and commitment related to all students' learning, challenging professional growth, and collaborative leadership.

Adapted from "Framework for Teaching Levels of Performance Sample Operational Definitions" created by Pam Rosa, Danielson Group Associate

d. Common Statewide Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory Delineation (Teachers and Principals)

Eight of the nine TPEP pilot districts have agreed that the satisfactory/not satisfactory line should be between a Level 1 and Level 2 for both teachers and principals. The ninth district has brought forward concerns related to the policies for the rest of the tiers. Specifically, the policies related to teaching practice at Tier "2". The concerns have been taken into account by the steering committee.

Superintendent Dorn recommends that the satisfactory/not satisfactory delineation will be between a 1 and a 2 for the purposes of the pilot and recommendations regarding further changes to the RCW regarding Tier "2" will be included in the July 1, 2012 report.

3. District Determined Components

According to the May 2011 publication “*A Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems*” from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, “...states now must decide the extent to which the teacher evaluation model will make allowances for local flexibility and provide a balance between local and state control that encourages collective responsibility and accountability.” Throughout the TPEP pilot work and based on evidence across the evaluation work across the country, there are components of any evaluation system that will have the most direct impact on student learning by ensuring stakeholder decision making at the district level.

a. Instructional and Leadership Framework (Teachers and Principals)

The Instructional Frameworks listed below (Table 12) served as the foundation for the rubrics designed by the TPEP districts. Districts listed under the Comprehensive Instructional Frameworks (teachers only) will continue to work with Danielson, Marzano and Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) frameworks to ensure there is alignment between the comprehensive instructional framework and the Washington State criteria. The comprehensive instructional framework is the research-based observation tool that covers all eight of the revised Washington State teacher criteria. The importance of the instructional and leadership frameworks to the development of the evaluation models cannot be underscored. Measuring teacher and principal performance will hinge on the clarity and usability of the observation instruments being developed by the TPEP districts through the use of instructional and leadership frameworks.

Table 12
Teacher Instructional Frameworks by District
 Comprehensive
 Instructional Frameworks

District	Modified Version	Danielson	Marzano	5-D (CEL)	AWSP	Marzano/Reeves	5-D (CEL)
Anacortes				X	X		X
Central Valley	X		X			X	
Kennewick	X				X		
North Mason		X			X	X	
North Thurston		X			X		
Othello	X				X		
Snohomish		X			X		
Wenatchee			X		X	X	
Consortium		X			X		

b. Multiple Measures of Teacher and Principal Performance

The TPEP districts were intentional throughout the year to investigate and select measures within their district TPEP teams that met both the new evaluation criteria and other elements of E2SSB 6696. Table 13 and 14 describe the measures that are currently under consideration in each of the pilot sites. The changes to this new paradigm of evaluation are vast, but perhaps the biggest change rests in the variety of measures used to capture information about teacher and principal performance. The TPEP districts will continue to refine and put these measures into practice next year in the pilot. Recommendations will be forthcoming at the conclusion of the 2011-12 pilot year.

Table 13
Measures Under Consideration by District - Teacher

District	Observation	Student Data	Perception Surveys	Portfolio	Lesson Plans	Professional Growth Plans	Student Artifacts	Peer Evaluation	Feedback Meetings	Self-Assessment
Anacortes	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Central Valley	X	X			X	X	X		X	X
Kennewick	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
North Mason	X	X			X		X			X
North Thurston	X	X			X	X	X		X	X
Othello	X	X			X		X			X
Snohomish	X	X			X	X	X		X	X
Wenatchee	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X

Table 14
Measures Under Consideration by District - Principal

District	Observation	Building Level Student Achievement Data	Formative Assessment Results	Summative Assessment Results	Perception Survey	Portfolios	Artifacts	School Failure Rates	School Safety and Climate Plans	Other
Anacortes	Model still in development									
Central Valley	X				X		X		X	School improvement plans
Kennewick	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
North Mason	Model still in development									
North Thurston	Model still in development									
Othello	Model still in development									

Snohomish	X	X	X		X		X		X	
Wenatchee	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
Consortium	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	

III. Findings

A. Research and Reports

OSPI ensured a careful data collection system for the development year, focusing squarely on seeking feedback on the evaluation changes in the law and ongoing feedback from the TPEP pilot sites on the development of the new models. Summarized below is a list that describes both the state-wide and TPEP pilot site data collections OSPI directed during the 2010-11 development year.

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) Pilot and Statewide Survey and Reports

State-wide surveys and interviews

- **OSPI Statewide Evaluation Data DOED Survey**

12/15/10 – 1/21/11

- This collection of educator evaluation data was required by the DOED upon receipt of ARRA funds.
- 294 of the 295 districts participated in this survey.

- **TPEP Statewide Evaluation Electronic Survey**

2/15/11 – 3/15/11

- This electronic survey was disseminated to all certificated classroom teachers, principals and district administrators in Washington State.
- Purpose: To better understand current evaluation practices and how to best support implementation of E2SSB 6696.

- **TPEP Statewide Interviews**

4/1/11 – 4/15/11 – interviews; 4/15 – 4/30 – interview analysis

- Follow-up to Statewide Evaluation Electronic Survey.
- Purpose: These interviews were completed to follow-up to the electronic survey in order to gather feedback and experiences from districts regarding the current evaluation system and hopes for the future.

- **TPEP Educator Forums**

2/7/11 – 3/9/11

- Participants: 340 educators
- Purpose: To provide outreach from the state and local pilot site perspective and collect feedback regarding current evaluation practices and hopes for future evaluation systems.

Pilot-specific work

- **Pilot Interviews and Model Review**

- Interviews with TPEP pilot teachers, principals and district administrators were conducted to gather feedback and experiences from pilot districts regarding the process of developing an evaluation system.
- The TPEP evaluation model development was analyzed by a group of American Institutes for Research (AIR) evaluation experts and provided to each pilot district.

- **Pilot Focus Group (Consortium)**

- A similar process was used for the consortium to gather feedback and experiences from the consortium participants regarding the process of developing an evaluation system.

- **TPEP Individual Case Studies and Cross -Case Analysis**

- A summary report documenting the process and implementation of the new evaluation models will be produced for each TPEP site and a cross-case analysis of the TPEP project will be completed.

- **TPEP Practitioner Panel Review**

(Teachers, Principals, Superintendents, Professional Development, Human Resource, Data, & Finance Experts)

- 35 Practitioners from outside of the TPEP sites were selected by the TPEP steering committee to review, analyze, and offer suggestions in the evaluation system development and implementation process for both the TPEP pilot sites and the Statewide TPEP work.

B. Blueprint for Changing and Implementing the Washington State Evaluation System

The TPEP project made it a priority to not only seek input from the selected TPEP pilot sites, but also seek feedback from practitioners outside of the pilots to ensure stakeholders participate in the evaluation system development throughout the entire three-year implementation process. The state-wide data collected through the project produced the following “blueprint” for changing and implementing the Washington Evaluation System. The data also presented three distinct challenges to implementation. This blueprint and challenges demonstrate the congruency between TPEP pilot sites’ development and the input from the general field of practitioners in Washington State.

Blueprint

The data collected from the TPEP project this year determined the new system should be:

1. Focused squarely on improving teaching and learning.
2. Guided by instructional frameworks that reflect the most up-to-date, evidence-based practices for teaching and leading.
3. Supported by rubrics that include clear descriptions of practice and performance; multiple rating levels; and multiple measures to stimulate conversation and reflection that support improved practice for student learning.
4. Providing intensive evaluator training.

Challenges

The challenges to changing and implementing the Washington State evaluation system are grouped in three areas:

- Culture Shifts
 - Data
 - Professional Development/Training
1. Changing the culture from one of evaluation as compliance to one of professional growth.
 - *78 percent of district administrators responding to the OSPI Evaluation Survey indicated that the primary purpose of their district's teacher evaluation system was compliance.*
 - *Fewer than 25 percent of administrators responding to the OSPI Evaluation Survey report using rubrics to evaluate teachers.*
 2. Determining and including student growth and perception survey data are components needing more study.
 - *Telephone Interviews conducted with TPEP pilot participants and educators across the state cautiously suggest OSPI consider including student growth data as one measure for educator effectiveness.*
 - *Telephone interviews and focus group participants overwhelmingly suggest OSPI wait to include teacher value-added scores, unless in the pilot educator evaluation settings.*
 - *Telephone interviews with administrators and teachers reported wanting some flexibility in determining the mix of measures used in a district's evaluation system.*
 3. Professional development and training must be a priority for future implementation of the new Washington State evaluation systems.
 - *Data collected from the OSPI educator evaluation survey suggest that classroom and school based observations are inconsistent in timing and value.*
 - *Teachers and administrators indicate they are hard-pressed to adjust and monitor their instructional and leadership practices when the feedback is out-of-date or loosely tied to instructional or leadership challenges.*
 - *Administrators and teachers indicate that in the new evaluation system, time and ratio of evaluator to evaluatee will be a significant factor in the success of the implementation.*

IV. Next Steps

A. TPEP Pilot Sites

The TPEP pilot sites will continue their work over the summer and begin piloting their models fall 2011. OSPI will continue to work with the American Institute of Research, the TPEP Steering Committee organizations, and other supporting partners to support the work of the pilot.

OSPI will be responsible for analyzing the work of the pilots through the 2011-12 SY. This will include looking at the model implementation, use of student data, and evaluator training among other areas. OSPI will continue to work to involve stakeholders in consultation as statewide implementation approaches.

B. State-level Taskforce Committees

A key learning of the work of the TPEP project has been the understanding that this change is one that is ongoing and multi-faceted. A state system should not wait another 25 years before another update. The fields of teaching and leading have changed dramatically over the past 25 years and even over the course of the first year of TPEP development, emerging research has changed our course several times.

Any solid reform enlists a process of evaluation and feedback. The TPEP project should follow suit. It has been the vision of the project from the beginning to have practitioners at the heart of the work. This will continue through three very specific committees. The areas of student growth, evaluator training, and perception survey data have presented challenges to the TPEP districts. In an effort to support the TPEP districts and the rest of the state, the TPEP Steering Committee has recommended three taskforce committees research and present recommendations regarding the inclusion of these areas in our teacher and principal evaluation systems.

Table 15

State-level Taskforce Committees		
Taskforce	Organizational Lead	Supporting Organizations
Student Growth Data	OSPI	WEA, AWSP, WASA, WSPTA, WSSDA
Evaluator Training and Inter-rater Reliability	AWSP	OSPI, WEA, WASA, WSPTA, WSSDA
Perception Survey Data	AWSP/WSPTA	OSPI, WEA, WASA, WSSDA

The TPEP pilot sites have tackled a great deal this year in their work and every district in the state that will follow their work closely over the next year should laud the progress they have made. However, as we have watched in other states and large districts across the country, there are many areas that more study will yield better and more articulated options for State Superintendent Dorn's final recommendation completed July, 2012.

Timeline

The committees will be formed in August 2011 and run through February 2012. They will be comprised of 2/3rds. TPEP practitioners and 1/3rd experts from the field. These committees will present Superintendent Dorn, the TPEP Steering Committee, and the TPEP pilot sites with research-based best practices and guidance around the three areas outlined above.

V. Recommendations

E2SSB 6696 requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to make recommendations in this report regarding whether a single statewide evaluation model should be adopted, whether modified versions developed by school districts should be subject to state approval, and what the criteria would be for determining if a school district's evaluation model meets or exceeds a statewide model. The report also is to identify challenges posed by requiring a state approval process.

Superintendent Dorn has based the following recommendations on the work of the TPEP Pilot sites and the TPEP Steering Committee input.

1. One or Multiple Models

Districts should be encouraged to select from a limited number of state approved teacher and principal evaluation models. However, it is recommended that a state approval process be developed for those districts not wanting to select one of the state approved models.

2. Evaluation System Components

The Superintendent will require that all systems have specified components that will include, but not be limited to:

- a. A research-based instructional framework (teachers) or leadership framework (principals) that clearly describes practice and performance. The Superintendent will approve a limited number of frameworks based on the results of the pilot. Other frameworks, including modified research-based frameworks, will be subject to a case-by-case approval process. The framework must incorporate the state evaluation criteria and must clearly “map-back” to the state evaluation criteria;
- b. The use of the state-adopted evaluation criteria and definitions for both teachers and principals. A definition for each of the criteria will be finalized at the conclusion of the pilots;
- c. Rubrics, which are based on the instructional framework (teachers) or leadership frameworks (principals), that clearly define the continuum from unsatisfactory through effective teaching and leading practices;
- d. A four-level rating system that describes performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria has been met or exceeded. At the conclusion of the pilot, the title and definition for each of the levels will be determined by the Superintendent for statewide use. The Superintendent will also establish the delineation between “not satisfactory” and “satisfactory” performance in the four-level system;
- e. Multiple measures for determining effective teacher and principal performance. Currently, the pilots are considering a number of tools, including observation, self-assessment, perception surveys, and student growth. At the conclusion of the pilots, the effectiveness and implementation challenges of these tools will be evaluated and minimum requirements will be established;

- f. Professional development for principals and classroom teachers regarding the content of the new evaluation systems. The professional development must include information regarding the instructional framework, evaluation criteria, scoring rubrics, and the tools that will be used to measure performance; and
- g. Evaluation training for all evaluators (e.g., principals, district administrators) involved in the new evaluation systems.

School districts must be able to demonstrate that teachers, principals, parents, and others were involved in the decision-making process for the new evaluation system within the school district.

As discussed above, based on the outcomes of the TPEP pilots a final set of recommendations with specific approval criteria will be included in the report completed by July 1, 2012.

3. State-Approval Process

At the conclusion of the pilots, the Superintendent shall finalize the components and requirements that must be included in evaluation systems. Districts will be required to include all of the required components as specified by the Superintendent.

During the 2012-13 school year, school districts should be required to submit a description of their proposed evaluation systems that they intend to use beginning in the 2013-14 school year. The description of the system shall include how they will address each of the required components, which will be subject to a thorough, rigorous state review process.

If the system includes one of limited number of frameworks and meets specified criteria for the other components, it shall be approved. If other frameworks are used, the framework shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

The initial review will be conducted by OSPI staff, who will make recommendations to a Review Panel consisting of representatives of teachers, principals, parents, school directors, and school district administrators.

4. Challenges to a State Evaluation Approval Process

The challenges to a state review process rest in two areas: time and resources. The capacity over the next two years to approve all models will be time consuming and require expertise at the state level to remain intact and enhanced through continued consultation with evaluation experts and practitioners. If the system is to be functioning at a high level during the 2013-14 statewide implementation year, serious consideration will need to be given to providing the resources to prepare all the districts in an intentional way for the new teacher and principal evaluation system.

VI. Conclusion

As with other states overhauling their evaluation systems across the country, there is a deliberate sense of urgency within the TPEP project. This urgency is tempered by the commitment to also get this right for students and not to rush to quick fixes that will not have long lasting impact. There are two important aspects of our project that should be noted as standing out among the deluge of state action around educator evaluation.

First, Washington State is taking the bold and important step in redesigning, piloting and implementing both the teacher and principal evaluation systems at the same time. Washington is one of only 12 states that has legislation requiring evaluation reforms. Although this has more than doubled the workload in the TPEP pilot sites, it has been a consistent message all year by everyone involved that the two are inextricably linked and must be implemented together.

Second, the partnerships and collaboration around this work is unprecedented. The coalition that has formed around the TPEP work from the state to the local level has made a profound impact on the hope and promise that the new evaluation systems will be a meaningful and intentional professional growth and accountability model for years to come. As with all new reforms, the new teacher and principal evaluation systems are going to face challenges. The ultimate goal of the TPEP project is to improving teaching and leading for all students in Washington State.

VII. Bibliography

Advocating for teacher quality in all 50 states. *Work in Progress*, The Joyce Foundation (2010). Retrieved June 24, 2011 from <http://www.joycefdn.org/content.cfm/advocating-for-teacher-quality-in-all-50-states>

Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. New York: McKinsey and Company. Retrieved September 15, 2009, from http://www.mckinsey.com/locations/UK_Ireland/~media/Reports/UKI/Education_report .ashx

Brandt, C., Thomas, J., & Burke, M. (2008). *State policies on teacher evaluation practices in the Midwest Region*. Issues & Answers Report, REL 2008-No. 004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Midwest. Retrieved September 15, 2009, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/techbrief/tr_00408.pdf

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching (2nd edition)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. ISBN: 978-1416605171

DuBois, C.C., & Brandt, C. (2011). *Washington teacher principal evaluation pilot cross-case analysis*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research.

Evaluating principal leadership in a performance-based school: The eight new principal evaluation criteria. Olympia, WA: Association of Washington School Principals (2010). Retrieved June 23, 2011, from

http://www.awsp.org/Content/awsp/PrincipalsHandbook/PrincipalEvaluationCriteria/Principal_Leadership_1.31.11_web.pdf

Fetters, J., & Behrstock-Sherratt, E. (2011). *Washington's teacher/principal evaluation pilot (TPEP) educator forums: Final report*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research.

Five dimensions of teaching and learning (5d). Seattle, WA: Center for Educational Leadership. Retrieved June 23, 2011 from <http://www.k-12leadership.org/services/5-dimensions>

Goe, L., Holdheide, L., & Miller, T. (2011). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems: A tool to assist in the development of teacher evaluation systems*. Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved June 23, 2011, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/practicalGuideEvalSystems.pdf>

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning (review of research)*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved September 15, 2009, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/Knowledge%20Center/Attachments/PDF/ReviewofResearch-LearningFromLeadership.pdf>

Marzano, R. (2011). *The art and science of teaching causal teacher evaluation model*. Blairsville, PA: Learning Sciences International.

Reeves, D. (2008). *Assessing educational leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational results*. Cheltenham VIC, Australia: Hawker Brownlow Education. Retrieved June 23, 2011 from <http://www.hbe.com.au/PUBLIC/HBEItemImages/pdf/CO8273.pdf>

State Legislation: Emerging trends reflected in the state phase 1 Race to The Top applications. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates (2010). Retrieved June 24, 2011 from http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/RtT_State_Legislation.pdf

Washington state school district teacher and principal evaluation system survey results. Olympia, WA: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2011). Retrieved June 23, 2011 from http://www.k12.wa.us/Communications/StimulusPackage/SEES_Summary_PDF_SY2009-10.pdf

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on difference in teacher effectiveness*. Brooklyn, NY: <http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect.pdf>

VIII. Appendices

Appendix A

- Teacher Evaluation Model Visual Diagram

Appendix B

- Principal Evaluation Model Visual Diagram

Appendix C

- Washington TPEP Cross-Case Analysis:

Appendix D

- Anacortes Case Study & Evaluation Models
- Central Valley Case Study & Evaluation Models
- Kennewick Case Study & Evaluation Models
- NEWESD 101 Consortium Case Study & Evaluation Models
- North Mason Case Study & Evaluation Models
- North Thurston Case Study & Evaluation Models
- Othello Case Study & Evaluation Models
- Snohomish Case Study & Evaluation Models
- Wenatchee Case Study & Evaluation Models

Appendix E

- Washington TPEP Statewide Data Analysis Report:

Appendix F

- Practitioner Workgroups Proposal April 2011
- TPEP Model Review Templates
- TPEP Practitioner Panel Participants
- TPEP Practitioner Panels System & State Feedback

Appendix G

- OSPI School Employee Evaluation Survey PDF Summary
- OSPI School Employee Evaluation Survey Data File

Appendix H

- TPEP Pilot Site Interview Compilation Video

Full version with complete appendices available at:

http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/tpep_leg_report-july_2011_full.pdf

Links for Appendix C to Appendix H available in the Table of Contents

RCW 28A.405.100 Teacher Evaluation Criteria

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Defined in RCW

Defined in WAC —
not determined until
conclusion of the
pilot

Defined by in draft by
TPEP pilots

Proposed Satisfactory/
Not satisfactory line

* Required by RCW

This line indicates a probable cause
for non-renewal. The superintendent
will also establish the delineation
between “not satisfactory” and
“satisfactory” performance in the
four-level system.

Criteria Definitions
are developed to create a common definition
and understanding for each criterion.

Rubrics
are linked to each criterion and its de-
scriptors and developed using the dis-
trict’s comprehensive instructional
framework. Each criterion is scored by
it’s own set of measures and evidence.
Each measure or piece of evidence may
carry differing weight in determining the
final score for each criterion.

**Comprehensive Instructional
Frameworks**
are district’s model of instruction and
common language surrounding their
instructional practice, aligned to the 8
criteria in RCW. Rubrics developed us-
ing instructional frameworks linked
back to clear criteria definitions.

**Measures & Evidence
To be defined.**

Ongoing Analysis & Discussion of Measures & Evidence (Teacher & Principal)

Observation*

Other Measures & Evidence

Self Assessment

Student Growth Data



Level 1

Final Summative Evaluation
Level 2

Level 3

Level 4

“When student growth data, if available and relevant to the teacher and subject matter, is referenced in the evaluation process it must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools. As used in this subsection, “student growth” means the change in student achievement between two points in time.”

“The four-level rating system used to evaluate the certificated classroom teacher must describe performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded.”

RCW 28A.405.100 Principal Evaluation Criteria

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Defined in RCW

Defined in WAC — not determined until conclusion of the pilot

Defined by in draft by TPEP pilots

Proposed Satisfactory/ Not satisfactory line

Criteria Definitions
are developed to create a common definition and understanding for each criterion.

Rubrics
are linked to each criterion and its descriptors. Each criterion is scored by it's own set of measures and evidence. Each measure or piece of evidence may carry differing weight in determining the final score for each criterion.

Leadership Framework
In addition to using "Evaluating Principals in a Performance-Based School," districts also used standards from the national organizations for principals, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Val-Ed, and the work of Dr. Marzano and Doug Reeves.

Measures & Evidence To be defined.

Observation

Other Measures & Evidence

Perception Data

Student Achievement Growth Data

Ongoing Analysis & Discussion of Measures & Evidence (Principals & District Administrators)



Level 1

Level 2

Level 3

Level 4

Final Summative Evaluation

The superintendent will also establish the delineation between "not satisfactory" and "satisfactory" performance in the four-level system.

"When available, student growth data that is referenced in the evaluation process must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools. As used in this subsection, "student growth" means the change in student achievement between two points in time."

"The four-level rating system used to evaluate the principal must describe performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded."

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

For more information about the contents
of this document, please contact:
Michaela Miller, OSPI
E-mail: Michaela.miller@k12.wa.us
Phone: (360) 725-6116

To order more copies of this document,
please call 1-888-59-LEARN (1-888-595-3276)
or visit our Web site at <http://www.k12.wa.us/publications>

Please refer to the document number below for quicker service:
11-0027

This document is available online at:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/EdLeg/TPEP/default.aspx>
<http://tpep-wa.org/>

This material is available in alternative format upon request.
Contact the Resource Center at (888) 595-3276, TTY (360) 664-3631.



Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200
2011