

Teacher Evaluation Training

1. **Purpose:** Opportunity for teachers to gain an in depth understanding of the revised teacher evaluation system and the instructional framework that will be used to judge teacher performance.
2. **Description of services provided:** School districts used these funds to provide training for teachers to learn the processes and procedures of the revised educator evaluation system as well as the specifics of their district's selected instructional framework, the application of student growth, the appropriate use of artifacts and evidence, and deeper dives into any of the State 8 Teacher Evaluation Criteria. ESDs offered learning opportunities for district teams to understand the ways student growth goals and measures are incorporated into the scoring. Those district teams then used the materials created by ESDs to replicate workshops for educators back in their home districts. Districts and ESDs also hired OSPI-approved instructional framework specialists to lead teacher workshops on the use of the frameworks. OSPI offered a "TPEP Colloquium" and some districts used this funding to send teachers. When teachers were released from their duties, substitute pay was funded from this grant. Many districts used this funding to pay for teachers to attend workshops held outside their contract schedule or calendar. Districts also used funding to pay teachers to work together in teams to develop student growth goals and measures.
3. **Criteria for receiving services and/or grants:** All districts received an allotment based on teacher FTE. Those that applied by the grant deadline were approved to claim expenses against their allotments. Allotments for districts that did not apply were reallocated to participating districts.

Beneficiaries in 2017-18 School Year:

of School Districts: 229
of Schools: NA
of Students: NA

of OSPI staff associated with this funding (FTEs): 0

of contractors/other staff associated with this funding: 0

FY 18 Funding:	State Appropriation:	\$5.0 million
	Federal Appropriation:	\$0.0
	Other fund sources:	\$0.0
	TOTAL (FY18)	\$5.0 million

4. Are federal or other funds contingent on state funding? If yes, explain. No.
5. State funding history:

Fiscal Year	Amount Funded	Actual Expenditures
FY18	\$5,000,000	\$4,790,902
FY17	\$5,000,000	\$4,937,561
FY16	\$5,000,000	\$4,890,234
FY15	\$5,000,000	\$4,973,789
FY14	\$10,000,000	\$9,402,213

6. **Number of beneficiaries (e.g., schools, students, districts) history:**

Fiscal Year	# of Districts
FY18	229
FY17	216
FY16	212
FY15	213
FY14	280

7. **Programmatic changes since inception (if any):** In FY18, as in FY 17, because funding in this budget proviso is restricted to teacher training, the program offered funding through a separate iGrant from Performance-Based Evaluations, the TPEP program budget, to cover training expenses for administrators. However, the 2018 Legislature changed proviso language to allow this fund to be used for both teacher and administrator training. This will allow districts to complete a single iGrant form for all of their TPEP training needs, reducing workload and facilitating districts in taking a more integrated view of the program.
8. **Evaluations of program/major findings:** Most districts accessed the Teacher Training Fund in 2016-17. Those districts that did not use the funds tended to be small and remote. Districts used the funds for salary and benefits to support additional teacher time, substitute teachers for release time, purchasing the services of approved trainers and registration fees, training supplies and materials and travel to training.

The University of Washington completed a study to see how districts are managing and funding TPEP now that the program is at full implementation. They have done case studies of ten districts that have been constructively engaged in TPEP. The site visits yielded the following trends:

- Shifting of responsibilities at the district level between the Human Resource and the Learning and Teaching departments.
- Hiring assistant principals and deans of students to lessen the load of TPEP on school administrators.
- Implementing in variable ways across districts.
- Shifting away from a professional learning focus on TPEP, toward either a deeper dive into the instructional framework or on another path not seemingly related to TPEP.
- Using TPEP data most effectively at the school level.

- Balancing the tension between the twin purposes of accountability and professional growth.

9. **Major challenges faced by the program:** In the iGrant application, districts indicated a wish to continue to have this funding, and to have more and closer opportunities for professional learning. This has been especially challenging with the substitute shortage. Rural and remote districts face the greatest challenges, as training opportunities are largely provided at the ESD site. ESDs are becoming more innovative in their delivery and more sensitive to districts' geographic needs.

10. **Future opportunities:** With the second year of this biennium, the funds have been allocated to both teacher and principal training (rather than just to teacher training). This will allow us to deliver both types of funding through one grant process for each district, reducing workload at the district and at the state level, and granting districts greater flexibility.

11. **Statutory and/or Budget language:**

Budget Proviso: ESSB 6032, Sec. 511 (16) - \$5,000,000 of the general fund--state appropriation for fiscal year 2018 and \$4,000,000 of the general fund—state appropriation for fiscal year 2019 are provided solely for the provision of training in the performance-based teacher evaluation program.

12. **Other relevant information:**

13. **List of schools/districts receiving assistance:** See OSPI [website](#).

14. **Program Contact Information:**

Sue Anderson

Sue.Anderson@k12.wa.us

Director, Educator Effectiveness

360-725-6116