

Incorporating Student Academic Growth in Teacher and Principal Evaluations at Schools Implementing the Transformation Model

**MERIT Network/
School Improvement Grant
Progress Report**



Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction

August 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.

Incorporating Student Academic Growth in Teacher and Principal Evaluations at Schools Implementing the Transformation Model

MERIT Network/School Improvement Grant Progress Report

Prepared by

Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator/Contractor
Tonya Middling, Director, Project Development, Management, and
Implementation, Secondary Education and School Improvement, OSPI

Secondary Education and School Improvement
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dan Newell, Assistant Superintendent

Randy I. Dorn
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ken Kanikeberg
Chief of Staff

Bob Harmon
Assistant Superintendent, Special Programs, Secondary Education, School
Improvement and Federal Accountability

August 2011

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
I. Introduction	1
II. Overview: Federal Requirements for School Improvement Grants	1
III. Overview: State Requirements (E2SSB 6696)	4
IV. Technical Assistance and Support	4
V. Summary of District Progress	6
VI. Next Steps and Timeline	12
VII. Conclusion	14
VIII. References	15
IX. Appendices	16
Appendix A: Evaluation Requirements for SIG Compared to E2SSB 6696 .	17
Appendix B: New Teacher and Principal Evaluation Criteria	17
Appendix C: Sample Solutions Presented at Cross-MERIT Meeting	19
Appendix D: BERC Training Agendas	21
Appendix E: TPEP/MERIT Collaboration	23
Appendix F: On-Site Technical Assistance	27
Appendix G: Human Resource Management Framework	28

Executive Summary

Background

In spring 2010, nine districts representing 18 schools were selected to receive federal *School Improvement Grants* (SIGs) and participate in Cohort I of the MERIT Network. MERIT stands for Models of Equity and Excellence through Rapid Improvement and Turnaround; when SIGs are awarded, the districts and their eligible schools are part of the MERIT Network. Each MERIT district is assigned a liaison that is responsible for offering technical assistance and monitoring implementation of the chosen federal model. SIG districts and schools have many requirements that must be met as they strive to substantially raise student outcomes and exit improvement status. Those implementing the federal Transformation Model are required to address a problem of practice that challenges schools, districts, and states across the nation: **incorporating student growth as a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluations.**

Context

Both federal and state requirements impact MERIT districts as they address this problem of practice:

- **Federal:** The 14 Cohort I SIG schools implementing the Transformation Model must incorporate student growth as a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluations by 2011–12. This is optional for the three Cohort I SIG schools implementing the Turnaround Model. Note the six SIG schools selected for Cohort II and three of the four schools designated for required action through E2SSB 6696 are implementing the Transformation Model; they are required to incorporate growth as a significant factor by 2012–13. This is optional for the one Required Action District (RAD) school implementing the Turnaround Model.
- **State:** Washington State legislators enacted E2SSB 6696 in spring 2010; this bill mandates all districts to revise teacher and principal evaluation criteria and implement a four-level rating system that incorporates multiple measures of student growth, by the 2013–14 school year.

This report depicts the efforts of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's Division of Secondary Education and School Improvement (SE & SI) to provide technical assistance and other supports to Cohort I SIG grantees. Intersections of SE & SI's efforts around this *federal requirement* and the *state requirement* are also highlighted.

Technical Assistance

In 2010–11, SE & SI provided support to MERIT districts around the teacher and principal evaluation requirement in several ways: Cross-MERIT Network meetings, Baker Education Resource Consulting (BERC, or BERC Group) Human Resource System Training, collaboration with the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP), and on-site technical assistance.

Summary of District Efforts

In their End-of-Year Report, all Cohort I districts/schools were required to describe progress toward meeting this requirement and provide evidence of implementation and were provided a response determining status in one of the four categories:

- 1) Meets expectations
- 2) Adequate year 1 progress
- 3) Insufficient evidence
- 4) No evidence of implementation

All districts indicate they are working closely with their teacher and principal groups to incorporate student growth in teacher and principal evaluations. Highlights include:

- **Sunnyside, Seattle, and Longview** have both Teacher and Principal evaluation systems that meet appropriate year 1 progress.
- **Tacoma, Marysville, and Grandview** have Principal systems that meet appropriate year 1 progress, and **Tacoma** has a Teacher system that meets appropriate year 1 progress.
- **Several districts** are using E2SSB 6696 criteria to develop their principal evaluation process; many are collaborating with the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) in the process.

Next Steps

SE & SI will continue to provide technical assistance to support MERIT Cohort I and MERIT Cohort II/Required Action Districts. Strategies include: continued collaboration with AWSP and TPEP, BERC Group Human Resource System Training, AWSP Principal training for effective use of evaluation processes and tools, and technical assistance in developing tools and processes to support implementation of evaluation models. Additionally, MERIT liaisons will monitor district/school 90-day action plans to assess progress toward meeting this federal requirement.

I. Introduction

In spring 2010, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) selected 18 schools and their districts to receive *School Improvement Grants* (SIGs). Federal guidelines require SIG grantees to address a problem of practice that challenges schools, districts, and states across the nation: incorporating student academic growth as a significant component in teacher and principal evaluations. Furthermore, SIG recipients must implement their revised evaluation criteria and processes by the 2011–12 school year. While this *federal requirement* applies only to SIG grantees, Washington’s legislators enacted a *state requirement* (E2SSB 6696), also in spring 2010, that mandates all districts across the state to revise teacher and principal evaluation criteria and implement a four-level rating system that incorporates multiple measures of student growth, by the 2013–14 school year.

While federal and state requirements share a common vision—incorporating student growth as a significant component of teacher and principal evaluation—the approaches vary greatly. This report depicts the efforts of OSPI’s Division of Secondary Education and School Improvement (SE & SI) to provide technical assistance and other supports to SIG grantees. Intersections of SE & SI’s efforts around the *federal requirement* with the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Pilot (TPEP) developed to set the stage for meeting the *state requirement* are also highlighted.

This document begins with brief overviews of federal SIG guidelines and state regulations. Technical assistance provided to SIG grantees through SE & SI and its partners is described next. Brief summaries of approaches used by each of the nine SIG districts to address this challenging problem of practice follow. Next steps with this effort and a summary conclude the narrative. Appendix A provides a comparison of SIG and E2SSB 6696 requirements; Appendix B provides a list of possible ways of using student growth data; Appendix C includes agendas for SIG meetings that were focused on teacher and principal evaluation systems; Appendix D includes copies of agendas for BERCC training; Appendix E describes agendas from TPEP/MERIT collaboration meetings; Appendix F describes on-site technical assistance provided to several MERIT districts; and Appendix G outlines the key components of the Human Resource Management Framework under development.

II. Overview: Federal Requirements for School Improvement Grants

In fall 2009, the U.S. Department of Education announced it would make a total of \$3.546 billion available nationwide for federal *School Improvement Grants* (SIGs) from the combined American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and Fiscal Year 2009 funds appropriated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Washington State’s portion of the combined federal resources was approximately \$49.5 million over a three-year period. The purpose of these funds is to turn around the lowest 5 percent of persistently low-achieving Title I schools and Title I-eligible secondary schools, so that these schools make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.

Federal guidelines required SIG recipients to implement one of four models designed to produce rapid improvement in student learning. Table I provides brief descriptions of each model.

Table 1: Descriptions of Federal *School Improvement Grant* Intervention Models

Model	Description
School Closure	Refers to a district closing a school and enrolling students who attended the school in other higher achieving schools in the district.
Restart	Occurs when a district converts the school or closes and reopens it under management of an educational management organization (EMO).
Turnaround	Includes replacing the principal and rehiring no more than 50 percent of the school’s staff; adopting a new governance structure; implementing strategies to recruit, place, and retain high-quality staff; implementing a research-based instructional program aligned to state standards; providing on-going, high-quality job-embedded professional development; promoting the continuous use of student data to inform instruction; extending learning time for students and staff; and providing appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students. School staff implementing the Turnaround Model may also implement any of the elements of the Transformation Model
Transformation	Requires replacing the school principal and addresses four areas critical to transforming persistently low-achieving schools: developing teacher and principal leader effectiveness, including using evaluations based in significant measure on student growth; implementing instructional reform strategies; extending learning time and creating community connections; and providing operating flexibility and sustained support.

SIG Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Requirements

As described in Table 2, the federal Turnaround and Transformation intervention models require districts to implement practices to increase teacher and leader effectiveness.

Table 2: Federal Intervention Model Requirements Focused on Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

Model	Requirement
Turnaround	Districts must use locally adopted “turnaround competencies” to review and select staff and implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff. Districts/schools may also implement requirements for the Transformation Model.
Transformation	Schools must implement an evaluation system developed with staff that uses student growth as a significant factor. “Student growth” means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics, growth data must be based on a student’s score on the State’s assessment. A state may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms. Districts must also design ways to identify and reward staff who increase student outcomes, and support and then remove those who do not.

Cohort I SIG Participants

In Washington State, 27 districts representing 47 of our persistently lowest-achieving schools (PLAs) were eligible to apply for SIGs; 21 of these districts representing 41 schools submitted applications. Eighteen schools and their districts were selected through a comprehensive and competitive process to participate in Cohort I of the MERIT Network. Just as the term MERIT connotes being worthy of recognition and respect, so does the acronym MERIT represent anticipated outcomes for participants in the program: transforming schools into **Models of Equity and Excellence through Rapid Improvement and Turnaround**. Specifically, during the three-year grant period, each school is expected to dramatically turnaround performance by implementing one of the four federally defined intervention models. Table 3 provides a list of participants and their selected intervention model.

Table 3: MERIT Cohort I Participants and Selected Intervention Model

School	District	Federal Model
Hunt Middle School	Tacoma	Closure
Tulalip Elementary School	Marysville	Turnaround
Giaudrone Middle School	Tacoma	Turnaround
Stewart Middle School	Tacoma	Turnaround
Grandview Middle School	Grandview	Transformation
Cascade Middle School	Highline	Transformation
Chinook Middle School	Highline	Transformation
Monticello Middle School	Longview	Transformation
Totem Middle School	Marysville	Transformation
Cleveland High School	Seattle	Transformation
Hawthorne Elementary School	Seattle	Transformation
West Seattle Elementary School	Seattle	Transformation
Sunnyside High School	Sunnyside	Transformation
Jason Lee Middle School	Tacoma	Transformation
Adams Elementary School	Yakima	Transformation
Stanton Academy	Yakima	Transformation
Washington Middle School	Yakima	Transformation
Wellpinit Elementary School	Wellpinit	Transformation

III. Overview: State Requirements (E2SSB 6696)

State legislation enacted in spring 2010 (E2SSB 6696) requires all districts in Washington State to implement revised criteria and a four-level rating system to evaluate teachers and principals by the 2013–14 school year. See Appendix B for additional information. The system must describe performance along a continuum that indicates the extent to which the criteria have been met or exceeded. When student growth data 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. “Student growth” refers to the change in student achievement between two points in time. In preparation for statewide implementation in 2013–14, the legislature provided funding to TPEP in 2010–11 and 2011–12. Eight districts from across the state and a consortium of districts in Northeast Washington Educational Service District 101 participated in the pilot in 2010–11; these districts are slated to begin implementation in 2011–12.

IV. Technical Assistance and Support

During the SIG application process, the BERC Group conducted an on-site visit to SIG-eligible districts/schools and conducted a needs assessment aligned to the federal requirements and OSPI’s *Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools*. The BERC Group found that many districts needed technical assistance and support in order to create an integrated Human Resource Management System and to address ways to fulfill SIG requirements around teacher and principal evaluation systems. SE & SI provided support to MERIT districts around the teacher and leader effectiveness requirement in several ways; descriptions follow.

MERIT Network Meetings

In fall 2010, Seattle Public Schools (SPS) hosted a series of four voluntary meetings for interested MERIT districts in which Dr. Eric Anderson, the district’s Manager for Research and Evaluation, shared current research in using student growth data. He provided models of ways to use student growth, including the district’s newly negotiated model, and offered to run data for MERIT districts using the [Colorado Growth Model](#) and a Value-Added Model which links student performance to teacher and principal effectiveness. He also consulted individually with MERIT districts as requested. MERIT districts participated in one or more of the series of network meetings. Carol Rava-Treat and Scott Whitbeck, also from SPS, shared the process and products of work between the district and Seattle Education Association around negotiations on required elements of the Transformation Model. Their information was instrumental in providing a picture of possibilities for other MERIT districts. See Appendix C: Sample Solutions Presented at Cross-MERIT Meeting, August 2010.

BERC Human Resource System Training

Over the course of four days in fall 2010, Lee Goeke, consultant with the BERC Group, provided all nine MERIT district teams with background information and research on various components of an effective human resource system and led districts through a process to develop a systemic model of Human Resources Management. At the core of the model are competencies (traits or ways of thinking or acting) that drive other system functions (e.g., recruitment, hiring, professional development, evaluation, and retention). Mr. Goeke and other members of the BERC Group led participants through discussions of essential competencies and specific ways they could revise/create human resource systems driven by these competencies. This work was tied to the SIG requirement to

“implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for recruiting, placing and retaining effective teachers.” A significant amount of time during these workshops was spent supporting districts in (a) using E2SSB 6696 and documents from Public Impact to develop competencies and (b) utilizing these competencies to drive a “rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation system” for teachers and principals. See Appendix D: BERC Training Agendas.

During these workshops, participants also looked at research and strategies for using student growth data as part of teacher and principal evaluation. This work was facilitated by Eric Anderson, Seattle Public Schools, and Duane Baker, BERC Group.

See Appendix G for a summary of the “Human Resource Management Framework and Scope of Work.”

TPEP Collaboration

Initially, MERIT districts and TPEP districts planned to work together on new evaluation models. After the first joint TPEP and MERIT meeting in August 2010, it was determined that the groups would work separately, because of the differences between the requirements in E2SSB 6696 guiding the work in TPEP districts and SIG requirements guiding the work in MERIT districts. Leaders from both groups also agreed to maintain collaborative relationships to enhance and inform each other’s work. See Appendix B.

Although not mandated, many MERIT districts wanted to align their evaluation work with E2SSB 6696 requirements, so the evaluation system they developed to meet SIG requirements in 2011–12 would also satisfy state requirements for 2013–14. To help provide continuity and facilitate communication, Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator, participated in TPEP Steering Committee Meetings and trainings and shared relevant learnings, processes, and tools with MERIT districts. MERIT districts were invited to participate in TPEP trainings with Charlotte Danielson, Laura Goe from the Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, and sessions with Gretchen Weber from the American Institutes of Research (AIR). Three MERIT districts, Yakima, Highline, and Wellpinit, joined with TPEP districts adopting the Charlotte Danielson Framework. These three MERIT districts also participated in selected TPEP trainings. The collaborative work between MERIT and TPEP resulted in more clarity and guidance as to what an effective evaluation system, aligned with both E2SSB 6696 state requirements and SIG federal requirements, should include. See Appendix E: TPEP/MERIT Collaboration.

Technical Assistance

MERIT Liaisons maintain regular communication with district and school leaders around implementing required elements of their selected intervention model. Liaisons also monitor progress of 90-day action plans and provide technical assistance as needed. Districts struggling with the requirement around teacher and principal evaluation received on-site technical assistance from their MERIT Liaison; Eric Anderson, Seattle Public Schools; Lee Goeke from the BERC Group; Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator; and Michaela Miller, TPEP Project Director. See Appendix F: On-Site Technical Assistance.

Note: Cohort I districts/schools were required to submit End-of-Year Reports detailing progress toward each required element of their selected intervention model. OSPI MERIT liaisons reviewed these reports and provided guidance (e.g., examples of evaluation systems satisfying federal requirements) to districts not meeting the

requirement. Districts were also given an extension of time, pending clarification of the requirement by the U.S. Department of Education in July 2011.

V. Summary of District Progress

Overview

MERIT districts have multiple paths they can follow to develop teacher and principal evaluation systems aligned with SIG guidance. With an eye towards 2013–14 and statewide implementation of E2SSB 6696, some districts purposefully chose to ensure their efforts met both SIG requirements and E2SSB 6696 requirements. Other districts had evaluation systems in place that already at least partially met SIG requirements. Finally, some districts determined that they didn't have capacity at this time to align their work with E2SSB 6696 requirements. These districts focused on meeting the SIG requirement to adapt their current system to include student growth as a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluation. All districts indicate strong union involvement in the process.

While districts are accustomed to using student data to inform instruction, they struggle with using these same data to evaluate teachers and principals. MERIT liaisons report that resistance at the local level to implementing new evaluation systems may be philosophical and/or the district/school may lack knowledge of how to proceed. Some also seem to be seeking minimal adherence to the SIG requirement as they develop their plan. Liaisons also note OSPI has intentionally chosen not to impose a method; instead districts are encouraged to follow federal guidance.

District-determined Components

In order to ensure stakeholder decision-making and commitment at the local level, districts are provided latitude to determine specific components of their evaluation system, including instructional and leadership frameworks and multiple measures used to assess performance.

As illustrated in Table 4, most districts are utilizing the framework provided by Charlotte Danielson in *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2nd ed.). All districts used E2SSB 6696 criteria and had access to AWSP's *Evaluating Principal Leadership in a Performance-Based School: The Eight New Principal Evaluation Criteria*.

Table 4: Instructional and Leadership Frameworks by District

District	Teacher Evaluation				Principal Evaluation		
	Modified Version	Danielson	Marzano	5-D (CEL)	AWSP	5-D (CEL)	Modified Version (IMPACT)
Grandview		X			X		
Highline		X					
Longview		X			X		
Marysville				X		X	
Seattle		X			X		
Sunnyside	X				X		
Tacoma	Information not available						
Yakima		X					
Wellpinit		X					

MERIT districts are considering multiple measures for both teacher and principal evaluation systems. Tables 5 and 6 illustrate some of these measures. As indicated in OSPI’s *Teacher and Principal Evaluation Pilot Report to the Legislature* (2011, July), “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” (p. 18). Districts are expected to continue to refine these measures as they move forward in implementing their evaluation systems.

Table 5: Measures Under Consideration by District for Teacher Evaluation Systems

	Observation	Student Achieve Data	Perception Surveys	Portfolio	Lesson Plans	Student Artifacts	Self-Assessment	Other
Grandview	X	X				X	X	
Highline	Model under development							
Longview	X	X		X		X	X	X
Marysville	X	X			X		X	
Seattle	X	X				X	X	
Sunnyside	X	X		X		X	X	
Tacoma	X	X		X	X	X		X
Yakima	Model under development							
Wellpinit	Model under development							

Table 6: Measures Under Consideration by District for Principal Evaluation Systems

District	Observation	Student Achieve Data	Perception Surveys	Portfolio	Grad Rates	Artifacts	School Safety and Climate Plans	Other
Grandview	X	X						
Highline	Model under development							
Longview	X	X						
Marysville	X	X	X	X		X		X
Seattle	X	X						
Sunnyside	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Tacoma	Model under development							
Yakima	Model under development							
Wellpinit	Model under development							

Summary of Progress for Each Cohort I District

A summary of each MERIT district’s progress on developing teacher and principal evaluation plans for schools implementing the Transformation Model follows. While not required to do so, schools implementing the Turnaround Model could also engage in the process. Summaries are based on a review of the June 2011 *End-of-Year Annual Reports* submitted by each district/school. At the time of this report (August 2011), Sunnyside, Seattle, and Longview school districts have both Teacher and Principal evaluation systems that meet appropriate year 1 progress. Tacoma, Marysville, and Grandview school districts have Principal systems, and Tacoma has a Teacher system that meets appropriate year 1 progress.

All other districts continue to work with their local associations to complete a “rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation system for teachers and principals that use student growth as a significant factor” and they expect to meet the requirement prior to the start of the 2011–12 school year.

Grandview School District

- **Teacher Evaluation:** Negotiations with the Grandview Education Association have been finalized, and a new evaluation tool with a measurement for student growth as a significant factor was submitted to OSPI for final approval. The evaluation tool will be implemented in the “2011–2012” school year. The district is using its current system for teacher evaluation. In addition to the seven criteria currently used by the district, an eighth criterion was added for the MERIT school: Demonstrates Impact on Student Learning. The certificated classroom employee sets student learning goals and will provide evidence of growth in student learning. Criterion 8 includes three indicators with a four-tier rubric for each indicator: (1) Sets student learning goals, (2) Uses multiple data points to guide and modify instruction, and (3) Provides evidence that demonstrates growth in student learning. Assistance in this document was guided by Lee Goeke and additional support was provided by Leslie Rose.
- **Principal Evaluation:** The district used E2SSB 6696 criteria to create rubrics for its principal evaluation system. Under Criterion 8: “Closing the Gap- Demonstrating a commitment to closing the achievement gap,” the district

included the following indicator: Demonstrated academic student growth; the proficient level requires student test results, based on the previous year's state assessments in reading and mathematics, increased in both subject areas in at least two grades levels.

Highline School District

Highline School District joined TPEP districts and formed Teacher and Principal Evaluation Committees charged with developing evaluation systems for use across all schools. Committees have neither completed work on the rubrics nor finalized plans for how to use student growth in evaluating teachers or principals. End-of-year assessment by the MERIT Liaison indicates "Appropriate year 1 progress has been made pending submission of completed Teacher and Principal Evaluation systems following updated guidance." The district is expected to continue its efforts to meet the federal requirements for developing new teacher and principal evaluation systems that use student growth as a significant factor by the beginning of the "2011-2012" school year.

- **Teacher Evaluation:** Based on the work from a Teacher Evaluation Committee, the district has a tentative agreement to use the Danielson Instructional Framework enhanced by the district's equitable practices. Additionally, the district is finalizing language for the current evaluation tool with language that meets the student growth requirements for MERIT schools, and has plans to provide professional development on the Danielson framework in fall 2011 for all teachers and principals. The district joined the TPEP project this year to further advance its adoption of a four-tier model with criteria embedded from the E2SSB 6696 legislation.
- **Principal Evaluation:** A Principal Evaluation Committee is working to develop four-tier rubrics based on E2SSB 6696 principal evaluation criteria. The evaluation system will align with the work of the teacher evaluation system committee. The following were utilized in developing their draft tool: AWSP Evaluating Principal Leadership, Highline Public School Current Principal Evaluation Tool; BERC Draft Rubric (from earlier MERIT school evaluation meetings); and *Principal Leadership Actions* from *New Leaders for New Schools*.

Longview School District

A committee has developed a new evaluation system for Monticello Middle School. It includes self-reflection, observations, student growth measures, and evaluation documents. The district has also developed a letter of understanding with the teacher union, and the evaluation committee is in the process of putting together a notebook for each teacher. Training in the new evaluation system is scheduled for August. Based on documentation submitted with the End-of-Year Report, the district's MERIT liaison commented that "there is evidence of a thoughtful and thorough teacher evaluation system."

- **Teacher Evaluation:** Longview used the work from BERC Human Resource Workshops to develop competencies, four-tiered rubrics, forms, and procedures. The significance of the use of student data is defined within one of the eight criteria (Criterion 6 - *Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning: 6.6 – Results of Student Growth Measures*) on which teachers are evaluated. Teachers must work with their supervisor to develop goals identifying how they will implement and measure the use of multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student

learning. Based on performance on this and other criteria, teachers will be placed on one of three professional growth plans (i.e., proficient, emerging, or directed) the following year.

- **Principal Evaluation:** The district's revised principal evaluation system reflects the work of the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP). The core of the principal evaluation system is a portfolio collection of evidence that addresses the eight E2SSB 6696 criteria. The use of student growth as a significant factor in the principal evaluation is reflected by including student performance data to demonstrate proficiency for the following criteria: (1) *Creates a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching for students and staff*; (4) *Competent in curriculum, instruction, and assessment*; and (5) *Monitors and evaluates effective instruction and assessment*.

Marysville School District

During the "2010–2011" school year, the Marysville School District formed an evaluation team and worked with the local union on the development of an evaluation tool matching the eight criteria required by E2SSB 6696.

- **Teacher Evaluation:** The district worked with the Marysville Education Association to develop a teacher evaluation tool using the E2SSB 6696 teacher criteria and a four-tiered rubric; they have plans to implement the evaluation tool in "2011–12". Documents show that teachers will be evaluated based on the criterion of *Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning*.
- **Principal Evaluation:** Committees developed four-tier rubrics based on E2SSB 6696 principal evaluation criteria as well as an additional criterion: *Improving student achievement-Produce student growth results*. The student growth measures used in the principal evaluation will be determined in the pre-conference process between the supervisor and the principal. Assessment selection may include state and district assessments, classroom-based assessments, graduation and high school credit statistics, discipline data and other data included in the school improvement planning process. Data gathered for this criterion will be a significant part of the overall evidence of growth of students, staff, and the school that the principal must provide at the end of the year.

Seattle School District

- **Teacher Evaluation:** Last spring, staff from SIG schools helped develop standards for performance for all SIG school staff members. The district also worked with the Seattle Education Association (SEA) to develop a new teacher evaluation system based on Danielson's Framework and four-tiered rubrics. All teachers throughout the district will be required to set Student Academic Achievement Goals mutually agreed on between the teacher and evaluator. Definitions and guidelines for use of student growth and clearly defined performance expectations are outlined in the SEA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The Memorandum of Understanding for SIG schools calls for all instructional staff in SIG schools to be held accountable to a dual bar for performance, they must be rated either proficient or innovative on the evaluation tool AND they must

meet an annually established target for typical student growth, or they will be displaced. Teachers new to the profession will be evaluated on a graduated performance expectation level. Those expectations were specified in a Commitment Contract (CC), and staff members were required to either agree to the heightened expectations or be displaced to a non-SIG school. This process will continue for all three SIG schools in Seattle, for the 3-year term of the grant.

- **Principal Evaluation:** The district is working with its principal group to complete rubrics based on the E2SSB 6696 criteria. For MERIT schools, they will add a supplement to the Standard Seattle PASS Evaluation: Improving student achievement to produce student growth results. The complete principal evaluation process and tools will be completed by fall 2011.

Sunnyside School District

- **Teacher Evaluation:** An action team that included Sunnyside Education Association members and district staff used E2SSB 6696 criteria to create new four-tiered teacher evaluation tools and a professional growth process to be implemented for all staff at Sunnyside High School (SHS). In addition to using the new evaluation tool at SHS, the district will pilot the tool at the other seven district schools. Tools include student growth as a factor through an indicator for Criterion 6: *Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning*. The indicator indicates: *Student academic growth (Required demonstrations of student growth). To demonstrate proficiency, 80 percent of students will show academic growth.*
- **Principal Evaluation:** The district worked with its principal group to complete rubrics based on the E2SSB6696 criteria. Language specifically addressing use of student growth data is within Criterion #3: *“Leads development, implementation and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements.”* Indicator 3.4 *Student Academic growth (Required demonstrations of student academic growth).*

Tacoma School District

- **Teacher Evaluation:** A teacher evaluation task force met several times over the year, and the Tacoma Education Association president and task force members participated in MERIT evaluation technical assistance opportunities. Jason Lee Middle School, the only school implementing the Transformation Model in Tacoma, will incorporate new evaluation criteria with a growth model component that utilizes the district’s data dashboard. Details of the evaluation tools for teachers and specific ways the district will use student growth as a significant factor in the evaluation process were finalized in July and include in Standard 7 evidence of a four-tier rating system that includes growth in student learning from a minimum of three sources of data, including state assessment results where required.
- **Principal Evaluation:** The principal evaluation task force met over the course of the year. They are using the AWSP/E2SSB 6696 criteria as a basis for their work.

Yakima School District

The district joined TPEP districts in using the Danielson Framework and rubrics and included indicators to use student growth. However, there is lack of clarity around use of the state assessment to measure student growth.

- **Teacher Evaluation:** The district and Yakima Education Association worked closely to develop tools and processes.
- **Principal Evaluation:** The district is still developing the model for principal evaluation.

Wellpinit School District

- **Teacher Evaluation:** The district is collaborating with the TPEP Consortium and will join the consortium in adopting the Danielson Framework and rubrics for their teacher evaluation tool. The use of student growth as a significant factor will be negotiated in June 2011. The district is considering the use of a combination of measures to assess student growth (e.g., Measured Academic Progress (MAP) scores over time, Benchmark Math Assessment data through the school year, Measurements of Student Progress (MSP), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), and other growth measures as appropriate).
- **Principal Evaluation:** This evaluation will be based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and AWSP's *Evaluating Principals in a Standards Based School* (E2SSB 6696 Criteria). An aligned student growth model is under development and is scheduled for completion by July 31, 2011.

VI. Next Steps and Timeline

As illustrated in Table 7, SE & SI will continue to target technical assistance and support to ensure districts/schools develop and implement teacher and principal evaluation systems that incorporate student academic growth as a significant component.

Table 7: MERIT/Required Action District Implementation Timeline

MERIT Cohort I	2010–11 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• District/school teams develop models, tools, and processes for their proposed teacher and principal evaluation systems.• SE & SI provides professional development, technical assistance, and support.
	2011–12 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Districts/schools initially implement their evaluation systems.• Districts/schools engage in professional development (e.g., Danielson Instructional Framework, principal and teacher training around using the tools) to support educators effectively implement the system.• SE & SI provides professional development, technical assistance, and support to district/school teams as needed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SE & SI monitors progress through 90-day plans and End-of-Year Report. <p>2012–13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts/schools fully implement their evaluation systems. • Districts/schools continue to provide professional development to support educators in order to effectively implement the system. • SE & SI continues to provide professional development, technical assistance, and support to district/school teams as needed. • SE & SI monitors progress through 90-day plans and End-of-Year Report.
<p>MERIT Cohort II & Required Action Districts</p>	<p>2011–12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District/school teams develop models, tools, and processes for their proposed teacher and principal evaluation systems. • SE & SI provides professional development, technical assistance, and support. <p>2012–13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts/schools initially implement their evaluation systems. • Districts/schools engage in professional development (e.g., Danielson Instructional Framework, principal and teacher training around using the tools) to support educators effectively implement the system. • SE & SI provides professional development, technical assistance, and support to district/school teams as needed. • SE & SI monitors progress through 90-day plans and End-of-Year Report. <p>2013–14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts/schools fully implement their evaluation systems. • Districts/schools continue to provide professional development to support educators in order to effectively implement the system. • SE & SI continues to provide professional development, technical assistance, and support to district/school teams as needed. • SE & SI monitors progress through 90-day plans and End-of-Year Report.

Descriptions of activities planned for 2011–12 to support Cohort I and Cohort II MERIT Districts and Required Action Districts in developing and implementing their new Human Resource and Evaluation Systems include the following:

Collaboration with Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)

SE & SI contracted with AWSP to provide technical assistance (a) to support districts in developing a principal evaluation tool and (b) to provide school based professional development support for principals required to implement the new teacher evaluation

tool. The latter could include training on evaluating marginal or ineffective teachers, building a culture of continuous improvement, utilizing effective strategies for conducting pre-and post-observation conferences, developing collections of evidence, and calibrating observations to ensure fair and equitable practice.

BERC Group Human Resource System Training

Lee Goeke from the BERC Group will conduct a series of Human Resource System Development Workshops for MERIT Cohort II and Required Action District's (RAD); these will be similar to the workshops provided for Cohort I in 2010–11. Cohort I districts can also participate as they continue to refine their Human Resource Systems to meet SIG requirements. See Appendix G for a summary of the "Human Resource Management Framework and Scope of Work."

TPEP Collaboration

Highline, Wellpinit, and Yakima School Districts will continue to partner with TPEP districts in implementing the Danielson Framework. MERIT Cohort II and RADs may opt to select the Danielson Framework for their work. Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator, will continue to provide MERIT/TPEP collaboration support.

On-Site Technical Assistance

MERIT Liaisons will continue to differentiate feedback and technical assistance as they monitor individual district/school progress. Districts can also access on-site technical assistance from Lee Goeke of the BERC Group; Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator; and Michaela Miller, TPEP Project Director.

VII. Conclusion

In spring 2010, the nine districts selected to participate in the MERIT Cohort I stepped forward to undertake huge efforts to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for their students. SIG districts and schools have many requirements, in addition to the teacher and principal evaluation requirement, that must be met in order to receive continued funding. The capacity of districts to support the work needed to meet these requirements continues to vary.

All districts are working closely with their teacher and principal groups to incorporate student growth data in teacher and principal evaluations. As of July 2011, **Sunnyside, Seattle, and Longview school districts** have both Teacher and Principal evaluation systems that meet appropriate year one progress. **Tacoma, Marysville, and Grandview school districts** have Principal systems, and **Tacoma** has a Teacher system that meets appropriate year one progress. All expect to meet the requirement prior to the start of the 2011–12 school year when the new evaluation system must go into effect. Districts are approaching this SIG requirement in different ways, since no specific method of addressing this challenging problem of practice, incorporating student data as a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluation, has been imposed by the State. Regardless of the path taken, SE & SI will continue to provide technical assistance to support districts and schools in their efforts to satisfy this requirement.

Updates regarding the work of MERIT districts will be provided as evidence of satisfying this requirement becomes available.

VIII. References

- Association of Washington School Principals. (2010). *Evaluating principal leadership in a performance-based school: The eight new principal evaluation criteria*. Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.awsp.org/Content/awsp/PrincipalsHandbook/PrincipalEvaluationCriteria/Principal_Leadership_1.31.11_web.pdf
- Center for Educational Leadership. (n.d.). *Five dimensions of teaching and learning (5d)*. Retrieved from <http://www.k-12leadership.org/services/5-dimensions>
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching (2nd ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- 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 from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/practicalGuideEvalSystems.pdf>
- Goe, L. (2008, May). *Key Issue: Using value-added models to identify and support highly effective teachers*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Marzano, R. (2011). *The art and science of teaching: Causal teacher evaluation model*. Blairstown, PA: Learning Sciences International.
- National Education Policy Center. (n.d.). *Getting teacher assessment right: What policymakers can learn from research*. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu>
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2011). *Student learning, student achievement: How do teachers measure up? A report by the Student Learning, Student Achievement Task Force*. Retrieved from www.nbpts.org/index.cfm?t=downloader.cfm&id=1305
- The New Teacher Project. (2010). *Teacher Evaluation 2.0*. Retrieved from The New Teacher Web site: <http://tntp.org/publications/issue-analysis/teacher-evaluation-2.0/>
- 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: Retrieved from <http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect.pdf>

IX. Appendices

- A. Evaluation Requirements for SIG compared to E2SSB 6696
- B. New Teacher and Principal Evaluation (TPEP) Criteria
- C. Sample Solutions Presented at Cross-MERIT Meeting, August 2010
- D. Baker.Education.Research.Consulting (BERC Group) Training Agendas
- E. TPEP/MERIT Collaboration
- F. On-site Technical Assistance
- G. Human Resource Management Framework

Appendix A: Evaluation Requirements for SIG Compared to E2SSB 6696

<p>Federal Requirements <i>(School Improvement Grant Guidance)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals which are developed with staff and use student growth as a significant factor. • Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice, have not done so. • Implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for recruiting, placing and retaining effective teachers.
<p>State Requirements (E2SSB 6696)</p>	<p>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. 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 performance between two points in time.</p>

Appendix B: New Teacher and Principal Evaluation Criteria

Teacher Criteria	Principal Criteria
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement. 2. Demonstrating effective teaching practices. 3. Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs. 4. Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum. 5. Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment. 6. Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning. 7. Communicating and collaborating with parents and school community. 8. Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creating a school culture that promotes 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.

Appendix C: Sample Solutions Presented at Cross-MERIT Meeting

**Cross-MERIT Meeting, August 2010
Measuring Student Achievement Growth for Teacher Evaluation SAMPLE
SOLUTIONS –
From BASIC to COMPLEX**

	Basic/Barebones	Modest	Complex
Assessments Used	State test only (MSP/HSPE)	Add: State EOCs Vendor-developed assessments (e.g., MAP, ACT) – though administration may be complex	Add: District-developed EOCs Classroom-Based Assessments
Assignment of Teachers to Students (i.e., accurately attributing growth results)	Merge existing databases – link by course number or teacher number	Add: Auditing and verification of course assignments and classroom lists	Add: Weighting process (using district databases) in cases where multiple teachers are assigned to a teacher or a student is only with a teacher for a portion of the year End-of-year linkage procedure: Allow teachers to self-identify proportion of time a student spent in class (e.g. Houston)
Quantitative/ Statistical Growth Measures (in the absence of a vertically-scaled assessment)	Standardized Scales (Z-Scores) Value Tables – i.e. assigning points for students moving across proficiency levels (e.g. Prince George County, MD)	Univariate models: outcomes for the current year only are modeled based on prior scores (and possibly other covariates such as student characteristics) Simple value-added model: e.g., differencing student’s actual score and student’s expected	Multilevel mixed effects model (with varying intercepts and/or slopes) – some variables are fixed (do not vary across teachers) and some are random (vary across teachers—these are the “teacher effect”) Multivariate models where multiple years of student outcomes

	Basic/Barebones	Modest	Complex
		<p>score (usually calculated from OLS linear regression)</p> <p>Fixed effect models where each teacher is included as a variable</p> <p>Quantile regression: estimates a conditional distribution of scores for each student – e.g., Colorado Growth Model</p>	<p>and associated teacher effects are modeled simultaneous (e.g. EVAAS)</p>
Missing Data (e.g., missing demographic information or incomplete test score history)	Delete cases with missing data	<p>Impute missing data using the mean value or regression based imputation</p> <p>Include a dummy-coded covariate for missing cases</p>	Longitudinal models that allow for incomplete data (e.g., EVAAS)
Valid Cases – Which students are included based on attendance or mobility?	Include all students present on test day regardless of amount of time spent in the classroom	Develop an exclusion rule ahead of time for removing students from analysis (e.g. Colorado’s 85%/85% rule)	Include variable in model that account for proportion of time a student spent in a given classroom (e.g., EVAAS)
Scoring	Provide output directly from model (e.g., estimated teacher effect or median student growth percentile)	<p>Add:</p> <p>Convert results/effects to normed value (e.g. NCE, 1-5 rubric) based on empirical distribution of results/effects</p>	<p>Add:</p> <p>Make adjustments for state and district mean for teachers, teacher’s 3-year average effect, students linked to teachers</p>

Appendix D: BERC Training Agendas

Washington State MERIT School Grants Human Resources Management Workshops Tacoma, Washington

The Human Resource Management Workshops are designed to focus on those requirements under the *School Improvement Grant (SIG)* that require fundamental change in human resource management programs and practices. These fall primarily under the category of Developing and Increasing Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness. However, there are also significant issues that must be addressed through collective bargaining under the categories of:

1. Comprehensive Instructional Reform Strategies
2. Increasing Learning Time and Creating Community-Oriented Schools
3. Provide Operational Flexibility and Sustained Support

School Improvement Grant Requirements: All but three of the schools selected for a SIG grant have elected the Transformation Model. Three selected Turnaround, and one selected closure.

The transformation model has five (5) required activities under the category of *Developing and Increasing Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness*. Those activities are:

1. Replace the Principal.
2. Use a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation system for teachers and principals that:
 - a. takes into account data on student growth,
 - b. takes into account other factors such as observation-based assessments and collections of professional practice, and
 - c. are designed with teacher and principal involvement.
3. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff.
4. Provide ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development regarding:
 - a. subject-specific pedagogy,
 - b. developing a deeper understanding of the community served, and
 - c. provide for differentiated instruction.
5. Implement of such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions designed to recruit, place, and retain staff.

Required activities under the turnaround model for *Developing and Increasing Teacher and School Leader Effectiveness* are similar to the above with the added requirements of:

1. Replacing half of the teaching staff.
2. Using a locally developed set of competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment.

Relationship to School & Classroom Practices Study: The study of school and classroom practices conducted in advance of grant application included an assessment of the readiness and ability of the district to implement required changes in human resource management programs and practices. Different districts had different needs;

however, some areas were relatively common among all districts. The workshop is intended to focus on these areas apart from support provided through OSPI or the grant for areas more specific to a given district.

Subsequent to awarding of grants, districts have taken or begun initiatives under these common areas. The workshop will provide for sharing of progress to date with the objective of building on that progress and allowing other districts to leverage the work already being done.

Focus: A series of workshops will focus on the five (5) **common characteristics** of human resource management that are shared by all cohort districts. These are:

1. Developing teacher and administrator competency models to guide all aspects of the Human Resource Management System and that are aligned to the statutory requirements of a new evaluation system (E2SSB 6696 and *School Improvement Grant*).
2. Creating systemic professional development programs that align with the competency model and the statutory requirements of a new evaluation system.
3. Enhancing the skill of building administrators in carrying out their HRM responsibilities to include candidate screening and selection, teacher evaluation and coaching, addressing performance improvement, addressing employee behavior.
4. Exploring new recruiting, retention, and assignment strategies for teachers and/or administrators.
5. Developing strategies for gaining greater HRM flexibility in collective bargaining agreements.

Framework: Participants will be provided with background information concerning the research, innovative methods, and strategies for addressing the five common characteristics. Group facilitation will allow districts to individually and collaboratively apply the research to their own environment.

Outcomes:

1. Districts will depart the workshops with a detailed change plan specific to their needs in each of the five common characteristics.
2. Districts will create a MERIT school network that can be further developed and exploited to the mutual benefit of all districts as they design, implement, and assess the human resource management changes.
3. Each district will depart with an awareness of the needs of the district and knowledge of the support that the district can access and how that support can assist them.

Appendix E: TPEP/MERIT Collaboration

January 20 and 21, 2011: On January 20, 2011 (Spokane): Yakima School District and Wellpinit School District joined with the TPEP districts and on January 21, 2011 (Federal Way) Highline School District, Longview School District, Seattle Public Schools and Tacoma School District joined with TPEP Districts in the morning to hear Charlotte Danielson. In the afternoon MERIT Districts met with Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator, the agenda for the day is below:

Evaluation Development Workshop

January 20 and 21, 2011

Featuring: Charlotte Danielson

Eastside: Thursday, January 20, 8:00 – 3:00: The Davenport Hotel

Westside: Friday, January 21, 8:00 – 3:00: Washington Education Association, Federal Way

AGENDA

8:00 – 12:00 Presentation by Charlotte Danielson

12:00 – 12:45 Lunch

12:45 – 3:00 TPEP and MERIT Districts will meet separately

MERIT Follow-up:

How will what you gained through this morning's work with Charlotte influence your next steps?

Where is your district in the development of Teacher and Principal Evaluation models that use student growth as a significant factor? What are your planned next steps? What support do you need?

We are planning to have Danielson work with MERIT Districts this August. Based on what you heard this morning what do you think would be topics beneficial to your district's work?

What to Bring:

For access to the most resources and materials please bring your laptops, tablets, and/or smartphones. The Davenport will have free guest wi-fi access.

Washington State
Teacher & Principal Evaluation Project
AGENDA
February 16 & 17, 2011
Renton Technical College, Renton, WA.

Criteria/Rubric Development & Evidence/Measures

Workshop Goals:

1. Establish a shared understanding among the TPEP pilot sites of the new teacher and principal evaluation criterion.
2. Create a foundational understanding of rubric design (including such items as gradation, language specificity and “floor/1-ceiling/4” discussion) to ensure individual district models are clear and understandable moving forward. *This is not to say we are aiming at piloting one model, quite the opposite. This would not be a pilot if we did not have more than one model next year.*
3. Learn and explore various evidence and measures in which to continue the development of district models.

Wednesday, February 16th

Criteria/Rubric Development

Charlotte Danielson

8:30-9:00am - Continental Breakfast

Morning

9:00am-11:30am

Teacher and Principal Criteria

The morning will focus on a large group synthesis of the eight criteria for teachers and eight criteria for principals. The goal of this part of the day will be to have the 9 TPEP sites come to a shared understanding of the meaning of each criterion. The purpose of this exercise is to ensure a solid foundation of understanding as the sites continue to develop their district models. Danielson will also be reviewing the elements of effective rubric design in more depth.

Lunch: 11:30am-12:15pm

Afternoon

12:15pm-3:30pm

Rubric Design and Criteria Alignment

Districts will work individually and collaboratively for the afternoon to align rubrics to the criteria and ensure a solid foundation of rubric design. Districts will continue to work with Danielson to review and discuss findings from the draft rubrics. The outcome of the afternoon will be refining drafts of evaluation rubrics.

Next Steps & Adjourn: 3:30pm Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot Visit our blog & resource site: <http://tpep-wa.org> Follow us on Twitter: [http://www.twitter.com/waOSPI_TPEP 2](http://www.twitter.com/waOSPI_TPEP2)

Thursday, February 17th

Morning

8:00-8:30am - Continental Breakfast

8:30am-9:00am Guest Speaker: Superintendent Randy Dorn, OSPI

9:00am-10:00am Criteria/Rubric Design Cont'd

10:00am-10:15am Break

**10:15am-11:30am Evidence and Measures, Priorities, Purpose and Method
(Gretchen Weber, AIR)**

Evidence and Measures: Gretchen Weber from the American Institute for Research (AIR) will guide districts through a process of determining relevant evidence and measures to explore in their district models for the 2011-12 pilot. Districts will be provided both research and examples of various evidence and measures and given time to discuss implications of using them within their pilot model.

Evidence and measures to be discussed will include, but not be limited to: Planning and Classroom Observation, Self-Assessment and Reflection, Perception Survey Data, Student Work Samples, Student Learning/Achievement Data, Peer Review/Evaluation, Portfolio Assessment

11:30am-12:30pm Lunch: Guest Speakers: Ann Randall, WEA & Gary Kipp, AWSP

Afternoon:

12:30pm-3:30pm Evidence and Measures Cont'd, Priorities, Purpose and Method

3:00-3:30pm March Planning & Adjourn

Appendix F: On-Site Technical Assistance

January 7, 2011: A “Think Tank” session was held with Tacoma Education Association jointly facilitated by Michaela Miller, TPEP Project Coordinator, and Leslie Rose, MERIT Teacher and Principal Evaluation Coordinator. Michaela and Leslie provided participants with background information regarding TPEP and SIG requirements, research articles, and process tools to guide their work in developing an evaluation tool for their Transformation Model school, as well as background information that might guide their work as they develop an effective evaluation system for all Tacoma School District teachers.

February 7, 2011: Yakima School District invited Leslie Rose to present at a meeting with all of their MERIT school teachers. At this meeting she shared the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness SIG requirements, highlighting use of student growth, and provided several conceptual models of how other districts have accomplished use of student growth to evaluate teacher effectiveness.

February 15, 2011 and April 15, 2011: Highline School District invited Leslie Rose to participate in Principal Evaluation Committee meetings during which she clarified the requirements of ES 6696 and SIG, provided resources such as the AWSP Leading in a Performance Based School document, shared ways other states have addressed use of student growth, and answered clarifying questions.

May 17, 2011: Leslie Rose met with the Grandview School District teacher bargaining team and district bargaining team to address questions around the use of student growth in teacher evaluation.

Additional on-site support includes:

- Lee Goeke, BERG Group, has met with the Grandview School District teacher negotiating team to help facilitate the process and provide communication protocols.
- Highline and Yakima School Districts have worked with Michaela Miller to plan training follow-up with the Danielson Group.
- Numerous e-mails and phone calls to provide research documents and examples to Tacoma, Highline, Seattle, Yakima, Wellpinit, and Grandview school districts.
- Following initial submission of End-of-Year Reports MERIT liaisons provided sample language from approved evaluation systems to districts not yet meeting requirement.

Appendix G: Human Resource Management Framework

The research-based framework outlined below is under development by OSPI in collaboration with Lee Goeke from the BERC Group. The framework describes seven components of competency-based models focused on effective management of human resources. Components are not intended to be viewed in isolation; rather they must work together in order to create an effective system to improve human resource functions in a school district. Components include:

- Developing a Competency-based Model
- Targeted Recruitment
- Values-based Selection
- Induction and Mentoring
- Intentional Professional Development
- Competency-based Evaluation
- Recognition and Retention

Once completed, the framework will provide Washington's school districts with actionable steps and guidance around which a comprehensive human resource management system can be built. Anchored in current research, the framework will offer clarity and vision for districts to integrate all functions of the human resource system around core competencies.

For example, the draft framework lists specific actions as essential to implement the first component: developing a competency model to drive all human resource functions. Accompanying each action are specific strategies used by leadership and goals/outcomes. Actions include:

- Develop a Competency Model
 - Begin with classroom teachers as the center of the educational enterprise
 - Assemble the research
 - Form a representative team(s)
 - Identify the critical roles, responsibilities, and performance requirements specific to your district
 - Identify the competencies necessary to succeed in each role, responsibility, and requirement (Competencies should include evaluation criteria as well as additional essential competencies such as "turnaround" competencies).
 - Enter the competencies into a Competency Model
 - Develop concurrent competency models for other groups (i.e., staff specialist, support staff, administrative staff).
 - Assure alignment of each model to the teacher model.
- Create a protocol for use of the Competency Model for:
 - Targeting recruitment
 - Screening applicants
 - Selecting applicants
 - Identifying initial professional growth needs
 - Teaching reflection
 - Teaching evaluation
 - Recognition and retention

The framework is expected to be completed in the winter of 2011.

**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:
Tonya Middling, OSPI
E-mail: tonya.middling@k12.wa.us
Phone: (360) 725-6392**

**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:
11-0028**

**This document is available online at:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/>**

**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