



Randy I. Dorn • State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building • P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200

UPDATE: State of the State for Teacher and Principal Evaluation 2015

Authorizing legislation: [RCW 28A.405](#)
<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=28A.405>

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP)
Dr. Gil Mendoza, Deputy Superintendent

Prepared by:

- Jeanne Harmon, Director, Educator Effectiveness (retired)
- Sue Anderson, Director, Educator Effectiveness, sue.anderson@k12.wa.us, (360) 725-6116
- Molly Becker, Administrative Assistant, molly.becker@k12.wa.us, (360) 725-6118

Executive Summary

As a result of 2010 and 2012 legislation, educator evaluation in Washington now focuses on continuous improvement for every educator every year. The ultimate purpose of this change was to improve student learning.

Beginning September 2013, every provisional teacher and principal in Washington and all those on probation changed to the revised process, which includes observations and measures of student growth. School districts also moved some of their experienced staff to the revised educator evaluation during 2013-14. More experienced educators were added in 2014-15. Eighty-three percent of teachers and 95% of principals have moved to the revised system. The rest will switch over by September, 2015.

Two groups study the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) under contract with OSPI. American Institutes for Research (AIR) used the 2013-14 results to give baseline data about educator performance. They also asked teacher and administrator preparation programs how they are using the revised educator evaluation.

The University of Washington (UW) analyzed professional learning spending patterns and surveyed school and district staff about implementation. UW also conducted site visits to learn more about student growth goals and measures.

Findings include:

- Most educators have moved to the revised evaluation system.
- Most educators were rated proficient or distinguished in 2013-14.
- No significant discrepancies were found in the patterns of 2013-14 baseline data about educator performance.
- Half the teachers in a statewide survey believe TPEP will improve student learning.
- Most principals said TPEP has improved their understanding of quality instruction and helped them identify teachers who need more support.
- Most teachers received some TPEP training in 2014-15, focused on the instructional framework and rubrics, on student growth measures, and on evidence and artifacts.
- Administrators and teachers disagree about teachers' ability to set and measure student growth.
- Some districts added staff to allow principals more time for instructional responsibilities and most districts paid teachers for learning beyond the school day and calendar.
- Principal preparation program faculty understand TPEP better than faculty in teacher preparation programs.

Governance

The Legislature created the TPEP Steering Committee in RCW.28A.405.100. Members include representatives from:

- Association of Washington School Principals
- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Washington Association of School Administrators
- Washington Education Association
- Washington State Parent Teacher Association
- Washington State School Directors Association

The partners meet monthly to monitor implementation, provide guidance to OSPI and discuss potential solutions for challenges that arise in the field. Members bring multiple perspectives to each conversation and act on consensus. The “[state and local decisions matrix](#)” and “[TPEP FAQs](#)” are living documents that provide districts guidance to supplement the RCWs and the WACs.

2013-14 Educator Performance Data

OSPI collects educator performance data every fall for the year prior. The first full year of TPEP implementation was 2013-14, when 65% of classroom teachers and 79% of school administrators were evaluated using the revised system. Districts selected one instructional framework for evaluating teachers and one leadership framework for evaluating school administrators.

Table 1: District Choice - Instructional Framework

Districts with fewer than 2,000 students were more likely to select the Marzano Teacher Evaluation

Instructional Framework	0-2,000	2,000-5,000	5,000-10,000	10,000-15,000	15,000+
CEL 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric	61	21	7	5	6
Danielson Framework for Teaching	53	22	11	4	15
Marzano	73	6	10	0	1
Total	187	49	28	9	22

Model and the Marzano School Leadership Evaluation Model. The state’s largest districts were more likely to select the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

Table 2: District Choice - Leadership Framework

All districts with enrollment larger than 10,000 students selected the AWSP Leadership Framework.

	0-2,000	2,000-5,000	5,000-10,000	10,000-15,000	15,000+
AWSP Leadership Framework 2.0	176	47	26	9	22
Marzano School Leadership Evaluation Model	10	2	2	0	0
No Response	1	0	0	0	0
Total	187	49	28	9	22

The revised system includes a change from two ratings (Unsatisfactory and Satisfactory) to four (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished). A total of 38,856 teachers and 2,271 school administrators were rated using the revised system in the spring of 2014.

The majority of teachers and principals in 2013-14 were rated proficient. Fewer than 1% were rated Unsatisfactory, a statistic consistent with historical data. Depending on the framework, an additional 3-9% were rated Basic. Twenty percent of teachers and fourteen percent of school administrators were rated Distinguished. The researchers noted that the revised system provides additional information about high-performing educators and that *“a more nuanced four-tier system allows educators to potentially be rated as distinguished, which may encourage enhanced performance by high-achieving educators.”*

Table 3: Teachers and Principals Rated Using a Four-Tier System (2013-14)

Rating	Teachers		Principals	
	Sum	Percentage	Sum	Percentage
<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	153	<1%	4	<1%
<i>Basic</i>	1,804	5%	168	7%
<i>Proficient</i>	29,069	75%	1,789	79%
<i>Distinguished</i>	7,830	20%	310	14%
<i>Total</i>	38,856	100%	2,271	100%

Note. A total of 2,304 schools from 290 districts provided teacher evaluations using the four-tier system. Principal evaluations were based on reports from 290 of 295 school districts. Because of rounding error, column percentages do not sum to 100.

District size did not appear to affect educator ratings. The researchers saw some differences among teacher ratings depending on choice of instructional framework. The only difference between the pattern of districts using AWSP and Marzano leadership frameworks was in the number of Basic ratings.

Because 2013-14 was the first year of implementation, differences in ratings are likely related to differences in rubric language among the frameworks and to local fidelity to rater agreement. Framework authors suggest 1-2 hours per month is needed to maintain high levels of rater agreement. Not all districts have invested to this level. Most districts have set inter-district rater agreement as a goal they expect to reach in two or three years. Intra-district rater agreement will remain a long range goal without Legislative direction and funding.

[AIR's full report](#) can be found on the TPEP website.

2014 Statewide Implementation Survey

From 2011-2013, every educator in Washington was sent a survey invitation. By 2013, most educators reported they understood the frameworks, the use of student growth and the process of summative rating.

The TPEP Steering Committee decided to survey a representative sample of educators. Five hundred teachers, 200 principals, 100 assistant principals, 100 superintendents and 30 TPEP leads were recruited based on school demographics, location and educator experience. Survey themes included goal setting for student growth, educators' views of training, professional development and staff supports, and the use of electronic tools to manage the work.

More than half of the teachers said TPEP will improve the quality of their instruction and 49% believe it will improve student learning. Principals indicate that the instructional framework is helpful in evaluating teachers. Principals also said TPEP helped them identify teachers who need additional support (84%). Eighty percent of superintendents view TPEP as having a positive impact on the district.

Student Growth

Teachers statewide talk with other teachers to set goals for student growth, but examine assessment results by themselves. Teachers are confident in their ability to set rigorous goals, but principals identify that area as one of great challenge for teachers. Superintendents say the use of multiple measures as a challenge for teachers and believe principals' ability to help teachers is limited. All groups mentioned that finding time to collaborate was a concern.

Teachers use classroom-based assessments as evidence of student growth. Approximately 95% of administrators encourage the use of department, grade-level or PLC-developed assessments and 80% recommend the use of district assessments. Fewer administrators recommend the use of state assessments (13-28%).

Statewide survey results were confirmed when the UW research team visited districts. To understand in more depth what a variety of leaders in six districts had to say, see the [UW Goal Setting and Measures report](#).

Professional Learning

Ninety-three percent of teachers on the revised evaluation received some evaluation training from their district in 2014-15. One third reported 2-3 days and 14% reported more than three days. Sixty-one percent of teachers said training on goal setting for student growth was useful.

Most teachers felt confident in their ability to set student growth goals and work with assessments, but still want additional training. Principals reported teacher leaders facilitated training on the instructional framework, goal setting, evidence collection, and development of classroom-based assessments.

Staffing and Support for Principals

As with any massive change, implementing TPEP has stressed a system already working at capacity. Eighty-six percent of principals indicate TPEP has increased their stress. Both principals (62%) and superintendents (74%) note time is a great concern.

OSPI launched a Working Conditions survey this spring that should provide insight into the challenges of the principalship. Once the results are public, the TPEP Steering Committee will use the annual data to track increased support for TPEP implementation.

Principals spend 3-5 hours conducting observations and 1-2 hours writing post-observation summaries. Since the work is cyclical, it does not spread evenly across the school calendar. In order to accommodate this significant change in the school leader's role, districts are rethinking support options. About a quarter of principals and assistant principals said the district added additional staff or reassigned duties to allow principals more instructional leadership time. Half of those added a full-time or part-time assistant principal. Some added a dean of students (27%) or hired outside evaluators (9%). Three-quarters of districts added instructional coaches or other teacher leader supports in the past two years. While teacher leaders cannot conduct evaluations, they can do informal observations for coaching purposes, meet with PLCs, grade level groups and departments, provide professional learning and relieve administrators of other duties to gain time for evaluation work.

Central office staffing has also changed in one third of the responding districts. Half reported adding new staff, 80% reassigned existing staff to assist with TPEP and 84% formed district-wide committees to support TPEP implementation. A smaller percentage hired retired principals to conduct evaluations (16%) or restructured their human resources department (19%).

2014-15 State-funded Teacher Learning

The 2014 Legislature authorized \$5million *"solely for the provision of training for teachers in the performance-based teacher principal evaluation program."* OSPI grants were based on the number of teachers each school district employed as of October 1, 2013. The rate was \$85 per teacher (approximately \$5 per student). Most districts added local dollars to fund a more robust training

plan. Several used local funds to assure that principals and teachers learned together. Several ESDs accessed funds to support TPEP work in the forty-eight small districts that decided not to apply to offer training locally. In the spring, OSPI redistributed available funds to 34 districts with approved plans and evidence of local TPEP expenditures.

Participation

The UW research team examined the grant applications submitted to OSPI by 215 districts. Thirty-two districts submitted applications too late to be analyzed. Forty-eight chose not to apply. Most of those are located in rural Eastern Washington, with enrollments under 1000 students. Student poverty, race/ethnicity, and transitional bilingual and migrant status did not affect grant participation.

Learning Activities

Districts submitted a grant application describing the TPEP learning activities they planned for teachers in 2014-15. Nearly all districts planned activities focused on the instructional framework and rubrics (92%), on student growth measures (93%), and on evidence and artifacts (86%). New teachers were a significant audience (88%). Grade level teams were mentioned by 56% of districts as a target audience and 47% mentioned department teams. Few differences were noted by region. Districts with 5,000+ students were more likely to specify training for new teachers.

Spending Patterns

Districts often hired external trainers to facilitate learning (61%). Of those, almost half sent teachers to training at their local Educational Service District (ESD). Small and rural districts sought support from ESDs more often than large suburban or urban districts. Seventy-three districts planned to spend grant funding on training provided by an ESD.

Most districts paid for teacher training time outside school hours (71%). Half the districts used funds to hire substitute teachers during school time. Districts also purchased resource books for teachers and reimbursed transportation to ESD learning events.

Table 4: Grant Funds Usage

		Number of Districts	Substitutes	Compensation for time outside work day	Others Support
Participating Districts		215	52%	71%	56%
Region	Central	31	48%	81%	52%
	Eastern	86	56%	74%	62%
	Western	98	50%	65%	53%
Instructional Framework	CEL	81	51%	64%	48%
	DAN	84	52%	82%	61%
	MAR	50	54%	64%	62%
Enrollment	<500	51	41%	55%	47%
	500-1,000	36	64%	64%	67%
	1,000-5,000	71	59%	77%	55%
	5,000-10,000	26	58%	77%	69%
	>10,000	31	35%	87%	52%

Uses of funding explicitly cited in the TPEP teacher training plan submitted by districts.

The [UW report](#) can be viewed on the TPEP website.

Educator Preparation Programs and TPEP

Principal Preparation

Principal preparation programs are required by RCW28A.410.278 to incorporate TPEP skills and processes into their curriculum. Thirty-nine faculty from principal preparation programs responded to a survey in the spring of 2015. One third of those have six or more years of experience teaching in the program and are full-time faculty.

The majority of faculty reported they understand TPEP and require candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills through class assignments or in the internship. They spent less time on

knowledge of the instructional and leadership frameworks and more time on the process of observing and conferencing with teachers.

Faculty asked for help prioritizing TPEP concepts and integrating them into an already-packed curriculum. Faculty members learn primarily from candidates about how TPEP works in schools. This can lead to confusion, as districts make many local decisions regarding the process. OSPI will help by providing webinars, teaching modules and case studies.

Teacher Preparation

The Professional Educator Standards Boards (PESB) recently adopted requirements for teacher preparation programs that parallel the state statute for principal preparation regarding TPEP. More than 200 faculty in teacher preparation programs responded to a survey in the spring of 2015. Of those, half are full-time faculty and two-thirds have six or more years of experience teaching in the program.

Faculty members rely on their partnerships with school districts for their understanding of TPEP. They are familiar with the evaluation criteria and framework rubrics, the four-tier performance rating, and how to participate in an evaluation conference, but spend less time addressing those concepts in class. They teach and require candidates to demonstrate the ability to self-assess, reflect on instructional practice, gather evidence over time and establish growth goals for individual students, small groups of students, and the whole class. In the final semester, candidates spend a significant amount of time completing their exit performance assessment (EdTPA). Teacher preparation faculty recognize some connections between TPEP and EdTPA, but request greater clarity in order to reinforce these connections and integrate their work.

The [AIR report](#) with key findings can be found on the TPEP website.

Next Steps

As the new system was being put in place, Washington created eVAL, an online evaluation system for teachers and principals. OSPI recently submitted a proposal to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for funding for eVAL. If granted, Gates will fund technical development and user enhancements for eVAL, as well as a pilot program to use student perception data in evaluation, the development and delivery of professional development on formative assessment, and more research about statewide implementation of TPEP.

References

- American Institutes for Research analysis of School Employee Evaluation Survey (SEES) [data](#). [SEES data intro and data tables](#) (Teacher and Principal).
- American Institutes for Research. "Washington Educator Preparation Survey of Faculty: Summary of Key Findings." April 2015. http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/15-2145_WA%20TPEP%20faculty%20survey%20memo_teacher%20prep_FINAL.pdf
- University of Washington. Washington's Teacher and Principal Evaluation System: Efforts to Support Professional Development. April, 2015. http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/UW_TPEP_FinalReport2015.pdf
- University of Washington. "State Funding for Professional Development: TPEP Training." April, 2015. http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/UW_TPEP_PrelimRpt_664_April_2015.pdf
- University of Washington. "Washington's Teacher and Principal Evaluation System: Goal Setting and Measures of Student Growth for Instructional Improvement." January, 2015. http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/UW_TPEP%20Report_FINAL.pdf
- American Institutes for Research. "Washington Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program Faculty Survey Report: Summary of Key Findings." May, 2015. http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/15-2316_WA_TPEP%20faculty%20survey%20report%20ed_5-8-15_FINAL.pdf

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.

Download this material in PDF at <http://www.k12.wa.us/LegisGov/Reports.aspx>. For more information about TPEP, the frameworks or research reports, see the [TPEP website](#).

This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at (888) 595-3276, TTY (360) 664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: **15-0031**.



Randy I. Dorn • State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building • P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200