

State Council for Educator Effectiveness

Technical Advisory Group

District Guidelines Work Group

DRAFT RESOURCE for Posting on Resource Bank**Developing a Quality Educator Evaluation System
Sample Implementation Timeline**

This resource was designed by a work group comprised of school district and university leaders based on the experiences of districts that have recently developed and implemented educator evaluation systems. It is intended to help districts consider the various steps involved in creating comprehensive evaluation systems. It is aligned with the timelines articulated in the state's educator evaluation law (Senate Bill 10-191).

Step 1 (spring/summer 2011)

Understand the changes required by the state's new educator evaluation law (Senate Bill 10-191). Educate district stakeholders (board members, accountability committee, administrators, teachers, parents/community members) re: the law and its expectations. Develop a sense of ownership in making change. Set tone that this is an opportunity to develop a system that builds/sustains a culture of continuous improvement within a district.

- Form a steering committee (SC) of key stakeholders to lead district in enacting changes. Local district contexts will determine whether this is a decision-making body or advisory group.
- Engage in self-study to gauge district's propensity for change.
- Clarify and communicate the district's "theory of change."
- Develop comprehensive list of those who need to understand the change and what aspects of implementation are likely to be a "paradigm shift." For example, the notion of differentiations in performance levels will be new to many teachers/administrators, and yet this concept is essential to embrace if districts are going to move
- Determine the scope of change required within the district, e.g., compare requirements of evaluation system SB 191 requires with current system.
- Identify key components of change.
- Set strategic agenda/timeline to guide the district's multi-year roll out of a new evaluation system.
- Ensure key perspectives and voices are included in development and roll out of system.
- Reach out to and learn from districts who have developed evaluation systems that meet the new requirements.

Step 2 (fall 2011): Review Educator Quality Standards

- Understand the state's educator effectiveness definitions and corresponding quality standards that will serve as required elements of local educator evaluation systems.
- Ensure the district's evaluation system aligns with the state's quality standards.

Step 3 (fall 2011): Develop a Measurement Framework & Determine Infrastructure**Required to Maintain Data Collection, Data Entry Auditing, & Data Analysis**

- Seek opportunities to leverage resources and expertise in accomplishing this step, by considering whether to use systems/tools developed and made available by state (e.g., if state is able to establish a standard web-based platform) or collaborating with other districts.
- Ensure that infrastructure to maintain data collection and auditing of data entry has clear decision rules for matching teachers with students and rigorous, systematic auditing systems to verify accuracy of matches.
- Sound educational practices should trump data system needs. That is, if a grade-level team can better deliver quality mathematics instruction by collaboration and assessing/regrouping students throughout the academic year, that practice should not be undone by data system needs.

Step 4 (spring 2012): Select and Beta-test Measurement Tools

- Draw on tools validated and available in Resource Bank developed by CDE.
- Tools should identify teaching actions/practices that are associated with student achievement and growth.
- Identify schools or teachers to beta-test the measurement tools in a strategic and purposeful manner, e.g., start with tested subjects, choose school or grade-level teams or individual teachers who represent different constituencies in change process, choose key teacher leaders who will engage others constructively in process.
- If possible, beta-test tools in spring in small number of classrooms in tested grades/subjects so analyses can be conducted in summer 2012 relating observation ratings and student growth measures.

Step 5 (summer 2012): Develop Model to Train Observers/Evaluators and Licensed Staff

- Develop criteria to select observers/evaluators who have requisite knowledge and skill to conduct reliable observations or evaluations of other exemplars of teacher work.
- Develop and implement training process to ensure awareness and understanding of the evaluation process, including differences of formative and summative assessment.
- Develop and implement training processes to ensure reliability in scoring and that calibration of observers occurs annually. We note that access to digital video records may prove useful for this task.
- Develop and implement training processes to provide feedback to teachers.
- Develop criteria and mechanism to evaluate effectiveness of training.

Step 6 (fall 2012): Pilot system

- Conduct trainings in late summer/early fall allowing cadre of observers/evaluators ability to learn and score reliably, but link observations to student growth, and determine tool differentiates teaching performance and that valid inferences can be drawn from data (e.g., seek to guard against scenarios where a teacher is "good" on tool but student growth is low OR teacher is "bad" on tool but student growth is high) [note this is a tricky proposition]
- November: self check on implementation progress for revision of implementation process
- Check implementation indicators, do they align with good implementation?

Step 7 (spring 2013): Evaluate pilot year and develop a set of lessons learned for use in roll-out

- Attend to participant and stakeholder's perceived sense of the process: Is it efficacious? Is it fair? Is it valid & reliable?
- Analyze observation data to ensure that tools are pegging teaching practices associated with student growth.
- Circulate draft of lessons learned and finalize lessons learned.

Step 8 (May/June 2013): Revise system based on pilot lessons learned**Step 9 (July/Aug 2013): Train administrators, teachers others for implementation district wide that fall****Step 10 (fall 2013): Implement across district****Step 11 (spring 2014):**

- Use indicators of effective implementation to manage implementation
- Allocate support resources based on implementation issues

- Develop lessons learned
- Revise tools

Step 12 (summer 2015)

- Provide additional support/training based on lessons learned.

Implementation Matrix

DRAFT February 10, 2011

Statutory Authority

The statutory language guiding the recommendations is provided below:

- 22-9-105.5 (3) (e) On or before March 1, 2011, to develop and recommend to the State Board guidelines for adequate implementation of a high-quality educator evaluation system that shall address at a minimum the following:
- (I) Ongoing training to ensure full understanding of the system and its implementation
 - (II) Evaluation results that are normed to ensure consistency and fairness
 - (III) Evaluation rubrics and tools that are deemed fair, transparent, rigorous and valid (recommendations for this item will be provided by another work group)
 - (IV) Evaluations conducted using sufficient time and frequency, at least annually, to gather sufficient data upon which to base an evaluation rating
 - (V) Provide adequate training and collaborative time to ensure educators fully understand and have resources to respond to student academic growth data
 - (VI) Student data that is monitored at least annually to ensure correlation between student academic growth and outcomes educator effectiveness rating
 - (VII) Process by which a non-probationary teacher may appeal his or her second consecutive performance rating of ineffective (recommendations for this item will be provided by the appeals work group)

Underlying Assumption

The recommendations are based on the assumption that the State Council will recommend required elements for district-developed educator evaluation systems and provide a state exemplar educator evaluation system that incorporates these required elements. The state exemplar system would be available for districts that choose to adopt it rather than develop their own systems.

State Role

These implementation guidelines recommend a support and monitoring role for the Colorado Department of Education (CDE).

Support. The support function includes:

- Development of tools, training, and resources to support the implementation of the state exemplar system by districts that choose to use it
- Population of an online resource bank of tools, resources, and best practices related to implementing high quality educator evaluation systems
- Dissemination and sharing of best practices, resources, and tools
- Professional development and technical assistance on key aspects of quality educator evaluation systems
- Training on data use, specifically support with using the Colorado Growth Model
- Reporting and analysis of student performance results, growth data, and educator evaluation statistics to inform local educator effectiveness and continuous improvement efforts

Statutory Language To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address:	Required Elements District	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	CDE Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
<p>Ongoing training on the use of the system that is sufficient to ensure that all evaluators and educators have a full understanding of the evaluation system and its implementation. The training may include such activities as conducting joint training sessions for evaluators and educators;</p>	<p>Districts shall have in place a process for providing training on their evaluation system to evaluators and educators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process shall ensure the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators have a full understanding of the evaluation system and receive regular training to improve inter-rater reliability, increase accuracy of ratings, and support ongoing and constructive performance feedback. • Licensed personnel have a full understanding of the evaluation system, including expectations, evaluation rubrics, timelines, required processes and forms, and the consequences of the evaluation process. • Licensed personnel are provided with materials and appropriate training explaining the evaluation system upon hiring, at the beginning of each school year, and after any changes have been made. • Communication is provided to licensed personnel prior to and following key evaluation milestones (e.g., prior to and following mid-year and end-of-year reviews) to explain the purpose of the evaluation activities and the results of the evaluation. • The district engages in regular monitoring of the quality and effectiveness of its evaluation system training and communication (e.g., through staff perception surveys) and uses the data gained through its monitoring activities to improve training and support on the evaluation 	<p>Some districts may choose to use trained evaluators from BOCES, other districts, or CDE to increase objectivity and spread costs of implementation.</p>	<p>Survey educators regarding the sufficiency of the training they receive on the evaluation system (use TELL survey or other statewide surveys as appropriate) and their level of understanding with their district evaluation system.</p> <p>Analyze survey data for outliers and provide support to districts that may be experiencing difficulty in communicating with and training their evaluators and personnel on their evaluation system.</p> <p>Monitor the effectiveness of district training by checking for consistency of performance ratings with student growth and school performance ratings.</p> <p>Offer state-level training and/or training of trainers (such as BOCES and other service providers) for districts using the state's model evaluation system.</p> <p>Examine the feasibility of a state-level platform to support the delivery of training for districts using the state model.</p>	<p>Evaluator training modules and/or examples of quality training for evaluators and for personnel</p> <p>Sample communications and information packets for evaluators and educators</p> <p>Resources on how to use growth data and how to use/interpret data in the performance evaluation system</p> <p>Resources on change management and on how to deliver quality instructional feedback</p> <p>Resources could include: web-based videos, annotated sample growth reports, webinars, handbooks, data guides, simulations, district examples, etc.</p> <p>Provide professional development on how to use growth data and how to use/interpret data in the performance evaluation system.</p> <p>Provide professional development on change management and instructional feedback (having meaningful conversations at the school level).</p>

Statutory Language	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	CDE Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
<p>To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address:</p> <p>Evaluation results that are normed to ensure consistency and fairness</p>	<p>Districts must have in place a process for ensuring that evaluation results are normed across their schools.</p>	<p>Norming processes could include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of video-taped instruction to train on evaluation and norm to rubrics 	<p>Compare effectiveness ratings from different schools that have students performing at similar proficiency levels.</p> <p>Compare the effectiveness ratings for schools/districts with the same school/district performance framework ratings (e.g., effectiveness ratings of priority and turnaround schools/districts).</p> <p>Use the data to identify outliers. Share with districts to determine if any systematic biases are occurring in the rating process. Assist as appropriate.</p> <p>Compare ratings across districts to monitor state-wide consistency.</p>	<p>Sample norming processes</p> <p>Tools for CAD/ and SST teams to use to support their examination of districts' evaluation systems</p> <p>Strengthen the review of evaluation systems during Comprehensive Assessment of District Improvement (CAD) and School Support Team (SST) visits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular, random audits of evaluation results by third-party evaluators • Pool of trained observers to conduct all reviews

Statutory Language	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
<p>To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address:</p> <p>Evaluations* that are conducted using sufficient time and frequency, at least annually, to gather sufficient data upon which to base the ratings contained in an evaluation;</p>	<p>Districts shall have in place a process to ensure that evaluations are conducted using sufficient time and frequency, at least annually, to gather sufficient data upon which to base the ratings contained in an evaluation.</p> <p>Evaluations shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. be based on multiple observations with at least one observation of sufficient time to observe a full lesson or comparable professional activity for licensed personnel who are not in the classroom; and 2. incorporate data from a range of sources. 	<p>The number of observations may vary based on educator effectiveness (e.g., less effective educators receiving more frequent observations than more effective educator(s)).</p> <p>Sources of data for evaluations may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations • Professional interactions • Ongoing analysis of student data • Ongoing analysis of additional data such as student/parent surveys, learning plans, professional development plans 	<p>Monitor staff perceptions of the sufficiency of the time, frequency, and range of data used for evaluations (use TEL or other surveys as appropriate).</p> <p>Examples of how districts assign evaluators to licensed personnel, including optimum ratios of evaluators to personnel</p>	

Statutory Language	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address:		<p>Districts shall have in place a process for providing training on growth data. Where appropriate, this training should be incorporated in the overall training on the evaluation system.</p> <p>Districts shall provide for collaborative time for educators to plan and respond to student performance data (formative, summative, and growth data). At a minimum, the collaborative time should be made available with enough frequency and duration to enable teachers to collaborate on the diagnosis of student performance challenges, plan for instructional changes, and test implementation of those changes.</p>	<p>Survey educators regarding the sufficiency of the training on growth data and the adequate provision of collaborative time and resources to respond to the data (use TELL survey or other statewide surveys as appropriate).</p> <p>Provide state-level training on growth data.</p>	<p><i>Examples and best practices of district training on growth data</i></p> <p><i>Examples and best practices of how districts can arrange their schedules to allow for collaborative time</i></p> <p><i>Examples and best practices related to the organization and facilitation of effective collaborative work groups</i></p>

Statutory Language	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
CDE				
<p>To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address:</p> <p>Student data that is monitored at least annually to ensure the correlations between student academic growth and outcomes with educator effectiveness ratings</p>	<p>Districts shall have in place a process for monitoring at least annually the correlation between student growth and educator effectiveness ratings and for taking action when correlations are not present.</p>	<p>Analyze and compare the effectiveness ratings for teachers who are from different schools but have similar student learning outcomes.</p> <p>Identify outliers and examine cause to determine if systematic biases might be occurring.</p> <p>Work to tighten correlation of ratings across schools.</p>	<p>Analyze the percent of teachers in each effectiveness rating by school rating as identified in the school performance framework.</p> <p>Look for outliers where effectiveness ratings are not correlated with school performance ratings.</p> <p>Share with districts to determine if any systematic biases are occurring in the rating process. Assist as appropriate.</p> <p>Develop mechanisms for testing the correlation of other student measures as defined by the State Council.</p>	