

Implementation Guidelines for Consideration by the State Council on Educator Effectiveness Second Read

Introduction

Two work groups were asked to provide recommendations to the State Council regarding guidelines for the adequate implementation of high quality evaluation systems, with one focusing on district implementation and the other focusing on CDE support and monitoring. After a first read by the State Council of both work groups' recommendations, the State Council requested that the recommendations of the two work groups be aligned and synthesized into one set of recommendations. This document reflects a first draft of the combined recommendations.

Summary of Changes from First Read

The primary change from the State Council's first read is the format of the recommendations which is designed to delineate required elements from implementation considerations and to clarify CDE's role in supporting and monitoring implementation. All references to "meet or exceed" from the original recommendations have been eliminated. Edits were made to clarify recommendations based on State Council members' written and verbal feedback.

In addition, when combining the work of the CDE and district work groups, those recommendations that were deemed more likely to appear as rules and/or as guidance to CDE were included in this document. Implementation suggestions for districts that would be more likely to appear as helpful district resources on CDE's resource bank have not been included here but will be integrated into the resources that CDE is preparing for the online resource bank.

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 on 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

Monitoring. In addition to supporting districts with implementation of SB 10-191, CDE is responsible for monitoring districts' adherence to the law. The work group recommends that CDE focus its monitoring efforts on the primary question:

- Are students meeting growth expectations and achieving postsecondary and work force readiness benchmarks?

The work group believes that this is the initial lens that the department should use to identify leading districts and those districts that may need targeted support.

Additional critical questions that should guide the collection and monitoring functions of CDE include:

- Are educators increasing their effectiveness over time?
- Are districts retaining highly effective and effective educators at a greater rate than ineffective educators?
- Are districts increasing the number of highly effective and effective teachers in high needs schools and subject areas?
- Are districts attracting more highly effective educators?
- Are effectiveness ratings consistent with school performance?
- Is there adequate differentiation of teacher performance levels over time?
- Are districts using educator evaluations to facilitate meaningful dialogue that elevates professional discourse for the benefit of students?
- Are educators transforming teaching and learning through a continuous cycle of planning, assessment, and improvement?
- Is the state experiencing greater alignment of pre-service training and ongoing professional development of educators?

CDE should integrate monitoring and data collection into existing activities to the extent possible. For example, current student performance data on statewide tests, the human resources data collection (with the additional collection of educator evaluation ratings), TELL survey results, statewide student and parent surveys, and other state-level data collections can be leveraged to answer many of the questions identified above.

As the data is analyzed, CDE should focus its efforts on those districts that appear as outliers (e.g., have high numbers of highly effective educators but are not meeting growth expectations, have high inequities in percentages of effective and highly effective teachers teaching high-needs students, etc.). CDE can use existing state-level activities such as School Support Team visits and Comprehensive Assessment of District Improvement visits or other state-level on-site reviews to review districts' educator evaluation systems and provide targeted assistance to districts.

It is critical that schools and districts view educator performance evaluation as an integral part of their continuous improvement efforts. As a result, the work group strongly recommends that CDE integrate educator effectiveness data into the school and district unified planning process by including the data as a component of the School and District Performance Frameworks and/or as a highly visible component of the root cause analysis that drives the unified plan. By doing so, districts will have greater visibility of their educator effectiveness data and will be able to use the data to inform their improvement efforts. At the same time, CDE will enhance its ability to monitor local evaluation systems, identify and share best practices, and provide targeted assistance or take action where needed.

Overview of Implementation Guidelines and Clarification of Definitions

The recommendations below are organized by the relevant statutory language. For each statutory provision, recommended guidelines for district implementation are provided. The district guidelines are divided into two sections: 1) "required elements," or those elements that every district must have in place; and 2) "implementation considerations," or suggestions that districts might wish to consider as they implement their educator evaluation systems (these are not requirements, but in many instances help to explain and/or provide examples of ways districts might meet required elements). The guidelines provide corresponding recommendations for CDE support and monitoring related to each statutory provision, and include examples of related resources that CDE is encouraged to make available on the state's resource bank.

In the statutory language and recommendations below, the term "evaluation" is referenced. The work group has interpreted "evaluation" to represent the summative activity that incorporates data from observations, professional practice, student data, and other data sources to result in a performance rating. This clarification is stated to avoid confusion in interpreting evaluations and observations as the same activities.

Statutory Language	District		CDE	
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address at a minimum the following:	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	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> <p>The process shall ensure the following:</p> <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 	<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 licensed 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>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>

Statutory Language	District		CDE	
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address at a minimum the following:	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
	<p>year, and after any changes/updates have been made to the evaluation system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 system. 		<p>Examine the feasibility of a state-level platform to support the delivery of training for districts using the state model.</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	District		CDE	
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address at a minimum the following:	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
<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 • District administrators, peers, or impartial master teachers to conduct observations side-by-side with the instructional manager to norm ratings • Regular, random audits of evaluation results by third-party evaluators • Pool of trained observers to conduct all reviews 	<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>Strengthen the review of evaluation systems during Comprehensive Assessment of District Improvement (CADI) and School Support Team (SST) visits.</p>	<p>Sample norming processes</p> <p>Tools for CADI and SST teams to use to support their examination of districts' evaluation systems</p>

Statutory Language	District		CDE	
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address at a minimum the following:	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
<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>*As noted earlier, the work group has interpreted “evaluation” to represent the summative activity that incorporates data from observations, professional practice, student data, and other data sources to result in a performance rating.</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>Districts shall ensure that evaluators have adequate time to conduct evaluations.</p> <p>Districts shall demonstrate that the ratio of evaluators to licensed personnel is manageable and is resulting in quality evaluations.</p>	<p>The number of observations may vary based on educator effectiveness (e.g., less effective educators receiving more frequent observations than more effective educators).</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 TELL or other surveys as appropriate).</p>	<p>Examples and best practices regarding the time and frequency of evaluations</p> <p>Examples of how districts assign evaluators to licensed personnel, including optimum ratios of evaluators to personnel</p>

Statutory Language	District		CDE	
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address at a minimum the following:	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
<p>Provision of adequate training and collaborative time to ensure that educators fully understand and have the resources to respond to student academic growth data</p>	<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>Examples and best practices of district training on growth data</p> <p>Examples and best practices of how districts can arrange their schedules to allow for collaborative time</p> <p>Examples and best practices related to the organization and facilitation of effective collaborative work groups</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>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. Share with districts to determine if any systematic</p>	

Statutory Language	District		CDE	
To recommend guidelines for implementation that shall address at a minimum the following:	Required Elements	Implementation Considerations	Support & Monitoring	Sample Materials for the Resource Bank
		Work to tighten correlation of ratings across schools.	biases are occurring in the rating process. Assist as appropriate. Develop mechanisms for testing the correlation of other student measures as defined by the State Council.	

Resources Referenced

In preparing the draft recommendations, the work group relied on work products and/or experiences from the following locations:

- Rhode Island Educator Evaluation System Design
- New York City Public Schools Teacher Effectiveness Pilot
- New Haven Public Schools, Connecticut
- Houston Independent School District, Texas
- Washington D.C. Public Schools
- Harrison Public Schools, Colorado
- Denver Public Schools, Colorado
- Eagle County Public Schools, Colorado

Work Group Members

- Jill Hawley, TNTP
- Kady Dodds, CDE
- Kelly Hupfeld, CU SPA
- Scott Marion, Center for Assessment
- Nora Flood, Colorado League of Charter Schools
- Pat Donovan, AON Hewitt
- Jami Goetz, CDE

Insert list from district work group of people who participated in the calls