



**MARZANO** Research

# Support for Local Implementation of Educator Evaluation Systems

## Comparable States Report

Mary Klute, Mckenzie Haines, Kara Underwood, Trudy Cherasaro



# MARZANO

— Research —

## Referencing this Report

This report should be cited as: Klute, M., Haines, M., Underwood, K., & Cherasaro, T. (2017). *Support for local implementation of educator evaluation systems: Comparable states report*. Centennial, CO: Marzano Research.

© 2017 Marzano Research



# Support for Local Implementation of Educator Evaluation Systems

## Comparable States Report

Prepared for

Michigan Department of Education

by

Mary Klute

Mckenzie Haines

Kara Underwood

Trudy Cherasaro

Marzano Research

12577 E. Caley Ave., Centennial, CO 80111

**CONTENTS**

---

- Background ..... 1
  - Reference..... 2
- Methods ..... 3
  - Selection of Comparable States..... 3
  - Data Collection Process..... 4
- Findings ..... 5
  - Examples of Each Type of State Support for Implementation..... 7
    - Training on the Educator Evaluation Systems..... 7
    - Stakeholder Groups ..... 7
    - Funding..... 8
    - Guidance Documents ..... 8
    - Webinars and Videos ..... 9
    - Online Platforms ..... 9
    - Regional Staff to Support Implementation..... 9
    - Directories of Training on Approved Rubrics ..... 10
    - Newsletters ..... 10
    - Professional Growth-Plan Templates..... 10
    - Self-Assessment Tools for Evaluating the Quality of Implementation of the Systems.. 10
    - Process for Sharing Resources from Districts Across the State ..... 11
    - Repositories of Sample SLO Goals..... 11
    - Workshops on Topics Related to Educator Evaluation ..... 11
    - Annotated Bibliographies of Recent Research on Educator Effectiveness ..... 12
    - Online Calibration Systems..... 12
    - Training Modules on Areas of Professional Practice Assessed by the Evaluation Framework..... 12
- Conclusion..... 13

Appendix A. Approved or Recommended Evaluation Frameworks .....	14
Appendix B: State Profiles .....	17
Maine.....	17
Background and Context .....	17
Teacher Evaluation .....	17
Administrator Evaluation.....	19
Requirements for Implementation.....	21
State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems.....	22
References.....	24
New Jersey .....	26
Background and Context .....	26
Teacher Evaluation .....	26
Principal Evaluation .....	28
Requirements for Implementation.....	29
State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems.....	29
References.....	31
Oklahoma.....	35
Background and Context .....	35
Teacher and Leader Evaluation .....	35
Requirements for Implementation.....	36
State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems.....	36
References.....	38
Oregon .....	40
Background and Context .....	40
Teacher Evaluation.....	40
Administrator Evaluation.....	41
State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems.....	42
References.....	45
Washington.....	46
Background and Context .....	46
Teacher Evaluation .....	46
Principal Evaluation .....	47

Requirements for Implementation..... 48

State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems..... 49

References..... 51

## **TABLES AND FIGURES**

---

Table 1. Selected States.....	3
Table 2. State Supports for Local Implementation of Educator Evaluation Systems .....	5
Table A1. Approved Evaluation Frameworks for Administrators, by State.....	14
Table A2. Approved Evaluation Frameworks for Teachers, by State .....	15
Table B1. Approved Teacher and Leader Practice Instruments.....	26
Table B2. Approved Teacher and Leader Evaluation Frameworks.....	35

## BACKGROUND

---

In 2009, Michigan passed Senate Bill 981, which required that annual teacher evaluations include student growth as a significant factor in the evaluation ratings. Following the passage of this bill, additional legislation was put into place to expand and clarify the legislative work, resulting in the development of Public Act 173 in 2015. This act requires that annual educator evaluations not only incorporate student growth but also use a state-approved observation tool that, according to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), does the following:

- “Evaluates the teacher’s or administrator’s job performance at least annually while providing timely and constructive feedback.
- Establishes clear approaches to measuring student growth and provides teachers and administrators with relevant data on student growth.
- Evaluates a teacher’s or administrator’s job performance, using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor.
- Uses the evaluations to inform decisions regarding the effectiveness of teachers and administrators; promotion, retention, and development of teachers and administrators; whether to grant tenure and/or allow progression to the Professional Education Certificate; and the removal of ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and administrators.” (MDE, n.d., p. 7)

To inform ongoing and future support to districts as they implement new educator evaluation systems, MDE contracted Marzano Research to conduct a research project that provides information about recommendations for educator evaluation implementation. In particular, MDE has expressed interest in learning about recommendations in six focus areas:

- Provision of professional development and mentoring aligned to individual educator evaluation areas or results.
- Integration of cultural competency into evaluation models and professional development for teachers and administrators.
- Provision of quality feedback to teachers and administrators throughout the school year as part of the educator evaluation process.
- Training of teachers and administrators on educator evaluation systems and the multiple components within the systems and tools.
- Evaluation of administrators in general, as well as specific evaluation of school-based administrators as compared to district-level administrators.
- Incorporation of multiple measures of student growth in educator evaluation, including the aggregation of multiple measures of growth and the combination of aggregated growth measures with the professional practice component to produce an overall effectiveness rating.



The project has been divided into five phases. This report summarizes the work completed in the third phase, which focused on identifying ways that states support their educator evaluation systems. This report focuses on five states that have systems that are similar to Michigan's, in that those states provide lists of approved or recommended rubrics. Previous phases of this project involved identifying recommended practices for the implementation of educator evaluation systems through a literature review, and then assessing the extent to which Michigan districts and Public School Academies are implementing those practices. Later phases will involve case studies of districts and Public School Academies to identify barriers to implementation and determine potential strategies to mitigate barriers, and surveying teachers to learn about their perceptions of and responses to the feedback they receive from evaluators.

## REFERENCE

Michigan Department of Education. (n.d.). *Michigan educator evaluations at-a-glance*. Lansing, MI: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Educator\\_Evaluations\\_At-A-Glance\\_522133\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Educator_Evaluations_At-A-Glance_522133_7.pdf)

## METHODS

### SELECTION OF COMPARABLE STATES

To identify up to five potential states to include in this report, Marzano Research examined education agency websites for all 50 states and gathered information about the design of each agency’s educator evaluation systems. In addition, we consulted the National Council on Teacher Quality website for further information. Through this process, we identified state education agencies (SEAs) that, similarly to MDE, provide lists of approved or recommended tools that districts can use in designing their educator evaluation systems.

After reviewing this information, Marzano Research selected four states as our top recommendations, as well as four alternatives. The top recommendations have lists of approved evaluation instruments and include relatively detailed information on their websites, which suggests that these states are farther along in supporting districts with implementation of the systems. The four alternative states were either (1) less similar to Michigan in that they recommend, rather than approve, evaluation instruments, or (2) less detailed in regard to information on their websites. After consultation with MDE, we decided to focus on five states. Table 1 presents information about the evaluation systems in each of these states.

**Table 1. Selected States**

States	Number of Approved Evaluation Instruments for Administrator Evaluations <sup>a</sup>	Number of Approved Evaluation Instruments for Teacher Evaluations <sup>b</sup>
Maine	5	6
New Jersey	17	26
Oklahoma	3	5
Oregon <sup>c</sup>	3	4
Washington	2	3

<sup>a, b</sup> See Appendix A for the names of the instruments approved by each state.

<sup>c</sup> Oregon does not have a list of approved instruments from which local education agencies must choose. Instead, the state has provided a list of recommended instruments that the state has determined align with its teaching standards. Districts may use instruments not on the list as long as they provide evidence that the instruments align with state teaching standards.

## DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

The collection of information for each comparison state proceeded in two phases. The first phase involved gathering information from SEA websites about supports for local implementation of educator evaluation systems. This information was summarized in short profiles of each of the five selected states.

In the second phase, Marzano Research conducted semi-structured telephone interviews with SEA personnel. We sent the profiles to personnel beforehand so that we could use the time during the phone calls to verify the information obtained from websites and gather additional information about state supports. Additional information gleaned from the telephone interviews was incorporated into revised profiles, which are presented in Appendix B.

## FINDINGS

The five selected states offered a range of supports for successful district implementation of educator evaluation systems. Specifically, Marzano Research identified 18 types of supports. Table 2 presents descriptions of these supports and information about which states provide them. All but one of the states supplied training modules on their educator evaluation systems, assembled stakeholder groups to inform ongoing improvement of the systems, and provided funding to support local implementation of the educator evaluation systems. Three of the five states offered guidance documents or manuals, webinars or videos, online platforms, and regional staff to support implementation. The remaining supports in Table 2 were offered in only one or two of the states. Further descriptions of the supports follow the table.

**Table 2. State Supports for Local Implementation of Educator Evaluation Systems**

Type of Support	Description	States				
		ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Training modules on educator evaluation systems	Modules that local education agencies can use to deliver trainings on educator evaluation systems. These modules include slide presentations, facilitator notes, and, in some cases, interactive activities for participants.	X		X	X	X
Stakeholder groups	Groups of stakeholders convened by the state to inform ongoing improvements to the evaluation systems.	X		X	X	X
Funding	State funding to support district implementation of educator evaluation systems.	X		X	X	X
Guidance documents/manuals	Documents that describe educator evaluation systems in detail on websites.	X	X		X	
Webinars/videos	Recordings of previously delivered webinars and videos that were created to provide information on specific topics.		X	X	X	
Online platforms	State-provided online platforms to facilitate the evaluation process, or supports to districts via online platforms provided by developers of specific evaluation rubrics.	X		X		X

Type of Support	Description	States				
		ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Regional staff to support implementation	Staff who work for, or in partnership with, the state to provide ongoing, individualized support for implementation of educator evaluations to districts in a particular region.		X		X	X
Directories of trainings on approved rubrics	Lists of trainings on approved rubrics that are offered or sponsored by entities across the state, including links to information about registration.			X		X
Newsletters	Newsletters sent to educators to inform them about the educator evaluation systems.	X		X		
Professional growth-plan templates	Tools for developing professional growth plans that are aligned with evaluations.		X	X		
Self-assessment tools for evaluating the quality of implementation of the systems	Checklists and rubrics to support districts in identifying areas for improvement in their implementation of the educator evaluation systems.		X			X
Processes for sharing resources from districts across the states	Formal processes for sharing tools and procedures developed by local education agencies to support their implementation of educator evaluation systems.				X	X
Repositories of sample SLO goals	Examples of high-quality student learning objectives (SLOs) for a variety of grade levels and subjects.				X	
Workshops on topics related to educator evaluation	Workshops focused more generally on how to conduct high-quality evaluations, rather than focused specifically on state systems.		X			
Annotated bibliographies of recent research on educator effectiveness	Links to reports describing recent research on educator effectiveness.	X				
Online calibration systems	Online systems to support observer calibration.	X				

Type of Support	Description	States				
		ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Training modules on areas of professional practice assessed by the evaluation framework	Trainings that are developed to target areas of professional practice on which educators across the state tend to earn lower scores.		X			

## EXAMPLES OF EACH TYPE OF STATE SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION

### Training on the Educator Evaluation Systems

SEAs have developed training modules on the following topics:

- Providing overviews of the evaluation systems
- Using evaluation frameworks and rubrics in teacher evaluations
- Conducting high-quality observations
- Using student learning objectives (SLOs)<sup>1</sup>
- Using artifacts as sources of evidence in educator evaluations
- Summative scoring
- Providing effective feedback
- Reflecting on and using evaluation data to inform professional goal-setting

### Stakeholder Groups

The Maine Department of Education (DOE) has worked with regional and statewide groups that include stakeholders from elementary, secondary, and higher education. These groups have focused on identifying ways to maximize the use of available resources in the state to recruit, support, and retain educators. The groups have helped to identify needs for educator evaluation support and resources that can meet those needs.

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) convenes Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) Regional Advisory Groups to provide feedback on the implementation and effectiveness of the evaluation process.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) organized an ESSA Educator Effectiveness Work Group, whose primary purpose was to support the development of the ESSA state plan. Because ESSA reduced the federal requirements for educator evaluation, the group

<sup>1</sup> The five states we examined used a variety of terms for student learning objectives. For clarity, we use the term student learning objective (SLO) in the body of the report. In the profiles in Appendix B, we use the state-specific terms for SLOs.

also worked with ODE to develop guidance for districts related to changes in the ODE educator evaluation system during the transition to ESSA.

The Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) assembled the Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) Steering Committee to create evaluation system criteria, student growth tools, professional development programs, and evaluator training for teachers and principals.

### **Funding**

Maine DOE provides funding to districts to support their implementation of educator evaluation systems. Many districts have utilized this funding to support training on the evaluation models.

Because Oklahoma no longer requires student growth to be included in the evaluation process, OSDE is re-allocating funds to support professional development programs that are aligned with areas of need identified through the evaluation process, and for improved implementation of the qualitative frameworks within the TLE process.

ODE provides funding through its School District Collaboration Grant Program to support districts in designing and implementing new approaches in four areas related to educator effectiveness: career pathways, evaluation processes, compensation models, and professional development opportunities.

Washington OSPI has provided funds to support training for teachers and leaders on the evaluation system.

### **Guidance Documents**

The Maine DOE website includes documents that direct teachers and leaders to legislation regarding effective teaching, school leadership, and evaluation system requirements. The website also provides a glossary of terms to support educators in using a common vocabulary. In addition, Maine DOE has developed guidance documents to support educator use of SLOs, including a handbook for developing SLOs and guidance for selecting high-quality assessments for SLOs.

The New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) website includes a library of documents that provide overviews of the teacher and principal evaluation systems, in-depth descriptions of the components of each system, resources related to student growth percentiles and SLOs, and guidance for calculating summative evaluation scores and conducting evaluation conferences.

ODE has developed the Oregon Framework, which synthesizes the requirements from state legislation and administrative rules into one document, describes how the system has

changed over time, and details the required elements of the system (see Appendix B). ODE has also produced detailed guidance on the SLO process.

### **Webinars and Videos**

SEAs have archived webinars and training videos that cover a variety of topics, including:

- Local design of evaluation systems
- Implementation of SLOs
- Procedures for determining summative evaluation ratings
- Processes for submitting summative evaluation ratings to the states

### **Online Platforms**

Maine DOE uses the performance management system RANDA, which supports the entire evaluation process through collection of evidence, aggregation of data, and reporting. RANDA also facilitates the feedback process.

In Oklahoma, districts employ a variety of online platforms specifically designed for use with particular evaluation frameworks. OSDE has developed video tutorials and written instructions for the process of transferring summative evaluation data to the state.

Washington OSPI uses eVAL, a system which provides a platform for uploading and reviewing evaluation materials, aligning evidence to criteria, engaging in self-assessment, and viewing evaluation summaries.

### **Regional Staff to Support Implementation**

NJDOE has three full-time implementation managers who work closely with districts to support implementation of AchieveNJ, its educator evaluation system. The managers meet with district staff to assess the extent to which the evaluation system is being implemented with fidelity and to devise strategies to help staff address any challenges to implementation. Anticipating a reduction in funding for these positions, NJDOE has begun to work closely with staff in its 21 county-based offices to build their capacity to support implementation of AchieveNJ.

ODE has worked closely with two other organizations, the Chalkboard Foundation and the Oregon Education Association, to provide support to local school districts. During the initial rollout of the educator evaluation systems, these organizations supported the delivery of regional workshops around the state. Currently, they offer assistance in response to requests from local education agencies.

Washington OSPI collaborates with regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs), which are independent organizations, to provide support for TPEP and facilitate professional learning networks related to educator evaluation in their regions. The ESDs also serve as conduits for communication between educators in their regions and Washington OSPI.



Washington OSPI has also developed a cadre of learning-focused supervision specialists, practitioners who conduct training on providing feedback that is based on evaluation results and that stimulates professional growth.

### **Directories of Training on Approved Rubrics**

OSDE maintains a list of trainings offered by the creators of approved rubrics.

Washington OSPI also maintains a list of trainings on the approved rubrics that are provided through the ESDs.

### **Newsletters**

Maine DOE sends regular emails to regional superintendents to provide answers to the most commonly asked questions about the educator evaluation system in the previous month.

OSDE supports stakeholders' understanding of the TLE system through newsletters it has distributed, since 2013, via email or text on a monthly basis. (Lately, however, newsletters have been distributed less frequently.) Recent issues have addressed what changes have been made to TLE legislation, how to set growth goals, and where to provide opinions and feedback on the TLE system.

### **Professional Growth-Plan Templates**

The NJDOE website provides resources to support educators in developing professional development plans. Resources include an optional template for plans, as well as example plans.

OSDE has developed templates that support the implementation of the state's professional learning focus. These templates help educators to identify professional learning foci, the alignment of those foci with improving student achievement, and methods for demonstrating professional learning. Additionally, the templates allow educators to record their reflections on what has worked best, how growth has been displayed, and how evaluators can continue to support teachers in their professional learning.

### **Self-Assessment Tools for Evaluating the Quality of Implementation of the Systems**

As part of its implementation quality toolkit, NJDOE has created a self-assessment tool that districts can use to identify areas of improvement in their implementation of the educator evaluation system. The Implementation Quality District Self-Assessment includes rating scales for 41 items within five broad domains of implementation: goals, expectations, and communications; training and support; data systems and infrastructure; analysis and monitoring; and organizational systems and culture. NJDOE provides tools in each of these five areas to support districts in using self-assessment data to improve implementation.

In collaboration with a group of district, school, and teacher leaders, Washington OSPI is developing an evaluation system toolkit, which will include a set of best practices for districts to consider as they implement evaluation systems. The group identified four elements that are necessary in an evaluation system that supports educator growth. Then, they determined measurable indicators of each of those elements and created a self-assessment tool. Finally, they selected examples of best practices related to each element from state and national resources. The toolkit is expected to be completed by October 2017. Washington OSPI will first share the toolkit with one ESD and gather feedback to inform revisions. It expects to have a version for wide dissemination in time for the 2018/19 school year, and plans to revise the toolkit on an annual basis.

### **Process for Sharing Resources from Districts Across the State**

The ODE website includes examples of tools and procedures that have been developed by Oregon districts to support their implementation of the evaluation systems. These resources include sample rubrics for specialists and teacher evaluation handbooks, as well as tools for goal setting, gathering evidence of professional practice, and providing effective feedback.

Washington OSPI holds a TPEP Best Practices Colloquium once or twice per year. This event provides an opportunity for districts to share best practices. Five to six districts present a short overview of the best practices they want to share, followed by breakout sessions that provide attendees with opportunities to meet with district leaders and learn more about their practices. Additionally, authors of each of the evaluation frameworks, or their representatives, conduct workshops.

### **Repositories of Sample SLO Goals**

ODE provides examples of SLO goals in its SLO guidance document. In addition, the ODE website includes examples of SLG goals for specialists (i.e., counselors, librarians, special education teachers, speech pathologists, and teachers on special assignment); teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels; and administrators at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The website also provides a link to a searchable bank of sample goals developed by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

### **Workshops on Topics Related to Educator Evaluation**

NJDOE has offered a variety of workshops focused on more generally improving the quality of evaluations, rather than specifically targeting components of the state's evaluation system. For example, it has offered workshops on topics such as reframing principal evaluation; supporting, retaining, and elevating highly effective teachers; supporting school leaders; and preparing educators.

### **Annotated Bibliographies of Recent Research on Educator Effectiveness**

The Maine DOE website includes a page with descriptions of research reports on educator effectiveness, including links to full-text versions of those reports.

### **Online Calibration Systems**

Maine DOE worked with Frontline Education to develop an online calibration system. The system includes over 60 videos that educators can view to improve the extent to which evaluators are using the evaluation rubrics consistently.

### **Training Modules on Areas of Professional Practice Assessed by the Evaluation Framework**

NJDOE has developed trainings through the Achievement Coaches program. Achievement coaches are highly effective teachers whom NJDOE invited to create professional development modules related to those areas of practice in which teachers across the state tended to score lower. During two annual summer institutes, the achievement coaches trained staff from 34 districts so that they could deliver the training to colleagues in their own districts. In addition, districts that participated in the summer institutes were required to partner with other districts that did not. Through this program, NJDOE estimates that the trainings reached over 10,000 educators in more than 120 districts.

## CONCLUSION

---

All of the SEA staff with whom we spoke emphasized that meaningful communication with local education agencies was critical to their work in supporting local implementation. They further mentioned the necessity of communicating information in a variety of ways to stakeholders because they may have different communication preferences. However, personal communication, either over the phone or through in-person meetings, remained most important. For example, some SEA representatives described efforts to spend time in the field talking with educators about new evaluation systems and building relationships during the early stages of implementation. They saw these efforts as expensive but worth the investment.

This desire to communicate with educators in a variety of ways is reflected in the results of this study. The five states use a wide range of strategies to support local implementation of educator evaluation systems. Across the five states, 18 distinct strategies were identified, with each state adopting seven to eight strategies. Among those most commonly identified were developing training modules on educator evaluation systems, convening stakeholder groups to inform ongoing improvement to the systems, and providing funding to support implementation.

## APPENDIX A. APPROVED OR RECOMMENDED EVALUATION FRAMEWORKS

**Table A1. Approved Evaluation Frameworks for Administrators, by State**

Administrator Framework	ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) Leadership Framework					X
Focal Point Principal Evaluation Instrument		X			
H.E.A.T Principal Evaluation Instrument		X			
Lenape's Principal Evaluation System		X			
Leverage Leadership Performance Model		X			
Maine Principals' Association	X				
Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubrics		X			
Marzano's School Leadership Evaluation Model	X	X	X		X
Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Balance Leadership: Principal Evaluation System		X	X		
Multidimensional Leadership Performance System		X			
Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric		X			
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	X				
Newark Public Schools Leadership Framework		X			
New Jersey LoTi Principal Evaluation Instrument		X			
New Leaders Principal Evaluation Rubric		X			
Oregon Educational Leadership/Administrator Rubric					X
Pendleton Administrator Rubric				X	
Principal Evaluation and Improvement Instrument		X			
Reeves' Leadership Performance Matrix			X		
Rhode Island Model Building Administrator Evaluation and Support System		X			

Administrator Framework	ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Salem-Keizer School District Administrative Assessment and Evaluation Rubric				X	
School ADvance Educator Evaluation System and Administrator Evaluation Tools		X			
Stronge Leader Effectiveness Performance Evaluation Model		X			
Thoughtful Classroom Principal Effectiveness Framework (TCPEF)		X			

**Table A2. Approved Evaluation Frameworks for Teachers, by State**

Teacher Framework	ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Center for Educational Leadership's 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning		X			X
Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching	X	X		X	X
Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)		X			
Classroom Strategies Scale Model		X			
College-Ready Promise Teaching Framework (CRPTF)					
Focal Point Teaching Practice Model		X			
H.E.A.T/Danielson Teacher Evaluation Instrument		X			
IMPACT: The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) Effectiveness Assessment System for School-Based Personnel		X			
Insight Core Framework		X			
Kenilworth Teacher Evaluation Instrument		X			
Lenape Regional Teacher Evaluation Instrument		X			
Maine School Administrative District 49 Teacher Evaluation Rubric	X				
Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubrics	X	X		X	
Marzano's Casual Teacher Evaluation Model		X	X	X	
Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model	X		X		X

Teacher Framework	ME	NJ	OK	OR	WA
Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Teacher Evaluation Standards		X			
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Rubric	X				
Newark Public Schools Framework for Effective Teaching		X			
New Jersey LoTi Teacher Evaluation Instrument		X			
North Star Academy Teacher Evaluation Rubric		X			
Pearson Framework for the Observation of Effective Teaching		X			
Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation and Support System		X			
Salem-Keizer School District Licensed Staff Assessment and Evaluation Rubric				X	
SmartStart TeachElite Evaluation System		X			
Stronge Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Performance System		X			
TAP Performance Standards			X		
Teacher Evaluation and Improvement Instrument		X			
Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Framework (TCTEF)		X			
Tulsa Model's TLE Observation and Evaluation System			X		

## APPENDIX B: STATE PROFILES

---

### MAINE

#### Background and Context

Maine passed legislative rules and statutes requiring that Maine School Administrative Units (SAUs) develop, pilot, and implement systems of performance evaluation and professional growth for teachers and principals (Maine DOE, 2015). In keeping with requirements in Rule Chapter 180,<sup>2</sup> Maine DOE developed one complete Teacher Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth (T-PEPG) model, two complete Leader Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth (LEPG) models, and the Auburn School Department (ASD) Administrator Evaluation Framework, which are available for districts to voluntarily adopt. Districts opting to generate their own models must meet the requirements outlined in the legislative rules.

#### Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation models must include measures of professional practice and student learning and growth (SLG). Additionally, the models must use a four-point scale to rate teachers' levels of effectiveness.

#### *Professional Practice*

Teacher measures of professional practice must be based on standards that are aligned to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. In addition to the state model (T-PEPG), Maine DOE determined that the following evaluation frameworks meet this requirement:

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Five Core Propositions (with rubrics created by Maine Schools for Excellence)
- TEPG Rubrics created by the Maine Schools for Excellence
- The Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson
- The Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework
- Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubrics
- Maine School Administrative District 49 Teacher Evaluation Rubric

The Maine DOE T-PEPG model evaluates professional practice and growth through a rubric that describes effective teaching practices aligned with standards from the NBPTS framework. These standards are divided into five constructs, or the Five Core Propositions. If an SAU chooses a professional practice model that is not approved by Maine DOE, it must demonstrate that the model meets the criteria established by the state.

---

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/rules/05/071/071c180.docx>.



### ***Student Learning and Growth***

The SLG component must be a significant factor in determining a teacher’s effectiveness rating and must be based on multiple measures. Districts are required to use state assessment results as one measure for teachers of students in tested subjects and grades, and student learning objectives (SLOs) for all students as another measure (Rule Chapter 180).

In the Maine DOE T-PEPG model, the total number of SLOs needed to generate an impact rating differs, depending on a teacher’s professional growth plan. The minimum number that is required is two in a three-year evaluation cycle. Teachers can utilize a variety of assessments to evaluate students’ progress toward meeting SLOs—school-based, course-based, teacher-developed, district-designed, or state assessments, as well as school- or districtwide performance data. The SLG component is calculated based on the percentage of students achieving SLOs. The final analysis of students’ success and teachers’ impact on their learning will inform the teachers’ SLOs for the following school year. The intention is to have teachers refine their performance to align more with the curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and thereby continue to improve SLG (Maine DOE, 2014d).

### ***Student Perception***

The Maine DOE T-PEPG model includes a measure of student perception, but this measure has not been implemented yet. Maine DOE plans to release details on this measure in future years of implementation. The intention is to gather these data through interviews or surveys to inform professional practice, self-reflection for teachers, and professional goal writing (Maine DOE, 2014c). There is no requirement that districts include student perception in their models.

### ***Summative Rating***

SLG must be a part of summative effectiveness ratings and have a discernable impact on teachers’ ratings. Districts decide the percentages that student growth contributes in ratings and the methods for calculating the summative ratings (Maine DOE, n.d.-f), but, currently, the SLG component must account for at least 20 percent of a teacher’s rating. If districts would like student growth to account for a lower percentage, they must provide Maine DOE with justification. Districts can adopt any method of combining scores from the different components as long as it results in the placement of teachers into one of four effectiveness rating categories: *highly effective*, *effective*, *partially effective*, or *ineffective*.

In districts using the Maine DOE T-PEPG model, evaluators first rate teachers’ professional practice on each of the 11 standard indicators. These ratings are then combined according to guidance in the Maine DOE T-PEPG Professional Practice Rubric to determine an overall professional practice rating, and the Professional Growth Rubric to determine an overall professional growth rating (Maine DOE, 2014c). To determine their impact on SLG, teachers are rated by the percentage of students who met their growth targets: *high* (85–

100 percent), *moderate* (71–84 percent), *low* (41–70 percent), or *negligible* (0–40 percent). For each teacher, evaluators use a matrix approach to combine the SLG rating and the professional practice and professional growth rating into a summative effectiveness rating (Maine DOE, 2014c).

### **Administrator Evaluation**

Principal evaluation models follow the same requirements as teacher evaluation models in that they must include measures of professional practice and student growth and must result in a summative rating that falls on a four-point scale. The state developed two model systems of performance evaluation and professional growth for principals: the ASD Administrator Evaluation Framework and the Maine DOE LEPG. If SAUs choose to employ different models, they must meet state criteria, including being aligned to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. In addition to the state models, Maine DOE determined that the following evaluation frameworks meet this requirement:

- Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubrics
- Marzano’s School Leader Evaluation Model
- NBPTS Core Proposition for Accomplished Educational Leaders (with rubrics created by Maine Schools for Excellence)
- Principal professional practice evaluation model created by the Supervision and Evaluation Committee of the Maine Principals’ Association

Additionally, the SLG component must be a significant factor in determining principals’ effectiveness ratings and be based on multiple measures. Currently, the SLG component must account for at least 20 percent of an administrator’s rating. If districts would like SLG to account for a lower percentage, they must provide the Maine DOE with justification. There are no requirements for combining measures of professional practice and student growth. Districts may adopt any method as long as it results in the placement of principals into one of four effectiveness rating categories: *highly effective*, *effective*, *partially effective*, or *ineffective*.

### ***Auburn School Department (ASD) Administrator Evaluation Framework***

The ASD Administrator Evaluation Framework evaluates principals professional practice on six components:

- Professional growth and learning
- Student growth and achievement
- School planning and progress
- School culture
- Instructional leadership
- Stakeholder support

All components are assessed according to separate rubrics. Each administrator completes a professional growth plan that identifies and targets one student growth goal and one professional growth goal. Using a rubric to ensure that district goals are supported, evaluators measure student growth through schoolwide achievement data and then assign scores. To assign scores, evaluators consider multiple sources of evidence, such as annual written goals for professional growth and development, artifacts indicating the degree to which professional growth plans have been met and monitored, self-reflections from administrators, observations, interviews, surveys, and participation in professional learning opportunities. The goal of the ASD framework is to provide motivation for ongoing professional growth, and to establish leader accountability for meeting professional standards and student proficiency (Maine DOE, 2014b).

To determine a summative effectiveness rating for principals, evaluators first rate them on each of the standards within the six domains and determine domain ratings based on the number of standards rated *effective* in each domain. Next, evaluators determine an overall professional practice rating based on the number of domains rated as *effective*. Evaluators then determine student growth ratings based on the percentage of teachers who meet the PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Adjust) student growth goal. For each principal, evaluators employ a matrix approach to combine the SLG rating and the professional practice and professional growth rating into a summative effectiveness rating (Maine DOE, 2014b).

These ratings then help to determine appropriate professional development plans for administrators (Maine DOE, 2014b). Administrators rated as *highly effective* or *effective* in all six domains can select areas for their professional development plans for the following school year. Meanwhile, administrators rated as *needs improvement* or *ineffective* will be monitored and given focused goals to address areas for improvement. Regular meeting times will also be scheduled to discuss and monitor progress (Maine DOE, 2014b).

### **Maine DOE LEPG model**

The Maine DOE LEPG model was designed for principals but can be adapted for assistant principals and other educational leaders. The system includes five performance categories: professional practice, professional growth, school conditions, school growth, and learner growth.

The professional practice category is measured by observations, artifact reviews, survey results, SLO reviews, and professional development reviews, while the professional growth category is assessed by artifact reviews of progress towards professional goals. Both the professional practice and professional growth components are rated on a four-point scale, ranging from *ineffective* to *distinguished*.

The school conditions category is measured by school climate surveys. The survey results reflect all stakeholders' reports of the school climate, and are translated into a four-point scale, ranging from *low* to *high*.

The school growth category is based on outcomes for school improvement and student learning, as identified by principals and evaluators. These outcomes are directly related to school goals and SLOs created by teachers. At the end of a school year, evaluators conduct a review of progress towards reaching school goals and assign a rating, ranging from *did not meet* to *exceeded*. Evidence supporting school growth should be collected and reviewed at least twice a year.

The final category reflects the overall ratings of learner growth, measured by school-level percentages of students achieving SLOs and other factors such as student growth on schoolwide assessments. As with school growth, learner growth components are rated on a four-point scale, ranging from *did not meet* to *exceeded* (Maine DOE, 2014a).

To calculate summative principal effectiveness ratings, evaluators assign scores for each of the five categories according to the following weights: 45 percent professional practice, 10 percent professional growth, 10 percent school conditions, 15 percent school growth, and 20 percent learner growth. Evaluators then compare weighted averages to cut scores and arrive at summative effectiveness ratings of *ineffective*, *developing*, *effective*, or *distinguished*.

Summative ratings help to determine appropriate professional growth plans. Plans for leaders rated as *ineffective* are monitored more closely, and they may also be assigned mentors or coaches to improve performance. Leaders rated as *effective* or *distinguished* are given individualized growth plans. In addition, leaders receiving a *distinguished* rating should be considered to mentor or coach others or to support new leadership positions.

### Requirements for Implementation

SAUs are required to meet certain implementation criteria in their teacher and principal evaluation models (Rule Chapter 180).

- Frequency of evaluations – Each year, SAUs must conduct observations of professional practice and provide formative feedback for each educator, but are only required to conduct a full evaluation of each educator at least every three years.
- Training – All evaluators must complete training in the following areas: conducting pre- and post-observation conferences, providing meaningful feedback, observing and evaluating professional practice, and developing and guiding professional growth plans.
- Written evaluation – Evaluators must provide write-ups of evaluation results that identify strengths and include recommendations.

In addition, all PEPG systems require annual training, identification of yearly district goals, and reviews of the PEPG handbook (Maine DOE, n.d.-a).

## State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems

### *Monitoring Survey*

Maine DOE has surveyed all of the school districts in the state to gather feedback on how the implementation of the evaluation systems is progressing. In the survey, district leaders can report on the types of assistance they need to improve their implementation (e.g., developing quality assessments for SLOs, training in observation calibration). They can also indicate how they would prefer that Maine DOE provide the assistance (e.g., local trainings, technical assistance, regional trainings, videos, webinars).

### *Funding*

Maine DOE offers funding to districts to support their implementation of educator evaluation systems. Many districts have used this funding to provide training on the evaluation models.

### *Stakeholder Groups*

Maine DOE has worked with regional and statewide groups that include stakeholders from elementary, secondary, and higher education. The groups have focused on identifying ways to maximize the use of available resources in the state to recruit, support, and retain educators. These groups have also helped to identify needs for educator evaluation support and resources that can meet those needs.

### *Trainings*

To better help teachers and leaders fully participate in the state PEPG models, Maine DOE provides a variety of training resources on its website. For example, all of the materials from a February 2016 training on SLOs are archived on the website.

Maine DOE has also created a series of teacher and leader training modules. These modules consist of PowerPoint presentations, facilitator guides and handouts, interactive learning activities, and educational toolkits built around best practices (Maine DOE, n.d.-c).

#### *Teacher Modules*

- **System Overview, Expectations, and Goal Setting:** Provides an overview of the PEPG evaluation system and explains the basic structure as well as associated terminology.
- **Student Learning Objectives:** Describes the process for developing SLOs.
- **Reflection and Goal Setting:** Covers reflection and goal settings within the T-PEPG framework.
- **Evidence, Observation, and Feedback:** Describes expectations for observations, the collection of evidence, and the sharing of timely feedback.

- **Reflecting and Adjusting:** Supports participants in using the T-PEPG rubric and using student data to monitor progress towards teachers' professional goals. Also provides an overview of the summative scoring process and professional growth planning process.

#### **Leader Modules**

- **System Overview, Expectations, and Goal Setting:** Provides an overview of the PEPG evaluation system and explains the basic structure as well as associated terminology.
- **Evidence, Feedback, and Growth:** Educates participants on how to engage in conversations regarding instructional feedback from classroom observations. In addition, instructs participants on how to select, submit, and score artifacts.
- **Reflection, Rating, and Planning:** Describes best practices and procedures for submitting evidence, scoring evidence, and rating summative evaluations.
- **Summative Scoring and Feedback:** Focuses on comparing types of evidence and scores, scoring challenges or concerns, and offering practice in providing leader feedback (for superintendents only).

#### ***Student Learning Objectives***

The Maine DOE website provides a range of resources for developing SLOs, including templates, a handbook, and an approval checklist. The website also features a checklist for evaluating SLO quality, a protocol for obtaining peer review of SLOs, and examples of high-quality SLOs. Additionally, a narrated video series and PowerPoint presentations describe the process of developing SLOs.

Maine DOE also provides guidance on measuring SLG for special educators: *Student Learning and Growth in a PEPG System Considerations for Special Educators* (Maine DOE, n.d.-a).

#### ***Online Calibration System***

Maine DOE has worked with Frontline Education to develop an online calibration system, which includes over 60 videos that can help educators to improve the extent to which evaluators consistently use the evaluation rubrics.

#### ***Regular Communication with Educators***

Maine DOE staff communicate with educators across the state in two primary ways. First, they attend monthly regional meetings of superintendents to share information about the educator evaluation system. Secondly, they disseminate regular emails to regional superintendents to provide answers to the most commonly asked questions about the educator evaluation system in the previous month.

### Other Tools and Resources

The Maine DOE website provides a number of additional tools and resources to enhance the likelihood of success with the PEPG system. For instance, the website houses a glossary of terms to build a common language, as well as documents that direct teachers and leaders to related laws regarding effective teaching, school leadership, and requirements for the PEPG system. Additionally, a map on the website provides information about each district's evaluation model to facilitate collaboration among neighboring districts using the same model. The website also provides an annotated bibliography of recent research on educator evaluation and a one-page overview of the PEPG main goals. (Maine DOE, n.d.-c). Maine DOE also has an online performance management system, RANDA, which supports educator evaluation. This online platform facilitates the creation of observation reports while improving the entire evaluation process through collection, aggregation, and reporting. It is also critical for generating accurate and timely feedback while also managing and simplifying data.

### References

- Maine Department of Education. (n.d.-a) General information on development and implementation of PEPG system components. Retrieved from <http://www.maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/general/index.html>
- Maine Department of Education. (n.d.-b). *Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth (PEPG) model quality assurance inventory: Auburn School Department Administrator Evaluation Framework*. Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/maine-doe-quality-assurance-inventory-state-principal-model-asd-administrator-evaluation-framework.pdf>
- Maine Department of Education. (n.d.-c). Resources. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/excellence/resources/index.html>
- Maine Department of Education. (n.d.-d). State Principal Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth models. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/principals/index.html>
- Maine Department of Education. (n.d.-e). State Teacher Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth models. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/teachers/index.html>
- Maine Department of Education. (n.d.-f). *Student learning and growth: Approaches to measuring teacher effectiveness* [PowerPoint]. Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/Student-Learning-and-Growth.pptx>

- Maine Department of Education. (2014a). *Maine DOE state Leader Evaluation and Professional Growth (LEPG) model for principals: Adapted Maine Schools for Excellence "Model LEPG Program."* Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/Maine-DOE-LEPG-Model.pdf>
- Maine Department of Education. (2014b). *Maine DOE state Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth (PEPG) model for principals: Auburn School Department Administrator Evaluation Framework.* Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/maine-doe-principal-PEPG-model-auburn-administrator-valuation-framework-handbook-2014-15.pdf>
- Maine Department of Education. (2014c). *Maine DOE Teacher Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth model: A handbook and implementation guide for school administrative units (2014–2015).* Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/Maine-DOE-TPEPG-Model.pdf>
- Maine Department of Education. (2014d). *Maine DOE T-PEPG model Student Learning Objective (SLO) framework: A handbook for teachers and administrators (2014–2015).* Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from <http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/Maine-DOE-SLO-Handbook.pdf>
- Maine Department of Education. (2015). *Pilot readiness guide: Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth system.* Augusta, ME: Author. Retrieved from [http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/PILOT\\_READINESS\\_GUIDE\\_2015.pdf](http://maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/PILOT_READINESS_GUIDE_2015.pdf)



## NEW JERSEY

### Background and Context

The goal of AchieveNJ, the NJDOE educator evaluation system, is to “raise student achievement by improving instruction through the adoption of evaluations that provide specific feedback to educators, inform the provision of aligned professional development, and inform personnel decisions” (NJDOE, 2017).

### Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation consists of two components: teacher practice and student achievement.

#### *Teacher Practice*

Teacher-practice instruments include domains of professional practice that align to NJDOE professional standards for teachers. Evaluators measure teacher practice through observations that use one of twenty-four approved teacher-practice instruments (Table B1). Nontenured teachers are required to have at least three observations, and tenured teachers must have at least two. Observation must be a minimum of twenty minutes in length. One observation is announced and preceded by a conference, and at least one must be unannounced (NJDOE, n.d.-m).

**Table B1. Approved Teacher and Leader Practice Instruments**

Teachers	Principals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Center for Educational Leadership’s 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric</li> <li>• Charlotte Danielson’s 2013 Instructionally Focused Edition</li> <li>• Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, 2007, 2011, and 2013 editions</li> <li>• Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)</li> <li>• Classroom Strategies Scale Model</li> <li>• College-Ready Promise Teaching Framework (CRPTF)</li> <li>• Focal Point Teaching Practice Model</li> <li>• H.E.A.T./Danielson Teacher Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• IMPACT: The DCPS Effectiveness Assessment System for School-Based Personnel</li> <li>• Insight Core Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal Point Principal Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• H.E.A.T. Principal Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• Lenape’s Principal Evaluation System</li> <li>• Leverage Leadership Performance Model</li> <li>• Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubric</li> <li>• Marzano’s School Leadership Evaluation Model</li> <li>• Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Balanced Leadership: Principal Evaluation System</li> <li>• Multidimensional Leadership Performance System</li> <li>• Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric</li> <li>• Newark Public Schools Leadership Framework</li> </ul>

Teachers	Principals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kenilworth Teacher Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• Lenape Regional Teacher Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• Marshall’s Teacher Evaluation Rubrics</li> <li>• Marzano’s Causal Teacher Evaluation Model</li> <li>• Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Teacher Evaluation Standards</li> <li>• Newark Public Schools Framework for Effective Teaching</li> <li>• New Jersey LoTi Teacher Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• North Star Academy Teacher Evaluation Rubric</li> <li>• Pearson Framework for the Observation of Effective Teaching</li> <li>• Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation and Support System (Edition II)</li> <li>• SmartStart TeachElite Evaluation System</li> <li>• Stronge Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Performance System</li> <li>• Teacher Evaluation and Improvement Instrument</li> <li>• Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Jersey LoTi Principal Evaluation Instrument</li> <li>• New Leaders Principal Evaluation Rubric</li> <li>• Principal Evaluation and Improvement Instrument</li> <li>• Rhode Island Model Building Administrator Evaluation and Support System (Edition II)</li> <li>• School ADvance Educator Evaluation System and Administrator Evaluation Tools</li> <li>• Stronge Leader Effectiveness Performance Evaluation Model</li> <li>• Thoughtful Classroom Principal Effectiveness Framework (TCPEF)</li> </ul>

### ***Student Achievement***

Evaluators measure student achievement through a median student growth percentile (mSGP) and student growth objectives (SGOs). An mSGP is included in an evaluation when the teacher has at least twenty students who have SGP scores and are enrolled in the class for 70 percent of the school year. SGOs are measurable goals for students that are aligned to standards with at least two data points to allow for the assessment of student improvement. All teachers must set SGOs in collaboration with their supervisors. These goals can be based on assessments created or chosen by teachers, departments, or districts. Students usually take pretests using the chosen assessments to gauge their levels at the beginning of the school year and to determine attainable goals. Teachers are evaluated in relation to whether their students attain the set goals, which they create with a scoring plan in order to measure the objective attainment levels: *exceptional*, *full*, *partial*, and *insufficient*. When an evaluator includes an mSGP in an evaluation, the teacher must have at least one SGO. When an mSGP is not included, a teacher must set two SGOs (NJDOE, n.d.-j).

### **Summative Rating**

The state provides guidelines for how evaluation components should be weighted. Weights differ, depending on whether or not a teacher has an mSGP. When an mSGP is included in an evaluation, it accounts for 30 percent, while teacher practice accounts for 55 percent and SGOs for 15 percent.<sup>3</sup> When an evaluation does not include an mSGP, teacher practice accounts for 85 percent and SGOs for 15 percent. The summative evaluation score is then converted to a four-level final rating of *highly effective*, *effective*, *partially effective*, or *ineffective* (NJDOE, n.d.-j).

### **Principal Evaluation**

Principal evaluation includes two components: principal practice and student achievement.

#### **Principal Practice**

Principal practice instruments are based on NJDOE professional standards for leaders. Evaluators measure principal practice through observations that use one of 17 approved leader instruments (see Table 1; NJDOE, 2015). Principal practice scores are based on at least two observations. Evaluators may conduct these observations during “building walk-throughs, staff meetings, parent conferences, and/or a case study analysis of a significant student issue” (NJDOE, n.d.-m).

#### **Student Achievement**

Evaluators measure student achievement through schoolwide mSGP scores (when available), SGO averages, and administrator goals. Principals in schools with tested grades receive mSGP scores. To measure principals’ influence on student achievement, evaluators calculate averages of all teacher SGO scores. In addition, principals set between one and four administrator goals to measure increases in student achievement, such as higher test scores, and thereby gauge progress toward meeting those goals, such as increasing test scores. The superintendent decides how many goals principals must have each year and then works with the principals to establish them (NJDOE, n.d.-d). Evaluators score administrators according to the scoring plan set for each goal to determine if they *exceptionally*, *fully*, *partially*, or *insufficiently* met each goal (NJDOE, n.d.-b).

### **Summative Rating**

Evaluators weight components differently, depending on whether or not a principal has an mSGP. When an evaluation includes a schoolwide mSGP, it accounts for 30 percent, while principal practice accounts for 50 percent, and administrator goals and SGO averages account for 10 percent each. When an evaluation does not include an mSGP score, principal practice accounts for 50 percent, administrator goals for 40 percent, and SGO averages for 10 percent of the overall score (NJDOE, n.d.-k). The summative evaluation score is then

<sup>3</sup> During the transition to PARCC testing, the weight for the mSGP was reduced to 10 percent.

converted to a four-level final rating of *highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective* (NJDOE, n.d.-j).

### **Requirements for Implementation**

Once an evaluation instrument is chosen, superintendents must ensure that all observers meet statutory requirements, including training on implementing the chosen rubric every year and participating in at least two co-observations prior to observing on their own (NJDOE, n.d.-j).

Also required is an annual summary conference between a supervisor and a teacher or principal before filing the annual performance report. This conference includes a review of the preliminary annual performance report—which describes performance of the teacher or principal in relation to the practice instrument and any available indicators of student achievement measures, such as SGOs and mSGPs—as well as a review of the teacher’s or principal’s progress toward meeting the goals of their professional development plan. The supervisor then prepares a final annual performance report (NJDOE, n.d.-m; n.d.-n).

### **State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems**

#### ***Field Staff***

NJDOE has three full-time implementation managers who work closely with districts to support implementation. These managers meet with district staff to assess the extent to which the evaluation system is being implemented with fidelity and to devise strategies to help staff address any challenges to implementation. Anticipating a reduction in funding for these positions, NJDOE has begun to work closely with staff in its 21 county-based offices to build their capacity to support implementation of AchieveNJ.

#### ***Advisory Committee***

During the first two years of piloting AchieveNJ, NJDOE convened an advisory committee of 120 educators from districts that were piloting the system. This committee provided feedback on the design of the system. To continue to receive feedback on a variety of topics, such as alternative ways of evaluating highly effective teachers, NJDOE has maintained a smaller group of administrators and teachers who represent a range of districts across the state.

#### ***Calibration Activities for Observers of Teachers***

NJDOE requires that all observers participate in training every year on the chosen practice instruments, while a more intensive training is required for all new evaluators. Evaluators must also participate in two co-observations twice a year. Although districts are in charge of providing this training, NJDOE has worked with districts to develop training guidelines and three ways to satisfy calibration of observers.

NJDOE suggests that districts regard observation training as a continuous improvement cycle in which calibration occurs throughout the year instead of only at the beginning. It also recommends that districts create observation cycles and protocols, and that teachers be included in training so that they can better understand the practice instruments.

The three ways to satisfy calibration of observers are:

- A video observation that allows a group of observers to come together, choose a classroom video, observe, individually use evidence to assign a score, and then share as a group to discuss conclusions and plan for future observations. The hope is that observers will become more familiar with using a chosen practice instrument to observe classrooms.
- A redacted observation report review that allows a group of observers to come together, examine an observation report and any questions the observed teacher had, and then discuss any changes to and the rationale for the final evaluation report. The goal is that observers will better understand how to use evidence in providing feedback.
- A co-observation that allows for two observers to observe a classroom together, individually assign a score, and then share to discuss conclusions. The aim is to encourage inter-rater reliability. (NJDOE, n.d.-e)

### ***NJDOE Workshops***

In the summer of 2017, NJDOE provided workshops on improving accuracy to add value, reframing principal evaluation, and supporting, retaining, and elevating highly effective teachers (Brown, 2017). In 2016, the department provided workshops on the requirements and protocols for highly effective educators, SGO quality, support for school leaders, and teacher preparation (NJDOE, n.d.-g).

### ***Achievement Coaches***

NJDOE has developed additional trainings through the Achievement Coaches program. Achievement coaches are highly effective teachers whom NJDOE invited to create professional development modules related to those areas of practice in which teachers across the state tended to score lower. During two annual summer institutes, the achievement coaches trained staff from 34 districts so that they could deliver the training to their colleagues in their own districts. In addition, districts that participated in the summer institutes were required to partner with other districts that did not. Through this program, NJDOE estimates that the trainings reached over 10,000 educators in more than 120 districts.

### ***Implementation Quality Toolkit***

The implementation quality framework describes all components of the evaluation system. Educators can view each component and find links to relevant tools on the following:

- Expectations and communication, which includes an implementation quality district self-assessment and protocols for creating common observations.
- Educator training and capacity building, which includes an SGO presentation, an SGO video series, an SGO quality rating rubric, updated guidance and exemplars on administrator goals, and a protocol for effective feedback.
- Execution and monitoring of the evaluation process, which includes an observation report quality rubric, calibration activities for observers, suggestions for improving accuracy and adding value, and a guidebook for reflective practice protocol implementation.
- Organizational capacity and culture, which includes a collaborative teams toolkit, guidance on the school improvement panel, and guidance on creating an AchieveNJ teacher survey.
- Data systems and infrastructure, which includes a tool for teacher SGO tracking and scoring. (NJDOE, n.d.-i)

### ***NJDOE Website***

The NJDOE website offers tools for implementing AchieveNJ. For example, a section for evaluation scoring includes a teacher evaluation scoring calculator, a principal evaluation scoring calculator, and guidance on using mSGPs and SGOs. Another section for evaluation and support forms and tools includes conference forms, goal forms, and tools for evaluation scoring, SGOs, and system improvement. An additional section is devoted to laws and regulations related to AchieveNJ, while another includes information on AchieveNJ and professional development and connections between evaluations and professional development. The website also features a section that provides resources to support educators in developing professional development plans, including an optional template for plans as well as example plans. A resources section houses information on the local committees, including the District Evaluation Advisory Committee and the School Improvement Panel; evaluation instruments and requests for qualifications, frequently asked questions, forms and tools, an implementation quality toolkit, SGOs, SGPs, and a document library. The document library includes resources on general information, teacher evaluation, principal evaluation, staff evaluation, SGOs, SGPs, evaluation scoring and conferences, the TEACHNJ Act, committees, recent reports, broadcast memos, and a resource archive (NJDOE, n.d.-f).

### **References**

- Brown, K. (2017, May 9). Re: AchieveNJ end-of-year reminders [Memo]. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/050917Reminders.pdf>
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional standards for education leaders*. Reston, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/ProfessionalStandardsforEducationalLeaders2015forNPBEAFINAL.pdf>

- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-a). *AchieveNJ in 2016–17 and beyond*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/2016Beyond.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-b). *AchieveNJ: Principal and assistant/vice principal evaluation scoring guide*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/PrincipalEvaluationScoringGuide.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-c). *AchieveNJ: Teacher evaluation scoring guide*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/TeacherEvaluationScoringGuide.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-d). *Administrator goals: Guidance, exemplars, and optional goal-setting template*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/iqt/training/AdministratorGoals.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-e). *Calibration activities for observers*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/iqt/execution/calibration.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-f). Evaluation resources. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-g). Events, forums, and trainings. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/events.shtml>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-h). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved from [http://www.state.nj.us/education/genfo/faq/faq\\_eval.shtml](http://www.state.nj.us/education/genfo/faq/faq_eval.shtml)
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-i). Implementation Quality toolkit. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/iqt/>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-j). *Overview of AchieveNJ*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/intro/guide.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-k). Principal evaluation calculator. Retrieved from <http://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/principal/scoring.shtml>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-l). *Student Growth Objectives: Developing and using practical measures of student learning*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/SGOGuidebook.pdf>

- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-m). *Summary of legal requirements for principal evaluation and tenure cases*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/implementation/principallegalrequirements.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-n). *Summary of legal requirements for teacher evaluation and tenure cases*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/implementation/legalrequirements.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-o). Teacher evaluation calculator. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/scoring.shtml>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (n.d.-p). Teacher evaluation: Overview. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2014). *New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers alignment with InTASC: NJAC 6A:9-3.3 (effective May 5, 2014)*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nj.gov/education/profdev/profstand/ProfStandardsforTeachersAlignmentwithInTASC.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2015). *Approved principal practice evaluation instruments*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/approvedprincipallist.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2015). *Approved teacher practice evaluation instruments*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/approvedlist.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2016). *2016–17 course roster verification and submission*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/CourseRosterVerificationandSubmission.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2016). *User guide for the 2015–16 principal median Student Growth Percentile report*. Trenton, NJ: Retrieved from <http://www.nj.gov/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/percentile/principalmSGPuserguide.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2016). *User guide for the 2015–16 teacher median Student Growth Percentile report*. Trenton, NJ: Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/percentile/mSGPuserguide.pdf>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2017). *2015–16 educator evaluation implementation report*. Trenton, NJ: Author. Retrieved from



<http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/resources/201516EducatorEvaluationImplementationReport.pdf>

## OKLAHOMA

### Background and Context

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) Commission oversees the OSDE school evaluation system. Each school district can develop its own evaluation policies for teachers and leaders as long as they align with state laws, statutes, and checklists (OSDE, n.d.-e).

### Teacher and Leader Evaluation

Prior to the 2016/17 school year, the OSDE evaluation system for teachers and leaders included three components: a qualitative component, which involved an evaluation of professional practice through an approved rubric; a quantitative component, which consisted of measures of student academic growth, including value-added measures for teachers of tested subjects and grades; and additional academic measures, which included other assessment data or student survey data. In spring of 2016, the state legislature passed a law that reduced the requirements for evaluation systems. Specifically, starting in the 2016/17 school year, the quantitative component and additional academic measures became optional. Although quantitative measures are no longer required in the evaluation process, some expectations persist for evaluators to review and discuss state-mandated test results with teachers and leaders. Yet, currently, only the qualitative component is required.

To assess the qualitative component, districts must choose from a list of evaluation frameworks that were approved after the TLE Commission reviewed them against a checklist summarizing the legislative criteria for teacher and leader evaluation systems. Thus far, the commission has approved five teacher evaluation frameworks and three leader evaluation frameworks (Table B2).

**Table B2. Approved Teacher and Leader Evaluation Frameworks**

Teachers	Principals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marzano’s Casual Teacher Evaluation Model</li> <li>• Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model</li> <li>• National Institute for Excellence in Teaching’s TAP Framework</li> <li>• Oklahoma TAP Teaching Standards</li> <li>• Tulsa Model’s TLE Observation and Evaluation System</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marzano’s School Leadership Evaluation Model</li> <li>• Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Balance Leadership: Principal Evaluation System</li> <li>• Reeves’ Leadership Performance Matrix</li> </ul>

Under current law, the frequency of teacher evaluations is determined by experience and previous evaluation ratings. Based on their experience, teachers are classified as either *probationary* or *career* teachers. Probationary teachers must be evaluated and receive formative feedback at least four times per year. Career teachers, on the other hand, are required to be evaluated and receive feedback at least twice per year. Furthermore, career teachers who are rated *highly effective* or *superior* are eligible for an exemption from the annual evaluation and are required to be evaluated only once every three years. All teachers, including exempt career teachers, must complete an annual Individualized Program of Professional Development, which includes setting “growth goals” that are informed by their evaluation results.

### **Requirements for Implementation**

All new evaluators are required to attend multiday trainings on evaluation frameworks. To be certified to conduct evaluations, administrators must pass a written examination as well as an inter-rater reliability examination. Certification is valid for two years.

### **State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems**

#### ***Funding***

Now that OSDE no longer requires quantitative measures in its evaluation process, it is re-allocating funds for professional development programs, annual professional development plans suited to each teacher’s needs, and improved implementation of the qualitative frameworks within the TLE process.

#### ***Required Training***

Because school districts are responsible for ensuring that personnel are up to date on trainings and recertification, all individuals designated to conduct evaluations must participate in trainings (OSDE, n.d.-i). OSDE maintains a list of trainings on the Tulsa, McREL, and Marzano models on its website.

#### ***Tools and Resources***

To support the use of approved evaluation models, a variety of online platforms are available: the Oklahoma Teacher and Leader Effectiveness system and TalentEd, for use with the Tulsa model; iObservation, for use with the Marzano model; and Searchsoft, for use with the McREL model. These online platforms support implementation of the systems and provide tools for using evaluation data to inform professional growth plans.

For each platform, the state provides step-by-step video tutorials and written instructions for uploading summative evaluation data to the state. Districts can also elect to manually submit the summative evaluation data, so OSDE also provides a video tutorial and instructions for manually entering evaluation data (OSDE, n.d.-c).

### ***TLE Regional Advisory Groups***

During the 2016/17 school year, OSDE developed stakeholder advisory groups from the five regions in Oklahoma to assist in the improvement of the state evaluation system. These groups, designed to represent the viewpoints and multiple perspectives of the education community, include teachers, district administrators, higher education representatives, teacher union presidents, school counselors, principals, assistant principals, and superintendents. Over 600 individuals volunteered for participation (OSDE, n.d.-h). The groups meet three times per year to provide feedback on the implementation and effectiveness of the TLE process. During day-long meetings, stakeholders have discussed TLE norms and requirements, challenges to the TLE process, and ways to use rubrics, develop artifacts, and manage time. They have also reviewed TLE data, addressed professional learning standards, and led discussion about desired outcomes of the TLE process (see Agenda #1 and #2 in OSDE, n.d.-h).

### ***Communication About the Professional Learning Focus***

To support the rollout of the professional learning focus, OSDE staff have traveled around the state to deliver in-person presentations to administrators and teachers. They have also conducted webinars and developed a two-minute video—available on the OSDE website—to describe the professional learning focus.

### ***TLE Newsletters***

The state also supports stakeholders' understanding of the TLE system through newsletters, which OSDE began distributing via email or text on a monthly basis in 2013. Recently, though, newsletters have been distributed less frequently. The newsletters address topics ranging from professional learning opportunities, webinar presentations, TLE training, and the proper way to start an evaluation year. Recent issues have addressed changes to TLE legislation, growth goals, and places to provide opinions and feedback on the TLE system (OSDE, n.d.-g).

### ***Professional Learning Resources***

A number of resources, such as videos, webinars, PowerPoint slides, and Word documents, address the new professional-learning component to the TLE system. Each tool targets either district leaders, evaluators, or educators and is between 20 and 25 minutes long (OSDE, n.d.-b). The resources clearly define professional learning as compliance-based or performance-based. Compliance-based professional learning consists of required training (e.g., training on the proper use of technology), while performance-based professional learning focuses more on how to grow as a professional and how to concentrate on specific content and areas of interest (OSDE, n.d.-a).

Key elements addressed in these resources include the association between student achievement and teacher and school leadership, and the use of the TLE system as a

measure of educator growth. One frequently addressed element concerns how the professional learning focus is intentionally not given a score, measure of completion, or a specific number of hours or points because meaningful professional learning cannot be accurately measured. Instead, better academic results for students will occur through meaningful feedback, collaboration, and mentoring linked to professional growth (see *Professional Learning Focus Webinars* in OSDE, n.d.-b).

Additionally, a professional learning document addresses the guidelines and suggested templates for implementing the professional learning focus. This document discusses how professional learning involves making personalized learning a goal for all individuals in the TLE system, as well as what responsibility school districts have in monitoring compliance with professional learning. The template consists of specific professional learning foci, their alignment with improving student achievement, and methods for demonstrating professional learning. The template also encourages users to articulate what has worked best, how growth has been displayed, and how evaluators can continue to support teachers in their professional learning (OSDE, n.d.-d).

## References

- Horwath, B., Medina, R., & Boren, M. (2016). *SREB Educator Effectiveness Progress Monitoring report: Oklahoma fall 2016*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board; Seattle, WA: Education First. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/161129SREBEEPMOKFinalReport.pdf>
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. (2010). *Explanation of the TAP teaching standards*. Santa Monica, CA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www3.wcschools.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Explanation-of-TAP-Teaching-Standards.pdf>
- National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. (2013). *Oklahoma TAP teaching standards (OTTS)*. Santa Monica, CA: Author. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/TAP%20Teaching%20Standards.pdf>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-a). PowerPoint presentation – PL Focus for district leaders. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/documents/2017-03-11/powerpoint-presentation-pl-focus-district-leaders>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-b). Professional Learning Focus. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/professional-learning-focus>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-c). Qualitative reporting documents. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/qualitative-reporting-documents>

- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-d). SMART - Professional learning focus [Form]. Retrieved from [http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/Professional%20Learning%20Focus\\_Print.pdf](http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/Professional%20Learning%20Focus_Print.pdf)
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-e). Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE). Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/tle>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-f). *Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission teacher evaluation framework/model selection criteria*. Oklahoma City, OK: Author. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/TLE-TeacherEvalCriteria.pdf>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education (n.d.-g). TLE newsletter. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/newsblogs/tlenews>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-h). TLE Regional Stakeholder Advisory Groups. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/tle-stakeholder-regional-advisory-groups>
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. (n.d.-i). TLE training. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/tle-training>
- OSDE Instruction Group. (2017, April 7). Professional Learning Focus for teachers-20170407 1959-1 [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/212320144>
- Tulsa Public Schools. (n.d.). *Tulsa Public Schools' Teacher observation and evaluation system: Its research base and validation studies*. Tulsa, OK: Author. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/TLE-TPSEvalResearchBrief.pdf>
- Tulsa Public Schools. (2014). *TLE observation and evaluation rubric: Teachers*. Tulsa, OK: Author. Retrieved from <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/Tulsa%20Framework%202014-2015.pdf>
- Tulsa Public Schools. (2015). *TLE observation and evaluation handbook for evaluators using the Tulsa Model*. Tulsa, OK: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.tulsaschools.org/4 About District/ documents/TLE/Handbook TLE Observation and Evaluation System.pdf](https://www.tulsaschools.org/4%20About%20District/documents/TLE/Handbook%20TLE%20Observation%20and%20Evaluation%20System.pdf)

## OREGON

### Background and Context

Oregon law and administrative rules require that all teacher and administrator evaluation systems to incorporate five elements:

- Teacher evaluation systems must align with Oregon Model Core Teaching Standards, and administrator evaluation systems must align with the Oregon Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards.
- Systems must include four differentiated performance levels.
- Evaluations should be based on multiple sources of information, including evidence of performance in three areas: professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth.
- Evaluations should occur within a continuous improvement cycle that includes self-reflection, goal setting, observations, formative assessment, and summative assessment.
- Teachers and administrators must be provided with professional development opportunities that are aligned to areas of growth identified through the evaluation process.

Districts have flexibility in designing their systems as long as they meet or exceed these requirements (ODE, 2017c).

### Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation includes measures of three components: professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth.

#### *Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities*

The professional practice and professional responsibilities components are assessed by a rubric. Districts can use any rubric that aligns with the Model Core Teaching Standards. ODE has recommended four rubrics that it has determined align to the standards:

- Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching
- Marshall's Teacher Evaluation Rubrics
- Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model
- Salem-Keizer School District Licensed Staff Assessment and Evaluation Rubric

If a district chooses an alternative rubric, it must use an ODE crosswalk tool to demonstrate that the rubric is aligned with the standards (ODE, n.d.-b).

### ***Student Learning and Growth***

The SLG component is assessed using SLG goals. Each year, in collaboration with their supervisors, teachers must set two SLG goals that are rigorous, attainable, and based on the standards for which they provide instruction. Following the passage of ESSA, teachers are no longer required to use statewide assessments to measure their SLG goals.

Teachers and the evaluators must meet at least three times to review the SLG goals. During the first meeting, goals are established. Evaluators employ a SLG Goal Quality Checklist, developed by ODE, to determine whether goals should be approved. During a midyear conference, teachers and evaluators review progress toward meeting goals and consider whether they need to make adjustments in strategies. The third conference should occur at the end of courses or classes. During this conference, teachers and evaluators analyze student data and score the SLG goals (ODE, 2017b). ODE developed an SLG scoring rubric for assigning points to the SLG goals. However, after ESSA, this rubric is no longer required. Starting in the 2017/18 school year, districts can determine how to evaluate SLG goals (ODE, 2017a).

### ***Summative Rating***

Previously, ODE required a matrix scoring approach to determine summative ratings for teachers. However, beginning in the 2017/18 school year, districts no longer have to use this approach but instead have discretion to determine the method of arriving at summative ratings. Even so, ratings must still include data related to all three components (ODE, 2017a).

### ***Administrator Evaluation***

Administrator evaluation in Oregon has a similar structure to teacher evaluation, as it includes measures of the same three components: professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth.

### ***Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities***

The professional practice and professional responsibilities components are assessed by a rubric. Districts can use any rubric that aligns to the Oregon Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards. ODE has recommended three rubrics that it has determined align to the standards:

- Oregon Educational Leadership/Administrator Rubric
- Pendleton Administrator Rubric
- Salem-Keizer School District Administrative Assessment and Evaluation Rubric

If a district chooses an alternative rubric, it must use an ODE crosswalk tool to demonstrate that the rubric aligns with the standards (ODE, n.d.-b).



### ***Student Learning and Growth***

The SLG component is assessed in relation to SLG goals. Each year, principals set two SLG goals in collaboration with their supervisors. One goal must relate to student academic performance, while the other may concern nonacademic goals for students. Similar to the process for teachers, goals are collaboratively set, approved, and reviewed and involve at least three meetings. Evaluators employ a SLG Goal Quality Checklist, developed by ODE, to determine whether goals should be approved (ODE, 2017b). Starting in the 2017/18 school year, districts can determine how to evaluate SLG goals (ODE, 2017a).

### ***Summative Rating***

Previously, ODE required a matrix scoring approach to determine summative ratings for administrators. However, beginning in the 2017/18 school year, districts are no longer required to use this approach but have discretion to determine the method of arriving at summative ratings. Even so, the ratings must still include data related to all three components (ODE, 2017a).

### **State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems**

#### ***Educator Effectiveness Toolkit***

Oregon has organized all resources related to educator evaluations in an “Educator Effectiveness Toolkit” posted on its website (ODE, n.d.-a). The toolkit includes resources in various formats, which are described in greater detail below.

#### ***ESSA Educator Effectiveness Workgroup***

This workgroup, whose members were selected through an application process, included ODE staff as well as educators and other stakeholders from across the state. The primary purpose of the group was to support the development of Oregon’s ESSA state plan (ODE, 2016). However, this group also worked with ODE to develop guidance for districts during the transition to ESSA. Guidance was presented in one-page documents describing the requirements for educator evaluations that remained the same and the areas in which districts had increased flexibility, for the 2016/17 and 2017/18 school years (ODE, 2017a). ODE posted these documents on the Educator Effectiveness Toolkit webpage.

#### ***Guidance Documents***

The Oregon Framework document (ODE, 2017c) synthesizes the requirements from state legislation and administrative rules. It describes changes to the system over time, including changes in response to ESSA, as well as the background, purpose, and the five required elements for educator evaluation systems.

Another guidance document (ODE, 2017b) focuses on SLG goals, explaining the rationale for using them, their required components, the steps in the collaborative process for setting

them, and guidance for scoring them. The document also includes several examples of SLG goals for a variety of grade levels and subject areas.

In addition, Oregon has developed shorter documents that describe specific components of the evaluation system. These documents include two-page summaries of the Oregon Model Core Teaching Standards and the Oregon Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards, and a six-page document describing how to use the Oregon Matrix to determine a summative evaluation rating,<sup>4</sup>

### ***Training Materials***

A training module, titled *Student Learning and Growth Foundations*, includes all resources needed to deliver the training in a district, including a PowerPoint presentation, facilitator notes, and interactive activities.

In addition, the toolkit webpage includes a number of PowerPoint presentations, with facilitator notes, on *Educator Evaluation and Support System Basics*, the Oregon Matrix, *SLG Goals 101: Requirements and Recommendations*, and *Artifacts 101: The Role of Artifacts in Educator Evaluation*.

### ***Webinars and Videos***

The toolkit also includes links to recorded webinars and videos on various topics, including a webinar about using the Oregon Matrix, seven training videos about SLG goals, and a webinar providing guidance to charter schools on developing evaluation systems.

### ***Tools to Support Districts and Charter Schools in Designing Systems***

Furthermore, the toolkit includes other tools that districts and charter schools can use when developing evaluation systems. For districts and charter schools with existing teacher and administrator standards, ODE has developed crosswalk tools that assess the extent to which the existing standards align with the Oregon Model Core Teaching Standards and the Oregon Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards.

ODE has created a second set of tools, the Teacher Rubric Gap Analysis Tool and Administrator Rubric Gap Analysis Tool, for districts or charter schools that choose rubrics other than those recommended by ODE. These tools assess the extent to which alternative rubrics align with the teacher or administrator standards.

An additional resource is a document with guiding questions to assist districts and charter schools in developing their systems. The guiding questions relate to the design of systems as well as their implementation.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Oregon Matrix was required for determining summative evaluation ratings from 2014/15 through 2016/17.

Finally, an entire section of the toolkit focuses on supports for charter schools, whose evaluation systems were not required to be fully implemented until 2016/17.

### ***Funding***

Through ODE's District Collaboration Grant program, districts can receive funding to design and implement new approaches in four areas related to educator effectiveness: career pathways, evaluation processes, compensation models, and professional development opportunities. ODE requires grantees to use improvement science methodology, which is a model for continuous improvement.

### ***Sample SLG Goals***

In addition to the example goals provided in the SLG guidance document, the toolkit webpage includes a variety of SLG goals for specialists (i.e., counselors, librarians, special education teachers, speech pathologists, and teachers on special assignment); teachers at the elementary, middle and high school levels; and administrators at the elementary, middle and high school levels. The toolkit also features a link to a searchable bank of sample goals, developed by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

### ***Examples from Oregon Districts***

The toolkit includes examples of ways Oregon districts are implementing and supporting their evaluation systems. These examples include:

- Rubrics for educators whose responsibilities do not completely align with the teacher or administrator rubrics (e.g., counselors, school psychologists, instructional coaches, speech language pathologists).
- Tools to support collaborative goal setting for SLGs and professional practices.
- Tools for observing principals when conducting staff meetings or conducting a post-observation conferences with teachers.
- A tool that lists artifacts that might provide evidence for each standard in the Danielson framework.
- Guiding questions for feedback conversations.
- Sample teacher evaluation handbooks.

### ***Regional Support Staff***

ODE has worked closely with two other organizations, the Chalkboard Foundation and the Oregon Education Association, to provide support to local school districts. During the early stages of implementation of the educator evaluation systems, these organizations supported the delivery of regional workshops around the state. Currently, they offer assistance in response to requests from local education agencies.

## References

- Oregon Department of Education. (n.d.-a). Educator effectiveness toolkit. Retrieved from [http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator\\_effectiveness/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator_effectiveness/Pages/default.aspx)
- Oregon Department of Education. (n.d.-b). Educator effectiveness toolkit – Performance rubrics. Retrieved from [http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator\\_effectiveness/Pages/EEToolkit-Performance-Rubrics.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator_effectiveness/Pages/EEToolkit-Performance-Rubrics.aspx)
- Oregon Department of Education. (2016). *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Educator Effectiveness Workgroup charter*. Salem, OR: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.oregon.gov/ode/rules-and-policies/ESSA/ESSAWG/Documents/4-6-16-final---educator-effectiveness--work-group-charter.pdf>
- Oregon Department of Education. (2017a). *Guidance for educator evaluations for 2017–18*. Salem, OR: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator\\_effectiveness/Documents/2017-18%20EE%20Guidance%20brief.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator_effectiveness/Documents/2017-18%20EE%20Guidance%20brief.pdf)
- Oregon Department of Education. (2017b). *Guidance for setting Student Learning and Growth (SLG) goals*. Salem, OR: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator\\_effectiveness/Documents/slgg-guidance.docx](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator_effectiveness/Documents/slgg-guidance.docx)
- Oregon Department of Education. (2017c). *Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems*. Salem, OR: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator\\_effectiveness/Documents/oregon-framework--for-eval-and-support-systems.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/educator_effectiveness/Documents/oregon-framework--for-eval-and-support-systems.pdf)

## WASHINGTON

### Background and Context

Washington’s Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) is organized around six core principles:

- Quality teaching and leading
- Professional learning
- Teaching and leading work performed by a core team of professionals
- Evaluation systems that reflect and address the career continuum
- Balance between “inputs or acts” and “outputs or results”
- Teacher and principal evaluation models that co-exist within the complex relationships between district systems and negotiations (Washington OSPI, n.d.-a)

Each district must choose one instructional and leadership framework from a list provided Washington OSPI and then display the chosen framework on its website. To make changes to the framework, a district must submit an application with justification to the TPEP Steering Committee (Washington OSPI, n.d.-a).

### Teacher Evaluation

Washington OSPI requires two components for teacher evaluations: teacher practice and impact on student growth. Additionally, districts can choose whether student feedback also contributes to teacher evaluation final ratings (“Minimum criteria,” 2012).

#### *Teacher Practice*

Washington legislature has established minimum criteria for measuring teacher practice:

- i. “Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement;
- ii. demonstrating effective teaching practices;
- iii. recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs;
- iv. providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum;
- v. fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment;
- vi. using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning;
- vii. communicating and collaborating with parents and the school community; and
- viii. exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning.” (“Minimum criteria,” 2012)

For evaluations aligned to these minimum criteria, three approved teacher frameworks may be used to measure teacher practice:

- Center for Educational Leadership’s 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric 3.0

- Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching
- Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model (Washington OSPI, n.d.-g)

Evaluators must observe all teachers at least twice a year. The total observation time across all observations must be at least 60 minutes. An exception to this is for third-year provisional teachers, who must be observed three times a year, with a total observation time across all observations of at least 90 minutes. In addition, principals must provide written feedback after each observation (“Minimum criteria,” 2012).

### ***Impact on Student Growth***

Teachers’ impact on student growth is assessed in relation to five state-developed rubrics, which focus on the extent to which teachers establish appropriate growth goals and can offer evidence that students met those goals. Teachers must provide multiple sources of evidence—including classroom-, school-, district-, and state-based assessments—to demonstrate student progress toward goals. Ultimately, though, districts decide which multiple measures of student growth are appropriate (“Minimum criteria,” 2012).

### ***Summative Rating***

Using state-provided cut points, an evaluator converts a score from the teacher-practice rubric to a four-point scale. The evaluator calculates the student-growth impact score by summing across the five rubrics and then uses the state-provided cut scores to convert the sum into a three-level student-growth impact score. Finally, the evaluator compares these two scores to a matrix to determine the final summative rating. This final rating classifies educators into four levels of effectiveness: *unsatisfactory*, *basic*, *proficient*, and *distinguished*.

### **Principal Evaluation**

As in teacher evaluations, principal evaluations include two required components: principal practice and impact on student growth. Additionally, districts can choose whether building staff feedback also contributes to principal evaluation final ratings (“Minimum criteria,” 2012).

### ***Principal Practice***

Washington legislature has established minimum criteria for measuring principal practice:

- “Creating a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching students and staff;
- demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap;
- providing for school safety;
- leading the development, implementation, and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements;

- v. assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local district learning goals;
- vi. monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices;
- vii. managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities; and
- viii. partnering with the school community to promote student learning.” (“Minimum criteria,” 2012)

Districts may choose from two approved frameworks for measuring these criteria: Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) Leadership Framework; and Marzano’s School Leadership Evaluation Model (Washington OSPI, n.d.-g).

### ***Impact on Student Growth***

Impact on student growth is assessed in relation to three state-developed rubrics, which focus on the extent to which principals implement school improvement planning processes that impact student learning, and the extent to which they can provide evidence of student growth. Ratings on the rubrics should be informed by student data rather than principal behavior. Districts may choose which types of student data (e.g., classroom-based, districtwide, statewide) can serve as evidence of student growth for the rubrics.

### ***Summative Rating***

Using state-provided cut points, an evaluator converts a score from the principal-practice rubric to a four-point scale. The evaluator calculates the student-growth impact score by summing across the five rubrics and then uses the state-provided cut scores to convert the sum into a three-level student-growth impact score. Finally, the evaluator compares these two scores to a matrix to determine the final summative rating. This final rating classifies educators into four levels of effectiveness: *unsatisfactory*, *basic*, *proficient*, and *distinguished*.

### **Requirements for Implementation**

Most teachers and principals must receive comprehensive summative evaluations for all eight criteria once every four years. Those who received an *unsatisfactory* or *basic* rating in the previous year must receive comprehensive summative evaluations in the current evaluation year. Moreover, in their first three years, teachers and principals must have comprehensive summative evaluations. Washington recommends that principals receive comprehensive summative evaluations every year, although this is not required (“Minimum criteria,” 2012).

In years when comprehensive summative evaluations are not required, principals and teachers complete focused evaluations. These evaluations concentrate on one of the eight criteria. The assignment of a criterion is at the discretion of the evaluator. Professional growth activities are also linked to the selected criterion (“Minimum criteria,” 2012).

## State Supports for Implementation of the Evaluation Systems

### *General Training Funds*

In 2017, the Washington State Legislature set aside money for training teachers and leaders on the evaluation program for the 2017/18 school year. Funds may be applied to training provided by framework authors or representatives, instructional or leadership framework specialists, or learning-focused supervision specialists. Each evaluator must attend a training event before the evaluation process begins (Washington OSPI, n.d.-e).

### *ESD Training Events*

Educational Service Districts (ESDs) provide three stages of training on instructional frameworks. To create a statewide cadre of trainers on each of the evaluation frameworks, Washington OSPI provided training for three cohorts of educators across the state to become trainers. Stage one, which occurs before evaluation of staff, includes a two-day training for evaluators of teachers on the frameworks and their alignment with state criteria. Stage two occurs during the year-long evaluation cycle and includes 30 hours of training for evaluators of teachers and principals on the formative and summative application of the frameworks. Finally, stage three includes ongoing professional development on calibration and rater agreement (Washington OSPI, n.d.-f).

New principals must participate in stage one training for two days and stage two training for four days. Principals who have changed frameworks and who have already participated in stage one and stage two training for the full six days must take stage one training for two days and stage two training for two days. All principals are strongly encouraged to complete training on rater agreement, learning-focused supervision, and equity. All principal evaluators must participate in the AWSP Leadership Framework training because no training is offered for Marzano's School Leadership Evaluation Model, which will be phased out after the 2017/18 school year (Washington OSPI, n.d.-k).

### *Training Modules*

The Washington OSPI website houses nine training modules on TPEP. The goals of these modules are to increase knowledge of components and foster common understanding of the system among all stakeholders, and to provide guidelines for implementing the system. All modules include facilitator guides and participant handouts. The nine training modules focus on:

- Using the frameworks in evaluating teachers and principals: This module includes overviews of the frameworks, and domain/dimension cards and component cards for instructional frameworks.
- Multiple measures of performance: This module includes information on multiple measures, self-assessments, goal setting, and gathering evidence.
- Student growth: This module covers the use of student growth in evaluations.



- Observations and rater agreement: This module includes information on conducting high-quality observations, maximizing rater agreement, and increasing fidelity.
- Professional growth: This module includes information on high-quality feedback to promote professional growth.
- Summative rating: This module includes information on combining multiple measures into a summative rating.
- Creating coherence: This module covers connections between college and career readiness standards and TPEP, ELA and math standards alignment, a coherence protocol, and action planning.
- Teacher preparation: This module aligns teacher preparation with TPEP.
- Principal preparation: This module aligns principal preparation with TPEP.

### ***TPEP Steering Committee***

Washington OSPI assembled a steering committee to create models for implementing the evaluation system criteria, student growth tools, professional development programs, and evaluator training for teachers and principals. This committee consists of representatives from the teachers' association, principals' association, district administrators' association, school board members' association, and the parent-teacher-student association. These committee members consult with human resource specialists, professional development experts, and assessment experts ("Minimum criteria," 2012).

### ***eVAL***

Supported by the state, eVAL is a web-based system designed to aid in the evaluation process by supporting communication between teachers or principals and their supervisors and by providing a space to upload and review evaluation materials. For teachers, eVAL is helpful for looking at data related to observations, conducting self-assessments, uploading evidence and aligning it to criteria, responding to reflection questions posed by principals, and viewing evaluation summaries. For principals, eVAL is best for entering data related to practice, scheduling conferences, recording notes during observations, submitting teachers' summative evaluation scores to district offices, and viewing reports such as evaluation summaries (Washington OSPI, n.d.-c).

### ***TPEP Best Practices Colloquia***

The TPEP Best Practices Colloquia are one-day events that are held once or twice a year. These events provide an opportunity for districts to share best practices. Five to six districts begin by presenting a short overview of the best practices they want to share, followed by breakout sessions that provide attendees with opportunities to meet with district leaders and learn more about their practices. Additionally, authors of each of the evaluation frameworks, or their representatives, conduct workshops.

### ***Evaluation System Toolkit***

In collaboration with a group of district, school, and teacher leaders, Washington OSPI is developing an evaluation system toolkit, which will include a set of best practices for districts to consider as they implement evaluation systems. The group identified four elements that are necessary in an evaluation system that supports educator growth. Then, they determined measurable indicators of each of those elements and created a self-assessment tool. Finally, they selected examples of best practices related to each element from state and national resources. The toolkit is expected to be completed by October 2017. Washington OSPI will first share the toolkit with one ESD and gather feedback to inform revisions. It expects to have a version for wide dissemination in time for the 2018/19 school year, and plans to revise the toolkit on an annual basis.

### ***Regional Support Staff***

Washington OSPI works closely with the regional ESDs, which are independent organizations, to provide support for TPEP and facilitate professional learning networks related to educator evaluation in their regions. The ESDs also serve as conduits for communication between educators in their regions and Washington OSPI.

Washington OSPI has also developed a cadre of learning-focused supervision specialists, practitioners who conduct training on providing feedback that is based on evaluation results and that stimulates professional growth.

### **References**

Minimum criteria for the evaluation of certificated employees. Revised Code of Wash. § 28A.405.100 (2012). Retrieved from <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=28A.405.100>

Minimum procedural standards—Conduct of a student growth inquiry for certificated classroom teachers. Wash. Administrative Code § 392-191A-100 (2016). Retrieved from <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=392-191A-100>

Washington Education Association. (n.d.-a). Professional learning – WEA TPEP courses available. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonea.org/pd/teacher-evaluation-tpep/#TPEPTraining>

Washington Education Association. (n.d.-b). Teacher evaluation: TPEP. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonea.org/pd/teacher-evaluation-tpep/>

Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-a). Development and implementation. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/DevelImplement.aspx>

Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-b). eVAL. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/eVAL/default.aspx>

- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-c). *eVAL system features*. Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/eVAL/eVAL\\_system\\_features.pdf](http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/eVAL/eVAL_system_features.pdf)
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-d). *Legislation*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/Legislation.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-e). *Professional learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/ProfLearning.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-f). *Rater agreement*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/RaterAgreement.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-g). *State evaluation criteria, frameworks, and rubrics*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/Frameworks/default.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-h). *State vs. local decision matrix*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/DecisionMatrix.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-i). *Student growth*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/StudentGrowth/default.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-j). *Teacher/principal evaluation WAC change*. Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/pubdocs/FocusedevaluationWACchangeFAQ.pdf>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-k). *Training and events*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/Events.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (n.d.-l). *Training modules*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/Modules/TeacherPrep.aspx>
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2014a). *Criterion scoring methodology guidance from the Washington State framework authors*. Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/pubdocs/Criterion\\_Scoring\\_Methodology-All\\_Ifs.pdf](http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/pubdocs/Criterion_Scoring_Methodology-All_Ifs.pdf)
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2014b). *Washington State criteria student growth rubrics* (Version 1.2). Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/StudentGrowth/WA\\_Student\\_Growth\\_Rubrics\\_v1.2\\_current.pdf](http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/StudentGrowth/WA_Student_Growth_Rubrics_v1.2_current.pdf)
- Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2014c). *Washington State leadership student growth rubrics* (Version 2.0). Olympia, WA: Author. Retrieved

from

[http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/StudentGrowth/WA Leadership Student Growth Rubrics v2.0 current.pdf](http://www.k12.wa.us/TPEP/StudentGrowth/WA_Leadership_Student_Growth_Rubrics_v2.0_current.pdf)

---

The research department at Marzano Research envisions an education system that utilizes research and evidence to make school work for kids. To realize that vision, we partner with educators to support them in understanding, using, and conducting research to improve education systems and outcomes for students.

Cofounded a decade ago by Robert Marzano and Jeff Jones, Marzano Research began working with state and local education organizations and practitioners to understand the challenges they face and support them in defining the questions, conducting the research, and implementing the answers to enhance educational results.

Today, Marzano Research has grown to become one of the leading research organizations in the country, providing rigorous research, evaluation, and technical assistance to federal, state, local, and private partners. As part of that work, we serve as the lead for the Regional Education Laboratory in the central region, working with state and local education agencies in seven states as thought partners and researchers to address some of the most challenging issues in education.

---



# MARZANO

— Research —

---

Marzano Research  
12577 E Caley Ave  
Centennial, CO 80111  
[info@marzanoresearch.com](mailto:info@marzanoresearch.com)  
888.849.0851

---