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Content for Session

• Review of Rules, with opportunities for district interaction around:
  – Scoring
  – Student Growth
  – Rater Agreement

• State Implementation Recommendations

• Supports
Teams respond to the question, “What actions have you taken since we last met?”
Shifting Thinking

Educator Quality

Data Access

Assessment as Autopsy

Reflection for Improved Individual Teaching and Leadership Practice

Educator Effectiveness

Utilizing Data for Improving Instruction

Assessment as Diagnostic Tools to Improve Leadership & Instruction

Reflection for Improved Collective Teaching and Leadership Practice
Influences on TPEP Development

- TPEP Pilot Sites & Steering Cmte
- Instructional and Leadership Framework Authors
- E2SSB 6696 & Race to the Top
- Research and Best Practice

2010-12

- ESSB 5895
- ESEA Flexibility Waiver

2012

- Washington State Evaluation and Professional Growth System

2012-
• Memorandum No. 004-13M K-12 Education was released on January 31, 2013. It had two attachments
  – Chapter 392-191A WAC
# Evaluation Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Component</th>
<th>5895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria (RCW)</td>
<td>Stays the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Definitions</td>
<td>Stays the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional/Leadership Frameworks</td>
<td>3 Approved Frameworks OSPI –September 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Tiered System</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Summative Scoring Methodology</td>
<td>OSPI –December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rulemaking has started as of August 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory Delineation</td>
<td>Years 1-5 between 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years 5 + between 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 years in a row or 2 out of 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures and Evidence</td>
<td>Observation* and Student Growth*(*Required in RCW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artifacts and other Evidence related to Framework Rubrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK
- Marzano
- Danielson
- CEL 5D

LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK
- AWSP
- Marzano

TRANSLATION PROCESSES
- WA State Teacher Evaluation Criteria
- Teacher Evaluation Model
- WA State Principal Evaluation Criteria
- Principal Evaluation Model

NO TRANSLATION REQUIRED
Classroom Teacher

Classroom Teachers

Includes:
- English LA
- Math
- Special Education
- Music
- PE
- Art
- CTE

May Include:
- Teacher-Librarians
- Instructional Coaches

Non-Classroom Teachers

ESA
School Counselors, SLP, OT, PT, School Nurses

Staff who provide academically-focused instruction to students

Districts may consider creating four-tiered systems for non-classroom teachers, but are advised to consider the design and implementation of new evaluation systems are considerable.
Scoring
Comprehensive Evaluation - Teachers

• Assesses all 8 evaluation criteria.

• All criteria contribute to the comprehensive summative evaluation rating.

• Student Growth Rubrics embedded in Criterion. (3, 6, 8)

• All provisional classroom teachers and any classroom teacher not on level 3 or level 4 receive Comprehensive evaluation.

• All classroom teachers shall receive a comprehensive summative evaluation at least once every four years.
Comprehensive Evaluation - Principals

• Assesses all 8 evaluation criteria.

• All criteria contribute to the comprehensive summative evaluation rating.

• Student Growth Rubrics embedded in Criterion. (3,5,8)

• “Due to the importance of instructional leadership and assuring rater agreement among evaluators, particularly those evaluating teacher performance, school districts are encouraged to conduct comprehensive summative evaluations of principal performance on an annual basis.”
  • Section 1, (12 c(v))
Evaluation Summative Scoring Process

**Standards**

- Criteria 1
- Criteria 2
- Criteria 3
- Criteria 4
- Criteria 5
- Criteria 6
- Criteria 7
- Criteria 8

**Frameworks + Student Growth Rubrics**

**Evidence**

- Observation
- Artifacts
- Other evidence relevant to the frameworks

**Criterion Rating**

- District determined process
- Distinguished
- Proficient
- Basic
- Unsatisfactory

**Summative Rating**

- State determined process
- Distinguished
- Proficient
- Basic
- Unsatisfactory
# The RAW Score Model

## Teaching Criteria

* Indicate Criterion embedded with student growth rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Overall Criterion Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1: Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2: Demonstrating effective teaching practices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Criterion 3: Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4: Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5: Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Criterion 6: Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 7: Communicating and collaborating with parents and school community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Criterion 8: Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Summative Score**  
22

### OSPI Approved Summative Scoring Band

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Band</th>
<th>8-14</th>
<th>15-21</th>
<th>22-28</th>
<th>29-32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators place teachers into *preliminary* summative rating categories based on score bands.

As illustrated above, this teacher would receive a *preliminary* overall summative rating of Proficient.
Evaluation Summative Scoring Process

Frameworks + Student Growth Rubrics

Criteria 1
Criteria 2
Criteria 3
Criteria 4
Criteria 5
Criteria 6
Criteria 7
Criteria 8

Evidence

Observation
Artifacts
Other evidence relevant to the frameworks

Criterion Rating

District determined process
Distinguished Proficient Basic Unsatisfactory

Summative Rating

State determined process
Distinguished Proficient Basic Unsatisfactory

Student Growth Measures
(From 3 specific criteria)

Student Growth Impact Ratings:
Low, Average, High
Focused Evaluation
Certificated Classroom Teachers

- Includes an assessment of one of the eight criterion.

- Student Growth Rubrics from one of the three criterion
  - *If a teacher chooses 3,6 or 8; their accompanying student growth rubrics will be used.*
  - *If a teacher chooses Criterion 1,2,4,5,7, the accompanying student growth rubrics from Criterion 3 or 6 will be used.*

- Approved by the teacher’s evaluator.

- A focused evaluation must be performed in any year that a comprehensive evaluation is not scheduled.
Student Growth/ Focused Evaluation

• The scoring matrix and student growth impact rating is used only for comprehensive evaluations. OSPI is in the process of writing the guidance and will include student growth guidance for the focused evaluation.
Focused Evaluation
Principals and Assistant Principals

• Includes an assessment of one of the eight criterion.

• Student Growth Rubrics from one of the three criterion
  – The focused evaluation will include the student growth rubric row selected by the principal or assistant principal.

• Criterion and Student Growth Rubric Rows must be approved by the principal’s evaluator.

• A focused evaluation must be performed in any year that a comprehensive evaluation is not scheduled.
Focused Evaluation Summative Scoring Process

**Standards**

One Criterion is chosen and approved by evaluator.

- Criteria 1
- Criteria 2
- Criteria 3
- Criteria 4
- Criteria 5
- Criteria 6
- Criteria 7
- Criteria 8

**Framework Components** + Student Growth Rubrics

- (3, 6, 8 use their SG rubrics)
- All others use Criterion 3 or 6 SG rubrics

**Evidence**

- Observation
- Artifacts
- Other evidence relevant to the frameworks

**Criterion = Summative Rating**

- Distinguished
- Proficient
- Basic
- Unsatisfactory

**Student Growth Measures**
- **Qualitative/Holistic Model:** This model requires collection of artifacts and observation by the evaluator and holistically deriving a qualitative rating on the 4 tiers for each teacher based on a preponderance of evidence.

- **Mathematical Formula Model:** This model uses a mathematical algorithm to add up each component and divide by the number of indicators/components to drive out a number for each criterion. The same process is completed for the criteria to finalize a summative rating.

- **Percentage and/or Points Model:** This model assigns percentages or points to each form of evidence (Example: Observations are worth 65%, Artifacts 15%, Impacts on Student Learning 15% and self reflection/reflection 5%)

- **Raw Score or Range Model:** This model uses appropriate evidence (observation, artifacts, impact on student learning, self-assessment) to derive a raw score for each criterion. Those criterion scores are then added up to create a summative raw score. Summative rating is defined through a Raw Score Range (Example: Level 1: 8-13 Level 2: 14-19 Level 3: 20-26 Level 4: 27-32). **This is the method used for the state’s overall summative scoring methodology.**

- **Raw Score or Range/Conditions Hybrid Model:** This model combines the above raw score model with certain district level conditions (example: cannot be overall proficient with one unsatisfactory criterion score or unsatisfactory in safety criterion automatic overall unsatisfactory).

- **Conditions Model:** This model puts certain evaluation conditions depending on the contract status of the teacher.
## District Decisions around Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do we know?</th>
<th>Possible Resources</th>
<th>District Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Criterion level scoring is a district determined process.</td>
<td>• Framework developer guidance coming in mid-Spring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criterion level scoring must be determined by an analysis of the evidence.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Growth
Both E2SSB 6696 and ESSB 5895 contain language around student growth including:

- Student growth data that is relevant to the teacher and subject matter must be a factor in the evaluation process and must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools. Student growth means the change in student achievement between two points in time.

Changes...

- Student growth data must be a substantial factor in evaluating the summative performance of certificated classroom teachers for at least three of the evaluation criteria.

- Student growth data elements may include the teacher’s performance as a member of a grade-level, subject matter, or other instructional team within a school when the use of this data is relevant and appropriate.
The TPEP steering committee organizations approved statewide rubrics for student growth to ensure consistency in implementation of the evaluation system across Washington State.

The rubrics for student growth describe both goal-setting and outputs of student learning.

OSPI has provided student growth rubrics for each of the three criterion:
- Teachers #3, #6, and #8
- Principals #3, #5, and #8
Using District, School, and Classroom-based Data (Teachers)

• Five Student Growth Criteria
  – 3.1 Establish Student Growth Goals
    Re: individual or subgroups of students (achievement/opportunity gap)
  – 3.2 Achievement of Student Growth Goals
    Re: individual or subgroups of students (achievement/opportunity gap)
  – 6.1 Establish Student Growth Goals using Multiple Student Data Elements
    Re: whole class based on grade-level standards and aligned to school and district goals
  – 6.2 Achievement of Student Growth Goals
    Re: whole class based on grade-level standards and aligned to school and district goals
  – 8.1 Establish Team Student Growth Goals
    Re: Teacher as part of a grade-level, content area, or other school/district team
It is student growth, not student achievement, that is relevant in demonstrating impacts teacher and principals have on students.
### Student Growth 3.1: Establish Student Growth Goal(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not establish student growth goals or establishes inappropriate goals for subgroups of students not reaching full learning potential. Goals do not identify multiple, high-quality sources of data to monitor, adjust, and evaluate achievement of goals.</td>
<td>Establishes appropriate student growth goals for subgroups of students not reaching full learning potential. Goals do not identify multiple, high-quality sources of data to monitor, adjust, and evaluate achievement of goals.</td>
<td>Establishes appropriate student growth goals for subgroups of students not reaching full learning potential. Goals identify multiple, high-quality sources of data to monitor, adjust, and evaluate achievement of goals.</td>
<td>Establishes appropriate student growth goals for subgroups of students not reaching full potential in collaboration with students, parents, and other school staff. Goals identify multiple, high-quality sources of data to monitor, adjust, and evaluate achievement of goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Growth 3.2: Achievement of Student Growth Goal(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth or achievement data from at least two points in time shows no evidence of growth for most students.</td>
<td>Multiple sources of growth or achievement data from at least two points in time show some evidence of growth for some students.</td>
<td>Multiple sources of growth or achievement data from at least two points in time show clear evidence of growth for most students.</td>
<td>Multiple sources of growth or achievement data from at least two points in time show evidence of high growth for all or nearly all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Growth Principal Rubric Language**

**Student Growth Criterion 3:** Leading the development, implementation and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not assist staff to use multiple types of data to reflect on effectiveness of lessons, guide lesson and assessment development, differentiate instruction, and to determine whether re-teaching, practice or moving forward is appropriate; focuses more on student characteristics rather than the actions of teachers; no improvement in student academic achievement.</td>
<td>Occasionally assists staff to use multiple types of data to reflect on effectiveness of lessons, guide lesson and assessment development, differentiate instruction, and to determine whether re-teaching, practice or moving forward is appropriate; strategies result in incomplete relationship between the actions of teachers and the impact on student achievement; minimum improvement in student academic growth.</td>
<td>Regularly assists staff to use multiple types of data to reflect on effectiveness of lessons, guide lesson and assessment development, differentiate instruction (highly achieving as well as non-proficient) and to determine whether re-teaching, practice or moving forward with instruction is appropriate at both the group and individual level; strategies result in clear relationship between the actions of teachers and the impact on student achievement; demonstrated and measurable improvements in student academic growth readily apparent.</td>
<td>Is proficient AND demonstrates leadership by routinely and consistently assisting teachers to use multiple types of data to reflect on effectiveness of lessons, guide lesson and assessment development, differentiate instruction, and to determine whether re-teaching, practice or moving forward with instruction is appropriate at both the group and individual level; explicitly demonstrates consistent and measurable improvements in student academic growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Growth Rubric and Rating (Teachers Only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Goal-Setting Score Based on Rubric</th>
<th>Student Growth* Score Based on Rubric</th>
<th>Overall Student Growth Criterion Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth Score</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Must include a minimum of two student growth measures (i.e., state-, district-, school-, and classroom-based measures).

** A student growth score of “1” in any of the student growth rubrics will result in a Low growth rating.

Evaluators place teachers into summative rating categories based on score bands.

As illustrated below, this teacher would receive a low student growth rating.
Summative Rating & Impact on Student Learning Matrix

Consequences as a result of Intersection between Summative Rating and Impact on Student Learning Rating

- **Unsatisfactory Rating**
  - Plan of Improvement
  - Low
  - Average
  - High

- **Basic Rating**
  - Student Growth Inquiry

- **Proficient Rating**
  - Student Growth Inquiry
  - Distinguished Rating

Impact on Student Learning
Evaluation Summative Scoring Process

Standards

- Criteria 1
- Criteria 2
- Criteria 3
- Criteria 4
- Criteria 5
- Criteria 6
- Criteria 7
- Criteria 8

Frameworks + Student Growth Rubrics

Evidence

- Observation
- Artifacts
- Other evidence relevant to the frameworks

Criterion Rating

- District determined process
- Distinguished
- Proficient
- Basic
- Unsatisfactory

Summative Rating

- State determined process
- Distinguished
- Proficient
- Basic
- Unsatisfactory

Student Growth Measures

(From 3 specific criteria)

Student Growth Impact Ratings:

- Low, Average, High
Remember . . .

• The scoring matrix and student growth impact rating is used only for comprehensive evaluations.
  – OSPI is in the process of writing the guidance and will include student growth guidance for the focused evaluation.
Student Growth Inquiry Consequences:

Within two months of receiving the low student growth score or at the beginning of the following school year, whichever is later, one or more of the following must be initiated by the evaluator:

• Triangulate student growth measure with other evidence (including observation, artifacts and student evidence) and additional levels of student growth based on classroom, school, district and state-based tools;
• Examine extenuating circumstances possibly including: goal setting process/expectations, student attendance, and curriculum/assessment alignment;
• Schedule monthly conferences with the teacher to discuss/revise goals, progress toward meeting goals, and best practices; and/or
• Create and implement a professional development plan to address student growth areas.
Convening a group of educators to analyze the student growth process and determine next steps with regard to districts implementation of this portion of the TPEP work. It will be an initial step in looking at the implementation in the following areas:

1. Assessment Literacy
2. Student Growth Rubrics
3. Student Growth Measures
4. Examples of Student Growth Goals

• OSPI and the TPEP steering committee feel it is critical that this process is authentic and relevant to the existing context in districts.
What is our plan for ensuring district assessment literacy?

What assessment data can we consider for teachers and principals that includes state, district, school and classroom-based tools?

What will drive our decision-making process?

How will we utilize the findings of the Student Growth focus Group?
Rater Agreement
Rater Agreement Background

• The TPEP project has relied heavily on the growing body of research, the framework authors and the practical input from practitioners in the pilot sites to create a “working definition” of rater agreement for the 2012-13 school year.

• The new law requires that evaluators of both teachers and principals “must engage in professional development designed to implement the revised systems and maximize rater agreement.”
Rater Agreement Definition

The extent to which the scores between the raters have consistency and accuracy against predetermined standards. The predetermined standards are the instructional and leadership frameworks and rubrics that define the basis for summative criterion level scores.
Stages of Rater Agreement

Stage 1
Foundational Understanding of the BIG IDEAS in the Framework

Stage 2
Application of Framework as a Formative Tool for Growth

Stage 3
Summative Determination of Criterion Level Scores

2-3 Day Foundational Training

Ongoing Rater Agreement Training
Rater Agreement

Strategies for district work on continued rater agreement training:

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-
• Memorandum No. 004-13M K-12 Education was released on January 31, 2013. It had two attachments
  – Chapter 392-191A WAC
Legislative Requirements

• School district boards of directors to adopt an implementation schedule beginning 2013-14

• All provisional and probationary classroom teachers begin in 2013-14 on a comprehensive evaluation.

• All principals in their first three consecutive years, those judged unsatisfactory in 2012-13, or those in their first year in a district on a comprehensive principal evaluation in 2013-14.

• All classroom teachers, principals and assistant principals are evaluated under the revised systems no later than 2015-16.
Steering Committee Implementation Recommendations Include . . .

• All certificated classroom teachers, principals and assistant principals are evaluated on either a comprehensive or focused evaluation using the new state criteria beginning 2013-14.

• All certificated classroom teachers on an continuing contract complete a comprehensive evaluation by the end of 2016-17.
Rationale for Recommendations

• More intentional rater agreement training during the first years of implementation.
• More reasonable accommodation for the variety of teacher-principal caseload numbers.
• More careful evaluations of provisional status teachers that will be on a comprehensive evaluation in the first year of implementation.
## Four Year Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probationary Classroom Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Provisional or Non-Probationary Classroom Teachers (4 years of satisfactory evaluations)</strong></td>
<td>25% on Comp 75% on Focused</td>
<td>25% on Comp 75% on Focused</td>
<td>25% on Comp 75% on Focused</td>
<td>25% on Comp 75% on Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Teacher</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>17 FTE Comp</td>
<td>15 FTE Comp</td>
<td>10 FTE Comp</td>
<td>15 FTE Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>16 FTE Comp</td>
<td>17 FTE Comp</td>
<td>15 FTE Comp</td>
<td>10 FTE Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>8 FTE Comp</td>
<td>16 FTE Comp</td>
<td>17 FTE Comp</td>
<td>15 FTE Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Provisional</strong></td>
<td><strong>41 FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>42 FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 FTE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probationary Classroom Teachers</strong></td>
<td>1 FTE Comp</td>
<td>3 FTE Comp</td>
<td>4 FTE Comp</td>
<td>3 FTE Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Provisional or Non-Probationary Classroom Teachers</strong></td>
<td>Total: 378 FTE</td>
<td>Total: 369 FTE</td>
<td>Total: 374 FTE</td>
<td>Total: 377 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 years of satisfactory evaluations)</td>
<td>Comp: 75</td>
<td>Comp: 110</td>
<td>Comp: 125</td>
<td>Comp: 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focused: 303</td>
<td>Focused: 259</td>
<td>Focused: 249</td>
<td>Focused: 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total teachers on a Comprehensive</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total teachers on a Focused</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
<td><strong>279</strong></td>
<td><strong>259</strong></td>
<td><strong>293</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Planning

Use the provided Teacher and Principal Implementation Plan forms to plan for your district’s transition to the new evaluation system.
Supports

• In-district expertise
• Neighbor district expertise
• ESD services
  – In-house Framework Specialists
  – Networking Opportunities
  – Support groups
  – Assessment PD coming
  – OESD Website documents Coming!
• OSPI/ TPEP website and iTunes online training modules – more coming
• eVAL
Additional Resources

• North Mason School District Materials include
  – A draft CBA revision (Special thanks to David Peterson). While this draft has not been formally adopted, it is the result of David's analysis of the revised RCW and WAC and the learning of a district deeply involved in the state pilot project.
  • An electronic copy has been provided to your district.
And From our Friends at 113

http://www.esd113.org/Page/1632

A resource with examples of tools and forms.
What’s New in eVAL

• updated to include the state rules for final summative evaluation scoring
• eleven new features including improved notes and feedback
• changes in reporting and printing
• capacity to take a snapshot of progress at any point in time
• to learn more about eVAL, or would like an introductory tour, please contact Jeff Allen
District Planning

• Continue to work on the following aspects of the new system:
  – Criterion level scoring
  – Student growth issues
  – Rater agreement strategies for stage 3 rater agreement
  – Implementation Planning
Plus/Delta Debrief

• Create at least 2 post-it notes for the Plus/Delta Chart on your way out.
  – **Plus**: What was a real “plus” of these sessions? What went well and should be repeated?
  – **Delta**: Where is their room for improvement for future meetings?
Next OESD Regional Teaching and Learning Consortium...

Open Educational Resources (OER)

- What is OER?
- Where can I find quality materials?
- How is it used?
- What are the advantages?
- How can it be implemented in my district?

Friday, April 19, 2013
9-12pm

Bring a team!