

## **Legislative Report**

### **Group 1: p. v and vi (Background, Setting the context, Summary of SB 6696)**

Summary: Presents background information

- Identifies measures of effective teaching and leading.
- Authentic professional growth model
- Collaborative partnership (teachers, admin, District & building, PTA)
- Attempting to address current situation – compliance viewed as primary purpose by 80%.

Need to know:

- Compensation / Tenure – how are they tied to evaluation system?
- What does “equitable distribution” mean? Bell curve? Students? Teachers?

### **Group 2: p. vi and vii (TPEP pilot districts, Development Year, TPEP Communications)**

Summary: History of TPEP

- Randy Dorn’s recommendation will maintain rigor and value differences.
- All the work done by pilot schools has been imported to a website.
- There is an appendix and cross case analysis/case studies to use as resources.

Need to know:

- How can we learn from the work already done?
- We need to be familiar with the RCW.

Surprises:

- Half of the money was used in the initial pilot year. How much will be available for professional development and implementation in other Districts?
- Why add more Districts this year? Why not allow those piloting to continue the work?
- That there is a balancing act between rigor and value of Districts.

### **Group 3: p. vii and viii (Superintendent’s Recommendations)**

Summary: Districts should select from a limited number of models with common satisfactory/unsatisfactory delineation. Superintendent can choose one model or modify versions. Must have:

- Multiple measures
- Professional learning for principals and teachers
- State adopted evaluation criteria
- Research based framework

Surprises:

- A lot has to happen fast. Not much time to evaluate and adjust after 2012-13 pilot.
- There is a “rigorous” state review process for each District plan.
- There are three frameworks; other frameworks that are research supported can be used.

#### **Group 4: p. 1 and 2 (Introduction part A1 & A2)**

Summary: There are three main tasks:

- 1) Create model for evaluation criteria
- 2) Create model for student growth
- 3) Professional development in District

Timeline

Student engagement and teacher performance

Instructional model decision (framework)

Need to know:

- Skills in groups/Districts – What has each District done so far?
- What are the skills in group to create above 3 main tasks?

Surprises:

- Develop own model as a District (instructional framework)

#### **Group 5: p. 3 – 5 (Introduction part A3)**

Summary:

- Comparison of the current criteria and revised criteria for teachers and principals
- Moving from a binary rating to a four-level system
- Student task force in February
- Student growth, when used, must have multiple measures.
- Use of student data to inform instruction rather than tied directly to evaluation
- Student growth is important – criteria pre & post assessment for students.
- Multiple measures
- Take effect 100% 2013-14

Need to know:

- How will instructional frameworks provide information needed to move from a 2 tier to a 4 tiered system?
- What does student growth look like? How to identify and measure growth?

Surprises:

- WA Legislature – student growth data does not have to be included in evaluation. It must be based on multiple measures.
- Task force
- Written into legislation: growth vs. value added

#### **Group 6: p. 6 and 7 (Introduction part A4 & A5)**

Summary: TPEP Steering Committee

- State level steering committee: OSPI, WSPTA, AWSP, WEA, WASA
- Develop nine new evaluation systems (8 Districts and 1 consortium)
- Reference charts on page 7
  - Variety of demographics
  - Level of participation within Districts
  - Pilot is unique to each District
  - Participation of teachers vs. principals