

ESSB 5895

Teacher and Principal Evaluation Decisions

(Current as of 3/15/12)

OSPI created this document to help district understand the new evaluation law for classroom teacher and principals (ESSB 5895). This law builds on the existing law E2SSB 6696 (RCW 28A.405.100).

The document contains the following:

- System and Implementation
- Evaluation Components (with a separate student growth attachment)
- Consequences or Outcomes of Evaluation
- Professional Learning

System and Implementation

Items	Definition (ESSB 5895)	State Decisions (OSPI and TPEP Steering Committee)	Local Decisions	Project Tasks and Upcoming Events
TPEP: New Evaluation System	A new evaluation and professional growth system for classroom teachers* and building principals and assistant principals**	<p>The new evaluation system is defined by state law and informed by TPEP steering committee organizations and TPEP pilot districts.</p> <p>TPEP Core Principles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The critical importance of teacher and leadership quality. 2.The professional nature of teaching and leading a school. 3.The complex relationship between the system for teacher and principal evaluation and district systems and negotiations. 4.The belief in professional learning as an underpinning of 	<p style="text-align: center;">Classroom teachers*</p> <p>The new evaluation system is designed for “classroom teachers.” Because this system is built around the criteria in RCW, reviewing the criteria and instructional frameworks is advised. The following list provides districts direction in making this decision.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Overall</p> <p>Classroom teachers-YES Includes: PE, Music, Art, Special Education Can possibly include: Librarians and Instructional Coaches</p> <p>ESAs-NO ESAs, Teacher-Librarians and Instructional Coaches who provide academically-focused instruction to students may be considered in the new evaluation system. Districts may consider creating four-tiered systems for non-classroom teachers, but are</p>	<p>Communication to Education Community</p> <p>Pilot District Webinar- March 14th 3:30-5pm</p> <p>RIG District Webinar- March 15th, 3:30-5pm</p> <p>OSPI-Statewide Overview Webinar- March 27th</p>

		<p>the new evaluation system.</p> <p>5.The understanding that the career continuum must be addressed in the new evaluation system.</p> <p>6.The system must determine the balance of “inputs or acts” and “outputs or results.”</p>	<p>advised to consider the design and implementation of new evaluation systems are considerable.</p> <p>Principals**</p> <p>The new evaluation system is designed for certificated principals and assistant principals. .” Because this system is built around the criteria in RCW, reviewing the criteria and leadership frameworks is advised.</p>	
Comprehensive Evaluation	<p><i>Formerly known as the “long form evaluation.”</i></p> <p>Assesses all 8 evaluation criteria</p> <p>All criteria contribute to the comprehensive summative evaluation rating</p> <p>All provisional classroom teachers and any classroom teacher not on level 3 or level 4 receive Comp evaluation.</p> <p>All classroom teachers shall receive a comprehensive summative evaluation at least once every four years</p>		<p>Local decision about which level 3 and 4 teachers are rotated through a comprehensive evaluation as long as it is at least once every four years and first rotation completed by 2016</p>	
Focused Evaluation	<p><i>Formerly known as the “short form and/or PGO.”</i></p> <p>Includes an assessment of one of the eight criteria.</p> <p>Professional growth activities linked to the selected criteria.</p> <p>Approved by the teacher or principal’s evaluator.</p> <p>A focused evaluation must be performed in any year that a comprehensive evaluation is not scheduled. (both teachers</p>		<p>Local decision about which criteria to select, activities that connect to focused evaluation and if a group of teachers use the same goal/activities.</p>	

	and principals)			
Implementation Schedule	All districts must begin implementation in 2013-14 school year and be fully implemented by 2016 Requires provisional or probationary teachers, and principals with fewer than 3 years of experience, unsatisfactory performance, or new to the district to be transitioned first. Nothing prevents earlier transition.			
Communications Plan	Plan for effectively communicating elements of changes in the new evaluation system based on legislative, steering committee or OSPI direction	State model communication plan developed by OSPI, steering committee and TPEP districts	Local level decisions but based on best practice.	Target date for first iteration of communications plan is April 1

Evaluation Components

Items	Definitions	State Decisions	Local Decisions	Project Tasks
Criteria	8 New Teacher and Principal Criteria by which certificated classroom teachers, principals and assistant principals will be evaluated beginning 2013/14.	Defined in legislation. 8 Criteria (Principal and Teacher) Must score the 8 criteria		
Criteria Definitions	Definitions developed by TPEP districts during pilot development to help clarify criteria and assist in determining evidence and measures.	Defined by state		
Instructional/Leadership frameworks	Research-based instructional/leadership framework with established definitions or rubrics.	Three frameworks (Danielson, Marzano, UW CEL 5Ds +)	Decide on 1 of 3 frameworks. Must post selection on district web site.	OSPI to identify up to 3 preferred instructional frameworks by Sept. 1 st , 2012.
Modification or	Minor modifications or adaptations to		Local decision about any	OSPI to establish a process for

Adaptations to Instructional Frameworks	preferred instructional frameworks.		minor adjustments made to the framework	approving minor modifications or adaptations by Sept. 1 st , 2012. Instructional Frameworks will be available statewide by April 1 st , 2012
Four Tiered System	Four tiers defined by state (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)	Defined by state (common labels for every district)		
Summative performance rating descriptors	Language that defines overall evaluation score based on development work of TPEP.	Draft submitted in July, 2011 legislative report		OSPI to adopt rules by Dec. 1 st , 2012.
Final Summative Score	Common method for calculating the comprehensive and focused evaluation performance ratings for each of the preferred instructional frameworks. Giving appropriate weight to the indicators evaluated under each criteria and maximizing rater agreement among frameworks.	Required by the state. OSPI to prescribe a common method of calculating a final summative score.		OSPI to adopt rules by Dec. 1 st , 2012.
Cut Line	Defines “not satisfactory” for principals and for the purpose of teacher probation: Level 1 or level 2 for those with more than 5 years of experience and rating is received for 2 consecutive year or 2 out of 3 years.	Cut Line between level 1 and 2 during the first five years and then moves to between level 2 and 3 after five years		
Measures and Evidence	Required: Observation, Student Growth Student input (teachers) and building staff input (principals) may also be included in the evaluation process.	State decides on some measures including observations and student growth data	Local decisions around goal setting, reflections, self-assessment, artifacts, professional contributions	
Student Growth Data	See attached			

Consequences or Outcomes of Evaluation

Items	Definitions	State Decisions	Local Decisions	Project Tasks
Probation	For teachers with cont. contract and 5+ years experience who receive level 1 for 2 consecutive years receive notification of discharge within 10 days of 2 nd evaluation or May 15, whichever is earlier. Non “material” procedural errors do not invalidate the process.	If not deemed satisfactory, teacher is placed on probation. 60 days and completed before May 15.	Local decision: If teacher has 5+ years experience and scores at level 1, probationary period may be extended through the next year.	
Removed from Probation	Must be removed if final score is level 2 (if provisional or 5 or fewer years experience) and level 3 if over 5 years of experience.	Automatic triggers for removing employees from probation		
Request for support	If requested, shall be assigned by the ESD from a list of evaluation specialists compiled by the ESD		Probationer may request an additional evaluator. If requested, must be granted.	
Reporting	Reports started last year (2010-11 school year) for all employee groups.	Requires districts to report to OSPI aggregate evaluation data of current system for district employees (not just the principals and classroom teachers.)		
Human Resource Decisions	Beginning in the 2015-16 school year, evaluation results must be used as one of multiple factors in making human resource and personnel decisions. Human resource decisions include, but not limited to: staff assignment, including consideration of an agreement to an assignment by appropriate teacher, principal or district administrator.		Local decision about the extent evaluation results are used in HR decisions. There is no definition of “factor.” Not defined in percentages, not defined as equal weighting, local decision regarding definition.	Report to the legislature: Dec. 1 st 2017
Human Resource Decisions	A classroom teacher or principal may apply the focused evaluation			

	professional growth activities toward the professional growth plan for professional certificate renewal as required by PESB.			
--	--	--	--	--

Professional Learning

Items	Definitions	State Decisions	Local Decisions	Project Tasks
Support and Professional Development	School districts shall require each administrator, each principal or supervisory personnel who has responsibility for evaluating classroom teachers or principals to have training in evaluation procedures. Before school district implementation principals and admin who have eval responsibilities must engage in prof dev. designed to implement the revised systems and maximize rater agreement.	State to offer training on the new evaluation system. All principals must receive training before implementing the new evaluation system.	Decision made at the local level to decide on level of support, professional development and training	Meet with framework authors on April 25 th and 26 th to discuss plans for training and ongoing rater agreement plans.
Calibration and Inter-rater reliability	Before school district implementation principals and admin who have eval responsibilities must engage in prof dev. designed to implement the revised systems and maximize rater agreement.	Inter-rater agreement training must be taken by principals before evaluating teachers	Decision made at the local level to decide how to calibrate scoring process and provide high quality training for principals and teachers	

		ESSB 5895 Student Growth: Teachers & Principals	
		Current Law (RCW 28A.405.100)	ESSB 5895
Multiple Measures	Teacher	When student growth data, if available and relevant to the teacher and subject matter, is referenced in the evaluation process it must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools. As used in this subsection,	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.
	Principal	Student growth data that is referenced in the evaluation process must be based on multiple measures that can include classroom-based, school-based, district-based, and state-based tools.	Student growth data that is relevant to the principal 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.
Weighting	Teacher	Not defined	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.
	Principal	Not defined	Student growth data must be a substantial factor in evaluating the summative performance of the principal for at least three of the evaluation criteria.
Student Growth Elements	Teacher	Not defined	In addition to the multiple measure described above: 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.
	Principal	Not defined	Not defined
Student Growth	Teacher	Student growth means the change in student achievement between two points in time.	Student growth means the change in student achievement between two points in time.
	Principal	Student growth means the change in student achievement between two points in time.	Student growth means the change in student achievement between two points in time.