

Teacher Evaluation Training

1. **Purpose:** Opportunity for teachers to gain an in depth understanding of the revised teacher evaluation system and the instructional framework that will be used to judge teacher performance.
2. **Description of services provided:** School districts used these funds to provide training for teachers to learn the processes and procedures of the revised educator evaluation system as well as the specifics of their district's selected instructional framework, the application of student growth, the appropriate use of artifacts and evidence, and deeper dives into any of the State 8 Criteria. ESDs offered learning opportunities for district teams to understand the ways student growth goals and measures are incorporated into the scoring. Those district teams then used the materials created by ESDs to replicate workshops for educators back in their home districts. Districts and ESDs also hired OSPI-approved instructional framework specialists to lead teacher workshops on the use of the frameworks. OSPI offered a "TPEP Colloquium" and some districts used this funding to send teachers. When teachers were released from their duties, substitute pay was funded from this grant. Many districts used this funding to pay for teachers to attend workshops held outside their contract schedule or calendar. Districts also used funding to pay teachers to work together in teams to develop student growth goals and measures.
3. **Criteria for receiving services and/or grants:** All school districts and Educational Services Districts were eligible to apply. Based on the number of teachers employed statewide for 2015–16, the allocation was \$78.50 per teacher on top of a \$500 "floor" per district. Districts submitted plans via iGrants and they were approved by the OSPI Director of Educator Effectiveness. Districts were required to use OSPI-approved instructional framework specialists or personnel approved by the superintendent to teach the framework to teachers, and used either ESD or local district staff to train teachers on the evaluation process and the use of student growth.

4. **Beneficiaries, 2016-17 School Year:** Teachers in 216 school districts.

5. **FY17 Funding - State Appropriation:** \$5,000,000

Number of staff associated with this program/service (indicate where applicable):

	<u>Fiscal Year 2017</u>
# of OSPI staff associated with this funding (FTEs):	0
# of contractors/other staff associated with this funding:	0

Fiscal Year	Amount
FY17	\$5,000,000
FY16	\$5,000,000
FY15	\$5,000,000
FY14	\$10,000,000

6. **Are federal or other funds contingent on state funding?** no

7. **First year funded:** 2014

8. **Grant beneficiaries, student impacted** Teachers in 216 school districts.

9. Programmatic changes since inception: n/a

10. Evaluations of program/major findings:

Most districts utilized the Teacher Training Fund in 2016-17. Those districts that did not use the funds tended to be small and remote. Districts used the funds for salary and benefits to support additional teacher time, substitute teachers for release time, purchasing the services of approved trainers and registration fees, training supplies and materials and travel to training.

The University of Washington has just completed a study to see how districts are managing and funding TPEP now that the program is at full implementation. They have done case studies of ten districts that have been constructively engaged in TPEP. The site visits yielded the following trends:

- Shifting of responsibilities at the district level between the Human Resource and the Learning and Teaching departments.
- Hiring assistant principals and deans of students to lessen the load of TPEP on school administrators.
- Implementing in variable ways across districts.
- Shifting away from a professional learning focus on TPEP, toward either a deeper dive into the instructional framework or on another path not seemingly related to TPEP.
- Using TPEP data most effectively at the school level.
- Balancing the tension between the twin purposes of accountability and professional growth.

Conclusions from the study included the following:

1. How TPEP is implemented in schools and districts is a reflection of the organization's leadership capacity and belief systems.
2. The strength of TPEP is in its use of an instructional framework to support continuous growth of student and professional learning.
3. Relying on scoring to prompt improvement is not a productive strategy.
4. TPEP cannot be done in isolation.

Analysis of the study results yielded the following policy recommendations:

- There is a need for continuous professional development and collaboration to support TPEP implementation, for both teachers and administrators.
- Differentiated supports are needed to address special circumstances.
- Sustaining TPEP to support continuous improvement will require integration with other initiatives, a recognition of the challenges, and ongoing promotion.

11. Major challenges faced by the program:

For the 2016-17 school year, districts knew prior to the end of school what their allocation for the year would be and planned accordingly. TPEP implementation continues to be most challenging in small and remote districts, where budgets are smaller, distances greater, and opportunities for collaboration fewer. "Floor" funding was provided for both teacher and administrator grant allocations to provide a reasonable level of funding even for the smallest districts, but the other challenges remain.

Now that the program is at full implementation, districts are continuing to explore how TPEP is or can be integrated into other district initiatives. OSPI continues to provide information on "what works" by contracting with the ESDs to create administrator networks, online tools and a resource bank for sharing successful tools and strategies developed locally. OSPI also again contracted with the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession to hold a TPEP Colloquium in Tacoma, in which

districts brought tools and strategies to share with other districts. It was well-attended and well-received; in 2017-18, one Colloquium will be held in Yakima (November) and one in SeaTac (March). The focus is on student growth measures.

To encourage teachers and principals to work on challenging skills during the Focused evaluation period, and to allow principals to observe teachers in activities that matched the criterion being evaluated, OSPI pursued some changes to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) in the spring of 2016. Districts who did not implement these changes will need to do so in 2017-18, which should eliminate the disincentive of a possible negative employment action stemming from choosing to work on an area of challenge during the Focused evaluation.

“Rater agreement” and calibration with the instructional frameworks is key to ensuring fidelity to the state’s program for ensuring educator effectiveness and growth. In addition, while training in the instructional frameworks for administrators is required in the RCW, the costs of attending this training (travel, additional time, district contract with an approved trainer) are not allowable under this fund, which is solely for teacher training. Currently, this need is being met with program administration funds.

12. Statutory and/or Budget language:

Budget Proviso: 2ESHB 2376 – Sec. 511 (16) - \$5,000,000 of the general fund-state appropriation for fiscal year 2016 and \$5,000,000 of the general fund-state appropriation for fiscal year 2017 are provided solely for the provision of training for teachers in the performance-based teacher principal evaluation program.

Program Contact Information: Sue Anderson (Sue.Anderson@k12.wa.us) 360-725-6116