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A 2010 report from the National Education Association’s Professional Standards and Practice Committee summarizes the primary purpose for evaluating teachers:

“The core purpose of teacher assessment and evaluation should be to improve the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and classroom practices of professional educators.”

What is your collaborative teams’ goal for the teacher evaluation system you are currently creating? Work through this activity to see if you can come to a consensus on a shared goal or goals for your teacher evaluation system.

This is an essential first step to assessing the effectiveness of any new initiative or system. When designing the system, what were the outcomes you had in mind for your educator evaluation and support systems? What is it that you wanted these systems to do? One key way of knowing how well your system is implemented is by measuring that implementation against the goals you had for the system in the first place. This is the starting place for deciding what other factors need to be tweaked, overhauled, added or subtracted in the continuous and reflexive design process. Additionally, these goals act as signals to your stakeholder groups about the values you held in place throughout the design process, as well as a way to prioritize resource allocation and attention throughout the implementation process.

Directions for the Defining Goals for the Evaluation System Template:

1. You may have already done this at the start of your design team process – if so, review those goals. If not, think about the things an evaluation and support system “should” do. Write these down as concrete outcomes of a system.
2. As the team identifies and agrees on its goals, prioritize them and record them in rank order. Goals should reflect the value lenses of your collaborative group.
3. You can have as many goals as your collaborative team deems necessary (just duplicate the template).

Possible Goals for an Evaluation and Support System:
Starting with concrete goals and having stakeholders react to them may help guide conversations. Here are just a few examples as a starting point:

- Develop a common definition of effective teaching or effective leading
- Differentiate supports for educators based on their performance
- Opportunities for educators to collaborate with colleagues who excel in their area of growth
- Aligned professional learning opportunities for all educators
- Build evaluators’ expertise in observing practice and analyzing instruction to support educator development
- Engage teachers in reflection and self-assessment regarding their practice
- Develop a culture of collaboration among teachers
- Create a culture of continuous improvement among teachers, school leaders, and system administrators
- Improve the learning of students
## Defining Evaluation System Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Small Groups or Pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write down your goal for the Educator Evaluation and Supports Systems in the Individual column. Then pair up or get into small groups, and come up with a combined goal or goals for which the group reached consensus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Whole Group Goals

On the basis of the above answers, please reconvene as a whole group and write consensus goal(s) for your Educator Evaluation and Supports Systems:
## Defining Evaluation System Goals

*Prioritize these goals below*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part of implementation is trying to anticipate consequences or issues that might arise. Examples could include: 1) Principals are unable to meet observation minimums; 2) Teachers who are having to write one of their two Student Learning and Growth Goals based on the OAKS data are worried about that goal and feel they are inordinately focused on raising OAKS scores, and teaching to the test.

1. **Start listing the issues in brainstorming format**
2. **Send out a short email survey that includes this list of issues** to each principal, building representative, and other key teacher leaders; have them check any of the brainstormed issues they have seen or heard of, and give them an opportunity to list any additional issues of which they are aware.
3. **Overall, for each goal or issue, we must ask ourselves:**
   a. What was planned? What did we think would happen?
   b. What happened? How does this compare and contrast with what was planned to happen?
   c. Why did it happen?
   d. What can we learn from what happened and apply to improve the system?
4. **Here are some key questions you could use to begin to decide what are the most important issues to monitor and how to do just that:**
   a. **General Key Questions:**
      i. What are the most critical elements of the evaluation system design and implementation that we must monitor carefully and refine immediately to build and maintain buy-in and ensure success?
      ii. Who needs to be involved in monitoring learning and adapting each of these critical elements of the systems? Who needs to be involved in monitoring learning and adapting the overall design and implementation? What overlap in membership do we need in the two groups?
      iii. How do we ensure that the experiences of people on the ground (Teachers and Principals) are captured in our monitoring and that their thinking informs refinements?
      iv. How do we include senior leaders (including the School Board) in monitoring implementation or keep them informed and ensure their support in significant mid-course corrects are required?
      v. What structures (e.g., work groups, standing meetings, surveys of school staff to evaluate central office services) are currently in place that could be used to monitor learning and inform improvements?
      vi. How will we define and respond to the infrastructure and capacity implications of what we learn and want to improve?
      vii. How can we explicitly and consistently communicate that the evaluation system is dynamic, that it will evolve to be responsive and reflect our learning, and that this dynamic nature is a strength (not a liability) of the system?
      viii. How much change is reasonable, and how frequently is change feasible (e.g., will we refine the evaluation system at the end of year one to reflect feedback and then keep version 2.0 stable for several years)?
      ix. What are the information management implications of the monitoring outlined?
      x. Who needs to be involved in developing the mechanisms/tools that will allow us to monitor implementation?
      xi. How will we ensure that the information is used to drive continuous improvement?
      xii. How does what we have done in this step support educator growth and development?
b. **Rubric Key Questions:**

i. Does the rubric provide a system of support to assist educators to move from one performance level to another?

ii. How does the rubric differentiate to meet the needs of each individual educator, including across specialty areas or assignments and across years of experience?

iii. Multiple Measures Key Questions: Do the selected measures within our system...

   a. Measure performance as intended? In other words, are they valid?
   
   b. Measure what we intended them to over a period of time under similar conditions? In other words, are they reliable?
   
   c. Measure the same definition of teaching effectiveness across different grade levels, schools, content areas, etc.? In other words, are they comparable?

iv. Taken as a whole, what have been the benefits of the comprehensive system of measures? What have been the limitations?

v. What capacity/resources are needed to develop and implement the measures now and over time?

vi. Is the approach and measure transparent and understandable to stakeholders?

vii. What provisions are in place to ensure ongoing review, calibration, and adjustments when necessary?

c. **Aligned Professional Learning (PL)/Professional Development (PD) Key Questions:**

i. Is there a clear policy on how evaluation will inform personnel decisions? Is this policy established within the collective bargaining agreement or related agreements? Has this policy been clearly articulated to both teachers and administrators in the district?

ii. Does the evaluation and support process provide reasonable, attainable identification of way to correct significant discrepancies?

iii. Does the evaluation and support system provide opportunities for educators to see and receive professional development (PD) that aligns with their evaluation?

iv. Does the process support relevant, robust, and timely supports for professional growth, especially when assistance is needed?

v. Envisioning how the evaluation and support system process could be aligned to and inform a professional growth system in the district:

   1. How could this be aligned with curricular standards, district goals, school goals, and identified needs of educators and students?
   
   2. What tools/systems and targeted supports would need to be in place?
   
   3. How could you assess the outcomes of the PL/PD?
   
   4. How could the evaluation system and PL/PD systems support educators’ new knowledge and skills?
   
   5. If the results of formative evaluations are positive, how would that impact the PL/PD opportunities? What if the results identify significant shortcomings?
   
   6. How can we individualize professional learning opportunities and still have a fluency in our overall professional growth system supported by our evaluation system?
   
   7. How do our professional learning opportunities institutionalize the Learning Forward Standards? What resources are needed for this?
Directions for the Monitoring Implementation Template:

1. Identify the things about system implementation that you know you will need to monitor regularly. Some suggestions are:
   a. Completion rate of self-evaluations
   b. Professional goal completion
   c. Student goals completion
   d. Initial goal conferences completion
   e. Observations (formal) – rate of completion, frequency, etc.
   f. Observations (informal) – rate of completion, frequency, etc.
   g. Mid-course goal conferences completion
   h. Artifact gathering – what is being gathered? By whom? By when? Frequency, etc.
   i. End-of-course goal conferences completion
   j. Completion rate of evaluations
   k. Aggregated ratings of educator performance in domain areas
   l. Disaggregated ratings of educator performance in component areas
   m. Aggregated ratings of educator performance in student goals
   n. Disaggregated ratings of education performance in student goals
   o. Overall rating of educator performance
   p. Relationship of scoring in different measures of evaluation
   q. IRA and IRR of observers
   r. Baseline performance level over a period of time prior to any decisions regarding educator proficiency levels

2. Have a conversation about each of the columns in the template to determine when, how, and by whom this monitoring will be done. The final columns is critical, as it asks how you will use what you learn from the monitoring to improve the system.

3. This template will need to be able to grow and expand as the implementation progresses – it’s important to remember that through the process, the issues will change (or new issues will arise), and thus this form will need to be responsive to this.
### Monitoring Implementation of Goal/Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What we want to know about implementation</strong></th>
<th><strong>When we want to know it</strong></th>
<th><strong>How we will gather this information</strong></th>
<th><strong>Who will gather it</strong></th>
<th><strong>With whom this information will be shared</strong></th>
<th><strong>How we will use information to improve design &amp; implementation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Are observations happening and at what pace relative to the pace expected?</td>
<td>Weekly or bi-weekly</td>
<td>Weekly tracking of observation data inputted into TalentEd</td>
<td>HR Asst. Dir.</td>
<td>-Collaborative design team -Principal supervisors -Trainers working w/principals</td>
<td>-Data will be used to inform principal training &amp; supervision, examination &amp; revision of rubric &amp; principal responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

**CENTER FOR GREAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS**
“Communicate early and often.” Regular communication is vitally important through implementation process. Keeping communication channels open, on-going, and flexible to listen and respond to identified needs throughout the process is key.

**Keys to Successful Communication**

- Always strive to address the needs of all stakeholders and consider what feedback is needed, and when it is reasonable and appropriate in the process.
- Regularly communicate to those affected by decisions before, during, and after decisions are made.
- Identify and clearly articulate the purpose for each communication to:
  - convey vision, priorities, and goals;
  - solicit input from stakeholders;
  - build buy-in and generate ownership;
  - ensure clarity regarding expectations and opportunities; or
  - facilitate feedback to guide improvement

Keep in mind, when words and deeds are consistent, they build trust. Trust is a foundation for successfully implementing an effective system of evaluation and professional growth.

1. **Key questions to consider when planning your communication strategies:**
   a. What have we learned about effective communication from past successes and/or failures?
   b. Who are key audiences, and what are their greatest interests and concerns regarding the design and implementation of the new evaluation system?
   c. For whom in the central office will the evaluation have significant implications? How can we most effectively communicate with them and gather their feedback to inform improvements?
   d. What are or will be the school board’s greatest interests and concerns about the evaluation system? How can we anticipate these and communicate effectively with the board about them?
   e. What does the public want and/or need to know about the evaluation system, and how can they most effectively be kept informed?
   f. What are existing communication channels/venues for keeping stakeholders informed and engaged? Are there regular opportunities for leaders of the evaluation work to talk with and hear from teachers and principals? What is the best method of communication for each message?
   g. Will focus groups and/or online surveys lead to more candid feedback from educators?
   h. What are the opportunities to keep stakeholders informed and for them to participate in shaping the work? Are they adequate? If not, what new formats or venues are needed?
   i. What are the most important messages we need to convey? Do the messages reinforce the district’s focus on professional growth and development? Do communications reflect the district’s core values and explain the role of evaluations in this context?
   j. Who are the best messengers for different audiences and content?
   k. What role can teachers and principals play in designing the communication and communicating about the evaluation system design and implementation?
   l. How can we partner with the union to ensure strong two-way communication?
   m. What concerns about the evaluation system can we anticipate? How can we proactively address these through communication?
   n. How will the system collect feedback from front-line implementers? Are there adequate venues for principals, other evaluators, and teachers to share their perspectives?
   o. Whom do we need to engage in designing and executing the communication strategy?
   p. Where do we need to develop new methods for communicating information and gathering feedback?
q. How does what we have done in this step support teacher growth and development?

Directions for Monitoring Communication Template:

1. Identify each stakeholder group that needs to know about the evaluation system (e.g., teachers, parents, human resources department), what they need to know (e.g., elements of the evaluation system), and when.
2. List the current vehicles you have for communicating with each group (e.g., newsletters, quarterly meetings, etc.) and which have been most effective in the past. Imagine new ways of communicating, too.
3. Identify what you need to learn from each group (e.g., their understanding of the system) and how you can gather that information (e.g., surveys, focus groups).
## Monitoring Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>What they need to know</th>
<th>When they need to know it</th>
<th>Various methods for communicating/most effective messengers</th>
<th>What we need to learn from them</th>
<th>How we can gather this information</th>
<th>Process for using this information to improve design and implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Teachers</td>
<td>Who will be conducting their observations</td>
<td>Before observations start</td>
<td>In writing, staff meetings,</td>
<td>Their experiences with different observers</td>
<td>Surveys, focus groups</td>
<td>Will share information with Principal PD/trainers, will make sure observations happening per plan (fidelity checks by Ppal supervisors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensuring that organizational capacity is in place and the new evaluation and support systems support one another is critical. Furthermore, to establish or accommodate important parts of the new educator evaluation and support systems, aligning infrastructure is essential. Therefore, this assessment becomes the first step to creating organizational groundwork that will support and enhance the implementation process. Sometimes this means you may need to go back to the design phase and re-create a portion of the evaluation and support system since the organizational capacity in place simply cannot support the system. However, many times an assessment of policies and procedures, data systems, and personnel (from a time and job responsibilities perspective) may elicit an easier answer than redesign – namely, infrastructure change.

**Directions for Monitoring Organizational Capacity Template:**

1. **Policies and procedures**
   a. Answer the first question, then for each answer, make sure to follow-up with answers to questions ii-iv
      i. What policies and procedures need to be developed or changed?
      ii. Who has the ability/authority to change them?
      iii. Does this require board action or bargaining?
      iv. When will this need to be done?

2. **Data systems**
   a. Answer the first question, then for each answer, make sure to follow-up with answers to questions ii-iv
      i. What changes/additions need to be made to the existing data systems?
      ii. What data sources are involved?
      iii. What job positions/departments need to be involved in building this system?
      iv. When will this need to be done?

3. **Time and job responsibilities**
   a. Answer the first question, then for each answer, make sure to follow-up with answers to questions ii-iv
      i. What are the biggest challenges relative to time and job responsibilities?
      ii. Who has the ability/authority to address them?
      iii. What are the recommendations to address the challenges?
      iv. When will this need to be done?
## Monitoring Organizational Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What policies and procedures need to be developed or changed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Who has the ability/authority to change them</strong></th>
<th><strong>Board action or bargaining</strong></th>
<th><strong>When will this need to be done</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Require demonstration of competence for evaluators</td>
<td>Collaborative evaluation team as creators of handbook</td>
<td>Board vote</td>
<td>At next adoption of handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes/additions need to be made to the existing data systems</strong></td>
<td><strong>What data sources are involved</strong></td>
<td><strong>What job positions/departments need to be involved in building this system</strong></td>
<td><strong>When will this need to be done</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Need to build info management system into which rubric performance levels info can be entered and easily retrieved to plan for aligned professional learning</td>
<td>Educator self-reflections, evaluator summative rubric scores on component-level</td>
<td>Information management, representative from collaborative design team, professional development team</td>
<td>By Jan 1 (in time to make calendar decisions for next school year &amp; before probationary evals are done)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the biggest challenges relative to time and job responsibilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Who has the ability/authority to address them</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are the recommendations to address the challenges</strong></td>
<td><strong>When will this need to be done</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Responsibility for observing principals</td>
<td>Superintendent (since Asst. Sup’s = Principal evaluators)</td>
<td>Create schedule where Sup. covers for Asst. Sup’s 1x/mo so observations can occur</td>
<td>By July 1st for following school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To ensure that the educator evaluation and support systems are meeting the designed goals, it is important to ensure that all key personnel in the school district are capable of carrying out their roles and responsibilities in this system. Thus, an assessment of capacity is necessary. When you are monitoring capacity, it is important to think broadly about all the stakeholders in the system and parse out their individual, categorical aptitudes and abilities.

1. First, you must again identify all the stakeholders essential to implementing the system. Some stakeholders may be:
   a. Association Leaders/Teacher Leaders
   b. Evaluators of Teachers
   c. Principals
   d. Evaluators of Principals
   e. Professional Development leaders
   f. Other staff essential to the system

2. Next, for each stakeholder group it is important to outline the following:
   a. What are this group’s roles and responsibilities?
   b. What skills are necessary to fulfill the role?
      i. How did you consider the training needs for each of the multiple measures chosen for educators and evaluators? (i.e., depth of understanding of rubric, observation, artifact gathering and analysis, self-assessment, professional goals, student learning and growth goals, reflection throughout process, mid-course formative evaluation and goal meeting, end of year formative or summative evaluation and goal meeting, etc.)
      ii. How did you differentiate tools for specialists (at minimum Special Education and English Language Development Specialists)?
      iii. How did you consider the training needs around making a summative evaluation?
      iv. How did you decide who would be the evaluators? What criteria was in place?
      v. How did we train all stakeholders on our common definition of effective teaching?
      vi. Which capacity issues are we most concerned about building because they (a) are essential to the successful implementation of the evaluation system and (b) will present the greatest challenge for capacity building?
   c. How will skill deficits will be determined, and more importantly, remedied?
      i. How can we focus resources to address these areas of concern or redesign the system to tap more existing capacity and lessen the capacity development requirements?
      ii. As we think about each category of employees whose capacity needs to be developed so they can do this different kind of work, what is our assessment of the capacity of the people in these positions (who may have been hired for a different job) to build these skills and make the transition to a new way of working?
   d. How does what we have done in this step support educator growth and development?

**Directions for Monitoring Capacity Template:**

1. Identify all the various stakeholder groups/roles that will be essential in implementing the new educator evaluation and support systems.
2. Determine capacity needs, then decide how, by who, and by when it will be built.
## Monitoring Personnel Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job positions whose capacity needs to be built</th>
<th>Capacity that needs to be built</th>
<th>How will it be built</th>
<th>Who will build it</th>
<th>Date by which capacity will be built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Principals as evaluators of teachers</td>
<td>Calibration in assigning performance levels on rubric</td>
<td>Calibration sessions (monthly) after initial 2-day IRA/IRR training</td>
<td>Outside consultant through OEA and Ppal evaluators</td>
<td>Ongoing – initial training by Aug 18th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that we have assessed our educator evaluation and support systems’ implementations compared to the goals we had for that system, brainstormed and thought about all issues and future concerns pertaining to the implementation, assessed our communications, infrastructure, and capacity, it is time to combine all these concepts into a working Action Plan around monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of our systems.

Putting all the elements together for successful implementation requires a concurrent assessment of what current capacity and resources allow, thinking about realignment of these resource and timing it to meet the assessed needs and building capacity, as well as a systems perspective to weave this work simultaneously with all the other work and new initiatives currently underway. Your action plan ultimately, like everything else with your work around educator evaluation, will also need to be dynamic and flexible enough to adjust as the identified issues and needs change. While you will benchmark and predict progress toward your identified goals and list the “when” and “by whom” each task will be accomplished, it will be important to keep these key questions in mind.

1. **Key Questions to Consider When Combining All Our Planning:**
   a. How do we sequence and pace the building of infrastructure and capacity to ensure that we have everything we need in place for the smoothest possible implementation?
   b. What are the advantages and disadvantages of piloting the evaluation system initially so that we can refine it before moving to full-scale implementation?
   c. What things that we want to address require other pieces of the design to be in place, and what does that mean for pacing the work?
   d. Where might we generate additional resources to support this work?
   e. Who will be critical partners with us in this work, and how does their capacity and way of working need to inform the work plan?
   f. Who needs to be part of the overall team for this work? What are the responsibilities of this team? What other teams need to be brought in and what are their responsibilities?
   g. What project management and oversight structures do we need to put in place to ensure the work plan is implemented, monitored, and refined?
   h. At what level does the system’s senior leadership need to be involved to be kept informed and prepared to make any critical decisions?

**Directions for the Action Plan Template**

a. **Identify action steps needed to develop and implement your evaluation system, when each step needs to happen, and who will be the lead.**

b. **Also identify others who need to be involved in each step, how you will monitor progress, who is responsible for monitoring progress, and how you will know the step is complete. Note: The initial development of the work plan will be iterative as you engage a variety of players in the process.**

c. **After completing the grid, discuss the reflection questions on the next page.**
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action step</th>
<th>Project leader</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Completion dates</th>
<th>Progress checks</th>
<th>Deliverable/ outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ex: Identify trainers for each building so there are at least 2 “go to” people on Student Goals | Head of PD department & union lead on design team   | Principals, Teaching & Learning team, Collaborative Evaluation team | By February 15   | PD Proposal to Collaborative Eval team and Head of PD & HR by Dec 1 | -Identification of trainers by Dec 1  
  -Increase knowledge of Student Goals  
  -Increase Student outcomes       |