

“The long-term sustainability and success of the evaluation policy may be linked to the ways in which districts think and talk about teaching. According to many educators, the conversation should be centered around instruction and professional growth, rather than scoring and ‘checking off a box.’ Districts communicate the primary purposes of TPEP, and this can influence whether or not educators see the policy as a means to continuous improvement or as simply a requirement to be met. Districts can also prioritize the creation of a trusting and collaborative culture that supports improvement efforts and coherently integrates the evaluation system into the broader set of initiatives and activities aimed at improving student and professional learning.”

- Ana Elfers and Margaret Plecki, *Washington’s Teacher and Principal Evaluation System: Examining the Impact of a Complex Policy* (University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, July 2017)

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) manages the state’s Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP), working with its education partners and a statewide cadre of framework and other training specialists to provide professional learning and other supports for the evaluation system.

In the fall of 2016, in partnership with OSPI and leaders from some of Washington’s Educational Service Districts (ESDs), the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP) brought together people from all parts of the system and all regions of the state to develop a toolkit of practices and resources that could guide district and school work in supporting the evaluation system. This body of knowledge becomes more robust and rich with each review. With that in mind, the vision for this document is that it becomes refreshed periodically to include the insights and resources of practitioners around the state and nation.

OVERVIEW

Purpose of this document: While statutes, rules, and collective bargaining agreements guide the overall implementation of TPEP, the actual district and school practices taking place within these guidelines determine the positive impact on individual and system growth. This document is designed to capture key elements and indicators of robust evaluation systems in a format that allows district, school, and classroom leaders to see their program strengths and develop possible next steps.

What's in the Toolkit? The Evaluation System Toolkit is organized into four Elements:

- 1. District Leadership**
- 2. Professional Learning - Teachers**
- 3. Professional Learning - Principals and Principal Evaluators**
- 4. Foundational and Routine Procedures**

The section for each Element includes the following:

- A general description of the Element
- Key indicators of quality practice
- System status descriptors for each indicator, with the opportunity to gauge the current level of practice
 - E - Emerging: New awareness of this indicator and its importance
 - IM - Implementing: Indicator is solid feature of the system
 - S - Sustaining: Indicator is key feature of the system and receives continuous attention
- Ideas and examples from around the state
- Vignette(s) of problematic practices and discussion questions
- Reflections and next steps
- Resources

Who is the audience, and how might we use this? The Toolkit is designed to promote reflection, assessment, and growth of the evaluation systems with district leaders, school leaders, and teacher leaders. Best use will be made if users:

- 1. Collaborate:** Both job-alike and heterogeneous teams will bring value to the exploration of the Toolkit.
- 2. Explore the system Elements and self-assess:** Indicators of quality practice for each Element are further described in rubrics that allow users to self-assess the status of their own systems.
- 3. Discuss the vignettes:** These stories of TPEP “misses” include discussion questions that support analysis of what makes programs successful and how they might be improved.
- 4. Determine next steps:** Use the reflective questions to set priorities for refining the systems and processes, and to determine who will be responsible for implementing these.

Reflective Questions:

- As you consider your district's/school's areas of strength in this element, what are some ways you are or could be using these strengths to leverage growth outside of the evaluation system itself?
- Looking at the indicators in which your district's/school's practice is “Developing”, which might have the greatest impact were you to focus time and energy on strengthening them?
 - What specific actions might be important in making that happen?

- Who would be responsible for leading the work?

Evaluation System Element 1: DISTRICT LEADERSHIP

District vision and leadership are critical for organizational success. District leaders, including the school board, superintendent, and other key managers from across the departments of the central office need to develop and articulate a vision and set of practices that sends a clear message that the district system values and supports a learning-centered philosophy and structure. Regular data analysis should be used to determine impact of the evaluation system and to determine areas for growth. A mutually accountable feedback system needs to be established between stakeholders.

KEY INDICATORS OF QUALITY PRACTICE:

- The district superintendent sponsors and supports the work of the evaluation system.
- District leadership promotes and models a spirit of growth in their daily work.
- There is a regular review of the teacher and principal evaluation systems.
- A strong relationship/partnership exists between the administration and the various associations' leaders.
- District and school leaders use evaluation data to guide district and school professional learning and support for teachers and principals.

Self-Assessment:

Emerging = E Implementing = IM Sustaining = S

Key Indicators	Descriptors of quality performance	System Status
District leadership sponsors and supports evaluation work.	The district's strategic goals, improvement plans and budget reflect a priority for teacher and administrator growth through a rigorous evaluation system implemented with integrity.	E IM S
	A district-level leader is identified to facilitate and lead the district's teacher and principal evaluation work.	E IM S
	District leadership ensures that evaluators of principals and teachers receive required and on-going training.	E IM S

	<p>District leaders have a thorough understanding of the instructional framework adopted by the district.</p> <p>District leaders have a thorough understanding of the leadership framework adopted by the district.</p> <p>District leaders recognize the need to build the capacity for evaluators to have learning-focused conversations and crucial conversations.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>Organization is committed to educator growth and has moved beyond ritual compliance.</p>	<p>The district's vision for teacher and principal growth is well articulated and is accompanied by the policies and supports teacher and principal evaluators need to implement that vision.</p> <p>There is an expectation that all individuals within the community—students, teachers, and leaders at all levels—are constantly learning and growing over time.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>There is a regular review of the teacher and principal evaluation systems.</p>	<p>The district actively seeks and responds to feedback from all stakeholder groups about the evaluation system.</p> <p>District leadership annually reviews summative teacher and principal evaluations for equity, quality, and calibration purposes.</p> <p>District leadership leads and engages in regular and ongoing professional development and calibration on the instructional and leadership frameworks across the district.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>

District administration and associations have a strong partnership.	District administrators and association leaders meet on a regular basis.	E IM S
	District administration actively seeks and responds to feedback from associations.	E IM S
Data is used to guide the evaluation process.	District leaders expect and support principals in using evaluation and student performance data to inform building professional development that meets the needs of their teachers.	E IM S
	District ensures principals and teachers have access to actionable data and opportunities to plan and use data.	E IM S
	District ensures resources, structures and systems are available to teachers and principals to meet in collaborative teams about student growth.	E IM S

Ideas and examples from around the state (and nation):

- The Superintendent designates a particular day of the week for administrators to specifically target classroom visits, and lets parents know that school leaders will not be available because they will be observing in classrooms on that day.
- The Superintendent is present in buildings and visits classrooms with the principals.
- Prior to the start of the school year, district leaders hold a meeting during which school leaders analyze their criterion-level evaluation data and reflections, looking for areas of strength and challenge. District and school leaders then use this information to develop budgets and plan professional learning for their staff.
- District leaders meet monthly with principal and association representatives to discuss emerging issues with an eye toward preventing problems down the road.
- District leaders ensure that principals are provided equitable opportunities for growth.
- On a regular basis, the district-level principal meetings begin with a rater agreement activity. Principals view a ten-minute classroom videotape and discuss in small groups where teaching practice in the video falls on their instructional framework rubric. Groups compare their conclusions and determine areas for deeper study at a future meeting.
- Other ideas...

Vignette for discussion:

Principals in Peachtree District are not finding time to access learning and conversations to support increasing teacher expertise in their schools. They are regularly pulled out of their schools for district-level meetings that are consumed by operational and routine conversations unrelated to increasing teacher expertise. Principals feel this time detracts from time they could be using for classroom visits and conversations with teachers.

Discussion Questions:

1. What advice might you give to district leaders in Peachtree to meet principal needs for learning and collaboration while also meeting district leader needs to communicate key procedures, etc?
2. What are some ways district leaders ensure principals devote significant time to educator growth and development?
3. Thinking of your own district, what are some practices at the school and district level that demonstrate your commitment to educator growth?
4. What is your process for reviewing your evaluation system and making appropriate changes? How are the associations included in this?
5. What are some ways the superintendent and other district leaders sponsor evaluation work based on a philosophy of growth? How do they model this philosophy?

Resources

Some of the following resources talk about the conditions at the district level that must be present for school principals to be more effective. Even though they don't speak directly to teacher evaluation, they do give district leaders a general direction of how to best support principals in high performing schools - of which teacher evaluation is an integral component.

Great Principals at Scale: Creating District Conditions That Enable All Principals to Be Effective
<http://newleaders.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Great-Principals-at-Scale-Report.pdf>

The District Leadership Challenge: Empowering Principals to Improve Teaching and Learning
http://publications.sreb.org/2009/09V11_District_Leadership_Challenge_color.pdf

What Do Effective District Leaders Do? Strategies for Evaluating District Leadership
http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/Evaluating_District_Leadership.pdf

Evaluation System Element 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING - TEACHERS

Professional learning for teachers includes ongoing, job-embedded, just-in-time learning. Collaboration around the instructional framework using common language, rubrics and student evidence serves to reflect on and refine instructional practice.

KEY INDICATORS OF QUALITY PRACTICE:

- New teachers and teachers new to an instructional framework receive initial training to acquire knowledge of the framework.
- Teachers new to the district receive training in district and school evaluation procedures.
- Districts/schools provide ongoing professional learning to all teachers, to dive more deeply into the instructional framework.
- Districts provide training and support in setting student growth goals, matched with key teacher learnings, all aligned with the instructional framework.
- Teachers are supported in choosing a challenging area (criterion) for their Focused evaluation, and in growing in that area.

Self-Assessment: Developing = E Implementing = IM Sustaining = S

Key Indicators	Descriptors of quality performance	System Status
New teachers and teachers new to an instructional framework receive initial training to acquire knowledge of the framework.	New teachers and teachers new to the instructional framework will participate in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 6 hours of initial training led by a Framework Specialist or other trained district designee. ● A self-assessment and the development of a professional growth goal with their evaluator 	E IM S E IM S
Teachers new to the district receive training in district and school evaluation procedures.	Teachers newly hired in the district, whether experienced or new, receive training on the conduct of the comprehensive evaluation, including both state and locally-determined procedures.	E IM S
Districts/schools provide ongoing professional learning to all teachers, to dive	School districts use a needs assessment to offer or direct teachers to the ESE or district resources for a variety of ongoing, just-in-time training throughout the school year aligned to the state’s Professional Learning Standards and the	E IM S

<p>more deeply into the instructional framework.</p>	<p>instructional framework (whole group, one-on-one, in PLCs, etc.)</p> <p>Sessions are designed to improve instructional practice to increase student growth and align to the state’s Professional Learning Standards.</p> <p>School districts have knowledge of and utilize available resources to facilitate a variety of learning sessions. Some examples of these sessions may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TPEP coordinators ● Framework Specialists ● Instructional Framework Trainers of Trainers ● ESE offerings ● Online TPEP modules and other online OSPI resources <p>School districts provide opportunities for ongoing professional collaboration around instructional practices, using the framework and student evidence to determine levels of student learning.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>Districts provide time and support for training and support in setting student growth goals, matched with key teacher learnings, all aligned with the instructional framework.</p>	<p>Teachers attend training on setting student growth goals. Teachers write goals with the intention of using student data to measure student growth.</p> <p>Teachers receive one on one coaching in writing and monitoring student growth goals when requested.</p> <p>Principals meet with teachers to review goals.</p> <p>Throughout the school year, teachers and principals monitor progress using artifacts and evidence.</p> <p>Student growth goal-setting is connected to the work of PLCs and school improvement plans.</p> <p>Principals and teachers look at student growth through an equity lens.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>

	<p>Principal and teacher meet for a final student growth conference using artifacts and evidence.</p> <p>Teachers are encouraged to identify non-academic supports that might be needed, in addition to the academic supports, for students struggling to meet student growth goals.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>Teachers are supported in choosing a challenging area (criterion) for their Focused evaluation, and in growing in that area.</p>	<p>Using the results of the comprehensive evaluation, teachers and their evaluators collaboratively select a criterion to focus on the following year.</p> <p>Teachers have opportunities to grow in their selected criterion. (Professional development, coaching, peer observation, etc...)</p> <p>Where possible and agreed upon by all parties, principals facilitate collaborative groups of teachers working on a common criterion.</p> <p>Teacher evaluators carefully consider decisions to transition a teacher on a Focused evaluation to Comprehensive, providing support instead if the teacher is clearly working hard to grow in the chosen criterion.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>The school/district makes use of teacher leaders when possible to assist in leading professional learning on the framework or system development.</p>	<p>Teacher leaders participate in the “Teacher Overview Training of Trainers” to gain the capacity to provide foundational training on the framework to teachers new to the district.</p> <p>Teacher leaders serve on teams/committees that monitor and grow school-wide and district-wide practices for teacher evaluation.</p>	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>

Ideas and examples from around the state (and nation):

- Using data and reflections from the previous year’s evaluations, the district provides a calendar with a menu of professional learning options tied to specific areas of the instructional framework, both those offered in-district and those offered at the ESD.
- A principal spends ten minutes at each staff meeting highlighting one component of their Framework and shares a specific example from a classroom that they observed.
- A principal gathers staff and uses the School Improvement Plan to help teachers write student growth goals aligned with the student growth goals in the school improvement plan, where appropriate (and does not force this where the fit is questionable).
- Each school in the district has at least one teacher who has attended the “Teacher Overview Training of Trainers” for the district’s instructional framework, and is ready to provide the overview to teachers new to the school.
- The principal models the “growth mindset” by sharing with staff what s/he is working on for their evaluation: which criterion s/he has chosen, what professional learning and support s/he is seeking, what some of the struggles are, and what success will look like in their chosen criterion.
- A district surveys all new hires trained in their instructional framework. Survey results are compiled, disaggregated (new to the profession, experienced teacher but changed framework, etc.) and data is used to plan for professional learning to precede the second round of observations. Facilitators of professional learning plan and meet regularly with teachers to address their expressed needs.
- Other ideas...

Vignette A:

Bellwether School District leaders have just announced that the district will be bringing in a national expert on differentiation for a day of district-wide professional development. They will also begin their implementation of PBIS, and provide professional development for all elementary teachers on the new math curriculum. The principals across the district have just received their schools’ discipline data, and have been asked to “work on that.” The teachers on a Comprehensive evaluation, especially those at the elementary level, are expressing some alarm about the number of initiatives.

Discussion questions:

1. What might be some ways that a principal, in collaboration with teacher leaders, can address the issues of “initiative fatigue” described here?
2. How are decisions about the professional learning focus for teachers made in your school/district? What role does data play in those decisions?

Vignette B:

Allaboard Elementary School's site team looked at their students' attendance data and decided that every teacher should set an attendance goal as their student growth goal for TPEP. Teachers used the previous year's data to set up growth percentages in attendance for each of their students, and developed weekly tracking systems. Some staff members were concerned about losing the focus on academic goals with this new directive.

Discussion questions:

1. What might be some ways that a school could leverage both academic (required by statute) and nonacademic goals in the student growth goal setting for teacher evaluation?
2. What school-level resources are available to teachers who uncover needs for non-academic supports in order for students to reach their academic learning goals?

Resources

Standards for Professional Learning outline the characteristics of professional learning that lead to effective teaching practices, supportive leadership, and improved student results. These are now required standards for Washington state, per HB 1345 <https://learningforward.org/standards>

Evaluation System Element 3: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING - PRINCIPALS AND THEIR EVALUATORS

An effective teacher and principal evaluation system promotes teacher and principal skill and capacity and provides quality assurance. Such a system requires evaluators to participate in high quality and ongoing professional learning opportunities in the instructional/leadership framework and its rubrics, along with the process of conducting learning focused collaborative conversations with teachers and principals.

KEY INDICATORS OF QUALITY PRACTICE: PRINCIPALS

- All principals have a deep knowledge of their district’s instructional framework for teachers.
- All principals have opportunities to engage in professional learning that results in increased rater agreement and calibration to the Instructional Framework.
- All principals have the skills to conduct feedback conversations that promote teacher reflection and growth.
- All principals have opportunities for ongoing, differentiated, job-embedded professional learning.
- All principals are supported to effectively guide teachers in developing and monitoring student growth and learning.
- Principals receive training and support for the Leadership Framework and their own evaluation.

KEY INDICATORS OF QUALITY PRACTICE: PRINCIPAL EVALUATORS

- All principal evaluators have a deep knowledge of the AWSP leadership framework.
- All principal evaluators have opportunities to engage in professional learning that results in increased rater agreement and calibration to the Leadership Framework.
- All principal evaluators have the skills to conduct feedback conversations that promote principal reflection and growth.
- All principal evaluators are supported to effectively guide principals in developing and monitoring student and teacher growth and learning.

Self-Assessment: Emerging = E Implementing = IM Sustaining = S

Key Indicators	Descriptors of quality performance	System Status
All principals have a deep knowledge of their district’s instructional framework for teachers.	Principals participate in Stage 1 Training (Foundational Stage) that consists of framework orientation and aligning evidence.	E IM S
	Principals participate in Stage 2 Training (Application Stage) that consists of training on scoring, calibration, and best practices.	E IM S

All principals have opportunities to engage in professional learning that results in increased rater agreement and calibration to the Instructional Framework.	Principals engage in collaborative activities that develop common understandings of levels of performance in the Instructional Framework (i.e., rater agreement.)	E IM S
	Principals engage in professional learning that ensures their ratings are calibrated to the Framework. (Per the Framework authors.)	E IM S
All principals have the skills to conduct feedback conversations that promote teacher reflection and growth.	Principals have professional learning opportunities on effective feedback conversations.	E IM S
	Principals have ongoing coaching and practice in developing skills in collaborative feedback conversations.	E IM S
	Principals work with teachers to develop collaborative relationships and promote a growth mindset.	E IM S
	Principals engage in collaborative conversations with teachers that promote reflection and growth.	E IM S
All principals have access to ongoing, differentiated, job-embedded professional learning opportunities.	Principals participate in differentiated learning opportunities while ensuring that all principals have support for professional development that prepares them for advancement.	E IM S
	Principal Supervisors provide or assure differentiated mentoring/coaching opportunities to principals.	E IM S
	Principals receive training for electronic tools for teacher evaluation (e.g., eVAL).	E IM S
	Principals have opportunities to professionally collaborate to refine their practice on a regular, ongoing basis (monthly calibration, reflection, & learning walks).	E IM S
	Principals receive regular input on their feedback to teachers.	E IM S

	Principals continually update their skills and knowledge in classroom observation as it relates to the framework.	E IM S
All principals effectively guide teachers in developing and monitoring student growth and learning.	Principals promote systems that support teachers in setting and monitoring appropriate and meaningful student growth goals and ongoing student learning.	E IM S
	Principals provide teacher growth and leadership opportunities.	E IM S
	Principals facilitate professional collaboration for vertical, horizontal, or other teams.	E IM S
Principals receive training and support for the Leadership Framework and their own evaluation.	All new principals and assistant principals receive training in the Leadership Framework (may occur with their evaluators.)	E IM S
	All administrators receive ongoing training in the Leadership Framework (deeper dive).	E IM S
All principal evaluators have a deep knowledge of the AWSP leadership framework.	All principal evaluators receive a 2-day training in Leadership Framework.	E IM S
All principal evaluators have opportunities to engage in professional learning that results in increased rater agreement and calibration to the Leadership Framework.	Principal evaluators engage in collaborative activities that develop common understandings of levels of performance in the Leadership Framework (i.e., rater agreement.)	E IM S
	Principal evaluators engage in professional learning that ensures their ratings are calibrated to the Framework.	E IM S
All principal evaluators have the skills to conduct	Principal evaluators have professional learning opportunities on effective feedback conversations.	E IM S

feedback conversations that promote principal reflection and growth.	Principal evaluators have ongoing coaching and practice in developing skills in collaborative feedback conversations.	E IM S
	Principal evaluators work with principals to develop collaborative relationships and promote a growth mindset.	E IM S
	Principal evaluators engage in collaborative conversations with principals that promote reflection and growth.	E IM S
All principal evaluators are supported to effectively guide principals in developing and monitoring student and teacher growth and learning.	Principal evaluators promote systems that support principals in setting and monitoring appropriate and meaningful student growth goals and ongoing student learning.	E IM S
	Principal evaluators provide principal growth and leadership opportunities.	E IM S
	Principal evaluators facilitate professional collaboration for vertical, horizontal, or other teams.	E IM S

Ideas and examples from around the state (and nation):

- Principals and teachers watch an instructional video and code the components and calibrate the level of performance together.
- Principals compile components of the evaluation to determine Professional Learning needs (desegregate by department, grade level).
- Principals/leadership team desegregates student growth data and have conversations around gaps/trends.
- Principal Teams conduct regular calibration conversations to develop consistency around evaluations/reports, conducting observations, feedback conversations, pre-conference conversations, etc.
- Principal evaluators lead Instructional Rounds for which principals identify a problem of practice, and observe classrooms and hold discussions to learn more deeply about it.
- Principals bring evidence or anecdotal stories that focus on one component to a meeting. Principals discuss how they would score this evidence and decide on next steps and a possible conversation with the teacher.

Vignette:

A group of principals do a book study on how to have feedback conversations that promote professional growth because they know they need to improve their conversations with teachers and make them more learner focused. After the book study, the team revamps their questions for goals conferences and pre and post conferences. A year later, the team no longer consistently uses the questions they agreed upon.

Vignette Reflective Questions

1. How might a principal approach his/her colleagues or district leadership about this?
2. What might need to be in place for the team to stay consistent?
3. How does the team help new principals learn the systems they've agreed upon?
4. What evidence of or possibilities for effective collaboration do you see in the vignette?

Resources:

Lipton, Laura and Wellman, Bruce. "How to Talk So Teachers Listen." Educational Leadership. September 2007, Volume 65. Pages 30-34. (This article describes effective learning focused conversations, including 3 key components: psychologically safe environment, clear focus, and a differentiation based on responses.)

Lipton, Laura and Wellman, Bruce. Learning-focused Supervision: Developing Professional Expertise in Standards-Driven Systems. (This book focuses on effective learning conversations from a supervisory standpoint. It describes effective learning focused conversations, including 3 key components: psychologically safe environment, clear focus, and a differentiation based on responses. It includes exercises to practice these components.)

Marshall, Kim. "It's Time to Rethink Teacher Supervision and Evaluation." Phi Delta Kappan. June 2005. (This article discusses a four part strategy for teacher evaluators to use to improve teaching and learning. Marshall recommends changing emphasis from evaluation of teaching to continuously analyzing learning.)

Evaluation System Element 4: FOUNDATIONAL AND ROUTINE PROCEDURES

Districts must have effective systems in place to ensure that teacher and principal evaluation occur and are documented in an effective, efficient and legally compliant manner. In themselves, Foundational Elements and Routines do not lead an organization towards improvement in terms of professional growth or student success; however progress can be optimized when these elements are well-constructed and clearly communicated.

KEY INDICATORS OF QUALITY PRACTICE:

- Procedures guide and support a process that results in meaningful learning conversations.
- Tools and processes offer structures to reduce ambiguity and uncertainty and allow for a system to be efficient and relevant.
- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities provide a foundation for the system.
- Clear, aligned, and consistent communication with all stakeholders is present to support the TPEP process.
- Evaluators and evaluatees collaboratively engage in the TPEP process, resulting in a sense of shared ownership.

Self-assessment: Emerging = E Implementing = IM Sustaining = S

Key Indicators	Descriptors of quality performance	System Status
Procedures guide and support a process that results in meaningful learning conversations.	Practices are aligned to district policy/ procedures, state law, and the State’s TPEP Steering Committee recommendations. The procedures described in Collective Bargaining Agreements comply with RCW and WAC and correctly portray the intent of a professional growth mindset and system, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Timelines and Evaluation Process ● Training ● Other procedures as deemed appropriate 	E IM S E IM S E IM S
Tools and processes offer structures to reduce ambiguity and uncertainty and allow for a system to be efficient and relevant.	Tools are appropriately and consistently utilized for teachers and principals to promote the organization and tracking of methods to support the TPEP process. Below are steps in the process that may require tools and/or tracking methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student Growth Goals (setting and measuring) ● Observation cycle ● Annual list of Focused/Comprehensive assignments ● Collection of Evidence/Artifacts 	E IM S E IM S E IM S E IM S

<p>Clearly defined roles and responsibilities provide a foundation for a system.</p>	<p>Clear roles and responsibilities are established to support the work of TPEP (among central office/departments/schools). Examples may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tracking annual list of focused/comprehensive evaluations, provisional/continuing status, and assigned evaluators ● Analyzing system-wide data ● Tracking/coordination of required training 	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>Clear, aligned, and consistent communication with all stakeholders is present to support the TPEP process.</p>	<p>Clear, aligned, and consistent communication with all stakeholders is present to support the TPEP process. Examples of communication may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adheres to the required timelines, with appropriate notification ● Reflects a growth-focused process ● Various stakeholders receive timely and appropriate communication (e.g., school board members, certificated and classified staff, association leaders, school administrators, central office administrators, families, students) including RCW, WAC, and framework updates. 	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>
<p>Evaluators and evaluatees collaboratively engage in the TPEP process, resulting in a sense of shared ownership.</p>	<p>Evaluators and the evaluatees collaboratively engage in the TPEP process, resulting in a sense of shared ownership. Examples of this may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluator and evaluatee collaborate on artifacts and evidence ● Evaluatee reflects on their level performance as measured by the framework and evidence collected ● Evaluator provides opportunity for evaluatee to share reflection on their performance measured by the framework and evidence collected 	<p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p> <p>E IM S</p>

Ideas and examples from around the state (and nation):

- A district developed and communicates annually to stakeholders a system that allows for all to be aware of the TPEP processes. A “Year at a Glance” document for both teachers and principals aligns trainings and requirements to the intended audiences.

- In a district, the evaluator and evaluatee discuss collaboratively collected evidence and artifacts calibrated to the framework. The evaluatee adds additional evidence to the conversation, reflecting a growth-oriented process.
- After principals finish an observation, they look around the room and record information they didn't capture in their scripting. They stay in the classroom for a few minutes to align their observational evidence to the components in the rubrics. Within 24 hours, observation notes are shared with teachers so they can add information.
- Principals observe planning and preparation during PLC or team meetings. They take one set of notes in a Word document, and then pull out the notes applicable to each teacher for their individual observations.
- Principals talk with their specialists in teams - music, PE, World Languages, Special Education, etc. - about what Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient and Distinguished Levels of Performance would look like in their particular areas with the goal of developing a shared understanding.
- To build relationships and trust, principals attend teacher trainings on the instructional framework or other trainings that do a deeper dive into the framework.

Vignette:

A district receives feedback early on in the school year from their association that teachers don't know who their assigned evaluator is, what the timelines for observations are, and where to locate forms and procedures for writing student growth goals. Some teachers aren't clear whether they are on a Comprehensive or Focused evaluation.

Discussion Questions:

1. How might miscommunication and uncertainty about legal requirements impact the ability to have growth conversations?
2. What might be some ways stakeholders could be informed on an annual basis about the foundational elements and routines of TPEP?
3. What might be some procedures/activities that could be in place to support the idea of "shared ownership" of the TPEP process?

Vignette:

A district is in year 4 of a 5-year strategic improvement plan that includes a professional learning focus. Even though 80% of teachers score basic in a subscore of Criterion 2 where there is a pattern of questioning techniques, the district continues with the plan without adapting to the identified needs.

Discussion Questions:

1. What are some ways a district might consider incorporating TPEP data review into their strategic plan goals?
2. What processes are in place to connect TPEP data to professional learning?
3. What resources are available to support the district in changing their focus?

Vignette:

A Special Education teacher is teaching a student with multiple, severe disabilities. The principal sees that in the instructional framework, it describes student discussion and responses to teacher questioning at the Proficient and Distinguished levels. The principal tells the teacher that she can receive no higher than a Basic rating because the student with whom she is working is unable to speak.

Discussion Questions:

1. What might be some additional ways for the principal to approach this situation?
2. What district-level resources might be helpful?

Resources:

Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems: A Roadmap for Improvement. The Aspen Institute, Washington, DC. 2016