



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Governance | Accountability | Achievement | Oversight | Career & College Readiness

Title:	Update on Teacher Principal Evaluation Systems (TPEP) Implementation.	
As Related To:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Effective and accountable P-13 governance. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Comprehensive statewide K-12 accountability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Closing achievement gap.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Strategic oversight of the K-12 system. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Five: Career and college readiness for all students. <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Relevant To Board Roles:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Oversight <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating
Policy Considerations / Key Questions:	How can the professional development needs of Washington educators to implement TPEP and Common Core be addressed by the Legislature in upcoming budgets?	
Possible Board Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt <input type="checkbox"/> Approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other - Discuss	
Materials Included in Packet:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Graphs / Graphics <input type="checkbox"/> Third-Party Materials <input type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint	
Synopsis:	<p>Board members will discuss the current status of TPEP implementation in the context of the professional development needs of Washington state educators.</p> <p>Dr. Helene Paroff, Assistant Director at WASA for Professional Development, will update the Board on the status of TPEP implementation in ESD 101 region (reflecting her recent role as ESD 101 Assistant Superintendent and TPEP coordinator) and draw policy connections between our state's work in TPEP and the implementation of Common Core State Standards.</p>	



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

Washington's 2014 State of the State Educator Survey Report: Summary of Key Findings

Bo Zhu

Nick Yoder, Ph.D.

Jessica Giffin

Chris Brandt, Ph.D.

June 2014

Executive Summary

With the implementation of the new teacher and principal evaluation systems and the Common Core State Standards in 2013–14, educators in the state of Washington are experiencing significant change. These two new initiatives are spearheaded by the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and supported by the Washington Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project (WA TPEP) steering committee¹ and the education service districts (ESDs) in the state. OSPI partnered with American Institutes for Research (AIR) to survey the readiness, supports, needs, expectations, and concerns of all educators in the state as they relate to the two initiatives. Survey results are intended to help Washington stakeholders better understand the current state of educator evaluation across Washington’s 295 districts and to strategize how best to support districts’ implementation of these new policies.

Between February and March 2014, teachers, principals, district leaders (i.e., superintendents, assistant superintendents, and central office staff), and school directors² were invited to complete a brief survey about their districts’ educator evaluation systems and Common Core State Standards implementation. A total of 7,051 responses were collected from educators on such topics as understanding, communication, supports needed, and results of the evaluation systems as well as the requirements of the new Common Core.

Key Findings

The following key findings emerged from the survey:

- The majority of responding teachers were very familiar or somewhat familiar with the state of Washington’s revised requirements for evaluating teachers (Senate Bill 5895).
 - Of the teachers surveyed, 21.9 percent still stated that they were vaguely familiar or not at all familiar with the revised requirements of evaluating teachers.
 - Teachers varied in their understanding of the components of the teacher evaluation system. For example, 75.9 percent of responding teachers understood the instructional framework; however, only 55.9 percent of responding teachers understood the revised summative rating process.
- The majority of responding principals and district leaders understood the various components of the teacher evaluation system but had varying levels of understanding of the principal evaluation system.
 - More than 80 percent of district leaders reported understanding the various components of the teacher evaluation. More than 90 percent of principals reported understanding the components of the teacher evaluation system with the exception of the summative rating process (74.3 percent) and student growth goals (70.6 percent).
 - Although the majority of principals (81.5 percent) and district leaders (88.4 percent) reported understanding the leadership framework, participants reported less familiarity with other components of the principal evaluation system, particularly the

¹ A list of organizations that compose the WA TPEP steering committee can be found in Appendix A.

² *School director* is the formal term used in Washington state for school board members.

principals. For example, only 47.6 percent of responding principals reported understanding the summative rating process.

- Many district leaders and school directors overestimate their teachers'/principals' understanding of the teacher/principal evaluation system.
 - District leaders and school directors were asked to rate how well they thought their teachers understood the various components of the evaluation system. Approximately one third of teachers did not agree with their district leaders and school directors about their level of understanding.
 - District leaders and school directors also were asked to rate how well they thought their principals understood the various components of the evaluation system. Of the responding principals, 83.4 percent agreed with their district leaders and school directors about how well they understood the leadership framework; however, only 37.3 percent of principals agreed with how other measures of principal effectiveness will be used.
- Responding principals and district leaders agreed on the most important aspects of their role as evaluators.
 - Three fourths of principals reported that their primary role as a teacher evaluator was to communicate with teachers and develop relationships with them, and three fifths of principals agreed that their primary role was to provide instructional leadership.
 - Although not all district leaders served in the capacity of principal evaluator, those who did agreed with principals about the most important aspects of their role as evaluators. Three fourths of district leaders reported that their primary role as principal evaluators was to communicate with principals and develop relationships with them, and three fifths of district leaders agreed that their primary role was to provide coaching.
- Participants reported on a wide range of perceived outcomes that could result from the implementation of the revised evaluation systems.
 - This survey was conducted half way through the first year of implementation, and approximately half of the teachers and half of the principals reported potential positive effects on their professional learning. For example, 45.5 percent of teachers and 44.5 percent of principals reported that they would receive more detailed feedback.
 - Evaluators (i.e., principals for teacher evaluation and district leaders for principal evaluation) were more optimistic about the potential effects of the revised educator evaluations. For example, the majority of responding principals and district leaders stated that the revised educator evaluation systems would have an impact on improving instructional practice and leadership practice, respectively.
- Across respondent groups, receiving more training on how student growth will be used in educator evaluations was the most commonly cited support needed to implement the evaluation systems.

- The majority of survey respondents were familiar with the Common Core State Standards; however, participants within a district often did not agree with the level of Common Core implementation in their district.
- Across respondent groups, participants agreed that they did minimal outreach to parents and community members as they transitioned to the Common Core State Standards.
- Although a small majority of participants reported that they were not familiar with the integration of educator evaluations and the Common Core State Standards, 60.6 percent of teachers reported that their instruction incorporates the Common Core and expectations that align to evaluations.

Limitations

Due to low response rates, **results should be interpreted with caution.** Results do not necessarily reflect the conditions and perceptions of respondents across the state, nor do the views of educators within a district necessarily reflect the views of all educators within that district. Results reflect the thoughts and opinions of only those who opted to complete the survey. Nevertheless, they raise some interesting points for consideration.

Recommendations

Findings from this survey resulted in a series of eight recommendations for OSPI, the ESDs, and the state legislature:

- More training for teachers from OSPI and their district is needed.
- More training for principals on the principal evaluation is needed.
- More training for school directors is needed.
- Assessment of level of understanding of teachers and principals is needed.
- Better communication on teacher and principal evaluations is needed.
- There is a need to support the culture shift in the primary role of evaluators as instructional leaders or coaches.
- Further study on the effect and outcomes of the evaluation system is needed.
- There is a need to develop additional trainings and resources on the Common Core State Standards and on making connections between the Common Core and educator evaluations.

More detailed descriptions of each of these recommendations can be found on page 42.