Teacher Evaluation Training, AB

Agency: 350 Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Budget Period: 2013-15

Recommendation Summary Text:

Superintendent requests $30,215,000 to train every teacher in the new evaluation system. During the 2010 legislative session, E2SSB 6696 created a new teacher evaluation system to be implemented across the state. The goal of the new evaluation system is to improve teaching in the classroom and ultimately increase student achievement. In the 2012 session, the legislature took a positive first step in supporting the system by requiring and funding support for principal and administrator training. However, in order to truly reap the payoffs of the new evaluation system, teachers must also be included in the training. Our K-12 system will reach its ultimate goal when there is widespread teacher ownership of the new evaluation system.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures		FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
General Fund	001-01	$25,169,000	$5,046,000	$30,215,000
Total Cost		**$25,169,000**	**$5,046,000**	**$30,215,000**

Staffing	FY 2014	FY 2015	Annual Avg.
Total FTEs Requested	0.0	0.0	0.0

Package Description

Background

The prototypical school funding formula provides approximately one building administrator to 19 school building staff. This span of control does not provide a lot of time for teachers and principals to share a common understanding for performance expectations in the new evaluation system. The new evaluation system provides the opportunity for communicating and holding all educators to clear expectations. 16 school districts piloted the new evaluation system in the 2011-12 school year. Both principals and teachers received training in the system. As a result, principals reported that the 15-20 hours of time spent on each comprehensive evaluation was well spent because there was a mutual understanding of the process. However, teachers in districts outside of the pilots are not being trained on the instructional framework that defines the expectations, the evaluation criteria or required evidence. Unlike other professions where the evaluation system entails a form being filled out by a supervisor, the teacher evaluation system requires demonstration of performance through evidence such as teacher practice, student test scores, student portfolios, and other artifacts.

Current Situation

The teacher evaluation system is built on three approved instructional frameworks, which define effective teaching. Current proviso funding provides every principal in the state access to two days of training on the instructional framework. In addition, the current Regional

Teacher Evaluation Training, AB

Implementation Grantees (RIG) districts have access to up to 30 hours of rater agreement training to increase the quality evaluations based on guidance from the framework authors. Over 900 principals received the 2-day training in August 2012 and will continue with the 30 hours this school year.

District superintendents and principals with the responsibility of evaluating their assistant principals also have access to three days of training and four additional days of coaching on the leadership framework that informs the principal evaluation system. Over 300 administrators were trained in August 2012.

There is no statewide plan or funding to support teacher learning of the new evaluation system. The research done during the TPEP pilot and best practice in education points to an urgent need to have everyone directly affected by the new evaluation system understanding the immediate and long-term facets of the system. In addition, as school districts adopt an implementation schedule so that all teachers are evaluated by the 2015-16 school year, teachers will need more in depth training as they transition to the comprehensive evaluation system.

Proposed Solution
Superintendent Dorn requests the funds necessary to offer eight hours of training to every teacher in the state. The training will include the following:
- 2 hours spent understanding the instructional framework that defines the expectations for effective teaching.
- 1 hour understanding how the instructional frameworks fits within the state evaluation criteria.
- 3 hours understanding the evaluation tool and evidence required to demonstrate effectiveness, including an introduction to the state's student growth rubrics.
- 2 hours understanding the four levels of performance and the evidence that defines each level.

In addition, Superintendent Dorn requests funding to train a small team of staff from each of the 295 districts on the use of student growth measures. The goal of those trainings will be for the teams to be able to go back to their districts and train their staff on the student growth measures to be used in the teacher evaluation system. The assumption is that districts will provide an additional three hours of training for one-third of teachers every year of implementation.

Contact person
Michaela Miller - (360) 725-6116

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?
There are three specific results that will be achieved by implementing this package:

Teacher Evaluation Training, AB

1. Shared Standards of Practice
   In order to set high expectations of the new evaluation system for all educators; all educators must know the expectations. By providing initial training on the new evaluation systems, both teachers and principals have a shared understanding and can move more efficiently into full implementation of the new systems.

2. Build on Existing Collaborative Structures
   The TPEP system up to this point has relied heavily on the collaborative state and district level approach. In order to build upon this collegiality and trust, we must not leave even one person behind. Providing this training to teachers will ensure everyone is included and the targets are clear for expectations in the new professional growth and evaluation system.

3. Accountability through Transparency
   In order to hold individuals or groups accountable for student learning, the targets must be transparent and understood by all educators that impact our students. By implementing this package, trust in the new system will grow and educators will find themselves collectively responsible for student learning. Principals and teachers are uniquely positioned to have a significant impact on student learning, however they are not the sole factors. District leaders, principals and teachers *must* be afforded the opportunity over the implementation years to analyze the accountability aspects of the new evaluation system and transparently report those results.

Performance Measure Detail

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation provided resources and support to study the impact of our evaluation system specifically focused on the new eVAL management system and student growth. The research project will continue through the three years of the teacher and principal evaluation implementation. OSPI will look at both qualitative and quantitative aspects of our system and embed that learning in the training provided to teachers, principals (in the existing funds) and district teams.

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?
Superintendent Dorn supports high quality teaching that increases student achievement.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?
This package supports the Governor's priority to improve student achievement.

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?
The new teacher evaluation system has the potential to dramatically increase student achievement and the lives of Washington's students.

Teacher Evaluation Training, AB

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?
OSPI has worked closely with the TPEP steering committee organizations (WEA, AWSP, WASA, WSPTA, WSSDA) and have discussed this potential package with them. They are supportive of the efforts to include everyone in the training of the new evaluation systems.

In addition, key members of our steering committee have been meeting with stakeholder groups (League of Education Voters, Partnership for Learning, and Stand for Children) over the past two years and recently met with them about this and other issues related to implementation. They too are supportive of these efforts to train teachers and district teams around the frameworks and student growth measures.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?
OSPI continues to develop online training modules for teachers. However, the instructional framework authors will not allow their entire training package to be openly shared on the Internet. Therefore, it is necessary to provide face-to-face training with teachers and supported as best practice from research on the learning progression.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?
Beginning with the 2015-16 school year, ESSB 5895 requires that the evaluation be used in making personnel decisions. Due to the fact that the evaluation system will be tied to work assignment, reductions in force and other decisions in the future, there is a potential for litigation if teachers are not properly trained.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?
None.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?
No changes to existing statutes or rules would be required.

Expenditure Calculations and Assumptions

It is assumed that 80% of the teachers will participate in the teacher evaluation training in August 2013; approximately 54,000 individuals. OSPI will reimburse school districts $300 per teacher that attends the training for their salary, benefits and travel costs at an estimated cost of $15.958 million. $3.508 million is necessary to train the trainers and cover the meeting costs for the 54,000 teachers.

For the student growth teams, it is assumed that districts will receive, on average, $8,000 in FY14 and $4,000 in FY15 and FY16 to send a small team of staff to a two-day training in FY14 and one-day trainings in FY15 and FY16. The total district grant amount is $2.36 million in FY14 and $1.180 in FY15 and FY16. $1.113 million in FY14 and $326,000 in FY15 and FY16 are necessary to train the trainers and cover the costs for the meetings. In addition, districts will receive $115 per teacher for participation in the student growth trainings at the district level. It

Teacher Evaluation Training, AB

is assumed that one-third of teachers will participate in the training each year until full implementation in 2015-16 for a total cost of $2,549,000 each fiscal year.

It is assumed that 2,350 new teachers will receive the 11 hours of teacher evaluation training at an estimated cost of $1.151 million per year ongoing.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?
The majority of the training costs are one-time; ongoing costs are necessary to provide 11 hours of training to new teachers each year. Once the legislature funds mentors, instructional coaches and professional development statewide, the costs for training of new teachers could be covered through these new investments.

Object Detail

		FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
A	Salary and Wages	$0	$0	$0
B	Employee Benefits	$0	$0	$0
C	Contracts	$2,686,000	$214,000	$2,900,000
E	Goods/Services	$0	$0	$0
G	Travel	$1,617,000	$128,000	$1,745,000
J	Equipment	$0	$0	$0
N	Grants	$20,866,000	$4,704,000	$25,570,000
	Interagency Reimbursement	$0	$0	$0
	Other	$0	$0	$0
	Total Objects	**$25,169,000**	**$5,046,000**	**$30,215,000**

Expenditures & FTEs by Program

Activity Inventory Item	Prog	Operating Expenditures		
		FY 2014	FY 2015	Total
A020 Professional Development	055	$25,169,000	$5,046,000	$30,215,000
Total Activities		**$25,169,000**	**$5,046,000**	**$30,215,000**

Six-Year Expenditure Estimates

Fund	13-15 Total	15-17 Total	17-19 Total
General Fund-State	$30,215,000	$6,197,000	$2,302,000
Expenditure Total	**$30,215,000**	**$6,197,000**	**$2,302,000**
FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0