

# Idaho State Department of Education

## Findings Response to the McREL Report

### Findings

- Finding #1: 34 percent of the evaluations did not include summative ratings but instead provided individual classroom observations.
  - This finding supports that additional training needs to occur regarding the difference between a classroom observation and an evaluation. The following definitions were written by the Professional Evaluation Review Committee (PERC) – the committee that provided the recommendations for the independent review of teacher evaluations.
    - **Observation** is the examination of one teaching episode. The observer documents what was seen during the teaching episode.
    - **Evaluation** is the determination of performance over a period of time. It includes multiple measures in order to make a determination of overall performance.
- Finding #2: 64 percent of evaluations included data from one observation, only 39 percent included data from a second observation.
  - This finding is about whether the form provided evidence of both observations. That does not necessarily indicate that the LEA did not include the documented observations. IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.07 does not require that the documented observations be included in the personnel file, only the evaluation.
- Finding #3: Reporting practices varied in that some evaluations included narrative only, while others used rubrics and ratings. When the Danielson Framework was used, it was often the case that components were omitted, added, and/or reworded from the Danielson Framework rubric adopted by the SDE.
  - IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.01 “Each district evaluation model shall be aligned to the state minimum standards that are based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching Second Edition domains and components of instruction.”
  - The rule states the evaluation needs to be “based” on the Charlotte Danielson Framework, it does not indicate that the evaluation needs to be the exact Danielson Framework. This allows the LEA’s flexibility in developing evaluation models that are based on the Danielson Framework.
- Finding #4: Reviewers found that most evaluations did not contain an IPLP or goals of any kind (55 percent). Of those evaluations that did include an IPLP, most included either one (44 percent) or two (33 percent) goals.
  - The IPLP was not required in Idaho Code for the 2014-2015 school year. Idaho Code required it beginning July 1, 2015 with House Bill 296 – Career Ladder.
- Finding #5: Reviewers also noted that most (61 percent) of the goals were aligned to the Danielson Framework.
  - The IPLP was not required in Idaho Code for the 2014-2015 school year. Idaho Code required it beginning July 1, 2015 with House Bill 296 – Career Ladder.

- Finding #6: Of the 142 evaluations that included a first observation, 83 percent were based on the Danielson Framework; however only 19 percent of those included all 22 components
  - This finding supports that additional training needs to occur regarding the difference between a classroom observation and an evaluation (See response to Finding #1 above).
- Finding #7: Of the 88 evaluations that included a second observation, 75 percent used the Danielson Framework; however only 26 percent of those included all 22 components.
  - This finding supports that additional training needs to occur regarding the difference between a classroom observation and an evaluation (See response to Finding #1 above).
- Finding #8: The 149 evaluations that included a summative form showed more consistent use of the Danielson Framework – 80 percent used the Danielson Framework, 94 percent of which included all 22 components.
  - IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.01 “Each district evaluation model shall be aligned to the state minimum standards that are based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching Second Edition domains and components of instruction.”
  - The rule states the evaluation needs to be “based” on the Charlotte Danielson Framework, it does not indicate that the evaluation needs to be the exact Danielson Framework. This allows the LEA’s flexibility in developing evaluation models that are based on the Danielson Framework.
- Finding #9: The majority (61 percent) of evaluations that included a summative form provided evidence of a 67/33 percent weighting of professional practice and student achievement.
  - This finding is about whether the summative form provided evidence of the 67/33 percent weighting. If the evidence of weighting was not included on the summative form, that does not necessarily indicate that the LEA did not utilize the 67/33 percent weighting.
- Finding #10: Reviewers also found that most (72 percent) of the summative forms included the performance scale of *Unsatisfactory*, *Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Distinguished*. In general, teachers were rated highly on summary rating forms, with most (between 69 and 88 percent) receiving a score of *Proficient* across the 22 components. Further, the average total score on the summary forms was a score of 3 or *Proficient*.
  - IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.05 subsection (n) requires a “minimum of three (3) rankings”: *Unsatisfactory*, *Basic*, and *Proficient*. It is up to the LEA to determine whether they want to include *Distinguished*.
  - It is important to note, according to Charlotte Danielson, “performance at the *Unsatisfactory* level represents teaching that is below the licensing standard of “do not harm.” For example, students are treated with sarcasm or put-downs (Component 2a), the environment is chaotic (Component 2c), or learning is shut down (Component 3c).” (Page 39, *Enhancing Professional Practice – A Framework for Teaching 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*, by Charlotte Danielson).
- Finding #11: For evaluations that included student measures, reviewers found that the category of “other” measures (those that did not fall into the SDE list of possible measures) were most frequently used – examples include student survey data and student attendance. The second most frequently used measure was the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT). Reviewers also found over half of the evaluations contained no policy information (57 percent).

- The list of student measures was not required in Idaho Code for the 2014-2015 school year. Idaho Code required it beginning July 1, 2015 with House Bill 296 – Career Ladder.
- Finding #12: only three (1 percent) of 225 evaluations contained all of the following criteria prescribed by SDE:
  - Two observation time points
    - IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.07 does not require that the documented observations be included in the personnel file, only the evaluation.
  - Summary rating based on all 22 Danielson Framework components
  - Use of the Danielson Framework rating scale (Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished)
    - IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.01 “Each district evaluation model shall be aligned to the state minimum standards that are based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching Second Edition domains and components of instruction.”
    - The rule states the evaluation needs to be “based” on the Charlotte Danielson Framework, it does not indicate that the evaluation needs to be the exact Danielson Framework. This allows the LEA’s flexibility in developing evaluation models that are based on the Danielson Framework.
    - The rule does not require the use of the Danielson Framework rating scale.
  - Summative rating weighting of 67 percent professional practice and 33 percent student achievement
    - The summative form may not have provided evidence of the 67/33 percent weighting. That does not necessarily indicate that the LEA did not utilize the 67/33 percent weighting.
  - An overall summary rating score
  - A completion date of May 1st or earlier

The list above includes six (6) criteria, of which 3 of the 6 were not required by law at the time the 2014-2015 evaluations were conducted. As a result, it would be appropriate and expected that districts would not meet all of these requirements.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- Three main ideas:
  - Educating stakeholders on the difference between evaluation and observation.
    - **Observation** is the examination of one teaching episode. The observer documents what was seen during the teaching episode.
    - **Evaluation** is the determination of performance over a period of time. It includes multiple measures in order to make a determination of overall performance.
  - Complete another desk review on 2015-2016 evaluations. The findings and recommendations in this report were based on criteria that was not required for the 2014-2015 teacher evaluations. Idaho Code required it beginning July 1, 2015 with House Bill 296 – Career Ladder.

- Provide support and training for districts on an evaluation process. The Danielson Framework is the tool; it does not include an evaluation process. There is a difference between evaluation and observation (see the definitions of observation and evaluation under the response to Finding #1).
  - **The training funded and provided by the state was on observation, not evaluation.**
  
- Need for greater focus on consistency and adherence to key components of the evaluation system. Inconsistent implementation suggests that some districts either selected not to follow the prescribed process or lacked sufficient understanding of the system.
- Align the process of teacher evaluation to relevant policies at the state and district level to eliminate any potential conflict among policy, process, practices and procedures used to support and evaluate teachers.
- Annually communicate to all teachers, teacher supervisors, and central office leaders the teacher evaluation process. Be specific and detailed about the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in order to maximize the benefit.
- Be sure that all teachers, supervisors and professional development staff are clear on the expectations for using and how to use the teacher evaluation rubric.
- Provide all districts with a definition of educator effectiveness that includes exactly what is expected and what measures may be used to determine an overall teacher performance score.
- Be clear about the purpose of goal setting, and determine exactly how goal attainment may be used as part of the overall evaluation of teachers.
  - IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120.01 “Each district evaluation model shall be aligned to the state minimum standards that are based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching Second Edition domains and components of instruction.”
  - The rule states the evaluation needs to be “based” on the Charlotte Danielson Framework, it does not indicate that the evaluation needs to be the exact Danielson Framework. This allows the LEA’s flexibility in developing evaluation models that are based on the Danielson Framework.
  - This recommendation suggests the possible need to define the key components of the evaluation system or process in order for districts to be able to implement consistently.
  - Framework is the tool; it does not include an evaluation process. There is a difference between evaluation and observation (see the definitions of observation and evaluation under the response to Finding #1).
    - **The training funded and provided by the state was on observation, not evaluation.**
  
- Ensure that all teachers, teacher supervisors, and central office leaders receive training on the process.
- Focus efforts on improving fidelity of performance monitoring. Questions still exist as to whether teacher supervisors know and understand what to look for and how to provide feedback to teachers based on the teacher evaluation process.
- Identify opportunities to train teachers, supervisors, and professional development staff to connect evaluation protocols to the adopted models of teacher practice.

- Provide support and training for districts on an evaluation process. The Danielson Framework is the tool; it does not include an evaluation process. There is a difference between evaluation and observation (see the definitions of observation and evaluation under the response to Finding #1).
  - **The training funded and provided by the state was on observation, not evaluation.**
- Monitor and track adherence to the process to ensure consistent application.
  - Complete another desk review on 2015-2016 evaluations. The findings and recommendations in this report were based on criteria that was not required for the 2014-2015 teacher evaluations. Idaho Code required it beginning July 1, 2015 with House Bill 296 – Career Ladder.