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Introduction

1.1 The Purpose of Educator Effectiveness

Research consistently identifies effective teaching and instructional leadership as the most important school-based factors impacting student learning. Every child in every community deserves excellent classroom teachers and building leaders. Every educator deserves a specific, individualized roadmap to help move his or her students and professional practice from point A to point B. The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System serves as that roadmap. The System improves teacher and principal evaluation systems to provide educators with more meaningful feedback and support so they can achieve maximum results with students. In short, Wisconsin created the Educator Effectiveness System to improve support, practice, and outcomes.

The EE System was designed by and for Wisconsin educators to evaluate teachers and principals through a fair, valid, reliable, and manageable process using multiple measures across two main areas: educator practice and student outcomes.

Benefits to Teachers and Students

The new evaluation system provides teachers with ongoing feedback and meaningful information about how their practice impacts student learning.

- Teachers coach and mentor each other based on identified strengths and growth opportunities, giving educators more control over their professional growth.
- The EE System acknowledges the critical role educators play, and provides the opportunity to reflect on and refine practice to continually meet student needs.
- Evaluators complete rigorous observation training before evaluating teachers and collecting evidence aligned to a specific rubric. This minimizes evaluator subjectivity and bias.

Several Wisconsin educators who are experts in improving student learning helped shape the new System by serving on workgroups, providing feedback, and participating in pilot efforts.

Pilot Feedback and Continuous Improvement

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has committed to developing an EE System that educators consider appropriate, meaningful, and informative. As such, DPI also committed to collecting ongoing feedback and evaluating System impact through an external evaluator following Full Implementation in order to continuously improve and refine the System.
As Figure 1 illustrates, Wisconsin DPI spent one year (2011-12) developing the EE System with educators and two years (2012-14) collecting educator feedback through pilot-tests of the EE System. As the figure indicates, DPI will continue collecting feedback to improve the System even after implementation begins. More information on the EE System is available at [http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/](http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/). More information on how pilot feedback has informed the EE System is available in the Feedback and System Evaluation section on the DPI website.

### Continuous Improvement

#### 1.2 Mandated Educators and Frequency of Evaluation

**Mandated Educators**

2011 WI Act 166 mandates all public school districts and 2R charter schools to use the new WI EE System to evaluate all principals and teachers beginning in 2014-15. DPI recognizes that educator roles may look different in various local contexts. Based on their locally determined job responsibilities, the EE System, as it is currently designed, may not appropriately evaluate some educator roles. DPI created a [Flowchart](http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/) to help districts identify which educators the System will appropriately evaluate and provide meaningful and informative feedback.

**Defining “Teacher”**

The Department of Public Instruction recognizes that teacher roles may look different in various local contexts. “Teacher,” for the purposes of the WI EE System, means any employee engaged in the exercise of any educational function for compensation in the public schools, including charter schools established under s. 118.40, whose **primary** responsibilities include **all** of the following: managing a classroom environment and planning for, delivering, and assessing student instruction over time.

**Frequency of Evaluation**

Act 166 and implementation of the EE System have not changed the frequency of required evaluations; only the evaluation process. Per state law (PI. 8), districts
must evaluate teachers and principals using the EE System at least during the educator’s first year of employment and every third year thereafter, which DPI refers to as completing the Effectiveness Cycle. Districts may choose to evaluate more frequently. DPI refers to these summative evaluation years as Summary Years, other years as Supporting Years, and the combination of Summary and Supporting (if applicable) as an Effectiveness Cycle. This process manual focuses on the evaluation activities required during a Summary Year. While Summary Years and Supporting Years are similar in many ways, this manual notes activities that are required only in Summary Years. (Note: DPI has received feedback and decided to use “Summary Year” as a less evaluative term, rather than “Summative” or “Rating Year” beginning in 2014-15 and beyond).

1.3 New Technology to Simplify Evaluations

DPI contracted with Teachscape© to develop an online evaluation/observation and management system to support the local implementation of the EE System. Teachers and their evaluators will use the Teachscape software for training to understand the Framework for Teaching, certification of evaluators of teachers, evaluation planning, data storage, and ratings of performance. Teachers and evaluators will complete all Educator Effectiveness activities discussed in this manual within Teachscape. DPI will incorporate in-depth training explaining how to use Teachscape to support implementation of the EE System within the Step 4 Deep Dive training modules. Teachers and their evaluators will have access to the following Teachscape components:

- **Focus**—Preparation and Training for Observers and Educators
- **Reflect**—Observation and Evaluation Management System
- **Learn**—Comprehensive Professional Learning System

For additional information about Teachscape, click here for the Teachscape Information Brief.

1.4 Educator Effectiveness System Training

**DPI Required Training**

DPI created a training plan to prepare educators for EE System implementation. Educators using the DPI EE model must complete system training components relevant to their role. The four-step training plan developed by DPI is shown on the following page.
**Step 1** is a short orientation video released in mid-October 2013 intended for anyone impacted by the EE System. **Step 2** is an online overview module required for all teachers, principals, and their evaluators. **Step 3** is face-to-face training for evaluators of teachers and principals on how EE is implemented and supported by school districts and DPI. Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) will facilitate this face-to-face training, or districts can access it online and deliver it directly. **Step 4** is a series of three self-guided online modules that dive deeply into the EE process, including how to enter data into Teachscape.

DPI will release these role-specific modules throughout the course of the 2014-15 school year for superintendents, principals, and teachers: one at the beginning, one during the middle, and one at the end.

DPI contracted with CESAs to provide regional EE support. The CESAs identified EE Implementation Coaches (ICs) who can provide training, support to districts implementing EE, and answer questions about the system. Milwaukee, Racine, Green Bay, Madison, and Kenosha, as large urban school districts, also have implementation coaches, who have received DPI system training and Teachscape training, and are in regular contact with DPI. Districts should contact their local CESA directly to learn about available support options.
**Teachscape Training**
All evaluators of teachers must complete comprehensive online training and pass a rigorous evaluator assessment in Teachscape before evaluating teachers in 2014-15. Evaluators of principals do not need to complete this Teachscape training, as their training is included in the DPI-required four-step implementation training plan.

**Additional Training Materials**
DPI created a [Professional Learning on Demand library](#) of online training materials that districts and educators can access voluntarily. Resources will continue to be added. Currently the library includes:

- Training on the use of Student/School Learning Objectives (SLOs), available through the [SLO Toolkit](#) and [Repository of SLO Examples](#);
- Training for coaches and evaluators, available through the [Coaching Conversations Toolkit](#); and
- Training on [Creating SMART SLOs](#).
Overview of the Teacher Evaluation Process

This section of the manual focuses on the teacher evaluation process, specifically:

- An overview and a summary of the main roles and responsibilities of participants;
- A description of the Framework for Teaching, which educators will use to assess and help guide teacher professional practice;
- An overview of the Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP), which includes guidance on developing a professional practice goal (PPG) and an SLO; and
- An overview of value-added assessment data and additional student growth measures.

2.1 Overview of Teacher Evaluation Process, Roles, and Responsibilities

The cyclical teacher evaluation process guides performance management and growth. Figure 3 identifies components of the Summary Year cycle. First, principals facilitate an orientation to the system for those in a Summary Year. Next, educators and their evaluators set an SLO and PPG. At the Planning Session, the teacher and their evaluator discuss goals, and schedule observations and evidence collection. A mid-year (or mid-interval in the case of shorter SLO goal intervals) review meeting between the teacher and his or her evaluator provides an opportunity for feedback and revisions to the goal, student populations, or other variables (as necessary). Following additional evidence collection and opportunities for feedback until the end of the year or goal interval, the evaluator reviews the data, develops scores, and discusses results in a End of Cycle Summary Conference. Section III: Steps in the Teacher Evaluation Process describes each step in the evaluation process.
Teachers develop EEPs in both Summary and Supporting Years within Teachscape. During Summary Years, the teacher completes a Self-Review within Teachscape before developing the EEP.

Educators, their evaluators, effectiveness coaches, and other personnel each have different roles and responsibilities within the process. The following sections summarize the roles and responsibilities for each.

The following lists identify key responsibilities of teachers and evaluators as they relate to the teacher evaluation process, including possible roles for individuals supporting the teacher Effectiveness Cycle.

**Teacher Responsibilities**

Teachers play an important role in their own evaluations. As such, they must understand the EE System and the tools used within the System to evaluate practice. Teachers will complete all of the following steps within Teachscape. Teachers will:

- Attend the orientation meeting before beginning the Summary Year. Teachers in their Summary Year will need to be updated on any system changes or requirements. This can be done in the Planning Session, through written communications, and/or using updated DPI online training modules;
- Complete all required system training modules;
- Reflect on practice, review the *Framework for Teaching*, and complete the Self Review in Teachscape prior to the Planning Session in the Summary Year.
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- Develop an EEP in Teachscape that includes an SLO PPG, and professional growth strategies and support needed to achieve those goals.
  - Review student data and create an SLO using the SLO plan section of the EEP.
  - Based on the Self-Review of Performance and SLO, identify at least one PPG. Districts may create more than one PPG and/or SLO;
- Submit, through Teachscape, the EEP to the evaluator prior to the Planning Session;
- Meet with an evaluator for the Planning Session;
- Complete the pre-observation documentation in Teachscape in preparation for the announced observation;
- Complete the post-observation documentation in Teachscape after the announced observation;
- Plan to gather artifacts that document teacher practice evidence. Provide the evaluator with evidence before the Mid-Year (Mid-Interval) Review by uploading evidence to Teachscape;
- Prepare for the Mid-Year (Mid-Interval) Review by completing the EEP mid-interval progress update in Teachscape;
- Meet with an evaluator for the Mid-Year (Mid-Interval) Review;
- Prepare for the End of Cycle Summary Conference; self score SLOs, and submit final evidence and the EEP end-of-interval progress update in Teachscape;
- Meet with an evaluator for the End of Cycle Summary Conference;
- Use Summary results to inform performance goals and professional development planning for the following year; and
- Sign-off on final scores within Teachscape.

Evaluator Responsibilities
The evaluator should serve as an instructional coach. This role requires objectively evaluating the current professional practice of the teacher and providing valuable, respectful, feedback to inform professional growth. An evaluator MUST hold an active administrator license, as required within PI 34. Teacher evaluators will:

- Via the Teachscape system, complete the evaluator training and become certified as an evaluator in the process for the evaluation of teacher professional practice.
• Schedule and facilitate the orientation for teachers in a Summary Year, discuss evaluation policy and procedures, and provide necessary forms to those in a Summary Year.*

• Use Teachscape to prepare for and schedule the Planning Session.

• Facilitate the Planning Session using the EEP.

• Complete a minimum of one announced observation of 45 minutes or two announced, 20-minute observations. Document observation evidence within Teachscape.

• Complete a minimum of one pre-observation conference and one post-observation conference with the teacher.

• Complete three-to-five unannounced informal mini-observations of about 15-20 minutes and document observation evidence within Teachscape.*

• Provide written or verbal formative feedback within one week of the observations.

• Monitor the teacher’s data collection throughout the year.*

• Use Teachscape to prepare for and schedule the Mid-Year (Mid-Interval) Review.

• Facilitate the Mid-Year Review using the EEP mid-interval progress update completed in Teachscape by the teacher.

• Assign professional practice scores and the SLO holistic score and document in Teachscape prior to the End of Cycle Summary Conference.

• Use Teachscape to schedule the End of Cycle Summary Conference.*

• Facilitate the End of Cycle Summary Conference.

• Submit holistic SLO score and professional practice scores in Teachscape.

* An Effectiveness Coach, described next, could assist with these steps.

Teacher Effectiveness Coach Role
The EE Design Team recommended the EE System include a mentor role to support ongoing formative feedback and help improve instructional practice. Accordingly, DPI included the Effectiveness Coach, an optional role, as part of the EE System. Districts may choose to designate an Effectiveness Coach to assist with formative and/or summative feedback.

DPI intentionally has not defined specific responsibilities for this optional role in order to allow districts to determine roles best suited for their particular contexts. DPI collected feedback during the pilot years to capture examples of how
districts have utilized the role. Effectiveness Coaches carried out duties ranging from instructional coaching to data support to the local coordination of the EE System. Educators holding a variety of positions have served as Effectiveness Coaches, including district curriculum directors, associate principals, CESA personnel, literacy and other content specialists, classroom teachers, and building administrators. DPI has created a Coaching Conversations to Support Educator Effectiveness toolkit to support those individuals whose role is coaching educators in the EE process.

Possible Roles for Effectiveness Coach include:

- **Support the evaluation of professional practice:**
  - Guide teachers through the evaluation processes;
  - Help develop PPGs;
  - Help define instructional strategies used to achieve goals;
  - Observe teacher practice and provide formative feedback (an effectiveness coach can contribute to a teacher’s practice and/or outcomes summary IF district principals agree AND the effectiveness coach holds a current, active administrative license as described above);
  - Observe teacher practice to collect evidence and align it to Danielson Framework for Teaching components (IF the Coach has passed Teachscape Focus certification);
  - Engage in discussions of practice; and
  - Guide teachers to professional development opportunities and other resources.

- **Support the SLO component:**
  - Help teachers access and interpret data;
  - Support teachers in writing and refining SLOs; and
  - Provide formative feedback on strategies used to achieve goals.

- **Coordinate building or district implementation:**
  - Participate in communication activities to raise awareness and improve understanding of the EE System;
  - Coordinate meetings, observations, documentation, and other aspects of implementing the System to keep processes on track and implemented as designed; and
  - Serve as a resource supporting principal or teacher understanding of policies and processes of the System.
• Facilitate EE Data:
  – Keep educators informed on aspects of student achievement data, including the nature and timing of data available, how to interpret and use data, the release schedules for types of data, etc.

Throughout this manual, specific examples are provided regarding how Effectiveness Coaches can support the teacher evaluation process. For additional information about the role of the Effectiveness Coach, see the Effectiveness Coach Information Brief.

2.2 Overview of the Framework for Teaching

Within the EE System, evaluators will use Charlotte Danielson’s 2013 Framework for Teaching, a research-based model designed to assess and support effective instructional practices.

The Framework for Teaching is organized into four domains and 22 components (see Figure 4). While evaluators can typically only observe Domains 2 and 3 during classroom lessons, teachers and evaluators need to collect multiple evidence sources within Teachscape for all components across all four domains. The Framework for Teaching provides complete descriptions of the domains and components, as well as indicators and descriptions of performance levels, and can be downloaded at http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/teacher/teacher-practice-evaluation. The following sections briefly describe the four domains.

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Domain 1 defines how a teacher organizes the content that the students are to learn (i.e. how a teacher designs instruction). All elements of the instructional design—learning activities, materials, assessments, and strategies—should be appropriate to both the content and the learners. The components of Domain 1 are demonstrated through the plans that teachers prepare to guide their teaching. The plan’s effects are observable through actions in the classroom.

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

This domain speaks to the non-instructional interactions that occur in the classroom. Activities and tasks that establish a respectful classroom environment
and a culture for learning are part of this domain. The atmosphere is businesslike; routines and procedures are handled efficiently. Student behavior is cooperative and non-disruptive, and the physical environment supports instruction. The components of Domain 2 are demonstrated through classroom interaction and are observable.

**Domain 3: Instruction**

Domain 3 encompasses the instructional strategies used to engage students in the content. These components represent distinct elements of instruction. Students are engaged in meaningful work that is important to students as well as teachers. Like Domain 2, the components of Domain 3 are demonstrated through teacher classroom interaction and are observable.

**Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities**

Professional Responsibilities describes the teacher’s role outside the classroom. These roles include professional responsibilities such as self-reflection and professional growth, in addition to contributions made to the school, the district, and to the profession as a whole. The components in Domain 4 are demonstrated through classroom records, professional development activities, and teacher interactions with colleagues, families, and the community.

**Figure 4: Framework for Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Domain 2: Classroom Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</td>
<td>2a Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</td>
<td>2b Establishing a Culture for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c Setting Instructional Outcomes</td>
<td>2c Managing Classroom Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</td>
<td>2d Managing Student Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e Designing Coherent Instruction</td>
<td>2e Organizing Physical Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f Designing Student Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</th>
<th>Domain 3: Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td>3a Communicating With Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b Maintaining Accurate Records</td>
<td>3b Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c Communicating with Families</td>
<td>3c Engaging Students in Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d Participating in a Professional Community</td>
<td>3d Using Assessment in Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e Growing and Developing Professionally</td>
<td>3e Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f Showing Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators and teachers will collect evidence of teaching practice related to Framework components from classroom observations and artifacts such as student work samples, logs of parent communications, and conversations about practice. Appendix A lists additional sample evidence sources for each component. Evaluators and teachers will collect and upload evidence of teaching practice related to the components of the Framework for Teaching within the Teachscape System.
The *Framework for Teaching* defines four levels of performance for each component. The levels of performance describe the qualities of a teacher’s observed **teaching practice** (not the qualities of the teacher as a person). *Figure 5* defines the levels of performance within the *Framework for Teaching*.

**Figure 5: Teacher Practice Levels of Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory  (Level 1)</th>
<th>Basic (Level 2)</th>
<th>Proficient (Level 3)</th>
<th>Distinguished (Level 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refers to teaching that does not convey understanding of the</td>
<td>Refers to teaching that has the necessary knowledge</td>
<td>Refers to successful, professional practice.</td>
<td>Refers to professional teaching that involves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts underlying the component. This level of performance</td>
<td>and skills to be effective, but its application is</td>
<td>The teacher consistently teaches at a proficient</td>
<td>students in innovative learning processes and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is doing harm in the classroom.</td>
<td>inconsistent (perhaps due to recently entering the</td>
<td>level. It would be expected that most experienced</td>
<td>creates a true community of learners. Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>profession or recently transitioning to a new</td>
<td>teachers would frequently perform at this level.</td>
<td>performing at this level are master teachers and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum, grade level, or subject).</td>
<td></td>
<td>leaders in the field, both inside and outside of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers typically demonstrate varying degrees of proficiency across the components. **This variation is expected.** While teachers likely expect perfection, no one teacher can perform at the highest levels at all times. New teachers may perform at the **Basic** level some of the time while working toward proficiency. Experienced teachers should be practicing at the **Proficient** level for most components most of the time. Teachers may be at the **Distinguished** level on some components, while demonstrating **Proficient** practice in other areas.

*Teachscape* will not only provide teachers an understanding of the *Framework for Teaching*, but also provide an extensive video library illustrating the various levels of practice within and across components (e.g., the difference between a “Level 3,” “high 3,” and “low 3”).

*Figure 6* includes an example of the scoring rubric with descriptions of performance levels pertaining to component 1a: *Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy*, which falls under the Planning and Preparation domain.
### Figure 6: (Component 1a.) Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory (Level 1)</th>
<th>Basic (Level 2)</th>
<th>Proficient (Level 3)</th>
<th>Distinguished (Level 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students.</td>
<td>• Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another.</td>
<td>• Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts of the discipline and the way they relate to one another.</td>
<td>• Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts of the discipline and the ways they relate both to one another and to other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice show little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student’s learning of the content.</td>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice indicate some knowledge of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete.</td>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice reflect accurate knowledge of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts.</td>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice reflect knowledge of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and provide a link to necessary cognitive structures needed by students to ensure understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher shows little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student’s learning of the content.</td>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice reveal a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.</td>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of pedagogical approaches in the discipline.</td>
<td>• Teacher’s plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Overview of the Educator Effectiveness Plan: Student Learning Objectives and Professional Practice Goals

Each teacher will develop an EEP in Teachscape each year in the Effectiveness Cycle. The purpose is to focus the teacher on desired student outcome goals and then align instructional practice to achieve these goals. EEPs consist of an SLO and PPG. A screen shot of the EEP in Teachscape is included in Appendix B for reference. Figure 7 below shows the breakdown of the EE score.

**Figure 7: Teacher Stacked Bar Chart**

**Educator Practices**

- 100% of Educator Practices Summary Score
- Individual scores for each of the 22 components of the Danielson Framework for Teaching

**Student Outcomes**

- 5% of Summary
- 95% of Student Outcomes Summary Score

- Student Learning Objectives
- Schoolwide Value-Added Reading or Graduation Rate
**Student Learning Objectives**
SLOs will account for 95 percent (3.8 out of 4 points) of a teacher’s student outcomes score. SLOs are rigorous, achievable goals developed collaboratively by teachers and their evaluators based on identified student learning needs across a specified period of time (typically an academic year). Teachers will develop one SLO annually, for a minimum of one to three SLOs available as evidence towards their final SLO score in their Summary Year, depending on how many years are in their Effectiveness Cycle. An SLO Toolkit is available for additional information related to SLOs.

**Professional Practice Goal**
A PPG is a goal focused on an educator’s practice. Teachers will develop one practice-related goal annually. This goal is not scored, but serves to align an educator’s SLO to his or her professional practice. Section III will detail the development of the EEP, including the SLO and the PPG. This section also explains observations and other evidence collection, the scoring process of SLOs and scoring the components of professional practice through the year-long evaluation process.

**2.4 Overview of Value-Added and Additional Student Outcomes Measures**
Value-added assessment data will not be available for use within a teacher’s outcomes measures in 2014-15, as the necessary student-teacher linkages will not be available. When the student-teacher linkages become available (2017 at the earliest), a teacher’s outcome score will include the value-added state assessment component. For 2014-15, a teacher’s outcomes score will include: his or her SLO; and either graduation rate (for high school teachers) or school-wide reading value-added (for elementary and middle school teachers).

**Value-Added**
Value-Added is a type of student growth model that measures how much students improve from one year to the next on state standardized assessments, in comparison to similar students. Value-added models look at growth over time and take students’ prior achievement levels into account, as well as non-school factors, such as poverty, special education status, and English language proficiency. Beginning in 2017-18, teachers who teach students in grades and content areas for which consecutive years of data exist, will have teacher-level value-added calculations included as one portion of their overall outcome score (1.8 out of 4 points). For those teachers who do not have value-added scores, SLOs will continue to represent 90% of the teacher’s student outcomes score.

**Additional Outcome Measures**
One additional student outcome measure is included in a teacher’s EE Score. Value-added contributes 0.2 points for either school-wide reading scores (for most elementary and middle school teachers) or graduation rate (for high school teachers). More detailed information on how final EE Summaries are created and reported appears in Section IV. Figure 8, below, represents the breakdown of student outcome measures.
Student Outcomes

5% of Summary

95% of Student Outcomes Summary Score

- Student Learning Objectives
- Schoolwide Value-Added Reading or Graduation Rate
Steps in the Teacher Evaluation Process

This section describes the teacher evaluation process, including the evaluation of teacher practice and the SLO, which will occur over the course of a school year. Figure 9 provides an illustration of the main steps teachers take as they go through the evaluation process. These sequential steps include:

- Step 1—Teacher Evaluation System Orientation
- Step 2—Development of the EEP
- Step 3—Planning Session
- Step 4—Observations, Evidence Collection, and Ongoing Feedback
- Step 5—Mid-Year Review
- Step 6—Final Teacher Scoring
- Step 7—End of Cycle Summary Conference
- Step 8—Use of Evaluation Results to Inform Future Goals

*Supporting Year Evaluation Timeline is included in Appendix C.*
3.1 Beginning of the School Year: Orientation and Goal Setting

Step 1: Teacher Evaluation System Orientation
During the first year of implementation and annually for new teachers (new to the district and/or new to the profession), principals will facilitate a teacher orientation. This orientation familiarizes teachers with how the EE System will work in their particular school. This orientation should take place in August or September. An orientation should include the following information:

1. **Teacher Evaluation System Overview**
   a. Provide teachers with an overview of the teacher evaluation process, key components, and timelines and deadlines.
   b. Discuss the *Framework for Teaching*, number of observations, and mini-observations.
   c. Encourage teachers to explore Teachscape resources.
   d. Discuss the development of the EEP, which includes one SLO and one PPG.
   e. Discuss how teachers will access and enter information in Teachscape.
   f. Discuss any questions or concerns.

2. **Effectiveness Coach Role**
   a. Identify district/school personnel in this role.
   b. Describe how this role will support the teacher, evaluator, and evaluation processes.
   c. Provide contact information.

3. **Effectiveness Cycle Scheduling**
   a. Describe the process for scheduling Planning Sessions, observations, Mid-Year Reviews and End of Cycle Summary Conferences within Teachscape.
   b. Begin identifying dates on calendars.

Step 2: Development of the Educator Effectiveness Plan
In both Summary and Supporting Years, the teacher evaluation system requires teachers to create student growth and educator practice goals. It is highly likely that these processes already occur at the school level. If so, the EE system will not create new processes or duplicate existing processes, but should simply integrate these steps within the context of the EE teacher evaluation process. For example, teachers likely analyze student data to develop specific goals as part of
instructional planning processes and will easily understand and continue these processes as part of the teacher evaluation. Teachers should develop their EEP in August, September, or October.

*Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP)*

EEPs consist of an SLO and PPG, and the instructional strategies and support needed to meet these goals. To develop these, a teacher will complete several steps. The detailed steps for creating the SLO and PPG goal statements are outlined below. EEPs are documented in Teachscape.

**SLO Goal Setting**

**Review student data.** To establish a focus for improving student outcomes and the SLO, teachers must first review student data to identify an area or areas of academic need. During this process, teachers should identify a target student population on which to focus their student outcome goal. Teachers will document baseline data, or the current level of mastery for the targeted learning area, at the beginning of the year using an appropriate assessment (either a formal pre-test measure or other appropriate indicator).

**Identify content and grade level.** Based on the student data review, teachers will identify and choose the appropriate learning content and grade level for the SLO. Content should be relevant to the teacher’s grade level and subject area. It should encompass broad curriculum and/or program standards from which student growth can occur over the course of time a student is with the teacher.

**Identify student population.** Following a review of the student achievement data and the identification of the learning content and grade level for the SLO, teachers will identify the target student population and how the data analysis supports the identified student population. For teachers with multiple sections of the same course, a target student population may be dispersed throughout all sections.

**Identify targeted growth.** Next, teachers must establish their SLO growth goal. Drawing upon baseline assessment data, teachers will first determine whether to develop a differentiated or tiered goal due to varying student needs across the population, or a single goal focused on a sub-population of students. While teachers might develop non-differentiated goals in situations where the population starts with very similar levels of prior knowledge or baseline data, DPI anticipates that differentiated growth targets will become the norm as teachers accumulate sufficient data to allow for this to happen through the implementation of multiple new statewide initiatives (e.g., statewide accountability and report cards, Smarter Balanced assessments, EE data, etc.).

**Identify SLO interval.** Next, the teacher must identify the SLO interval. SLO intervals typically extend across an entire school year, but shorter intervals are possible (e.g., semester for secondary school academic outcomes). The SLO interval should encompass the duration of time the student population is with the teacher.
Identify evidence sources to measure student progress. Teachers next identify the appropriate, high-quality assessment tool or evidence source(s) to determine progress toward set goals. Such sources might include district-developed common assessments and portfolios or projects of student work (when accompanied by a rigorous scoring rubric and baseline data providing a comparison of progress across the year).

When selecting evidence sources, teachers must remember that the EE System intentionally draws upon multiple measures, in which no single source of information regarding teacher performance greatly impacts the overall Student Outcomes Summary. Therefore, teachers must select evidence sources that do not “double-count,” or overly emphasize any one source of data within the System. Specifically, teachers preparing a SLO should not use standardized, summative state assessment data (Smarter Balanced) as evidence of SLO growth, as these measures will comprise a portion of a teacher’s overall outcome score during full system implementation. Instead, teachers should utilize assessments used by the district, school, or teacher-teams as evidence of SLO outcomes. Guidance on the components of a high-quality local assessment can be found in Appendix D, SLO Assessment Guidance.

Write the SLO. Teachers will record their SLO goal statement in Teachscape. SLO goal statements should meet SMART goal criteria: Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Results-based, and Time-bound. For more information, see Creating SMART SLOs within the Educator Effectiveness Professional Learning on Demand.

Determine instructional strategies and supports. Once the teacher determines the SLO goal statement, the teacher identifies and documents the instructional strategies and supports necessary to meet the goal(s) specified in the SLO. These might include collaborative efforts between the teacher and teams of educators, coaches, or the Curriculum and Instruction Director. These goals should align with teacher practice goals developed as part of the professional practice goal-setting process (described in the next section).

The steps involved in preparing an SLO should adhere to the guiding questions and criteria specified in the SLO Process Guide, located in Appendix E. Teachers can use the Guide to support each step in the SLO development process.

Self-Review of Professional Practice
In Summary Years, each teacher will reflect on his or her practice at the beginning of the school year and complete the teacher Self-Review within Teachscape. A screenshot of the Self-Review in Teachscape is included in Appendix F. The Self-Review focuses on the domains and components of the Framework for Teaching. The teacher completes the Self-Review in Summary Years to help inform the development of the PPG and prepare for evidence collection and meetings with the evaluator. It is optional in Supporting Years.
Steps in the Teacher Evaluation Process

Goal Alignment: PDP and Educator Effectiveness Goals
In Summary Years, teachers will self-reflect on their practice using the Framework for Teaching. By connecting the instructional strategies identified in their SLO goal to the Framework for Teaching, teachers can consider next steps needed to strengthen practice in those areas. Teachers will draw upon this analysis to inform the development of their PPG.

Professional Development Plan (PDP) goals reflect two of ten Wisconsin educator standards, and educators must develop broad goals so that the educator can continue to work within the goals in the event that educator changes districts, buildings, or grade levels. The PDP goals reflect both instructional strategies (I will....) and student outcomes (so that my students...).

While Licensure and Evaluation must remain separate processes due to legal requirements in state legislation, the process of setting goals for licensure can and likely will relate to the goals identified within the EE System. PDP goals should be broad and relate to the work within both the practice and student outcomes portions of the evaluation system. PDP goals can inform the work of the educator as it applies to their evaluation. Educators should not use the same goals for practice and outcomes. However, it is likely that one can inform the other (see Figure 10).

PPG Goal Setting
After developing an SLO and reviewing his or her Self-Review, the teacher will develop one PPG that, when aligned to the SLO, will increase the likelihood of success of their SLO. Teachers will document the PPG in Teachscape and reference the relevant SLO, if applicable, and the related Framework for Teaching components. However, teachers may write a PPG that involves practices they want to improve that are not necessarily related to the SLO. For this reason, DPI recommends but does not require that the PPG supports the SLO.

SMART goals should guide the development of the professional practice goal. See Appendix G for guidance on setting SMART goals.

Developing a PPG will help teachers focus their professional growth and evaluators focus activities for the year. However, evaluators will still assess all of the components from the Framework for Teaching rubric to provide the teacher a comprehensive picture of teacher practice.

Submit Planning Forms to Evaluator
Once teachers complete their EEP, the teacher submits it via Teachscape to his or her evaluator prior to the Planning Session. In a Summary Year, the teacher will also submit the Self Review. This submission should occur no later than the second week of October. Evaluators should review the EEP and use the SLO Process Guide to review the SLO (Appendix E) prior to the Planning Session to support collaborative, formative discussions during the Session.

Creating SMART SLOs Toolkit is available in the DPI Educator Effectiveness Professional Learning on Demand resources.
Step 3: Planning Session
During the fall of a Summary Year, typically in September or October, a teacher will meet with his or her evaluator in a Planning Session. During this session, the teacher and evaluator will collaborate to complete the following activities:

- Review the Self Review and EEP.
  1. Review the draft SLO goal and PPG set by the teacher.
  2. Discuss and adjust the goals if necessary. Finalize goals based on teacher and evaluator input.
     - To aid in reviewing high quality goals, DPI has provided an SLO Process Guide. This document is located in Appendix E.
- Identify actions and resources needed to meet the PPG and the SLO goal.
- Identify possible evidence sources related to the PPG and SLO goals.
- Set the evaluation schedule; including scheduled observations, meetings, and methods of collecting other sources of evidence.
3.2 Across the School Year: Observations, Evidence, and Formative Feedback

**Step 4: Observations, Evidence Collection, and Ongoing Feedback**

Observations and other evidence collection take place from October through May. Over the course of the school year, teachers and their evaluator collect evidence in Teachscape of progress toward meeting the PPG, SLO, and professional practice aligned to the *Framework for Teaching*. Evaluators should provide ongoing formative feedback to teachers through at least one pre- and post-observation conference, informal discussions, the Mid-Year Review, and the End of Cycle Summary Conference.

*Teachers should be provided with formative feedback through ongoing collaborative conversations with the principal, and be supported by the effectiveness coaches or district content coaches.*

**Observations**

In a Summary Year evaluators of teachers must conduct a minimum of one announced 45-minute observation (or two 20-minute announced observations), and 3-5 unannounced mini-observations of at least 15 minutes (at least two of the mini-observations take place in the Summary Year). *Figure 11* documents the minimum observation requirements.

**Figure 11: Minimum Number of Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 announced observation</td>
<td>45 minutes or (2) 20-minute observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 unannounced mini-observations</td>
<td>Each at least 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-Observation**

For the announced observation, teachers will complete the pre-and-post observation documentation in Teachscape to help focus the discussions and formative feedback. Teachers complete the pre-observation in advance of the pre-observation conference. A screen shot of what the Teachscape pre-observation looks like is included in Appendix H for reference. Completing the pre-observation helps shape the dialog of the pre-observation conference and allows the teacher to “set the stage” for the lesson. The information allows the teacher to identify the context of the classroom, the specifics of the lesson focus, and its intended outcomes.

**Post-Observation**

Post-observations should take place within one week of the observation. The post-observation (reflection) helps frame the dialog and resulting feedback from the observed lesson during the post-observation discussion. A screenshot of the post-observation documentation in Teachscape is included in Appendix I. Both the teacher and evaluator can use the questions to identify areas of strength and
suggestions for improvement. The post-observation conference can focus on classroom teaching artifacts (lesson plans, student work samples, etc.) that are related to the classroom observation. Both the pre-and post-observation conferences can also address progress on meeting the SLO and PPG.

Other Evidence Collection

In addition to information collected through observations, evaluators and teachers collect evidence of teacher practice throughout the school year. These other sources of evidence may include lesson plans, examples of student work, or other artifacts as determined during the Planning Session.

A list of possible artifacts linked to the domains and components of the Framework is provided in Appendix A. This evidence is used by the evaluator to score a teacher’s practice, using the rubric to identify appropriate levels of performance. Evaluators and teachers may collect and upload evidence in Summary and Supporting Years. Evaluators should not score a teacher’s practice until they obtain adequate information to assess each component of the Framework for Teaching. This will likely occur during the second half of the Summary Year. Evaluators use Teachscape to document and organize evidence from observations and artifacts. Once the evaluator determines that enough evidence for each component exists, the evaluator will select the performance level that best matches the evidence of practice for that component.

In addition to evidence of teacher practice, teachers will collect data at the specified intervals and monitor the progress of their SLO during the evaluation period indicated. Based upon the data collected, the teacher adjusts instructional strategies utilized to ensure that all students meet classroom and school expectations, and determine if the targeted population for the SLO is progressing toward the stated objective(s). Appendix D includes guidance around SLO evidence (assessment) sources.

Step 5: Mid-Year Review

In December or January (or sooner if the SLO interval is less than a year), the teacher and his or her evaluator will meet for a formative review of the teacher’s progress toward meeting his or her PPG and SLO. Teachers will document their SLO and PPG progress within Teachscape prior to the Mid-Year Review. A screenshot of the EEP mid-interval progress update is included in Appendix J.

At the Mid-Year Review, teachers and evaluators provide documentation regarding the status of goals, evidence of progress, and any barriers to success. Evaluators may discuss whether the teacher might adjust targeted outcomes specified in the original SLO if the original target is clearly either too low (e.g., most, if not all, students will meet the goal easily) or too high (e.g., many or all students will not meet the goal, even if they are learning a great deal and the teacher’s strategies are working as intended). Evaluators may also discuss adjustment to teacher instructional strategies to better meet their SLO and PPG. The SLO Process Guide (Appendix E) can be used again in the mid-year review to assist with ongoing formative feedback.
3.3 Spring: Final Scoring Process

Step 6: Final Teacher Scores
Near the end of the school year, the teacher will submit final evidence to his or her evaluator and the score for their self-scored SLO. The evaluator then assigns an overall holistic SLO score and scores each professional practice component. The teacher and evaluator will participate in a End of Cycle Summary Conference to discuss goals, outcomes, professional development opportunities, and next year’s goals.

Submit Final Evidence to Evaluator
Each teacher submits all final evidence, including self-scores for the SLO and professional practice evidence, to his or her evaluator in Teachscape prior to the End of Cycle Summary Conference.

Near the end of the school year, teachers document progress on their SLO and PPG in Teachscape by completing the EEP end-of-interval progress updates. A screenshot of the EEP end-of-interval progress update is included in Appendix L. Teachers should identify specific evidence to justify stated progress. Teachers will also submit the score for their self-scored SLO in Teachscape.

Final Scoring of Practice and SLOs
Once a teacher submits final evidence to his or her evaluator, the evaluator completes and documents final scores in Teachscape. The evaluator scores all components of the Framework for Teaching at one of the four performance levels.

Evaluators provide written feedback for the PPG and associated components. Evaluators will not assign a score to the PPG. Instead, evaluators consider evidence collected for the PPG along with other evidence to inform final practice scores.

Evaluators will review all submitted SLOs (minimum of one and maximum of six) as final evidence. The evaluator will draw upon this evidence to assign a single score of 1 to 4 using the SLO Scoring Rubric (Appendix M). The SLO scoring range (1 to 4) and revised SLO scoring rubric aim to incentivize improved data and assessment literacy, rigorous goal setting, progress monitoring, and self-scoring to impact teacher practice and student outcomes.

The SLO scoring rubric allows evaluator judgment. For more information, see the SLO Toolkit.

Step 7: End of Cycle Summary Conference
The End of Cycle Summary Conference should take place during April, May, or June. During this conference, the teacher and his or her evaluator meet to discuss achievement of PPG and SLO goals. Evaluators will review goal achievement and provide feedback. The evaluator will also discuss scores on the components of the Framework for Teaching and the overall SLO score. The teacher has the opportunity to comment on the end of cycle summary results.
Based on final scores and comments on goals, evaluators and teachers should identify growth areas for the following year.

Submit End of Cycle Summary Results
After the End of Cycle Summary Conference, evaluators will submit final scores in Teachscape. However, some pieces of the overall summary score may be determined and added after the submission (e.g., reading score data and graduation rate data).

Step 8: Use of Evaluation Results to Inform Future Goals
Results from the Effectiveness Cycle inform the teacher’s PPG and SLO for the following year. Discussion will focus on planning for the next Effectiveness Cycle and how results can inform professional development activities and support. Districts may also develop local procedures and policies using final score summaries, outlined in the next section.
Combining Measures and Scoring

4.1 Summary Graph
The EE System consists of educator practice and student outcomes measures. Final educator practice scores and student outcome scores will appear as coordinate points of an Educator Practices Summary and a Student Outcomes Summary. For example, Figure 12 illustrates the Summary Graph of a teacher receiving a score of Educator Practices Summary of 2.6 and a Student Outcomes Summary of 3.2. These Summaries provide a general sense of effectiveness and are important for teachers to see how well they are performing on the aggregated Student Outcomes and Educator Practices Summaries. The most important feedback to inform professional practice happens at the individual component level. Through review and feedback on each component and outcome measure, teachers will have specific information on their strengths and weaknesses and use the information for professional development planning. Figure 12 below shows how the two Summaries will be presented.

Figure 12: Example Summary Graph*

4.2 Summary Reporting
EE Summaries will be reported in WISEdash Secure, a secure new statewide data warehouse system. Only a teacher and his or her administrators will have permission to view data. While Summaries will remain in WISEdash Secure, artifacts and evidence uploaded in Teachscape will not transfer to a new district. If individual educators want to take Teachscape data with them to a new district, they must download the information from Teachscape and save it for their own records prior to leaving the old district.

*There is no statistical significance associated with the gradation of colors
4.3 Data Availability
Teachers will have access to various data points and scores across the Summary Year; they will not have “final” EE Summary Scores and Graph until (at the earliest) fall of the following year. This is due to the lag in scoring and changing statewide assessments.

4.4 Use of Evaluation Results by Districts
Local districts and school boards will determine how to use data from the EE System within their own context. DPI recommends that districts consider quality implementation practices, research, district culture, AND consult with legal counsel prior to making human resource decisions. DPI also recommends that decisions support the purpose of the System, supporting educator practice to improve student outcomes. For additional guidance and considerations, click on the Using Educator Effectiveness to Inform Human Resource Decisions Info Brief. See also the System Purpose and Data Use Info Brief.
Definitions of Key Terms

**Announced observation:** A formal, scheduled observation. It may be preceded by a pre-observation discussion and followed by a post-observation discussion where verbal and/or written feedback is provided by the evaluator to the teacher.

**Artifacts:** Forms of evidence that support an educator’s evaluation. They may include lesson plans, examples of student work with teacher feedback, professional development plans, and logs of contacts with families. Artifacts may take forms other than documents, such as videos of practice, portfolios, or other forms of evidence.

**Assessment/Evidence Source:** Assessment evidence sources include common district assessments, existing standardized assessments not already included as student outcomes within the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System (e.g., standardized, summative state assessment and standardized district assessment data), teacher-designed assessments and/or rubrics work samples or portfolios, and other sources approved by the evaluator.

**Attainment:** “Point in time” measure of student learning, typically expressed in terms of a proficiency category (advanced, proficient, basic, minimal).

**Baseline:** Measure of data the beginning of a specified time period, typically measured through a pre-test measure at the beginning of the year.

**Components:** The descriptions of the aspects of a domain. There are 22 components in the 2013 Danielson *Framework for Teaching*.

**Consecutive Years:** Each year following one another in uninterrupted succession or order.

**Domains:** There are four domains or broad areas of teaching responsibility, included in the 2013 *Framework for Teaching*: Planning & Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. Under each domain, 5-6 components describe the distinct aspects of a domain.

**Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP):** A plan documented in Teachscape that lists the Student Learning Objectives, Professional Practice goals and Professional Growth Strategies and Support for an educator, along with the activities required to attain these goals and the measures necessary to evaluate the progress made on them.

**Educator Effectiveness (EE) System:** The Wisconsin model for teacher and principal evaluation, built by and for Wisconsin educators. Its primary purpose is to support a system of continuous improvement of educator practice, from pre-service to in-service, which leads to improved student learning. The Educator
Effectiveness System is legislatively mandated by 2011 Wisconsin Act 166. The System refers to models of educator practice—whether districts use the DPI Model, CESA 6, or other approved equivalent model.

**Effectiveness Coach:** The Effectiveness Coach is an optional role in the EE System, and is intended to help support ongoing formative feedback to both evaluators and those being evaluated.

**Evaluation Rubric:** An evidence-based set of criteria across different domains of professional practice that guide an evaluation. Practice is rated across four scoring categories that differentiate effectiveness, with each score tied to specific “look-for’s” to support the summary. The EE System uses the *Framework for Teaching* as its evaluation rubric for teacher practice.

**Evidence:** Assessment or measure used to determine progress towards an identified goal.

**Evidence Collection:** The systematic gathering of evidence that informs the summary of an educator’s practice. In the EE System, multiple forms of evidence are required to support a teacher’s summary and are listed in this guide in Appendix A.

**End of Cycle Summary Conference:** The teacher and his or her evaluator meet to discuss achievement of the Professional Practice and SLO goal, review collected evidence, and discuss results and scores on the components of the *Framework for Teaching*.

**Framework:** The combination of the evaluation rubric, evidence sources, and the process of using both to evaluate an educator.

**Full Pilot:** In 2013-14 the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System is underwent a Full Pilot in volunteer districts across the state to test the alignment and integration of practice and SLOs, and to further refine its components and processes.

**Goal:** Specific and measurable learning objective that can be evaluated over a specific designated interval of time (e.g., quarter, semester, year).

**Indicators/Look-for’s:** Observable pieces of information for evaluators to identify or “look-for” during an observation or other evidence gathering. Indicators are listed in the Sources of Evidence (Appendix A).

**Inter-Rater Agreement:** The extent to which two or more evaluators agree in their independent scoring of educators’ effectiveness.

**Interval:** Period of time over which student growth will be measured under an SLO (typically an academic year, although other intervals are possible).

**Learning Content:** Content drawn from Common Core State Standards, Wisconsin Model Academic Standards, 21st Century Skills and Career and College Readiness Standards, or district standards. The learning content targets
specific academic concepts, skills, or behaviors that students should know as of a
given point in time.

**Learning Strategies:** Appropriate instructional strategies intended to support
student growth for the targeted population.

**Mastery:** Command or grasp of a subject; an expert skill or knowledge.

**Mid-Year (or Mid-Interval) Review:** A meeting scheduled by the evaluator at
the mid-point of the Summary Year. During this meeting, the evaluator may
discuss adjustment of the expected growth specified in an SLO based upon clear
rationale and evidence of need.

**Mini-Observation:** A short (15 minute minimum) unannounced observation of a
teacher’s practice in the classroom.

**Observations:** One source of evidence used to assess and provide feedback on
teacher performance. Observations are announced, scheduled in advance, with a
pre- and post-observation conference. Observations are carried out by the
educator’s evaluator or a designee, who looks for evidence in one or more of the
components of the *Framework for Teaching* evaluation rubric.

**Orientation:** The first step in the Educator Effectiveness evaluation process, the
Orientation takes place prior to or at the beginning of the school for the 2014-15
implementation and for new teachers who have not gone through the
Effectiveness Cycle. Educators will review the use of the professional practice
frameworks, the related tools and resources, timelines for implementation, and
expectations for all participants in the System.

**Planning Session:** A conference in the fall during which the teacher and his or
her primary evaluator discuss the teacher’s Self-Review and Educator
Effectiveness Plan, SLOs, Professional Practice Goals and actions needed to
meet goals. An evaluation schedule and process for evidence collection is
determined at this time.

**Post-observation conference:** A conference that takes place after an observation
during which the evaluator provides feedback verbally and in writing to the
teacher.

**Post-test:** Assessment administered at the end of a specified time period, as
specified under an SLO. Post-tests, sometimes referred to as summative
assessments, can be used to evaluate cumulative student learning at the end of an
instructional period.

**Pre-observation conference:** A conference that takes place before an
observation during which the evaluator and teacher discuss important elements of
the lesson or class that might be relevant to the observation.

**Pre-test:** Initial, or baseline, measure typically administered at the beginning of
the academic year. Pre-test data can be used to establish baseline levels of student
learning at the beginning of an instructional period. This can include a formal pretest, information from the prior year, work samples, or other available data.

**Professional Practice Goals:** Practice related goals are an important part of professional practice. Goals are set as educators prepare for their Educator Effectiveness Plans and the goals are monitored by the educator during the year.

**Progress Monitoring:** The process during which educators review the target population’s progress towards an identified goal using assessment data or other evidence sources. Progress monitoring may include the use of benchmark, or interim, assessments to measure students’ progress toward meeting a goal.

**Self-Review of Performance:** Teachers will complete a self-review at the beginning of the Summary Year. This self-review will ask educators to reflect on their past performance, relevant student learning data, and prior evaluation data using the Framework for Teaching.

**Student Learning Objectives (SLOs):** Rigorous, yet attainable goals for student learning growth aligned to appropriate standards set by individual educators. Educators must develop an SLO based on a thorough review of needs, identification of the targeted population, clear rationale for the amount of expected growth, and the identification of specific instructional strategies or supports that will allow the attainment of the growth goals. The ultimate goal of an SLO is to promote student learning and achievement while providing for pedagogical growth, reflection, and innovation.

**Targeted Growth:** Level of expected growth, or progress towards an identified goal, made by target population.

**Targeted Population:** Group(s) of students for whom an SLO applies.

**Value-Added:** A growth measure based on state assessment data that compares student growth at the school or classroom level to teachers or schools that had similar students (as defined by prior achievement and selected non-school factors, such as students’ poverty level and disability status, which may influence growth).
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Appendix A: Teacher Sources of Evidence
# Teacher Evidence Sources

## Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/&quot;Look-fors&quot;</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Evaluator/teacher conversations</td>
<td>● Adapting to the students in front of you</td>
<td><strong>Evaluator/teacher conversations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Lesson/unit plan</td>
<td>● Scaffolding based on student response</td>
<td>● Guiding questions Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Observation</td>
<td>● Teachers using vocabulary of the discipline</td>
<td><strong>Lesson plans/unit plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Teacher/student conversations</td>
<td>● Lesson and unit plans reflect important concepts in the discipline and knowledge of academic standards</td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Lesson and unit plans reflect tasks authentic to the content area</td>
<td>● Notes taken during observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Lesson and unit plans accommodate prerequisite relationships among concepts and skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Lesson and unit plans reflect knowledge of academic standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Classroom explanations are clear and accurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Accurate answers to students’ questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Feedback to students that furthers learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Interdisciplinary connections in plans and practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/“Look-fors”</td>
<td>Evidence Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students** | ● Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Lesson/unit plan  
● Observation  
● Student / parent perceptions | ● Artifacts that show differentiation and cultural responsiveness  
● Artifacts of student interests and backgrounds, learning style, outside of school commitments (work, family responsibilities, etc.)  
● Differentiated expectations based on assessment data/aligned with IEPs  
● Formal and informal information about students gathered by the teacher for use in planning instruction  
● Student interests and needs learned by the teacher for use in planning  
● Teacher participation in community cultural events  
● Teacher-designed opportunities for families to share their heritages  
● Database of students with special needs | **Evaluator/teacher conversations**  
● Guiding questions  
● Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  

**Lesson plans/unit plans**  
**Observations**  
● Notes taken during observation  

**Optional**  
● Student / Parent surveys |
| **1c: Setting instructional outcomes** | ● Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Lesson/unit plan  
● Observation | ● Same learning target, differentiated pathways  
● Students can articulate the learning target when asked  
● Targets reflect clear expectations that are aligned to grade-level standards  
● Checks on student learning and adjustments to future instruction  
● Use of formative practices and assessments such as entry/exit slips, conferring logs, and/or writer’s notebooks  
● Outcomes of a challenging cognitive level  
● Statements of student learning, not student activity  
● Outcomes central to the discipline and related to those in other disciplines  
● Outcomes permitting assessment of student attainment  
● Outcomes differentiated for students of varied ability | **Evaluator/teacher conversations**  
● Guiding questions  
● Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  

**Lesson plans/unit plans**  
**Observations**  
● Notes taken during observation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources | ● Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Lesson/unit plan  
● Observation | ● Evidence of prior training  
● Evidence of collaboration with colleagues  
● Evidence of teacher seeking out resources (online or other people)  
● District-provided instructional, assessment, and other materials used as appropriate  
● Materials provided by professional organizations  
● A range of texts  
● Internet resources  
● Community resources  
● Ongoing participation by the teacher in professional education courses or professional groups  
● Guest speakers  
● Resources are culturally responsive |  
| 1e: Designing coherent instruction | ● Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Lesson/unit plan  
● Observation  
● Pre-observation form  
● Learning targets  
● Formative assessments, such as entry slips/exit slips | ● Grouping of students  
● Variety of activities  
● Variety of instructional strategies  
● Same learning target, differentiated pathways  
● Lessons that support instructional outcomes and reflect important concepts  
● Instructional maps that indicate relationships to prior learning  
● Activities that represent high-level thinking  
● Opportunities for student choice  
● Use of varied resources - Thoughtfully planned learning groups  
● Structured lesson plans  
● Creation/curation/selection of materials |  

Evaluator/teacher conversations  
Online resources  
Community resources  
Ongoing participation by the teacher in professional education courses or professional groups  
Guest speakers  
Resources are culturally responsive  
Guiding questions  
Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  
Lesson plans/unit plans  
Observations  
Notes taken during observation lesson plan  

Optional  
Pre observation form  
Learning targets  
Entry / exit slips or other formative assessments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1f: Designing student assessment** | • Evaluator/teacher conversations  
• Lesson/unit plan  
• Observation  
• Formative and summative assessments and tools | • Formative assessments designed to inform minute-to-minute decision making by the teacher during instruction  
• Students have weighed in on the rubric or assessment design  
• Lesson plans indicating correspondence between assessments and instructional outcomes  
• Assessment types suitable to the style of outcome  
• Variety of performance opportunities for students  
• Modified assessments available for individual students as needed  
• Expectations clearly written with descriptors for each level of performance | **Evaluator/teacher conversations**  
• Guiding questions  
• Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  
**Lesson plans/unit plans**  
**Observations**  
• Notes taken during observation  
Optional  
• Formative and summative assessments and tools (i.e. rubrics, scoring guides, checklists)  
• Student developed assessments |
## Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport | ● Evaluator / teacher conversations  
● Observations  
● Video  
● Illustrations of response to student work | ● Active listening  
● Response to student work: Positive reinforcement, respectful feedback, displaying or using student work  
● Respectful talk, active listening and turn taking  
● Acknowledgement of students’ backgrounds and lives outside the classroom  
● Body language indicative of warmth and caring shown by teacher and students  
● Physical proximity  
● Politeness and encouragement  
● Fairness | Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Guiding questions  
● Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  
● Use questions on observation forms (especially describing students in class)  
Observations  
● Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)  
● Observer takes notes during pre- and post- observation conferences  
Optional  
● Video  
● Response to student work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b: Establishing a culture for learning</strong></td>
<td>• Observations</td>
<td>• Belief in the value of what is being learned</td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student assignments</td>
<td>• High expectations, supported through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors, for both learning and participation</td>
<td>• Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lesson plan</td>
<td>• Expectation of high-quality student work</td>
<td>• Observer takes notes during pre- and post- observation conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Video/photos</td>
<td>• Expectation and recognition of effort and persistence on the part of students</td>
<td>• Observer interacts with student about what they are learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Belief in the value of what is</td>
<td>• Confidence in students’ ability evident in teacher’s and students’ language and behaviors</td>
<td><strong>Student Assignments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>being learned</td>
<td>• Expectation for all students to participate</td>
<td>• Teacher provides examples of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of variety of modalities</td>
<td>• Use of technology: appropriate use</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student assignments demonstrate</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Optional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rigor, include rubrics, teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedback, student work samples</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of technology: appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Observer takes notes on what is happening at what time, tracking student engagement / time on task, classroom artifacts on procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2c: Managing classroom procedures</strong></td>
<td>• Observations</td>
<td>• Smooth functioning of all routines</td>
<td><strong>Syllabus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Syllabus</td>
<td>• Little or no loss of instructional time</td>
<td><strong>Communications to Students / Parents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent communication</td>
<td>• Students playing an important role in carrying out the routines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students knowing what to do, where to move</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/“Look-fors”</td>
<td>Evidence Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2d: Managing student behavior | ● Observations  
● Disciplinary records/plans  
● (content)  
● Student / parent feedback  
● Parent communications | ● Clear standards of conduct, possibly posted, and possibly referred to during a lesson  
● Teacher awareness of student conduct  
● Preventive action when needed by the teacher  
● Fairness  
● Absence of misbehavior  
● Reinforcement of positive behavior  
● Culturally responsive practices  
● Time on task  
● Absence of acrimony between teacher and students concerning behavior | Observations  
● Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)  
● Observer may tally positive reinforcement vs. punitive disciplinary action  
Optional  
● Disciplinary records/plans (content)  
● Student / Parent Feedback  
● Parent Communications |
| 2e: Organizing physical space | ● Observations  
● Video/Photos  
● Online course structure | ● Pleasant, inviting atmosphere  
● Safe environment  
● Accessibility for all students  
● Furniture arrangement suitable for the learning activities  
● Effective use of physical resources, including computer technology, by both teacher and students  
● Availability of relevant tools, such as mathematical manipulatives or a range of texts | Observations  
● Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)  
● Observer records classroom physical features on standard form or makes a physical map  
Optional  
● Photos, Videos  
● Online course structure |
## Domain 3: Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3a: Communicating with students</strong></td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Clarity of lesson purpose</td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessed student work</td>
<td>Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activities</td>
<td>- Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications with students</td>
<td>Teacher uses precise language of the discipline when communicating with students</td>
<td>- Dialogue with students and accurate / precise dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handouts with instructions</td>
<td>Absence of content errors and clear explanations of concepts and strategies</td>
<td>- Observer collects examples of written communications (emails / notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative assessments</td>
<td>Student comprehension of content</td>
<td><strong>Assessed Student Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications are culturally responsive</td>
<td>- Teacher provides samples of student work &amp; written analysis after each observation or end of semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessed student work - specific feedback</td>
<td><strong>Optional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of electronic communication: Emails, Wiki, Web pages</td>
<td>- Electronic Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formative assessments such as conferring logs, writer’s notebooks, exit / entry slips and/or reader’s response journals</td>
<td>- Handouts with instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formative Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/“Look-fors”</td>
<td>Evidence Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques</td>
<td>Observations, Lesson plan, Videos, Student work, Discussion forums</td>
<td>Questions of high cognitive challenge formulated by students and teacher, Questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches, even when there is a single correct response, Effective use of student responses and ideas, Discussion, with the teacher stepping out of the central, mediating role, High levels of student participation in discussion, Student Work: Write/Pair/Share, student generated discussion questions, online discussion, Focus on the reasoning exhibited by students in discussion, both in give-and-take with the teacher and with their classmates, Use of citations of textual evidence</td>
<td>Observations, Lesson plan, Videos, Student work, Discussion forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c: Engaging students in learning</td>
<td>Observations, Lesson plans, Student work, Use of technology/instructional resources</td>
<td>Activities aligned with the goals of the lesson, Activities layered to provide multiple entry points for students, Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem-solving, etc., Learning tasks that are authentic to content area; that require high-level student thinking and invite students to explain their thinking; that are culturally responsive, Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and persistent even when the tasks are challenging, Students actively “working,” rather than watching while their teacher “works,” Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragging out nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection, Student – student conversation, Student directed or led activities / content</td>
<td>Observations, Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic), Observer tracks student participation, time on task, examines student work, and teacher / student interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional
- Lesson plans
- Student work
- Use of technology/instructional resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3d: Using assessment in instruction</strong></td>
<td>● Observations ● Formative / summative assessment tools ● Lesson plans ● Conversations w / evaluator</td>
<td>● Teacher pays close attention to evidence of student understanding ● Teacher poses specifically created questions to elicit evidence of student understanding ● Assessments are authentic to content area ● Assessments are culturally responsive ● Teacher circulates to monitor student learning and to offer feedback ● Students assess their own work against established criteria ● Assessment tools: use of rubrics ● Differentiated assessments – all students can demonstrate their learning ● Formative / Summative assessment tools: frequency, descriptive feedback to students ● Lesson plans adjusted based on assessment</td>
<td>Observations ● Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic) Formative / Summative Assessment Tools ● Teacher provides formative and summative assessment tools or data Optional ● Lesson plans ● Conversations with evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>● Observations ● Lesson plans ● Use of supplemental instructional resources ● Student feedback</td>
<td>● Incorporation of students’ interests and daily events into a lesson ● Teacher adjusts instruction in response to evidence of student understanding (or lack of it) ● Teacher seizing on a teachable moment ● Lesson Plans: Use of formative assessment, use of multiple instructional strategies</td>
<td>Observations ● Observer “scripts” lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic) ● Takes notes on teacher taking advantage of teachable moments Optional ● Lesson plans ● Use of supplemental instructional resources ● Student Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4a: Reflecting on Teaching** | ● Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Observations  
● Teacher PD goals/plan  
● Student / parent feedback | ● Revisions to lesson plans  
● Notes to self, journaling  
● Listening for analysis of what went well and didn’t go well  
● Specific examples of reflection from the lesson  
● Ability to articulate strengths and areas for development  
● Capture student voice (survey, conversation w/ students)  
● Varied data sources (observation data, parent feedback, evaluator feedback, peer feedback, student work, assessment results)  
● Accurate reflections on a lesson  
● Citation of adjustments to practice that draw on a repertoire of strategies | **Evaluator/Teacher conversations**  
● Guiding questions  
● Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection.)  

Optional  
● Grade book  
● PD plan  
● Student / parent survey  
● Observations |
| **4b: Maintaining Accurate Records** | ● Evaluator/teacher conversations  
● Lesson/unit plan  
● Grade book  
● Artifact – teacher choice  
● Systems for data collection | ● Information about individual needs of students (IEPs, etc.)  
● Logs of phone calls/parent contacts, emails  
● Student’s own data files (dot charts, learning progress, graphs of progress, portfolios)  
● Routines and systems that track student completing of assignments  
● Systems of information regarding student progress against instructional outcomes  
● Process of maintaining accurate non-instructional needs | **Evaluator/Teacher conversations:**  
● Guiding questions  
● Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  

**Lesson plans/unit plans**  
Optional  
● Grade book  
● PD plan  
● Progress reports |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4c: Communicating with families</strong></td>
<td>• Logs of phone calls/parent contacts/emails&lt;br&gt;• Observation during parent teacher meeting or conference</td>
<td>• Interaction with PTA or parent groups or parent volunteers&lt;br&gt;• Daily assignment notebooks requiring parents to sign off on assignments&lt;br&gt;• Proactive or creative planning for parent-teacher conferences (including students in the process)&lt;br&gt;• Frequent and culturally appropriate information sent home regarding the instructional program and student progress&lt;br&gt;• Two-way communication between the teacher and families&lt;br&gt;• Frequent opportunities for families to engage in the learning process</td>
<td><strong>Logs of communication with parents</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Teacher log of communication (who, what, why, when, “so what”?)&lt;br&gt;• Progress reports, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4d: Participating in the professional community</strong></td>
<td>• Observation&lt;br&gt;• Attendance at PD sessions&lt;br&gt;• Mentoring other teachers&lt;br&gt;• Seeking mentorship</td>
<td>• Inviting people into your classroom&lt;br&gt;• Using resources (specialists, support staff)&lt;br&gt;• Regular teacher participation with colleagues to share and plan for student success&lt;br&gt;• Regular teacher participation in professional courses or communities that emphasize improving practice&lt;br&gt;• Regular teacher participation in school initiatives&lt;br&gt;• Regular teacher participation in and support of community initiatives</td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Notes taken during observation&lt;br&gt;<strong>Attendance at PD sessions</strong>&lt;br&gt;Optional&lt;br&gt;• PLC agendas&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of community involvement&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of mentorship or seeking to be mentored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/“Look-fors”</td>
<td>Evidence Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4e: Growing and developing professionally | • Evaluator/teacher conversations  
• Observation  
• Lesson/unit plan  
• Professional development plan  
• Mentoring involvement  
• Attendance or presentation at professional organizations / conferences / workshops / PLCs  
• Membership in professional associations or organizations  
• Action research | • Frequent teacher attendance in courses and workshops; regular academic reading  
• Participation in learning networks with colleagues; freely shared insights  
• Participation in professional organizations supporting academic inquiry | **Evaluator/Teacher conversations**  
• Guiding questions  
• Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  

**Lesson plans/unit plans**  
**Observations**  
• Notes taken during observation  

Optional  
• PD plan  
• PLC agendas  
• Evidence of participating in PD  
• Evidence of mentorship or seeking to be mentored  
• Action research |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/“Look-fors”</th>
<th>Evidence Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4f: Showing professionalism | ● Evaluator/ Teacher conversations  
● Observation of participation in PLC meetings or school leadership team meetings  
● Scheduling and allocation of resources  
● School and out-of-school volunteering | ● Obtaining additional resources to support students’ individual needs above and beyond normal expectations (i.e., staying late to meet with students)  
● Mentoring other teachers  
● Drawing people up to a higher standard  
● Having the courage to press an opinion respectfully  
● Being inclusive with communicating concerns (open, honest, transparent dialogue)  
● Having a reputation as being trustworthy and often sought as a sounding board  
● Frequently reminding participants during committee or planning work that students are the highest priority  
● Supporting students, even in the face of difficult situations or conflicting policies  
● Challenging existing practice in order to put students first  
● Consistently fulfilling district mandates regarding policies and procedures | Evaluator/Teacher conversations  
● Guiding questions  
● Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)  

Optional  
● Teacher provides documents to evaluator at end of year/semester  
● Written reflection  
● Parent and student survey  
● Observing teacher interacting with peers/students/families  
● Record of unethical behavior |
Appendix B: Teacher Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP)
Teacher Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP)

After analyzing the Self-Review and student data, use this information to develop and record your SLO and PPG. Identify professional growth strategies and support needed to help achieve this SLO and PPG. Submit the completed EEP (SLO and PPG) to your evaluator prior to your planning session.

Screenshot of Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP): SLO in Teachscape

Wisconsin Teacher Student Learning Objective (SLO) Planning and Monitoring Form

Evaluator: Wisconsin Review Principal2
Practitioner: Wisconsin Review Teacher2

After completing your self-review entries, school or grade level instructional improvement plans, and student data, develop and record a Student Learning Objective (SLO). Identify your instructional strategies and the support you need to help achieve this SLO.

These prompts and entries help guide your SLC development. While you should complete each entry, you do not necessarily need to respond to each of the questions or criteria.

Baseline Data and Rationale

What sources(s) of data did you examine in selecting this SLO? Summarize trends and patterns. If this is the same SLO as you submitted last year/semester/interval, please provide justification for why you are repeating your goal. Did you consider both qualitative and quantitative data?

Learning Content/Grade Level

Which content standards are relevant to/reinforced in support of your goal? Is this content reinforced throughout the interval of this goal? Did you identify the national, state, or local standards relevant to your role in the district?

Student Population

Which students are included in the target population? How does the data analysis support the identified student population?
Targeted Growth

Have you identified the starting point for each target student? How did you arrive at these growth goals?

Time Interval

Does the goal apply to the duration of the time you spend with your student population (ex. Year, Semester, Trimester, etc.)?

Evidence Sources

What benchmark assessments will you use (pre-instruction, mid-interval, post-instruction)? What formative practices will you use to monitor progress throughout the interval? What summative assessment will you use to determine student growth at the end of the interval? Is the assessment aligned to the instructional content within the SLO? Free of bias? Appropriate for the identified student population?

SLO Goal Statement (SMART criteria)

Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based, Time-bound:

Instructional Strategies and Supports

What professional development opportunities support this goal? What instructional methods will you employ so that students progress toward the identified growth goal? How will you differentiate instruction to support multiple growth goals within your population? Who might you collaborate with in order to support the unique learning needs within your group?
Screenshot of Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP): PPG in Teachscape

Wisconsin Teacher Professional Practice Goal (PPG)

Evaluator: Wisconsin Review Principal
Practitioner: Wisconsin Review Teacher

After completing your self-review and identifying instructional strategies to support your student growth goals, develop and record a Professional Practice Goal (PPG). Identify the instructional strategies and support you need to achieve this PPG.

The instructional strategies you identified for your SLO can inform your PPG, or you can focus on other areas you and/or your evaluator have identified.

Professional Practice Goal (PPG) Planning Form

Based on your self-review craft your PPG goal statement:

If your PPG and SLO goals are aligned, how are they related?

Identify related Danielson Framework for Teaching domain/component(s):

Describe applicable instructional or non-instructional activities:

Identify resources and support you need to achieve this PPG:
Appendix C: Supporting Year Evaluation Timeline
Supporting Year Evaluation Timeline

**Overview of the Educator Effectiveness System: Supporting Year**

**Gathering Evidence**

| Educator gathers evidence of progress towards EEP goals |
|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|

**Meetings**

- **Educator meets with peers to discuss creation of EEP**
- **Educator prepares/ submits Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP) in Teachscape prior to the meeting**
- **Educator meets with peers to discuss progress on EEP**
- **Educator prepares/ submits Mid-Interval Review in Teachscape prior to the meeting. If educator is working on a goal with a shorter interval, it is important to conduct a mid-interval check.**
- **Educator meets with peers to discuss progress on EEP and to inform SLO scoring**
- **After meeting, educator submits SLO self-score.**
- **Educator submits End-of-Interval Review and inputs a draft SLO self-score in Teachscape prior to the meeting.**
Appendix D: SLO Assessment Guidance (Ensuring High Quality)
SLO Assessment Guidance (Ensuring High Quality)

Those preparing SLOs have substantial autonomy in selecting evidence sources for documenting the growth toward identified goals, so long as the educator and evaluator mutually agree upon these evidence sources. This autonomy, however, does not mean that an educator can use any source of evidence. This appendix provides guidance regarding components of quality evidence that evaluators should consider when supporting sources of evidence for the SLO process.

In the coming years, DPI will begin developing a “repository” of high-quality, exemplar SLOs, along with potential evidence sources for each one to identify those resources which currently exist, and to develop new resources to fill resource gaps. The repository will allow educators to sort SLOs, as well as appropriate evidence sources, by grade, subject, and content area.

What is validity?

Validity defines quality in educational measurement. It is the extent to which an assessment actually measures what it is intended to measure and provides sound information supporting the purpose(s) for which it is used. Thus, assessments themselves are not valid or invalid. The validity of assessments resides in the evidence provided by it and its specific use. Some assessments have a high degree of validity for one purpose, but may have little validity for another. For example, a benchmark reading assessment may be valid for identifying students who may not reach the proficiency level on a state test. However the assessment could have little validity for diagnosing and identifying the cause of students’ reading challenges. The evaluation of quality within an assessment begins with a clear explanation of the purpose(s) and serious consideration of a range of issues that tell how well it serves that purpose(s). The dynamic between an assessment's purpose and the resulting data generated by the assessment is key to determining the validity of assessments.

Assessments Should:

- Be aligned with standards
- Provide reliable information for intended score interpretations and uses
- Be proctored with consistency
- Be fair and accessible
- Provide useful reporting for intended users and purposes
- Be developed with cohesion

Why do we need alignment to standards?

Alignment is how well what outcomes are assessed matches what has been taught, what is learned and the purpose for giving the assessment. For assessments to provide data in order for staff to make inferences about student learning, the assessment must be aligned with the standards, inclusive of criteria from novice to mastery.

The essential issues for alignment focus on these questions:

1. How does _______________ reflect what is most important for students to know and be able to do?

2. How does _______________ capture the depth and breadth of the standard, noting a rigorous progression toward proficiency?
3. Is ________________ aligned to the Common Core State Standards or other relevant standards?

4. Do the sequence and rigor of ___________ align vertically and horizontally within the SLO?

5. What timeframe is assigned in order to have accountability for the standards within the instructional framework?

### Questions to Ask About Assessments While Developing a Student Learning Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to Ask</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Content**      | - How well do the items/tasks/criteria align to appropriate standards, curriculum and essential outcomes for the grade level or course?  
- In what ways would mastering or applying the identified content be considered “essential” for students learning this subject at this grade level?  
- How do the content, skills and/or concepts assessed by the items or task provide students with knowledge, skills and understandings that are (1) essential for success in the next grade/course or in subsequent fields of study; or (2) otherwise of high value beyond the course? |
| **Rigor**        | - In what ways do the items/tasks and criteria address appropriately challenging content?  
- To what extent do the items or task require appropriate critical thinking and application?  
- How does the performance task ask students to analyze, create, and/or apply their knowledge and skills to a situation or problem where they must apply multiple skills and concepts? |
| **Format**       | - To what extent are the items/tasks and criteria designed such that student responses/scores will identify student’s levels or knowledge, understanding and/or mastery? |
| **Results**      | - When will the results be made available to the educator? (The results must be available to the educator prior to the end of year conference) |
| **Fairness**     | - To what extent are the items or the task and criteria free from words and knowledge that are characteristic to particular ethnicities, subcultures, and genders?  
- To what extent are appropriate accommodations available and provided to students as needed? |
| **Reliability**  | - Are there a sufficient number of items in multiple formats for each important, culminating, overarching skill? |
| **Scoring**      | - Does the performance task have a rubric where the criteria clearly define and differentiate levels of performance and as a result, the criteria insure inter-rater reliability?  
- Do open-ended questions have rubrics that (1) clearly articulate what students are expected to know and do and (2) differentiate between levels of knowledge/mastery?  
- To what extent does scoring give appropriate weight to the essential aspects? |
SLO Process and Scoring Guide

Guidance on Student/School Learning Objectives (SLOs)
Every year, Wisconsin educators must conduct the SLO process—selecting, monitoring, and scoring SLO goals collaboratively with evaluators and/or peers. The dialog within the SLO process provides an opportunity to strengthen SLO goals, identify quality evidence/assessments, and discuss academic growth for students, thereby supporting professional growth for the educator. For more information on SLO goals, visit the SLO Toolkit.

SLO PROCESS
To support Wisconsin educators and evaluators through the annual SLO process, DPI developed the SLO Process Guide. A quality SLO process is characterized by several critical features—the Process Guide lists these features and aids formative conversations associated with the creation and ongoing monitoring of SLO implementation and progress. Additionally, this Process Guide can also support final SLO scoring discussions, as final SLO scores now incorporate the impact of quality SLO processes. Educators and evaluators can use the third column within the Process Guide to record their collaborative conversations or to document self-reflections.

SLO PROCESS GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Quality Indicators</th>
<th>Reflections/Feedback/Notes for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Data and Rationale</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educator used multiple data sources to complete a thorough review of student achievement data, including subgroup analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data analysis supports the rationale for the SLO goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The baseline data indicates the individual starting point for each student included in the target population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SLO is aligned to specific content standards, representing the critical content for learning within a grade-level and subject area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The standards identified are appropriate and aligned to support the area(s) of need and the student population identified in the baseline data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SLO is stated as a SMART goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student population identified in the goal(s) reflects the results of the data analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth trajectories reflect appropriate gains for students, based on identified starting points or benchmark levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO Quality Indicators</td>
<td>Reflections/Feedback/Notes for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth goals are rigorous, yet attainable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted growth is revisited based on progress monitoring data and adjusted if needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interval</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interval is appropriate given the SLO goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interval reflects the duration of time the target student population is with the educator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-point checks are planned, data is reviewed, and revisions to the goal are made if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-point revisions are based on strong rationale and evidence supporting the adjustment mid-course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessments chosen to serve as evidence appropriately measure intended growth goals/learning content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments are valid, reliable, fair, and unbiased for all students/target population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evidence reflects a balanced use of assessment data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress is continuously monitored and an appropriate amount of evidence can be collected in time for use in the End of Cycle Summary conference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher created rubrics, if used to assess student performance, have well crafted performance levels that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly define levels of performance;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are easy to understand;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Show a clear path to student mastery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional (for teachers) and Leadership (for principals) Strategies and Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies reflect a differentiated approach appropriate to the target population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies were adjusted throughout the interval based on formative assessment and progress monitoring data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with others—teachers, specialists, instructional coaches, Assistant Principals—is indicated when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate professional development opportunities are addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately and appropriately scored the SLO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score is substantiated by student achievement data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Beginning of Year**

Working collaboratively with their evaluator or a peer, educators draw upon the SLO Process Guide to develop an SLO and document the goal within Teachscape (or an alternative online system). In Summary Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators. (*Note: evaluators no longer approve SLOs and EEPs, but instead provide formative feedback.*)

**Middle of Year**

Working collaboratively with their evaluator or a peer, educators draw upon the SLO Process Guide to monitor progress towards an SLO across the year and adjust instructional strategies accordingly. Educators can also use the Process Guide to consider a mid-year adjustment to an SLO based on data collected through the progress monitoring process. In Summary Years, Educators must conduct this process with their evaluators.

**End of Year**

At the end of the SLO interval, educators draw upon all available evidence of their SLO implementation and progress, including the criteria listed in the Process Guide, to inform the selection of a self-score. Using the revised SLO Scoring Rubric (see page 86) for the SLO, educators will self-score their SLO and document the score in Teachscape. In Summary Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators. Additionally, evaluators will review all SLOs (from the Summary Year and supporting Years) and the supporting documentation prior to the End of Cycle Summary Conference as evidence towards a final, holistic SLO score. Evaluators draw upon the SLO Process Guide to inform the determination of the holistic score using the SLO Scoring Rubric. Evaluators document the holistic score into Teachscape (or an approved alternative system). During the End of Cycle Summary Conference, evaluators discuss collaboratively with educators the SLO implementation and progress across the Effectiveness Cycle and the resulting holistic score. The holistic score is the final SLO score that will factor into an educator’s Student Outcomes Summary Score, instead of an average of an educator’s individual SLOs, as originally proposed.

*Updated in Teacher Evaluation Process Manual - September 2014*
Wisconsin Teacher Self-Review Screenshot

The self-review process allows teachers to reflect on their practice and prior evaluations and prepare for the development of their Educator Effectiveness Plan. Please review Danielson’s Framework for Teaching, and then score yourself for each component. Based on those scores, identify and record an area in which you think further development is necessary related to that component. Complete and submit the Self-Review documentation in Teachscape to your evaluator prior to your Summary Year Planning Session.

**Screenshot of the Self-Review of one of the Danielson Framework for Teaching components in Teachscape**
Appendix G: SMART Goal Guidelines
SMART Goal Guidelines

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System encourages the use of SMART goals when setting both professional practice and SLO goals. The concept of SMART goals was developed in the field of performance management. SMART is an acronym standing for **Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Results-based, and Time-bound.**

**Specific** goals are those that are well-defined and free of ambiguity or generality. The consideration of “W” questions can help in developing goals that are specific:

- What?—Specify exactly what the goal seeks to accomplish.
- Why?—Specify the reasons for, purposes or benefits of the goal.
- Who?—Specify who this goal includes or involves.
- When?—Specify the timeline for the attainment of the goal.
- Which?—Specify any requirements or constraints involved in achieving the goal.

**Measurable** goals are those which have concrete criteria for measuring progress toward their achievement. They tend to be quantitative (how much? how many?) as opposed to qualitative (what’s it like?).

**Attainable** goals are those that are reasonably achievable. Goals that are too lofty or unattainable will result in failure, but at the same time, they should involve extra effort to achieve. In either extreme (too far-reaching or sub-par), goals become meaningless.

**Results-based** goals are those that are aligned with the expectations and direction provided by the district or building goals. They are goals that focus on results and are relevant to the mission of an organization such as a school, helping to move the overall effort of a school forward.

**Time-bound** goals occur within a specified and realistic timeframe. Often in schools, this timeframe may be a school year, although it could be a semester, or a multi-year goal, depending on local contexts and needs.
Screenshot of Teacher Pre-Observation in Teachscape

Wisconsin Pre-Observation Form (Teacher)
Evaluator: Wisconsin Review Principal2
Practitioner: Wisconsin Review Teacher2

General
To which standards does this lesson align?

How does this learning "fit" within the broader context of the curriculum for your course?

Briefly describe the students in this class, including those with special needs.

How will you assess student progress and/or understanding of content?

Is there anything that you would like me to specifically observe during the lesson?
Appendix I: Post-Observation Screenshot
Screenshot of Post-Observation in Teachscape

Wisconsin Post-Observation Form (Teacher)
Evaluator: Wisconsin Review Principal2
Practitioner: Wisconsin Review Teacher2

In general, what worked?

What didn't work?

What will you do differently, please provide specific examples.

Other comments related to this lesson.
Mid-Interval Review of Progress Screenshot

Summarize the status of your SLO and PPG, include the evidence used to demonstrate progress for the SLO and PPG, and if necessary identify barriers to success and the strategies/modifications of strategies to address the barriers. Submit these completed sections to your evaluator in Teachscape in your Summary Year prior to your Mid-Year Review or come prepared to discuss these elements at the Mid-Year Review.

Screenshot of Mid Interval Review for SLOs in Teachscape
Mid-Year Review of Progress

Describe your progress towards achieving the goal:

Summarize the evidence of progress:

Articulate strategies/modifications to address barriers (if necessary):

Describe key next steps:
Wisconsin Teacher End of Cycle Summary Screenshot

To be completed by evaluator

---

*Summary Year SLO score is based on the evaluator’s holistic assessment of SLO process and student outcomes using the new SLO Rubric (Appendix M).*
Appendix L: EEP End-of-Interval Progress Update Screenshot
EEP End of Interval Progress Update Screenshot

Summarize the status of your SLO and PPG, include the evidence sources used to demonstrate completion for your SLO and PPG, and discuss your lessons learned from the SLO and PPG process. Complete and submit these sections in Teachscape to your evaluator in your Summary Year prior to your Final Summary Conference.

*Screenshot of End of Interval Review of SLO in Teachscape*
End-of-Year Review of Progress

What is the status of your PPG at the end of the year?

Discuss the evidence you gathered throughout the year:

What did you learn that would inform future PPG processes, plans, or goals?

Additional comments:

Save & Finish Later  Submit
Appendix M: Wisconsin SLO Scoring Rubric
Wisconsin SLO Scoring Rubric

SLO Rubric Overview
Both educators and evaluators will use the revised SLO Scoring Rubric (see below) to determine SLO scores. Educators will self-score their individual SLOs in all years (Summary and Supporting Years). Evaluators will assign a holistic SLO score considering all SLOs—the SLO implementation and student progress. Using the SLO Scoring Rubric, evaluators determine an educator’s holistic SLO score by identifying the rubric level that best describes the educator’s SLO implementation process and student growth, drawing upon the preponderance of evidence. This method of scoring ensures a holistic approach is taken. It allows evaluators to recognize student growth as well as professional growth across the SLO cycle, which aligns with the purpose of the Wisconsin EE System. The holistic score is the final SLO score that will factor into an educator’s Student Outcomes Summary, instead of an average of an educator’s individual SLOs, as originally proposed.

SLO Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description (not exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student growth for SLO(s) has <strong>exceeded</strong> the goal(s). Educator engaged in a comprehensive, data-driven SLO process that resulted in exceptional student growth.</td>
<td>Evidence indicates targeted population’s growth exceeded the expectations described in the goal. Educator set rigorous superior goal(s); skillfully used appropriate assessments; continuously monitored progress; strategically revised instruction based on progress monitoring data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student growth for SLO(s) has <strong>met</strong> goal(s). Educator engaged in a data-driven SLO process that resulted in student growth.</td>
<td>Evidence indicates the targeted population met the expectations described in the goal. Educator set attainable goal(s); used appropriate assessments; monitored progress; adjusted instruction based on progress monitoring data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student growth for SLO(s) has <strong>partially met</strong> the goal(s). Educator engaged in a SLO process that resulted in inconsistent student growth.</td>
<td>Evidence indicates the targeted population partially met expectations described in the goal. Educator set a goal; used assessments; inconsistently monitored progress; inconsistently or inappropriately adjusted instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student growth for SLO(s) has <strong>not met</strong> the goal(s). Educator engaged in a SLO process that resulted in minimal or no student growth.</td>
<td>Evidence indicates the targeted population has not met the expectations described in the goal. Educator set inappropriate goal(s); inconsistently or inappropriately used assessments; failed to monitor progress; failed to adjust instruction based on progress monitoring data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>