A guide for monitoring district implementation of educator evaluation systems

Trudy Cherasaro
David Yanoski
Marzano Research

Lyn Swackhamer
RMC Research Corp.

This guide provides a three-step process and sample tools for state departments of education to monitor district implementation of state- or district-developed educator evaluation systems. Districts can also use the tools to self-monitor implementation and guide further development of their systems. For each step of the process, the guide provides sample tools developed by Regional Educational Laboratory Central and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The steps guide states in collecting and analyzing policy and practice data on educator evaluation systems and in examining adherence to guidelines for quality educator evaluation systems.

Why this guide?

Most states are implementing new educator evaluation systems as part of their flexibility requests under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. While some waiver states (10) require all districts to use a single, statewide educator evaluation system, most waiver states (36) leave some discretion to the school districts to design their own systems (Center on Great Teachers & Leaders, 2013). Principle 3 of the flexibility request requires states to ensure that local education agencies implement teacher and principal evaluation systems (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). The monitoring required is intended to go beyond asking districts to confirm compliance with state guidelines. Instead, it is designed to focus on understanding how districts are implementing the systems so that states can provide support as needed (Pennington, 2014).

States are developing a wide range of methods to monitor district educator evaluation systems, including creating new departments within state departments of education, encouraging peer review of teacher

evaluation proposals between districts, and implementing electronic data systems for approving and monitoring the systems (Pennington, 2014).

This guide walks users through a three-step process that states can use to monitor district implementation of educator evaluation systems to comply with the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act flexibility requests. It also offers example tools developed together with the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education that states can adapt to provide districts with greater clarity on state expectations about educator evaluation systems. Districts could also use state-developed tools to self-monitor their evaluation systems or gather formative data about implementation to adjust their processes. Additionally, districts could adopt or adapt survey tools to gather feedback from their educators about implementation of their evaluation systems.

The three steps in the state monitoring process are:

1. Develop state guidelines for educator evaluation systems.

2. Develop data-collection methods.

3. Determine adherence criteria and review data against the criteria.

Step 1. Develop state guidelines for educator evaluation systems

Description. Many states have developed guidelines for educator evaluation systems as part of their flexibility requests under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As the guidelines are put into practice, states should review them to identify areas for refinement. For example, states may look for redundant or overlapping guidelines or imprecise language that could lead to multiple interpretations. States should seek feedback from trainers or district leaders about the clarity of the guidelines and about how different terms are interpreted. As states develop data-collection instruments and criteria related to each of their guidelines, they can continue to identify changes needed to improve clarity.

Example from Missouri's Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation Systems. During the development of Missouri's flexibility request, the state developed the Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation Systems, which includes 7 principles and 35 indicators of an effective educator evaluation system (table 1).

To review these principles and indicators, Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Central invited a team of about 10 trainers and Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education leaders to identify and clarify imprecise terms for each principle. Missouri has a pool of trainers in each region to provide training and help districts implement new educator evaluation systems aligned to the state principles. The trainers selected for this meeting represented various regions of the state as well as various roles, such as superintendents, principals, and university faculty. Before the meeting, REL Central and Missouri education leaders identified 21 terms that needed clarification.

During a six-hour meeting, REL Central guided a conversation with the trainers and Missouri education leaders to answer two questions:
*   What does this term mean in Missouri?
*   What is the observable evidence related to this term?

The answers were used to develop a working definition of the terms that guided the remainder of the process for developing a monitoring system. Examples of two clarified definitions are shown in table 2.

Table 1. Missouri's Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation Systems

Principles	Indicators
1. Performance of educators is measured against research-based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement.	• Educator performance targets are research-based and proven. • Performance targets align to appropriate state and national standards. • Performance targets articulate essential practices. • Performance targets are clearly articulated. • Performance targets of the educator link to improvements in student learning.
2. Multiple ratings are used to differentiate levels of educator performance.	• Includes a minimum of 3 differentiated levels. • Includes clear statements of performance at each level. • Each level allows for discrete, independent, measureable elements. • Each level reliably describes current practice. • Levels provide clear direction for growth and improvement in practice.
3. A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.	• Includes required mentoring as a component of a comprehensive induction process. • Complies with Missouri statute regarding the probationary period. • Is informed by the state's mentor standards. • Includes confidential, non-evaluative support linked to the district's overall plan for professional development. • Focuses on essential practices of particular significance for novice practitioners and educators.
4. Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels.	• Is a significant contributing component of the overall evaluation process. • Uses multiple measures of student performance including both formative and summative assessments. • Includes multiple years of comparable student data. • Highlights growth in student learning across two points in time as opposed to simple measures of status. • Includes the state assessment where available and additional district- and school-determined assessments.
5. Ongoing, timely, deliberate, and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research-based targets.	• Is delivered effectively and is meaningful to the improvement of practice. • Focuses on the impact of professional practice to increase student learning. • Is offered at least once annually to everyone either formally, informally, or both. • Is offered in close proximity to the data gathering process (observation, survey, artifact review). • Occurs within the context of a professional, collaborative culture.
6. Standardized, periodic training is provided for evaluators to ensure reliability and accuracy.	• Evaluators demonstrate skills aligned to minimum quality assurance standards established by districts and/or the state. • Training includes conducting observations focused on the quality of instruction. • Assessing student data, analyzing artifacts, and interpreting survey information occur. • Time for the effective delivery of meaningful feedback is incorporated. • Training is offered both initially and periodically to those who evaluate educator performance.
7. Evaluation results and data are used to inform decisions regarding personnel, employment determinations, and human resource policies such as promotion, retention, dismissal, induction, tenure, and compensation.	• Guides district employment policies and procedures. • Guides district decisions regarding employment determinations. • Informs in particular those policies that affect the extent of student learning. • Empowers the district to recognize and utilize highly effective educators. • Informs district strategies for providing targeted interventions and support.

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, n.d.

Table 2. How general evaluation terms were adapted for use in Missouri

Term	What does this term mean in Missouri?	What is the observable evidence related to this term?	Working definition
Research based	Aligned to the Missouri teacher and leader standards	District crosswalks[a] or alignment studies	The district evaluation system is aligned with the Missouri teacher and leader standards as evidenced by crosswalks and alignment studies
Multiple measures	Two or more means of determining student growth	Evaluation summative ratings based on two or more means of determining student growth	The district process includes student growth in the evaluation rating that is based on two or more sources for determining student performance

a. A crosswalk is a report or table that documents the alignment between sets of standards. It identifies areas where the standards overlap as well as areas where there are gaps in the alignment.

Source: Authors' summary based on conversations with Missouri education leaders in 2014; see text for details.

After the meeting, REL Central compiled a list of working definitions for each term and collected feedback from meeting attendees, additional trainers, and Missouri education officials.

Missouri is considering changes to the Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation Systems based on these conversations and other clarifications that emerged during development of a system for monitoring implementation. These changes will include additional examples to clarify terms and changes to language.

Step 2. Develop data-collection methods

A state's guidelines for educator evaluation systems should address district policies and practices. To determine whether guidelines are being met, it is thus necessary to collect both policy and practice data.

Policy data

Description. Policy data include policy documents or other district documents that describe the district's educator evaluation system. These data can be collected at the district level and examined for adherence to state guidelines.

To determine the types of policy data to collect, a state could convene a meeting with district leaders and trainers or other state staff who work closely with district leaders and ask participants to identify the policy documents related to each of the state's guidelines. The state can then create a list of documents aligned to each guideline. This checklist can be used to collect policy documents from each district by asking districts to identify which documents they have and to provide links to electronic documents or upload the documents to a state website or a secure data-sharing site such as Dropbox.

Example from Missouri's policy data collection checklist. REL Central convened five trainers and Missouri education leaders to develop a checklist to collect policy data from districts. During a two-hour conversation, the team was asked to brainstorm all possible documents that districts might have that describe district policy or guidelines related to each of the indicators in the seven principles in the state's Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation Systems.

The resulting list of documents constitutes the policy evidence related to each of Missouri's principles of effective evaluation systems. The checklist gives district personnel a starting point for gathering district

documents related to each principle. In addition, district personnel were asked to indicate how they will provide the documents to the state—on a website, through a secure data-sharing site such as Dropbox, in hard copy only—or whether they do not currently have these documents or they do not exist.

To pilot the checklist, Missouri asked three districts to use the checklist to submit policy documents. The checklist will continue to be modified as districts submit documents. An excerpt from a REL Central and Missouri policy data collection checklist form is shown in figure 1; the full checklist is in appendix A and available on REL Central's website (http://www.relcentral.org).

Practice data

Description. Practice data can be defined as information about how district policies are being put into practice. These data help the state and district understand whether the district evaluation system is being implemented as intended. Practice data can be collected through surveys that ask stakeholders questions about their experiences with the system.

Figure 1. Excerpt from REL Central and Missouri's policy data collection checklist form

Principle 1: Performance of educators is measured against research based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement				
	Availability/location			
Type of document	**On website using this link**	**Submitted in Dropbox**	**Only available in hard copy**	**Not available/ does not exist**
1. Description of evaluation model being used (please select one): If other, provide any supporting documents tying the model to research ☐ Missouri State Model ☐ Danielson Model ☐ Marzano Model ☐ Missouri University Model ☐ District Developed Model ☐ Other (please provide name): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding the implementation and use of the educator evaluation model	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. District educator evaluation committee meeting agendas	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. Report(s) on studies focused on aligning evaluation targets to state and/or national standards	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
a. Crosswalks between standards and evaluation model	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
b. Research documents	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
c. Literature review supporting link to each standard	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
d. Other (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
e. District performance targets	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. Other documents relevant to Principle 1 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Source: Authors' creation based on conversations with Missouri education leaders in 2014; see text for details.

To determine what practice data to collect, a state can convene a meeting with a sample of district education leaders or trainers and ask the group to identify survey questions for each of the state's guidelines that would help determine whether policies are being put into practice. This meeting could be combined with the meeting on policy documents, with the same group asked to identify both relevant policy documents and survey questions. As part of this process, the group should identify who (for example, teachers, principals, or district administrators) needs to answer each question. A suggested template to brainstorm potential survey questions, with examples from Missouri's principles and indicators, is shown in table 3. In this template the group lists each of the indicators from state guidelines and, for each indicator, lists the survey data related to the indicator that it would like to collect.

Once the survey questions and potential respondents are determined, the state can create separate online surveys for each group of respondents (such as teachers and principals) using online survey software such as SurveyMonkey. If possible, to gather feedback on the clarity of the questions, a state should conduct a small field test of the surveys. During this field test, the state would ask a small sample from each group to take the survey and then follow up by asking the survey respondents: Are the questions clear and unambiguous? Do the questions use language that is relevant and appropriate for the specific audience? The sample should represent multiple perspectives, including teachers from different content areas and grade levels, principals across various school levels, and district administrators from various regions and types of districts. Responses can be used to adjust the survey questions.

A state can then send out the survey invitations directly or provide districts with the survey links so that districts can invite staff to take the surveys.

Example from Missouri's surveys. REL Central led a team of five Missouri trainers and education leaders through the process described above to develop surveys to collect feedback from four groups of educators. Each survey included questions related to each principle and its indicators. Before the meeting, REL

Table 3. Template for identifying survey questions for collecting practice data, with examples from Missouri

Indicator	Potential survey data
Example: Includes clear statements of performance at each level.	*Example: Teachers and principals indicate that teacher rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving practice.* *Principals indicate that principal rubrics provide a clear path for improving instruction.* *Teachers indicate that the teacher rubrics and scoring guides clearly describe what they need to know and do to earn each rating score.*
Example: Includes required mentoring as a component of a comprehensive induction process.	*Example: Teachers indicate that they have a school- or district-assigned mentor.* *Teachers indicate that they met with their mentors three or more times during the school year.* *Mentors indicate that they met with their mentees three or more times during the school year.*

Source: Authors' creation based on conversations with Missouri education leaders in 2014; see text for details.

Central compiled example survey questions using published surveys on educator evaluation systems. During the four-hour meeting, the team identified the "big idea" behind each indicator, asking: What would educators report is happening if these indicators were in place? Then, the team reviewed and adopted or adapted example survey questions to match the big ideas. When necessary, new survey questions were written. After the meeting, REL Central compiled survey questions and shared draft surveys with the meeting participants and with additional trainers and Missouri education leaders for feedback and revisions. Additionally, a survey research expert reviewed the surveys. Revisions were made based on feedback. These are the four surveys that were developed, with a description of the topics covered in each survey:

- *Teacher survey.* Asks questions about the usefulness and clarity of the system, student growth, evaluator feedback, and mentoring experiences.
- *Principal survey.* Asks questions about the usefulness and clarity of the teacher and principal evaluation systems, student growth in both systems, evaluator feedback they received, feedback they provided, training on the teacher evaluation system, and implementation of the mentoring program.
- *District administrator survey.* Asks questions about the usefulness and clarity of the teacher and principal evaluation systems, student growth in both systems, feedback they provided, and training on the teacher evaluation system.
- *Mentor survey.* Asks questions about the support mentors provided to mentees.

The surveys are shown in appendixes B, C, D, and E and are available in Word format on REL Central's website (http://www.relcentral.org).

Step 3. Determine adherence criteria and review data against the criteria

Description. Once a state has developed guidelines and determined the needed policy and practice data related to those guidelines, it can develop adherence criteria to determine whether a district is meeting the state guidelines. For policy documents, the criteria should describe what policy documents the state would expect to see in a district to demonstrate that a guideline is being met. For practice data, the criteria should describe the percentage of respondents the state would expect to agree with survey questions related to each of the guidelines.

To develop the criteria, state leaders can use information gathered during step 1 when clarifying imprecise terms. For example, the observable evidence presented in table 1 for the term "research based" could easily translate into the following criterion: "The district has a crosswalk or alignment study that shows alignment between district standards and national or state teacher and leader standards."

State leaders need to determine whether responses should be expected from a majority of respondents or whether another threshold is more appropriate. When setting thresholds, state leaders should keep in mind any legislation or legal requirements that should be reflected in the criteria.

The state also needs to determine who will review the data against the criteria and which districts will be involved in the review each year. Although it would help to understand how every district is implementing educator evaluation systems, this may be an unreasonable expectation given the amount of time it would take to gather and review this much data. The state may opt to collect and review data from a sample of districts each year, with plans to collect data from all districts over the course of the next few years. As a starting point, the state could target districts that have been recognized as needing improvement based on the state's accountability system so it can provide additional support to these districts.

Example from Missouri's rating guide. REL Central led two Missouri education leaders through a process to develop adherence criteria to determine whether a district is meeting the state guidelines. The adherence

criteria were documented in a rating guide that lists criteria for policy documents and practice data for each principle and provides an overall scoring process for determining the extent to which each principle is met. As a first step in creating a rating guide, REL Central developed a document that linked the working definitions of evaluation terms, appropriate policy documents, and survey questions relevant to each indicator. Using this document, REL Central guided a six-hour conversation with Missouri education leaders to refine the list of policy and practice evidence needed for each principle. This refined list was used to develop criteria for each principle and to set thresholds for determining whether the criteria were met. Policy criteria describe which types of documents a district must have in place. Practice criteria describe which survey questions show evidence of implementation. Missouri decided to set thresholds that required a majority of both policy and practice data to fully meet the principle. A draft rating guide was developed based on this process.

A district leader reviewed the draft rating guide and provided feedback on clarity of the criteria, threshold levels, and feasibility of the process. REL Central and Missouri education leaders also tested the draft rating guide using data collected from the pilot of the policy data collection checklist and sample survey data. To test the rating guide, a team of four raters independently reviewed and rated two districts' data and then discussed the results when ratings did not match to make refinements and reach consensus. Testing the rating guide took a full day. On the same day, the team also developed a sample summary report format to summarize the ratings for each district and identify action steps for criteria that were not met.

A snapshot of the Missouri rating guide is shown in figure 2. The full rating guide is in appendix F. The sample summary district report is shown in appendix G. Missouri plans to collect and review data from districts in need of improvement to inform their district accreditation process. It also plans to review data from a sample of districts each year until all districts are eventually reviewed.

The process is iterative

Although this process for developing a state implementation monitoring system has been presented in linear steps, it is actually an iterative process in which each step informs the process as a whole. As each step is completed, a state may choose to realign all the documents and tools. For example, Missouri revised the surveys while developing the rating guide because it became clear that some of the survey questions were not tightly aligned with the criteria and others were redundant. Missouri is continuing to refine its process as additional data are collected.

In the initial conversations to clarify imprecise terms in the evaluation principles and indicators, Missouri began to look more deeply at its expectations and the language used to describe them. Missouri education leaders realized that it would have been beneficial to have completed this process sooner, so that there would have been a greater degree of clarity about expectations before implementation began. However, at each phase in the process Missouri developed a deeper understanding of its expectations, resulting in information that districts can use as they implement their new evaluation system.

Figure 2. Excerpt from the REL Central and Missouri rating guide

Principle 1: Performance of educators is measured against research based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement.			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Educator performance targets are research-based and proven. Performance targets align to appropriate state and national standards. Performance targets articulate essential practices. Performance targets are clearly articulated. Performance targets of the educator link to improvements in student learning.	Policy documents	The district is using one of the following models: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model.	*Met*—using listed model or district model that meets all criteria
		If district is using a district-developed model, or another model, the district: · cites research and theory used in developing performance targets in their evaluation documents. · has a crosswalk or alignment study that shows alignment between district standards and national or state teacher or leader standards. · has a crosswalk or alignment study that some of the performance targets have high effect sizes. · has documents that demonstrate that a majority of the district's teacher and leader performance targets include links to student evidence.	*Partially met*—using district model that meets the majority of criteria *Not met*—using district model that does not meet the majority of criteria
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: · The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly define what is expected of me as a teacher/principal. *(Teacher and Principal survey)* · The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides are appropriate for my position. *(Teacher and Principal survey)* · The teacher evaluation system is fair to teachers in all classrooms, content, and grade levels. *(Teacher survey)* · I have improved my practice as a result of the teacher/principal evaluation system. *(Teacher and Principal survey)* · The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides available to me are appropriate to all of the positions that I evaluate. *(Principal survey)*	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 1 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Source: Authors' creation based on conversations with Missouri education leaders in 2014; see text for details.

Appendix A. Policy data collection checklist

Regional Educational Laboratory Central worked with Missouri trainers and education leaders to develop a checklist to collect policy data from districts. The checklist includes possible documents that districts might have that describe district policy or guidelines related to each of the indicators in the seven principles in the state's Essential Principles of Effective Evaluation Systems. The checklist gives district personnel a starting point for gathering district documents related to each principle.

Principle 1: Performance of educators is measured against research based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement				
		Availability/location		
Type of document	**On website using this link**	**Submitted in Dropbox**	**Only available in hard copy**	**Not available/ does not exist**
1. Description of evaluation model being used (please select one): If other, provide any supporting documents tying the model to research ☐ Missouri State Model ☐ Danielson Model ☐ Marzano Model ☐ Missouri University Model ☐ District Developed Model ☐ Other (please provide name): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding the implementation and use of the educator evaluation model	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. District educator evaluation committee meeting agendas	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. Report(s) on studies focused on aligning evaluation targets to state and/or national standards	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
a. Crosswalks between standards and evaluation model	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
b. Research documents	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
c. Literature review supporting link to each standard	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
d. Other (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
e. District performance targets	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. Other documents relevant to Principle 1 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Principle 2: Multiple ratings are used to differentiate levels of educator performance

Type of document	Availability/location			
	On website using this link	Submitted in Dropbox	Only available in hard copy	Not available/ does not exist
1. District rubrics or rating scales	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. Guidance on rating protocol and/or additional descriptors	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding use of multiple rating scales	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. District review of performance standards for clarity	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. District review of performance standards for ability to differentiate	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
6. Documentation on training provided to evaluators	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
7. Description of how the rating scales were developed (for example, the process, the review, or pilot-testing)	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
8. Other documents relevant to Principle 2 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders

Type of document	Availability/location			
	On website using this link	Submitted in Dropbox	Only available in hard copy	Not available/ does not exist
1. Induction program description	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. Induction program calendar or schedule	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. Mentoring program description	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. Mentoring program calendar or schedule	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. Training and/or requirements for serving as a mentor	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
6. New hire orientation day agenda	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
7. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding induction, mentoring, and orientation	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
8. Crosswalk document(s) mapping mentoring program to state guidance	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
9. District plan for probationary teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
10. District plan for transitioning from year 1–2 intensive support to year 3–5 probationary period	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
11. Other documents relevant to Principle 3 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Principle 4: Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels

Type of document	Availability/location			
	On website using this link	Submitted in Dropbox	Only available in hard copy	Not available/ does not exist
1. District guidance on incorporating student performance into evaluation ratings	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
a. Information on how the district is using student achievement data in evaluating teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
b. Information on whether the district is using the state growth data	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding incorporating student performance into evaluation ratings	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. Listing of measures of student performance being used in the district evaluation system	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. List of assessment options available to teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. Other documents relevant to Principle 4 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Principle 5: Ongoing, timely, deliberate, and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research based targets

Type of document	Availability/location			
	On website using this link	Submitted in Dropbox	Only available in hard copy	Not available/ does not exist
1. District plan for providing and documenting feedback to teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. Calendar or schedule for providing feedback	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding providing feedback to teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. Plans for training evaluators on providing feedback	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. Other documents relevant to Principle 5 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Principle 6: Standardized, periodic training is provided for evaluators to ensure reliability and accuracy

Type of document	Availability/location			
	On website using this link	Submitted in Dropbox	Only available in hard copy	Not available/ does not exist
1. District plans for training evaluators on performance standards	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. District information on establishing inter-rater reliability for evaluators	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. Calendar or schedule for training sessions (including number of training sessions)	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. Training curriculum	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding training evaluators	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
6. Other relevant to Principle 6 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Principle 7: Evaluation results and data are used to inform decisions regarding personnel, employment determinations, and human resource policies such as promotion, retention, dismissal, induction, tenure, and compensation

Type of document	Availability/location			
	On website using this link	Submitted in Dropbox	Only available in hard copy	Not available/ does not exist
1. District professional development plans	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
2. District promotion, retention, dismissal, and compensation procedures	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
3. District program(s) designed to recognize and reward highly effective teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
4. District support options for ineffective teachers	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
5. District plans for implementing and evaluating educator evaluation system	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
6. Plans for providing bonuses, support, or dismissals based upon the educator evaluation system results	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
7. Board policy or action statement(s) regarding human resource policies	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐
8. Other relevant to Principle 7 (please describe): Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	☐	☐	☐

Appendix B. Teacher survey on district implementation of educator evaluation systems

Teacher evaluation system

1. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's teacher evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides clearly define what is expected of me as a teacher.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides clearly describe what I need to know and do to earn each rating score.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides are appropriate for my position.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides provide a clear path for improving my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation system is fair to teachers in all classrooms, content areas, and grade levels.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have improved my practice as a result of the teacher evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Student growth in teacher evaluation

2. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's plans for incorporating student growth in teacher evaluation.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I believe that the student growth measures that I will be evaluated on reflect my contribution to student learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My impact on student growth is a significant part of my evaluation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our teacher evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Which of the following student growth measures will be used in your evaluation? (check all that apply)
   - ☐ Multiple measures
   - ☐ Formative data
   - ☐ Summative data
   - ☐ Multiple years of comparable student data
   - ☐ State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
   - ☐ Additional district-and school-determined common assessment(s)
   - ☐ Student growth across two points in time

Evaluator feedback

4. Did you receive feedback from your evaluator during this school year?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

5. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about the feedback you received from your evaluator.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The feedback I received from my evaluator promotes a professional collaborative school culture.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The feedback I received from my evaluator was given in the spirit of continuous improvement.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The feedback I received from my evaluator helped me to become a more effective teacher.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My evaluator's feedback included specific strategies that I could use to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have used my evaluator's feedback to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The professional development and training I received throughout the school year was tailored to my specific needs as identified in my evaluation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. In general, my evaluator provided feedback within:
   - ☐ 1 working day
   - ☐ 2 working days
   - ☐ 3 to 4 working days
   - ☐ More than 4 working days (not timely)

7. What subject/content area do you currently teach? (check all that apply)
    ☐ Language arts
    ☐ Math
    ☐ Science
    ☐ Social studies
    ☐ Art
    ☐ Health
    ☐ Physical education
    ☐ Music
    ☐ Technology
    ☐ World language
    ☐ Other: _____

8. What grade level do you currently teach? (check all that apply)

    ☐ Early childhood   ☐ 6th grade
    ☐ Kindergarten   ☐ 7th grade
    ☐ 1st grade   ☐ 8th grade
    ☐ 2nd grade   ☐ 9th grade
    ☐ 3rd grade   ☐ 10th grade
    ☐ 4th grade   ☐ 11th grade
    ☐ 5th grade   ☐ 12th grade

9. How many years (including this year) have you taught?

    ☐ 1   ☐ 12
    ☐ 2   ☐ 13
    ☐ 3   ☐ 14
    ☐ 4   ☐ 15
    ☐ 5   ☐ 16
    ☐ 6   ☐ 17
    ☐ 7   ☐ 18
    ☐ 8   ☐ 19
    ☐ 9   ☐ 20
    ☐ 10   ☐ More than 20
    ☐ 11

Mentoring

10. Do you have a school- or district-assigned mentor?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

11. How often did you meet with your mentor this school year?
    ☐ Never
    ☐ Once per year
    ☐ Twice per year
    ☐ Three times per year
    ☐ More than three times per year

12. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's mentoring program.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The mentoring process is non-evaluative.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The support I received from my mentor has helped me improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My mentor provided me with the resources I needed to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My mentor provided me with effective support.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Which of the following experiences were you offered as part of your mentoring experience? (check all that apply)
   ☐ Frequent, targeted feedback
   ☐ Opportunities to observe expert teachers
   ☐ Assistance with developing strategies
   ☐ A review of school and district expectations
   ☐ Collaborative development of lesson plans
   ☐ Collaborative look at student data
   ☐ The development of a growth plan based on needs
   ☐ Suggestion of resources
   ☐ Opportunities to self-reflect on your practice
   ☐ Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction
   ☐ Modeling of effective teaching practices

Appendix C. Principal survey on district implementation of educator evaluation systems

Principal evaluation system

1. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's principal evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The principal evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides clearly define what is expected of me as a principal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The principal evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides clearly describe what I need to know and do to earn each rating score.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The principal evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides are appropriate for my position.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The principal evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides provide a clear path for improving my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I am evaluated on whether I provide feedback to teachers each year.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have improved my practice as a result of the principal evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Student growth in principal evaluation

2. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's plans for incorporating student growth in principal evaluation.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I believe that the student growth measures used in my evaluation reflect my contribution to student learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My impact on student growth is a significant part of my evaluation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our principal evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our district approves student assessments that will be used in the principal evaluation system to measure student growth.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Student growth in my district's principal evaluation system is measured using the following (check all that apply):

☐ Multiple measures
☐ Formative data
☐ Summative data
☐ Multiple years of comparable student data
☐ State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
☐ Additional district- and school-determined common assessment(s)
☐ Student growth across two points in time

Evaluator feedback

4. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about the feedback you received from your evaluator.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The feedback I received from my evaluator was given in the spirit of continuous improvement.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The feedback I received from my evaluator helped me to become a more effective principal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My evaluator's feedback included specific strategies that I could use to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have used my evaluator's feedback to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The feedback I received from my evaluator helped me to become a more effective principal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My evaluator's feedback included specific strategies that I could use to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have used my evaluator's feedback to improve my practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. In general, my evaluator provides feedback within:

☐ 1 working day
☐ 2 working days
☐ 3 to 4 working days
☐ More than 4 working days (not timely)

6. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's teacher evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ rating guides clearly describe what teachers should know and do to earn each rating score.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ rating guides available to me are appropriate to all of the positions that I evaluate.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation rubrics/ rating guides provide a clear path for improving teacher practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation system provides me with the information I need to make well-informed personnel decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation system provides me with the information I need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to faculty needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform our comprehensive school improvement plan.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform decisions on how to utilize highly effective educators.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to recognize or reward of effective teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support (such as professional development and performance plans).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I provide feedback intended to promote a professional collaborative school culture.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The feedback I provide to teachers is linked to research-based practices.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. Do you provide feedback at least once per year to each teacher?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

8. Please rate your level of agreement with the following questions about the training you received on your district's teacher evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
My district provides standardized training on the teacher evaluation system for all evaluators.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I have been assessed on my ability to reliably and accurately evaluate teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9. Which of the following topics were included in your training on your district's teacher evaluation system?
   ☐ Procedures for ensuring inter-rater reliability
   ☐ Providing effective feedback
   ☐ Assessing student data
   ☐ Analyzing artifacts
   ☐ Interpreting survey information
   ☐ Opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback

Student growth in teacher evaluation

10. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's plans for incorporating student growth in teacher evaluation.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our teacher evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In our district, accountability around growth measures is comparable across grade levels and content areas.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our district approves student assessments that will be used in the teacher evaluation system to measure student growth for each grade level and content area.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. Student growth in my district's teacher evaluation system is measured using the following (check all that apply):
   ☐ Multiple measures
   ☐ Formative data
   ☐ Summative data
   ☐ Multiple years of comparable student data
   ☐ State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
   ☐ Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)
   ☐ Student growth across two points in time

Mentoring

12. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's mentoring program.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I align mentor support to teacher needs identified in their evaluations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I actively participate in identifying and assigning effective mentors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My district has a comprehensive system for training effective mentors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Principal background

13. What grade levels does your building serve? (check all that apply)
    - ☐ Early childhood
    - ☐ Kindergarten
    - ☐ 1st grade
    - ☐ 2nd grade
    - ☐ 3rd grade
    - ☐ 4th grade
    - ☐ 5th grade
    - ☐ 6th grade
    - ☐ 7th grade
    - ☐ 8th grade
    - ☐ 9th grade
    - ☐ 10th grade
    - ☐ 11th grade
    - ☐ 12th grade

14. How many years (including this year) have you been a principal?
    - ☐ 1
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5
    - ☐ 6
    - ☐ 7
    - ☐ 8
    - ☐ 9
    - ☐ 10
    - ☐ 11
    - ☐ 12
    - ☐ 13
    - ☐ 14
    - ☐ 15
    - ☐ 16
    - ☐ 17
    - ☐ 18
    - ☐ 19
    - ☐ 20
    - ☐ More than 20

Appendix D. District administrator survey on district implementation of educator evaluation systems

Teacher evaluation system

1. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's teacher evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The teacher evaluation rubrics/rating guides clearly describe what all teachers need to know and do to earn each rating score.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation rubrics/rating guides provide a clear path for improving teacher practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well-informed personnel decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to faculty needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform comprehensive school improvement plans.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform decisions on how to utilize highly effective teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective teachers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support (such as professional development and performance plans).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My district provides standardized training on the teacher evaluation system for all evaluators.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My district holds principals accountable for providing feedback to teachers each year.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our evaluators provide feedback in the spirit of continuous improvement.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Which of the following topics were included in the principal training on your district's teacher evaluation system?
   ☐ Procedures for ensuring inter-rater reliability
   ☐ Providing effective feedback
   ☐ Assessing student data
   ☐ Analyzing artifacts
   ☐ Interpreting survey information
   ☐ Opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback

Principal evaluation system

3. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's principal evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The principal evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides clearly describe what principals need to know and do to earn each rating level.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The principal evaluation rubrics/ scoring guides provide a clear path for improving principal practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well-informed personnel decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to administrator needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform district improvement efforts.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the principal evaluation system are used to identify effective administrators.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the principal evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective administrators.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support to administrators.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. As an evaluator, do you provide feedback at least once per year to each principal?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

5. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about your district's plans for incorporating student growth in the educator evaluation system.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Our district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our principal evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our teacher evaluation system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our district approves student assessments that will be used in the principal evaluation system to measure student growth.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our district approves student assessments that will be used in the teacher evaluation system to measure student growth.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In our district, accountability around growth measures is comparable across grade levels and content areas.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Student growth in our district's teacher evaluation system is measured using (check all that apply):
   ☐ Multiple measures
   ☐ Formative data
   ☐ Summative data
   ☐ Multiple years of comparable student data
   ☐ State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
   ☐ Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)
   ☐ Student growth across two points in time

7. Student growth in our district's principal evaluation system is measured using (check all that apply):
   ☐ Multiple measures
   ☐ Formative data
   ☐ Summative data
   ☐ Multiple years of comparable student data
   ☐ State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)
   ☐ Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)
   ☐ Student growth across two points in time

Appendix E. Mentor survey on district implementation of educator evaluation systems

1. Please rate your level of agreement about your district's mentoring program.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I received the training needed to become an effective mentor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I had the resources needed to provide support to my mentee(s).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The support that I provided to my mentee(s) helped them to improve their practice.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. On average, how often did you meet with your mentee(s) this school year?
   - ☐ Never
   - ☐ Once per year
   - ☐ Twice per year
   - ☐ Three times per year
   - ☐ More than three times per year

3. Which of the following experiences did you offer your mentee(s) as part of the mentoring experience? (check all that apply)
   - ☐ Frequent, targeted feedback
   - ☐ Opportunities to observe expert teachers
   - ☐ Assistance with developing strategies
   - ☐ A review of school and district expectations
   - ☐ Collaborative development of lesson plans
   - ☐ Collaborative look at student data
   - ☐ The development of a growth plan based on needs
   - ☐ Suggestion of resources
   - ☐ Opportunities to self-reflect on practice
   - ☐ Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction
   - ☐ Modeling of effective teaching practices

Mentor background

4. Please indicate the subject/content area in which you serve as a mentor (check all that apply):
   - ☐ Language arts
   - ☐ Math
   - ☐ Science
   - ☐ Social studies
   - ☐ Art
   - ☐ Health
   - ☐ Physical education
   - ☐ Music
   - ☐ Technology
   - ☐ World languages

5. Please indicate the grade levels in which you serve as a mentor (check all that apply):

   - ☐ Early childhood
   - ☐ Kindergarten
   - ☐ 1st grade
   - ☐ 2nd grade
   - ☐ 3rd grade
   - ☐ 4th grade
   - ☐ 5th grade
   - ☐ 6th grade
   - ☐ 7th grade
   - ☐ 8th grade
   - ☐ 9th grade
   - ☐ 10th grade
   - ☐ 11th grade
   - ☐ 12th grade

6. How many years (including this year) have you served as mentor?

   - ☐ 1
   - ☐ 2
   - ☐ 3
   - ☐ 4
   - ☐ 5
   - ☐ 6
   - ☐ 7
   - ☐ 8
   - ☐ 9
   - ☐ 10
   - ☐ 11
   - ☐ 12
   - ☐ 13
   - ☐ 14
   - ☐ 15
   - ☐ 16
   - ☐ 17
   - ☐ 18
   - ☐ 19
   - ☐ 20
   - ☐ More than 20

7. How many years (including this year) have you taught?

   - ☐ 1
   - ☐ 2
   - ☐ 3
   - ☐ 4
   - ☐ 5
   - ☐ 6
   - ☐ 7
   - ☐ 8
   - ☐ 9
   - ☐ 10
   - ☐ 11
   - ☐ 12
   - ☐ 13
   - ☐ 14
   - ☐ 15
   - ☐ 16
   - ☐ 17
   - ☐ 18
   - ☐ 19
   - ☐ 20
   - ☐ More than 20

Appendix F. Missouri's rating guide

Regional Educational Laboratory Central worked with Missouri education leaders to develop a rating guide to document criteria for determining adherence to the essential principles of effective evaluation systems (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, n.d.). For each of the principles, the rating guide identifies criteria related to the policy documents and the practice survey data and provides a scoring process to determine whether the criteria have been met.

Principle 1: Performance of educators is measured against research based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Educator performance targets are research-based and proven. Performance targets align to appropriate state and national standards. Performance targets articulate essential practices. Performance targets are clearly articulated. Performance targets of the educator link to improvements in student learning.	Policy documents	The district is using one of the following models: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model. If district is using a district-developed model, or another model, the district: · cites research and theory used in developing performance targets in their evaluation documents. · has a crosswalk or alignment study that shows alignment between district standards and national or state teacher or leader standards. · has a crosswalk or alignment study that some of the performance targets have high effect sizes. · has documents that demonstrate that a majority of the district's teacher and leader performance targets include links to student evidence.	*Met*—using listed model or district model that meets all criteria *Partially met*—using district model that meets the majority of criteria *Not met*—using district model that does not meet the majority of criteria
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: · The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly define what is expected of me as a teacher/principal. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides are appropriate for my position. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · The teacher evaluation system is fair to teachers in all classrooms, content, and grade levels. *(Teacher survey)* · I have improved my practice as a result of the teacher/principal evaluation system. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides available to me are appropriate to all of the positions that I evaluate. *(Principal survey)*	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 1 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Principle 2: Multiple ratings are used to differentiate levels of educator performance			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Includes a minimum of 3 differentiated levels. Includes clear statements of performance at each level. Each level allows for discrete, independent, measureable elements. Each level reliably describes practice. Levels provide clear direction for growth and development in practice.	Policy documents	The district is using one of the following models: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model. If district is using a district-developed model, or another model, the model: • includes rubrics or scoring guides that include at least three levels. • includes rubrics or scoring guides that have a differentiated statement at each level. • includes rubrics or scoring guides that have a differentiated rating at each level. • includes rubrics or scoring guides that include a logical sequence of growth.	*Met*—using listed model or district model that meets all criteria *Partially met*—using district model that meets the majority of criteria *Not met*—using district model that does not meet the majority of criteria
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: • The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving teacher practice. *(Teacher, Principal, and District administrator surveys)* • The principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving principal practice. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* • The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly describe what teachers should know and do to earn each rating score. *(Teacher, Principal, and District administrator surveys)* • The principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly describe what principals need to know and do to earn each rating score. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)*	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 2 rating		*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Includes required mentoring as a component of a comprehensive induction process. Complies with Missouri statute regarding the probationary period. Is informed by the state's mentor standards. Includes confidential, non-evaluative support linked to the district's overall plan for professional development. Focuses on essential practices of particular significance for novice practitioners and educators.	Policy documents	District documents indicate that mentoring is required for new teachers and principals. District documents describe a mentor program that is aligned to the Missouri mentor standards (3 years for teachers, 5 years for principals). District policies state that mentors will not share information about their mentee and the information will not be used for adverse job action purposes. District documents highlight essential practices for new educators (years 1–5) including but not limited to those practices identified by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in documents such as the Model Evaluation System. AND/OR District documents highlight other practices for new teachers and provide a rationale for inclusion of these practices.	*Met*—district documents describe a mentoring system that meets all policy criteria *Partially met*—district documents describe a mentoring system that meets the majority of policy criteria *Not met*—district documents do not describe a mentoring system or less than the majority of policy criteria are met
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: · The mentoring process is non-evaluative. *(Teacher survey—new teachers)* · The professional development and training I receive throughout the school year is tailored to my specific needs as identified in my evaluation. *(Teacher survey)* · The support I received from my mentor has helped me improve my practice. *(Teacher survey—new teachers)* · My mentor provided me with the resources I needed to improve my practice. *(Teacher survey—new teachers)* · My mentor provided me with effective support. *(Teacher survey—new teachers)* · I had the resources needed to provide support to my mentee(s). *(Mentor survey)* · I received the training needed to become an effective mentor. *(Mentor survey)* · The support I provided to my mentee(s) helped them to improve their practice. *(Mentor survey)* · I align mentor support to teacher needs identified in their evaluation. *(Principal survey)* · I actively participate in identifying and assigning effective mentors. *(Principal survey)* · My district has a comprehensive system for training effective mentors. *(Principal survey)* The majority of mentors will report that they offered and the majority of teachers report that they received *(Teacher and Mentor surveys)*: · Frequent, targeted feedback · Opportunities to observe expert teachers · Assistance with developing strategies · A review of school and district expectations · Collaborative development of lesson plans · Collaborative look at student data · The development of a growth plan based on needs · Suggestion of resources · Opportunities to self-reflect on your practice · Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction · Modeling of effective teaching practices 100 percent of mentors report that they met with their mentee three times or more this school year. 100 percent of new teachers report that they have a district or school assigned mentor AND they met with their mentor three times or more this school year.	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 3 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Principle 4: Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Is a significant contributing component of the overall evaluation process. Uses multiple measures of student performance including both formative and summative assessments. Includes multiple years of comparable student data.	Policy documents	District documents indicate: • how student growth is calculated into the evaluation score and offer a justification for how it is a significant component. • that student growth must be based on two or more means for determining student performance. • which possible measures of student growth could be included in evaluations including district and school determined assessments when state assessments are not available. • that student growth is defined as student learning across two points and describe that measures should include multiple years of comparable data (of similar content and format). • which measures of student growth provide comparable data over years. • that state assessment data must be used as one of the measures of student growth for teachers in tested grades and subject areas. • there is an approval process for district or school assessments.	*Met*—district documents describe a system for incorporating student growth that meets all policy criteria *Partially met*—district documents describe a system for incorporating student growth that meets the majority of policy criteria *Not met*—district documents do not describe a system for incorporating student growth or does not meet the majority of policy criteria
Highlights growth in student learning across two points in time as opposed to simple measures of status. Includes the state assessment where available and additional district- and school-determined assessments.	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: • My impact on student growth is a significant part of my evaluation. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* • I believe that the student growth measures used in my evaluation reflect my contribution to student learning. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* • My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our teacher evaluation system. *(Teacher, Principal, and District administrator surveys)* • My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our principal evaluation system. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* • Our district provides guidance on the student assessments that will be used in the teacher evaluation system to measure student growth for each content area and grade level. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* • Our district provides guidance on the student assessments that will be used in the principal evaluation system to measure student growth. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* • In our district, accountability around growth measures is comparable across grade levels and content areas. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* The majority of respondents (teachers, principals, and district administrators) indicate that student growth in their district's teacher evaluation system includes: • Multiple measures. • Formative data. • Summative data. • Multiple years of comparable student data. • State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data). • Additional district and school determined common assessment(s). • Student growth across two points in time.	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 4 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Principle 5: Ongoing, timely, deliberate, and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research based targets			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Is delivered effectively and is meaningful to the improvement of practice. Focuses on the impact of professional practice to increase student learning. Is offered at least once annually to everyone either formally, informally, or both. Is offered in close proximity to the data-gathering process (observation, survey, artifact review). Occurs within the context of a professional, collaborative culture.	Policy documents	District documents (such as feedback forms or observation forms) provide a framework to evaluators for providing effective feedback. District documents describe an observation feedback schedule in which feedback is offered at least once annually (either formally or informally).	*Met*—district documents describe a system of feedback that meets all criteria *Partially met*—district documents describe a system of feedback that meets only one criteria *Not met*—district documents do not describe a system of feedback or no criteria were met
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: · The feedback I received from my evaluator was given in the spirit of continuous improvement. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · The feedback I received from my evaluator helped me to become a more effective teacher/principal. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · My evaluator's feedback included specific strategies that I could use to improve my practice. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · I have used my evaluator's feedback to improve my practice. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · The feedback I provide to teachers is linked to research-based practices. *(Principal survey)* · Our evaluators provide feedback in the spirit of continuous improvement. *(District administrator survey)* · I am evaluated on whether I provide feedback to teachers each year. *(Principal survey)* · My district holds principals accountable for providing feedback to each teacher each year. *(District administrator survey)* · In general, my evaluator provides feedback within two working days. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* · The feedback I receive from my evaluator promotes a professional collaborative school culture. *(Teacher survey)* · I provide feedback intended to promote a professional collaborative school culture. *(Principal survey)* The majority of teachers and principals indicate that they have received feedback at least once from their evaluator during this school year. *(Teacher and Principal surveys)* The majority of principals indicate that they provide feedback at least once per year to each teacher. *(Principal survey)* The majority of district administrators indicate that they provide feedback at least once per year to each principal. *(District administrator survey)*	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 5 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Principle 6: Standardized, periodic training is provided for evaluators to ensure reliability and accuracy			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Evaluators demonstrate skills aligned to minimum quality assurance standards established by districts and/or the state. Training includes conducting observations focused on the quality of instruction. Assessing student data, analyzing artifacts, and interpreting survey information occur. Time for the effective delivery of meaningful feedback is incorporated. Training is offered both initially and periodically to those who evaluate educator performance.	Policy documents	District documents or tools describe how training includes: • procedures for ensuring inter-rater reliability. • providing effective feedback. • assessing student data. • analyzing artifacts. • interpreting survey information. • opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback. District documents include a training schedule in which training is offered at least once a year.	*Met*—district documents describe a system of training that meets all criteria *Partially met*—district documents describe a system of training that meets the majority of criteria *Not met*—district documents do not describe a system of training or less than a majority of criteria were met
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: • I have been assessed on my ability to reliably and accurately evaluate teachers. *(Principal survey)* • My district provides standardized training on the teacher evaluation system for all evaluators. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* The following topics were included in principal training on the teacher evaluation system *(Principal and District administrator surveys)*: • procedures for insuring inter-rater reliability. • providing effective feedback. • assessing student data. • analyzing artifacts. • interpreting survey information. • opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback.	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 6 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Principle 7: Evaluation results and data are used to inform decisions regarding personnel, employment determinations, and human resource policies such as promotion, retention, dismissal, induction, tenure, and compensation			
Indicators		**Criteria**	**Criteria met?**
Guides district decisions regarding employment determinations. Informs in particular those policies that affect the extent of student learning. Empowers the district to recognize and utilize highly effective educators. Informs district strategies for providing targeted interventions and support.	Policy documents	District policies indicate that evaluation results will be used for: · developing growth/improvement plans. · planning/delivering professional development. · recognizing staff. District policies indicate that evaluation results will be used for: · retention. · dismissal. · induction. · tenure.	*Met*—district documents describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies that meets all criteria *Partially met*—district documents describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies that meets the majority of criteria *Not met*—district documents do not describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies or no criteria were met
	Practice data from surveys	The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: · The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well-informed personnel decisions. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* · The results from the teacher evaluation system are used within the district to inform comprehensive school improvement plans. *(District administrator survey)* · The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform our comprehensive school improvement plans. *(Principal survey)* · The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective teachers. *(Teacher, Principal, and District administrator surveys)* · The results from the teacher evaluation system inform decisions on how to utilize highly effective teachers. *(Teacher, Principal, and District administrator surveys)* · The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to faculty needs. *(Principal and District administrator surveys)* · The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well-informed personnel decisions. *(District administrator survey)* · The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to administrator needs. *(District administrator survey)* · The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform district improvement efforts. *(District administrator survey)* · The results from the principal evaluation system are used to identify effective administrators. *(District administrator survey)* · The results from the principal evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective administrators. *(District administrator survey)* · The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support to administrators. *(District administrator survey)*	*Met*—meets all practice criteria *Partially met*—meets the majority of practice criteria *Not met*—does not meet the majority of practice criteria
Overall Principle 7 rating	*Met*—meets policy and practice criteria	*Partially met*—meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria	*Not met*—does not meet policy nor practice criteria

Description of evidence/Explanation of rating:

Action plan:

Appendix G. Sample district summary report

Missouri developed a sample summary report format to summarize the ratings for each district and identify action steps for criteria that were not met. The summary report has two parts: an overall rating by principle and rating by policy and practice, with action steps.

Overall rating by principle

Rating	Principle 1	Principle 2	Principle 3	Principle 4	Principle 5	Principle 6	Principle 7
Fully met							
Partially met							
Not met							

Rating by policy and practice with action steps

Principle	Policy Fully met	Partially met	Not met	Action steps	Practice Fully met	Partially met	Not met	Action steps
1	■			None.	■			None.
2	■			None.		■		Survey results indicated that the teachers and district administrators did not agree that the evaluation rubrics clearly describe what teachers need to know and do to earn each rating score. The district should walk through the rubric with teachers, principals, and district administrators and explain the district expectations related to each level of the rubric.
3		■		Provide documents that describe the mentoring program for principals.		■		Survey results indicated that teachers receiving mentoring were not offered a collaborative look at student data or modeling of effective teaching practices during their mentoring experiences. The district should work with mentors to ensure that these experiences are provided.
4			■	Provide policy documents that describe how student growth is incorporated into the evaluation system.		■		In the survey, teachers indicated that formative and summative data are not included in the student growth component of the teacher evaluation system. Once student growth policies are in place, the district should provide professional development to teachers regarding the student growth component of the teacher evaluation system.
5		■		Provide documents that state that feedback is provided for each teacher each year.	■			None.
6		■		Provide documents that indicate that evaluators are regularly using the Missouri Observation Simulation Tool system for training.		■		In the survey, district administrators indicated that principal training on the evaluation system did not include analyzing artifacts. Clarify the content of the trainings with district administrators.
7		■		Provide documents that indicate how the results of the educator evaluation are used to recognize or reward staff.		■		In the survey, teachers did not agree that the results from the teacher evaluation system were used to recognize or reward teachers. District administrators did not agree that the results from the principal evaluation system were used to recognize or reward principals. Develop, implement, and communicate policies to recognize or reward educators based on evaluation results.

References

Center on Great Teachers & Leaders. (2013). Databases on state teacher and principal evaluation policies [Web-based database]. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (n.d.). *Essential principles of effective evaluation systems.* Retrieved April 15, 2014, from http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/eq-ees-essential-principles.pdf

Pennington, K. (2014, May). *ESEA waivers and teacher-evaluation plans: State oversight of district-designed teacher-evaluation systems.* Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved April 15, 2014, from http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/TeacherEvalWaivers-FINAL.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2012). *ESEA flexibility.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved April 15, 2014, from http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc

The Regional Educational Laboratory Program produces 7 types of reports

Making Connections
Studies of correlational relationships

Making an Impact
Studies of cause and effect

What's Happening
Descriptions of policies, programs, implementation status, or data trends

What's Known
Summaries of previous research

Stated Briefly
Summaries of research findings for specific audiences

Applied Research Methods
Research methods for educational settings

Tools
Help for planning, gathering, analyzing, or reporting data or research