

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System Equivalency Process Review

*Guidelines and Application to use an Alternative
Model Measuring Educator Practice for the
2013-14 Full Pilot*

WI Department of Public Instruction

Spring/2013



INTRODUCTION

This guide supports applicants in developing and submitting an alternative model to measure educator practice during the 2013-14 Full Pilot. The guide provides in-depth descriptions of the documentation and processes required to demonstrate equivalency, including:

- The timeline and important dates regarding the Equivalency Review Process;
- Demonstrations and Assurances required of applicants; and
- The application process.

Table of Contents

<u>BACKGROUND</u>	3
<u>MODELS OF PRACTICE AND EQUIVALENCY REVIEW</u>	4
<u>TIMELINE: EQUIVALENCY REVIEW PROCESS</u>	5
<u>DEMONSTRATIONS</u>	6
<u>ASSURANCES</u>	6
<u>EQUIVALENCY REVIEW PROCESS APPLICATION</u>	7

BACKGROUND

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System was outlined by a Design Team brought together by the State Superintendent. The Design Team represented a collaborative effort of state professional education organizations, educator preparation programs, the Governor's office, and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI). Together, the group identified elements of a performance-based educator evaluation system designed to provide students with highly qualified educators who effectively improve student learning. The state intends for the system, and any of its components used to evaluate educators, to be valid, reliable, and comparable within and across districts. Educators must be confident that the results they receive from an evaluation in one district would be similar to those from any district's evaluation across the state. For this reason, WI adopted a statewide system of measuring educator effectiveness. The statewide system combines multiple measures of student outcomes and growth (50%) with methods to observe and measure educator practice (50%).

Models of Professional Practice

Upon determining the overall system, the Design Team identified observation rubrics for evaluating teacher and principal practice. Following a review of educator effectiveness and evaluation research, the Design Team selected Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching due to its close alignment to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards, which anchors Wisconsin's teacher education and licensure system. Subsequently, a work team comprised of Wisconsin practitioners and experts, tasked with selecting or adapting rubrics to measure teacher practice, selected the rubrics associated with the 2011 version of the Danielson Framework, due to its strong research base, both in content and validity. Since this date, the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has opted to upgrade to the newly released 2013 version due to its incorporation of the Common Core State Standards.

Similarly, the Design Team tasked a work team comprised of Wisconsin practitioners and experts with identifying, adapting, or developing a rubric for evaluating principal practice that aligns with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. The work team developed a principal evaluation rubric based on rubrics developed in Indiana, Colorado, and Illinois, as well as references to other research-based models (e.g., Douglas Reeves' approach). The work team also identified evidence sources and developed a timeline, process, and evaluation forms for evaluating principal practice. DPI has continued to improve and refine these rubrics throughout the Developmental Pilot. Teacher Practice Evaluation and Principal Practice Evaluation process manuals outline all of these features ([resources found here](#)).

Models of Professional Practice and Equivalency Review

The Design Team and work teams recognized that any one model for evaluating professional practice and its rubrics for observation might not suit every district. Therefore, the Design Team recommended the state develop an application process for districts wishing to use alternative models to measure teacher or principal practice within the statewide system of educator effectiveness. Accordingly, the Wisconsin Legislature included language in Act 166, the legislation setting forth requirements regarding educator evaluations, for the Department of Public Instruction to develop an application and approval process (Equivalency Review) for districts intending to use alternative practice models. The legislation states the following requirements of the Equivalency Process:

- An alternative model must align to the InTASC standards for teachers and the ISLLC standards for principals.
- An alternative model for measuring teacher practice must also align to the following four domains: 1) Planning and preparation, 2) Classroom environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional responsibilities.
- A district intending to use an alternative model must apply for Equivalency from the Department of Public Instruction.

For that purpose, the Department of Public Instruction, in collaboration with a group of education stakeholders familiar with the Educator Effectiveness system, established parameters for the review of models to measure professional practice—otherwise referred to as the Equivalency Review Process. Within the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness system, only models of educator practice are subject to equivalence; the equivalency review process does not apply to the measures of student outcomes. Applicants must align observation rubrics to the InTASC (teacher) and ISLLC (principal) standards, as well as to the intentions of the statewide system. That is, any approved district’s model must include an educator evaluation and support system that continuously improves teacher and principal practice through a fair, valid, and reliable process using multiple measures to improve student and school outcomes.

Applicants

This section aims to define who can or must apply for equivalency. The Equivalency Review Process allows districts, consortia of districts, and charter schools the opportunity to apply to use a model for evaluating professional practice alternative to that in the EE System (described below). The district must develop and submit an Equivalency Application to the DPI describing in detail (as required within the application Demonstrations) its model for evaluating professional practice, to include both teachers¹ and principals (initially, and education specialists and central office staff in the future).²

To participate in the state model, districts **MUST**:

- Attend state-developed training;
- Use the *Framework for Teaching 2013* observation rubrics and the Wisconsin Principal rubrics;
- Use Teachscape for evaluation processes and data collection and reporting;
- Report data in Teachscape to DPI at the component level;
- Certify any and all evaluators in Teachscape (*Note: any evaluator, regardless of model, must hold a supervisor license as required in PI 34*);
- Evaluate educators using the state evaluation process timeline (e.g., number and types of observations within and across evaluation cycles);
- Participate in the evaluation of the state EE system and model; and

¹ “Teacher” 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 (2r), Stats., whose primary responsibilities include all of the following:

- (a) Instructional planning and preparation.
- (b) Managing a classroom environment.
- (c) Pupil instruction.

² However, the following flexibility exists within the state model and does not require application for equivalency:

- Districts can create their own informal evaluation forms (e.g., walk-through forms) to align to local contexts;
- Districts can utilize the formative processes and professional development provided within the State Model as necessary; and
- Districts can require schools to conduct observations more often than required.

- Use the state model for **ALL** roles (i.e. principals and teachers initially, specialists and central office in the future), per Act 166.

Timeline: Equivalency Review Process

Applicants shall meet the following deadlines in order to be considered for approval by the department for the 2013-14 school year:

1. Any school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school shall submit all applications **on or before April 19, 2013**. Applications shall include a completed Equivalency Review Process Application form and all supporting evidence.
NOTE: The Equivalency Review Process Application form may be obtained at no charge from the Department of Public Instruction, Educator Effectiveness Team, P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841.
Or on our website: <http://dpi.wi.gov/files/forms/doc/f1656.doc>
2. **Any approved Equivalent Practice Model will be granted approval for the 2013-14 school year only.**

All questions should be directed to the attention of [The Educator Effectiveness Team at the Department of Public Instruction](#) or to:

Department of Public Instruction
c/o Educator Effectiveness
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53703

*Full Pilot (2013-14): Any district interested in joining an approved consortium of districts must notify the lead contact person for the approved consortium in order to submit an addendum to their application to DPI by **September 15, 2013**. Otherwise, the district must wait until the following year to include their signatures within the consortium's required annual application. We anticipate this process will begin in January, 2014.*

Future Years

Applicants shall meet the following deadlines in order to be considered for approval by the department after the 2013-14 school year.

1. Any school district, consortium of school districts or charter school planning to submit an application for an Equivalent Practice Model, even if that Equivalent Practice Model has been previously approved, shall provide written notification to the department of their intention on or before **January 15**. The notification shall include the name and contact information for the staff member responsible for the application.
2. Applicants shall submit all applications on or before **March 15**. Applications shall include a completed Equivalency Review Process Application form and all supporting evidence to the department.

NOTE: The Equivalency Review Process Application form may be obtained at no charge from the Department of Public Instruction, Educator Effectiveness Team, P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841.

3. Except as provided in paragraph (4), school districts, consortia of school districts, and charter schools **must reapply for approval annually**.
4. Beginning in the 2016-17 school year, applicants may apply for and receive approval for a period of longer than one year, as determined by the department.

Note: Any district interested in joining an approved consortium of districts must notify the lead contact person for the approved consortium in order to submit an addendum to their application to DPI by **September 15**. Otherwise, the district must wait until the following year to include their signatures within the consortium's required annual application.

Demonstrations

As part of the equivalency review process, applicants must demonstrate:

1. The alignment of framework and rubrics to InTASC standards and each of the following four domains: 1) Planning and preparation, 2) Classroom environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional responsibilities. And for principal evaluation, alignment of framework and rubrics to the ISLLC standards.
2. The research-base supporting the model and its rubrics has valid and reliable results.
3. The rubrics have four performance levels with clearly delineated, observable differences between levels which align to the state model's performance levels.
4. The Equivalent Practice Model includes the same minimum number and type of observations and evaluations as the state model. The Equivalent Practice Model specifies how formative and summative feedback will inform the educator's professional growth plan.
5. The development and implementation of a comprehensive orientation and training program for evaluators that certifies the evaluator's understanding of the evaluation model and processes, as well as inter-rater agreement. The Equivalent Practice Model specifies how and when recertification will be required.
6. The development and implementation of ongoing processes to monitor and improve inter-rater agreement.

Assurances

As part of the equivalency review process, applicants must agree to do the following:

1. Applicants and their participants shall report teacher-level, school-level, and district-level data required by the department within guidelines established by the department.
2. Applicants shall transfer data electronically to the department according to established technologies as defined by the department, including ability to assign unique identification numbers for entities as part of the data sharing protocols specified by the department.
3. Applicants shall participate in a statewide evaluation conducted by an independent, non-biased external evaluator.
4. Applicants shall implement any corrective actions required by the department if the department determines there is credible evidence indicating that a school, school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school is no longer in compliance with the requirements of this application.

Equivalency Review Process Application

Instructions: Applicants must be able to mark “Yes” to each of the following statements. Additionally, applicants must provide evidence to support these statements in the forms provided (*DPI will accept either electronic or hardcopy materials*).

DEMONSTRATIONS	COMPLETE	SATISFACTORY <i>For DPI Use</i>
1. Demonstrate, with evidence , alignment of framework and rubrics to the InTASC standards (for teacher evaluations) and the ISLLC standards (for principal evaluations).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Demonstrate, with evidence , the research-base supporting the frameworks and rubrics.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Demonstrate, with evidence , the rubrics clearly differentiate between four performance levels.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Demonstrate, with evidence , implementation of the same minimum requirements for number of observations and observation type.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Demonstrate, with evidence , the development and provision of comprehensive orientations and trainings to participants that certifies understanding of the model and its associated processes, as well as inter-rater agreement.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6. Demonstrate, with evidence , the development and implementation of processes to ensure and improve inter-rater agreement.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Demonstrating Equivalency

1. *Demonstrate Equivalence of Evaluation Standards and Rubrics with Evidence*
 - a) **Teacher Rubrics.** The WI Educator Effectiveness System draws upon Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2011), which directly aligns to the InTASC standards (*see Appendix A*). In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must demonstrate direct alignment between the domains and components within the proposed tool and each of the InTASC standards, as well as the four domains as stated in Act 166.

Demonstration of Teacher Rubric Equivalence

Teacher Practice Rubric and InTASC Standards Comparison	
InTASC Standard	Alternative Teacher Framework Component(s)
#1. Learner Development The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.	
#2: Learning Differences The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	
#3: Learning Environments The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	
#4: Content Knowledge The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.	
#5: Application of Content The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.	
#6: Assessment The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher’s and learner’s decision making.	
#7: Planning for Instruction The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing	

upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	
#8: Instructional Strategies The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.	
#9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.	
#10: Leadership and Collaboration The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.	
Teacher Practice Rubric and Four Domains	
#1: Planning and Preparation	
#2: Classroom Environment	
#3: Instruction	
#4: Professional Responsibilities	

- b) **Principal Rubrics.** The WI Educator Effectiveness System was also developed to align with the ISLLC standards (see *Appendix B*). In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must show direct alignment between the domains and elements within the proposed tool and each of the ISLLC standards.

Demonstration of Principal Rubric Equivalence

Wisconsin Principal Practice Rubric and 2008 ISLLC Standards Comparison	
ISLLC Standards	Alternative Principal Framework Components
Standard 1 An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.	
Standard 2 An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	
Standard 3 An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for safe, efficient, and effective learning	

environment.	
Standard 4 An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	
Standard 5 An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.	
Standard 6 An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	

2. *Demonstrate the Model’s Research-Base with Evidence*

The Design Team and work teams selected the Danielson Framework and its rubrics due to the research base supporting the correlation between performance ratings on the Danielson Framework and student outcomes. For example, the Gates Foundation’s Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study and the Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago study conducted by the Consortium on Chicago Schools Research (CCSR) confirmed earlier studies by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CRPE) that the Danielson Framework can provide valid, reliable results, as well as a common language for formative feedback regarding educator practice. Although the principal evaluation literature is not as well developed as the teacher evaluation research base, the standards and rubrics of the principal evaluation model derives from the research available on principal and leadership effectiveness.

In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must provide citations from credible research studies, as well as the significant findings, to illustrate the research-base which supports the use of a given tool (*similar to the sample provided in Appendix C*).

Alternative Teacher Practice Rubrics Research Base		
Year of Study	Research Title	Findings
Alternative Principal Practice Rubrics Research Base		
Year of Study	Research Title	Findings

3. *Demonstrate the Detail within the Four Performance Categories with Evidence*

The Design Team selected specific rubrics to measure teacher and principal practice due to the level of detail and valuable information provided to both evaluators and educators. Specifically, the level of detail allows evaluators to easily identify differences between various levels of practice, as well as

help educators identify specific practices which will help them improve to higher levels of practice. As such, applicants must provide evidence (i.e., rubrics) that selected rubrics offer similar levels of detail, including four or more performance levels with clearly delineated, observable differences between each level. Specifically, applicants must demonstrate that rubrics:

- Have four performance levels that are comparable to the state’s categories (*Note: while the category names do not need to be equivalent, the description of a Level 1 must be comparable to the state’s Level 1 to ensure comparability across the state*);
- Clearly differentiate across levels with distinctive, observable practices that are comparable to the state model’s four levels; and
- Provide specific, observable practices to inform improvement and growth (*see sample provided in Appendix D*).

Submit rubrics to demonstrate that they:

- Have four or more performance levels which are comparable to the state’s levels;
- Clearly differentiate across levels with distinctive, observable practices; and
- Provide specific, observable practices to inform improvement and growth.

4. *Demonstrate Equivalence to the Wisconsin State Evaluation Process with Evidence*
 Applicants **must** align processes to evaluate educator practice to the state model (*see Appendix E*). To demonstrate alignment of the processes, applicants must submit a comprehensive Process Guide, similar to those found on the [Educator Effectiveness webpage](#).

Submit a process guide to demonstrate that the applicant’s model requires the same minimum number of observations and type of observations as the state model.

5. *Develop and Provide Comprehensive Orientations and Trainings with Evidence*
 Applicants must demonstrate that users of the system have access to comprehensive training sessions which certifies evaluator’s understanding of the evaluation model and its processes, as well as inter-rater agreement. The training program must focus on generating consistency in the use of the system. A comprehensive orientation program addresses the following outcomes: understanding of standards, rubrics, and evidence sources; the timing, number, and type of observations; inter-rater agreement and certification; and using data from evaluations to identify professional growth needs and improve instructional practice.

Evidence may include agendas, training outlines, facilitation manuals, and training calendars. To demonstrate equivalence of training processes, applicants must list training sessions made available to participants, intended outcomes, and participants involved, as well as identify and attach evidence sources (*see sample provided in Appendix F*).

Training Session	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample (Attach to Application)

--	--	--	--

6. *Develop and Implement Ongoing Processes to Monitor and Improve Inter-rater Agreement with Evidence*

The Design Team indicated the importance of validity, reliability, and comparability within one of its Guiding Principles. As such, the Design Team noted the necessity for processes to ensure rater agreement. Using Teachscape, the online tool associated with the Wisconsin state model, evaluators can complete an online rater certification process and ongoing recalibration to help establish evaluation consistency.

Applicants for equivalency must provide evidence demonstrating a process to ensure and improve rater-agreement beyond the initial orientation and training sessions. Such evidence might include the process guide, a training calendar, facilitation manuals, and training agendas and a description of how evaluations will be monitored for consistency (e.g., simultaneous observations by two raters followed by debriefing sessions).

To demonstrate equivalence of rater processes, applicants must list the processes made available to participants, intended outcomes, and participants involved, as well as identify and attach evidence sources (*see sample provided in Appendix G*).

Process	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample (Attach to Application)

Equivalency Review Process Assurances

Instructions: Applicants must provide the following assurances by marking “Yes” to each of the following statements.

ASSURANCES	COMPLETE	SATISFACTORY <i>For DPI Use</i>
1. Applicants and their participants shall report teacher-level, school-level, and district-level data required by the department within guidelines established by the department.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Applicants shall transfer data electronically to the department according to established technologies as defined by the department, including ability to assign unique identification numbers for entities as part of the data sharing protocols specified by the department.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Applicants shall participate in a statewide evaluation conducted by an independent, non-biased external evaluator.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Applicants shall implement any corrective actions required by the department if the department determines there is credible evidence indicating that a school, school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school is no longer in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix A

Demonstration of Teacher Rubric Equivalence

Teacher Practice Rubric and InTASC Standards Comparison	
InTASC Standard	WI Teacher Framework Component(s)
<p>#1: Learner Development The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes 1f: Designing Student Assessments Professional Responsibilities 4a: Reflecting on Teaching 4c: Communicating with Families</p>
<p>#2: Learning Differences The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students The Classroom Environment 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</p>
<p>#3: Learning Environments The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p>The Classroom Environment 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures 2d: Managing Student Behavior 2e: Organizing Physical Space Professional Responsibilities 4c: Communicating with Families</p>
<p>#4: Content Knowledge The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources Instruction 3c: Engaging Students in Learning 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p>
<p>#5: Application of Content The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources The Classroom Environment 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning Instruction 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques 3c: Engaging Students in Learning 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p>
<p>#6: Assessment The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation 1f: Designing Student Assessments Instruction 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</p>
<p>#7: Planning for Instruction The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction Instruction 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</p>

	<p>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p> <p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4d: Participating in Professional Communities</p> <p>4f: Showing Professionalism</p>
<p>#8: Instructional Strategies</p> <p>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p>Planning and Preparation</p> <p>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</p> <p>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</p> <p>Instruction</p> <p>3a: Communicating with Students</p> <p>3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</p> <p>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</p> <p>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</p> <p>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p> <p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</p>
<p>#9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</p> <p>The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p>	<p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4a: Reflecting on Teaching</p> <p>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</p> <p>4d: Participating in a Professional Community</p> <p>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</p> <p>4f: Showing Professionalism</p>
<p>#10: Leadership and Collaboration</p> <p>The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.</p>	<p>Instruction</p> <p>3a: Communicating with Students</p> <p>Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</p> <p>4c: Communicating with Families</p> <p>4d: Participating in a Professional Community</p> <p>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</p> <p>4f: Showing Professionalism</p>
Teacher Practice Rubric and the Four Domains	
Four Domains	WI Teacher Rubric Domains
#1: Planning and Preparation	Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
#2: Classroom Environment	Domain 2: Classroom Environment
#3: Instruction	Domain 3: Instruction
#4: Professional Responsibilities	Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

Appendix B

Demonstration of Principal Rubric Equivalence

Wisconsin Principal Effectiveness Rubric and 2008 ISLLC Standards Comparison	
ISLLC Standards	WI Principal Rubric
<p>Standard 1 An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.</p>	<p>1.2 Instructional Leadership 1.2.1 Cultivating a Mission and Vision for ALL Students 1.2.6 Data Usage in Teams 1.2.7 Rigorous Student Learning Objectives</p>
<p>Standard 2 An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</p>	<p>1.1 Human Resource Leadership 1.1.3 Evaluation of Teachers 1.1.4 Professional Development 1.2 Instructional Leadership 1.2.2 High Expectations for Academic Achievement 1.2.3 Classroom Observations and Feedback 1.2.4 Instructional Time 1.2.5 Teacher Collaboration 1.2.7 Rigorous Student Learning Objectives 2.2 Intentional and Collaborative School Climate 2.2.1 Building Positive Relationships</p>
<p>Standard 3 An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</p>	<p>1.1 Human Resource Leadership 1.1.1 Recruiting and Selecting 1.1.2 Strategic Assignment of Teachers and Staff to Positions in School 1.1.5 Distributed Leadership 1.2 Instructional Leadership 1.2.4 Instructional Time 2.3 School Management 2.3.1 Managing the Learning Environment 2.3.2 Financial Management</p>
<p>Standard 4 An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</p>	<p>2.1 Personal Behavior 2.1.3 Using Feedback to Improve School Performance and Student Achievement 2.2 Intentional and Collaborative School Climate 2.2.1 Building Positive Relationships</p>
<p>Standard 5 An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.</p>	<p>1.3 Instructional Leadership 1.2.1 Cultivating a Mission and Vision for ALL Students 2.1 Personal Behavior 2.1.1 Professionalism</p>
<p>Standard 6 An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<p>2.1 Personal Behavior 2.1.4 Initiative and Persistence 2.3 School Climate 2.3.3 Policy Management</p>

Appendix C

Demonstration of Research Base

Danielson Teacher Practice Rubrics Research Base (abbreviated)		
Year of Study	Research Title	Findings
2012	Measures of Effective Teaching Project	The Danielson Framework was amongst several rubrics tested in the MET study. The study demonstrated that ratings based on the Danielson Framework were correlated with Value Added student achievement measures. The strength of the relationship improved with multiple ratings and other evidence sources.
2011	Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago: Lessons Learned from Classroom Observations, Principal-Teacher Conferences, and District Implementation, Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute, November 2011	This report summarizes findings from a two-year study of Chicago's Excellence in Teaching Pilot, which was designed to drive instructional improvement by providing teachers with evidence-based feedback on their strengths and weaknesses. The pilot consisted of training and support for principals and teachers, principal observations of teaching practice conducted twice a year using the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching, and conferences between the principal and the teacher to discuss evaluation results and teaching practice. Download the report.
2011	"The Effect of Evaluation on Performance: Evidence from Longitudinal Student Achievement Data of Mid-career Teachers" Taylor, Eric, Tyler, John H. : NBER Working Paper No. 16877.	This study investigated the effect of teacher evaluation on the quality of instruction, and found that the very act of going through a year-long evaluation process in Cincinnati strengthens teacher performance. While the research and statistical details are still at a preliminary stage, the results suggest that the correlations are positive, and the effect sizes are large enough to be quite consequential. Furthermore, they found that not only does a teacher's effectiveness increase in the year in which they are undergoing evaluation, but the effects of going through the evaluation cycle are even larger in the years after the evaluation.
2006	Multi-year, mixed-methods study investigating the validity of teacher evaluation in four sites: Cincinnati, Ohio; Los Angeles, California; Reno/Sparks, Nevada; and Coventry, Rhode Island. Milanowski, et. al.	The study used linked student and teacher data to assess the relationship between student achievement and teachers' performance evaluation scores. The value-added model used achievement scores that were estimated on prior achievement and other student characteristics which determined a fairly high correlation in two of the four sites

		<p>between what the teachers were observed to be doing in the classroom and their students' achievement gains. The authors of study noted that high correlations could be due to using multiple observation data, highly trained evaluators, and the teachers having a shared understanding of what constituted good teaching.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Appendix D

Sample of Teacher Rubric Illustrating Number of Performance Categories and Detail

Domain 1a. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy			
Ineffective (Level 1)	Minimally Effective (Level 2)	Effective (Level 3)	Highly Effective (Level 4)
<p>In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students.</p> <p>Teacher's plans and practice show little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student's learning of the content.</p> <p>Teacher shows little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student's learning of the content.</p>	<p>Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another.</p> <p>Teacher's plans and practice indicate some knowledge of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete.</p> <p>Teacher's plans and practice reveal a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.</p>	<p>Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts of the discipline and the way they relate to one another.</p> <p>Teacher's plans and practice reflect accurate knowledge of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts.</p> <p>Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of pedagogical approaches in the discipline.</p>	<p>Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts of the discipline and the ways they relate both to one another and to other disciplines.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.</p>

Appendix E

WI STATE EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS MODEL
NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS and Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summative evaluations for initial educators happen annually. Summative evaluations for veteran teachers occur every third year with formative processes occurring every year.• Student Outcomes data assessed annually.• Ongoing formative feedback provided in formative years.
Teacher Observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• At least 1 (45 min) or 2 (20min) announced observations that include a pre conference and post conference;• At least 1 (45 min) or 2 (20min) unannounced observation; and• 3-5 informal and unannounced observations of at least five minutes in length.
Principal Observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• At least 2 observations; and• 2-3 informal school visits or walkthroughs.

Appendix F

Evidence of WI Training Processes (abbreviated)

Training Session	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample (Attach to Application)
Teacher Practice Evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the WI Educator Effectiveness Teacher Practice Evaluation and the Developmental Pilot stage of this initiative. • Understand how Educator Effectiveness fits into the overall DPI goal of college and career readiness for every WI student. • Understand and be able to implement each of the steps and tasks of the Teacher Evaluation Cycle, including the establishment of personal and organizational routines. • Understand how the <i>Danielson Framework for Teaching</i> is constructed and the criteria for distinguishing levels of performance at the component level. • Identify forms of rating bias and areas of common rating errors to avoid. • Identify evidence sources most appropriate for each component of teacher effectiveness. • Practice observing and rating evidence sources, with feedback, in line with the WI Educator Effectiveness Teacher Practice Evaluation. • Identify emerging issues to consider at the district and regional levels as this initiative works toward statewide implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams of five from districts, including: two evaluators, two teachers, and a peer reviewer/mentor • Danielson Group trainers • WI Regional Trainers • DPI • Facilitators representing educational stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process manual • Facilitation guide • PPTs • <i>Danielson Framework</i> text • <i>Smart Cards</i> • Agendas • Lists of participating districts

Appendix G

Evidence of WI Rater Agreement Processes (abbreviated)

Process	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample (Attach to Application)
<p><i>Teacher Practice Evaluation Training</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand how the <i>Danielson Framework for Teaching</i> is constructed and the criteria for distinguishing levels of performance at the component level. • Identify forms of rating bias and areas of common rating errors to avoid. • Identify evidence sources most appropriate for each component of teacher effectiveness. • Practice observing and rating evidence sources, with feedback, in line with the WI Educator Effectiveness Teacher Practice Evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams of five from districts, including: two evaluators, two teachers, and a peer reviewer/mentor • Danielson Group trainers • WI Regional Trainers • DPI • Facilitators representing educational stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process manual • Facilitation guide • PPTs • <i>Danielson Framework</i> text • <i>Smart Cards</i> • Agendas • Lists of participating districts
<p><i>Teachscape Online Training, Proficiency, and Calibration</i></p>	<p><i>Training</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observers can practice gathering evidence, aligning it to the FFT, and scoring each component of Domains 2 and 3. • Provides specific, immediate feedback and evidence-based scoring rationales. <p><i>Proficiency Testing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment was developed as a scientifically sound test for assessing classroom observers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WI evaluators using the state system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachscape literature • Teachscape website • Teachscape WI state proposal • Teachscape estimates

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The performance-based assessment uses multiple choice item and innovative video-based test items to measure observers' understanding of the Framework, ensuring the ability to identify evidence and scoring accuracy. • Observers who complete the training and participate fully in the practice scoring pass the test at a rate well over 90%. <p><i>Calibration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Teachscape calibration system shows observers two master-scored videos that are grade span specific. • Evaluators identify evidence, align, and score. • Evaluators are given feedback about their accuracy relative to the master scores and provided with suggestions for next steps if needed. • The tool can support up to three calibration events per year. 		
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--