



Navigation Links:  
[Statewide summary](#)

Individual CESA Summaries

[CESA 1](#)  
[CESA 2](#)  
[CESA 3](#)  
[CESA 4](#)

[CESA 5](#)  
[CESA 6](#)  
[CESA 7](#)  
[CESA 8](#)

[CESA 9](#)  
[CESA 10](#)  
[CESA 11](#)  
[CESA 12](#)

**Statewide Summary**  
**Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary**  
**July 2024**

**Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024. Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

## Response rate

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a 70% response rate. Table 1 shows the breakdown of responses by CESA and Table 2 shows the breakdown of responses by district/school census locale.

**Table 1: CESA Percent of Respondents**

<b>CESA</b>	<b>RESPONSE NUMBER (n= 320)</b>	<b>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</b>
1	53	17%
2	40	12%
3	27	8%
4	13	4%
5	21	7%
6	34	11%
7	14	4%
8	27	8%
9	13	4%
10	26	8%
11	35	11%
12	17	5%

**Table 2: Local Percent of Respondents**

<b>LOCALE</b>	<b>RESPONSE NUMBER (n= 320)</b>	<b>PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS</b>
City, Large	14	4%
City, Midsize	6	2%
City, Small	20	6%
Suburban, Large	27	8%
Suburban, Midsize	19	6%
Suburban, Small	16	5%
Town, Fringe	18	6%
Town, Distant	26	8%
Town, Remote	5	2%
Rural, Fringe	50	16%
Rural, Distant	64	20%
Rural, Remote	56	17%

## Survey Responses

### *Orientation and training for educators and evaluators*

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO
319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO
299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=321)
Process manuals	136 (42%)
Seminars	64 (20%)
Written materials	190 (59%)
Online resources	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	180 (56%)
CESA training	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=44):

- Items mentioned more than once:
  - Individual or small group training/meetings
  - District developed resources/training materials (ex: website, review videos, etc.)
  - New staff orientation/training
  - District professional development days
  - Information/documents via CESA 6
  - Mentors

***Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement***

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO
309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO
304 (96%)	13 (4%)

***Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle***

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO
309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	34 (11%)
Annually	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=6):

- As assigned
- Every 3 years for sure, but depending on the needs of the employee it may also be annually
- New to the district teachers for the first three years of employment and all summative year teachers.
- Some are annual while others are at the beginning of a evaluation cycle
- Summative Year (n = 2)
- The beginning of each of the three years they are new to the district.

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO
311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO
293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO
303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO
309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO
312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	42 (13%)
Every other year	1 (~0%)
Every third year	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	76 (24%)

Comments (n=21):

- All teachers participate in EE annually. The summative is completed every third year. Annual evaluation for new teachers in years 1-2-3
- Annual for the first three years of employment and then once every third year
- Annually when on probation then every three years, but informal walk throughs are conducted with feedback every year.
- Annually with the third year being the summary year
- At minimum every 3, some may be moved to annually as needed. All teachers have formal feedback with the principals regardless of 'year'
- Every teacher in our building receives two reviews on an annual basis
- Every third year, with a more frequent evaluation if needed based on previous evaluations and data
- Every year for first 3 years then every 3rd year
- Every year for the first three years (with the option to move off cycle sooner than three years if evidence confirms) and then every third year after that.
- First two years of service in the district followed by every third
- New to the district is annually for the first 4 years then every three years there after
- RCF
- Staff do EE submissions each year, year 3 we have formal evaluation process and assign staff their next cycle evaluation round based upon staff needs
- Staff gets an evaluation every year In their first three years
- Summary evaluation every third year with multiple mini observations during the other two years
- Teachers have a formative evaluation annually and a summative evaluation every 3 years
- Year 1, 2 are annual. Year 3 is option for those new educators based on principal recommendation. All veterans are reviewed every three years or annually when there is a performance issue
- every 3 or more often as needed
- every year the first 3 years of employment then a 3 year cycle
- if improvement needed
- new teachers are annual for 3 years, Experienced teachers are every third year



14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

EVALUATION CYCLE	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	131 (42%)
Every other year	20 (6%)
Every third year	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	45 (14%)

Comments (n=12):

- Cycles mentioned more than once:
  - Annual for the first three years of employment and then once every third year
  - None for Principals currently

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

EE CONFERENCES	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Planning session	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

EE CONFERENCES	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Planning session	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	294 (94%)

**Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle**

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

<b>STATE (n=309)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the statewide responses on the main requirements.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

Nearly all respondents (99%) reported that they provide an orientation, and a significant majority (93%) provide ongoing training opportunities for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources (59%), written resources (59%), and process manuals (42%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

Respondents indicated that the majority of evaluators (97%) have been trained, and most (96%) also participate in calibration activities.

*Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of entities (98%) report that teachers and principals complete a self-review, and the majority (21%) reported completing it at the beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle, with some completing it annually (2%).

*Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Almost all teachers (99%) and principals (93%) complete an SLO annually, and a majority receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs (96%).

*Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Almost all teachers and principals (99%) are evaluated in their first year of employment, and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (62%), or there is a combination approach (24%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year), typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (42%), followed by every third year (37%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (96%) and principals (94%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 86% and principals = 77%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (86%) and principals (71%) but less frequently for principals than the other conference.

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre- and post-conference (26%) or a series of mini observations without pre- and post-conferences (26%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of “sampling visits” (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit (38%), followed by a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference (19%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 1 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 1 supports 71 school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools. Of the 71, 53 responded to the survey, for a **75%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### **Orientation and training for educators and evaluators**

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 1 (n=53)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
53 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 1 (n=53)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
49 (92%)	4 (8%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 1 RESPONSES (n=53)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	31 (58%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	9 (17%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	32 (60%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	28 (53%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	25 (47%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	21 (40%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=7):

- Items mentioned more than once:
  - District created materials/processes
  - Coaching sessions



***Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement***

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 1 (n=52)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
51 (98%)	1 (2%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 1 (n=52)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
49 (94%)	3 (6%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

***Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle***

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 1 (n=52)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
52 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

<b>TIME</b>	<b>CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=50)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)</b>
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	11 (21%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	1 (2%)	34 (11%)
Annually	38 (73%)	209 (66%)

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

<b>CESA 1 (n=52)</b>		<b>STATE (n=314)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
52 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

<b>CESA 1 (n=52)</b>		<b>STATE (n=314)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
48 (92%)	4 (8%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

<b>CESA 1 (n=52)</b>		<b>STATE (n=314)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
51 (98%)	1 (2%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 1 (n=52)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
51 (98%)	1 (2%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 1 (n=52)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
52 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=52)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	13 (25%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	25 (48%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	14 (27%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=5):

- Annual for the first three years of employment and then once every third year (n=2)
- Staff gets an evaluation every year In their first three years
- Teachers have a formative evaluation annually and a summative evaluation every 3 years
- every 3 or more often as needed

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=52)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	23 (44%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	4 (8%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	18 (35%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	7 (13%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=4):

- Cycles mentioned more than once
- Annual for the first three years of employment and then once every third year
- None for Principals currently
- Principals had not been previously evaluated in many years. We will now be evaluating principals annually

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=52)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	50 (96%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	49 (94%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	50 (96%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=52)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	45 (87%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	39 (75%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	47 (90%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=52)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	5 (10%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	7 (13%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	17 (33%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	10 (19%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	10 (19%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	3 (6%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=52)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	5 (10%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	7 (13%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	6 (12%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	20 (38%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	3 (6%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	1 (2%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	10 (19%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 1 (n=52)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
48 (92%)	4 (8%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 1 (n=53)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
45 (87%)	7 (13%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 1 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=53)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	12 (23%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	15 (29%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	23 (44%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	13 (25%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	23 (44%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying in which CESA the respondent is located). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the responses on the main requirements by those completing the survey within CESA 1.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

Nearly all respondents reported that they provide an orientation (100%) and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (92%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include: written materials (60%), process manuals (58%), and online resources (53%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

Respondents indicated that the majority of evaluators have been trained (98%) and a slightly smaller percentage (94%), also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

All respondents reported that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (73%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All teachers (100%) and almost all principals (92%) were reported to have completed an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (98%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Almost all teachers and principals (98%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment. Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (48%) or there is a combination approach (27%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year), typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (44%), followed by every third year (35%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (96%) and principals (90%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 96% and principals = 87%). The mid-year review is held for most teachers (94%) and a majority of principals (75%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.



*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.* Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre-and post-conference (33%). This was followed by a number of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (19%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive “sampling visits” in place of one formal school visit (38%), followed by announced, formal school visits with a pre-and post-conference (38%).

## **Additional information**

The following resources may also help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 2 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state and within CESA 2.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 2 support 74 school districts and 6 independent and non-instrumentality charter schools. Of the 80 entities, 40 responded to the survey for a **50%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### ***Orientation and training for educators and evaluators***

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

<b>CESA 2 (n=40)</b>		<b>STATE (n=320)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
39 (98%)	1 (3%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

<b>CESA 2 (n=40)</b>		<b>STATE (n=320)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
36 (90%)	4 (10%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

<b>RESOURCE</b>	<b>CESA 2 RESPONSES (n=40)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)</b>
Process manuals	15 (38%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	6 (15%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	23 (58%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	22 (55%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	20 (50%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	7 (18%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=8):

- Items mentioned more than once:
  - New Teacher/Mentor Training
  - Coaching/Professional Development

***Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement***

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 2 (n=40)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
39 (98%)	1 (3%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 2 (n=40)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
38 (95%)	2 (5%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

***Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle***

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 2 (n=39)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
39 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=39)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	10 (26%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	5 (13%)	34 (11%)
Annually	22 (56%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=2):

- Every 3 years for sure, but depending on the needs of the employee it may also be annually

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 2 (n=39)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
38 (97%)	1 (3%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 2 (n=39)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
36 (92%)	3 (8%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 2 (n=39)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
38 (97%)	1 (3%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 2 (n=39)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
37 (95%)	2 (5%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 2 (n=39)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
39 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=39)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	7 (18%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	27 (69%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	5 (13%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=2):

- At minimum every 3, some may be moved to annually as needed. All teachers have formal feedback with the principals regardless of 'year'
- RCF

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=39)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	17 (44%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	1 (3%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	14 (36%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	7 (18%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=39)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	31 (79%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	30 (77%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	38 (97%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=39)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	31 (79%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	24 (62%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	37 (95%)	294 (94%)

**Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle**

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=38)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	1 (3%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	1 (3%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	1 (3%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	15 (39%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	8 (21%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	1 (3%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	9 (24%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (5%)	42 (14%)



18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=38)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	4 (11%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	2 (5%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	4 (11%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	15 (39%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	1 (3%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	5 (13%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	7 (18%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 2 (n=38)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
36 (95%)	2 (5%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 2 (n=38)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
37 (97%)	1 (3%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 2 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=40)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	7 (18%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	11 (29%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	19 (50%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	12 (32%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	23 (61%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying in which CESA the respondent is located). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the responses on the main requirements by those completing the survey within CESA 2.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

Nearly all respondents reported that they provide an orientation (98%) and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (90%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include: written resources (58%), online resources (55%), and process manuals (38%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement*

The majority of evaluators have been trained (98%) and most, although a slightly smaller percentage (95%), also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

All reported that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (56%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Almost all teachers (97%) and principals (92%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (97%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Almost all teachers and principals (95%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (69%) or there is a combination approach (13%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new

educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (44%), followed by every third year (36%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (97%) and principals (95%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 79% and principals = 79%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (77%) and principals (62%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre-and post-conference (39%). This was followed by a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (21%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference (18%), followed by at least one announced, formal school visit (11%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may also help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 3 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 3 supports 31 school districts. Of the 31 districts, 27 responded to the survey for a **87%** response rate.

## Survey Summary

### **Orientation and training for educators and evaluators**

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 3 (n=27)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 3 (n=27)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
22 (81%)	5 (19%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 3 RESPONSES (n=27)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	7 (26%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	4 (15%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	18 (67%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	15 (56%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	18 (67%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	16 (59%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=3):

- District developed resources
- New teacher orientation meetings during the school year
- Face to face

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (96%)	1 (4%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	5 (19%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	6 (23%)	34 (11%)
Annually	15 (58%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (96%)	1 (4%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
23 (88%)	3 (12%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
23 (88%)	3 (12%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)



**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	2 (8%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	19 (73%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	5 (19%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=0):

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	10 (38%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	3 (12%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	13 (50%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	0 (0%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	20 (77%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	22 (85%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	25 (96%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	16 (62%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	16 (62%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	24 (92%)	294 (94%)

**Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle**

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	1 (4%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	2 (8%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	4 (15%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	5 (19%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	5 (19%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	5 (19%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	4 (15%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	3 (12%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	2 (8%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	1 (4%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	9 (35%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	4 (15%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	7 (27%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 3 (n=26)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
23 (88%)	3 (12%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 3 (n=26)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
24 (92%)	2 (8%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 3 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	8 (31%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	12 (46%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	8 (31%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	6 (23%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	17 (65%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying in which CESA the respondent is located). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the responses on the main requirements by those completing the survey within CESA 3.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (81%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources, written materials, and process manuals.

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

All evaluators were trained and participated in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

Most (96%) report that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (58%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Most teachers (96%) and principals (88%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (88%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers and principals (100%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (73%) or there is a combination approach (19%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated every third year (50%), followed by annually (38%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (96%) and principals (92%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 77% and principals = 62%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (85%) and principals (62%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.* Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre-and post-conference (19%). This was followed by a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (19%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit (35%), followed by a number of sampling visits including a pre- and post-conference (27%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 4 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 4 supports 26 school districts. Of the 26 districts, 13 responded to the survey for a **50%** response rate.



## Survey Summary

### ***Orientation and training for educators and evaluators***

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (92%)	1 (8%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 4 RESPONSES (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	9 (69%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	3 (23%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	10 (77%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	7 (54%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	6 (46%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	5 (38%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=2):

- School generated information specific to EE process
- Mentors

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (92%)	1 (8%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (92%)	1 (8%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	4 (31%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	0 (0%)	34 (11%)
Annually	9 (69%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (92%)	1 (8%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	2 (15%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	8 (62%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	0 (0%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	3 (23%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=2):

- Annually with the third year being the summary year
- Every teacher in our building receives two reviews on an annual basis

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	7 (54%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	1 (8%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	4 (31%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	1 (8%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0)

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	11 (85%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	12 (92%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	13 (100%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

EE CONFERENCES	CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Planning session	10 (77%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	11 (85%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	12 (92%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

OBSERVATION PROCESS	CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=321)
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	0 (0%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	2 (15%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	2 (15%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	2 (15%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	5 (38%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (15%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	0 (0%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	0 (0%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	1 (8%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	5 (38%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	6 (46%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	1 (8%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 4 (n=13)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
12 (92%)	1 (8%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 4 (n=13)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 4 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=12)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	2 (17%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	6 (50%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	7 (58%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	5 (42%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	7 (58%)	177 (58%)



## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying in which CESA the respondent is located). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the responses on the main requirements by those completing the survey within CESA 4.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation and a large majority (92%) provide ongoing training opportunities for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include written materials (77%), process manuals (69%), and online resources (54%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

The majority of evaluators have been trained (92%) and also participate (92%) in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

All reported that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (69%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All teachers and principals were reported to have completed an SLO annually and received a holistic evaluation of their SLO (92%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Respondents indicated that all teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every other year (62%) or there is a combination approach (23%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (54%), followed by every third year (31%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (100%) and principals (92%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the mid-year/interval review (teachers = 92% and principals = 85%). The planning session is held for a majority of teachers (85%) and principals (77%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive a number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference (38%). This was followed by a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (15%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference (46%), followed by a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit (38%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 5 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to the implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 5 supports 36 school districts, of those 21 responded to the survey for a **58%** response rate.

## Survey Summary

### Orientation and training for educators and evaluators

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 5 (n=21)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
21 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 5 (n=21)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
20 (95%)	1 (5%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 5 RESPONSES (n=21)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	7 (33%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	8 (38%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	12 (57%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	15 (71%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	13 (62%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	12 (57%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=3):

- Items mentioned:
  - Mentors
  - Principal meetings

***Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement***

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
18 (90%)	2 (10%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
17 (85%)	3 (15%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

***Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle***

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
19 (95%)	1 (5%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=20)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	3 (15%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	1 (5%)	34 (11%)
Annually	16 (80%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
20 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
19 (95%)	1 (5%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
20 (100%)	0 (0%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
19 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 5 (n=20)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
19 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	2 (11%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	13 (68%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	4 (21%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=1):

- New teachers are annual for 3 years, Experienced teachers are every third year

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	7 (37%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	2 (11%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	7 (37%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	3 (16%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=1):

- New teacher's annually for three years, experienced, every 3 years

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	12 (63%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	14 (74%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	19 (100%)	301 (96%)



16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	13 (68%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	13 (68%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	18 (95%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	2 (11%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	2 (11%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	4 (21%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	8 (42%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	1 (5%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (11%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	1 (5%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	1 (5%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	0 (0%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	7 (37%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	2 (11%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	5 (26%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	3 (16%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 5 (n=19)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
19 (100%)	0 (0%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 5 (n=19)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
19 (100%)	0 (0%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=19)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	2 (11%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	11 (58%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	5 (26%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	5 (26%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	11 (58%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying in which CESA the respondent is located). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the responses on the main requirements by those completing the survey within CESA 5.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation and a large majority provide ongoing training opportunities (95%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources (71%), employee handbooks (62%), and written materials (57%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement*

The majority of evaluators have been trained (90%) and most, although a smaller percentage (85%), also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

Most respondents (95%) report that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (80%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All teachers and most principals (95%) complete an SLO annually and all receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO.

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Respondents indicated that teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (68%) or there is a combination approach (21%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (37%) or every third year (37%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (100%) and principals (95%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the mid-year review (teachers = 74% and principals = 68%). Planning sessions are held for a majority of teachers (63%) and principals (68%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.* Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive a number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period (42%). This was followed by an announced, formal observation with a pre-and post-conference (21%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of “sampling visits” in place of one school visit (37%), followed by a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference (26%)

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 6 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024. Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 6 supports 39 school districts, of those 34 responded to the survey for a **87%** response rate.

## Survey Summary

### Orientation and training for educators and evaluators

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 6 (n=34)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
34 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 6 (n=34)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
33 (97%)	1 (3%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 6 RESPONSES (n=34)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	12 (35%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	7 (21%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	15 (44%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	18 (53%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	23 (68%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	18 (53%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=6):

- Items mentioned more than once:
  - District professional development days/training materials

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 6 (n=33)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
33 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post-observation discussion)?

CESA 6 (n=33)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
32 (97%)	1 (3%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 6 (n=33)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
33 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)



7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=32)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	6 (18%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	6 (18%)	34 (11%)
Annually	20 (61%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=1):

- Summative Year

***Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
32 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
31 (97%)	1 (3%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
31 (97%)	1 (3%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
31 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
31 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=31)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	2 (6%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	16 (52%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	13 (42%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=3):

- Annually when on probation then every three years, but informal walkthroughs are conducted with feedback every year
- Every year for the first three years (with the option to move off cycle sooner than three years if evidence confirms) and then every third year after that
- Year 1, 2 are annual. Year 3 is option for those new educators based on principal recommendation. All veterans are reviewed every three years or annually when there is a performance issue

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	13 (42%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	1 (3%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	9 (29%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	8 (26%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=2):

- Every year for the first three years (with the option to move off cycle sooner if evidence permits), and then every third year after that
- New Principals are evaluated in their first year and then every three years. All veterans are reviewed every three years unless there is a position change, which then triggers a review

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	28 (90%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	26 (84%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	31 (100%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	26 (84%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	24 (77%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	30 (97%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	1 (3%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	2 (6%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	4 (13%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	4 (13%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	3 (10%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	8 (26%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	9 (29%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	2 (6%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	1 (3%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	4 (13%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	1 (3%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	13 (42%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	6 (19%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	4 (13%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 6 (n=31)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
30 (97%)	1 (3%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
31 (100%)	0 (0%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=30)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	9 (30%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	12 (40%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	17 (57%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	8 (27%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	22 (73%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying in which CESA the respondent is located). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are

being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the responses on the main requirements by those completing the survey within CESA 6.

#### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation and almost all (97%) provide ongoing training opportunities for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include: online resources (53%), written resources (44%), and the process manuals (35%).

#### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

All evaluators have been trained (100%) and most, although a smaller percentage (97%), also participate in calibration activities.

#### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

All respondents report that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (61%) reported completing it annually.

#### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Respondents reported that all teachers and almost all principals (97%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (97%).

#### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Respondents indicated that all teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (52%) or there is a combination approach (42%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (42%), followed by every third year (29%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (100%) and principals (97%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 90% and principals = 84%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (84%) and principals (77%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

#### *Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive a series of mini observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference (29%). This was followed by a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (26%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of “sampling visits” in place of one school visit (42%), followed by a number of sampling visits including a post-conference (19%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)





## **CESA 7 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024. Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the following six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a statewide response rate of **70%**. CESA 7 supports 37 school districts and 2 independent and non-instrumentality charter schools. Of the 39 entities, 14 responded to the survey for a **36%** response rate.

## Survey Response

### ***Orientation and training for educators and evaluators***

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

<b>CESA 7 (n=14)</b>		<b>STATE (n=320)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
13 (93%)	1 (7%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

<b>CESA 7 (n=14)</b>		<b>STATE (n=320)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
12 (86%)	2 (14%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

<b>RESOURCE</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSES (n=14)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)</b>
Process manuals	5 (36%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	3 (21%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	7 (50%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	7 (50%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	7 (50%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	4 (29%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=5):

- District EE Website, District made review videos
- EE Coach led coaching sessions
- I am not sure about any trainings
- Locally developed materials
- individual meetings

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (93%)	1 (7%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
14 (100%)	0 (0%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
14 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=14)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	3 (21%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	2 (14%)	34 (11%)
Annually	9 (64%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
14 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
14 (100%)	0 (0%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (93%)	1 (7%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
14 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
14 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=14)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	1 (7%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	10 (71%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	0 (0%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	3 (21%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=1):

- Summary evaluation every third year with multiple mini-observations during the other two years

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=14)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	5 (36%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	1 (7%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	6 (43%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	2 (14%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=14)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	12 (86%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	11 (79%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	14 (100%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=14)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	10 (71%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	10 (71%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	14 (100%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=14)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	2 (14%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	1 (7%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	5 (36%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	4 (29%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	2 (14%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (7%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=14)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	1 (7%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	0 (0%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	2 (14%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	5 (36%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	3 (21%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	3 (21%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 7 (n=14)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
11 (79%)	3 (21%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)



20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 7 (n=14)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (86%)	2 (14%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=14)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	5 (36%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	3 (21%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	9 (64%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	3 (21%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	8 (57%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are

being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the CESA 7 responses on the main requirements.

#### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

Nearly all respondents reported that they provide an orientation (99%) and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (93%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources (59%), written resources (59%), and process manuals (42%).

#### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

Respondents indicated the majority of evaluators have been trained (97%) and also participate in calibration activities (96%).

#### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of respondents (98%) report that teachers and principals complete a self-review, and the majority (64%) reported completing it annually.

#### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Almost all teachers (99%) and principals (93%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (96%).

#### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Almost all teachers and principals (99%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (62%) or there is a combination approach (24%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (42%), followed by every third year (37%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (96%) and principals (94%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 86% and principals = 77%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (86%) and principals (71%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

#### *Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre- and post-conference (26%). This was followed by a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (26%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive “sampling visits” in place of one school visit (38%), followed by a series of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference (19%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 8 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the following six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 8 supports 27 school districts and all of them responded to the survey for a **100%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### ***Orientation and training for educators and evaluators***

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
28 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 8 RESPONSES (n=28)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	12 (43%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	6 (21%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	18 (64%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	18 (64%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	18 (64%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	14 (50%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=3):

- One-On-One Meetings w/Staff
- building level training
- small group meetings

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post-observation discussion)?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (93%)	2 (7%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=28)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	6 (21%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	3 (11%)	34 (11%)
Annually	19 (68%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
28 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
28 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=28)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	4 (14%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	16 (57%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	8 (29%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=1):



14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=28)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	12 (43%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	10 (36%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	6 (21%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=28)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	25 (89%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	25 (89%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	28 (100%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=28)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	22 (79%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	23 (82%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	26 (93%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=28)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	2 (7%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	1 (4%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	1 (4%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	9 (32%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	9 (32%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	2 (7%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	4 (14%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=28)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	3 (11%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	1 (4%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	3 (11%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	9 (32%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	2 (7%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	4 (14%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	6 (21%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 8 (n=28)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 8 (n=28)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 8 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=28)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	3 (11%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	8 (30%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	12 (44%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	6 (22%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	16 (59%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the CESA 8 responses on the main requirements.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation (100%) and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (96%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources (64%), written resources (64%), and process manuals (43%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

Respondents indicated that the majority of evaluators have been trained (96%) and most, although a slightly smaller percentage (93%), also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of respondents report that teachers and principals complete a self-review (96%) and the majority (68%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Almost all teachers (96%) and principals (96%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (96%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers and principals (100%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (57%) or there is a combination approach (29%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (43%), followed by every third year (36%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (100%) and principals (93%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the mid-year review (teachers = 89% and principals = 82%). Planning sessions are held for a majority of teachers (89%) and principals (79%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.* Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre-and post-conference (32%). This was followed by a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (32%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive “sampling visits” in place of one school visit (32%), followed by a series of sampling visits in place of one school visit including a pre- and post-conference (21%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 9 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of the six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024. Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the following six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 9 supports 22 school districts, of those 13 responded to the survey for a **59%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### **Orientation and training for educators and evaluators**

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
11 (85%)	2 (15%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 9 RESPONSES (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	7 (54%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	2 (15%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	8 (62%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	6 (46%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	5 (38%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	6 (46%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=0)



***Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement***

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post-observation discussion)?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

***Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle***

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	2 (15%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	2 (15%)	34 (11%)
Annually	9 (69%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
11 (85%)	2 (15%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (92%)	1 (8%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 9 (n=13)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=13)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
Annual evaluation	1 (8%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	8 (62%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	4 (31%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=0):

- All teachers participate in EE annually. The summative is completed every third year. Annual evaluation for new teachers in years 1-2-3

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	6 (46%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	2 (15%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	5 (38%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	0 (0%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	11 (85%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	12 (92%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	12 (92%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	10 (77%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	9 (69%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	12 (92%)	294 (94%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	0 (0%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	1 (8%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	3 (25%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	4 (33%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	1 (8%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	1 (8%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (17%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=13)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	1 (8%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	1 (8%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	1 (8%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	1 (8%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	4 (33%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	2 (17%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (17%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 9 (n=12)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
12 (100%)	0 (0%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 9 (n=12)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
12 (100%)	0 (0%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 9 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=12)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	2 (17%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	9 (75%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	9 (75%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	2 (17%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	8 (67%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the CESA 9 responses on the main requirements.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

Nearly all respondents reported that they provide an orientation (99%) and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (93%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources (59%), written resources (59%), and process manuals (42%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement*

Respondents indicated that the majority of evaluators have been trained (97%) and most, although a slightly smaller percentage (96%), also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of respondents (98%) report that teachers and principals complete a self-review, and the majority (69%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

Almost all teachers (99%) and principals (93%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (96%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Almost all teachers and principals (99%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (62%) or there is a combination approach (24%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (42%), followed by every third year (37%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (96%) and principals (94%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 86% and principals = 77%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (86%) and principals (71%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

### *Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive an announced, formal observation with a pre- and post-conference (26%). This was followed by a series of mini observations without pre- and post-conferences (26%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive “sampling visits” in place of one school visit (38%), followed by a number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference (19%).



## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 10 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the following six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 10 supports 29 school districts, of those 26 responded to the survey for a **90%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### Orientation and training for educators and evaluators

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (96%)	1 (4%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 10 RESPONSES (n=26)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	8 (31%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	7 (27%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	13 (50%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	0 (0%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	0 (0%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	0 (0%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=4):

- EE Guidebook (in district)
- Local Training
- Professional Development led by the admin team
- mentors

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post-observation discussion)?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (96%)	1 (4%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=26)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	9 (35%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	3 (12%)	34 (11%)
Annually	13 (50%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=1):

- New to the district teachers for the first three years of employment and all summative year teachers

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 10 (n=26)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
26 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	4 (15%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	16 (62%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	6 (23%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=0)

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	11 (42%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	3 (12%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	9 (35%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	3 (12%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	25 (96%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	19 (73%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	24 (92%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	19 (73%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	17 (65%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	25 (96%)	294 (94%)



**Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle**

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	2 (8%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	1 (4%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	1 (4%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	3 (12%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	9 (36%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	4 (16%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	5 (20%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=26)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	1 (4%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	1 (4%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	0 (0%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	8 (32%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	1 (4%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	12 (48%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (8%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 10 (n=25)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
24 (96%)	1 (4%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 10 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
23 (92%)	2 (8%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 10 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=25)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	4 (16%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	9 (36%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	14 (56%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	5 (20%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	17 (68%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the CESA 10 responses on the main requirements.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation (100%) and a significant majority provide ongoing training opportunities (96%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include online resources (59%), written resources (59%), and process manuals (42%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

Respondents indicated that all evaluators have been trained (100%) and most, although a smaller percentage also participate in calibration activities (96%).

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of respondents (96%) reported that teachers and principals complete a self-review and half (50%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All teachers (100%) and principals (100%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO.

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers and principals (100%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (62%) or there is a combination approach (23%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (42%), followed by every third year (35%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (96%) and principals (96%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the planning sessions (teachers = 96% and principals = 73%). The mid-year review is held for a majority of teachers (73%) and principals (65%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

### *Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive a number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period without pre- and post-conferences (36%). This was followed by a number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference (20%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received “sampling visits” in place of one school visit, including a post-conference (48%), followed by a number of sampling visits (32%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 11 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the following six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to the implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 11 supports 39 school districts, of those districts 35 responded to the survey for a **90%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### *Orientation and training for educators and evaluators*

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 11 RESPONSES (n=35)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	15 (43%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	6 (17%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	21 (60%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	29 (83%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	15 (43%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	18 (51%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=5):

- In-person support sessions
- Individuals meetings
- Information via CESA 6
- Mentor
- Principal led trainings as needed

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post-observation discussion)?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
34 (97%)	1 (3%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
34 (97%)	1 (3%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)



7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

<b>TIME</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)</b>
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	5 (14%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	3 (9%)	34 (11%)
Annually	27 (77%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=0)

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

<b>CESA 11 (n=35)</b>		<b>STATE (n=314)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

<b>CESA 11 (n=35)</b>		<b>STATE (n=314)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
32 (91%)	3 (9%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 11 (n=35)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
35 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	2 (6%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	27 (77%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	6 (17%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=1):

- First two years of service in the district followed by every third

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	14 (40%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	15 (43%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	6 (17%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0):

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	31 (89%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	34 (97%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	32 (91%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	25 (71%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	26 (74%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	34 (97%)	294 (94%)

**Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle**

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	0 (0%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	3 (9%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	10 (29%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	11 (32%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	6 (18%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	4 (12%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=35)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	1 (3%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	2 (6%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	3 (9%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	14 (41%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	1 (3%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	9 (26%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	4 (12%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 11 (n=34)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
32 (94%)	2 (6%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 11 (n=34)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
33 (97%)	1 (3%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 11 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=34)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	6 (18%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	17 (50%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	17 (50%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	8 (24%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	14 (41%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the CESA 11 responses on the main requirements.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation (100%) and provide ongoing training opportunities (100%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include: online resources (83%), written materials (60%), and process manuals (43%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement*

Respondents indicated that all evaluators have been trained (100%) and most, although a smaller percentage (97%), also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of respondents (97%) reported that teachers and principals complete a self-review, and the majority (77%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All teachers (100%) and a majority of principals (91%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (100%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers (100%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment (100%).

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (77%) or there is a combination approach (17%) to the timing, typically due to new or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated every third year (43%), followed by annually (40%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (91%) and principals (97%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the mid-year review (teachers: 97%; principals: 74%). Planning sessions are held for a majority of teachers (89%) and principals (71%) but less frequently than the other two conferences.

### *Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (32%), followed by receiving an announced, formal observation with a pre- and post-conference (29%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive “sampling visits” in place of one school visit (41%), followed by a number of sampling visits including a post-conference (26%).



## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)



## **CESA 12 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary July 2024**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a second annual survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 10 and June 16, 2024.

Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the following six requirements of the EE System:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rate for statewide completion along with a summary of the survey responses. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements across the state.

### **Response rate**

The survey was administered to 455 public school districts and independent and non-instrumentality charter schools that received EE grant funding in 2023-24. Of the 455 districts and schools, 320 responded to the survey for a **70%** response rate. CESA 12 supports 17 school districts and all 17 responded to the survey for a **100%** response rate.

## Survey Responses

### ***Orientation and training for educators and evaluators***

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 12 (n=17)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
17 (100%)	0 (0%)	319 (99%)	2 (1%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 12 (n=17)		STATE (n=320)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
17 (100%)	0 (0%)	299 (93%)	22 (7%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 12 RESPONSES (n=)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=320)
Process manuals	8 (47%)	136 (42%)
Seminars	3 (18%)	64 (20%)
Written materials	13 (76%)	190 (59%)
Online resources	12 (71%)	190 (59%)
Employee handbook	14 (82%)	180 (56%)
CESA training	8 (47%)	138 (43%)

Other, specify (n=2):

- Learning Walks focused on the instructional framework
- Whole Staff Professional Development Session & Worktime, 1:1 support and follow-up

**Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement**

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 12 (n=17)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
16 (94%)	1 (6%)	309 (97%)	8 (3%)

5. Have or will certified administrators in your district/school complete at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation among evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 12 (n=17)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
17 (100%)	0 (0%)	304 (96%)	13 (4%)

**Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle**

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 12 (n=16)		STATE (n=315)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
15 (94%)	1 (6%)	309 (98%)	6 (2%)

7. At what point do educators, including principals, typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=16)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER AND PERCENT (n=317)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	1 (6%)	65 (21%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	2 (13%)	34 (11%)
Annually	12 (75%)	209 (66%)

Other, specify (n=1):

- As assigned

***Educators must complete at least one student (for teachers) or school (for principals) learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 12 (n=16)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
16 (100%)	0 (0%)	311 (99%)	3 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 12 (n=16)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (81%)	3 (19%)	293 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 12 (n=16)		STATE (n=314)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
15 (94%)	1 (6%)	303 (96%)	11 (4%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 12 (n=16)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
16 (100%)	0 (0%)	309 (99%)	3 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the district/school?

CESA 12 (n=16)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
16 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (100%)	0 (0%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=16)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	2 (13%)	42 (13%)
Every other year	1 (6%)	1 (~0%)
Every third year	8 (50%)	193 (62%)
Combination of the above?	5 (31%)	76 (24%)

Comments (n=4):

- Every third year, with a more frequent evaluation if needed based on previous evaluations and data
- New to the district is annually for the first 4 years then every three years thereafter
- Every year the first 3 years of employment then a 3 year cycle
- If improvement needed

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=16)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Annual evaluation	6 (38%)	131 (42%)
Every other year	2 (13%)	20 (6%)
Every third year	6 (38%)	116 (37%)
Combination of the above?	2 (13%)	45 (14%)

Comments (n=0)

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=16)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	13 (81%)	269 (86%)
Mid-year/interval review	15 (94%)	269 (86%)
End-of-cycle conference	15 (94%)	301 (96%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=16)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=312)</b>
Planning session	12 (75%)	239 (77%)
Mid-year/interval review	9 (56%)	221 (71%)
End-of-cycle conference	15 (94%)	294 (94%)



**Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle**

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=16)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	0 (0%)	16 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	8 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	26 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	2 (13%)	79 (26%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	7 (47%)	80 (26%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	1 (7%)	54 (18%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	5 (33%)	42 (14%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=16)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=321)</b>
At least one announced, formal school visit	0 (0%)	22 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a post-conference	2 (13%)	23 (7%)
At least one announced, formal school visit - including a pre- and post-conference	0 (0%)	22 (7%)
A number of "sampling visits" (aka informal, unannounced school visit lasting at least 10-15 minutes) in place of one school visit	9 (60%)	118 (38%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre-conference	0 (0%)	10 (3%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a post-conference	1 (7%)	58 (19%)
A number of sampling visits in place of one school visit, including a pre- and post-conference	3 (20%)	52 (17%)

19. All teachers, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

<b>CESA 12 (n=15)</b>		<b>STATE (n=321)</b>	
<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
13 (87%)	2 (13%)	287 (93%)	20 (7%)

20. All principals, whether or not they are completing an evaluation cycle this year, received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 12 (n=15)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
13 (87%)	2 (13%)	289 (94%)	18 (6%)

21. Which of the WI EE System flexibilities has your district implemented, if any. [check all that apply]

FLEXIBILITY	CESA 12 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=15)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=297)
Additional calibration activities beyond one (1) event required of evaluators annually.	4 (27%)	64 (22%)
Integrated WI EE System orientation to local orientation for new to school or district teachers.	10 (67%)	123 (41%)
Identification of focus components through self-review and collaborative conversations between evaluators and educators.	11 (73%)	151 (50%)
Use of an educator's self-review as evidence of practice for experienced educators with demonstrated effectiveness (more than three [3] years of full-time experience as a teacher or principal and not on a plan of improvement or other local human resources processes).	5 (33%)	78 (26%)
Combined student/school learning objectives (SLO) and professional practice goals by incorporating professional practice improvement as instructional or leadership strategies of the SLO.	11 (73%)	177 (58%)

## Summary of Results

As these results are considered, there are several limitations to the survey to bear in mind. First, the surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Second, another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Third, some survey item response choices (e.g., item 3) are difficult to interpret, since the categories may overlap or not be mutually exclusive. Despite these limitations, the survey provides a basic picture of whether the six required elements are being implemented within CESAs and across the state. The following summarizes the CESA 12 responses on the main requirements.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

All respondents reported that they provide an orientation (100%) and ongoing training opportunities (100%) for their staff. The three most frequently reported resources include written resources (76%), online resources (71%), and process manuals (47%).

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement*

Respondents indicated that the majority of evaluators have been trained (94%) and all (100%) also participate in calibration activities.

### *Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

A great number of respondents (94%) report that teachers and principals complete a self-review and the majority (75%) reported completing it annually.

### *Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All teachers (100%) and almost all principals (81%) complete an SLO annually and receive a holistic evaluation of their SLO (94%).

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers and principals (100%) are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment (100%).

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (50%) or there is a combination approach (31%) to the timing (annually, every other year, every third year) typically due to new educator or veteran educator status. Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (38%) and every third year (38%).

The most frequently held EE conference for both teachers (94%) and principals (94%) is the end-of-cycle conference, followed by the mid-year review for teachers (94%) and the planning sessions for principals (75%). The planning sessions for teachers (teachers = 81%) and the mid-year review for principals (56%) are also held by the majority.

### *Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a series of mini-observations without pre- and post-conferences (47%), followed by an announced, formal observation with a pre-and post-conference (13%).

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a number of "sampling visits" (60%), followed by a number of sampling visits including a pre- and post-conference (20%).

## **Additional Information**

The following resources may help inform planning EE support:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)