The Indiana Evaluation Pilot: Mid-Year Report and Recommendations

March 2012

Teachers, Administrators, and Students: Rising Together

Nothing we can do for our students matters more than giving them effective teachers. Research has proven this time and again. We need to do everything we can to give all our teachers the support they need to do their best work, because when they succeed, our students succeed. Without effective evaluation systems, we can't identify and retain excellent teachers, provide useful feedback and support to help teachers improve, or intervene when teachers consistently perform poorly.

Indiana's innovative pilot of evaluation systems emphasizes collaboration between teachers and administrators, who are working together with one goal in mind: helping students learn. This requires more than just careful design and strategic processes - it requires a sustained and meaningful culture shift at the school level. At the core of this culture shift is a change in the way we envision the relationship between teachers and administrators. Indiana's pilot evaluation project is informed by three core principles:

Teachers deserve to be treated like professionals.

Current evaluations treat teachers like interchangeable parts—rating nearly all teachers good or great and failing to give teachers the accurate, useful feedback they need to do their best work in the classroom. Teachers deserve regular feedback on their performance, opportunities for professional growth, and recognition when they do exceptional work.

Better evaluations give principals the tools they need to become instructional leaders.

The new systems will help principals support their teachers by helping them accurately pinpoint teachers' strengths and weaknesses. Helping teachers reach their potential in the classroom is a principal's most important job as an instructional leader, and a new evaluation system will hold principals accountable for helping all their teachers learn and grow.

When teachers grow, students grow.

Novice and veteran teachers alike can look forward to detailed, constructive feedback, tailored to the individual needs of their students. Teachers and principals will meet regularly to discuss successes and areas for improvement and set professional goals. The end result is better instruction for every student.

Legislative Overview

If we want to dramatically improve education in Indiana, we must re-imagine the systems and policies that collectively shape the learning experience for students.

In the spring of 2011, the Indiana legislature passed IC 20-28-11.5, a new law relating to the evaluation of all certified teaching staff and administrators. Prior to this legislation, evaluation systems around the state varied greatly in quality and consistency. The new law introduced three main requirements of all evaluation systems:

- Every teacher must receive an evaluation annually;
- Every evaluation system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective; and
- Every evaluation system must incorporate measures of student growth and achievement as a *significant* portion of a teacher's evaluation.

The new legislation positioned Indiana at the forefront of a nationwide push to elevate the teaching profession by giving educators regular, meaningful feedback on their job performance. All corporations must include the three legislative requirements in their evaluation plans by start of school year 2012-2013, or as soon as current contractual obligations expire. Each corporation must submit an evaluation plan to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), which will be made publicly available online to serve as a resource for all corporations in the state.

The Indiana Evaluation Pilot

To support corporations in this work, the IDOE created a model teacher evaluation system. This system, named RISE, was developed over the course of two years by the Indiana Teacher Evaluation Cabinet. The Cabinet is composed of a diverse group of educators and administrators from around the state, more than half of whom have won awards for excellence in teaching. RISE is an optional, modifiable evaluation system. Each school corporation is different, and corporations may choose to adopt RISE in full, adopt RISE with modifications, or develop their own system completely independent of RISE that fits the unique needs of their principals, teachers, and students.

In school year 2011-2012, the DOE, with the support of TNTP[i], is piloting RISE and following the implementation of other locally developed or purchased evaluation systems in order to test and gather feedback to share statewide. The pilot presents an opportunity for school corporations to gain hands on experience with the new process, recognize their best educators, and to make sure that every classroom is led by a great teacher. Additionally, it offers the IDOE a valuable opportunity to gain feedback and insight from the field, which can be used to sharpen and refine RISE for the following year.

Six corporations out of 37 applicants were chosen for the pilot based on diversity of location and size as well as readiness to implement, for the pilot evaluation year. Three of these corporations—Greensburg Community Schools, Fort Wayne Community Schools, and Bloomfield School District—are piloting the RISE evaluation model. The other three corporations—Beech Grove City Schools, MSD Warren Township, and Bremen Public Schools—are piloting alternative evaluation systems. For a profile of each of these pilot districts and further details on evaluation model design, please see Appendix A.

This report will summarize lessons from the pilot thus far, with a particular focus on planning, design, and initial implementation. The findings and recommendations are intended to guide corporations in developing evaluation plans for implementation in 2012-2013. This report is not, however, a comprehensive planning or implementation guide. For additional guidance on formulating an evaluation plan and other topics mentioned in this report, please visit the DOE guidance website.

A follow-up report released this summer will provide detailed conclusions and further recommendations from the pilot year.

Interim Findings

The following interim findings and recommendations are based on multiple sources of data collected throughout the first half of the pilot year. Pilot corporation teachers and evaluators were surveyed twice, once in August and again in January, to understand their experience with prior evaluation systems and the new system this year. Additionally, qualitative data was collected via individual interviews and focus groups.

Planning and System Design

1. Designing an evaluation system requires significant time and capacity.

Pilot corporations faced significant time and capacity challenges when designing evaluation systems. In fact, only one of three pilot corporations developing an alternative evaluation system opted to design the entire system itself; the other two opted to contract with outside vendors for support on one or more parts of the evaluation system.

The number of decisions needed to design an evaluation system can be overwhelming and requires significant time. Conversations regarding tools, systems, and processes that may seem concrete at the outset grow increasingly complex as more and more detailed questions are raised. One assistant superintendent cautioned, "I don't think you can underestimate the amount of time this takes…If districts have not started now, they will struggle next year."[ii]

Finding the right combination of stakeholders to make decisions or advise on decisions while adhering to a strict timeline can also be a challenge. Gathering input from those who will be part of the system is critical but time consuming. Many corporations form steering committees of teachers, principals and others to provide input on design decisions. Bringing together people with various opinions and interests can lead to increased buy-in, but requires additional time for each decision point. Corporations may struggle to meet deadlines if too many people, or those who aren't committed to solutions, are involved in the decision-making process.

One assistant superintendent cautioned, "I don't think you can underestimate the amount of time this takes…"

Another challenge is developing the expertise needed to make design decisions. While there are many existing frameworks for classroom observation, few models with measures of student learning exist-–a legally required component of all Indiana evaluation systems. While 4th-8th grade Language Arts and Math teachers have growth model data, the majority of teachers in a corporation do not have a statistical measure of student learning. Determining how to best measure student learning for these teachers can be difficult – this requires expert knowledge regarding assessments, which is often not available on many central office staff.

Training and Communication

1. Thorough, quality training is essential.

Evaluators need training in order to develop the skills they need to implement a new evaluation system. In August, pilot evaluators were surveyed about their prior experiences with teacher evaluation. Only 52% reported having received training on observing and evaluating teachers from at least one source.[iii] Given the lack of training, over a third of evaluators were not confident in their ability to effectively evaluate teachers, provide effective instructional coaching, or help struggling teachers become more effective.[iv] These are core skills of instructional leaders, and building administrators deserve to receive focused training to improve their practice. Therefore, one of the goals of implementing a new evaluation system in all corporations should be to ensure that instructional leaders have the tools and skills they need to confidently evaluate and give feedback to teachers.

Amount and type of training in pilot corporations differed by corporation and evaluation system; however, most evaluators found it to be helpful. Evaluators felt that training improved their skills and provided a standardized way of looking at instruction, allowing them to focus on how students are performing.[v] Pilot evaluators believed that training not only worked to build their understanding of complex components of the system like student learning measures, but also helped them to build core skills like taking evidence-based notes in observations, and effectively communicating the system to teachers.[vi] Improving the skills of evaluators also

helped to ensure successful implementation. Nearly eight in ten evaluators implemented key parts of the new evaluation systems with fidelity: using the observation rubric/framework to guide classroom observations; taking detailed, evidence-based notes during observations; and discussing specific evidence with teachers after observations.[vii]

While pilot corporations had success with training, the complexity of planning for comprehensive training sessions should not be underestimated. It is difficult to find time during summer months to train evaluators. Training during the school year usually requires evaluators to leave school buildings. Corporations may find it difficult to prioritize topics for training with the limited time given. While training has a positive effect on implementation, it can be challenging to know how much training to provide, given that training frequently takes evaluators away from other important aspects of their job. Although evaluators responded positively when asked about their training experiences, teachers still suggested in focus groups that administrators could have used more training in order to know and relay the system details correctly and consistently.[viii]

Training improved evaluators' skills and provided a standardized way of looking at instruction, allowing them to focus on how students are performing.

2. Frequent communication via various methods is critical to stakeholder understanding of the evaluation system.

Teachers better understand the most important components of the evaluation system when they receive frequent communication from a variety of sources.

Frequency of communication matters. Communicating with teachers about RISE *at least* once per week is associated with greater teacher understanding of the system.[ix] However, it is essential that this communication include accurate, consistent, and applicable information. Teachers receive communication daily about many different school and corporation initiatives, and information that is not essential to practice is easily lost or forgotten.

Corporations reported communicating about the new evaluation system using a number of methods: individual, department, and faculty-wide meetings, email updates, distributing hard copies of informational materials such as handbooks, and directing teachers to a website. With each additional method utilized both knowledge of the evaluation system, and opinion of the system as good for student learning, increases.[x] Holding meetings and trainings with teachers, as well as providing informational resources, in hard copy or via website, were found to be especially helpful when communicating about more complex topics, like measures of student learning.[xi]

In focus group discussions, both teachers and evaluators noted the importance of clear and concrete communication.[xii] They pointed specifically to the importance of clearly defining and discussing new terminology for understanding and engaging with the new evaluation system.

Clear and consistent communication allows teachers to understand the new system, and this understanding leads to trust needed for success.

Communicating to stakeholders can present challenges. Corporations may struggle to know when it is too soon to reveal information that may lead to more questions than answers. Often, chains of communication are established so that corporation leadership communicates to administrators and administrators then communicate to teachers. This "whisper down the lane" approach is dangerous if it leads to diluted accuracy of information. Clear and consistent communication allows teachers to understand the new system, and this understanding leads to the trust that is necessary for success.

Initial Implementation

1. **Observation protocols that stress frequent observations and feedback using detailed, student-centered rubrics help to improve instruction and student learning outcomes.**

Student-centered rubrics focused on clear expectations for instruction are an essential part of improved observations across pilot corporations. 95% of evaluators say they use the observation rubric to guide classroom observations[xiii] and 85% of teachers report that their evaluators use the rubrics to help guide post-observation feedback discussions.[xiv] A strong majority of teachers also say that they use the rubric for planning lessons on a day-to-day basis (77%), to reflect on their instruction (82%), and to improve their practice (77%).[xv] Qualitative research confirmed these findings; both teachers and evaluators think the rubric is a useful tool. As one RISE superintendent noted, "Probably every teacher would agree that the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (captures) what they should be doing. You really can't argue with the rubric."[xvi]

Improved observations with more opportunity for feedback lead to practices that improve student learning outcomes. Eight out of ten evaluators say that compared to last year, they are more confident that the feedback they provide helps make their faculty better teachers.[xvii] Conversations between evaluators and teachers are now more frequent and based on concrete evidence. One superintendent stated, "Now, with the multiple observations, we have much more communication one-on-one. There is a lot more opportunity for feedback."[xviii] Almost all evaluators (99%) responded that their observations provide teachers the feedback they need to promote student learning.[xix]

Like evaluators, teachers also believe the new evaluation systems increase opportunities to improve student learning. Teachers report they received more frequent feedback (65%) that was more relevant (61%) and helpful (61%) this year compared to prior years. Nearly seven in ten teachers agree that they consider their evaluator's feedback more frequently when planning daily lessons.[xx] They also agree that both observation feedback (79%) and the rubric/framework (68%) promote their students' learning.[xxi]

One superintendent noted, "Probably every teacher would agree that the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric captures what they should be doing."

In RISE focus groups, teachers reported that post-observation feedback has been actionable and tied back to the rubric. Teachers expressed that they like when evaluators identify an area for improvement based on specific evidence. However, they also feel it is important that evaluators provide an opportunity to discuss what they might have missed during an observation. Feedback regarding teacher work on measures of student learning has also been valuable. According to one teacher, this type of feedback has resulted in more standards-driven teaching: "(Now), if (students) do not master a certain skill, I will go back and teach them. We should be doing that."[xxii]

2. Lack of time to implement is a challenge for evaluators and teachers.

Finding enough time to implement the new system was a challenge for many evaluators; however, most felt it was time well spent.[xxiii] In focus groups, school administrators and superintendents reported that evaluators were shifting their priorities from tasks they could delegate, like lunch duty, to evaluation.[xxiv] Still, a majority noted that they could use additional staff to complete some of the less critical aspects of their jobs so that they could focus more on evaluation.[xxv]

Many teachers also indicated that the biggest implementation challenge is lack of time.[xxvi] In focus groups, teachers reported sacrificing planning time to focus on evaluation work.[xxvii] The most amount of time (4-6.5 hours) was spent working on the measures of student learning component of the evaluation system.[xxviii] It should be noted that this time includes not only training teachers on measures of student learning, but also the time spent creating and improving assessments. Having high quality assessments can not only improve student outcomes, but the bulk of this work only has to happen in the first year of implementation. Teachers also expressed that their workload around measures of student learning could be made easier with clear communication about what historical and current student data is available and how best to access it.

Mid-Year Recommendations

Based on the findings above, consider these recommendations when designing and planning for a new evaluation system.

1) Begin planning and design work now.

The time to start planning for next year is now. Whether designing your own system or adopting the RISE system, there are many crucial design decisions to be made at the corporation level including:

- Who will be involved in researching and providing recommendations around system design?
- Who will be involved in making key decisions about system design?
- Who must approve the evaluation plan?
- Who will be involved in measuring success of the system and refining the system accordingly?

A steering committee of stakeholders should be created to provide diverse opinions and increase system-wide buy-in. Participants should represent key stakeholder groups in a corporation (central office administration, building level administration, a diverse set of teachers, etc.), and be mission-driven individuals who believe identifying teachers' strengths and areas for development will help improve teaching and learning in their corporation. Committee size should be large enough to represent various stakeholder groups, but small enough to make decisions efficiently—around 7-10 individuals as a guideline. Committee members must be committed to a timeline. Corporations should create a process for making decisions and moving forward if members of the committee cannot agree on a solution to a particular issue.

The steering committee should familiarize itself with the requirements of the law as well as the DOE guidance on developing evaluation plans. This will help members to understand all of the factors and decisions involved in system design. If deciding whether or not to use parts or all of RISE, information related to this system can be found at www.riseindiana.org.

Some (but not all) of the many design topics to address while writing an evaluation plan include:

- **Components of the Evaluation System** – What will be involved in the evaluation of teachers other than a classroom observation protocol and measures of student learning? What will each of these components look like?

- **Scoring** – How will each component of the system be scored? How will these scores form a summative score in one of the four performance categories?

- **Training** – What training is necessary for evaluators to learn about the components of the evaluation system? Will teachers also be trained? When will this training occur and what will it look like?

- **Professional Development** – After observing teachers and identifying specific strengths and areas of development, what targeted opportunities will be provided to teachers to continually develop and improve their craft?

- **Remediation** – What is the specific improvement plan for struggling teachers in danger of dismissal?

- **Data Collection and Plan Refinement** – How will the corporation know if the evaluation system has been successful? What data needs to be collected and analyzed? What is the process for improving the evaluation plan based on data analysis and feedback?

A more comprehensive list of topics to be included in an evaluation plan can be found on the DOE guidance website.

A work plan should include time for research (if using a system other than RISE), writing multiple drafts of the plan, approval (if necessary), frequent communication with stakeholders, and training prior to implementation. If a corporation leaves out any of these crucial components, staff will not have enough time to plan for fall implementation.

For efficiency, consider dividing the steering committee into smaller groups to focus on the various design topics listed above. These smaller groups can perform the necessary research and then provide recommendations to the larger group. Ultimately, be creative, but don't reinvent the wheel. There is a multitude of existing evaluation systems other than RISE. Two alternative pilot districts are using pre-existing systems for their observation protocol and training (for more information on these systems, see Appendix A-2). Take time doing research on RISE and other systems before deciding to start from scratch.

2) Focus system design on a high-touch, low-inference observation protocol and accurate, fair measures of student learning.

Each evaluation system will have different components that form a summative evaluation rating. All, however, must include some type of classroom observation protocol, and measures of student learning per Indiana law.

When designing an observation protocol, there are a few best practices to keep in mind:

- **Design/purchase a low-inference observation rubric focused on students.** Low-inference language requires little subjectivity on the part of the evaluator. Expectations for good instruction should be clearly laid out, with examples whenever possible. Avoid language that allows different interpretations. The most common mistake here is differentiating performance levels based on vague frequency terms such as "sometimes", "often", "occasionally", etc. If subjective language cannot be avoided, training must bring evaluators to a common understanding of terms. Rubrics should also be focused on student actions instead of teacher actions whenever possible. Evaluation of teacher performance should be based on whether or not students are learning. Student engagement, interactions with each other, and interactions with the teacher all show student learning. Many rubrics make the mistake of only looking at teacher actions, without observing students.

- **Design a process that accounts for regular, timely, and actionable feedback.** Every observation should be followed by either written or verbal feedback. This feedback must occur in a timely manner following the observation. In order for it to be helpful, feedback must provide concrete evidence of what was observed in the classroom and specific suggestions for what can be improved in the future. Feedback should be directly aligned to the observation rubric. Suggestions for professional development opportunities aligned with areas for improvement are particularly helpful.

- **Include multiple observations of sufficient length to monitor progress throughout the year.** One of the primary goals of a good evaluation system should be to develop teachers over time. Observing a teacher once a year will not allow the teacher to incorporate feedback and show progress over the course of the year. Indiana law specifies that teachers be observed a minimum of two times per year. In reality, the strongest observation protocols include many more observations. There are many combinations of short and long or announced and unannounced observations that lead to a successful evaluation system. The important thing is that the evaluator is able to get an accurate picture of teacher performance over time and provide frequent feedback to teachers on their performance.

When developing measures of student learning for an evaluation system, best practices to consider are to:

- **Start by identifying good assessments of student learning.** The first step in designing good measures of student learning is ensuring that all teachers, regardless of their subject or grade level, have good assessments of student learning. The state provides assessments for some grades and subjects (ISTEP, ECA, LAS Links, etc), but for many others, corporations and school leaders will be responsible for identifying assessments.

The assessment matrix tool on the RISE website will help organize information around assessments, regardless of whether or not a corporation is using RISE. If a corporation or school decides to create common assessments where none currently exist, collaboration between teachers is essential for creating a good product.

- **Take care not to use false measures of precision.** The concept of student growth or progress can be complicated. While the state provides a statistical measure for growth in some grades and subjects (ELA and Math in grades 4-8), many teachers are not covered by this measure. Be careful about using a pre-test and post-test method. A common mistake is subtracting scores on tests between the beginning and end of year. If the pre- and post-test are not aligned in terms of rigor and content, this is not an accurate measure of growth. Furthermore, corporations should avoid testing students on content they have not yet learned. Rather than trying to devise complex calculations with little assessment expertise, try to think about student progress in broader terms. How do teachers in your district know if students have learned? Do they set goals for themselves? Do they have assessments that measure this progress? Begin your design process by gathering this type of information from teachers.

- **Use the resources available.** The DOE provides guidance around assessments and rigorous measures of student learning on the DOE Guidance website. To see what measures are being used in RISE, visit the Measures of Student Learning page on the RISE website.

3) Prioritize transparent, accurate and frequent communication with stakeholders, underscoring the link between teacher development and improved student learning.

The ultimate goal of an effective evaluation system is to develop teachers and improve student outcomes. For implementation to be successful, teachers and administrators need to be clear about their specific roles and responsibilities, including how the new process will ultimately improve their practice. They also need to feel confident that their questions will be answered. This requires frequent two-way communication through multiple channels and media, including accurate and detailed information about the components of the system, as well as answers to common questions. Most importantly, communications should underscore the link between teachers' classroom practice and student learning.

The following are best practices when communicating to stakeholders:

- **Communication should take place early and often in order to provide transparency and increase stakeholder buy-in prior to implementation.** Reach out to administrators and teachers with all available information, and fill in the details as they come. Corporations or administrators may think that they are doing their staff a favor by

waiting until all details of the system are resolved before communicating, but this approach leaves staff in the dark, and may result in a negative perception of the system.

- **Offer a variety of types of communication.** Different people learn best through different channels and media. Communicate using a variety of methods such as individual, department, and faculty meetings, email updates, and hard copies of resources. The more methods you use to communicate the information, the better.

- **Communicate to all stakeholders.** Prioritize communication with evaluators and teachers, but don't forget about other key stakeholders. Many corporations will need to present information to school boards, and may also wish to communicate with parents and community members about the new system.

- **Remember to frame communication appropriately for the audience.** Different sets of stakeholders have differing sets of priorities. Communication may need to be re-framed for a school board, for parents, or for teachers. No matter the audience, make sure the information is digestible and framed to show how the new evaluation system compliments the many other efforts teachers and schools are already undertaking to advance student learning.

4) Allocate sufficient time and resources for training.

If opting to use part or all of the RISE system, Educational Service Centers (ESC) are providing monthly trainings on different topics between February and August 2012, with an intensive four day training during the summer. Contact your local ESC for more information on RISE training.

If using a system other than RISE, consider how training will be supported. Some corporations opting to partner with an established system (such as TAP) will receive training as part of their contract. If developing a unique system, corporations may still consider bringing in outside consultants to design training. While the least expensive option might be corporation-designed trainings, this requires a significant amount of time and expertise to do well. RISE pilot corporations will receive a total of 16-20 hours of training this year. Use this time estimate to help plan for a training schedule and costs.

If planning and designing training at the corporation level, consider the following best practices:

- **Choose topics early and start planning as soon as design is complete.** A frequent mistake is to try and start planning training before the details of the system have been finalized. This typically occurs when decisions are delayed and the design timeline has been extended. Avoid this. Appropriate time to plan training should be protected in the

work plan. Ensure that the training plan covers all necessary components of the evaluation system (observation protocol, measures of student learning, giving feedback, scoring, etc).

- **Organize training topics to prioritize those that require work prior to system implementation.** Any initial training should include a broad overview of the system. After this, however, plan to train first on topics that may require early work or practice. For example, if prepared to do so, provide training on the observation rubric during the current school year while administrators have a chance to practice in classrooms. If assessments of student learning need to be developed prior to system implementation, plan for this training and work accordingly.

- **Design training to be as hands-on as possible.** Incorporate small group discussion, debate, role-playing and workshops. Adults learn more when they are actively engaged in the learning process. Minimize the time spent lecturing and maximize time for practice and activities.

- **Deliver training in digestible sessions.** Topics that require teaching new skills or processes can be overwhelming. While many educators are familiar with observation rubrics and protocols, other parts of the system, such as measuring student learning, may be brand new. For these types of topics, hold several training sessions rather than one long training session to allow time for participants to digest information. Every session should include time to review content from the previous section and reflect on any questions or concerns.

Training for staff will differ depending on their level of involvement as evaluators. In most corporations, evaluators will include school-based administrators, but some corporations may also opt to include other individuals (teacher leaders, central office administrators, outside hired evaluators, etc.). All individuals who contribute to evidence collection surrounding teacher evaluation must be trained on the evaluation system per law. When it comes to classroom observations, multiple visits by multiple evaluators is preferable. It leads to more reliable ratings and provides teachers with a wider range of real-time feedback on their practice. At the same time, it is important to remember that all evaluators need to be carefully trained to ensure that teachers have confidence in their observers' abilities to effectively respond to what they see in the classroom. Certain components of a new evaluation system may also require additional work or skill-building for teachers (introduction to a new rubric, designing assessments for measuring student learning, etc.).

When teacher training is included, consider whether administrators train teachers in their buildings or if this training will be offered centrally at the corporation level. Regardless of whether or not teachers need to be *trained* on components of the system, it is essential that the entire system be *communicated* clearly and thoroughly.

5) Help administrators and teachers think about time management in advance of system implementation.

The additional requirements of a new evaluation system will necessitate that administrators allocate more time in their daily schedules for classroom observations and conferencing than ever before. To do this, there will be parts of their current routine that are given less time or eliminated. Administrators will need to re-focus their time on activities that allow them to be strong instructional leaders in their schools.

Consider the following strategies for assisting administrators with time management:

- **Offer professional development sessions or workshops on time management strategies this year.** If the evaluation system splits responsibilities between principals and assistant principals (or even others in the building), have these individuals work together to assess the work they do on a daily basis and plan for ways they can work more efficiently and effectively starting next year. If there are certain increased time commitments for principals that others will not have, help principals consider how they can better delegate non-evaluation responsibilities with their staff.

- **Re-evaluate central office demands of administrators.** Central office staff should take the time to review all requests made of administrators, in order to find ways of reducing paperwork or other redundancies in the system. Ensure that requests are necessary so that administrators can spend the time they need as instructional leaders in their schools. Job descriptions and hiring for the corporation should also reflect the importance of administrators as instructional leaders.

- **Offer efficient ways of collecting and storing data.** A significant amount of time in a new evaluation system is dedicated to completing necessary paperwork to track information on teacher performance. Ensure that the forms included in the evaluation system are all necessary and not repetitive in terms of information collected. If information eventually needs to be submitted electronically, look for solutions where evaluators can enter data in real time during the observation rather than transfer information from paper to computer later. Most pilot corporations are currently using or looking for electronic solutions to assist with this. Those using these solutions have found that they can save a lot time both during and after an observation.

As with any new skill, there is a learning curve with the work associated with new evaluation systems. For example, many RISE evaluators initially spent more than an hour to organize observation notes and prepare rubric-aligned feedback after an observation. However, after becoming more familiar with the process, the rubric, and assisting technology, this activity now takes about half the time it used to.

School leaders can also help teachers with effective time management and help save time by providing the resources needed to do the work. Ensure that teachers have easy access to current and historical student learning data at all times and provide them with the time they need for collaboration and independent work that may be required of them with the new evaluation system.

Conclusion

No matter what system is adopted or what training takes place, evaluation system design, planning, and implementation requires a serious time commitment and a willingness to transform school culture. For many educators, the new process represents a notable change in the way they spend their time and energy. In most schools, it will also require a deliberate shift in the way educators approach the relationship between teachers and administrators.

By emphasizing collaboration, classroom visits, real-time feedback, and frequent conversations about instruction and student learning, a new evaluation system gives school leaders the process they need to transcend the role of building manager and become true instructional leaders, engaged in the classroom, developing their teachers.

It gives school leaders the process they need to transcend the role of building manager and become true instructional leaders, engaged in the classroom, developing their teachers.

It's hard work, but it's the right work. Corporations who dedicate appropriate time to the development and implementation of a good evaluation system will begin to notice a shift in culture within schools. In just a few months, teachers and evaluators in pilot corporations have reported having more conversations about classroom practice than ever before, helping everyone focus their energies on our most important goal: helping students learn.

Appendix A-1

Pilot Corporation Profiles

Corp ID	Corp Name	Total Enrollment (11-12)	American Indian	Black	Asian	Hispanic	White	Multiracial	FRL	Pass ELA & Math ISTEP+ (10-11)	Pass ELA & Math ECA (10-11)	Grad Rate (2011)
0235	Fort Wayne Community Schools	30821	0.6%	24.7%	4.2%	13.8%	49.1%	7.6%	69.2%	63.0%	49.7%	88.1
2920	Bloomfield School District	1035	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%	2.4%	93.7%	2.3%	37.5%	69.4%	70.9%	97.2
1730	Greensburg Community Schools	2294	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	1.7%	95.2%	2.0%	50.7%	79.4%	65.9%	96.4
5360	MSD Warren Township	11899	0.2%	46.2%	1.0%	10.0%	35.6%	7.0%	66.5%	62.4%	54.7%	87.6
5380	Beech Grove City Schools	2734	1.0%	7.3%	0.7%	5.5%	79.6%	6.0%	63.6%	72.5%	67.5%	84.0
5480	Bremen Public Schools	1461	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%	21.4%	76.1%	1.5%	39.1%	79.2%	75.2%	87.8

Notes:

- The passing percentages provided for ECA are for first-time test takers.
- Enrollment data are from SY 11-12, while ISTEP+, ECA and grad rates are from 2010-11; these are the most recent data available for each data element.

Appendix A-2: Descriptions of Pilot Evaluation Systems

RISE (Bloomfield, Fort Wayne, Greensburg)

RISE consists of two main components, Professional Practice and Student Learning Measures, which are combined to determine a teacher's summative rating.

The Professional Practice component is measured by the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, which consists of four domains: Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Core Professionalism. Evidence of a teacher's Professional Practice is collected during a minimum of two formal forty-minute observations and three short twenty-minute observations, although some pilot corporations choose to do more. All observations must be followed by written feedback, and long observations are also followed by required post conferences. Observations are performed by primary and secondary evaluators. All pilot corporations are utilizing building administrators only as primary and secondary evaluators this year.

Student Learning Measures are comprised of three pieces of data: Individual Teacher Growth Model based on ISTEP scores (Grades 4-8 ELA and Math), School Wide Learning based on the A-F Accountability Policy, and Student Learning Objectives, teacher-written goals around rigorous assessments.

A teacher receives a 1-4 rating for Professional Practice and each of the three Student Learning Measures. Those ratings are rolled into an overall summative rating. Depending on a teacher's mix of classes, Professional Practice comprises 50-75% of a teacher's summative rating, and Student Learning Measures comprise the remaining 25-50%.

For more information about RISE, please visit www.riseindiana.org

TAP System (Beech Grove)

The evaluation component of the TAP System considers both classroom lesson evaluations and student achievement growth measures. The classroom lesson evaluations are measured using the TAP rubric which includes four domains: Designing and Planning Instruction, Instruction, The Learning Environment, and Responsibilities. Those four domains are further defined by 19 areas of effective instructional practice and an annual survey leading to an annual overall "Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities" (SKR) score. The TAP System requires 4-6 formal evaluations each year, two announced and two unannounced. Announced formal evaluations include a pre-conference and all four formal evaluations have post-conference and self-evaluation components. Observations are performed by master teachers, mentor teachers, and one or more administrators throughout the year.

Student achievement growth measures include both individual teacher/classroom-level data (when available) and school-level data. When determining both differentiated levels of teacher effectiveness and also performance-based compensation amounts, 50% of a teacher's rating is based on their annual SKR score and 50% is based on student achievement growth measures.

More information on the TAP evaluation system can be found at: www.tapsystem.org

Bremen Evaluation System (Bremen)

Bremen's evaluation system consists of two main components, an assessment of a teacher's Professional Skills and Measures of Student Learning, which combine to determine a teacher's summative rating.

Professional Skills are measured by the Bremen/McREL teacher evaluation rubric which consists of five standards: Leadership, Respect, Knowledge of Content Taught, Instruction, and Reflection on Practice. Evidence of a teacher's Professional Skills is collected during a minimum of three or four forty-minute observations. A pre-conference is required prior to the first formal observation, but not required for future formal observations. A post-conference is required following each formal observation. Observations are performed by building administrators.

Measures of Student learning are comprised of four pieces of data: school-wide growth based on ISTEP and ECA assessments, school-wide achievement based on ISTEP and ECA assessments, individual growth based on locally created assessments, and individual achievement based on locally created assessments.

A teacher receives an overall rating for Professional Skills and an overall rating for Measures of Student Learning. Those ratings are rolled up into an overall summative rating. Professional

Skills comprise 75% of the summative rating, and Measures of Student Learning comprise 25% of the summative rating.

MSD Warren Evaluation System (MSD Warren)

MSD Warren is in the process of finalizing the design of its teacher evaluation system. It contains two main components, a measure of a teacher's Professional Practice and Measures of Student Learning, which combine to determine a teacher's summative rating.

The Professional Practice component is measured by a teacher effectiveness rubric still in development. Currently, the rubric consists of four domains: Instructional Planning, Effective Instruction, Classroom Environment, and Professional Commitment. Evidence of a teacher's Professional Practice is collected during a minimum of four long, class-length observations and eighteen short five to seven minute observations. One long observation is announced, with a pre and post conference. Three long observations are unannounced and followed by written feedback. Short observations are followed by written feedback. Observations are performed by building administrators.

Measures of Student Learning are comprised of two pieces of data: Individual Growth Data and School-wide Growth Data. The means by which these two pieces will be measured is still in development.

A teacher receives a rating for each of the three individual rubric domains and the two Measures of Student Learning. Those ratings are rolled into an overall summative rating. Professional Practice comprises 70% of a teacher's summative rating, and Measures of Student Learning comprise the remaining 30%.

Comparison of Systems

	RISE (Bloomfield, Fort Wayne, Greensburg)	TAP (Beech Grove)	Bremen	MSD Warren
Minimum Observations	2 40-minute observations 3 10-minute observations *In addition to the RISE minimum requirements, Fort Wayne Community Schools requires daily 1-3 minute snapshots	4 formal observations (2 announced, 2 unannounced)	3-4 40-minute observations	4 class-length observations (1 announced, 3 unannounced) 1 5-7minute observation once every three weeks
Observation Rubric used	Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric • *Planning* (10% of rubric score) • *Instruction* (75% of rubric score) • *Leadership* (15% of score) • *Core Professionalism* (factored after other three domains are rolled up)	TAP Rubric Designing and Planning Instruction (15% of rubric score) Learning Environment (5% of rubric score) Instruction (75% of rubric score Responsibilities (5% of rubric score)	Bremen/McREL Rubric • *Leadership* (17.5% of rubric score) • *Respect* (17.5% of rubric score) • *Knowledge of Content Taught* (17.5% of rubric score) • *Instruction* (30% of rubric score) • *Reflection on Practice* (17.5% of rubric score)	District revised Teacher Effectiveness Rubric • *Instructional Planning* (10% of summative score) • *Effective Instruction* (50% of summative score) • *Classroom Environment* (10% of summative score) • Professional Commitment (factored after other three domains)

	*Overall rubric score calculated before being weighted into summative	*These weightings are different for TAP Master and Mentor teachers to reflect their specific job responsibilities.	*Overall rubric score calculated before being weighted into summative	**Overall rubric score not calculated before being weighted into summative
Student Data used	Individual Growth Model Data (Grades 4-8 ELA and Math) (20-35% of summative score) School Wide Growth Measure - based on A-F accountability policy (5% of summative score) Individual Student Learning Objectives (10-20% of summative score) *Overall student learning not score calculated before being weighted into summative.	Individual Growth Model Data (Grades 4-8 ELA and Math) (30% of summative evaluation where available) School Wide Growth Measure (20-50% of summative evaluation)	School-wide growth (15% of data score) School-wide achievement (15% of data score) Individual teacher student growth (30% of date score) Individual teacher student achievement (30% of data score) **Overall student learning score calculated before being weighted into summative.	School-wide growth (10% of summative score) Individual teacher student growth (20% of summative score) *Overall student learning score not calculated before being weighted into summative.
% of Summative Evaluation based on Rubric Score	50-75% depending on a teacher's classes	50%	75%	70%
% of Summative Evaluation based on Student Data	25-50% depending on a teacher's classes	50%	25%	30%

Endnotes

[i] TNTP, a national nonprofit organization founded by teachers, works with schools, districts and states to advance policies and practices that ensure effective teaching in every classroom. TNTP partnered with the IDOE to provide direct support to the three pilot corporations implementing RISE this year. The findings in this report are based on TNTP's analysis of data collected from all six pilot corporations. Recommendations are based not only on Indiana pilot findings, but on TNTP's experience doing similar work with other states and districts nationwide.

[ii] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[iii] 52% of evaluators responded strongly agree or agree to receiving training on how to observe and/or formally evaluate teachers from at least one of five different sources prior to June 2011. (n=88.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Beginning of Year Evaluator Survey, administered September-October 2011.

[iv] 38%, 37%, and 35% of evaluators responded without confidence (somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree) respectively to the statements "I provided effective instructional coaching and strategies (n=95)," "I effectively addressed poor instructional performance by helping struggling teachers become more effective (n=95)," and "I accurately evaluated all teachers (n=95)." Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Beginning of Year Evaluator Survey, administered September-October 2011.

[v] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[vi] 66%, 67%, and 66% of evaluators responded strongly agree or agree respectively when asked their level of agreement with the statements "I received training that helped me take good observation notes when observing teachers (n=154)," "I received training that helped me effectively communicate the new teacher evaluation system to teachers (n=153)," and "I received training that helped me understand how student learning (achievement and/or growth) is factored into the new teacher evaluation system (n=134)." Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[vii] 85%, 78%, and 78% of evaluators responded strongly agree or agree respectively when asked their level of agreement with the statements "I use the new system's observation rubric/framework to guide my classroom observations (n=133)," "I take detailed, evidence-based notes of what I see in my teachers' classroom (n=142)," and "After performing an observation, I discuss specific evidence of what I observed in the classroom with the teacher (n=142)." Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[viii] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[ix] After controlling for communication method, teachers who received communication about the new evaluation system at least once per week were 50% more likely to be considered to have the highest knowledge of the system than those who received less frequent communication. Teachers' knowledge was measured by their responses to 14 true/false questions about the new evaluation system. Those considered to have the highest knowledge were those teachers who answered enough questions correctly to put them in the top quartile of teachers. Knowledge was only asked of RISE teachers. Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[x] Controlling for frequency, every additional method of communication used increases both knowledge and perception of the system as good for students by .3 on a 10 point scale. See above footnote for actual knowledge variable explanation. Perception of the system as good for student learning is a composite variable with a 10 point scale created from 4 questions about whether the system is good for student learning. Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xi] Controlling for frequency, holding meetings to train teachers on the student learning measures process, directing teachers to a website about the new evaluation system, meeting with department or grade-level teams to discuss the student learning measures process, and providing a hard or electronic copy of the student learning measures process respectively increased actual knowledge by .5, .4, .3, and .3 on a 10 point scale. See above footnote for actual knowledge composite variable explanation. Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xii] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[xiii] 95% of evaluators responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) when asked their level of agreement with the statement "I use the new system's observation rubric/framework to guide my classroom observations." (n=133.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xiv] 85% of teachers responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) when asked their level of agreement with the statement "After being observed, my evaluator uses the new system's observation rubric/framework to discuss what he or she observed in the classroom with me." (n=1619.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xv] 77%, 82%, and 77% of teachers responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) respectively when asked their level of agreement with the statements "I consider the new teacher evaluation system's observation rubric/framework when planning lessons on a day-to-day basis (n=1650)," "I often reflect on my own instruction and consider how it fits within the new teacher evaluation system's observation rubric/framework(n=1651)," and "I consider the new teacher evaluation system's observation rubric/framework when seeking ways to improve my practice(n=1648)." Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xvi] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[xvii] 86% of evaluators responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) when asked their level of agreement with the statement "Compared to last year, I am more confident that the feedback I provide will help make the faculty better teachers." (n=132.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xviii] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[xix] 99% of evaluators responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) when asked their level of agreement with the statement "My observations of teachers provide teachers the feedback they need to promote their students' learning." (n=146.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xx] 65%, 61%, 67%, and 61% of teachers responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) respectively when asked their level of agreement with the statements "Compared to the last time I was evaluated, my

evaluator has provided more feedback that helps me improve my instruction (n=1575)," "…, my evaluator has provided me feedback that is more relevant to the classes and students I teach (n=1573)," "…,I more frequently consider my evaluator's feedback when planning daily lessons (n=1573)," and "…, I am more confident that my evaluator's feedback will help me become a better teacher (n=1566)." Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xxi] 79% and 68% of teachers responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) respectively when asked their level of agreement with the statements "My evaluator's observation of my instruction gives me the feedback I need to improve my students' learning (n=1595)," and "Having access to the RISE observation rubric/framework guides my instruction in a way that will promote my students' learning (n=1597)." Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xxii] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[xxiii] 60% of evaluators responded that "there is not enough time to implement many of the requirements of the new teacher evaluation system" as causing the biggest challenge to implementing the new teacher evaluation system (forced choice). (n=145.) 69% of evaluators responded net disagree (strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree) when asked their level of agreement with the statement "The time I've spent implementing the new teacher evaluation system could have been better spent on other aspects of my job." (n=143.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xxiv] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[xxv] 60% of evaluators responded net agree (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree) when asked their level of agreement with the statement "I need(ed) additional staff to complete some of the non-evaluation aspects of my job." (n=144.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Evaluator Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xxvi] 39% of teachers responded that "there is not enough time to implement many of the requirements of the new teacher evaluation system" as causing the biggest challenge to implementing the new teacher evaluation system (forced choice). (n=1659.) Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.

[xxvii] Source: Focus Groups and individual conversations at Pilot Corporations.

[xxviii] Non-RISE Teachers spent a median of 4 hours on measuring student learning; RISE Teachers spent a cumulative median of 6.5 hours on measuring student learning. Source: Indiana Pilot Corporations Mid-Year Teacher Survey, administered 1/16/12-1/27/12.