

COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST: PRINCIPLE 3

Legal Name of Requester:
Oregon Department of Education

State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request:

Name: Tryna Luton

Position and Office: Director, School Improvement and Accountability
Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation

Telephone: (503) 947-5922

Email address: tryna.luton@state.or.us

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):
Rob Saxton

Telephone:
(503) 947-5740

Signature of the Chief State School Officer:



Rob S. Saxton
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction

Date:
October 1, 2012

The State, through its authorized representative, hereby submits Principle 3 of its ESEA flexibility request for review by the U.S. Department of Education

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

3.A DEVELOP AND ADOPT GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding description and evidence, as appropriate, for the option selected.

<p>Option A</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has not already developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. the SEA’s plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year;ii. a description of the process the SEA will use to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines; andiii. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 14).	<p>Option B</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. a copy of the guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students;ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); andiii. a description of the process the SEA used to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines.
--	--

Oregon Interim Guidelines for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems

June 2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Oregon Department of Education wishes to extend appreciation to the members of the Oregon Educator Effectiveness Work Group for their invaluable input in development of the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems.

Oregon Educator Effectiveness Work Group

Dawn Baker	Principal, Lebanon School District
Colin Cameron	Director of Professional Development, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)
Vickie Chamberlain	Executive Director, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC)
Sara Cramer	Director Elementary Education, Eugene Public Schools
Kate Dickson	Director, Chalkboard Project
Lynn Evans	Director of Human Resources, Redmond School District
Kimberly Fandiño	Teacher and Coordinator for Grant Writing, Lebanon School District
Richard Forcier	Retired, Assistant Dean, College of Education, Western Oregon University
Lydia Gutierrez	Teacher, Salem-Keizer School District
Rita Hale	Research Associate, Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center (NWRCC)
Craig Hawkins	Executive Director, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)
Dana Hepper	Advocacy Director, Stand for Children Oregon
Rob Hess	Superintendent, Lebanon School District
Greg Kintz	School Board Member, Vernonia School District
Kevin Mechlin	Director, Portland Association of Teachers
Keith Menk	Deputy Director, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC)
Marsha Moyer	Director Licensed Personnel, Salem-Keizer School District
Jen Murray	Teacher, Greater Albany Public Schools
Sascha Perrins	Regional Administrator, Portland Public Schools
Amy Petti	Associate Professor, Educational Leadership & Policy, Portland State University
Chelle Robins	Community School Director, Four Rivers
Hilda Rosselli	Dean of the College of Education, Western Oregon University

Linda Samek	Dean of the School of Education, George Fox University
Randy Schild	Superintendent, Tillamook School District
Bob Sconce	Chair, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, Roseburg Public Schools
Sho Shigeoka	Equity Coordinator, Beaverton School District
Terrel Smith	President, Sherwood Education Association, Sherwood School District
Karen Stiner	Teacher, Bend-LaPine School District
Joe Swinehart	Teacher, Crook County School District
Lynette Thompson	Senior Program Advisor, Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center (NWRCC)
Maureen Twomey	Teacher, Lebanon School District
Erin Whitlock	Oregon Education Association, Center for Teaching and Learning
David Wilkinson	President, Beaverton Education Association, Beaverton School District
Colleen Works	Teacher, Corvallis School District

Department of Education Staff

Colleen Mileham	Assistant Superintendent, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation
Tanya Frisendahl	Educational Specialist, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation
Jennell Ives	Educational Specialist, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation
Heather Mauzé	Educational Specialist, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation
Stephanie Parks	Administrative Support, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation
Laura Petschauer	Educational Specialist, Student Learning and Partnerships
Theresa Richards	Director, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation

GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Oregon selected Option A to submit a plan and assurances to adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by June 2012. This section of the waiver outlines Oregon's plan to develop the state guidelines. Work has been underway for the past eight months to develop guidelines aligned with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) criteria and state requirements, involving teachers, principals and other stakeholders across the state.

Background on Educator Effectiveness

An effective educator workforce is essential for improving student learning and achieving the state's 40/40/20 Goal. The state will not meet the demanding requirements for improving student achievement without effective teachers and leaders.

For the past year, ODE has been working collaboratively with key stakeholders and organizations to create a supportive state policy infrastructure focused on educator effectiveness that leads to improved student learning. Oregon's goal is to develop a comprehensive educator effectiveness system that spans the career continuum of teachers and leaders, including preparation, licensing, induction, mentoring, professional learning, and performance evaluation.

Organizations that have played key roles in the educator effectiveness and evaluation work include:

- Oregon Legislature
- Office of the Governor
- Oregon Department of Education (ODE)
- Oregon Education Association (OEA; Oregon's teacher union)
- Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA)
- Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA)
- Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC; licensing agency)
- Oregon School Personnel Association (OSPA; school district human resources)
- Oregon School Districts
- Title I Committee of Practitioners (COPs) (advisory committee)
- Oregon University System (OUS)
- Oregon Coalition for Quality Teaching and Learning (OCQTL)
- Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE; all public and private)
- Stand for Children (nonprofit)
- Chalkboard Project (non-profit)
- Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center (NWRCC)
- Oregon Leadership Network (OLN)
- State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness (SCEE)

Three significant bills passed during Oregon's 2011 legislative session have provided a solid policy platform to build an evaluation and support system that is consistent with the ESEA flexibility waiver criteria. This legislation is highlighted below:

Senate Bill 290

- State Board of Education, in consultation with the TSPC, will adopt core teaching standards and administrator standards that improve student academic growth and learning by:
 - a. Assisting school districts in determining the effectiveness of teachers and administrators
 - b. Improving the professional development and classroom practices of teachers and administrators
- Core teaching standards and administrator standards take into consideration:
 - a. Multiple measures of teacher and administrator effectiveness
 - b. Evidence of student academic growth and learning based on multiple measures
- By July 1, 2013, school boards must use core teaching standards and administrator standards for all evaluations of teachers and administrators. The standards will be customized based on the collaboration of teachers and administrators and the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees of the school district.

House Bill 3474

- Implements House Bill 3619 Task Force on Education Career Preparation and Development recommendations for:
 - a. Teacher preparation and professional development

- b. Administrator preparation and professional development
- c. Licensure
- Requires creation of a comprehensive leadership development system for administrators
- Directs preparation of a plan to encourage national board certification for teachers and administrators
- Creates the Educator Preparation Improvement Fund to improve preparation of teachers and administrators; allocates funds for incentive grants
- Directs the preparation of guidelines for uniform set of performance evaluation methods for teachers.

Senate Bill 252

- Senate Bill 252 provides funding for school districts to improve student learning through the voluntary collaboration of teachers and administrators to design and implement the integration of performance evaluation systems with new career pathways, research-based professional development, and new compensation models
- Provides the opportunity to support piloting the development of local evaluation systems following the state guidelines during the 2012-13 school year
- District applications must be approved by school district superintendent, chair of the school district board, and the exclusive teacher bargaining representative.

Oregon's state guidelines for local evaluation and support systems are being developed on a strong foundation of legislative action and collaborative support, resulting in a coherent and comprehensive system of educator effectiveness. The table below highlights key legislation and events in Oregon's journey to-date.

Year	Legislation	Action
2007	House Bill 2574	Legislation established the Oregon Mentoring Grant to support new teachers and new administrators; funding has been allocated in school years 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12.
2007		The Oregon Leadership Network (OLN) was formed to strengthen educational leadership to increase equitable outcomes and improve student achievement and success, so that all students will meet or exceed state standards in reading and math. The vision of OLN is that there will be no performance gap between different ethnic or socioeconomic groups. OLN supports a comprehensive leadership network with equity at its core. (The work of OLN began in 2000 as the State Action for Education Leadership Project).
2007		The Chalkboard Project, a non-profit organization, launched the Creative Leadership Achieves Student Success (CLASS) project to support districts in the design and implementation of new models for career paths, professional development, evaluation, and compensation. Nearly 130,000 students and 7,000 teachers in 17 Oregon school districts have participated in the CLASS project.

2008		The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) Forum on Teacher Quality was convened and engaged key stakeholders in setting goals to improve teaching practice.
2008		The Oregon Coalition for Quality Teaching and Learning (OCQTL) was established. The primary focus of OCQTL is to ensure that all educators and education leaders in Oregon have the skills and support needed to ensure that every student can be successful. The Coalition has been instrumental in advocating for key legislation including House Bill 3619, Senate Bill 290, and House Bill 3474.
2009		Advancing Longitudinal Data for Educational Reform (Project ALDER) funded to develop a statewide longitudinal data system; including K-12 teacher-student linkage components to support instructional decision-making and analysis of teacher-level variables that may impact student achievement.
2010	House Bill 3619	Legislation established a taskforce on Education Career Preparation and Development to "develop a proposal for a seamless system of professional development that begins with career preparation and continues through employment as an educational professional." Taskforce recommendations were instrumental in the development of Senate Bill 290 and House Bill 3474.
2010		Oregon is part of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. The panel recommends strategies for transforming teacher education through clinical practice and partnerships.
2010		The Chalkboard Project received federal funding through the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant to support districts to develop new models for performance-based compensation.
2010		Oregon joined the State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness (SCEE) , sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers, organized to engage cross-state action on key education workforce issues.
2011	Senate Bill 290	Legislation required the State Board of Education to adopt core teaching standards and educational leadership/administrator standards for evaluation of teachers and administrators that include consideration of (a) multiple measures of teacher and administrator effectiveness and (b) evidence of student academic growth and learning based on multiple measures.
2011	Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723; 1724; 1725	Core teaching standards and educational leadership/administrator standards were adopted by the State Board of Education on December 2, 2011.

2011	Senate Bill 252	Legislation established the District Collaboration Grant to support funding for school districts to improve student achievement through the voluntary collaboration of teachers and administrators to design and implement new approaches to a) career pathways, b) evaluation processes, c) compensation models, and d) enhanced professional development opportunities.
2011		Oregon is participating in the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC), a consortium of 22 states involving 100 teacher preparation programs, to field test a teaching performance assessment system. The TPAC will create a body of teaching competence, providing a vehicle to improve teacher preparation programs, provide professional development to practicing teachers, and inform decisions about tenure of individual teachers. Oregon universities will be working on a statewide rubric for teacher work sample assessment.
2011	House Bill 3474	Legislation established the Educator Preparation Improvement Fund to create a comprehensive leadership development system for licensed administrators, and direct the preparation of a plan to encourage national board certification for teachers and administrators and the use of teaching and administrator standards in educator evaluations.
2012		Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) adopted the <i>Learning Forward Standards</i> for professional development; educators' continuing professional development for license renewal must be aligned to the standards.
2012	Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723 Revised	Governor John Kitzhaber requested the State Board to clarify, in rulemaking, the state's intentions and provide more specific guidance to school districts as they design their teacher and administrator evaluation systems consistent with Senate Bill 290 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver criteria. The Governor's letter (dated March 6, 2012) is attached.

Goal of Developing Effective Educator Evaluation and Support Systems

Evaluation matters because good teaching and good leadership are the most critical in-school factors contributing to a student's learning and success. The state and local school districts have a shared responsibility to support professional growth and practice of teachers and administrators through continual, job-embedded professional development and other ongoing professional learning opportunities. Meaningful evaluations are an important tool, among others, in a wider system supporting the professional growth process for each teacher and administrator. By conducting meaningful evaluations, a district sends a clear message that it believes in the crucial role educators play in meeting outcomes, and that it expects and supports continual professional growth and improvement. Teachers and administrators have a

challenging task in meeting the needs of an educationally diverse student population, and meaningful evaluations are necessary to provide educators with the support, recognition, and guidance needed to sustain and improve their efforts. Undertaking the work of designing, implementing, and monitoring an effective support and evaluation system for educators is both complex and time consuming; however, based on the powerful correlation between teacher and principal effectiveness to student learning and growth, this work is imperative and of the utmost importance to the state to meet its 40/40/20 Goal.

The goal of strengthening teacher and leader evaluation systems in Oregon is to ensure that all students are college and career ready by guaranteeing:

- improved student learning at all schools and for all students
- effective teachers in every classroom
- effective leaders in every school and district
- elimination of the achievement gaps between the highest and lowest performing student groups, while increasing achievement and success for every student
- continuous professional growth for teachers and leaders throughout their careers

Oregon believes that these goals can only be met by developing systems of educator evaluation and support that engender trust, enhance professional learning, and motivate collaboration, shared responsibility and continuous improvement. For that reason, the Governor, Chief Education Officer (CEdO), State Board of Education, and ODE are united with a broad constituency of stakeholder groups in the following commitments:

- No public reporting of individual teacher data
- Not supporting the use of standardized assessment data as the sole measure of student learning
- Not supporting student growth as the sole component on which to base evaluation
- Agreement that for an educator evaluation system to drive improvement of student outcomes, the data and information it provides must be used to improve instructional practices

Overview of Oregon's Proposed Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and Support Systems

The Educator Effectiveness Workgroup, established through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver process, is developing state guidelines for local evaluation and support systems. The Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems incorporates the requirements found in Senate Bill 290 and House Bill 3474 (described earlier), the state-adopted core teaching and educational leadership/administrator standards, and the ESEA waiver criteria set forth in this application. Oregon has school districts already leading the way in developing strong and meaningful evaluation systems, including those participating in the Creative Leadership Achieves Student Success (CLASS) Project and Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grants, and others. ODE will draw on this work to provide substantial guidance, technical assistance, and effective models to school districts.

Using guidance from "A Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation Systems" by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ), the workgroup has proposed an elective state level evaluation system which specifies certain aspects of the evaluation model but allow local flexibility in others. This model is consistent with the tight-loose

principle described throughout this waiver application. The state will ensure that certain components are part of the district models but allow for local flexibility in other aspects of the system.

Teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems in all Oregon school districts must include the following five elements:



These five required elements establish the parameters for local evaluation and support systems. The framework describes the state criteria for each of these elements. Districts must align their systems to these elements but have local flexibility in their design and implementation. Local systems must meet or exceed the state criteria for evaluation and support systems.

The state will provide model research-based evaluation processes that comply with the state guidelines. To ensure local evaluation systems are valid, reliable and consistent with state guidelines, district evaluation systems must include the required elements described in the Framework. Districts may elect to use models provided by the state or develop a local evaluation and support system that ODE determines meets or exceeds state guidelines. The state guidelines will ensure that local systems are rigorous and designed to support professional growth, accountability, and student achievement. In addition to state approval by fall 2013, districts will be required to submit their local evaluation systems to a Peer Review Panel to ensure not only compliance with the state requirements, but also to strengthen and validate the systems across the state. The review will result in a plan for technical assistance if needed and/or identification of best practices to share statewide.

Oregon’s Framework includes criteria for both teacher and administrator (i.e., principals, vice principals) evaluation and support systems.

Oregon's state guidelines are nearing completion. The table below provides a brief summary of state guidelines proposed by the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup. The workgroup, with input from stakeholders, will continue to develop these guidelines for adoption by the State Board of Education in summer 2012.

The proposed state guidelines for local evaluation and support systems are consistent with the ESEA Flexibility criteria in Principle 3. The table below aligns Oregon's adopted statute and rules and proposed guidelines with the ESEA Flexibility criteria. The column on the right provides a summary of the adopted statute and rules followed by a description of proposed guidelines.

ESEA Flexibility Criteria	Oregon's Adopted Statute/Rules and Proposed State Guidelines
<p>a. Continual improvement of instruction</p>	<p>Statute and Rule: Senate Bill 290 and Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723; 1724; 1725:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requires districts to use core teaching standards from The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and administrator standards adopted by the State Board of Education in all teacher and leader evaluations. Both sets of standards emphasize continuous improvement of teaching and learning. ▪ Requires districts to use evaluations to strengthen the knowledge, skills, disposition and practices of teachers and administrators. <p>Proposed State Guidelines: The focus of the evaluation system is on improving professional practice and student learning. To that end, linking evaluations with high quality professional learning is key. Aligned evaluation systems inform educators of strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities to make informed decisions regarding individual professional growth. High quality professional learning is sustained and focused, relevant to the educator's goals and needs. All educators should have opportunities for professional growth to meet their needs, not only those whose evaluation ratings are below proficient.</p>
<p>b. Meaningful differentiated performance levels</p>	<p>Proposed State Guidelines: Oregon's Framework uses a rating scale based on four performance levels. Definitions of each performance level as applied to the standards of professional practice are described below.</p> <p>Level 1: Does not meet this standard; performs below the expectations for good performance under this standard; requires direct intervention to improve practice.</p> <p>Level 2: Making sufficient progress toward meeting this standard; meets expectations for good performance most of the time and shows continuous improvement; expected improvement through focused professional learning and growth plan.</p> <p>Level 3: Consistently meets expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates effective practices and impact on student learning; continues to improve professional practice through ongoing professional learning.</p> <p>Level 4: Consistently exceeds expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates highly effective practices and impact on student learning; continued expansion of expertise through professional learning and leadership opportunities.</p> <p>District must use four levels but they may name the levels as desired (for example Level 1-ineffective, Level 2-emerging, Level 3-effective and</p>

	<p>Level 4-highly effective). Regardless of the terms used, they must align to the levels described in the Framework. ODE will provide approved research-based rubrics. To ensure validity, districts must adopt or adapt these adopted rubrics for their local evaluation systems.</p>
<p>c. Multiple, measures in determining performance</p>	<p>Statute and Rule: Senate Bill 290 and OAR 581-022-1723:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teaching and leadership standards take into consideration multiple measures of teacher effectiveness, based on widely accepted standards of teaching that encompass a range of appropriate teaching behaviors and that use multiple evaluation methods. ▪ The measures will take into consideration evidence of student academic growth and learning based on multiple measures of student progress, including performance data of students, schools and school districts. ▪ A school district board will include core teaching and administrator standards adopted by the State Board of Education for all evaluations of teachers and administrators of their school districts on or after July 1, 2013. The standards will be customized based on the collaborative efforts of teachers and administrators of the school district and the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees of the school district. <p>OAR 581-022-1724 Core Teaching Standards (InTASC):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The Learner and Learning <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Learner Development b. Learning Differences c. Learning Environments (2) Content <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Content Knowledge b. Application of Content (3) Instructional Practice <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assessment b. Planning for Instruction c. Instructional Strategies (4) Professional Responsibility <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice b. Leadership and Collaboration. <p>OAR 581-022-1725 Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards: Oregon's standards align with the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. They are unique in the nation due to the state's policy focus on equitable practice. Each of the six educational leadership/administrator standards includes specific language that</p>

highlights the need for equitable practice.

a) Visionary Leadership: An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by stakeholders. [ISLLC Standard 1]

b) Instructional Improvement: An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by sustaining a positive school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. [ISLLC Standard 2]

c) Effective Management: An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. [ISLLC Standard 3]

d) Inclusive Practice: An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources in order to demonstrate and promote ethical standards of democracy, equity, diversity, and excellence, and to promote communication among diverse groups. [ISLLC Standard 4]

e) Ethical Leadership: An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. [ISLLC Standard 5]

f) Socio-Political Context: An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. [ISLLC Standard 6]

Proposed State Guidelines:

(1) Multiple Measures for Teacher and Administrator Evaluations

Oregon’s teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems must include measures from the following three categories of evidence: (A) Professional Practice, (B) Professional Responsibilities, and (C) Student Learning and Growth. All teachers and administrators will be evaluated on the standards using measures from each the three categories in combination with one another. These categories are interdependent and provide a three-dimensional view of teaching and

administrator practice as illustrated below. Evaluators will look at evidence from all three categories to rate performance on the standards of professional practice (i.e., Core Teaching Standards and Educational Leadership/ Administrator Standards).

Categories of Evidence of Educator Effectiveness



(2) Student Learning and Growth

As with the state's accountability system, Oregon's guidelines for educator evaluation and support systems build on the belief that evidence of student learning and growth is significant to the work that teachers and leaders undertake. Oregon is committed to looking at evidence of student learning in ways that a) motivate student growth and provide clear goals for students and families; b) support Oregon's goal of learner-centered approaches to demonstrating proficiency / mastery in common core and other state standards; c) promote higher level thinking skills and college and career ready behaviors; and d) recognize and learn from students, educators and systems that demonstrate higher than average gains, particularly for those students who are furthest behind.

Local evaluation of teachers and administrators will reflect a strong link to student learning, reflected as growth and proficiency based on Oregon's college and career-ready standards (including adopted Common Core State Standards). Systems will support teachers and leaders to become highly effective in helping students achieve at high levels to meet these rigorous standards (outlined in Principle 1).

Oregon statute (SB 290), Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) and the ESEA waiver criteria require local evaluation and support systems to incorporate a robust set of measures of student learning and growth for all students as a significant contributor to the overall performance rating of teachers and administrators. Student learning and growth means

measures of student progress (across two or more points in time) and of proficiency / mastery (at a single point in time) in relation to learning standards, such as state or national standards. Student learning and growth may be evidenced by state assessments as well as national, international, district-wide and other school or classroom assessments and collections of student work that validly measure student learning and can be assessed in a reliable way.

As described further below, measures will include:

- For grades and subjects for which state assessments are required (ELA and mathematics in grades 3-8, 11):
 - (1) State assessment results; and
 - (2) Additional measures of individual student learning, such as any of those described in the second bullet below.
- For grades and subjects in which state assessments are not required:
 - (3) State, national, international or other common assessments appropriate to the curriculum and students being taught; and other valid and reliable measures of individual student learning, growth and proficiency, such as formative assessments, end of course tests, performance-based assessments; collections or portfolios of student work.

Within Oregon's Framework, three components make up a comprehensive evaluation: (A) Professional Practice, (b) Professional Responsibilities, and (C) Student Learning and Growth. The student learning and growth component represents the teacher/administrator's impact on a student's (or set of students') learning as measured by multiple sources of data.

Teachers and administrators, in collaboration with their supervisors/ evaluators, will establish challenging and meaningful student learning goals and select evidence from a variety of valid measures and regularly assess progress. The goal setting process for teachers must reflect most closely the teaching and learning that occurs at the classroom level and allow teachers to choose goals based on the needs of their students and select measures that align with their goals.

All teachers will select from a variety of measures. Teachers who are responsible for student learning in tested subjects and grades (i.e. ELA and mathematics in grades 3-8, 11) must include state assessments as one of their measures and must include other evidence of student learning from classroom, school, district, or national measures. The Oregon Department of Education will provide districts with state assessment data reflecting proficiency and growth, including multiple measures for students with particular needs, such as English language proficiency gains and alternative assessments for students with disabilities. Teachers will assemble other evidence of learning and growth from appropriate tasks or tests at the classroom level. Teachers in non-tested subjects and grades must use measures that are valid and authentic representations of individual student learning as demonstrated

in relation to learning standards, with at least one measure being comparable state or district-wide, or approved by the district or state as valid and reliable for use across classrooms. The process for establishing student growth goals is described in the following sections on multiple measures for teachers and administrator evaluations.

Multiple Measures Address the Needs of All Teachers

Using multiple measures of student growth and learning allows for the inclusion of *all* educators in the evaluation system, including those in non-tested subjects (e.g., the Arts, social sciences, CTE) and grades for which state tests are not administered. Student growth and learning goals and evidence from multiple measures, including classroom-based assessments, allows for demonstrations of deeper learning, such as key cognitive skills, academic behaviors, and other college and career readiness, to be considered in the evaluation.

The Model Core Teaching Standards (INTASC) are the foundation of teacher evaluation and support systems. The standards require that *all* teachers, including those in regular classrooms, learn to customize learning for learners with a range of individual differences, including students who have learning disabilities and students with cultural and linguistic diversity and the specific needs of English Language Learners. The standards also require that all teachers learn to work with other school professionals, such as special education teachers or ELL specialists, to plan and jointly facilitate learning on how to meet diverse needs of learners.

Through statewide and regional professional development all educators will participate in professional development activities to develop a clear understanding of the standards and the expectations for classroom practice and performance. Teachers in regular classrooms will have the opportunity to develop the skills needed for working with special populations of students and meaningful collaboration with colleagues. Approved, research-based scoring rubrics that measure performance on the standards will be used in all teacher evaluations. Teacher performance data will inform needs for additional and on-going training to help general education teachers to develop these skills over time.

ODE is working with partners to implement the Model Core Teaching Standards in teacher preparation programs to ensure all pre-service teachers develop these critical skills. In addition, specifically with regard to ELL, the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESLOL) Endorsement Work Group is exploring the possibility of pre-service programs requirement coursework towards ESOL endorsement; local or regional endorsement programs that may not require university coursework to help with cost of in-service education; and models for increasing the quality of pre-service and in-service clinical or practicum experience for teachers.

While all Oregon teachers are held to the same standards of professional practice, where applicable, evaluation processes and tools will be differentiated to accommodate the unique skills and responsibilities of SPED and ELL teachers. Evaluations based on multiple measures of student growth, professional practice, and professional responsibility allows appropriate customization of evaluations for special education teachers and ELL specialists. For these educators, meaningful, standards-based classroom measures provide another way to show concrete evidence of teachers' contributions to student growth where standardized tests for their particular subject, grade, or specialization are not available or appropriate.

Specialized skills and responsibilities for SPED teachers may include, for example:

- Considerable knowledge of evidence-based instructional strategies for students with special needs
- Appropriate use of instructional strategies and interventions to accommodate individual learning differences and augment achievement
- Considerable knowledge of current special education legislation/laws to maintain legal compliance
- Progress monitoring specifically with Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals
- Effective case management skills to maintain records, prepare reports and correspondence; complete accurate and appropriate IEPs and meet compliance timelines
- Considerable knowledge of social and behavioral interventions
- Specialized interventions for students with severe cognitive disabilities or other complex impairments
- Considerable knowledge of texts, materials, and specialized equipment to support the individual learning needs of students
- Considerable knowledge of current literature, trends, and community resources (local, state, national) to provide information or support to parents
- Effective collaboration and communication skills with parents, educational personnel, students and other involved parties

Specialized skills and responsibilities for ELL specialists may include, for example:

- Increase attention to home language and cultures
- Need to build connections between the students' school and home
- Assist teachers and administrators in employing appropriate research-based strategies to ensure students achieve literacy (e.g., developing and using ELL literacy strategies, curriculum products, implementation plans and assessment tools)
- Exhibit theoretical and research-based knowledge of language acquisition and child development
- Work collaboratively with teachers in recognizing and responding to

	<p>the multiple needs of the diverse learners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist teachers in utilizing a variety of ongoing, instructionally based assessment approaches to inform and differentiate instruction • Research, teach, and model best practices used to address the needs of those students who struggle with reading and writing • Assist with implementing a balanced approach of direct teaching using authentic, literature based reading and writing opportunities • Assist with district and schoolwide literacy initiatives • Keep abreast of technical, legislative, and professional developments and trends affecting ELL programs, disseminate information to appropriate district personnel and provide ongoing professional development, and make recommendations for program adjustments • Provide constructive feedback to teachers in their approach and instruction in reading, writing, language development, and all curricular areas • Disaggregate and analyze data to target instruction, enhance student learning, and inform teacher practice • Assist in monitoring the district's effectiveness and compliance with local, state, federal and court ordered requirements related to ELL programs <p>Multiple Measures for Teacher Evaluations</p> <p>The evaluation system must include a variety of evidence-based measures to evaluate teacher performance and effectiveness, based on the Model Core Teaching Standards. To provide a balanced view of teacher performance, evaluations of all licensed teachers must include evidence from the following three components: (A) Professional Practice, (B) Professional Responsibilities, and (C) Student Learning and Growth. Determining multiple measures for the district's local evaluation system is key; to be accomplished through a collaborative process involving teachers and administrators. Examples included under each category below are not all inclusive.</p> <p>A. <u>Professional Practice:</u> Evidence of the quality of teachers' planning, delivery of instruction, and assessment of student learning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Classroom Observation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluator's observation, documentation and feedback on a teacher's instructional practices; both formal and informal b. Examination of Artifacts of Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples: Lesson plans, curriculum design, scope and sequence, student assignments, student work <p>B. <u>Professional Responsibilities:</u> Evidence of teachers' progress toward their own professional goals and contribution to schoolwide goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples: Teacher reflections, self-reports, data analysis, professional goal setting, student growth goal setting, records of
--	--

contributions, peer collaboration, teamwork, parent/student surveys, meetings, record keeping, portfolios, building level leadership (committees, demonstration classrooms)

Peer collaboration is encouraged as an effective practice. Peer evaluation of teachers may be used in the formative process, but under current Oregon law is not an appropriate measure in summative evaluation.

C. Student Learning and Growth: Evidence of teachers' contribution to student learning and growth.

Teachers will establish at least two student learning goals and identify strategies and measures that will be used to determine goal attainment (see table below). They also specify what evidence will be provided to document progress on each goal:

- a) Teachers who are responsible for student learning in tested subjects and grades (i.e. ELA and mathematics in grades 3-8, 11) will use state assessments as one measure (category 1) and will also select one or more additional measures from category 2 or 3 that provide additional evidence of students' growth and proficiency/mastery of the standards, and evidence of deeper learning and 21st century skills.
- b) Teachers in non-tested (state test) subjects and grades will use measures that are valid representations of student learning standards from at least two of the following three categories, based on what is most appropriate for the curriculum and students they teach.

Types of Measures for Student Learning and Growth for Teacher Evaluations

Category	Types of Measures (aligned to standards)	Examples include, but are not limited to:
1	State or national standardized tests	Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS), SMARTER Balanced (when adopted), English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA), Extended Assessments
2	Common national, international, regional, district-developed measures	ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE, AP, IB, DIBELS, C-PAS, other national measures; or common assessments approved by the district or state as valid, reliable and able to be scored comparably across schools or classrooms

	3	Classroom-based or school-wide measures	Student performances, portfolios, products, projects, work samples, tests
<p>Teacher Goal Setting for Student Learning and Growth</p> <p>Student learning and growth is the third component of teacher evaluation. Student growth will be determined through a rigorous student growth goal setting process and the use of multiple measures. Teachers, in collaboration with their supervisor/evaluator will set learning goals aligned to state standards for their students and use assessments to measure their progress toward these goals.</p> <p>Goal setting for student learning is an important process for every Oregon educator. Educationally meaningful, measurable goals provide a clear path for teacher and students to succeed. Setting student learning goals helps ensure that lesson design, instruction and assessment result in learning for all students.</p> <p>Student growth goals and measures align with the standards the teacher is expected to teach and students are expected to learn. The goal should reflect students' progress toward proficiency or mastery of academic standards, cognitive skills, academic behaviors, and transitional skills. All measures must be aligned to standards and be valid and developmentally appropriate for the curriculum and the students being taught. The collective set of a teacher's goals should address all of his or her students. District priorities, school goals and classroom goals should be aligned, wherever possible.</p> <p><u>Student Learning and Growth Goal Setting Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers review baseline data and create goals that measure the learning of their students. Goals span a school year or complete course of study. • Teachers collaborate with supervisor/evaluator to establish student learning goals. In addition, teachers may collaborate to establish student learning goals for their grade levels, departments, or curricular teams. • Teachers will establish at least two student learning goals and identify strategies and measures that will be used to determine progress toward goal attainment. They also specify what evidence will be provided to document progress, which must be consistent with the guidelines set forth above (see table on appropriate measures). • Teachers complete the Teacher Goal Setting for Student Learning and Growth Template (outlined below) in collaboration with their supervisor/evaluator. During the collaborative planning process, the teacher and supervisor/evaluator ensure that quality goal setting occurs through a discussion of the rigor and rationale of each goal, appropriate research-based strategies, quality of evidence and standards addressed. The SMART goal process is used in the 			

	<p>development of student growth goals. (SMART = Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-focused; Timed and Tracked)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers meet with supervisor/evaluator to discuss progress for each goal mid-year and at the end of the year. Generally, goals remain the same throughout the year, but strategies for attaining goals may be revised. • Teachers, along with their supervisor/evaluator, reflect on the results and determine implications for future professional growth planning. <p>Goal Setting Template Outline</p> <p><u>Initial Conference:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content: What is your grade subject level? • Context: What are the characteristics or special learning circumstances of your class(es)? • Baseline Data: Where are my students now? (attach data) • Student Growth Goal Statement: What are the learning needs of my students? Does my goal meet the SMART criteria? • Strategies for Improvement: How will I help students attain this goal? <p><u>Mid-Course Review:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Mid-Course Data Review: What progress has been made? (attach data) • Strategies Modification: What revisions do I need to make to help students attain the goal? <p><u>Post Conference:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-of-Year Data: What does the end-of-year data show? (attach data) • Reflection on Results: What worked? (i.e. strategies, supports, resources, and assessments) • End Results: Rating on performance levels and student growth • Professional Growth Plan: How will I use these results for professional growth? <p>ODE will provide a goal setting template and disseminate exemplars across content areas and grades. Training on student learning and growth goal setting will be included in regional trainings.</p> <p>Multiple Measures for Administrator Evaluations</p> <p>The evaluation system must include a variety of evidence-based measures to evaluate administrator performance and effectiveness, based on the Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards (i.e., ISLLC). To provide a balanced view of administrator performance, evaluations of all building administrators (i.e., principals, vice-principals) must include evidence from the following three categories: (A) Professional Practice, (B) Professional Responsibilities, and (C) Student Learning and Growth. Determining multiple measures for the district's local evaluation system is key; accomplished through a collaborative process involving teachers and administrators. The measures listed</p>
--	--

under each category are provided as examples.

(A) **Professional Practice:** Evidence of school leadership practices, teacher effectiveness, and organizational conditions

- Observation and review of artifacts

Examples: 360 ° feedback, feedback to teachers, surveys developed collaboratively with staff (re: instructional leadership, teacher/student climate), staff communication, teacher development, student/staff handbooks, records of mentoring/coaching, teacher use of data, staff meetings, teacher observations, summative and formative teacher evaluation

(B) **Professional Responsibility:** Evidence of administrators' progress toward their own professional goals and contribution to schoolwide and district goals.

Examples: administrator reflection, self-report, professional goal setting, schoolwide improvement goals, data committee meetings, portfolios, parent and community involvement, decision-making, professional development log, staff retention rate, collaborative leadership, school-wide budget, master schedule, teambuilding, teacher evaluations

(C) **Student Learning and Growth:** Evidence of administrators' contribution to school-wide student learning and growth.

Administrators, in collaboration with their supervisor/evaluator, will establish at least two student growth goals from the three categories in the table below. One goal must be related to student learning and growth using state assessment (category 1) as a measure (e.g., building-level data on proficiency and growth in reading and math, including all subgroups).

Types of Measures for Student Learning and Growth for Administrator Evaluations

Category	Types of Measures	Examples include, but are not limited to:
1	State or national standardized tests	Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS), SMARTER Balanced (when adopted), English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA), Extended Assessments
2	Common national, international, regional, district-developed	ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE, AP, IB, DIBELS, C-PAS, other national measures;

		measures	or common assessments approved by the district or state as valid, reliable and able to be scored comparably across schools or classrooms
	3	Other school-wide or district-wide measures	Graduation rate, attendance rate, drop-out rate, discipline data, college ready indicators (PSAT, AP/IB tests, dual enrollment, college remediation rates), college and career readiness measures, and other measures of student learning and growth

Student growth goals and measures should align with Achievement Compact indicators where applicable:

- Grade 3 proficiency in reading and math, as measured by meeting or exceeding benchmark on the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS);
- Grade 6 on-track, as measured by rates of chronic absenteeism;
- Grade 9 on-track, as measured by rates of credit attainment and chronic absenteeism;
- Earning college credit in high school, through Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), dual enrollment, or college enrollment;
- Four- and five-year cohort graduation and completion rates; and
- Post-secondary enrollment, as collected through the National Student Clearinghouse.

Summative Evaluation

Oregon is committed to ensuring that summative evaluation represents a holistic judgment of the teacher’s or administrator’s performance based on the Standards of Professional Practice and of his/her impact on student learning and growth. In the pilot phase, as described below, ODE will work with experts and evaluators to design a study, collect and analyze data, collaborate with other states around their implementation findings, and ultimately develop guidelines for ensuring that evidence of student learning and growth is valid and reliable, and that it is included as a significant factor in teacher and administrator evaluation.

<p>d. Evaluation cycle</p>	<p>Statute and Rule: Senate Bill 290 and OAR 581-022-1723: A school district board must include the core teaching standards adopted under this section for all evaluations of teachers and administrators of the school district.</p> <p>Proposed State Guidelines: Oregon's local evaluation and support systems will evaluate teachers and administrators on an established cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Probationary teachers - annually ○ Contract teachers – every two years ○ Probationary Administrators – annually ○ Administrators – every two years
<p>e. Feedback for professional development</p>	<p>Statute and Rule: Senate Bill 290 and OAR 581-022-1723:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adopt teaching and administrator standards to improve student academic growth and achievement by improving the professional development and the classroom and administrative practices of teachers and administrators. ● Establish a formative growth process for teachers and administrators that support professional learning and collaboration with other teachers and administrators. ● Use evaluation methods and professional development, support and other activities that are based on curricular standards and that are targeted to the needs of each teacher and administrator. <p>Proposed State Guidelines:</p> <p>Oregon's Framework proposes an Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle for teacher and administrator evaluations:</p> <p>Step 1: Self-Reflection Based on the standards of professional practice the first step of an evaluation system is self-reflection. The educator reflects on and assesses his/her professional practice and analyzes the learning and growth of his/her students in preparation for goal setting.</p> <p>Step 2: Goal Setting (<i>Student growth goals and professional goals</i>) Based on the self-reflection, the educator identifies goals aligned with the standards of professional practice that encompass both practice and impact on student learning. The educator sets both professional practice goals and student learning goals. SMART goals (i.e., Specific, Measurable, Appropriate, Realistic, and Time-bound) and/or learning targets are used as a tool for effective goal setting.</p>

	<p>Step 3: Observation and Collection of Evidence (<i>Multiple measures</i>) The educator and evaluator collect evidence using multiple measures regarding student learning and growth, professional practice, professional responsibilities and student learning to inform progress throughout the process of evaluation.</p> <p>Step 4: Formative Assessment/Evaluation (<i>Analysis of evidence, Professional conversations, and Professional growth</i>) The evaluator and educator review the educator’s progress toward goals and/or performance against standards. This step includes three interdependent and critical parts including analysis of evidence, professional conversations, and professional growth. Both the educator and the observer analyze the evidence leading into a collaborative professional conversation. Feedback through professional conversations promotes awareness of growth and needed improvement and helps the educator make adjustments in his/her practice. The district’s evaluation cycle must include multiple observations and on-going feedback for teachers and principals each year whether the educator is on a one-year or a two-year evaluation schedule. Regular feedback is required aligned to professional growth opportunities for continued improvement of instructional and leadership practice.</p> <p>Step 5: Summative Evaluation This step is the culmination of multiple formative observations, reflections, professional conversations, etc. Evaluator assesses the educator’s performance against the standards of professional practice and progress toward student learning goals.</p> <p>Oregon’s local evaluation and support systems will align teacher and administrator evaluation with professional development. The evaluation process will align professional development opportunities with educator self-reflection, assessment, and goal setting.</p> <p>The focus of local evaluation and support systems is to help educators improve their practice to improve student learning. Collaborative teams should determine what kind of support a teacher or administrator can expect if they are not proficient on all standards. The process of improvement should be clear, easily understood, and result in educator and student success.</p> <p>Professional learning will be guided by the Learning Forward standards; be job-embedded, collaborative, and customized to individual educator needs.</p>
f. Personnel decisions	<p>Statute and Rule: Senate Bill 290 and Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopt teaching and administrator standards to improve student academic growth and achievement by assisting school districts in determining the effectiveness of teachers and administrators and in

	<p>making human resource decisions.</p> <p>Proposed State Guidelines: School districts must describe in policy how their educator evaluation and support system is used to inform personnel decisions (e.g., contract status, contract renewal, plans of assistance, placement, assignment, career advancement, etc.).</p>
--	--

Development of State Guidelines for Local Evaluation and Support Systems

Phase 1 – Draft Guidelines

In October 2011, the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup was established through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver process. The purpose of the workgroup, in collaboration with ODE and the Governor's office, is to create state guidelines that establish the parameters for local educator evaluation and support systems that comply with Senate Bill 290 and Oregon Administrative Rules 581-022-1723; 1724; and 1725 (see attachment 16).

The workgroup is comprised of 24 stakeholders with representatives from ODE, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), Oregon Education Association (OEA), K-12 teachers and administrators, human resource offices, public and independent university teacher preparation programs, local school boards, and non-profit education advocacy organizations.

Teachers, administrators, and other key stakeholders were involved in the development of Senate Bill 290 and the review of Oregon Administrative Rules, which provide the foundation for this work.

Phase 1 in the development of the guidelines involved a review of current education practices, research, other state models, and consultation with national experts. The workgroup met from October through November in large group meetings, WebEx meetings, and small subgroup meetings to recommend, discuss, and reach consensus on the proposed guidelines.

Phase 2 – Targeted Stakeholder Feedback

From January through June 2012, ODE and key partners, including OEA, TSPC, COSA, OSBA, OCQTL, OACTE, OSPA, Educational Service Districts (ESD), OLN, and others will engage teachers, principals, and other stakeholders across the state in a review of the guidelines to inform and elicit feedback.

ODE will conduct work sessions for the Oregon State Board of Education to discuss policy and implementation of the state guidelines for evaluation and support systems. Pilot districts will be called upon to present information about their design and implementation.

ODE and key partners will conduct outreach to their constituent groups and convene forums around the state targeted to teachers and administrators. The purposes of the outreach and forums are to develop a common vision for educator effectiveness and to solicit feedback on the proposed state guidelines for local evaluation and support systems.

Following the gathering and synthesis of feedback, the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup will make final recommendations on the state guidelines to ODE in May 2012 for adoption by the State Board in June 2012. At that time, a revision to the OARs for teacher and administrator evaluation and other policies will be considered to reinforce the adopted state guidelines as needed.

3.B ENSURE LEAs IMPLEMENT TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

- 3.B Provide the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, including mechanisms to review, revise, and improve, high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines.

Piloting State Guidelines for Evaluation and Support Systems in Districts

Oregon's plan to pilot the state guidelines will include both a) leveraging existing educator evaluation initiatives in the state as pilot sites and b) providing support for non-pilot districts by linking them with pilot districts through the Continuous Improvement Network (the Network), or through other established networks or initiatives.

Currently there are several initiatives in Oregon that are supporting design and implementation of local evaluation and support systems in school districts. These include the CLASS Project and the TIF grants, sponsored by the Chalkboard Project; and the School Improvement Grants (SIG) and District Collaborative Grant program (Senate Bill 252), administered by ODE. In addition, other school districts, including the state's largest, Portland Public Schools, have developed and begun to launch their own evaluations systems. ODE will engage a cohort of districts from these sites, as well as from all districts with priority and focus schools, to participate in the pilot. The pilot cohort will represent districts of various sizes, student demographics, and geographic differences across the state.

Pilot districts will be required to develop or align existing local evaluation systems with the state guidelines in the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems, and will agree to pilot one or more models for valuing student growth in summative evaluation. These sites will provide valuable information on the process for aligning existing evaluation systems with the state adopted guidelines as well as providing valuable data regarding the relationship between the various components of Oregon's evaluation framework.

The pilot study is designed is to test, evaluate and improve the student learning and growth goal setting process to ensure validity and reliability across the system, ensure selected measures are valid and reliable reflections of teachers' and principals' contributions to student learning, and ensure that uses of the process supports instructional and leadership improvement. ODE will work with pilot districts to implement processes that ensure school-wide and district-wide comparability of assessments and inter-rater reliability through training and on-site coaching.

Pilot districts will receive guidance and technical assistance on the state guidelines. ODE will leverage existing coaching and technical assistance support for the school districts that are currently involved in educator evaluation pilot programs (i.e., CLASS, TIF, SIG sites, Senate Bill 252 grants). As grant sites, these districts already receive on-site coaching and assistance from experts assigned to the school district. ODE will collaborate with these coaching networks as they work with their sites to align their current programs with the new state guidelines.

ODE will also provide guidance and opportunities for technical assistance to non-pilot districts through the Network. During the 2012-13 school year, ODE will collaborate with partners to provide opportunities for non-pilot districts to learn alongside pilot districts and provide access to expertise and resources as districts prepare to pilot new or aligned local evaluation systems in 2013-14.

ODE will collect and analyze data to evaluate the effectiveness of the guidelines, to make improvements in the guidelines, and to inform revisions to state policy and rules. A detailed plan for piloting will be developed, including timelines, data collection expectations and reporting requirements.

ODE Process for Reviewing and Approving District Systems

Adoption of the state guidelines (Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems) and revised Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723 by the State Board of Education will require that all school districts implement a teacher and administrator evaluation and support system compliant with those guidelines. Using the state guidelines as the basis for all local evaluation systems will ensure that local systems are rigorous and designed to support professional growth, accountability, and student achievement. ODE will ensure that each district develops, adopts, pilots and implements high-quality educator evaluation and support systems consistent with state guidelines through the following mechanisms:

2012-2013: ODE pilot Oregon Framework (state guidelines) in selected districts

- By September 1, 2012, ODE will work with evaluators and experts to design the pilot study that includes implementing and gathering data regarding at least two of the models previously approved by USED for including student learning and growth as a significant factor in evaluation.
- During the 2012-13 school year, ODE will work with a cohort of pilot districts to develop or align their local systems with the state framework (guidelines) and this application. The pilot will provide ODE the opportunity to build guidance and support materials for statewide implementation, collect best practices, and gain information to improve the state framework. Other districts will have opportunities to network and access lessons learned from pilot districts.
- During the 2012-13 pilot year, under the direction of the Chief Education Officer, ODE will collaborate with other states engaged in similar approaches, such as Kentucky, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and collect and analyze Oregon data. The focus of the pilot will be (1) to test and improve upon the teacher and administrator formative goal setting processes, to ensure validity and rigor across the system; (2) to ensure selected measures are valid and reliable reflections of student learning; and (3) to develop recommendations for how student learning should be weighted and incorporated into a summative evaluation framework.

- At least 50 schools participating in the pilot will use one of several methods of incorporating student learning and growth measures into teacher and leader evaluation, with a minimum of 10 schools using a matrix and at least another 10 using a percentage weighting system where learning and growth is incorporated at between 10-50 percent.
- In spring 2013, ODE will develop (and submit to USED for approval) amended guidelines that propose a specific method for incorporating student learning and growth as a significant measure of teacher and leader effectiveness that is consistent with the requirements of ESEA Flexibility.

2012-2013: All LEAs develop local evaluation and support systems consistent with state guidelines

- During the 2012-13 school year, ODE will work with partners to provide professional development to all districts to develop common understanding of the evaluation framework and required elements. In fall 2012, ODE will collaborate with partners to conduct an Educator Effectiveness Summit, with a focus on teacher and principal evaluations, for district teams followed by regional support and networking opportunities. The goal is to build capacity regionally to support high quality implementation. Districts will receive technical assistance to conduct a self-assessment of their current evaluation and support systems aligned with the state criteria. Districts design teams with members of administrative staff, teachers, principals, teachers union, and the local school board will work collaboratively to conduct the district self-evaluation and to design their local educator evaluation and support systems.

All LEAs submit revised evaluation and support systems and implementation plan; ODE will review, approve and identify technical assistance needs

- By July 1, 2013, all school districts will be required to submit to ODE revised evaluation and support systems aligned to the amended state guidelines and an implementation plan with local school board approval. The district's evaluation and support system and implementation plan must include the following assurances:
 - State adopted Model Core Teaching Standards and Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards
 - If the district is using other standards, attach a crosswalk of those standards to the state adopted standards
 - State approved scoring rubrics and four performance levels
 - District selected multiple measures from the three categories of evidence: (1) professional practice, (2) professional responsibilities, and (3) student learning and growth (as a significant factor). The district's student learning and growth goal setting process must demonstrate opportunities for teachers and principals to meet with their supervisor/evaluator to discuss progress for each goal and receive feedback during the year and at the end of the year (at least 2 times a year for each goal).
 - Professional growth and evaluation cycle, including use of evaluations for personnel decisions. The district's evaluation cycle must demonstrate multiple observations and on-going feedback for teachers and principals each year whether the educator is on a one-year or a two-year evaluation schedule.
 - Aligned professional learning opportunities – the district's cycle will demonstrate how professional learning for continuous improvement is aligned with the evaluation feedback.

- A plan for training all staff and evaluators on the local evaluation system
- By September 1, 2013, ODE will review and approve districts' evaluation and support systems/implementation plans and assurances and determine statewide and regional professional development and technical assistance needs for the 2013-14 school years.

2013-2014: All LEAs pilot implementation of local evaluation and support systems

- During the 2013-14 school year, all districts will pilot implementation of their local evaluation and support systems. Training, professional development, and technical support will be provided regionally. Districts will test reliability and validity of local evaluation systems. Teachers, principals, district staff and evaluators participating in the district pilot will receive training on the local evaluation system.

2014-2015: All LEAs fully implement local evaluation and support systems

- During the 2014-15 school year, all districts will fully implement their local evaluation and support systems and continue training for all schools, staff and evaluators.

2013-2015 ODE will establish a Peer Review Process

- During the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school year, ODE and the regional Network will develop and pilot a Peer Review Process using Peer Review Panels to ensure alignment of local evaluation and support systems with state guidelines. The Peer Review Process will include both an accountability component and collegial professional learning component. The Peer Review Panel will appraise districts' systems for alignment with state guidelines and identify districts' needs for professional development and technical assistance

By July 1, 2015 all LEAs present local evaluation and support systems to a Regional Peer Review Panel

- By July 1, 2015, all school districts must present their local evaluation and support systems to a Peer Review Panel. Districts will provide documentation and validation of the required elements, including school-wide and district-wide comparability of assessments.. The review will result in a plan for technical assistance if needed and/or identification of best practices that will be disseminated statewide. Peer review reports will be submitted to ODE by August 2015 to document compliance with state requirements and provide data to inform state policy decisions.

For ongoing monitoring and support, implementation of local educator evaluation systems will be aligned with the state's emerging accountability system. Through the Network, districts will be required to conduct an annual self-evaluation relative to school improvement indicators. For some priority and focus schools, the self-evaluation and initial diagnosis may suggest deficiencies in the key areas of educator effectiveness and/or teaching and learning. In those cases, the team conducting the deeper diagnosis will review the districts' educator evaluation tools and processes for compliance with law. Comprehensive Achievement Plans (CAPs) for those schools where these tools or processes are deficient would direct a process and timeline for development or revisions. Even more significantly, the focus and priority schools with work to be done in the areas of educator effectiveness will be given significant support, and in some cases direct intervention, in supporting educators to do their best work.

All districts will have access to the Network’s supports and information resources. The Network will serve to provide peer support, sharing of resources, best practices implementation support, and shared services in an effort to ensure continuous improvement for all districts.

Involvement of Teachers and Principals

School districts are required to develop or modify local evaluation processes in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Senate Bill 290 and Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723 requires the collaborative efforts of teachers with their exclusive bargaining representatives and administrators. Building on lessons learned, a collaborative process among teachers and administrators is more likely to result in meaningful evaluations as demonstrated in the CLASS Project and TIF grants.

Timeline for Development, Adoption, and Implementation

Timeline	Activities	Responsible Parties	Resources	Challenges
<p><u>2011-12 Focus:</u> Develop and adopt state guidelines</p> <p>Stakeholder input</p> <p>Revise/adopt Oregon Administrative Rule 581-022-1723</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board adopt Oregon Administrative Rules related to Senate Bill 290 in Dec. 2011 Establish stakeholder workgroup and develop the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems Collaborate with partners to review and provide input on the framework Disseminate framework to all school districts Develop an ODE Educator Effectiveness website to communicate and share resources statewide Enhance current state’s data system aligned to adopted Framework 	<p>ODE/Educator Effectiveness Workgroup</p> <p>Oregon State Board of Education</p> <p>ODE Partner Agencies/ Organizations</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Stakeholder workgroup</p> <p>National and international research on educator evaluation systems</p> <p>Presentations/ consultations with national experts (Laura Goe, Charlotte Danielson, Linda Darling-Hammond) sponsored by partner organizations (OEA, COSA, Chalkboard)</p> <p>Districts in Chalkboard Project and TIF grant pilots</p> <p>Leveraged funds</p> <p>State data system</p>	<p>Aggressive timeline</p>

	requirements			
<p><u>July/August 2012:</u> Design pilot study</p> <p>Conduct orientation and training for pilot schools/districts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE, evaluators and experts design pilot study that includes models for student growth • Host orientation for pilot school/districts • Conduct Framework training for District Collaboration Grant coaches and the Network 	<p>ODE/Contractor Consultants</p> <p>Network Leadership Coaches</p> <p>Pilot LEAs/Design Teams</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Training materials</p> <p>Oregon District Collaboration Grant, SIG, Title I and IIA funds</p> <p>Adopted Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems</p>	
<p><u>2012-13 Focus:</u> Launch pilots in selected schools/districts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coaching network and ODE provide coaching/technical assistance • Facilitate evaluator training for pilot school/districts • Collect data and information on alignment of Framework to local teachers and principal evaluation systems • Facilitate a network of pilot sites to share best practices • Analyze and disseminate pilot results statewide • ODE adjust Framework as needed based on pilot information 	<p>ODE/Contractor/ Pilot Leadership Coaches</p> <p>Pilot LEAs</p> <p>The Network/ESDs</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Network staff</p> <p>Leveraged funds</p>	<p>Adequate funding for statewide support and technical assistance/networking</p> <p>Short timeline for a pilot</p>
<p><u>2012-13 Focus:</u> Statewide professional development to build understanding of Framework</p> <p>Regional technical assistance to support districts</p> <p>Provide on-line</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct statewide Educator Effectiveness Summit in Fall 2012 • Coordinate regional professional development, support and networking for all school districts 	<p>ODE/Contractor</p> <p>Partner Agencies/ Organizations</p> <p>LEAs</p> <p>The Network/ESDs</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Collaborated effort with key partners</p> <p>Network staff</p> <p>Leveraged funds</p> <p>Expert presenters on evaluation topics</p> <p>LEA best practices</p>	<p>Adequate funding for statewide support and technical assistance/networking</p> <p>Adequate local funding and staff capacity for development and implementation</p> <p>Aggressive timeline requires providing statewide professional</p>

<p>professional development modules</p> <p>Districts develop/align local systems and implementation plan and submit to ODE</p>	<p>through the regional ESDs and the Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districts establish design teams and a collaborative process Districts design/re-design of their local educator evaluation and support systems By July 1, 2013 all school districts submit to ODE revised evaluation systems, implementation plan and assurances approved by local boards ODE review and approve; Identify professional development and technical assistance needs; collect and disseminate best practices 		<p>Examples and templates to guide LEA implementation planning</p>	<p>development/ technical assistance at the same time as piloting the Framework</p>
<p><u>2013-14 Focus:</u> All districts pilot implementation of local systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School districts pilot implementation; train staff and evaluators on their local educator evaluation system Districts receive ongoing regional technical assistance and support/networking opportunities ODE collect and disseminate best practices 	<p>ODE</p> <p>LEAs</p> <p>The Network/ESDs</p>	<p>Network staff</p> <p>Examples, models, best practices, and research provided through Network</p>	<p>Adequate funding for statewide support and technical assistance/ networking</p> <p>Adequate local funding and staff capacity for development and training in LEAs</p>
<p><u>2013-14 Focus:</u> Develop Peer Review Process</p> <p><u>2014-15 Focus:</u> Pilot the Peer Review Process in selected districts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborate with the Network to develop a Peer Review Process/Panel to approve districts' educator evaluation and support systems 	<p>ODE</p> <p>LEAs</p> <p>The Network/ESDs</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Network staff</p> <p>Research and models on Peer Review Process</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and identify needs for professional learning • Pilot Peer Review Process in selected districts 			
<p><u>2014-15 Focus:</u> Districts fully implement local systems</p> <p><u>Spring 2015:</u> Districts present to Peer Review Panel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District will fully implement local evaluation and support systems • By July 1, 2015, districts will present their educator evaluation and support system to a Peer Review Panel; local systems will be reviewed for alignment with state criteria and professional development/technical assistance needs • By August 2015, the Peer Review Panel submit accountability reports to ODE 	<p>ODE</p> <p>LEAs</p> <p>The Network/ESDs</p> <p>Regional Peer Review Panels</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Network staff</p> <p>Peer Review Panel Process Manual</p>	<p>Adequate local funding and staff capacity for training and implementation in LEAs</p> <p>Aggressive timeline for local development, training, and implementation</p>
<p><u>2015-16 Focus:</u> Refine state Framework</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring and support of implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE refine and revise the state Framework based on implementation lessons learned and ongoing national research • Continue to monitor and support implementation through the Network and other collaborative partnerships 	<p>ODE</p> <p>The Network/ESDs</p>	<p>ODE staff</p> <p>Network staff</p>	<p>Adequate local funding and staff capacity for implementation in LEAs</p>

Guidance and Technical Assistance

ODE will work with the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup and partners to develop a comprehensive and coordinated implementation plan that will support statewide guidance, technical assistance, and professional development to ensure that all districts are implementing

successful evaluation and support systems for their teachers and administrators, consistent with the state guidelines.

Capacity to implement educator evaluation and support systems at both the state and district levels will be informed by Oregon's partnership with State Implementation and Scaling-Up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP). The role of the SISEP Center is to build the capacity of state education systems to implement and scale up effective educational innovations statewide so that students can benefit from the outcomes.

Support for statewide technical assistance and professional development will build on existing support structures including the Network. ODE will work with ESDs, institutions of higher education, other partners and providers to develop and provide professional development, resources, and tools to prepare teachers and administrators to develop and implement local educator evaluation and support systems consistent with the state guidelines. . ODE will facilitate capacity building regionally to identify district needs for professional development and training based on evaluation results. Professional development will include all teachers and be targeted as needed for those teachers who are working with ELL and students with disabilities indicated by evaluation results. Regional support will include opportunities for networking and collaboration across districts to leverage training and sharing best practices. ODE will examine ways to modify the current state data collection for teacher and principal evaluation to determine trends and identify needs based on evaluations of the Model Core Teaching Standards and the Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards.

During the 2012-13 school year and beyond, ODE will collaborate with partners to provide statewide professional development available to all school districts through a variety of venues. Strategies may include but are not limited to:

- Training and supports provided to, and through, Regional Network Coordinators, Leadership Coaches, school appraisal teams, school support teams, consultants, and mentors who will form the backbone of Oregon's efforts to improve performance in priority and focus schools
- Coordinating with the Network
- Leveraging existing or establishing networks and communities of practice among school districts through which practitioners can share professional practice and review other models
- Hosting a statewide conference available to teams of educators (including teachers, principals, and district administrators)
- Coordinating with the Instructional Leadership Council (ILC) to provide delivery through the state's regional Education Service Districts (ESDs)
- Coordinating with the Oregon Induction Leadership Network (OILN), which provides leadership for Oregon's Mentoring Program for new teachers and administrators
- Infusing educator evaluation system information and training into existing professional learning venues (e.g. COSA Leadership Academy, OSBA annual conference, OEA conferences, etc.)
- Coordinating with Oregon's DATA Project collaborative statewide networks

This professional learning system provides an integrated approach to supporting educators, allowing them to make connections between initiatives and how each supports the other. This approach will help to make a strong link between college and career ready standards implementation and educator effectiveness to improve the quality of teaching and school leadership.

ODE will identify the staff, time, and resources to develop, pilot, implement, evaluate, and maintain a highly effective evaluation and support system at the state and local levels. ODE will

likely seek to engage the OEIB in recommending strategic investment (either in ODE or through grants directly to the Network, partners or districts) to support this important work. ODE and other agencies and institutions will continue to review current statutes, rules, and policies that govern preparation, induction, mentoring, and licensure of Oregon teachers and administrators to ensure support for and alignment to the guidelines for evaluation and supports, and to ensure all processes affecting educators along their career continuum are aligned with the definition and goals of educator effectiveness in Oregon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Assessing the effectiveness of school leaders: New directions and new processes.* (2009, March). New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-evaluation/Documents/Assessing-the-Effectiveness-of-School-Leaders.pdf>
- Auchter, J.E., & Parkerson, E.K. (Eds.) (2011). *Getting it right: A comprehensive guide to developing and sustaining teacher evaluation and support systems.* Arlington, VA: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/userfiles/file/NBPTS_Getting-It-Right.pdf
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2010). Measures of Effective Teaching Website. <http://www.metproject.org/>
- Braun, H.I. (2005, September). *Using student progress to evaluate teachers: A primer on value-added models.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, Policy Information Center. Retrieved from <http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICVAM.pdf>
- Brown-Sims, M. (2010, July). *Evaluating school principals (Tips & Tools).* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from http://www.tqsource.org/publications/KeyIssue_PrincipalAssessments.pdf
- Clifford, M., Hansen, U.J., & Wraight, S. (2012, April). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive principal evaluation systems.* Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/DesigningPrincipalEvalSys.pdf>
- Commission on Effective Teachers and Teaching (2012). *Transforming teaching: Connecting professional responsibility with student learning* (A report to the NEA). National Education Association. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Transformingteaching2012.pdf>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium (InTASC) model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf
- Curtis, R. & Wiener, R. (2012, January). *Means to an end: A guide to developing teacher evaluation systems that support growth and development.* Education & Society Program. The Aspen

- Institute. Retrieved from
http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/pubs/Means_To_An_End.pdf
- Danielson, C. (2010). *Evaluations that help teachers learn*. Educational Leadership, 68(4), 35-39.
<http://www.danielsongroup.org/UserFiles/files/Evaluations%20That%20Help%20Teachers%20Learn%20-%20Danielson.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Retrieved from
<http://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/creating-comprehensive-system-evaluating-and-supporting-effective-teaching.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E. & Rothstein, J. (2012, March). *Evaluating teacher evaluation*. Phi Delta Kapan, 23(6), 8-15.
- Davis, S., Kearney, K., Sanders, N., Thomas, C., & Leon, R. (2011). *The policies and practices of principal evaluation: A review of the literature*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd. Retrieved from
http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/resource1104.pdf
- Doyle, D. & Han, J. (2012) *Measure teacher effectiveness: A look “under the hood” of teacher evaluation in 10 sites*. New York: 50CAN; New Have, CT: ConnCAN; and Chapel Hill, NC: Public Impact. Retrieved from
http://conncan.org/sites/conncan.org/files/research/measuring_teacher_effectiveness.pdf
- Gallagher, C., Rabinowitz, S., and Yeagley, P. (2011). *Key considerations when measuring teacher effectiveness: A framework for validating teachers’ professional practices* (AACC Report). San Francisco and Los Angeles, CA: Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center. Retrieved from
http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/AACC_report_Key_Considerations_When_Measuring_Teacher_Effectiveness_352994_7.pdf
- Goe, L. (n.d.) *Evaluating teaching with multiple measures*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO. Retrieved from:
<http://www.lauragoe.com/LauraGoe/EvalTchgWithMultipleMeasures.pdf>
- Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008, June) *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from
<http://www.tqsource.org/publications/teacherEffectiveness.php>
- Goe, L., & Holdheide, L. (2011, March). *Measuring teachers’ contributions to student learning growth for nontested grades and subjects* (Research & Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from
<http://www.tqsource.org/publications/MeasuringTeachersContributions.pdf>
- Goe, L., Holdheide, L., & Miller, T. (2011, May). *A practical guide to designing comprehensive teacher evaluation systems*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for

Teacher Quality. Retrieved from
<http://www.tqsource.org/publications/practicalGuideEvalSystems.pdf>

- A guide for developing multiple measures for teacher development and evaluation.* (2011). Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers. Retrieved from
<http://www.aft.org/pdfs/teachers/devmultiplemeasures.pdf>
- Holdheide, L.R., Goe, L., Croft, A., & Reschly, D.J. (2010, July). *Challenges in evaluating special education teachers and English language learner specialists* (Research & Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from
<http://www.tqsource.org/publications/July2010Brief.pdf>
- Mathers, C., & Oliva, M., with Laine, S.W.M. (2008, February). *Improving instruction through effective teacher evaluation: Options for states and districts* (Research & Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from
<http://www.tqsource.org/publications/February2008Brief.pdf>
- Oregon Leadership Network (2009). Best Practices for Assessing Leadership Performance. Retrieved from http://oln.educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/81
- Sanders, N., & Kearney, K., (Eds.) (2008). *Performance standards and indicators for education leaders: ISLLC-based models*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from
http://www.ode.state.or.us/opportunities/grants/nclb/title_ii/a_teacherquality/isllcperformancestandards-limitedprintedition.pdf
- Skinner, K.J. (2010) *Reinventing educator evaluation: Connecting professional practice with student learning*. Boston: Massachusetts Teachers Association.
- Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices.* (2009, December). Organisation for Economic Development (OECD). Retrieved from
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/24/44568106.pdf>
- Teacher evaluation: A resource guide for National Education Association leaders and staff.* (2011). National Education Association (NEA). Retrieved from
<http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/teacherevalguide2011.pdf>
- The Danielson Group <http://www.danielsongroup.org/article.aspx?page=frameworkforteaching>
Promoting Teacher Effectiveness and Professional Learning website.