Notes from May 18th meeting in Olympia (David, Anne, Dana, Scott)

1. Next Steps
   1. Planned meetings – meet at least every 2-3 weeks
      1. June 1st, 10:00am in Olympia
         1. Should have finalized frameworks
         2. Show work in progress for software
         3. Discuss roles/functions
      2. June 17th, 10:00am – Phone meeting unless otherwise planned
2. What developers need
   1. Finalized frameworks
   2. Finalized canonical structure, terminology, performance level titles
   3. Name and Logo for application
   4. Spreadsheets for data import
      1. Frameworks
      2. Staff/roles
   5. Feedback on how much modification a district can make to a pre-defined framework.
3. Overall timeframe
   1. 2011-2012 – implementation of pilot, only pilot districts
   2. 2012-2013 – any district that is interested can begin to implement
   3. 2013-2014 – state reporting mandated, districts will want to begin looking at the app prior to this year to be ready to use it this year.
4. Submitting to the state
   1. Deadline for submission is May 15th. The annual cycle around this date.
   2. Considering model similar to COE. OSPI gets access to generate a data dump from a report screen.
   3. EDS integration.
   4. Right now it is the district security manager that assigns roles in EDS. They would be responsible for assigning appropriate roles.
5. Training, Validity
   1. Setup a teacher account that is used for training purposes, much like a Validity collection in COE. A group of principals all observe a classroom video and score. And then they can discuss scoring for improvement.
   2. Could also have anchor scores by experts to compare against.
   3. We report results similar to Individual Profile Report in COE.
6. Evidence Gathering
   1. Talked to Dana on the phone about how the other types of evidence (artifacts, reflections, narratives) are related to the criterion or rubric rows.
      1. He believes that artifacts will be mainly used to demonstrate competency for non-observable criteria.
      2. Principals now generally just do a big narrative when they are observing, and then look at each of these narratives at the end of the year to help them fill in the summative scores. We are trying to get them to do the scoring and the summative scores for each criteria during/after each observation. But many principals will still go in and just create a narrative and then come out and do the scoring as a separate step.
      3. Dana thought it would be a nice feature to allow the principal to link sections of text to a criteria/rubric row to allow them to show why they chose the score they did. This way they could have a single narrative for the whole observation and just align sections of the narrative to the criteria/rubric rows. It supports the way principals are likely to work.
      4. Artifacts and reflections are not associated with a specific observation or self-assessment. Just evidence provided for the principal to consider when doing the final evaluation. They can be loosely associated with an observation or self-assessment by their chronological order.
   2. Every piece of evidence should allow for the principal and teacher to attach notes.
   3. Each of the areas of evidence can be done independently, i.e. observation, reflection can be initiated at any time and any number of times. Different sections for each area are managed independently.
   4. Eventually need a profile of a teacher, based on years of experience. Are they on probationary status, first five years of experience. System differentiated based on all those data.
   5. Districts will have a methodology for determining the final summative score for each criteria, i.e. how they aggregate the input across different kinds of evidence. Part of the pilot is figuring out how to codify determining the summative score. It will be done manually in the pilot.
   6. Eventually some teachers will no longer need to be observed if they have had a certain number of years of distinguished performance. They would still get a summative score, just don't need to be observed. Nice to flag these teachers in the roster.
   7. There is an area where the data is aggregated for review and to input summative score.
   8. Districts will need to decide for each type of evidence whether it can be used to aggregate in summative score. Will it be used for accountability or just for growth. If just for growth it should not be presented in final summative screens.
   9. The instructional observation is mandated for accountability.
   10. No methodology/algorithm to help with calculating summative score.
   11. On the summary screen showing all of the evidence we should allow them to filter evidence within a date range to help them manage tracking down which teachers they need to request evidence from.
   12. Principal sets date when initial observations are complete, tells teachers to have certain number of self-reflection, self-assessment that the request (offline) that the teachers complete so they are available. But the system does not enforce this. It is all done offline and the app is just a repository for collection it all in one place to help forming the final summative score.
   13. What a principal decides to observe depends on the focus of the pre-conference. So you may not have any overlap in the criteria that are covered in the multiple observations across the year. Might not be able to show growth, but should allow for principals that do.
7. Some districts will decide there is one aspect of the school improvement plan they want to focus on observing.
8. Types
   * 1. Instructional Observation by Principal
     2. Self-assessment by Teacher
     3. Peer assessment? (on tpep-wa site)
     4. Self-reflection by Teacher
     5. Artifact Upload by Teacher
        1. Lesson Plans
        2. Surveys (student/parent)
        3. Professional Development Log Entry
        4. Parent Communication Log Entry (newsletter)
     6. Impact on Student Learning, Student Achievement by Teacher (not a stand-alone area for pilot, implemented through extended criteria)
9. Instructional Observation by Principal
   1. Principal observes teachers multiple times a year. Support at least two, no more than five.
   2. Criteria 7-8 are not observable. Should not be displayed in that context.
   3. Observational Workflow
      1. Real workflow begins before observation. Set up time to observe. May want to pre-filter the list to pick criteria that we are going to observe. Need room for notes possibly in observation.
      2. Principal observes then possibly has a post-observation discussion and may result in modifications. Has to occur within some define time period. Teacher gets a printed summary of observation to evaluate before conference.
   4. No requirement on how often, when, how many of the criteria.
   5. Principal indicates that they are finished with an observation, but they are still able to go back and edit it. Status just allows them to track whether they are done when viewing roster of teacher observations.
   6. Must complete active observation before another can be started.
   7. All summative performance levels are manually entered by the principal
      1. Each criterion has summative performance level for the components under it for each observation.
      2. There is a summative performance level for each criteria over multiple observations for the entire year.
      3. Summative scores are only applicable in the State Criteria View. Not the framework view.
   8. Principals are able to add narratives for each criteria and overall. We will not allow them to add narrative on individual rubric rows until we hear from the pilot that it is needed.
10. Self-assessment - Teacher
    1. Teacher fills out same observation rubric as the principal.
    2. Can do as many as she wants, when she wants, and which criteria/components she wants.
    3. Teachers only enter summative scores for the criteria. Not an overall score.
11. Self-reflection – Teacher
    1. In setup district creates a prompt and aligns it to the criteria and then reflective input would work like an eCOE prompt response. Doesn’t have to be for each criteria. After self-assessment, teacher decides an area to focus on. So maybe just a reflection on their weakest and strongest areas. The teacher picks which things they reflect on. It is not principal assigned, it is principal assessed. Well, may allow a principal to require number of reflections and can choose from this group of prompts. Reflections don't need to be tied to specific criteria.
    2. Would like the district to make custom forms. They can make as many prompts as they want and indicate which ones are required. District should make a single reflective form for all teachers. Can allow teachers choice as to which ones to answer. For example, some teachers would be asked to focus on a subset of the prompts.
    3. Dana proposed having a teacher reflection linked to the observation cycle so that a discussion regarding agreement of scores could follow, but at a minimum, the ability to create multiple self reflections should be supported.
12. Artifact Upload – Teacher to demonstrate communications with parents as an example
    1. Class newsletters
    2. Surveys
    3. Talked about teachers being able to access a form that allows them to document things like parent communications log or professional development log
    4. Talked about a generic artifact upload process for multiple types of evidence.
    5. Scott’s response – I think we need to handle both. The forms that I showed (Prof Dev and Parent Comm) you had a column for uploading artifacts that Dana suggested we move to the far right side. The parent log is directly aligned to C7 so it would be good to have that document separate from the generic artifact upload. The Prof Dev log can be connected to one or many criteria, but the entire view is necessary to show their pathway to growth. This could also be valuable as they discuss their implemented plan of improvement. I think there also needs to be a generic artifact load that allows filtering.
    6. Dana’s response – I was thinking we could create some forms based on Scott’s (Prof Dev and Parent Comm logs) and allow for document upload there. Kindof like the competence artifact process in eFOLIO. A Title, Description, Date, Purpose, Link to Criteria, and the artifact. Could be a set if separate forms, or could be a process that we walk folks through. I’d like the second option. We want to allow artifacts to be linked to more than one criteria.
13. Impact on Student Learning – Teacher – Student Achievement
    1. For pilot this will be done as an extension to the State Criteria. But in the future it may be a separate area of Evidence. The WEA would like a separate area as a place where a teacher can demonstrate impact on student learning. Teacher can identify standard they are teaching, do a pre-assessment, followed by instruction, followed by a post-assessment to identify growth. Assessment could be a MAP assessment, graphic organizer, district required assessment, results of a science fair.
    2. For pilot could add a 9th criteria that is Impact Student Achievement.
    3. Process and methodology of the actually measuring student achievement is external to the software. The software only logs the ‘goodness’ of the metric.
14. Instructional Model
    1. District decides on the model for all schools within the district.
    2. District would make a setup decision to use Framework or State Criteria or allow both.
       1. If the district decides to use framework only, then they would just see Framework in observation, but reporting would be tied to criteria.
       2. If the district decides to allow both, then the schools would have the ability to toggle between the framework and state view in the app
    3. There will be three pre-defined frameworks
       1. Danielson
       2. Marzano
       3. 5 Dimensions (UW)
    4. Districts will not be able to make their own framework from scratch. They will be able to create a framework derived from one of the three pre-defined ones.
       1. Cannot delete pre-defined framework structure.
    5. Each framework has their own terminology for the organizational hierarchy around the rubrics. When displaying through the framework, we need to use their terminology.
       1. Danielson – Domain, Component, Element
       2. Marzano – Lesson Segments, Questions
       3. State – Criteria, Component
       4. 5 Dimensions – Dimension, Sub-dimension
    6. Each framework may have their own terminology for the performance levels
    7. Despite variations of framework levels and terminology, it is assumed that scorable elements for the frameworks will be represented internally to the software by ‘Rubric Rows’,
       1. A ‘Rubric Row’ corresponds to a Danielson element and associated descriptors. The descriptors will describe levels of success for an element, corresponding to numerical scores 1 through 4.
       2. A framework is used in the context of the state criteria grouping rubric rows under one of the eight state criteria.
    8. For the pilot there are eight independent districts that will pick their own model
       1. Anacortes SD
       2. Snohomish SD
       3. North Thurston SD
       4. Wenatchee SD
       5. Othello SD
       6. Kenowick SD
       7. Central Valley of Spokane SD
       8. North Mason SD
    9. And a consortium of districts within ESD101 (tpep-web.org) that will all adopt the same framework.
       1. Davenport SD
       2. Liberty SD
       3. Medical Lake SD
       4. Pullman SD
       5. Reardan SD
       6. Ritzville SD
       7. Wilburn SD
    10. How do the state criteria extensions show up in the framework view? Just show them at the end of the framework as Criterion rows. Could organize them in a top level similar to Domain titled State Criteria extensions.
    11. How much do we allow them to edit if they are deriving from a pre-defined framework?
        1. They cannot add/remove domains, components, rubric rows. (Scott to seek guidance from committee).
        2. They can modify the text of a rubric row? It is up to them to use their judgement to modify as minimally as possible to maintain the integrity of the framework while at the same time addressing the specific needs of the population served.
        3. For the most part, they should be extending through the State Criteria by adding additional criteria and/or adding additional components to a State Criteria.
        4. They are allowed to skip any rubric rows when observing. We may allow them to indicate some of the framework rubric rows that they want to configure to be hidden during observation
15. Future Features
    1. Principal evaluation by his supervisor
    2. EDS integration
    3. Area of Evidence – Portfolio
    4. ‘Similarity analyzer’… Run a report that finds the differences between the predefined framework and a derivation created by a district.
    5. Trends over years
       1. By State Criteria, and State Criteria Components
    6. Support Principal walk-throughs as a form of Evidence for growth
       1. We need to study their walkthrough protocols to develop how to incorporate them as a form of evidence. districts will specify whether they are allowed to use walkthroughs as evidence. Isn't a priority for pilot, just a useful tool to support walkthroughs. Just a way to support something that state would find useful, but not really something that is necessary for evidence aggregated to a summative piece
       2. walkthrough as evidence, types:
          1. walkthrough by narrative/walkthrough by criteria. principal observes briefly and writes a narrative and an option to indicate whether the narrative is tied to a criterion.
16. Architectural Issues
    1. Teachers can be assigned to multiple schools
    2. For example a band director can be observed at more than one school. For the pilot we should associate a teacher with a single principal/school. But we should think about architecture to support teachers having a relationship to multiple principals with a primary.
    3. Support multiple evaluators. Scores should roll up. Need to indicate each observation owner. Don't allow multiple evaluators to work in the same observation session. Someone has to be responsible for the final manual summative score. The primary evaluator.
17. UI Issues
    1. Navigation should be moved to the top instead of on the left to give more space.
    2. Layout could be similar to HSB with each area of Evidence having its own tab.