**Business Requirements Document**

**Project: eVal Implementation**

**BRD Title: Evaluation Cycle**

**BRD: #7**

**Development required by:**

***Washington State’s eVal Team***

**BACKGROUND**

This Business Requirement Document (BRD) is part of a set of business requirement documents that are part of the Seattle School District’s 2015 implementation of Washington State’s online evaluation tool, eVal. eVal is an online tool developed by the State to support teacher professional growth in alignment with Washington State’s mandates for TPEP (Teacher Principal Evaluation Process). The project goal is to successfully integrate this tool into the District’s TPEP activities, adhering to the District’s obligations of its CBA and to the spirit of the TPEP process which is aimed at fostering professional growth through collaborative, face-to-face discussions between teacher and evaluator.

BRDs related to eVal functionality have been submitted to the State’s eVal development team. BRDs related to back-office activities which require District development have been submitted to DOTs (the District’s development team). Where noted, several of these documents require review and collaboration from both teams.

*For further information, please see Excel file “eVal Seattle - Enhancements and BRD Index” which contains listing of each enhancement that has been approved for development and the related BRD and assigned development team.*

| Version No. | Date | Name | Description of Change |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 10/31/14 | Donna Schmidt | Baseline; submitted to for review to eVal, DOTs and HR teams |
| 2 | 11/19/14 | Donna Schmidt | Misc. word smithing per stakeholder review (no material changes); updated Review/Approval table to reflect current status |

# High Level Requirement Description

This set of requirements all relate to the value of *Evaluation Cycle*, including the request to display it more visibly throughout the UI and to add a new field which would be set by the evaluator during the end-of-year conference, and would display on the evaluation report, as the evaluation cycle for the *following year*.

# Business Objective

The expected benefit of having the Evaluation Cycle type displayed in multiple places is for ease in the Evaluator performing the most appropriate and accurate evaluation type per teacher per school year, according to SPS Business Rules

# Business processes impacted by the change

The business rules determining a teacher’s evaluation cycle are based on the State’s TPEP process and additional rules stipulated by the CBA. There is no one particular party who is responsible for determining the evaluation cycle – it is based on interpretation of the CBA through discussions between the teacher, evaluator and HR (in a consulting role).

In the current state, the HR team manually attempts to calculate the evaluation cycle for each teacher and includes that value in a file referred to as the “School Roster” which is made available to school leaders at the beginning of each year (See BRD 11). This activity is labor intensive and the resulting value may or may not coincide with the evaluator’s discussions with the teacher.

In the future state, the teacher and evaluator will have an opportunity to discuss the evaluation cycle for the next year during the end-of-year evaluation activities of the current year. The value they agree upon for the next year will then be recorded in eVal in a new field as well as displayed on the evaluation report. This new value will also flow to the District as part of the EOY Data File (see BRD 6) and will be the basis of the value that will be included, the following year, in the School Roster provided by the District to school leaders.

# Requirement Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Requirement | Purpose or expected outcome |
| 7.1 | Display current year's evaluation cycle on Observation screen, Observation report, Scoring screen and Evaluation report | Having the current year’s evaluation cycle on these screens as easy reference will save time and improve accuracy throughout the process.  (This requirement assumes that the values displayed on these new screens will be “display only”; the actual data entry field where evaluators may change this value will remain in its current location on the Assignement Screen) |
| 7.2 | New eVal field for documenting the evaluation cycle for the *following year*. | At the end of the school year during evaluation discussions, the teacher and evaluator will discuss the appropriate evaluation cycle for that teacher for the following year. This value will then be entered by the evaluator and stored within eVal. (This value will also flow to the District in the EOY Data File, BRD 6) |
| 7.3 | Friendly UI which allows the evaluator and teacher to clearly understand which evaluation cycle pertains to which year (because, once the school year ends and a new one begins, the evaluation cycle that had been entered as the following year’s evaluation cycle will now, in fact, be the current year’s evaluation cycle…) | The District looks to the eVal team to suggest how this should be displayed in the UI, i.e., how to label the evaluation cycle values (once both current and future years are implemented) and where the data entry for the new field should reside within eVal. |
| 7.4 | If the next year’s evaluation cycle is Focused, there should also be the ability to select the area of focus | Currently, if the evaluation cycle is “F”, then the user has the opportunity to enter the Framework domain that will be the focus of the evaluation. The District is requesting this same functionality for the new field. |
| 7.5 | The evaluation report should display *both* the current evaluation cycle and the next year’s evaluation cycle |  |

# Out-of-Scope

The District is not expecting to send this value to the eVal system for upload. In a separate process not dependent on eVal, the District will make available to all school leaders a data file referred to as the “School Roster” which lists each teacher assigned to each school and includes their evaluation cycle. The evaluation cycle included on this Roster may or may not be identical to the value in the eVal system; nonetheless, there is no expectation that the District’s value will be loaded into the eVal system (except for those occaisions where an evaluator agrees with the District’s suggestion and updates the value manually through the eVal UI).

# Review and Approval

| Team | Person | Organizational and Project Roles | Role | Date review/approval received |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | Clover Codd | Exec Director Strategic Plan & Partnerships; **Project Sponsor** | Approve project deliverable | 11/5/14 |
| HR | Brent Jones | Asst Superintendent for Human Resources; Project Steering Committee representative for HR; Internal customer for many of the technology updates requested in these documents | Approve project deliverable | 11/19/14 |
| HR | Elaine Williams | Subject matter expert representing Labor Employee Relations Team | Review | 11/14/14 |
| HR | Denise Williams-Saunders | Subject matter expert representing Labor Employee Relations Team | Review | 11/14/14 |
| HR | Sue Means | Subject matter expert representing Labor Employee Relations Team | Review | 11/14/14 |
| DOTs | Nancy Petersen | Director, Enterprise Applications | Informational | 11/6/14 |
| DOTs | James Bradley | Manager, Business Applications | Informational | 11/6/14 |
| DOTs | Mabel Mah | Sr Business Analyst (SAP/HR); project systems analyst representing DOTs for design and development | Review and accept as milestone deliverable | 11/14/14 |
| eVal Dev Team | Anne Chinn | Lead eVal Developer | Review and accept as milestone deliverable | 11/7/14 |
| eVal Dev Team | Dana Anderson | eVal Supervisor/ Project Manager | Review and accept as milestone deliverable | 11/7/14 |