**Business Requirements Document**

**Project: eVal Enhancements**

**BRD Title: Designated final evaluation report (PDF), including electronic acknowledgement**

**BRD: #8**

**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 relates to the ability within the eVal tool for the evaluator to formalize one specific version of the Evaluation Report as the final report, and for that exact report to contain an acknowledgement within its contents that it is approved by the evaluator as the final report, and that it has been received by the teacher. This set of requirements also include the ability for the evaluator to over-ride (as an exception) the student growth impact rating and to be able (as an exception) to finalize the report without the teacher’s electronic acknowledgement.

# Business Objective

The District will be using the Evaluation Report created within eVal as the final Evaluation Report for the teacher from an HR perspective. Additionally, the District is striving for an end-to-end online process where the report does not fall to paper for signature, distribution or storage. Consequently, the eVal tool would need to provide a method through which the teacher and evaluator are looking at the precise same report version, the resulting PDF report memorializes the date that the evaluator considered the report final and the date that the teacher received the report, the PDF file can be completed even when certain usual business rules cannot be applied (such as teacher acknowledgement or student growth impact rating is missing), and the PDF file is available to the District. (See BRD 13 for requirements on an electronic repository in which the District will store the files and a secure transfer mechanism for retrieving the files from the eVal system).

# Business processes impacted by the change

**Changes to District Processes:**

***Current State:***

Evaluators fill out a Word document and review the document with the teacher during their evaluation discussion. (Some evaluators email the document to the teacher ahead of time). The evaluators then finalize the document, print it out, ask the teachers to sign it, and hand deliver the paper copy to the District’s HR team.

***Future State:***

Evaluators and teachers will continue to meet face-to-face for the actual evaluation discussion; however, evaluators will create their draft and final reports, including the teacher’s acknowledgement of receipt, utilizing new Val functionality which provides an end-to-end online workflow. The evaluators will no longer print paper copies, obtain a wet signature or manually convey the finished reports to the District’s HR team as that will also be done programmatically within the tool (though this option will remain available for exception cases).

**Changes to Processes within eVal:**

**Current State**:

The tool currently has three activities – scoring the teacher, submitting the teacher and creating the evaluation report.

1. **Scoring**

The scoring assumes that the evaluator has been entering scores for each observation (see BRD 2 for the request to disable this functionality) and always enters a student growth impact score.

1. **Submitting**

The evaluator cannot submit the teacher until scores are entered not just for the State criteria but also for the student growth impact score.

1. **Creating the evaluation report**

The evaluator can create an evaluation report at any time, creating different “snapshots” of the report. The underlying content remains the same (i.e., the observation itself can be locked down), but the choice of which sections of content appear on the report can be changed. For example, the phrase “There were colored pencils on the table” cannot be changed to “There were colored pencils on the table and the floor.” However, the decision on whether or not to include that particular observation can change each time the evaluator creates a new “snapshot” of the report. In the example above, if that language was part of Observation 2, the evaluator in the current system could create a snapshot where Observation 2 is included, then create one where it is not included. Or, the evaluator could change which parts of Observation 2 to include or not to include. Therefore, it could be difficult for the District, after the fact, to prove that the teacher was provided the exact evaluation report to review that was subsequently sent to HR as the final evaluation for the teacher’s personnel file.

1. **Signing and distributing the evaluation report (not performed in eVal; included here for clarity)**

The current report has signature blocks for the evaluator and the teacher and assumes the process at this point will fall to paper, i.e., the reporting snapshot will be printed out, manually signed and manually distributed.

**Future state: Summary**

Report creation will include the following stages (and each report stage will be clearly indicated onscreen to the teacher and evaluator):

1. **Ready for Evaluation Conference**

This version is to be used during face-to-face evaluation discussion between teacher and evaluator; it may have further changes made to it, depending on the outcome of that meeting

1. **Ready to be Provided to the Teacher**

This version has the changes made from the outcome of the face-to-face discussion between the teacher and the evaluator and is ready to be submitted in all aspects except that it does not yet have the date that it was electronically acknowledged by the teacher that the report was provided to them

1. **Ready for Submittal**

This version has the teacher acknowldgement but has not yet been submitted

1. **Submitted and Final**

This version is the final evaluation that the evaluator is submitting to the District. Where in the current state there is a signature block, in the future state it will show the date that the teacher acknowledged receipt and the date that the evaluator submitted it to the District as final. (There are a few exceptions to this rule as explained in the details below)

1. Once the report has been submitted, it will:
2. Exist as a PDF file
3. Be available for the District to pull into their own systems (see BRD 13 for requirements on the secure transfer of the files from eVal to the District)

**Future State: Details**

The following is a detailed explanation of each of the process steps listed above.

1. **Ready for Evaluation Conference**
   1. After the evaluator selects the sections they wish to appear on the report and is satisfied with their current version, they mark it as Ready for Evaluation Conference
      1. It should be clearly distinguished from a version that is post-conference and the final evaluation which the teacher will ultimately be presented and which they will need to acknowledge receipt.
      2. The word “draft” should be avoided, as this indicates a version that is not mature enough yet for the teacher to review.
   2. The parties will review this version during their face-to-face evaluation conference.
      1. Some evaluators will choose to email a copy of this version to the teachers before their evaluation conference so that the teachers have a chance to read it beforehand
         1. Evaluator will print the report to PDF and email it through Outlook (this is not a request to programmatically link to Outlook; the evaluator will print to PDF and email manually)
      2. Some evaluators will expect the teacher to log into eVal and access this version themselves
         1. Naming and/or on-screen indicators must be clear and intiuitive so that the teacher cannot inadvertently receive/review the wrong version
      3. Some evaluators will review this version online with the teacher during their face-to-face meeting
   3. If there are changes to the report as an outcome of the evaluation discussion with the teacher:
      1. If the change is around the sections that should appear on the report, the evaluator adjusts the print settings accordingly
      2. If the changes are around the actual content of the observations, and if both parties agree to changing the actual Observation data, then the evaluator and teacher use existing functionality to “unlock” the observation and update accordingly
   4. The evaluator may now either:
      1. Leave the version in its current state, i.e., ready for Evaluation Conference, and ask the teacher to review it again; or
      2. Move it to the next stage, Ready to be Provided to the Teacher
2. **Ready to be Provided to the Teacher**
   1. The evaluator will indicate they are ready for the report to be electronically acknowledged by the teacher that it was provided to them
   2. If there is no student growth rating impact, then the evaluator will be warned that they are attempting to submit the report without this rating. The evaluator can either return to the evaluation screen and submit the rating, or explicitly declare that their intent is to proceed without the rating.
      1. If the evaluator selects to proceed without the rating, audit fields should capture the fact that this evaluation for the teacher, done by this evaluator, was submitted without that rating.
   3. Naming and/or on-screen indicators must be clear and intiuitive so that the teacher cannot inadvertently receive/review the wrong version
   4. The teacher will be notified that a finalized evaluation report is ready for their receipt
      1. As the District may elect to turn “off” user-generated and system-generated messages (See BRD 1), it is not a critical requirement that the eVal system programmatically notify the teacher when a report is in this stage
      2. Whether the eVal tool has functionality to programmatically notify the teacher or not, the District will have a manual business process (outside of eVal) by which the evaluators must officially notify the teacher that the final evaluation report is ready in eVal, and that the teacher should now log in and formally receive it.
   5. The teacher logs into eVal and can easily find the precise report which has been submitted by the evaluator without any possibility that they inadvertently open the wrong report. There is an on-screen indicator showing that the report is waiting for their receipt.
      1. Note: The District’s CBA requirement is that the teacher be provided the evaluation report, not necessarily that they read it or agree with it. Therefore, the electronic acknowledgement need only prove that the teacher accessed the report within eVal.
   6. At this point in the process, the eVal system will record an electronic acknowledgement that the teacher opened the report. The eVal team can suggest their recommendation for a UI design; a possible option is as follows:
      1. When the teacher attempts to open the report, a modal pop-up appears (similar to accepting a software license) in which the teacher must either accept or cancel out of. This screen notifies the teacher that by clicking “Accept”, they are officially acknowledging receipt of their evaluation report.
      2. District to supply precise wording to eVal team for this pop-up, or eVal team to provide a configuration setting into which District can maintain their own language.
3. **Ready for Submittal**
   1. After the teacher closes the report, the report moves into this stage, and the on-screen indicator shows that the report has been provided to the teacher. This indicator shows up for both evaluator and teacher.
4. **Submitted and Final Report** 
   1. The evaluator may move the report to this final stage when:
      1. The report has moved to the “Ready for Submittal” stage, indicating that it has been received by the teacher; or
      2. At the evaluator’s discretion, they can proceed without the teacher’s electronic acknowledgement, thereby moving the report from the “Ready for Teacher Acknowldgement” phase directly to the “Submitted and Final” stage
         1. In this case, they must go through an exception process where they are alerted that they are trying to submit a report that has not yet been acknowledged by the teacher. If they explicitly choose this option, then audit fields will capture the evaluator and teacher names, the date that the report was flagged available for the teacher to receive, and the date that the evaluator chose to submit the report without the teacher’s acknowledgement of receipt.

or;

* + 1. At the evaluator’s discretion, they may choose to drop at this point to a paper process and request that their report be printed to PDF format using traditional signature blocks on the report.
       1. Audit fields will track that the process dropped to paper and that the final evaluation was not submitted electronically
       2. From this point onward, the process will remain paper and outside of eVal
  1. A PDF file is created representing the final evaluation report.
  2. The PDF name will include indicators that allow the District, when consuming the files, to programmatically upload the files to an electronic repository with appropriate indexing.
     1. Naming convention TBD; requires further discussion with eVal and District
  3. In lieu of signature blocks, the report will contain:
     1. Name and date that the evaluator submitted the report
     2. Name and date that the teacher acknowledged receipt
     3. If the teacher did not acknowledge receipt, the report will contain the date the evaluator made it available, the date it was submitted without acknowledgement.
  4. The evaluator has the ability to create a new evaluation report, following all of the stages and steps above, which would over-write the existing final report
     1. This would happen very rarely, but the option would need to exist
     2. When the District pulls the files, they will need to know either via naming convention or other indicator that a particular report is an additional report for a teacher whose evalution was already submitted (See BRD 10 for details)
  5. For the remainder of the school year (i.e., until the setting in eVal is switched for the following year), both the teacher and evaluator have continued access to the final, submitted report in a read-only capacity.
     1. At this point, they would be seeing the PDF file, i.e., it would include the teacher’s acknowledgement, the date submitted by the evaluator, etc.
     2. This report can be printed or downloaded by either party

*Additional Requirements related to the above process:*

Ideally (though not required), during this process, eVal wil provide information to the evaluator helpful indicators to assist them in applying a fair score. For example, a report may appear on the screen showing how many claim statements were in the Unsat, Basic, Prof or Dist categories and for which part of the rubric; and/or how many observations across the different rubric areas; and/or how many artifacts were uploaded by the teacher per rubric element, etc.

# Requirement Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Requirement | Purpose or expected outcome |
| 8.1 | The summative evaluation report has a lifecycle through which it can be drafted, reviewed with the teacher and updated accordingly, finalized, imprinted with proof that the teacher received it and submitted as a PDF file so that the District can transfer the file to their own systems. | See detailed future state process above. |
| 8.2 | Audit fields exist to show the progression of the evaluation report through the lifecycle phases | Example:  A field named “Provided to Teacher” might have a value of “April 15, 2015” signifying the date that the evaluator moved the evaluation report from “Ready for Evaluation Conference” to “Ready to be Provided to Teacher” |
| 8.3 | Audit fields exist to show that the evaluator requested an exception and why for the following activities:   * Score without student growth scores * Submit without teacher acknowledgement * Drop to paper | Example:   * Date field for “Scored without SGIR” * Text field for “Scored without SGIR Comments”   Etc. |
|  |  |  |

# Out-of-Scope

# 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 |