**Change Request**

**Project: eVal Implementation**

**CR Title: Misc Items arising from Design discussions**

**CR: #1**

**Development required by:**

***Washington State’s eVal Team***

**BACKGROUND**

This Change Request refers to the set of Business Requirement Documents (BRD) 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.

Change Requests for this project refer to *new* or *modified* requirements that have arisen after the original BRDs were approved and which have received approval to be included in the project scope.

*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 | 12/17/14 | Donna Schmidt | Misc. items that have arisen during design discussions and which are spread across several BRDs. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# High Level Change Description

This Change Request has multiple small changes that span the business requirement documents already submitted to the project. See BRD for full description.

# Business Objective

See BRD for full description.

# Business processes impacted by the change

See BRD for full description.

# Requirement Details

| Related BRD | REQ ID | Requirement | Purpose or expected outcome |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1.6 | Observations should have persistent, consistent names | The first observation for any teacher in a given year will be “Observation 1.” That name will not change, nor will any other observation for that teacher during that school year be named “Observation 1.” Each new observation will be named sequentially. |
| 1 | 1.7 | The Assignment screen will be able to display infinite number of evaluators for any school. | Some schools have many assistant principals (which maps to “principal” in eVal). On the screen, the panel showing head principal and assistant principal names and check boxes will scroll, so that the user can find the appropriate evaluator and assign them to a teacher. |
| 1 | 1.8 | The evaluators will have a generic container into which they can upload artifacts that are not related to a specific observation. | These can be accessible through the Observation panel (or wherever the eVal team chooses). These artifacts do not need to be mapped to an observation or to the rubric or to any elements other than to a teacher in general. Potential uses will be for the principal to load a variety of miscellaneous items they wish to share with the teacher, or for uploading the printed Observation report (which they cannot upload to the Observation, since the Observation at that point would be locked). |
| 1 | 1.9 | Artificats should have unique identifier and that identifier should be used in any screens by which the user is trying to locate their artifacts | (Similar to Observations.) |
| 1 | 1.10 | When uploading an artifact, the button should say “Save”, not “Insert” | (Per feedback received by teachers duing pilot. Users were confused as to whether their document had truly been “saved” or not) |
| 2 | 2.5 | Remove the “Assessment” panel from the scoring screen. | The District’s TPEP process does not require that a teacher’s self assessment be part of scoring. Keeping the panel infers that it should be part of the scoring. (This could also be a District setting – whatever the eVal team prefers) |
| 2 | 2.6 | The teacher should have ability to enter Reflections for any time  of year, as long as the report is in "Draft" (the default stage of the new workflow).  These reflections will show up automatically on the Summative Evaluation Report.  The teacher can mark their Reflections as Visible or Not Visible to the Evaluator. (They must be made Visible before the Evaluator moves the Report out of draft if they want their comments to appear on the report. | If the functionality depends on the teacher having a prompt, then we would like to explore the ability to pre-create a District-wide prompt that is "on" for all teachers.   Also, we would request the ability for the teacher to add to their Reflections, or delete them, or edit them, however  they wish throughout the year as long as the Summative Evaluation Report is in draft. |
| 2 | 2.7 | Remove the “Final Notes” section so that it is no longer available to either Teacher or Evaluator. | ( We already  have "Recommendations" as part of our TPEP process and in our training, we are not sure what to tell evaluators to enter into "Final Notes" and are concerned it might be confusing to them and inadvertently prompt them to put the same content in both sections.) |
| 2 | 2.8 | Remove the ability for the Teacher to add to "Final Recommendation." | Since the recommendation comes from the Evaluator, providing the teacher an opportunity to comment  on the Evaluator's recommendation implies a workflow where the teacher can  add comments after the report has moved into "Ready for Conference",  but that is not how our process flows.  In the  current manual process, as well as once we move to eVal,  the teacher may provide verbal feedback to the evaluator during the conference (and written comments via the Reflections field at any point leading up to the conference), but there is not a back-and-forth written communication  after the summative evaluation has been drafted. |
| 2 | 2.9 | On the scoring panel, add a text field for each State criteria entitled "Summative Statement  of Performance."  This would be a required field before the report can be moved out of Draft mode. | These new fields provide the evaluator an opportunity to  score on a "preponderance  of evidence",  i.e., across the full year, and is a requirement for them as they must use it to justify their reasoning for each Criteria score they enter.  (These new data fields would not need to be included in our extract, they would just need to appear on the Summative Evaluation Report.) |
| 3 | 3.7 | List the Observation # in Report Settings (right now the observations are only indicated by date which is not an easy identifier for the user to know which observation is which) |  |
| 3 | 3.8 | When the teacher prints the Observation Report, it should be titled “Observation Information” so that it is clear that this is not the same as the formal Observation Report that is provided to the teacher by the evaluator. | The teacher’s version should not have a signature block. |
| 3 | 3.9 | All users need ability to download any or all data in PDF form | (Similar to ZIP report available to DA). Teachers need ability to download all of their information prior to year end or when leaving the District. |
| 6 | 6.4 | The name of the download report that appers on the eVal UI when a user goes to retrieve the data should be “Custom Seattle Download Report” |  |
| 6 | 6.5 | The file name of the downloaded file must be uniquely identifiable from other files downloaded through this process | A sample design might be “Seattle eVal download” + [date & time stamp].  eVal team to collaborate with Seattle technology team to finalize naming convention. |
| 6 | 6.6 | Regarding data elements to be included in the download file: The list included in BRD 6 and additional fields listed in this document may not the final list, as new elements may be added throughout design discussions. Design documents should be the project team’s reference for final list.. | Data elements will include the following fields that eVal will receive from EDS:   * Username * Primary email * Alternate email   All of these are email accounts which may, or may not be, the District’s email. (We will instruct users to enter their District email into the “Alternate email” account; however, we cannot enforce that they do so.)  Other additional fields:   * School Code * School Year (“2014-2015”; *not* “2014” or “2015”)   Plus, new fields defined through design of BRD 8 and BRD 8A for capturing when evaluators complete a report without Student Growth, without teacher acknowledgement or drop to paper. See file spec for these details. |
| 6 | 6.7 | The downloaded file should be tab delineated with all fields varchar |  |
| 8 | 8.4 | The new fields regarding the following year’s eVal cycle (C or F, and if F, the area of focus, etc.) should be added by the evaluator during this workflow. |  |

Additionally, the following Business Requirement Documents have been added to the project:

BRD 17: Explanation of new security role needed in eVal to accommodate Education Directors; additional security requirements for approving District Administrator role. (Delivered to eVal technology team)

BRD 8A: Detailed requirements for BRD 8 regarding new workflow for creating evalution report.

# 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 |  |
| eVal Dev Team | Anne Chinn | Lead eVal Developer | Review and accept as milestone deliverable |  |
| eVal Dev Team | Dana Anderson | eVal Supervisor/ Project Manager | Review and accept as milestone deliverable |  |