

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction EQUIVALENCY REVIEW APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF PRACTICE PI-1656 (New 03-13)

For questions regarding this application, contact: Educator Effectiveness: Katharine Rainey <u>katharine.rainey@dpi.wi.gov</u> 608-267-0392 **INSTRUCTIONS:** Submit **original**. Application must be received or postmarked no later than **APRIL 19, 2013**. Late applications will not be accepted. Return to:

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ATTN: Katharine Rainey EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS P.O. BOX 7841 MADISON. WI 53707-7841

		I. GENERAL I	NFORMATION				
Applicant Agency or Lead if Applying as Consol	Applying as Consortium Mailing Address Street, City, State, Z		, State, ZIP				
Contact Person			Title				
Contact Person's E-Mail Address					Fax Area/No.		Phone Area/No.
Program Coordinator If other than contact person	n		Title				
Program Coordinator's E-Mail Address							Phone Area/No.
Program Coordinator's Mailing Address Street, City, State, ZIP		_	Approval Period				
				Beginning	Date Mo./Day/Yr.	Endir	ng Date Mo./Day/Yr.
				Jı	ine 2013		May 2014
Model Title							

II. ABSTRACT

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness design and work teams recognized that any one model for evaluating professional practice and its rubrics for observation might not suit every district. Therefore, the design team recommended the state develop an application process for districts wishing to use alternative models to measure teacher or principal practice within the statewide system of educator effectiveness. Accordingly, the Wisconsin Legislature included language in Act 166, the legislation setting forth requirements regarding educator evaluations, for the Department of Public Instruction to develop an application and approval process (Equivalency Review) for districts intending to use alternative practice models. The legislation states the following requirements of the Equivalency Process:

- An alternative model must align to the InTASC standards for teachers and the ISLLC standards for principals.
- An alternative model for measuring teacher practice must also align to the following four domains: 1) Planning and preparation, 2) Classroom environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional responsibilities.
- A district intending to use an alternative model must apply for Equivalency from the Department of Public Instruction.

For that purpose, the Department of Public Instruction, in collaboration with a group of education stakeholders familiar with the Educator Effectiveness system, established parameters for the review of models to measure professional practice —otherwise referred to as the Equivalency Review Process. Within the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness system, only models of educator practice are subject to equivalence; the equivalency review process does not apply to the measures of student outcomes. Appli cants must align observation rubrics to the InTASC (teacher) and ISLLC (principal) standards, as well as to the intentions of the statewide system. That is, any approved district's model must include an educator evaluation and support system that continuously improves teacher and principal practice through a fair, valid, and reliable process using multiple measures to improve student and school outcomes.

For additional information and documents to support this application process, refer to the Educator Effectiveness webpage.

As part of the equivalency review process, applicants must agree to do the following:

- 1. Applicants and their participants shall report teacher-level, school-level, and district-level data required by the department within guidelines established by the department.
- 2. Applicants shall transfer data electronically to the department according to established technologies as defined by the department, including ability to assign unique identification numbers for entities as part of the data sharing protocols specified by the department.
- 3. Applicants shall participate in a statewide evaluation conducted by an independent, non -biased external evaluator.
- 4. Applicants shall implement any corrective actions required by the department if the department determines there is credible evidence indicating that a school, school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school is no longer in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.
- 5. Administration of the program, activities, and services covered by this application will be in accordance with all applicable state and federal statutes, regulations, and the approved application.

IV. CERTIFICATION/SIGNATURE

I CERTIFY that the information contained in this application is complete and accurate to the best of my know ledge; that the necessary assurances of compliance with applicable state and federal statutes, rules, and regulations will be met; and, that the indicated agency designated in this application is authorized to administer this grant.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the assurances listed above have been satisfied and that all facts, figures, and representation in this application are correct to the best of my know ledge.

Signature of Applicant Agency Administrator

Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.

V. CONSORTIUM VERIFICATION

Copy as many pages as needed.

(IF APPLICABLE) EACH OF THE educational agency they represent I with applicable state and federal st	has authorized them to enter into a	he information contained in this applicat a consortium agreement, and to provide	ion is complete and accurate, that the local the necessary assurances of compliance
		ISTERING AGENCY	
Administering Agency			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
Agency Administrator		Signature	
	CONSORTIUM PART	ICIPANTS / LEA / ORGANIZATION	
1. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	L
2. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	LL
3. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	L
4. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature ≽	LL
5. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	
6. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	
7. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	
8. LEA/Organization		i	Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	
9. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	
10. LEA/Organization			Date Signed Mo./Day/Yr.
District Administrator		Signature	

VI. DEMONSTRATION OF COMPLIANCE Provide Evidence

Applicants must be able to check to each of the following statements as complete. Additionally, applicants must provide evidence to support these statements in the forms provided (*DPI will accept either electronic or hardcopy materials*).

- 1. The alignment of framework and rubrics to InTASC standards and each of the following four domains: 1) Planning and preparation,
 2) Classroom environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional responsibilities. And for principal evaluation, alignment of framework and rubrics to the ISLLC standards.
- 2. The research-base supporting the model and its rubrics has valid and reliable results.
- 3. The rubrics have four performance levels with clearly delineated, observable differences betw een levels which align to the state model's performance levels.
- 4. The equivalent model includes the same minimum number and type of observations and evaluations as the state model. The equivalent model specifies how formative and summative feedback will inform the educator's professional grow th plan.
- 5. The development and implementation of a comprehensive orientation and training program for evaluators that certifies the evaluator's understanding of the evaluation model and processes, as well as inter-rater agreement. The equivalent model specifies how and when recertification will be required.
- 6. The development and implementation of ongoing processes to monitor and improve inter-rater agreement.

VII-A. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY—TEACHER RUBRIC Provide Evidence

Demonstrate Equivalence of Evaluation Standards and Rubrics with Evidence

Teacher Rubrics. The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Systemdraws upon Charlotte Danielson's Framew ork for Teaching (2011), which directly aligns to the InTASC standards (see Appendix A). In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must demonstrate direct alignment between the domains and components within the proposed tool and each of the InTASC standards, as well as the four domains as stated in Act 166.

In the Teacher Practice Rubric and InTASC Standards Comparison table below, enter your evidence in response to the InTASC Standard.

Teacher Practice Rubric

	InTASC Standards	Alternative Teacher Framework Component(s)
1.	Learner Development The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.	
2.	Learning Differences The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	
3.	Learning Environments The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	
4.	Content Knowledge The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.	
5.	Application of Content The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.	
6.	Assessment The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their ow n grow th, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	

2. Classroom Environment

4. Professional Responsibilities

3. Instruction

VII-A. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-TEACHER RUBRIC (cont'd)

Page 5

Provide Evidence InTASC Standards Alternative Teacher Framework Component(s) 7. Planning for Instruction The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon know ledge of content areas, curriculum, crossdisciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as know ledge of learners and the community context. 8. Instructional Strategies The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply know ledge in meaningful ways. 9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. 10. Leadership and Collaboration The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner grow th, and to advance the profession. Act 166 requires alternative teacher rubrics to align to the follow ing four domains: 1. Planning and preparation, 2. Classroom environment, 3. Instruction, and 4. Professional responsibilities. In the table below, show alignment of these domains. **Teacher Practice Rubric and Four Domains** Alignment Domain 1. Planning and Preparation

VII-B. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-PRINCIPAL RUBRIC Provide Evidence

Demonstrate Equivalence of Evaluation Standards and Rubrics with Evidence

Principal Rubrics. The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Systemw as also developed to align with the ISLLC standards (see Appendix B). In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must show direct alignment between the domains and elements within the proposed tool and each of the ISLLC standards.

In the Principal Practice Rubric and the 2008 ISLLC Standards Comparison table below, enter your evidence in response to the ISLLC Standard.

Demonstration of Principal Rubric Equivalence

ISLLC Standards	Alternative Principal Framework Component(s)
Standard 1	
An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stew ardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.	
Standard 2	
An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional grow th.	
Standard 3	
An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	
Standard 4	
An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	
Standard 5	
An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.	
Standard 6	
An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	

VII-C. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-MODEL'S RESEARCH BASE

Provide Evidence

$\ensuremath{\mathsf{Dem}}\xspace$ on strate the Model's Research Base with Evidence

The Design Team and work teams selected the Danielson Framew ork and its rubrics due to the research base supporting the correlation betw een performance ratings on the Danielson Framew ork and student outcomes. For example, the Gates Foundation's Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study and the Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago study conducted by the Consortium on Chicago Schools Research (CCSR) c onfirmed earlier studies by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CRPE) that the Danielson Framew ork can provide valid, reliable results, as well as a common language for formative feedback regarding educator practice. Although the principal evaluation literature is not as well developed as the teacher evaluation research base, the standards and rubrics of the principal evaluation model derives from the research available on principal and leadership effectiveness.

In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must provide citations from credible research studies, as well as the significant findings, to illustrate the research-base which supports the use of a given tool (similar to the sample provided in Appendix C).

Alternative Teacher Practice Rubrics Research Base

Year of Study	Research Title	Findings
Alternative	Principal Practice Rubrics Research Base	

Year of Study	Research Title	Findings

Page 8

VII-D. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-DETAIL WITHIN FOUR PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES Provide Evidence

Demonstrate the Detail within the Four Performance Categories with Evidence

The design team selected specific rubrics to measure teacher and principal practice due to the level of detail and valuable information provided to both evaluators and educators. Specifically, the level of detail allow s evaluators to easily identify differences between various levels of practice, as well as help educators identify specific practices which will help them improve to higher levels of practice. As such, applicants must provide evidence (i.e., rubrics) that selected rubrics offer similar levels of detail, including four or more performance levels with clearly delineated, observable differences between each level. Specifically, applicants must demonstrate that rubrics:

- Have four performance levels that are comparable to the state's categories (Note: while the category names do not need to be equivalent, the description of a Level 1 must be comparable to the state's Level 1 to ensure comparability across the state);
- Clearly differentiate across levels with distinctive, observable practices that are comparable to the state model's four levels; and
- Provide specific, observable practices to inform improvement and grow th (see sample provided in Appendix D).

Submit rubrics to demonstrate that they:

- Have four or more performance levels which are comparable to the state's levels;
- Clearly differentiate across levels with distinctive, observable practices; and
- · Provide specific, observable practices to inform improvement and grow th.

VII-E. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-WISCONSN STATE EVALUATION PROCESS Provide Evidence

Demonstrate Equivalence to the Wisconsin State Evaluation Process with Evidence

Applicants must align processes to evaluate educator practice to the state model (see Appendix E). To demonstrate alignment of the processes, applicants must submit a comprehensive Process Guide, similar to those found on the Educator Effectiveness webpage.

Submit a process guide to demonstrate that the applicant's model requires the same minimum number of observations and type of observations as the state model.

VII-F. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-COMPREHENSIVE ORIENTATONS AND TRAININGS Provide Evidence

Develop and Provide Comprehensive Orientations and Trainings with Evidence

Applicants must demonstrate that users of the system have access to comprehensive training sessions which certifies the evaluator understands the evaluation model and its processes, as well as inter-rater agreement. The training program must focus on generating consistency in the use of the system. A comprehensive orientation program addresses the following outcomes: understanding of standards, rubrics, and evidence sources; the timing, number, and type of observations; inter-rater agreement and certification; and using data from evaluations to identify professional grow th needs and improve instructional practice.

Evidence may include agendas, training outlines, facilitation manuals, and training calendars. To demonstrate equivalence of training processes, applicants must list training sessions made available to participants, intended outcomes, and participants involved, as well as identify and attach evidence sources (see sample provided in Appendix F).

Training Session	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample
			Attached to Application

PI-1656

VII-G. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY-IMPLEMENT ONGOING PROCESSESS

Provide Evidence

Develop and Implement Ongoing Processes to Monitor and Improve Inter-rater Agreement with Evidence

The design team indicated the importance of validity, reliability, and comparability within one of its guiding principles. As such, the design team noted the necessity for processes to ensure rater agreement. Using Teachscape, the online tool associated with the Wisconsin state model, evaluators can complete an online rater certification process and ongoing recalibration to help establish evaluation consistency.

Applicants for equivalency must provide evidence demonstrating a process to ensure and improve rater-agreement beyond the initial orientation and training sessions. Such evidence might include the process guide, a training calendar, facilitation manuals, and training agendas and a description of how evaluations will be monitored for consistency (e.g., simultaneous observations by two raters follow ed by debriefing sessions).

To demonstrate equivalence of rater processes, applicants must list the processes made available to participants, intended outcomes, and participants involved, as well as identify and attach evidence sources (see sample provided in Appendix G).

Process	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample
			Attached to Application
			Attached to Application