

Chapter PI 47

EQUIVALENCY PROCESS FOR EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

PI 47.01 Purpose.
PI 47.02 Definitions.
PI 47.03 General requirements for applicants.

PI 47.04 General requirements for department.
PI 47.05 Corrective action.

PI 47.01 Purpose. (1) The state educator effectiveness system evaluates educators based on two components: educator practice and student outcomes. The department recognizes that any one model for evaluating educator practice might not suit every school district or charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats. Therefore, the department has developed an application process for school districts, consortia of school districts, and charter schools established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats., that wish to use alternative models to measure teacher and principal practice.

(2) Under s. 115.415 (3), Stats., the department must evaluate for approval any alternative model from a school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats. This chapter establishes the process by which an alternative model may be approved based on its alignment with the state standards.

History: CR 13-024: cr. Register November 2013 No. 695, eff. 12-1-13.

PI 47.02 Definitions. In this chapter:

(1) “Alternative model” means an alternative process for the evaluation of teacher and principal practice that is aligned to the state educator effectiveness model.

(2) “Department” means the Wisconsin department of public instruction.

(3) “Participant” means a school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats., whose alternative model has been approved by the department.

(4) “Principal” means the individual who serves as the administrator of a school.

(5) “Public schools” has the meaning defined in s. 115.01 (1), Stats.

(6) “Rubrics” means the tool supporting systematic, objective evaluation of educator practice during an observation of educator practice.

(7) “School district” has the meaning defined in s. 115.01 (3), Stats.

(8) “School year” has the meaning defined in s. 115.001 (13), Stats.

(9) “State educator effectiveness model” means the model for evaluating educator practice that is part of the state educator effectiveness system.

(10) “Teacher” means any employee engaged in the exercise of any educational function for compensation in the public schools, including charter schools as defined in s. 115.001 (1), Stats., whose primary responsibilities include all of the following:

- (a) Instructional planning and preparation.
- (b) Managing a classroom environment.
- (c) Pupil instruction.

History: CR 13.024: cr. Register November 2013 No. 695, eff. 12-1-13.

PI 47.03 General requirements for applicants. (1) **ELIGIBILITY.** Any school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats., may notify the state superintendent in writing of its intent to apply for a review of a proposed alternative model.

(2) **APPLICATION DEMONSTRATIONS.** As part of the review process, applicants shall demonstrate the following:

(a) For the teacher evaluation model, the alignment of framework and rubrics to the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards and to each of the following four domains:

1. Planning and preparation.
2. Classroom environment.
3. Instruction.
4. Professional responsibilities.

(b) For the principal evaluation model, the alignment of framework and rubrics to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards.

(c) For the evaluation of both teachers and principals:

1. The research base supporting the alternative model and its rubrics have valid and reliable results.
2. The rubrics have four performance levels with clearly delineated, observable differences between levels which align to the state educator effectiveness model’s performance levels.
3. The alternative model includes the same minimum number and type of observations and evaluations as the state educator effectiveness model.
4. The alternative model specifies how formative and summative feedback will inform the educator’s professional growth plan.
5. The alternative model includes 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 and supports consistency among evaluators. The alternative model also specifies how and when evaluator recertification will be required.
6. The alternative model includes the development and implementation of ongoing processes to monitor and improve consistency among evaluators.

(3) **ASSURANCES.** As part of the review process for alternative models, applicants shall agree to the following:

(a) Applicants shall report teacher-level, school-level, and district-level data required by the department within guidelines established by the department.

(b) Applicants shall transfer data electronically to the department according to the methods prescribed by the department.

(c) Applicants shall annually participate in a statewide evaluation conducted by an independent, non-biased external evaluator chosen by the department.

(d) Applicants shall implement any corrective actions re-

quired by the department if the department determines there is credible evidence indicating that a school, school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats., is no longer in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

(4) TIMELINE. Applicants shall meet the following deadlines in the year preceding the school year in which the alternative model is intended to be used in order to be considered for approval by the department:

(a) Any school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), Stats., that is planning to submit an application for an alternative model shall provide written notification to the department of its intention on or before January 15. The notification shall include the name and contact information for the staff member responsible for the application.

(b) Applicants shall submit all applications on or before March 15. Applications shall include a completed Equivalency Review Process Application form and all supporting evidence to the department.

Note: The Equivalency Review Process Application form may be obtained at no charge from the Department of Public Instruction, Educator Effectiveness Team, P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841.

(5) RE-APPROVAL. A participant shall reapply for approval for the following school year if its alternative model is modified or the requirements under this chapter are changed. The department shall provide notice to all participants if the requirements of this chapter are changed.

History: CR 13-024: cr. Register November 2013 No. 695, eff. 12-1-13.

PI 47.04 General requirements for department. (1)

The department shall make the final decision of whether to approve an alternative model. The department may engage external stakeholders to participate in the review process.

(2) The department shall notify an applicant in writing of the status of that applicant's alternative model on or before April 15 in the year preceding the school year in which the alternative model is intended to be used.

(3) If the department does not approve an application, an applicant will have an opportunity to submit additional evidence and supporting documents until May 15. If the department does not approve the application by June 15, the applicant shall continue implementing the state educator effectiveness model or join and implement a participant's alternative model within the timeframe prescribed by the department. The applicant may reapply the following year.

History: CR 13-024: cr. Register November 2013 No. 695, eff. 12-1-13.

PI 47.05 Corrective action. (1) The department may order a participant to implement corrective action specified by the department if the department determines one of the following:

(a) There is credible evidence indicating that a participant is no longer in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

(b) The participant's model produces unreliable or inconsistent results.

(2) If a participant fails to implement all corrective actions in the timeline specified by the department, the department may rescind approval of that participant's alternative model.

(3) If the department rescinds approval of a participant's alternative model, the participant shall adopt the state educator effectiveness model or join and implement another participant's alternative model within the timeframe prescribed by the department. The participant may reapply the following year.

History: CR 13-024: cr. Register November 2013 No. 695, eff. 12-1-13.