



TO: Dr. Greg Baker  
 FROM: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project (TPEP) Work Group  
 RE: District Instructional Framework Adoption Recommendation  
 DATE: December 5, 2012

**Background—TPEP and the Instructional Frameworks**

Washington State recently passed legislation requiring school districts to implement a new evaluation system for all teachers and principals beginning in 2013-14. This new system is intended to provide consistent, meaningful feedback to educators that will more effectively promote continuous professional growth. The process of transition to this new evaluation system is referred to as TPEP—the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Project.

There are many decisions that have already been made by the state. These include:

- Eight new evaluation criteria for teachers and principals
- Four-tiered rating system instead of the existing two-tiered system
- All school districts in Washington state using the new evaluation system for certificated staff and principals in 2013-14, with full implementation by 2015-16

One of the decisions that must be made at the district level is the adoption of an instructional framework. An instructional framework provides a common language that is shared by everyone in the district to create a common understanding about effective teaching, to give and receive feedback, and to collect and act upon data to monitor growth.

Washington State has selected three instructional frameworks from which to choose that are aligned with the eight new teacher evaluation criteria:

- Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching
- Robert Marzano’s Teacher Evaluation Model
- The University of Washington’s Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) 5 Dimensions +

**Timeline for the Process Leading to Selecting an Instructional Framework:**

<b>September 2012</b>	
Sept. 11	<b>1<sup>st</sup> TPEP Work Group Meeting at ESD 189</b> —The TPEP Work Group is a team of 12 teachers, administrators and labor association leaders participating in monthly professional development at ESD 189 through a Regional Implementation Grant (RIG.) At this meeting we learned about the TPEP legislation and the 8 new evaluation criteria for teachers and principals.
Sept. 20	<b>1<sup>st</sup> TPEP Information Presentation to BEA Leadership</b> —TPEP Work Group members presented about TPEP legislation and the 8 new evaluation criteria for teachers and principals.
<b>October 2012</b>	
Oct. 4	<b>1<sup>st</sup> TPEP Information Session for District Leadership Team</b> —TPEP Work Group members presented to the district leadership team a TPEP overview, information about TPEP legislation and the 8 new evaluation criteria for teachers and principals.
Oct. 5	<b>TPEP information session</b> sponsored by the Anacortes School District. Four TPEP Work Group members attended. Anacortes, as an original TPEP pilot district, has already gone through the instructional framework adoption process.

Oct. 3-17	<b>The TPEP Advisory Committee was formed.</b> This committee consists of more than 30 members including students, parents, labor association leaders, and staff representing 22 schools and central services. The specific purpose of the committee is to learn about and facilitate communication regarding the new state-mandated teacher and principal evaluation system with stakeholders throughout the system.
Oct. 24	<b>1<sup>st</sup> TPEP Advisory Committee Meeting</b> —TPEP Work Group members gave an overview of TPEP legislation and the 8 new teacher and principal evaluation criteria.
Oct. 25- Nov. 14	<b>TPEP Advisory Committee follow-up communication with stake holders</b> —Each committee member shared a TPEP overview PowerPoint with their staff, went over the 8 new evaluation criteria, and gathered concerns from teachers, reported in the TPEP Advisory Communications Survey. Most prevalent questions were about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Student Growth</li> <li>• Teacher Data Collection</li> <li>• Work Load associate with the new evaluation system (Teachers and Principals)</li> <li>• Evaluation of Specialists</li> </ul>
Oct. 29	<b>2nd TPEP Work Group Meeting at ESD 189</b> —The team learned about the three instructional frameworks and the on-line eVAL tool for collecting and recording evaluation data and artifacts. The team was expected to decide on a framework for our district by noon, but we decided we needed more information and time to process with our district stakeholders. We spent the week doing research.
<b>November 2012</b>	
Nov. 1	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> TPEP Information Session for District Leadership Team</b> —TPEP Work Group members presented to the district leadership team about the student growth component of teacher evaluations, and introduced the on-line eVAL data collection tool.
Nov. 2	<b>TPEP Work Group extra meeting</b> —Team members shared additional information they had gathered about the instructional frameworks. UW CEL 5D+ emerged as the best choice for our district.
Nov. 9	<b>1<sup>st</sup> TPEP Advisory Committee district-wide update</b> —This message was sent via e-mail to all district staff. It summarized what decisions have already been made by the state regarding the new teacher and principal evaluation system, and which decisions will be made at the district level.
Nov. 14	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> TPEP Advisory Committee meeting</b> —The TPEP Work Group shared information about the instructional framework selection process and the reasons why the group was leaning toward the UW CEL 5D+ framework. We gathered questions and concerns about what the Work Group may have missed in the decision-making process.
Nov. 15- Nov. 20	<b>TPEP Advisory Committee follow-up communication with stake holders</b> —Each committee member sent out an e-mail to staff summarizing the rationale for the consideration of recommending the UW CEL 5D+ instructional framework, and they followed up with building walk-throughs to connect with teachers one-on-one to see what questions or concerns they had.
Nov. 20	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> TPEP Advisory Committee district-wide update</b> —This message summarized the reasons for recommending the UW CEL 5D framework and included two survey questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What questions do you have about TPEP or the instructional frameworks?</li> <li>2. What concerns, if any, do you have with adopting the UW-CEL 5D+ framework?</li> </ol> Thirty six people responded to the survey. There was 1 comment that expressed concern specifically about the UW CEL 5D framework and 12 comments that were specifically in favor of the choice. Most of the questions and concerns had to do not with the framework selection, but with the evaluation process more generally. Common themes included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• Time/Workload required for teachers and principals</li> <li>• The use of test scores as part of teacher and principal evaluations</li> </ul>
Nov. 26, Nov. 28	<b>District-Wide TPEP Information Meetings</b> —These meetings provided an opportunity for district staff and community members to learn more about TPEP in general and about the instructional framework selection process specifically. Each meeting had 7 attendees, most of whom were members of the TPEP work group. The low attendance led the team to believe that people either feel well-informed about TPEP, or that learning more about it is not a high priority for staff at this time.

Nov. 27	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> TPEP Work Group Meeting at ESD 189</b> —The group learned about the AWSP Leadership Framework and more about the on-line eVAL tool for data collection.
<b>December 2012</b>	
Dec. 3	<b>AWSP Information Session on Principal Evaluation</b>
Dec. 5	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> TPEP Advisory Committee Meeting</b>
Dec. 12	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> TPEP Information Presentation to BEA Leadership</b>
Dec. 13	<b>School Board Meeting</b>

### **Instructional Framework Adoption Recommendation**

The district TPEP Work Group analyzed all three frameworks and learned that each offers a detailed and helpful description of what effective teaching looks like. In addition, each framework has a strong research base and is well aligned with the new state evaluation criteria.

While all of the frameworks are useful, there are significant differences between the frameworks in the areas of professional development support and alignment to our district's work:

- Of the three frameworks, the UW-CEL 5D+ has the strongest level of training support for professional development.
- The majority of districts in our region have adopted the UW CEL's 5D framework, enhancing our ability to collaborate around professional development.
- UW CEL's 5D+ framework represented the tightest alignment with district wide priorities, ongoing initiatives, and student outcomes described in The Bellingham Promise.
- The associated rubrics promote teacher self-reflection and support goal-setting.

In the feedback that was collected by TPEP Advisory Committee members during staff meetings, through e-mail, via face to face conversations, on-line surveys, and district-wide information sessions, district staff either expressed no preference regarding the instructional framework adoption or indicated that they were in favor of adopting the UW CEL 5D+ model.

For these reasons, the TPEP Work Group is recommending to the superintendent that Bellingham Public Schools adopt the UW CEL 5D+ as its instructional framework.

Sincerely,

#### The TPEP Work Group:

Julie Batten: Teacher, Geneva Elementary

Amy Carder: Program Administrator, DTL

Erin Gaulding: Teacher, Shuksan Middle School

Trina Hall: Program Administrator, DTL

Hank Harris: Executive Director of Human Resources

Michelle Kuss-Cybula: Principal, Fairhaven Middle School/BAO Vice President

Shirley Potter: BEA President

Brian Rick: Research and Assessment Director, DTL

Sara Strommer: Teacher, Shuksan Middle School/BEA Leadership Team

Ginger Thompson: Teacher, Sehome High School/BEA Leadership Team

Tom Venable: Deputy Superintendent

Matt Whitten: Principal, Geneva Elementary