

Colorado Department of Education

Proposed Purposes for Pilot

DRAFT – June 1, 2011

Purposes of the Pilot (NOTE: must indicate when during years 1-5 questions below can be answered):

1. Validation of instruments and system as a whole:
 - a. Subject the principal evaluation instruments and the system as a whole to a rigorous test in a variety of district contexts to ensure their validity.
 - b. Subject the teacher evaluation instruments and the system as a whole to a rigorous test in a variety of district contexts to ensure their validity.

2. Inform changes to CDE's implementation process, including its training and support of districts.
 - a. Determine whether the implementation process works well with respect to the sequencing of the rollout:
 - i. What to do differently for smaller/rural districts
 - ii. What to do with districts that are at different stages of readiness for change
 - iii. Other?
 - b. Determine whether the training and support provided to district leaders, principals, teachers and community partners resulted in:
 - i. Understanding of the purpose of the system
 - ii. Ability to use the tools and instruments properly to provide feedback to educators on their performance
 - iii. Ability to manage change in a manner that enables a positive transition to the new evaluation system
 - iv. Ability to identify and facilitate changes needed at all levels of the system to root the evaluation in broader systems change

3. Student growth measures
 - a. What measures are currently being used in districts and which of those can be used for the purposes of measuring student growth for evaluations for various grades and subjects?
 - b. What new assessments need to be developed? Once developed, are they valid for the purpose of measuring student outcomes/growth to inform high stakes evaluations?

4. State Model System
 - a. What are the outcomes of the state model system with respect to:
 - i. Educator outcomes
 1. Systems are able to provide more individualized and useful feedback to educators over time.

2. Districts are using educator evaluations to facilitate meaningful, growth-producing dialogue with and among educators.
3. Educators are reporting that the process is professionally meaningful and assists them in the improvement of their practice.
4. Education professionals collaborate around improving student outcomes.
5. Educators are using data and feedback to improve teaching and learning through an on-going process of planning, assessment and improvement.
6. The pre-service training and on-going professional development of educators are aligned with each other and with the Quality Standards that inform evaluations of educator performance.
7. State and districts are experiencing greater alignment between district, school and teacher goals.
8. The quality and quantity of valid and reliable measures of educator and student performance improves for all subjects and areas.
9. Districts, schools and teachers have more access to examples of best practices, including exemplars of instructional practice, and student work over time.
10. State Resource Bank is growing and being used more by more schools.
11. Resources are being used to continuously improve the value of the evaluation system.
12. The state and districts are able to identify opportunities to improve the effectiveness of educators statewide.

ii. Student outcomes

1. Student outcomes are improving.
 2. Educators are increasing their effectiveness over time.
 3. Districts are retaining highly effective and effective educators at a greater rate than ineffective educators.
 4. Districts are increasing the number and percentage of highly effective and effective educators in high needs schools and subject areas over time.
 5. Districts are attracting, developing and retaining more highly effective educators over time.
 6. Effectiveness ratings of teachers and principals are consistent with overall student and school performance.
- b. How do these outcomes compare with outcomes in districts using their own evaluation systems?
 - c. What “critical elements” from the state requirements for evaluation systems are either redundant or missing?

5. Increase support for implementation

- a. Having minimal number of problems with the system and rollout
- b. Having pilots in districts that will be models/leaders for other similar districts