

**FY2019 REPORT TO THE IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**2017 – 2018 EVALUATION REVIEW OF CERTIFICATED EDUCATORS**

**INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to Idaho Code § 33-1004B(14), a review of a sample of teacher evaluations must be conducted annually. Effective July 1, 2015, the statute specifically requires the following:

- A review of a sample of evaluations completed by administrators shall be conducted annually to verify such evaluations are being conducted with fidelity to the state framework for teaching evaluation, *including each evaluation component as outlined in administrative rule and the rating given for each component.*
- A portion of such administrators' instructional staff and pupil service staff employee evaluations shall be independently reviewed.

The 2015-16 and 2016-17 Evaluation Reviews (summarized in the FY2017 and FY2018 Reports respectively) were conducted in two phases. The first phase assessed compliance with IDAPA 08.02.02.120 while the second phase reviewed district evaluation policy and implementation. Because districts have now had several years to get policy and processes in place, the 2017-18 on-site and desk reviews assessed these aspects simultaneously.

The FY2019 report on the findings of the 2017-2018 Evaluation Review of Certificated Educators follows.

**Background**

In response to the legislative mandate that initiated oversight by Idaho State Board of Education staff in conducting the 2015-16 Evaluation Reviews, samples of teacher evaluations and supporting evidence were collected beginning in January 2017. Phases One and Two of the Evaluation Review were completed in March 2017, and a final report was presented to the Idaho State Board of Education at the June 2017 meeting.

The FY17 report concluded that inconsistent communication from state entities compounded confusion created over time in the wake of multiple changes to Idaho's evaluation processes. As a result, not all districts were implementing all aspects of evaluation rule with fidelity – with approximately 30% of evaluations reviewed missing one or more critical elements of the evaluation requirements. To address the areas found to be consistently noncompliant, detailed recommendations were put forth in both final reports encompassing the following areas:

1. Amend IDAPA 08.02.02.120 to clarify, simplify and better align with code for instructional staff, and redefine evaluation standards for pupil service staff based upon their own professional standards
2. Make additional guidance and training available to administrators

3. Create a coalition of representatives for Idaho administrator preparation programs to define consistent measures of preparedness, including specific competencies for administrator recertification requirements
4. Create a clearinghouse of best evaluation practices to be shared across districts

Of these five strands, work was complete through the legislatures acceptance of rule changes during the 2018 Legislature regarding recommendation 1 and work has begun or is substantially complete on the remaining three recommendations. Trainings on evaluation procedures and evidence collection were conducted throughout the state from late September to late October 2017 and 2018. Feedback from the field this year were centered around similar themes as prior years.

In March 2018, superintendents were notified of the pending FY2019 review and informed on which administrators were selected from their districts. Additional information was provided on the process for collecting evidence. As with the previous reviews, the FY19 review focused on the requirements called out in IDAPA 08.02.02.120. The review requires districts to provide evidence that district evaluations meet the fidelity of the state's evaluation model outlined in administrative rule, including the following:

- (i) the evidence used in scoring teacher evaluations;
- (ii) documentation of teaching observations;
- (iii) progress in documenting teacher's individual professional learning plans;
- (iv) demonstration of growth in student achievement, and;
- (v) proof of professional practice as shown through parent or student input, or a portfolio of professional work.

The 2017-2018 Evaluation Review commenced in August 2018 with districts beginning to upload evidence for review. On-site reviews took place from the end of September 2018 through October 2018. A full desk review of remaining evaluations was completed on October 26, 2018, and reviewers discussed possible process improvements and recommendations going forward. The attached report provides the findings and recommendations from the FY2019 evaluation review process.

#### **METHODS: FY2019 EVALUTION REVIEW**

The Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) staff randomly selected 180 administrators who conducted evaluations in the 2017-2018 school year. For each administrator chosen, the district was required to upload to a secure server at least two evaluations (with relevant supporting documents) completed in 2017-2018 for both teachers and/or pupil service staff who were randomly selected by Board staff. All evaluation materials were redacted of identifying information, not only to ensure a fully blind review but also confidentiality due to the sensitive nature of the evidence being assessed. In most cases, each evaluation was assessed and scored separately by two different reviewers.

The Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) staff randomly selected 45 of the 180 LEAs, for an onsite detailed review. Each administrator was instructed to provide two evaluations from

instructional staff and/or pupil service staff for on-site review. Table 1 provides the timeline for data collection and review.

**Table 1. Timeline**

<b>State Board of Education - Evaluation Review Timeline Overview and Update</b>	
<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
3/31/2018	Sent out notification to superintendents of randomly selected administrators (102 total LEAs) notifying them which administrators were chosen for evaluation review. Email included sample evidence for districts to model as they prepared their own uploads.
8/1/2018	OSBE secure server opened for districts to upload evidence.
9/25-9/27/18	Regions I and II Training and onsite review
10/2-10/3/2018	Region III Training and onsite review
10/9-10/11/2018	Region IV Training and onsite review
10/16-10/18/2017	Regions V and VI Training and onsite review
10/23/18	Server closed and all evaluation materials and completed surveys downloaded and prepared for review and data collection.
10/24-10/26/2018	Reconvened reviewers to complete desk reviews and discuss data and anecdotal information from on-site reviews, and to assist in developing recommendations.

**Data Sources**

Board staff collected 327 files containing evaluations conducted on certificated staff through the method described above (163 of 180 administrators submitted evaluations). As with the FY17 and FY18 review, the sample of administrators chosen for review purposefully represents the distribution of school administrators by region across the state of Idaho. This sample represents approximately 20% of administrators statewide, and 20% of certificated staff. Virtual charter schools and IDLA were included in the sampling and reported based on the region in which they are based. In addition to collecting two evaluations per administrator, each administrator was asked to fill out a survey designed to gauge individual perception of preparedness in conducting evaluations, level of desire for additional training in areas related to accurate, growth-producing evaluation practice. Included among the appendices is a full list of districts involved in the review, with districts selected for on-site visits denoted in bold font (Appendix A). A copy of the Administrator’s Evaluation Feedback Survey administered during the first phase of the review is also included (Appendix B). The key purpose of the on-site visits was to record qualitative data, as supplied by district office personnel and administrators, regarding implementation of - and fidelity to - the state framework for evaluation. In addition to reviewers’ notes, feedback was captured in a survey completed by the teachers evaluated by administrators. Completion of surveys for teachers was entirely voluntary. This survey instrument for teachers is included in this report as Appendix C.

### **Review process**

A team of 15 experienced educators from across Idaho participated in the review, including current and past superintendents, district leaders, principals, and faculty from Idaho educator preparation programs. A list of reviewers is included as Appendix D. The criteria for reviewing the evaluation documents was drawn directly from IDAPA 08.02.02.120 and Idaho Code § 33-1004B(14) for both instructional personnel and pupil service personnel, as applicable.

The purpose of the desk review, was for each reviewer to assess administrator compliance in conducting evaluations in the following areas: completeness in assigning a score for each of the 22 components of the state framework; reported dates of two documented observations; compliance in using at least one other district-selected measure to inform professional practice; and reported measure(s) of student achievement. A graphic of the content and rationale for each aspect reviewed in this part of the process is included as Appendix E. The process initiated last year was continued, in which all evaluations were blind reviewed by two separate reviewers, with discrepancies being resolved by a third reviewer.

For onsite visits, a volunteer subset of the 15 member team responsible for conducting the desk reviews participated. The purpose of onsite visits was for each reviewer to not only assess administrator compliance, but also to capture feedback and recommendations from practitioners closest to the evaluation process. Teachers voluntarily participated in surveys to assist reviewers in better understanding the implementation of district evaluation policies. During on-site visits, district leaders were interviewed to better understand strengths and challenges in practice.

### **Reliability of Reviewers**

To ensure accuracy and reliability among raters, all reviewers participating were chosen based upon their current knowledge and use of the state's evaluation framework. The team participated in a three-hour training session reviewing the criteria, discussing state requirements, and participating in calibration activities. Five sample evaluations were chosen for review. Each reviewer evaluated the samples independently, then in a small group lead by veteran reviewers. The entire team then discussed the samples and compared ratings. Training included clarifying conversations about current requirements, and opportunities throughout the three-day review to recalibrate, both in small group and full group discussions, as anomalies arose.

### **Data Analysis**

Data presented here regarding compliance in evaluation practice consists of the total number and percentages of compliant elements required for instructional staff and pupil service staff evaluations (n=327) as submitted by district administrators. These elements include components of the state framework for evaluation, dates of documented observations, measures of professional practice and student achievement.

Data from the Evaluation Feedback Survey (Appendix B) provides an overview of the perceptions of the selected administrators related to their preparedness in conducting evaluations and their desire for additional training.

Data from surveys completed by teachers (Appendix C) is also included for the purpose of exploring teacher understanding of district policy, and perceptions on evaluation as a means for professional growth.

**FINDINGS**


The findings presented here are based upon the criteria for completing evaluations of certificated personnel called out in IDAPA 08.02.02.120 to determine compliance with state law. These include:

- Use of the state framework which is comprised of 22 components;
- Two documented observations, the first conducted prior to January 1;
- A measure of professional practice such as portfolio or student/parent feedback, and;
- District/teacher selected measure of student performance.

**Data Specific to Compliance with IDAPA 08.02.02.120**

*Compliance – Evaluations meeting all IDAPA requirements*

*Figure 1. Evaluations meeting all areas of compliance required by the state*



Overall compliance increased significantly for instructional staff from 56% in FY2017 to 71% in FY2018 upon clarification of Board Rule for evaluation scoring and documented evidence. There was a low rate of compliance for pupil service staff evaluations due to the transition from requiring the instructional staff evaluation framework to allowing school districts to use performance standards adopted from individual professional organizations.


While a larger number of pupil service staff evaluations were not compliant, most reviewers agreed that the evaluations were being conducted substantively and effectively. Looking at compliance disaggregated by

region, however, the increased number of compliant evaluations for instructional staff is in no way consistent across the state:


**Figure 2. Scores by Component for Instructional Staff**

Compliance increased slightly from 79% in FY18 to 84% in FY19 for instructional staff evaluations. Pupil service staff indicate a much lower level of compliance with rating all 22 components.

Figure 2: Evaluations in which all 22 components of the framework were rated




**Figure 3. Scores by component for Instructional Staff**




Consistent with the FY2017 and FY2018 results, Component 3b-Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, is the area in which the majority of instructional staff struggle the most along with the addition of Component 2c-Managing Classroom Procedures. This certainly can be seen as an area for increased preparation and professional development opportunities.

**Figure 4. Scores by component for Pupil Service Staff**




Component 1a-Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy is the area in which the majority of pupil service staff struggle the most. This certainly can be seen as an area professional development opportunities, but may also be a function of the difficulty for to districts to accurately assess pupil service staff.

**Figure 4. Evaluations based upon a minimum of two documented observations (n=327)**




The increase in compliance for this requirement, up from 74%, most likely reflects increased awareness that documentation of observations would be collected. By the time the FY17 evaluation review began, many districts had destroyed evaluation evidence from the previous year. Because district leaders were notified of the FY19 Review prior to the end of the school year, those documents were not destroyed.

**Figure 5. Evaluations including at least one district selected measure of performance (n=327)**



**Figure 6. Evaluations including at least one measure of student performance (n=327)**






In summary, the slight improvement in overall compliance, represented by a 5% increase from the FY17 to the FY18 Review, likely has more to do with greater awareness in reporting than significant change in practice.

Looking at compliance disaggregated by region, however, the increased number of compliant evaluations for instructional staff is in no way consistent across the state:

**Figure 7. Evaluations meeting all areas of compliance required by the region (n=327)**



In summary, Regions 1,3,4, and 5 are above the state average in overall compliance.

**Data Specific to Implementation of Evaluation and Related Professional Learning**

***Evaluation Feedback Survey (Administrators) - Results***

Of the 163 administrators who participated in the review, 31% responded to the Evaluation Feedback Survey (n=52). Their geographic distribution indicates a fairly representative sample. While the absolute validity of these survey results must be considered in light of potential response bias, administrator feedback collected through the FY2019 survey instrument remained consistent with information collected through last year’s survey and two years of onsite visit interviews:

- 100% of administrators indicated that they regularly collected performance evidence to support evaluations, with 94% indicating they were confident in their ability to interpret and accurately rate performance evidence. 27% of administrators responded that they would like additional support/training in using evidence to accurately evaluate teachers

- 96% indicated that they regularly engaged in professional conversations about teacher practice stemming from observations/evaluation, with 56% responding that they would like additional support/training in facilitating those conversations.
- 88% of administrators believe evaluations of staff professional practice are completely or mostly accurate, though only 77% believe that the measure of staff impact on student success is completely or mostly accurate.


Figure 8a provides information on areas in which administrators would like additional support:

***Evaluation Feedback Survey (Teachers) - Results***

Teachers who were evaluated in 2017-18 by administrators chosen for review were sent the Evaluation Feedback survey. Unlike the survey for administrators, teacher surveys were completely anonymous, and participation was voluntary. Respondents (n=596) provided input on implementation of evaluation practice in their district and indicated areas for future professional learning in evaluation. Results were slightly stronger than those in the FY2017 report and are as follows:

- 91% of teachers indicated confidence in their ability to provide evidence to support an accurate evaluation of each of the 22 components up from 74%, though 53% reported a desire for more training in this area.
- 92% of teachers reported their administrators regularly collected evaluation evidence, up from 73% in 2016-17.
- 84% of teachers, up from 73%, reported their administrators regularly engaged with them in professional conversations about their practice
- Unlike the 88% of administrators who believe evaluations of staff professional practice are completely or mostly accurate, only 71% of staff agree. Compared to 77% of administrators, only 58% certificated staff believe that the measure of their impact on student success is completely or mostly accurate.

**Figure 8. Areas related to evaluation in which administrators and staff would welcome additional support and training**



In summary, the FY2018 evaluation review represent dramatic improvement in the percentage of compliant evaluations statewide. Except for Region 6 evaluations, overall compliance is much higher as a result of trainings and clarifying rule changes. In light of feedback from both administrators participating in the review and those who conducted the reviews, however, further clarification may still be necessary to further increase consistency and fidelity in evaluation practice.

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

The two previous reports determined that inconsistent communication from state entities compounded confusion created over time in the wake of multiple changes to Idaho’s evaluation processes. As a result, not all districts were implementing all aspects of evaluation rule with fidelity - with approximately 40% of evaluations reviewed missing one or more critical elements of the evaluation requirements.

Changes to Board Rule on evaluation were put into temporary rule in fall 2017. Trainings on evaluation procedures and evidence collection were conducted throughout the state from late September to late October 2018, and an administrator recertification course addressing all aspects of evaluation requirements is in development and will be launched in spring 2019.

**Conclusion**

As was the case in the FY2017 and FY2018 report, the vast majority of districts leaders are striving to improve evaluation processes for their districts and within their buildings. Following two years of rule clarification and training, 71% of the evaluations of certificated instructional staff are compliant with Idaho rule and statute, equating to a 20% increase in compliance since 2017. During the FY2019 Review administrators restated the need for consistency and support from all state level agencies, and reiterated their desire to ensure that evaluation process emphasizes professional growth and continuous improvement, in addition to accountability.


OFFICE OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION - STATUTORY EVALUATION REVIEW

DATA COLLECTION

**RANDOMLY SELECTED ADMINISTRATORS FROM IDAHO PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS**


- Administrators provide evaluations representing a variety of certificated staff (self-selected during onsite visits to display a range of performance levels)
- Evaluations and supporting documents reviewed (onsite reviews included qualitative data collection: discussion of practice, support, and needs)
- All identifying staff information redacted for confidentiality in all cases

**ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHER SURVEYS Completed** to capture multiple perspectives and needs assessment



**REVIEWERS**

- Practitioners with verified knowledge of Idaho's evaluation requirements
- Responsible for signing a confidentiality agreement prior to service
- During onsite reviews, recorded feedback from both district leaders and administrators on challenges and strengths related to evaluation



**Statutorily Required Review of Domains and Components**  
 IDAPA RULE 08.02.02.120  
 Compliance

**Review of Compliance with Evaluation Rule**  
 IDAPA 08.02.02.120

**Data to Inform Clarity of Process and Fidelity of Practice**  
 Idaho Code § 33-1004B and Evaluation Rule 08.02.02.120