SFSF Phase II State Plan

Appendix A

Descriptors and Indicators covered in this Appendix:

Descriptor (a)(1): Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Indicator (a)(3): Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Indicator (a)(4): Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Indicator (a)(5): Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.

Descriptor (a)(2): Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Indicator (a)(6): Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Indicator (a)(7): Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

State Plan Author: Erika Lomax

State Plan Development Date: Revised March 17, 2011

Part 1: Action Plan

The vision for evaluation is to catalyze development of strong systems for human capital management, taking into account the starting point of each LEA. For example, DCPS is considered a leading district in the realm of teacher evaluation as a result of its IMPACT system, a system which uses student growth data for teacher evaluation and human capital decisions, and its Teaching and Learning Framework, a rubric-based framework that outlines teacher competencies for effective planning, teaching, and improvement. IMPACT is a system for evaluation that combines teacher performance based on student growth with performance on

aspects of the Teaching and Learning Framework and other indicators to generate a score for effectiveness.

On the other hand, most charter LEAs, in contrast, are at a different point in their evolution. In addition to building student-level data systems, charter LEAs need support in developing evaluations linked to a newly defined growth measure and in building robust systems for managing their workforce. As a result, the Performance Management Framework (PMF) of the Public Charter School Board was introduced in January 2009 as a pilot and is currently being rolled out. The PMF was designed to create a consistent measure of quality performance of teacher and principals across charter schools.

OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data on its Educator Quality Data and Reporting web page. We will use the same process to publically report responses to the descriptors and indicators outlined above. Based on the two performance evaluation systems, the information that is generated and reported into the Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS)* will provide more promising data that can better inform human capital decisions regarding teacher or principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

The following timeline provides a schedule for the development of the EQAS:

#	Milestone	Due Date	Responsible Office	Potential Obstacles	Cost	Funding Source (Federal, State, Local)	Status
1	Inform LEAs of plans to collect teacher evaluation data via the Employed Educator Report (EER)* for SY 2009-10	January 2010	Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) at OSSE	N/A	None	N/A	Completed January 2010
2	Assess current LEA ability to provide responses to the required descriptor	January 2010	OELA at OSSE	N/A	None	N/A	Completed January 2010
3	Release web-based EER system (To be referred to as EQAS herein) inclusive of teacher evaluation data requests (SY 2009-10 will serve as pilot year for	April 2010	OELA at OSSE; Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO)	OELA budget would need to be appropriately loaded to establish procurement authority for needed	See budget breakout	Local	Budget not fully loaded. Data were collected via the EER (released May 2010). EQAS release now

	the collection of evaluation related data)			services to create a web-based data collection tool			scheduled for November 2011.
4	Preliminary EQAS information due from LEAs	June 2010	OELA at OSSE	Compliance Issues for LEAs that do not submit their data.	None	N/A	Completed June 2010. Data were collected via the EER.
5	EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE	July 2010	OELA at OSSE	None	None	N/A	Completed September 2010.
6	Final EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation responses)	August 2010	OELA at OSSE	Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit	None	N/A	Completed September 2010.
7	Make necessary adjustments to the EQAS based on feedback received during the 2009-10 reporting year	October 2010	OELA at OSSE	None	See budget breakout	Local	EQAS release now scheduled for November 2011.
8	Release SY 2010-11 EQAS	November 2010	OELA at OSSE	None	None	N/A	Budget not fully loaded. EQAS release now scheduled for November 2011.
9	Preliminary EQAS information due from LEAs	June 2011	OELA at OSSE	Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit	None	N/A	On schedule to collect data via the EER.
10	EQAS validation to be conducted by OSSE	July 2011	OELA at OSSE	None	None	N/A	
11	Final EQAS data due from LEAs (to permit the inclusion of year-end DC-CAS results in evaluation	August 2011	OELA at OSSE	Compliance issues for LEAs that do not submit	None	N/A	

	responses)						
12	Publically report EQAS results inclusive of teacher/principal evaluation data	September	OELA at OSSE; OCTO	None	None	N/A	

*OSSE currently collects educator quality data via the annual Employed Educator Report (EER) that serves as the foundation for collecting highly qualified teacher data, as well as data on other school-based instructional staff including school administrators, service providers and paraprofessionals. The EER provides the state with educator experience, licensure, assignment and qualification data to name a few. We are in the process of moving the EER from an Excel spreadsheet to a web-based environment (referred to as the Educator Quality Assessment System (EQAS) in an effort to reduce collection burden on LEAs and reporting burden on OSSE staff. Since the EER (soon to be EQAS) is the known vehicle to LEAs for the collection of educator quality data, OSSE plans to include the descriptors and indicators above in the 2009-10 EER collection process.

Part 2: General Requirements

(A) *Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks.*

Agency	Description of Agency's Involvement	Capacity
OSSE/OELA	The Office of Educator Licensure and Accreditation (OELA) is the primary office responsible for collecting and disseminating educator quality data.	OELA brings program and data collection requirement expertise to the project while OCTO brings technological expertise to the project. OELA has collected statewide educator quality data since 2002 and therefore has significant institutional knowledge of educator quality reporting requirements.
OSSE/Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and OCTO	OCIO and OCTO are the primary offices responsible for technology applications and website updating.	OCTO is the citywide office that manages all significant technological builds and serves as the gatekeeper on these projects to avoid duplication of effort among various agencies, as well as provides information on the city's infrastructure and ability to meet agency technology needs.

(B) *Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support.*

Agency	Description of Agency's Involvement
Vendor to be selected	Will build the EQAS reporting system.

(C) *Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan.*

Item/ Category	Cost	Funding Source (Federal, State, or Local)
Creation of EQAS	Qty Rate x mo. Cost	Title II-A State Activity funds and local funds
Project Manager	1 $125 x 8 = $220,000	
Business Analyst	2 $100 x 7 = $224,000	
Solution Architect	1 $130 x 8 = $166,400	
Database Administrator	1 $ 95 x 5 = $ 76,000	
Technical Writer	1 $ 75 x 6 = $ 72,000	
Software Developer	2 $ 95 x 3 = $ 91,200	
OCM Specialist	1 $100 x 5 = $ 80,000	
Integration Developer	1 $115 x 3 = $ 55,200	

(C) *Describe the way the State will publically report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).*

Per the ESEA report card requirements for states, LEAs and schools, OSSE currently publically reports highly qualified teacher data on its Educator Quality Data and Reporting web page.

Method(s) for Publicly Reporting the Plan and the State's Progress Reports on its Plans	Means	Frequency (i.e. quarterly, semi-annually, specific dates)	Website Address
OELA will provide implementation updates.	OELA will provide implementation updates on OSSE's SFSF web page.	Quarterly	http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1222,Q,564028,PM,1,seoNav,%7C31195%7C.asp

Part 3: Plan Element Verification (applicable for assurances A, C (except C11 & C12), and D)

Please fill out the following chart to indicate whether your state plan addresses how the State will collect and/or publicly report data.

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
Descriptor (a)(1)	X	X
Indicator (a)(3)	X	X
Indicator (a)(4)	X	X
Indicator (a)(5)	X	X
Descriptor (a)(2)	X	X
Indicator (a)(6)	X	X
Indicator (a)(7)	X	X